

A
WRITTEN **DISCUSSION**
ON THE
BIBLE SCHOOL

BETWEEN

DANIEL SOMMER

Editor of *The Octographic Review*

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

and

J. N. ARMSTRONG

President of Western Bible and Literary College

ODESSA, MO



1908

"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

Some questions P. 56

Oct 1919

The school does a better work P. 9, 125
purpose of the school P. P. 12, 33, 36, 43
11, 2, 12

School a soul saving institution P. 20

WRITTEN DISCUSSION
Scriptural authority of the school P. 21

Church the Bible School
only institution, etc P. 32

Armstrong has lost sight of the church P. 34

BETWEEN
No biblical authority for the school P. 49

School & Review compared P. 54, 68, 69
DANIEL SOMMER

Admits School is not wholly religious P. 65
Editor of The Octographic Review
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Admits he thinks human organizations
better than the divine P. 65

His salvation depends ^{and} on his gift to
the school P. 76

He who sends to other schools sin P. 82
N. ARMSTRONG

In no other way can we go back to Jerusalem P. 98
President of Western Bible and Literary College
ODESSA, MO.

School offers the most effectual opport-
unity to teach the Bible P. 146

Denies then admits teaching ungodly
fiction P. 208

1908 "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."

Sommer-Armstrong Discussion.

A DISCUSSION CONCERNING THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS
OF ESTABLISHING RELIGIO-SECULAR SCHOOLS
WITH THE LORD'S MONEY.

FIRST ESSAY.

"But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." 1 Tim. 5:8. "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Matt. 22:21. "For this cause pay ye tribute also." Rom. 13:6. "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." 1 Cor. 16:2.

The several scriptures just cited set forth the threefold financial obligations of Christians, namely, *to their own dependent ones, to Caesar—civil government—and to God—the cause of Christ*. Our own dependent ones must be provided for, and Caesar must be paid what he exacts. If when this is done there is nothing left then we have not been prospered, and therefore we are not required to give anything to the Lord's cause. The Lord does not require us to give him what our dependent ones really *need*, nor what Caesar *exact*s. But all that those dependent on us for support *do not need*, and which Caesar *does not exact* certainly *constitutes our prosperity*. Supporting our dependent ones and paying Caesar what he exacts will be all that the Lord will require of us if that be

all that we can do, after exercising due diligence and economy. God would not receive from the Jew as a gift to him what was due to parents (Mark 7:10-13), and he does not require that we as Christians shall give him what is due to parents or to any other dependent ones of our house, nor what is due to the civil government under which we live. To the Jew he said, "I hate robbery for burnt offering." (Isa. 61:8), and there is no evidence that he has ever changed his sentence on that subject.

Having stated what is due from Christians to those dependent on them, and what is due from Christians to civil governments, so that those obligations cannot be misunderstood, and having distinguished such obligations from those that are directly due from Christians to the Lord's cause, so that the distinction cannot be misunderstood, we are now ready to proceed. In so doing we quote, "For I mean not that other men be eased, and ye burdened, but by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want; that there may be an equality: As it is written, 'He that had gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack.'" 2 Cor. 8:13-15. This last statement of what has just been quoted from Paul was cited by him from Exodus, 16th chapter. There we learn that in gathering manna the Israelites were required to gather the same amount for every man, and to leave none of it over till the next morning. To that record Paul refers the Christians at Corinth when writing to them on the doctrine of "equality." That doctrine faithfully observed by disciples of Christ during the first half of the 19th century would have made the building of Bethany College *impossible*. Had that doctrine been faithfully observed till the present no other religio-secular school would have been founded by any disciple of Christ, unless as a means for the support of himself and his family. Certainly no such school would have been founded as a church institution. No imagination is sufficiently fertile to conceive the possibility of even so much as a thousand dollars of surplus money being in the hands of any Christian long enough for that one to think of founding with that sum a religio-secular school—a school three-fourths or more secular and one-fourth or less religious—if the doctrine of "equality," as set forth in the New Testament be faithfully obeyed. If we imagine that the death of a relative might

leave us with one thousand, or a hundred thousand dollars on hand that we do not need for ourselves, and which Caesar has no right to demand, the New Testament tells us what to do with it all. When disciples, for a time, at Jerusalem were so zealous that they gave not only their prosperity, but all their wealth, to Christ, they "laid it at the apostles' feet." Among the Gentile churches such zeal seems not to have prevailed, but they were commanded to give on the first day of the week as the Lord had prospered them. Beyond this precept an approved example of personal giving is recorded in 1 Cor. 16:17, where Paul said, "I am glad of the coming of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus: for that which was lacking on your part they have supplied." But in such giving there is not the slightest implication nor intimation, reference nor hint, in the direction of establishing a religio-secular institution.

Years ago a professed disciple had a business transaction with a man who overpaid him to the amount of five dollars. He seemed not to know what to do with that sum, but, after serious reflection he decided "to buy a Bible with it"! Well, we have all had business transactions with the Lord as well as with men. Now suppose that the Lord overpays us, or prospers us more than we need or deserve, to the amount of a thousand dollars or more. Shall we give it back to him in his own divinely appointed way, or shall we buy or build a religio-secular school with it? The reader will justly say that the mentioned professed disciple should have given the five dollars which he had been overpaid back to the man who had overpaid him. The same just judgment will decide that all disciples whom the Lord has prospered with a surplus, beyond what they need for their dependent ones and beyond what Caesar has the right to exact, *should give that surplus back to the Lord* in the way that he has directed in his word by precepts and examples therein recorded.

But have not Christians a right to teach school? That depends on the Christians. If they need to do something for a living, and school teaching be the best secular calling in which they can engage, we admit that they have a right to teach school, provided they are sufficiently capable and willing, and thus will not cheat pupils, parents nor the State. Well, have not Christians who are competent and willing to teach school a right to teach their pupils

the Bible? That depends on the time which they take to teach the Bible. They have no right to take any time which the county or state engages for teaching secular things and devote that time to teaching the Bible, unless there be special stipulation to that effect on the subject. We knew a teacher, who, by consent of the parents, assembled his school a few minutes earlier each morning than the law requires in order to have time for religious services. Only by such a plan, or some other to the same effect, can school teachers in the school houses where they are employed to teach secular knowledge scripturally have religious services with the children whom they instruct. A man might as well, so far as the moral feature of it is concerned, think of trying to pay a part of his taxes by putting that much into the Lord's treasury as to teach the Bible on a part of the time which the county or state employs and pays him for, in order to have him teach secular things. Read Isa. 61: 8, and Matt. 22: 21 again.

But nothing which has been said or can be said about teaching school or teaching the Bible in connection therewith touches *even at a remote angle* the case of a preacher who can proclaim the gospel successfully, and whose brethren will support him while so doing, settling down to teach secular things three-fourths, or any other proportion, of his time. The preacher's time all belongs to the Lord, except what he needs for his family, and what Caesar demands. And woe to that preacher who deceives himself to think that by some sort of indirect service, he can meet his obligations to the Lord!

But some man may ask, Would it not be scriptural to build a religio-secular school or college in order to make a living? Perhaps we should not deal with such a question till we find a Christian simple enough to invest twenty-five thousand dollars, more or less, in founding such a school. Where is the man who would take money enough to make a good living, with a probable surplus, and invest it in such a school in order to make a living? Caesar builds abundant secular schools, and generally of a very good grade. He does his best, and not many of his subjects could do much better. So it would be financial folly for a Christian to invest his living in a religio-secular school in order to make a living. But nothing that has thus far been said about schools or anything else in which

the question of a Christian's living, or support of his dependent ones, is concerned, touches the subject that we are discussing, namely, *The Unscripturalness of Establishing Religio-Secular Schools with the Lord's money.*

What shall we say then concerning such schools? Shall we spend twenty thousand dollars of the Lord's money in brick and mortar, lumber and hardware, skilled and unskilled labor, and sink twelve hundred dollars of interest on that sum each year, in order to teach as much Bible as one man can teach in a month? Yet this is, substantially, what has been and is being done in the best of the Bible schools now in existence. The New Testament can be privately read and studied, and then publicly read and considered, from beginning to end, within one month by any company or class of Bible readers, of proper age, that will lay aside secular employments and devote themselves to the New Testament for that length of time. In the course of three months the entire Bible can be privately read and studied, and then publicly read and considered. All this can be done in a meeting house already built, and thus without spending one dollar of the Lord's money for erecting school and college buildings, and we should remember that the Savior taught economy. After feeding five thousand by a miracle he said, "Gather up the fragments that remain that nothing be lost." John 6:12. Such economy forbids establishing the kind of institutions that we are writing against.

What then shall we say of religio-secular schools established with the Lord's money? We are by inspired scripture authorized to make these statements:

1. They are unscriptural because contrary to the divine doctrine of equality. Strict obedience to that doctrine makes them impossible.

2. They are unscriptural because contrary to the divine doctrine of justice. That doctrine requires that Christians shall render unto God the things that are God's.

3. They are contrary to the divine doctrine of economy. That doctrine requires that even fragments be gathered up that nothing be lost, and thus that there shall be no waste of the Lord's means in piling up brick and mortar structures in which to teach much that is secular and a little that is religious.

Or, by making these statements in another form we have the following:

1. The divine doctrine of "equality" requires all Christians to give according to prosperity in the Lord's appointed ways.
2. The Lord's appointed ways of giving do not embrace establishing religio-secular schools.
3. Therefore the divine doctrine of "equality" does not authorize Christians to establish such schools.

The following is also true:

1. Faithful obedience to the divine doctrine of "equality" will place all of the Lord's money in the church treasury, or in the hands of the Lord's needy ones.
2. With all the Lord's money thus placed there will be none in the hands of Christians for building religio-secular schools.
3. Therefore, faithful obedience to the divine doctrine of equality will make the building of religio-secular institutions by Christians impossible.

The following statement is likewise correct:

1. The divine doctrine of justice requires that Christians shall render to God the things that are God's in the divinely appointed ways.
2. Rendering to God the things that are God's in his own appointed ways will take all of the Lord's money out of the hands of individual Christians.
3. Therefore the requirements of the divine doctrine of justice when faithfully obeyed make it impossible for individual Christians to build religio-secular schools.

The following is also true:

1. The divine doctrine of economy requires that nothing be lost.
2. Expenditure of the Lord's money in erecting buildings for religio-secular schools is a loss to the church of money belonging to the Lord.
3. Therefore erecting buildings for the purpose of conducting such schools is contrary to the divine doctrine of economy.

March 15, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER.

DISCUSSION OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DANIEL SOMMER AND J. N. ARMSTRONG IN REGARD TO THE COLLEGE QUESTION.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S FIRST REPLY.

It is with unusual delight that I begin this discussion for it is on a subject that is dear to my heart, and I am glad of the privilege of teaching the truth concerning it. With my *whole heart* I believe that I hold the truth in this matter, and while I have not a single doubt as to my position's being the true one, I realize that *all men* are fallible and that many loyal hearts have been as confident in their position as I am in mine, and yet were wrong. So in humbleness I am ready to receive any truth Brother Sommer may present. It is for truth's sake that I have entered the discussion. I want the truth above everything else. Nothing else should be so precious to the heart of God's child as truth. Since truth always shines brighter when placed by the side of error, I consider the opportunity before me one of the greatest of my life thus far. I shall use it sacredly for God. I know that there are many hearts hungering and thirsting for the truth that, I believe, I hold. They may oppose my position, but if I hold the truth, they want it and will accept it with eagerness. May the Lord so bless me in the work that I may make the truth I hold stand out so clear that he who runs may read; and may He also see to it that every honest heart in the great brotherhood of Christ has the privilege of reading this discussion.

I believe the question involves the right of Christians to teach God's Word. With my *whole heart* I believe that the principle that would hinder our school work here would hinder the teaching of God's word on the farm, in the shop, yea, in all secular callings of men. This is a vital principle.

Again, I believe it involves the principle of placing in the hands of *men* the regulating of God's servants and their work. Namely, where I shall work; when, where, and how I shall spend my time and my money. How much time shall I give to farming and how much to preaching? How much money shall I employ in my business and how much shall I *give*? All Christians are involved in this principle.

According to my respondent's position, every dollar not needed to pay Caesar and to supply *real needs* of a man's dependent ones must be placed into the Lord's treasury on the first day of the week, or it must be given to the poor. He places the Christian who would use his surplus to increase his business, when that business is already paying Caesar and supplying the needs of his family, in the place of the man who kept and used for his own the sum of five dollars overpaid to him in a business settlement. Had I kept and used this five dollars as this man did, I should be a *thief*. Yet this is the seat occupied by all Christians to-day who have a thousand dollars invested in an honorable business, if five hundred dollars invested in that business would meet the expenses just mentioned. This practically places thousands of Christians under the sentence of "robbers of God," violaters of the "divine doctrine of justice." Just as this man should have returned the five dollars to its rightful possessor, so these Christians must trim their business and turn over the surplus to God, or die under the anathema of divine justice. This is the only way, according to my respondent, that these scriptures can be observed faithfully. I know Christians to-day who could sell ten thousand dollars worth, or more, of their business and have an abundance left for their living. Are these Christians sinners before God? Are they thieves and robbers of God? Have they been cheating and defrauding God all of these years?

"Charge them that are rich in this present world, that they be not high minded, nor have their hope set on the uncertainty of riches, but on God ——— that they do good, that they be rich in good works, that they be ready to distribute, willing to communicate." 1 Tim. 6:17, 18. (A. R. V.) This is the instruction given to the "rich." They are earnestly cautioned, but are not accused of violating the "doctrine of divine justice," nor are they called "robbers of God." It is dangerous to be rich, for the temptations to the rich are great, but a man may control much money and be as pleasing to God as I am with one dollar.

It matters not how much a man may have in land, bank stock, dry goods, or hogs, his righteousness does not depend on his having the wealth, but on the use he makes of it. If he runs that business that he may feed hungry mouths, clothe naked bodies, and preach the gospel of Christ—even as Paul ran his tent-making—whose

business is it? Why make me, or even my respondent, a judge of God's servant? "To his own Lord he standeth or falleth." Rom. 14:4. (A. R. V.)

Suppose a "rich" man has two farms and one of them makes an abundant supply for his needs and the payment of Caesar, and suppose this man honestly decides that he can do more good by selling the second farm and putting the money into a hardware store, has he a right to do it? Let my respondent tell us.

But suppose this man and his family should decide to sell the farm, build a school house, and run a school, have they this right? Let my respondent tell us. Let him believe, too, that it would be a poor financial deal. This is not the question.

Have they the right to keep this surplus money in land or to put it in another legitimate business, using their best judgment in making the change; or must they sell the land and place the money in the Lord's treasury or give it to the needy saints, or rest forever under the "anathemas" of divine justice? This is the question.

If Christians have the right to keep surplus money in a farm, running it to glorify God, to feed hungry mouths, clothe naked bodies, and feed hungry hearts by teaching the word of God to them; or, if in their best judgment it be a better work to take this money and support a school, running it to glorify God—to feed hungering and thirsting minds and hearts—I say, if they have this right, all of this ado about money should be cast aside forever. I believe with my whole heart that this right belongs to Christians—I appeal to every heart that may read this to consider as to whether this is the right of children of God. If this be our right there has never been a time that school buildings and all other necessary equipments could not have been furnished by the disciples without robbing God, or violating divine justice.

If my RESPONDENT BE CORRECT IN HIS THEORY of the LORD'S MONEY, the disciples of Christ are WOEFUL CRIMINALS. On the other hand, if Christians may invest their money in land, in banking, in merchandising, etc., beyond what will give them an economical living, they may invest this same money in any kind of school that is right in itself. From this there is no escape.

armst-
rang
P.125

Let my respondent face the *issue*, for he is guilty of disturbing the peace of God's children over *nothing*, *absolutely NOTHING*, unless, forsooth, it be wrong for Christians to invest their hard earned money in honorable businesses beyond a mere living. All of this talk about "piling up brick and mortar" is only so much "filling." If Christians may pile up "brick and mortar" for the banking business, what hinders them from piling up "brick and mortar" to teach minds and hearts, provided it be right to teach minds and hearts at all.

Now, I hang the whole issue here. If the school into which a Christian puts his money is right—right in itself—neither Daniel Sommer nor J. N. Armstrong has any right to accuse him of sin unless they would make the same accusation were this man to invest the same amount in a farm. "Can this be true?" you ask. It is the whole truth, yet in 1906, October 9, Brother Sommer said: "All that I have written on the subject has been under these two headings, namely, the mistake of thus using the Lord's money, and the mistake of thus naming such institutions."

If "money" and "name" be the two heads, one head is gone and should not be brought back into this discussion until it is established that the school in itself is wrong. Otherwise it comes with the same seathing force against every Christian who has more money invested in his business than is necessary to bring him a living. Such a Christian has put the "Lord's money" in "brick and mortar," in earth, in cattle, in hogs, etc. He is a violator of divine justice. Just as the man in the illustration stole the five dollars from his neighbors, so this man has stolen from God.

QUESTIONS.

1. Was this "wealth" among the brethren at Jerusalem the Lord's money?
2. Should one inherit "wealth" may he use it or must he put it into the Lord's treasury?
3. If the Jerusalem disciples had "wealth" that was their "own" and in their "power," could they not have used it in the building of a school building and starting a school without sinning, provided the school in itself was right?

4. If these Christians had "wealth" that they could have used in a school may not Christians to-day use their wealth in building the right kind of schools?

5. Suppose a Christian should be so "simple" and so selfish as to establish a school—a "religio-secular school"—solely to make a living out of it, would this be unscriptural?

When these questions are answered the money proposition will be a lost cause.

THE ISSUE—KIND OF SCHOOLS.

It is foolish and sinful to disturb the harmony of God's people over anything else than the issue.

It is self evident that if it is right to have schools, it is right to use money to build and to equip them. So the issue cannot be "Concerning the Unscripturalness of Establishing Religio-Secular Schools with the Lord's Money," but into *what kind* of schools may Christians put money that the Lord has entrusted to their control.

Every man that reads this pamphlet from the day it goes to the printer till Gabriel blows his trumpet will know the issue is the *kind* of schools. I do not believe that all of Brother Sommer's fog and smoke can hide the issue from the truth-searching heart.

As a disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ, I am willing to sacrifice personal preference, matters of judgment, and matters of opinion, in the doing of the work for which I contend; but the work itself I cannot sacrifice for it rests on true principles.

In an article in the Octographic Review of August 29, 1905, W. W. Otey commits himself to the following principles:

"I. Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge.

II. They may teach the Bible a part, or all the time.

III. They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity."

In the same paper of Sept. 5, 1905, Brother Sommer heartily endorses this article so far as these statements are concerned.

I have quoted these statements that the issue may stand out, for there is no use in contending over matters that are admitted by both disputants.

Contradicts P. 10, 18

Now, beside these admissions, I want to place our work, that all may see how great a fire a little matter kindleth—how much dust and smoke may be raised over nothing.

Five of us brethren are banded together to teach secular knowledge. We have no written contract with one another, hence the "band" is no stronger than oral agreement to come here and help build up this school. We have no understanding as to how long we shall be banded together. In this oral agreement there was nothing included as to who should be president of the school, but after the band was formed and we were preparing to make announcements, the brethren thought since some one must of necessity take the lead it would be well for the public to know who this one is. It was my suggestion that no one be designated as president.

incorporated bodies are not there

The old school here was an incorporated body, but we were unwilling for our school to be incorporated, although the town desired it, so we gave back the charter to the state at an expense of fifty dollars. In other words, we dissolved the charter that we might be nothing more, nor less, than Christians banded together to teach school. Here is the rest of the

P. 33
They do not strive to give their a higher and better education

In this "band," oral agreement of no time-limit, was included our purpose to teach the Bible to every student. To conduct the school that the greatest good might be done was the cherished purpose with us all. The ultimate ends that we strive to attain are to lead every student not a Christian to be a Christian, and to lead every one who is a Christian to be a better Christian. So far as the "band" itself, the organization of the five, is concerned, it is as simple as it can be. Brethren Sommer and Otey could never "band" themselves together with three other Christians with a weaker "band" and be banded at all.

With this weak "band" the work continues until now. If our purpose be what is wrong, let us fight it out on this ground.

It seems to me that the organization cannot be the issue, for we both admit that we may be banded together and our band is as weak as a band can be. But I want the truth, and I am willing for the band to be tested—I ask my respondent to show wherein it is wrong. I ask him to define his "band." He is committed to one.

If the purpose be the issue I ask my respondent to say so plainly. I believe our purpose is scriptural and I hold myself in readiness to defend it.

March 20, 1907.

SECOND ESSAY.

Make to yourself friends of [with] the mammon of unrighteousness; that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." Luke 16:9, "Charge them that are rich in this world that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. 6:17-19. "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that bid-deth him God speed is become partaker of his evil deeds." 2 John 9th, 10th, and 11th verses.

The foregoing scriptures when taken together inform us definitely on the following questions:

1. What Christians should do with their surplus money, which is called "unrighteous mammon" by the Savior, possibly because of the unrighteous use generally made of it.
2. Why Christians should use their surplus money as they are divinely directed.
3. Within what limits Christians must remain in using their surplus money.

* Concerning these divine instructions we shall now make a few additional remarks by way of explanation. 1. The Savior teaches his disciples to use their surplus money so as to secure for themselves friends by whom they will be received into "everlasting habitations" when death overtakes them and thus by death they fail on earth. 2. Paul sets forth the same idea when he commands that those who are rich shall so use their riches as to lay up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life. This cannot mean anything else than that they shall use their riches so as to please the Lord and be finally saved. 3. In using their surplus so as to lay hold on eternal life Christians are required to "do good," and "be rich

in good works." In explanation Paul adds, "ready to distribute, willing to communicate." This cannot mean anything else than that they should do as certain brethren did to Paul and as Paul commanded the churches to do on the first day of the week. (See 1 Cor. 16:1, 2, 17.) 4. In the use of their surplus means or prosperity, Christians *must not transgress or go beyond* the doctrine of Christ, but must abide in that doctrine, or they will let go their hold upon God and Christ by going outside of that doctrine. 5. If a Christian transgresses and goes outside of the doctrine of Christ in the use of means, or in anything else, it is dangerous for us to encourage that one or bid him God speed, for in so doing we become "partaker of his evil deeds." 6. But no Christian can build a religio-secular school with his surplus means, all of which belongs to the Lord, while abiding in the doctrine of Christ. On the contrary, all Christians who engage in the business of building such schools with the Lord's money certainly transgress, or *go beyond the doctrine of Christ*, and in so doing they *have not or hold not* to God and Christ as revealed in that doctrine. Therefore the building of such schools with the Lord's money is *unscriptural*.

But some man will, perhaps, say, "There is no special scripture against building religio-secular schools with the Lord's money." In answer to this we state that such reasoning mentions the sandy foundation upon which Rome and all her daughters have built their religious superstructures. What is worse, in their zeal to do as they please, they have, in some instances, ignored what is said in scripture directly against them. For instance what Paul wrote about certain ones, who would depart from the faith "forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats" was adopted by Rome regardless of what was divinely written by that apostle. The same is true of many other sects which advocate justification by faith only. They accept and urge that doctrine regardless of what James wrote against it. Besides, Rome's doctrine of purgatory and penance, infant baptism and infant condemnation have all been adopted on the ground that the scripture says nothing directly against them. Then infant church membership, getting religion, the mourner's bench method of converting sinners and sanctifying believers, with many other shades and grades of doctrine have been adopted on the plea that scripture

says nothing directly against them. And shall disciples who claim to be apostolic adopt that unscriptural plea in behalf of building religio-secular institutions with the Lord's money, which is a work outside of New Testament precept and example, implication and intimation? They cannot do so without transgressing the doctrine of Christ, and if they persist in so doing after their error has been fairly exposed they will certainly forfeit their discipleship.

To illustrate the absurdity of trying to justify spending the Lord's money to establish religio-secular institutions in the shape of Bible schools and colleges we mention an instance which was reported to us several years ago. A young couple in a certain state wished to marry, and they looked around for some one to "say the ceremony." As no preacher nor justice of the peace was convenient they appealed to the postmaster. He said that he thought he could accommodate them, but not for several hours. So he told them to go to his house and stay till after dinner. They did so. Then he told them that they should remain yet a while longer, and then he thought he could marry them. An hour or two later he came to the house and, smilingly, said that it was "all right," and they could at once be married, for, said he, "I have examined my post office guide from beginning to end and I fail to find even one section which *forbids* a postmaster marrying a couple, and *so it's all right.*" But will disciples of Christ adopt such reasoning in order to justify using the Lord's money to establish institutions that are chiefly secular? If so, we again say that they will *certainly forfeit their discipleship* if they refuse to repent after they have been plainly told of their error.

But this is not all. The Savior said, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." Matt. 7:18-20. With these statements of our Savior before our minds let us consider the history of religio-secular institutions, whether built by the Lord's money or not. In so doing we begin with the Alexandrian school of philosophy in Egypt, which, in the second century, as Mosheim's history declares, became a kind of theological seminary, and in which was conceived and brought forth what was called the "Neo-

Platonic system"—a system that was an admixture of Judaism, heathenism, the gosepl and human philosophy. The formation of that system was the doctrinal corruption of the gospel which opened the way for the speculations that afterwards resulted in the great apostasy which in the ninth century was manifest in the two great branches which still exist, and are to-day manifest, in the Greek Catholic and the Roman Catholic churches. Those leading churches, with the numerous offspring of the Roman Catholic Church, have been builders of theological seminaries, in which religious and secular learning have been imparted to students in order to build up their respective orders of ministers or clergymen. And whether the religious instruction imparted has predominated over the secular, or the secular has been greater than the religious, yet the result has been the same. In every instance the theological seminary has been the nourishing mother of the clergyman, and the clergyman has been the framer and advocate of human religious creeds. The seminary, the clergyman, and the creed thus belong together, but whether taken together or separately they may all be justly called *trees which have from first to last been bearers of evil fruit* when viewed in the light of the gospel of God's dear Son. The good that they have done has been more than overbalanced by the religious conceit which they have imposed and the religious divisions which they have wrought. "Every tree that beareth not good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire."

All this was quite well understood in the early half of the 19th century, yet regardless of the light of it all a large proportion of the Lord's money was devoted to building a religio-secular school called "Bethany College," in what is now known as Brooke county, of West Virginia. If not intended to be a theological seminary, yet that is what it became. The example set at Bethany was followed in near or about a score of other places in course of the last half of the 19th century. From first to last those colleges, established with money which should have been regarded as belonging entirely to the Lord, have been chiefly, if not wholly, committed to those who advocate humanisms in the worship and work of the churches. In them have been trained the very men who have wrought divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which is set forth in the gospel.

Humanize all this with the "Rough Draft" which not only insists that we fellowship them, but allows us to have them preach for us and use the money the church gives them for preaching SOMMER-ARMSTRONG DISCUSSION to help support the college if they are willing to take the Risk.

What shall we say then concerning religio-secular institutions of learning established by the Lord's money? They have a bad history in three particulars. 1. They are built by those who do not abide in the doctrine of Christ, but who transgress that doctrine. 2. They are built by those who are guilty of "evil deeds." (See 2 John 9th, 10th, 11th verses). 3. Their history outside of the New Testament is that of an evil tree whose fruit has consisted of clergymen, creeds, and sects. Therefore religio-secular schools established with the Lord's money are unscriptural.

If we present the foregoing truths in logical form we have the following:

1. Those who build religio-secular schools with the Lord's money transgress or go beyond the doctrine of Christ.
 2. Those who transgress or go beyond the doctrine of Christ have not or hold not God.

3. Therefore those who become transgressors of the doctrine of Christ by building religio-secular schools with the Lord's money have not or hold not God.

Or it may be stated thus:

1. In order to hold to God and Christ it is necessary to abide in the doctrine of Christ.

2. But those who build religio-secular schools with the Lord's money go beyond the doctrine of Christ, and thus do not abide in it.

3. Therefore those who build such schools with the Lord's money let go their hold on God.

Another statement of truth on this subject may be set forth thus:

1. Christ says that a tree is known by its fruit.

2. The fruit of religio-secular schools has been more evil than good throughout the gospel age.

3. Therefore such schools are more evil than good in the gospel age.

If an effort be made to offset the foregoing reasoning by referring to the good done by such schools I answer such reference, first, by referring to the good done by Moses and Aaron, when they said, "Must we fetch you water out of this rock?" Three millions or more of people with their flocks and herds were saved from famishing, yet God charged Moses and Aaron with *unbelief* and *rebel-*

lion. Num. 20:10, 11; 27:14. My second answer is that all sectarianism pleads the good that it has done and is still doing, as its justification. Can such schools and colleges, as we are censuring, make no better plea in their defense? If not, then they are certainly defenseless.

March 23, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S SECOND REPLY.

"Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" Psalms 133:1 (A. R. V.). Perhaps next to the desire for truth there should be a desire for peace among God's children in the heart of every disciple. Our Lord most earnestly entreated the Father that all of us might "be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us; that the world may believe that thou didst send me." Jno. 17:21 (A. R. V.). Unbelief, the worst of sins, abounds in the world, and God only knows how much the discord, strife and division in the religious world is responsible for this state of affairs.

We who are real brethren, who believe with our *whole hearts* that we must abide in the teachings of Jesus, should love this peace and union above every thing save truth. When we disagree we should not put on magnifying glasses but should rejoice to find the disagreement as small as it really is. And if, in our misunderstandings of each other, we have only seemed to differ, we should be glad to find that, in reality, we agree.

With my whole heart, I have believed that the differences in the brotherhood on the school question have arisen from misunderstandings. I have judged this from the writings of those who thought they were opposing our school work. I have never seen an argument against our school work here. The writings supposed to be against us have always been against things of which we are not guilty, and to much that has been written with the intent to demolish our work I can say a hearty Amen. True, our work has been criticised much concerning matters of judgment and opinion, but there has come scarcely a criticism of this kind

that cannot be turned with double force against every other kind of school in the land. So much is this true that my respondent has had a hard time keeping his readers from believing him to be opposed to all schools.

It may become necessary in this discussion for me to show that Brother Sommer has, in his own writings on the subject, arrayed himself against all schools, but has practically admitted that our school is better than all others.

In my first reply I did my best to make the issue stand out clear. I showed that it *could not* be the money proposition, but that the real issue, if there be a real issue at all, must be the kind of school. After describing our school as impartially as I knew how to do, I begged my respondent to show wherein the organization is wrong. I also told the purpose behind our work and begged to know if this be the issue, that we may find the real battle-ground. I believe it is a sin to fight over "words to no profit" (2 Tim. 2:14), and to avoid this sin I sought earnestly for the issue.

In his reply (?) Brother Sommer does not make the slightest allusion to these things. One may read his second essay and not find out from it that I had replied to his first. He not only made no effort to define the issue, but he also failed to notice a single one of the pointed questions I asked him in my first reply. He does not even promise to answer them at a future date. In fact, his entire article is a clipping from his tract, "Colleges as Church Institutions," written before Western Bible and Literary College existed. Why does he ignore what I said in reply to the first installment of the tract that he sent me? Doesn't he want the reader to see the issue? Isn't he debating for the sake of truth?

He is that "debater" (?) that has criticised, accused, and unmercifully condemned, disciples of Christ, and now when brought "face to face" he ignores every entreaty to discuss the issue and, school-boy-like, sends me matter prepared years before I wrote the article in which I so earnestly plead that he face the issue without loss of time.

"Before these days rose up Theudas, giving himself out to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred,

joined themselves: who was slain; and all as many as obeyed him were dispersed and came to nought." Acts 5:36 (A. R. V.). History repeats itself.

BRO. SOMMER'S SECOND ESSAY.

For a school-boy to make his "cut and dried" speech regardless of the speech of his respondent may be excusable; but such a course on the part of a man of such reputed powers, is inexcusable and can be explained, I think, in but one way: it is the best he can do for his lost cause.

I am sure that many who read my reply to Brother Sommer's first essay were anxious to see his response to it. It is a shame to treat truth-seeking hearts so. If Brother Sommer can do no better and will confess the fact to us, we shall be glad to excuse him, but so long as he makes such great professions and pretensions we have a right to expect better things of him.

He then admits the school to be a soul-saving institution

I believe with Brother Sommer that the Scriptures he quotes teach that Christians must use the mammon of unrighteousness entrusted to them to please the Lord in order that they may be finally saved, but his conclusion that this forbids the building of "religio-secular" schools is his own deduction, for which there is not a hint in the passages used. As I made clear in my first reply, if Christians may use the mammon of unrighteousness in "piling up brick and mortar" to engage in the banking business, they may do the same thing to engage in teaching school, provided the school in itself be right. As I said before, I hang the whole issue here. I say again that if the school into which a Christian puts his money be right in itself, neither Daniel Sommer nor J. N. Armstrong has a right to accuse him of sin unless they would make the same accusation were the man to invest the same amount in a farm.

In this article I am forced by Brother Sommer's failure to answer my former article to do much otherwise unnecessary repeating.

I must ask again the list of questions that I asked before, for

I consider them too important for Brother Sommer to fail to notice them if he can be induced to do so.

QUESTIONS.

1. Was this "wealth" among the brethren at Jerusalem the Lord's money?
2. Should one inherit "wealth," may he use it or must he put it into the Lord's treasury?
3. If the Jerusalem disciples had "wealth" that was their "own" and in their "power," could they not have used it in the building of a school building and started a school without sinning, provided the school in itself was right?
4. If these Christians had "wealth" that they could have used in a school, may not Christians to-day use their wealth in building the right kind of schools?
5. Suppose a Christian should be so simple and so selfish as to establish a school—a "religio-secular school"—solely to make a living out of it, would this be unscriptural?

I say again that when these questions are answered the money proposition will be a lost cause. *The school is not*

Since Brother Sommer is debating with me, it will be time enough for his tale of the postmaster when I make a "plea" for this school work on the silence of the Scriptures. *silent* Nobody *conceals* so far as I know, has made such a "plea," I am sure I have never *using* done so. It is a creature of his imagination, another straw-man. *the*

That Bethany College "became" bad does not prove that it was wrong to establish it, or that it is sinful for Christians to establish schools to-day. Many religious journals have become bad, but will my respondent apply his logic here and say that it is, therefore, wrong for Christians to establish a religious paper? Many innocent babies become criminals, must we conclude from this fact that it is wrong for people to have babies?

But do you not notice a change of base on the part of my respondent here? I thought all he has ever written on the subject has been under these two headings, namely, "The Mistake of thus Using the Lord's money," and "The Mistake of thus Naming such Institutions." But lo! here with one blow he stamps all

"religio-secular" schools as wicked regardless of the money that built them.

I wonder, now, what becomes of the school that he says Christians may establish by banding themselves together—the school in which they may teach both secular knowledge and the Bible? Does this "bad" history affect the righteousness of this school?

Nay, my friends, this is but an index to my respondent's condemnation of all schools in the land.

THE ISSUE AGAIN.

I. Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge.

II. They may teach the Bible a part or all the time.

III. They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity.

DANIEL SOMMER,
J. N. ARMSTRONG.

Thus far we are heartily agreed, and since such a school could not be established and equipped without the use of money, we are both committed to the use of money.

Brother Sommer knew for ten years that the Nashville Bible School was running, that it was using money, and that the Bible and secular knowledge was being taught in it.

In 1901 another school was established, being as nearly like the first as it is possible for one school to be like another, since the president of the one from its beginning became the president of the other.

In regard to this second school—Potter Bible College of Bowling Green, Ky.—Brother Sommer wrote in an unsolicited letter to Brother and Sister Potter: "I write you with reference to your new enterprise. As you have decided to expend means left in your hands by your dear dead for the purpose of education, I have no criticism to offer."

If Brother Sommer ever mentions this money-matter again, he should hide his face in shame. He has confused the people of God all over this country by his theory of "the Lord's money," and the only honorable way out of it for him is a full confession

that he has been wrong about it. King David on his throne sank in humility in acknowledgment of his wrong. Why should not Brother Sommer?

I say again, the issue cannot be the "banding together," neither can it be the teaching of the Bible in connection with other branches, for we are agreed on both of these matters.

I hope my respondent, in his next essay, will name the things wherein we are wrong that we may eliminate all other matters and meet the issue squarely. If the purpose to teach the Bible be the issue, I am ready to defend this purpose.

March 27, 1907.

THIRD ESSAY.

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, who is the head of all principality and power." Col. 2: 8-10.

In the foregoing statements Paul warns Christians against "philosophy," "vain deceit," "tradition of men," and "rudiments of the world," which things he declares are "not after Christ," and thus are not the outgrowth of following Christ. The apostle then declares that in Christ "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," and finally that Christians are "complete in" Christ "who is the head of all principality and power."

In the light of such inspired statements it may be safely said that religio-secular schools built with the Lord's money, being unauthorized and unmentioned in the New Testament, are unscriptural in the following particulars:

1. They are not the outgrowth of observing any precept or example, implication or intimation of the New Testament, and thus they are "not after Christ."

2. They are the outgrowth of following the teaching or example of uninspired men, and thus are "after the tradition of men," against which Paul forewarns Christians.

3. They are the outgrowth of adopting what are supposed

to be wise conclusions of men, and are thus after human "philosophy," against which Paul likewise forewarns Christians.

4. As the institutions against which we write are "not after Christ," but are after the "tradition of men," and "philosophy" of men, they are classed with "vain deceit," and "rudiments of the world," and thus are unscriptural.

5. They ignore the fact that Christians are by the apostle Paul declared to be "complete" in Christ, and for that reason they are unscriptural:

A few years ago in a certain institution of learning an interview was being held between certain students concerning the scripturalness of instrumental music in the worship, and missionary societies with other arrangements in the work of the church. One of those students said to another, "If you oppose all these things, what will you have left?" The answer given was this: "I am surprised at your question, though it is easily answered. We'll have *all* left that God gave us—The *Bible* and the *Church*. But now it's my turn to ask a question. If you begin to adopt human devices *where are you going to stop?*" "I see you have the advantage," said the first questioner.

The interview just mentioned reveals the principle involved in this discussion. If Christians are complete in Christ, as Paul declares, then religio-secular schools do not need to be built with the Lord's money. If by any method of reasoning we conclude that completeness in Christ does not forbid such schools, then the question arises, *What does it forbid?* Humanly devised missionary societies are *chiefly religious*. The humanly devised schools against which we are writing are *chiefly secular*. Now, what method of just reasoning will *condemn such societies* and yet *justify such schools?* How can that which is *chiefly religious* be condemnable, while that which is *chiefly secular* be commendable? How can the former be "a curse" to the churches of Christ, while the latter are blessings to those churches? How can the former be "unscriptural and anti-scriptural," while the latter are according to Scripture? Woe to the man who undertakes to justify the building of religio-secular schools with the Lord's money while denouncing missionary societies as "a curse" to the churches of Christ, and declaring that they are both "un-

scriptural and anti-scriptural!" To such a man we must say, "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things. . . . And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them who do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" Rom. 2:1, 3.

Imagination may stretch her wings and fancy may fly over the entire domain of sophistry, yet no plausible reason can be presented in favor of building religio-secular schools with the Lord's money which cannot be urged with equal justness in favor of near or about all the innovations which have thus far tended to divide and damage the disciple brotherhood. Moreover, no sound objection can be urged by any logician, nor unsound objection urged by any sophist, against the innovationism, which has thus far damaged and divided the disciple brotherhood, which cannot with equal justness be urged against such schools as we are now considering. Therefore, we again say, Woe to the man who attempts to condemn the mentioned innovationism and yet justify the mentioned schools! To such a man we may justly say, If thou being an apostolic disciple thinketh not after the manner of innovationists, why adviseth thou that apostolic disciples shall spend the Lord's money as do innovationists? And why endeavorest thou to defend such expenditure of the Lord's money as innovationists make in behalf of their devices by trying to defend things equally unauthorized?

All religious innovationism among disciples is conceived and brought forth, urged and introduced on the presumption that Christians are *not complete in Christ*. This presumption contradicts what the Holy Spirit has declared through the apostle Paul in Col. 2:10, and for that reason is condemnable. But what is the difference between presuming that Christians are not complete in Christ with reference to religious worship, or religious work, or religious education? *None whatever*. Each contradicts the apostle Paul *with positiveness*, and each is *equally condemnable* with the others. The first presumption calls for the organ, and perhaps other instruments of music, bought with the Lord's money, and perhaps some other money. The second calls for missionary

societies with numerous auxiliaries supported by the Lord's money, and all else that can be secured. The third calls for religio-secular schools and colleges built by the Lord's money, and perhaps some money that the Lord never claimed. Here then we have human devices as aids in *worship*, and *work*, and *education*. These three devices agree in one—yes, in two or three particulars. 1. They all ignore and even contradict Paul's statement, that Christians are complete in Christ! 2. They all presume that Christians are *not* complete in Christ, and that the Holy Spirit omitted something or left something lacking!! 3. They all presume that uninspired men are wise enough to discern what was omitted and supply what is lacking!!! This is the consummation of presumption.

There is, however, this difference between the human devices just mentioned: *Religio-secular schools are the oldest and most mischievous*. They began to be established in the second century of the gospel age, and from the first they have been institutions wherein the gospel has been doctrinally corrupted. From the Alexandrian school in Egypt down to the latest established religio-secular institution of learning, they have exerted an influence which has been largely, if not chiefly, in favor of sectism or innovationism, or both. They have all proved to be and have been proudly called *alma mater*—benign or nourishing mother—of clergymen, and these have been the fathers and advocates of creeds and sects, divisions and strifes, innovations and hobbies, digressions and perversions. The reformers whom they have nourished have often proved to be *deformers*, rather than *restorers*, of the New Testament teaching.

He who denies the foregoing statements certainly risks his reputation as a historian and a scripturist. Collegeism has led to preacherism, and preacherism has led to sectism, and sectism means both hobbyism and innovationism, and these taken together have led to religious corruption and confusion. The last result has been that with but few exceptions, sinners have not been converted and saints have not been perfected because the Savior's prayer for the oneness of his followers has, by many professed disciples, been ignored. Moreover, the foundation of Paul's exhortation to oneness is ignored by all religio-secular school builders. That

foundation consists of one body or church, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all. But there are some who would have us unite upon at least one order of outside institutions, namely, *the so-called Bible schools!* But as there is no authority for them we cannot unite upon them, and thus the introduction of them means discord and division, contention and strife. Those who have favored them, especially those immediately concerned in establishing them, are so sensitive in their behalf that intemperance marks their efforts to defend them when their scripturalness is questioned.

What shall we say then concerning religio-secular institutions of learning built with the Lord's money? In the light of inspired doctrine and uninspired history we are justified in making the following statements concerning them:

1. They are not the outgrowth of observing any precept or example, implication or intimation of the New Testament, and thus they are "not after Christ."

2. They are the outgrowth of following the teaching or example of uninspired men, and thus they are "after the tradition of men" against which Paul forewarns us.

3. They are the outgrowth of adopting what are supposed to be wise conclusions of men, and are thus after human "philosophy," against which Paul likewise warns Christians.

4. As the institutions against which we write are "not after Christ," but are after "tradition of men" and "human philosophy," they are by the Holy Spirit classed with "vain deceit," and "rudiments of the world," and thus are unscriptural.

5. They ignore the fact that Christians are by the apostle Paul declared to be "complete" in Christ, and for that reason they are unscriptural.

6. Adoption and advocacy of religio-secular schools as church institutions admit the very principle by which near or about all innovations which have damaged and divided the disciple brotherhood have been urged and introduced.

7. The uninspired history of such schools as those under consideration reveals the fact that they have been partly, if not wholly, in opposition to the purity and simplicity of the gospel. "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

yet you shook hands with one of
them at Pratt, Kans. and agreed to
not allow them to be an issue
between you, or words to that effect

8. Humanly ordained characters, institutions, arrangements, especially those that are not in any measure exemplified in the word of God, cannot be regulated by the word of God. Thus Aaron's calf and the worship rendered it; David's cart and his oxen-drivers; Solomon's standing army and his numerous wives; Jewish circumcision among Gentile Christians; the first theological seminary ever established, and the last religio-secular school which wears the name "Bible School," or "Bible College"—such institutions, and all others of similar character, are outside of God's word, cannot be controlled by his word, and are destined to damage the cause of Christ. Such institutions, considered as trees, have been known by their fruits in the past, are known by their fruit in the present, and will be known by their fruit in the time to come.

The foregoing statements may be otherwise expressed after this manner:

1. Whatever in religion is not the outgrowth of obedience to Divine precept, or example, implication or intimation, as set forth in the New Testament, is not "after Christ."

2. Religio-secular schools established by the Lord's money are not the outgrowth of such obedience.

3. Therefore such schools are "not after Christ."

Again:—

1. Whatever in religion is the outgrowth of following the precepts or examples of uninspired men is "after the tradition of men."

2. Religio-secular schools, built by the Lord's money, are the outgrowth of such following.

3. Therefore such schools are "after the traditions of men."

Again:—

1. Paul warns Christians against following "after the tradition of men" in religion.

2. Religio-secular schools, established with the Lord's money, are "after the tradition of men" religiously.

3. Therefore Paul warns Christians against such schools.

Again:—

1. Paul declared that Christians are "complete" in Christ.

2. Paul declared this when Christians had no religio-secular schools established with the Lord's money.

3. Therefore such schools are not necessary in order to completeness in Christ.

Again:—

1. All innovationism upon the work, as well as the worship of the churches of Christ is advocated upon the supposition that Christians are not "complete" in Christ.

2. Religio-secular schools established with the Lord's money are advocated upon that same supposition.

3. Therefore such schools are a species of innovationism.

Again:—

1. Every tree which brings forth evil fruit is thereby known to be an evil tree.

2. Religio-secular schools, established with the Lord's money, or money which should have been regarded as the Lord's, have a history of evil fruit when viewed in the light of the gospel.

3. Therefore such schools are evil trees when viewed in the light of the gospel.

Again:—

1. That is certainly an evil tree whose defense inspires its chief advocate to charge against a Christian of good behavior that "the most charitable view any one can take of his conduct is that he is possessed of a disordered mind."

2. The chief advocate of a certain tree, in form of a recently established religio-secular college, was inspired by the defense of such an institution to make such a charge against such a Christian.

3. Therefore the mentioned school is an evil tree.

Again:—

1. That is an evil tree whose defense requires its chief advocate to become discourteous, ungentlemanly, unjust, and undiscriminating in trying to defend it.

2. A certain tree, in the form of a recently established religio-secular institution, called "Bible College," has required such misconduct of its chief advocate in order to make a show of defense in its behalf.

3. Therefore, the mentioned college is an evil tree.

March 29, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER.

Armstrong ~~not~~ in his due
the first slang & abuse

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S THIRD REPLY.

My respondent has a written agreement with me to discuss our "differences" on the college question, yet I am before the reader again with nothing definite from him to which to reply. If he continues as he has started, the finished product will not be a discussion between Daniel Sommer and J. N. Armstrong, for thus far he has stoutly refused to debate with me, but it will be J. N. Armstrong's Review of Daniel Sommer's tract.

After he has repeatedly declared that we would not consider what was said on the opposite side; that we would not discuss the question; that we were lacking in sincerity, candor, and courage to a greater degree than "digressives," Roman Catholics, Mormons, or even infidels; it is a sin and a shame that he ignores everything placed before him.

Slang
etc

He has "puffed," "blown" and "bragged," as only "Daniel Sommer" can. He is that braggart that always does his bragging behind his Chinese wall with barred gates. Truly, his courage (?) is great when the enemy is far off.

This is
false

My experience has taught me why there cannot be a fair, even-handed discussion of any question in his paper. He who happens to take my respondent's side of the question can write fully and freely, saying all kinds of bitter things, if he chooses to do so, about the opposite side, but no others need apply for space.

more
abuse

A dog behind a strong fence often shows great bravery so long as the fence is between him and the traveler, but when the open gate is reached he loses his bristles, sobers down, wags his tail, and barks very deliberately.

P. 31, 35

Oh! the bravery that has been shown "behind the fence!" Never has there been more boasting done by any crowd than by those that have seemed to oppose this school work, and now when the champion, aye, even the father of it all, is brought hand to hand with "striplings," he refuses to consider one single thing that is being said.

In eight speeches in our college chapel with the brick and mortar piled all around him; and with young men and young women

who have heard the name of Daniel Sommer spoken with reverence, and almost with awe all their lives before him, he could not be forced to discuss the "Lord's money," or his absurd doctrine of the name. Besides these students there were representative brethren here—brethren who had quit their work and paid railroad fare to Odessa to hear Brother Sommer abolish Bible school work. One brother said he was going to the debate and Armstrong, Rhodes, Bell and Gardner would have to step down and out. He came, traveling nearly two hundred miles. While here he said he came to hear the issue discussed and was disappointed that it was not being done. Upon his return to his home, when he was asked which side "beat," he said that both sides "beat." This man was one of the many that went away from the oral debate disappointed. But Brother Sommer simply could not be forced to discuss the issue, although the elders, seeing he was not doing so, asked him to state the issue.

I hoped he would do better in the written discussion, but I am now in my third reply and, though I have begged and entreated him to say wherein we are wrong, he refuses to consider a single thing. I believe with my whole heart that he is afraid of the issue. He knows I have exploded from beginning to end his money theory. He dare not touch my questions for he sees the torpedo under them.

Will Daniel Sommer still be regarded as a debater? Will he be recognized as a man of power and ability longer? Will he be allowed to disturb the peace of God's children further? Will he be allowed to continue stamping disciples of Christ digressives, innovators and infidels? I am persuaded better things of the great brotherhood of Christ.

COMPLETENESS IN CHRIST.

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, who is the head of all principality and power." Col. 2:8-10. I want to emphasize this thought, for I believe with my whole heart that Christians are complete in Christ; that Christ is the head

over all things to the Church; that "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work;" that Christians must learn "not to go beyond the things which are written;" that "whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God." I believe the Church is the only institution in the world to propagate the religion of Jesus, the Christ; I believe "the house of God, which is the Church of the living God," is the "pillar and ground of the truth;" I believe that Christians should do everything that they do in the name of the Lord Jesus, as a bond servant of God; aye, I believe that Christians should have a single eye, one object, one master, and that all they do must be done as unto him, for the Lord's sake.

When I feed and clothe the beggar at my kitchen door I must do it as a member of the Church—the government of Christ—and not as a member of the home—the family government—for there is but one institution through which we can serve God and glorify His Son. When a Christian mother teaches her little ones around the hearthstone, she must do it as a follower of Christ, a member of his Church, for in no other name and under no other auspices has she authority to teach them. She, too, is complete in Christ.

The father in his home teaches his children; the farmer, his laborer; the teacher, his students; but all of them must teach as Christians, members of the Church of God, for the Church of the living God is commensurate with the needs of man.

I have been surprised at some of the scribes talking about two divine institutions to teach religion in the face of the scripture that the church is the pillar and ground of the truth. The blood-bought institution is the only one through which fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters may teach God's word, feed the beggar, care for the sick, or administer in any other way to humanity.

By thus exalting Christ and his Church, He received honor from every thought, purpose and act of our lives—we are living sacrifices unto him. One in coming to Jesus surrenders all—body, soul, and spirit—to Him, and becomes His slave for life—

Contra
dicts
pp. 6, 12
20, 21, 26
33, 34

His bond-servant. Forever afterward this slave can take no action save in the name of his master. Even in submitting to civil authority he must do it as a bond-servant of the Lord. Should his relation to other organizations become such that he cannot act in the name of his Master, as a bond-servant of Christ, but must act in the name of another government, that relation is wrong and should be abandoned.

This was our reason for dissolving the charter of the old school here. We wanted to be sure that we were only bond-servants of the Lord co-operating together in the work. Every one of us is as free as he would be in his farm, store, or shop. We owe no obligation to any institution save the church. We owe obligations to one another as brethren, just as we should were we farming. There is absolutely nothing here but individual co-operation. The school is not known legally, hence it cannot hold property, sue, or be sued.

I challenge the world to do regular systematic school work with less "organization" or "institutionism" than we have. If our school work be wrong, Christians cannot have schools in which they may be free to teach the Bible—the Word of the living God.

OUR PURPOSE.

With no more "organization" or "institutionism" than would be necessary were we editing and publishing a paper, we began our work and have continued it to this day. Our "band," or oral agreement, is no stronger than the agreement Priscilla, Aquilla and Paul must have had in their tent-making at Corinth.

With our heart aflame with this one-purposed life of our Savior, we started our school. We had a number of little purposes, but all of them subserve, lead to, and culminate in the one great end.

Verily, if our "banding" together interfere with our completeness in Christ, it is impossible for Christians to co-operate together in doing anything. The principle forbidding our "band" will force Christians to work *singly* in all they do.

But in the oral discussion our purpose was assailed and declared to be wrong. Is there anything in this charge? Motive

P. 36

60
a. makes no efforts
for the church, then

34

SOMMER-ARMSTRONG DISCUSSION.

a. has is moving power. No man who has not fixed his eye on some object toward which all his efforts and struggles have been directed has ever done much in life.

The man who accomplishes allows nothing to swerve him from his path, but loses sight of all objects that would in any way deflect his course, and with all the power of his being drives onward toward his goal.

He who does not have such fixedness of purpose is driftwood and calls forth the pity and contempt of mankind.

Jesus taught by his example this one-purposed life. He declared that his mission on earth was to do his Father's will; and every, thought, word, and deed of his earth-life found its soul in this one purpose. Of course, his great life had minor purposes, but all led to this one great and final purpose.

When he opened the blind eyes it was an act of mercy done to bless the man himself; when he raised the widow's son he, no doubt, had the purpose of blessing the mother and drying her tears, but above and beyond all of this his final purpose was the glorification of God and the salvation of men. Everything was subservient to this one end. See Jno. 4:34; 6:38; 8:29 (A. R. V.). In following this purpose Christ lost sight of himself—his ease, comfort, pleasure, profit and self-exaltation—and was led through sorrows, griefs, buffetings, thorns, strifes and scourgings to the cross; He became penniless, friendless, homeless and lifeless.

"The lamp of the body is the eye, if therefore thine eye be single thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil thy whole body shall be full of darkness." Matt. 6: 22, 23. The "single eye" sees but one object, while the diseased or "evil eye" sees objects double and indistinct. He who seeks God and his pleasure with an undivided heart, mind, and strength, or as Jesus puts it: seeks first the kingdom of God and his righteousness (Matt. 6:33) has the "single eye." This singleness of heart must control God's children, for no man can follow our blessed Master without making every purpose of his life lead to and culminate in the one great purpose.

With our heart aflame with this one-purposed life of our Savior we started our school. We had a number of little purposes, but all of them subserve, lead to, and culminate in the one great end.

Eph. 4:28 is not applied to the
B. S. work for they never get
through begging, hence have
nothing to give to those that ³⁵ are in need.

SOMMER-ARMSTRONG DISCUSSION.

Paul exhorted Christians to work for their fleshly masters, "not with eye service, as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart fearing the Lord: whatsoever ye do work heartily as unto the Lord." Col. 3:22-23. It mattered not what these masters required at the hands of these Christian servants, whether it were digging potatoes, making fires, washing clothes, or making tents, they were to do it heartily as unto the Lord, not as "men pleasers," but in "singleness of heart." "Let him labor, working with his hands the thing that is good that he may have whereof to give to him that is in need." Eph. 4:28. "Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake . . . as free and not using your freedom for a cloak of wickedness, but as bond-servants of God." I. Peter 2:13-16.

Young Christian wives are instructed to be workers at home, subject to their own husbands "that the word of God be not blasphemed." Titus 2:5. These young wives in sweeping the floors, making the beds, and cooking the food, have as one purpose the pleasing of their husbands, but above and beyond this they are exhorted and commanded to do their work "heartily as unto the Lord," "in singleness of heart," that they may save their husbands and their children, and that the word of God may run and be glorified by their lives. I. Peter 3:12.

Titus, a young preacher, was to teach: "Let our people learn to maintain good works (margin, profess honest occupations) for necessary uses (wants) that they be not unfruitful." Titus 3:14.

These Scriptures teach beyond all doubt that Christians, in all the relations, pursuits, and occupations open to disciples of the lowly Nazarene, must be moved with singleness of heart, as unto the Lord, that they may please him.

The life of the apostle Paul clearly demonstrates this plain lesson. He, with two others, made tents at Corinth. The following motives prompting him, he worked at this occupation "in singleness of heart":

- (1) That he might supply his own needs.
 - (2) That he might not burden others.
 - (3) That he might give to him that needed.
 - (4) That he might be an example to others in supporting the weak.
 - (5) That he might be saved himself.
 - (6) That he might save others.
 - (7) That the gospel might not be hindered.
- I. Cor. 9:12, 18, 23; II. Cor. 11:9, 12; 12:14, 15; Acts 20:33-35 (A. R.

Who does the school support?
It has to be supported.

The "purpose" is to build up
the church and save souls.

(V.). Behind these Scriptures and the life of Paul we stand. Surely we are complete in Christ from motive out!

Yet my opponent says, without qualification, that our work is "not the outgrowth of observing any precept or example, implication, or intimation of the New Testament," and thus it is "not after Christ." How can he be so rash in his statements?

The
G.D.
was
established
for the
purpose
of
building
up the
Church
& saving
souls

Is school teaching an honest occupation? Why is our school so wicked? What is the matter with it? If three Christians may agree to work together in tent-making, having for their purpose the saving of souls and the building up of the Church of God, why may not five Christians agree to work together in school teaching, having the same noble purpose? See below

If a man may wash clothes, a wife cook bread, and a citizen pay taxes heartily as unto the Lord, for the Lord's sake—as a bond-servant of Jesus, the Christ—why may I not teach Greek and Hebrew with the same blessed purpose? No man can successfully oppose our work here till the New Testament is lost and its teaching blotted from the hearts of men, yea, until good, sound common sense is put to shame. It is useless for Brother Sommer to butt his head against a brick wall. more all up

I have entreated Brother Sommer to name the thing in which he considers our school to be wrong, and he refuses to do it, so now I name it myself. We teach the word of God in our school. This is the "bear." He has tried to deny this, but in vain has he done so.

Had we not taught the Bible in our school, the weight of his little finger would never have been raised against it. He would not even object to our coming together in the morning for prayer and song service, but for us to come together to study God's word makes it a "religio-secular" school resting on the "traditions and philosophy of men," and classes it with "vain deceit," "rudiments of the world," and makes it an "ungodly institution"!

He is fighting God and the people will know it after this debate.

P.43
It is our chief purpose to train the hearts of those with whom we have to deal to love God and to devote their energies to his holy service. I repeat with emphasis, if you take from us this final purpose of the work, there remains no desire in my heart to continue it.

April 3, 1907.

FOURTH ESSAY.

In this essay I propose to expose the errors set forth in each of the replies thus far received from my respondent. In so doing I shall, first of all, quote our ninth rule of discussion, and the sense in which my respondent accepted it, as far as personalities are concerned. Here is the rule:

"The Bible shall be the only standard of appeal for authority in this discussion, and, therefore, all personal matters, and all human standards of appeal, shall be excluded."

[Signed]

DANIEL SOMMER,
J. N. ARMSTRONG.

In regard to this J. N. Armstrong said in a letter dated Jan. 8, 1907:

"I suppose I understand you in regard to 'personal matters.' I am glad to exclude from the debate 'abuse,' 'mud-slinging,' etc. No child of God should be guilty of these, either in or out of a discussion. With my whole heart I subscribe to this."

In the light of the foregoing the reader will please consider the personal reflections in each of my respondent's replies to me, especially the third, fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs of his third reply. If that is not personal "abuse," and "mud-slinging," then I have never seen an exhibition of it. I pronounce it *scurrility*, and therefore, unworthy of a professed Christian, a pretended gentleman, a college president, or an ordinary man.

And what is the occasion of all these personalities? Simply that I have preferred to present three essays setting forth my objections to my respondent's position before replying to what he has offered. And this is my privilege as a debater, and, especially, in view of the second term of our "agreement." That term stipulates thus:

"Daniel Sommer shall take the lead in the discussion, and shall be permitted to offer his objections to his respondent's position in an essay of two or three thousand words, and his respondent shall reply to it in an essay of equal length, if he so desire."

Does this term of agreement require me to make any response to, or take any notice of, what my respondent says? *No.* Why then should I be assailed with scurrility by my respondent? On the thirteenth page of my respondent's letter to me, dated "Jan. 3, 1907," I find the following:

"And although I am but a babe in Christ I entreat you as a father in Israel to beware of your present course towards disciples of Christ who may differ from you, but who are as honest and sincere as you are, and who are as loyal to God as you dare to be."

Reader, consider the foregoing and then read again the scurrilous assault made on me in my opponent's third reply, and decide if he is not a bad-tempered babe! Consider also that the babes at Corinth were "carnal," and that the babes among the Hebrew brethren were "unskillful in the word of righteousness." See 1st Corinthians 3:3, 4; Hebrews 5:12-14. Then the reader will understand what kind of a respondent I have. He is numbered with "truce-breakers" because he has violated his agreement in regard to personalities. (2d Timothy 3:3.) Besides, he is "carnal," and is "unskillful in the word of righteousness." Nor is this all. My opponent says three times that I have "refused" to reply to him. He even says that I have "stoutly refused to debate" with him. This is positively untrue. I have not "refused" anything of the kind, but have only *deferred* noticing what he says.

In each of my respondent's replies he makes use of the old subterfuge, in one form or another, that because Christians have a right to invest in a farm, or store, or something else, in order to get more money to put into the Lord's treasury, and thereby glorify God, therefore Christians have a right to establish such a school as that for which he contends. I designate such reasoning a "subterfuge," and might justly call it by a worse name. By such reasoning certain college advocates have been deceiving themselves and others for years. But I shall now expose it fully.

1. A Christian who has one farm may scripturally invest in another, or in some other business, in order to get more money to put into the Lord's treasury for the church to expend in the divinely-appointed way, and in so doing he acts as a steward of the

Lord in handling the Lord's means to advance and magnify the Lord's own church in the Lord's own way.

2. But when a Christian who has one farm, or more, imagines that the church is defective as a religious teacher, and then invests money, not to make more money to put into the Lord's treasury, and thus advance the Lord's church in the Lord's own way, but for *the purpose of* establishing a college to teach religion, and thereby supply the imaginary defect which was supposed to exist in the church as a teacher of religion—*such a Christian acts unscripturally.*

To the minds of most of my readers the subterfuge, the sophistry, the iniquity, of the reasoning, falsely founded on a Christian's privilege to invest money in order to make money to help the church, is, probably, now evident. But others may need a further exposure, and, therefore, I make a few more statements on this subject.

1. To invest the Lord's money in order to make more money for the Lord is a scriptural investment, because of the diligence in business which the Lord requires of Christians.

2. But to invest the Lord's money in order to establish a new institution, especially one which takes money *out of* the Lord's treasury, and begs for more, and which threatens Christians with perdition if they do not give to its support, and which proposes to excel the church in teaching religion—**THIS IS UNSCRIPTURAL.**

Having made the foregoing statements, in order to prepare the reader to consider the one-premise logic of certain college advocates, I now expose that logic.

1. Christians may scripturally invest money in order to make more money for the Lord's treasury to glorify God.

2. Therefore, Christians may scripturally invest money to establish a college to teach persons in religion to glorify God!

What is the connection between such a premise and such a conclusion? It is like this:

1. Christians may scripturally give money to do missionary work as individuals and as churches to glorify God.

2. Therefore, Christians may scripturally give money to establish a man-made society to do such work to glorify God!

Now, what is the defect in such reasoning? Logicians say that the major-premise is omitted, or suppressed. That major-premise, or chief proposition, in each of the above-given exhibitions of reasoning is this:

Everything that Christians may do to glorify God in his own institution they may also do to establish a new institution to glorify him.

Now the reader can see the innovating reptile which certain college advocates have been nursing in their bosoms for years. Innovators of the Christian church, generally, adopt one-premise logic to hide their fallacies, and certain college advocates do the same. This shows that those advocates are genuine innovators, as far as their method of reasoning is concerned. But the advocates of man-made missionary societies have this in their favor, namely, they propose to establish an institution to do a work *that is divinely ordained*. THAT WORK IS TO PREACH THE GOSPEL. On the contrary, the advocates of religio-secular colleges propose to do a work that is NOT DIVINELY ORDAINED, namely, establish an institution chiefly secular, TO MAKE AN OPPORTUNITY TO TEACH RELIGION. This being true the advocates of the man-made missionary societies certainly have the advantage over the college advocates with which we are contending. Therefore, I challenge my respondent to produce an argument against the man-made missionary society which is not against his college, or one in favor of his college which does not bear, with equal force, in favor of the man-made missionary society.

A CLEAR VIEW OF THE WHOLE MATTER.

1. A proper business investment, on the part of Christians, admits that the church is complete as a teacher of the Bible.

2. A proper business investment, on the part of the Christians, puts money into the church's treasury, and does not establish another treasury.

3. A proper business investment, on the part of Christians, increases the ability of the church to feed and clothe the poor persons, and to support preaching.

4. A proper business investment, on the part of Christians, tends to prevent begging for religious purposes.

1. A religious college, or missionary society, investment implies that the church is not complete as a religious teacher.

2. A religious college, or missionary society, investment takes money out of the church's treasury, and establishes another treasury.

3. A religious college, or missionary society, investment decreases the ability of the church to feed and clothe the poor and to support preaching.

4. A religious college, or missionary society, investment tends, in most instances, to introduce begging for religious purposes.

Having exposed my opponent's leading errors, so that all may see them, I shall now consider one, or more, of his replies in detail.

1. In his first paragraph my respondent expressed delight in beginning this discussion and professed much love for the truth. But any one of ordinary ability, and disposition to do so, could thus write as a matter of gush or pretention.

2. My opponent cannot "believe," with his "whole heart," what he falsely says in his second paragraph, about my position hindering "the teaching of God's word on the farm," because he cannot believe without testimony.

3. He cannot believe anything of the kind that he expresses in his third paragraph, for the question we are discussing involves the setting up of a NEW INSTITUTION not hinted at in the New Testament.

4. That paragraph states what is strictly untrue concerning my position. I am writing against a NEW INSTITUTION, and not against a Christian doing something to make money for the Lord.

5. The implication in that paragraph is wrong, and ignores the fact that I am not writing against working to help the Lord's cause in his own appointed way, but against something that is not hinted at in the New Testament.

6. The paragraph about "judging" is also wrong. I do not "judge" any one, except myself, in doing the Lord's will, but when men set up a new institution to teach religion I am told by the Divine word what their character is.

7. The supposition in the paragraph about a man who has two farms does not touch the question of setting up a new institution to teach religion.

8. The supposition that a Christian may establish a school depends on whether such school implies that the church is defective as a teacher of religion and whether that school will waste the Lord's money.

9. To invest in a "legitimate" business to make money to put into the Lord's treasury is scriptural, but to set up a new institution for the purpose of teaching religion is unscriptural, as it implies that the church is not sufficient.

The five questions propounded by my respondent have all been answered in the foregoing paragraphs which I have offered him. But the reader can see their bearing by substituting the name "missionary society" for the word "school" wherever that word occurs.

My respondent says: "It is foolish and sinful to disturb the harmony of God's people over anything else than the issue." If this is true, then why does he persist in disturbing and trying to confuse God's people by referring to investments in farms, stores and other departments of legitimate business to make money for the Lord's treasury, so that the church may feed the hungry and send out preachers—I say why does he do this in order to justify an institution that will take money out of the Lord's treasury and thereby prevent the church from feeding the hungry, and from sending out preachers, and which even calls preachers out of the field to do what many others can do as well as preachers can?

The "kind of schools" just described is the kind that is unscriptural. It is the kind that does the very opposite for the Lord's treasury, and for the Lord's cause generally, that the Lord has indicated that he desires his preachers and his people, generally, to do with their money and with their time.

My opponent says that his college work "rests on true principles." The facts show that it rests on FALSE REASONING. Here is what one of its advocates says:

"I never have believed that the New Testament authorized the establishment of such schools and have so stated publicly through our religious journals, in fact I know that the N. T. authorizes no such thing." D. W. Nay, in letter to W. W. Otey, Sept. 27, 1906.

If the New Testament has not "authorized" any "such thing" as those schools, how can they "rest on true principles," especially when they are pleaded for because of their religious features?

In that which W. W. Otey said in the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW for "August 29, 1905," there is not the slightest intimation in favor of a college to take money out of the Lord's treasury and to take preachers out of the field to teach secular knowledge in order to make an opportunity to teach religion. Here I quote what J. N. Armstrong wrote to W. W. Otey in a letter dated October 20, 1906:

"We established the school for teaching the regular literary branches, but, especially, that we might make an opportunity for building up the kingdom of God." P. 49

Did Paul do anything of that kind? Did he even work at secular business in order to "make an opportunity for building up the kingdom of God?" To ask this question is to answer it in the negative, and I believe that my readers, generally, will decide that such a purpose in establishing a college implies that God's plan of making opportunities to build up his kingdom is defective, and that the college supplies this defectiveness; that is, according to my opponent's reasoning. This is *irreverence*, PRESUMPTION, INNOVATIONISM.

Of course we should not contend over matters that are admitted by both disputants. But when that which I admit is extended, perverted, and distorted, then there is a reason for controversy. Chris-

tians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge, or the Bible, or both, and may do so without taking a dollar out of the Lord's treasury, or withholding a dollar from it. I conducted two Bible readings in my own home, and many others have been conducted in meeting-houses.

My opponent intimates that I raise "dust and smoke" "over nothing." Here again he shows that he is an innovator in disposition. With one accord innovators try to belittle the question of controversy between themselves and apostolic disciples. This is one of their "earmarks."

My opponent's second and third replies are largely a repetition of the fallacies set forth in the first of them, and I need not weary the reader with another exposure of them. In those replies he complains because I did not reply to what he presented, and he wrote as if he had not anything to do. Why did he not deal with the four arguments which I set forth in the last of my first essay? Reader, turn and read them again. They are in strict logical form, and remain not only unshattered and unshaken, but they remain undisturbed and unchallenged.

In the last part of my second essay I presented three arguments, in strict logical form, for my opponent to consider, but they remain almost, if not altogether, unnoticed by him. Let the reader turn back and examine them, and then consider that they remain as I stated them.

Finally, in the last part of my third essay I offered eight arguments, in strict logical form, for the consideration of my respondent. But instead of considering them he preferred to occupy space in repeating his subterfuges about farming, and other kinds of secular business, also in complaining of my procedure, and casting reflections upon me, even likening me to a cowardly dog that barks as a bluff.

In conclusion I mention that my opponent complains because I have offered him several of my essays in my tract on "The College Question." In his complaint he even likens me to a "schoolboy" who makes a "cut-and-dried" speech. In response to all this I simply state that it suited my convenience to use what I said in my tract, and it suited my conviction to use it without the change of a

sentence. Besides, I wished, if possible, to compel my opponent to consider what I set forth in that tract, but he has thus far largely ignored it, especially my logical form of reasoning, and prefers to complain of my course. Besides he repeats old subterfuges, engages in scurrilous attacks on me, and occupies space in writing about irrelevant matters. All this is the result of his devotion to his college idol. His condition of mind suggests Isaiah 44:20.

April 6. 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S FOURTH REPLY.

He admits that he had violated the agreement.

I count myself happy that my respondent has, at last, entered the box with me.

I am not surprised at being accused of violating the agreement; rather, have I been surprised that the accusation did not come sooner. But, my friends, I call your attention to the fact that what I said concerning my respondent reflected on him as a debator.

I did not mean to reflect on him as a man and a Christian—I nowhere reflected on his motives or his honesty. I have the right to expose his conduct as a debator, and God being my helper, I will do it. God knows whether or not I am a "carnal," "scurrilous," "bad-tempered babe," and I am glad to commit myself "to Him that judgeth righteously."

But I do not propose to be drawn away from the question involved into defending myself personally against false charges. I entered this discussion because I believed the truth was suffering, and I propose to show that Brother Sommer has no grounds for his contention—that he is utterly wrong.

His effort to justify himself in not replying to my articles calls forth pity from the thinking. What a farce a debate (?) in which one disputant takes no notice of what the other says would be! It appears that my respondent would be glad to have the field to himself, but he has done this long enough. That verbose, illogical, assumptive, presumptive tract, with which he is so well pleased, was

written on the misuse of the Lord's money and the misuse of a "sacred" name. Moreover, it was written when all he had said was on these two heads. (You notice in his last essay he is fighting the "institution.") My reply to his first essay completely demolished his money theory. You remember the list of questions asked in that reply and repeated in the next one? *He has never touched those questions.* I entreat him now to take them up, *one by one*, and answer them. If he does not do it, they stand against him.

His very first effort to reply to me misrepresents me squarely. He says that I reason thus: Because a Christian may invest in a farm to glorify God, "therefore Christians have a right to establish such a school as that for which he contends." I never made such an argument in my life.

I was replying to his article that taught: "Faithful obedience to the divine doctrine of 'equality' will place all the Lord's money in the church treasury, or in the hands of the Lord's needy ones."

"Rendering to God the things that are God's in his own appointed ways will take all of the Lord's money out of the hands of individual Christians."

In the face of such doctrine, I argued that since, according to my respondent's position, every dollar not needed to pay Caesar, and to supply the real needs of a man's dependent ones, must be placed in the Lord's treasury on the first day of the week, or to be given to the poor, the Christian who uses his surplus to increase his business, when that business is already paying Caesar and supplying the needs of his family, occupies the position of the man who kept and used for his own the sum of five dollars overpaid him in a business settlement.

I further argued that if Christians may invest in land, in banking, or in merchandizing beyond what will give them an economical living, they may invest this same money in any kind of a school that is *right in itself*. From this there is no escape. Nothing I have said about the farm, etc., justifies our school or those who put money into it, but it does bring us to the issue. I then placed our school before my respondent and entreated him to tell us wherein it is wrong.

My first article established, beyond all questions, that if Christians may have money that is their "own" and in their "power," it is none of Brother Sommer's business for what they spend it so long as the thing into which they put it is not sinful. And when he objects he becomes a meddler in other men's matters, a "busy-body."

Any man that teaches that the "surplus" is our prosperity and belongs to the Lord, and that all the Lord's money must be put into the treasury or given to the poor saints, will find himself jumping from the "frying pan into the fire."

It took three articles from me to induce him to leave his tract and notice gingerly what I am saying, and here he is in the fire, for in March he said that faithfully observing the doctrine of "equality" and the doctrine of divine justice takes all the Lord's money out of the hands of individual Christians and places it into the Lord's treasury and in the hands of poor saints, and in April he says that individual Christians may act as the Lord's "stewards" and invest the Lord's means in legitimate businesses to make more money "to advance and magnify the Lord's own church." I do not know what he may say next for his positions are so manifestly false that he cannot move without deepening his predicament.

ONE POINT GAINED.

There are Christians all over this country that Brother Sommer has taught to believe that these schools are wrong because they have used the Lord's money and the name "Bible." These same Christians believe that had we come into this country with our own money and established this work, omitting the word "Bible" from the name, it would be alright. They believe Brother Sommer teaches this; but in this last article he shifts from his position and says that it is the establishing of "an institution chiefly secular, to make an opportunity to teach religion." I am glad we are getting down closer to business. A sensible child knows that it is wrong to put the Lord's money, or any other money, into an ungodly institution, yet Brother Sommer has written for six or seven years trying to prove this fact to us. He has even written a tract

on the subject! This is certainly skillfully (?) handling the word of righteousness.

QUESTIONS.

1. Do you still "have no criticisms to offer" concerning the expenditure for education of the money left to C. C. Potter and wife?
2. The "Beamsville Bible College," conducted by Brother S. M. Jones, a classmate of mine, has no building of its own, but from the start has used the church-house. Is it an unscriptural institution?
3. Had we come to Odessa using only the grounds and building given us by the town, would you oppose the school anyway?
4. Do you still claim, as you did in October, 1906, that all you have said on this subject may be classed under the two headings, money and name?

I ask these questions that the issue may shine clear.

ANOTHER POINT GAINED.

My first article clearly established the right of Christians to control surplus money, using it, as a steward of the Lord, as he believes is best for the kingdom of God, notwithstanding the fact that Brother Sommer's first essay denied Christians this right and taught that a faithful observance of the doctrine of "equality" and of "justice" would put every dollar of the Lord's money out of the hands individual Christians and put in in the Lord's treasury or in the hands of his needy ones. In this last essay my respondent admits that a Christian may invest in a farm, his chief and final motive being to advance the kingdom of God. Somewhat contradictory, do you not think?

Aye, my brethren, the one purposed life of our Master must be imitated by his followers—in everything they must keep the "single eye." In doing this they may invest and re-invest, spend and re-spend the money entrusted to them as their best judgment may direct. They may invest in human hearts and minds, if they choose, or they may use their means otherwise for God. So long as

anystrange 4th Reply

contradicts P. 2)

the investment in itself is right, neither Daniel Sommer nor J. N. Armstrong has the *God-given* right to criticise it.

My respondent makes reference to my first article and answers with nine (9) assertions for which he offers no proof. The only proof attempted is a quotation from Brother Nay. He might have quoted from one of my letters instead of Brother Nay's for he has a letter from me, in which I state that I do not believe the N. T. authorizes these schools as it does baptism, etc. This is all Brother Nay means. He believes school-teaching is an honest occupation.

It is always easier to debate with the "other" man, but I ask Brother Sommer to let other men alone and I'll do my best to give him enough to do.

My respondent speaks of his "logical" forms of reasoning that I have not answered. Why, these "syllogisms" assume the very thing to be proved! A man can establish anything by assumption.

I answer his "clear view of the whole matter" by asking the reader to turn back to it and substitute "religious paper" for "religious college" and he will easily see the fallacy of such reasoning.

That it is the duty of the Christian to make every opportunity to teach God's word and save men is so manifestly true that it needs no proof. Why, my respondent, years ago, established, at a cost of \$12,000 of the Lord's money, a "private enterprise," a religio-secular journal, that he might open an effectual door of utterance. By this open door he can sit in his home and preach to thousands each week that he could not reach at all otherwise. Is it wrong for Christians to use an honest occupation so as to make opportunities to save men? Paul's example should lead every other Christian to use his profession likewise. If my greatest sin (?) in the end be that I used my school-teaching to make an opportunity to teach the Bible, I shall fear no evil. The B. C. is therefore a religious institution without any authority from the Lord for its dign.

P. III
MY LAST ARTICLE
 I now call your attention to the fact that my last reply stands untouched. In fact, this is true of everything I have written so far, aside from misrepresentations and proofless assertions.

P. 43

*no autho-
 rity for
 the B. C.
 there*

P. III

*see above
 and P. 43*

tions. In my last reply I showed that our school work interfered in no way with our completeness in Christ. Brother Sommer made no attempt to disprove my argument but continued to *assert* that we declare by our school that we are not complete in Christ. Such a course in a debater manifests his weakness.

THE ISSUE AGAIN.

I am still pleading for the issue and in Brother Sommer's last essay he more nearly approaches it than he has done before. It seems to be the *institution*. This is still indefinite for he does not condemn all institutions. He has an institution himself, a "religious" institution, so it is very indefinite to say our discussion involves a "*new institution*" not hinted at in the Bible; for the Octographic Review is an institution (see your dictionary) which is certainly not hinted at in the Bible. I ask him, again, what is the matter with our institution? He says Christians may "band" themselves together to teach school and may teach the Bible in their school. Now he says I have "extended, perverted, and distorted" this admission. In what way? I gave it, word for word, as it occurred in the O. R. In this very essay to which I am replying he says that "Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge, or the Bible, or both." This is all the admission I have ever claimed from him. In this admission he admits both the "band" and the "purpose." He then adds that this can be done "without taking a dollar out of the Lord's treasury, or withholding a dollar from it." Certainly it can! I taught for four years in a school at Bowling Green, Ky., that did just this. I understand that the Beamsville school is such a school and if we had not built a dormitory we should be doing it here right now. This is the lesson that Brother Sommer has seemed slow to get. All of his ado about money is only confusing to the brethren.

But our trouble now seems to be our "new institution." Indeed, is it the money taken out of the Lord's treasury that makes the institution? Does my respondent mean that we may band ourselves together, purposing to teach the Bible and secular knowl-

edge, and be alright until we take some money out of the Lord's treasury? If we had never called for or received a single dollar, but had started the school all the "new institution" that we have would be here any way. This is the predicament my respondent is in. He is out "of the frying pan into the fire." What does he oppose in these schools? When he is pressed on his "money theory" it is a "new institution" that he is fighting, and when you show that he himself grants all the institutionism (the "band" and the purpose) that we have it is the "money." What he may say the next time I do not know, but I am going to tell you again wherein our sin (?) lies. We have established a private school in which our chief and final purpose is the training of our students to be truthful, honest, pure, clean, unselfish, faithful to parents, just to men, believers in God and his son Jesus Christ—we have established a school in which we teach the Bible.

I earnestly entreat my respondent to answer the questions directly put to him in this article, if he does nothing else in his reply.

April 13, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER'S FIFTH ESSAY.

In his fourth reply my respondent says I did not answer his questions which he asked in his second reply. But the reader can see that they were all answered, by implication, in my fourth essay, as far as they had anything in them worthy of notice, though I did not make mention of them by number. But to confute my opponent, explicitly, I now take them numerically.

1. "Was this 'wealth' among the brethren at Jerusalem the Lord's money?" Answer.—Just as much of it was the Lord's money as he demanded.

2. "Should one inherit 'wealth' may he use it or must he put it into the Lord's treasury?" Answer.—That depends on whether he needs it or not, and what he intends to use it for. He may need it to pay his debts, or to support some one who depends on him.

3. "If the Jerusalem disciples had 'wealth' that was their 'own,' and in their 'power,' could they not have used it in the building of a school-building and starting a school without sinning, provided the school in itself was right?" Answer.—The proviso in the last part of this question assumes the point in controversy, and thus the question, as such, is unworthy of notice. The same inquiry might be propounded in regard to a Missionary Society, or any other humanisms.

4. "If these Christians had wealth that they could have used in a school may not Christians to-day use their wealth in building the right kind of schools?" Answer.—This question involves two assumptions which need to be proved before they can be justly used as a basis for a conclusion. First, the assumption that the Christians at Jerusalem had a divinely-given right to build any kind of school with the wealth under their control, and, second, the assumption that "the right kind of school" has been contended for by my opponent.

5. "Suppose a Christian should be so simple and so selfish as to establish a school—a 'religio-secular school'—solely to make a living out of it, would this be unscriptural?" Answer.—This question assumes that to build such a school for such a purpose would be "simple" and "selfish" in a Christian, and as Christians are required to be wise and to be unselfish, certainly the building of such a school would be "unscriptural."

My respondent says of the foregoing questions: "When these questions are answered the money proposition will be a lost cause." Let us see. I have answered them. How is the money proposition lost?

While answering questions is before my mind I now answer those my opponent propounded in his fourth reply to me.

1. "Do you still 'have no criticism to offer' concerning the expenditure of the money left to C. C. Potter and wife?" Answer.—I would have had criticisms to offer when I wrote to them if I had understood their purpose, as it has been manifested in the institution they established. As I now understand that purpose, and its results, I regard their institution as strictly unscriptural in origin, in name, and its outworkings.

2. "The 'Beamsville Bible College,' conducted by Brother S. M. Jones, a classmate of mine, has no building of its own, but from the start has used the church-house. Is it an unscriptural institution?" Answer.—That depends on what is taught in the Beamsville school, and whether the name "Bible" is made to cover what is not Biblical. All falsehood is unscriptural.

3. "Had we come to Odessa, using only the grounds and buildings given us by the town, would you oppose the school any way?" Answer.—Yes. The ORIGIN and PURPOSE of the Odessa school was unscriptural, as my discussion with Prof. Rhodes clearly reveals. Besides, the FALSEHOOD set forth in your denial that it is a "religious institution" proves the same.

4. "Do you still claim, as you did in October, 1906, that all you have said on this subject may be classed under the two headings, 'money' and 'name'?" Answer.—No. My discussions with Prof. Rhodes were largely, if not chiefly, concerning the unscriptural ORIGIN and unscriptural PURPOSE of the Odessa school, and the FALSEHOODS made use of in its behalf.

My respondent began his fourth reply by saying: "I count myself happy that my opponent has, at last, entered the box with me." The reader will see that I have not "entered the box" with him, for I have not charged him with being a "braggart" who excels all others, nor have I likened him to a cowardly dog, who barks as a bluff, nor have I used any other form of scurrility. Prof. Armstrong seems to have a genius for untruth.

My respondent makes mention in his fourth reply of what he designates, "One Point Gained." But all that he says under that heading is more fanciful than anything else. I have not shifted from any position I ever took on this College Question, except as its advocates revealed themselves, I learned that the colleges I oppose are worse than I thought they were. When I began to oppose them I did not know the "depths of Satan," as I now do. (Rev. 2:24.) The colleges I oppose are so bad that they require their advocates to become unscrupulous in trying to defend them.

My opponent in his fourth reply also makes mention of an imaginary something which he designates "Another Point Gained." Then under that heading he says what is strictly untrue, concerning

my first essay. Let the reader turn back and examine it, also the beginning of my second essay, where I admit that a Christian may be rich. I ended my fourth essay by stating that my opponent suggested to me the condition of heart expressed in Isaiah 44: 20, and I now say that I am again reminded of that scripture. The disregard for common veracity, as well as for the word of God, as manifested by the advocates of the colleges, I oppose is sufficient to condemn them, as certain as that the Bible is true.

My respondent says that in the "logical form of reasoning" to which I referred him I "assumed the very thing to be proved." Why did he not take my syllogisms, as I have taken his questions, and deal with them separately, and in their order? The reader can judge.

My respondent still tries to impress his readers that the REVIEW and his College are alike. Prof. Rhodes tried to make that impression. I answered him plainly. But as Prof. Armstrong now tries the same I shall set forth, in condensed form, what Prof. Rhodes said, and expose it not only plainly but so as to make both of those Professors ashamed—if they be not lost to a sense of shame.

THE CHART EXHIBITED BY PROFESSOR RHODES.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. The Review has a head. | 1. The College has a head. |
| 2. The Review has helpers. | 2. The College has helpers. |
| 3. The Review has patrons. | 3. The College has patrons. |
| 4. The Review has religious matter. | 1. The College has religious matter. |
| 5. The Review has secular matter. | 5. The College has secular matter. |

HERE IS THE EXPOSURE.

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Man has a head. | 1. A donkey has a head. |
| 2. Man has a mouth. | 2. A donkey has a mouth. |
| 3. Man has ears. | 3. A donkey has ears. |
| 4. Man has eyes. | 4. A donkey has eyes. |
| 5. Man has feet. | 5. A donkey has feet. |

But I need not go farther. The reader can see that if Prof. Rhodes' chart, which seems to be endorsed by Prof. Armstrong, proves that the REVIEW and the College are of the same order of enterprises, then my "exposure" proves that a man and a donkey are of the same order of animals.

My opponent says he will answer my "Clear View of the Whole Matter" set forth in my preceding essay by asking the reader to substitute "religious paper" for "religious college." In response to this I state that my respondent is not satisfied with violating the 9th command of the Decalogue and all that the New Testament says against falsehood, but he actually asks his readers to join him in that abominable business. The REVIEW'S defense of its existence is as widely separated from the defense which the college makes as truth is separated from error. I CHALLENGE MY RESPONDENT TO ENTER A COMPARISON ON THIS QUESTION. I pledge myself to show that the REVIEW does not make use of falsehood in its defense, while the College, as I am showing, rarely makes use of anything except falsehood. But this is not all. In my "Clear View of the Whole Matter" I class the "religious college" and the "missionary society" together, and my respondent does not deny, nor even intimate, that they do not belong together. On the contrary, as he refers to what I offered on that subject, and passes from it without a denial or intimation in opposition, I have a right to conclude that Prof. Armstrong KNOWS that his College is not more defensible than the Missionary Society, and thus KNOWS that he is, in principle, a GENUINE INNOVATOR.

In the midst of his fourth essay my respondent says of me. "I do not know what he may say next, for his positions are so manifestly false that he cannot move without deepening his predicament." The reader will notice that my respondent is not careful to state my positions in my own words, but states his false inferences concerning them, and then arrays his false inferences against each other. See the declaration near the middle of his last reply, whereby he says that my position "would put every dollar of the Lord's money out of the hands (of) individual Chris-

tians." I simply pronounce such a declaration strictly untrue, and refer the reader to my first essay for proof.

My respondent says that his fourth reply "stands untouched," except that I "continued to assert." The reader will be able to judge by looking at that article again. I do not understand why he cannot make any statement concerning me and my position, which is correct. I do not wish to think that he is of Cretian extraction.

QUESTIONS FOR MY RESPONDENT TO ANSWER.

1. Does the New Testament make any mention of a Christian whose business was that of a religio-secular school teacher?
2. Does the N. T. make mention of a Christian who was, by divine requirement, a writer of truth to individual Christians and to churches of Christ?
3. Does the N. T. make mention of any Christian who was a writer of truth to his brethren, and who commanded another Christian to "do" what he had "learned and received, and heard, and seen" in him?
4. Does such command certainly include anything that the N. T. does not inform us that a Christian ever did?
5. Does or does not such command certainly include that which the N. T. informs us that the apostle Paul did by divine authority?
6. Is there any difference, on the one hand, between investing in that which is religious, in order to follow Paul's example in teaching by letter-writing, and investing, on the other hand, in that which is secular, by teaching in a religio-secular school, that neither Paul nor any other Christian mentioned in the N. T. ever set an example for?
7. What is the difference, if any, in principle, between following the Roman Catholic example, in regard to infant sprinkling, and the Roman Catholic example in regard to religio-secular schools, as neither such sprinkling nor such schools are mentioned in the N. T. and both originated with the Apostacy?
8. What is the difference, if any, in principle, between a hu-

manly-established Missionary Society to teach persons in religion, and a humanly-established educational society to teach persons in religion?

9. What does the N. T. say to a young preacher in regard to treatment of "an elder," both negatively and affirmatively?

10. Has J. N. Armstrong, as a young preacher, treated Daniel Sommer, in this discussion, as an "elder" should be treated, especially when he charged him with being a "braggart" above all others, and that he has behaved like a cowardly, bluffing "dog" in regard to the college controversy?

11. What is the difference, if any, between a falsehood when told by a college professor and a falsehood when told by any other person?

12. Does the last part of Revelations 21:8 include college professors, and other advocates of colleges, if they become the kind of characters described in that part of that particular scripture?

Prof. Armstrong was particular in calling upon me to answer his questions, and I trust he will be particular in answering mine.

College advocates seem to have drunk so deeply of college wine that their brains are stupefied and their consciences seared. Notice the following, which I find in the latter part of Prof. Armstrong's second reply: "Many innocent babies become criminals, must we conclude from this fact that it is wrong for people to have babies?"

The question just quoted was asked by Prof. Armstrong to offset what I have said about Bethany College having become an apostate institution. But what are the facts? The First Command (Gen. 1:28) gives divine authority for "babies"—legitimate babies—but not does not authorize illegitimates. But where is the divine command which gives divine authority for a religious college? Such command cannot be found, and the existence of such a college is the result of a part of the church playing foul with the world. **SUCH A COLLEGE IS AN ILLEGITIMATE.** Now the reader can see the absurdity of Prof. Armstrong's question on this subject.

Near the beginning of his third reply my respondent makes

157
 mention of the fact that certain persons were "disappointed" over the course I pursued at Odessa, and he declares that I, "could not be forced to discuss the issue." I discussed THE UNSCRIP-TURALNESS OF THE ORIGIN AND OF THE PURPOSE OF THE WESTERN BIBLE AND LITERARY COLLEGE AT ODESSA, MO. This the published record will show. As that was logically and chronologically the first chapter of "the issue" my respondent's charge, as quoted above, is STRICTLY UNTRUE, even as is all else that he says against me. He comes as near as being "always wrong" as any man that I ever corresponded with.

Prof. Armstrong also says, "I believe with my whole heart that he is afraid of the issue." What recklessness! incaution, haste, impulse, passion, bitterness, vengeance—these are the words which are necessary to express what I find in his third reply, and in a part of his second.

Near the middle of his third reply I find this: "I challenge the world to do regular, systematic school work with less 'organization' or 'institutionism' than we have." Here is an admission that the Odessa college is, at least in some degrees, an "organization" or an "institutionism," and this admission shows the justness of my charge on that question. If it has a treasury separate from the church, and separate from the individual pocket-book of each of its teachers, it is a separate institution. This also proves it to be a separate "organization."

But this is not all. Prof. Armstrong challenges "the world," but does he challenge the church? He would better not. The church, in many places, does "regular, systematic school work" every Lord's day morning without the slightest "organization" or "institutionism" beyond its own officers, though the work is strictly Biblical. On the same principle, it could do other kinds of school work, and even manage a farm, as some churches have done. But the Odessa college requires some other "organization" or "institutionism" between the individual Christian, on the one hand, in his personal and family affairs, and the Church of Christ, on the other hand, in its congregational affairs. The Lord has ordained the private purse. See Luke 22:36. And he has ordained the church treasury. See I. Corinthians 16:1, 2; Philippians 4:15,

16. But he has neither ORDAINED nor even RECOGNIZED a COLLEGE TREASURY. My respondent seems to have a genius for fallacies.

He says in his third reply, "With no more 'organization' or 'institutionism' than would be necessary were we editing and publishing a paper, we began our work and have continued it to this day." In response to this I state that the REVIEW has not the semblance of an extra treasury, and never has had since it came under its present control. Can my respondent TRUTH-FULLY say as much for his college as an "organization" or "institutionism?" If not, then he is wrong again.

Near the close of his third reply my respondent says, "We teach the word of God in our school. This is the 'bear.'" But all my writings are in direct contradiction of this statement. My respondent seems determined to be ALWAYS WRONG, even as the ancient Cretians were in regard to truth.

April 17, 1907.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S FIFTH REPLY.

With all my respondent's dodging and carefulness to avoid committing himself in answering my questions, his money theory is pushed into the back-ground.

His doctrine all the time has been that, if people gave as the Lord directs, the disciples could never have furnished grounds and buildings for a school. That is, it would have been a financial impossibility, since there would not be enough surplus money in the hands of the disciples to equip such a school.

This has been his ridiculous contention for five or six years. Disciples may invest in lands, drugs, dry goods, lumber and groceries, but they may never have money enough on hand to build a school-house! Such teaching speaks aloud for its teacher.

For years he has been a "troubler" of Israel, and, like Ahab, he has charged this trouble to as consecrated disciples as live to-day. "History repeats itself." Whether Brother Sommer has intentionally laid false charges at the door of Christians or not,

but is classed with Ahab.

then is not a disciple,

is with him and his God, but that he has charged brethren falsely is sure. The two great sins, money and name, with which we have been charged all of these years have become secondary matters. For five or six years my respondent has disturbed the peace of God's children over secondary matters because of his ignorance of the situation.

Of course, if the thing itself is wrong it should be abolished and needs another name for money. Since Brother Sommer has for years occupied secondary ground thinking it to be primary, who knows but that in six more years he may discover further ignorance.

Now, I ask him to tell us what he has learned since October, 1906. Let him name one thing new. I predict now that when he names this "new discovery" it will not involve any part of the institutionism.

HIS ANSWERS.

My respondent has finally attempted the questions I asked twice and had to urge him the third time to answer.

In Nos. 1 and 2 he avoided the points by making a nice dodge. He makes no attempt to answer Nos. 3 and 4 and says they are unworthy of notice. The facts are they cannot be avoided and to answer them ruins him. Let him try it. Here are the questions again: 3. If the Jerusalem disciples had "wealth" that was their "own" and in their "power" could they not have used it in the building of a school-building and starting a school without sinning, provided the school in itself was right?

4. If these Christians had wealth that they could have used in a school, may not Christians to-day use their wealth in building the right kind of schools? It is not the assumptions (?) in these questions but the answers that *must* be given, if they are answered at all, that scares Brother Sommer. He should burn up that tract and humbly confess to its readers his serious mistakes.

I have been scrupulously careful not to reflect on my respondent's motives and honesty. I leave you to judge what success I have attained. I *did* say that he had "bragged" as only Daniel

Sommer could, and I repeat it, for I believe it is true, and as a debater on this College question I propose to show his methods to the brethren. I believe I ought to do it. In his last essay there are about eight insinuations concerning my regard for "common veracity."

God is my judge so I need make no defence. I gladly commit my character to his protection.

HIS QUESTIONS.

1. The business of every Farmer at Corinth was to be a "religio-secular" farmer. Likewise it was the duty of every school-teacher to be a "religio-secular" teacher. Does Brother Sommer condemn Christian teachers for being "religio-secular" teachers?
2.—3-5 Yes.

4.—Such a command includes everything mentioned and everything necessarily implied.

6.—It is just as scriptural to teach in a "religio-secular" school to follow Paul's example as it is to teach in and through a "religio-secular" journal and a "religio-secular" publishing-house and book-store.

Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5 are asked in defence of the "Octographic Review." A man is, without doubt, in a severe strait when he has to justify a "religio-secular" journal with its "Editor," "Corresponding Editors," "Field Editors," "Publisher," "Office Editor," "Contributorial Staff" composed of nine teachers, its publishing-house, and its book-store by the simple letter-writing of inspired men.

Were we in such a strait we might press the school of Tyrannus, in which Paul taught for two years, into service. The Review Company has a well organized "educational society" including thousands of students paying from \$10,000 to \$15,000 tuition every year and that for instruction in the gospel of Christ chiefly. Further, this "educational society" nourishes and cherishes a book-store, often devoting two or three columns of the valuable space of its paper to advertising books. Every week the students of this society are urgently appealed to to buy these books.

Not only is much valuable space devoted to the advertising of Brother Sommer's books, but it also advertises J. H. Filmore's books. J. H. Filmore, one of the largest song-book dealers in America, is a rank digressive and runs the book business for what there is in it. The Review helps him to push this business, making a profit on the books sold.

This educational society that Brother Sommer's fertile brain has given to the world is a religio-secular institution, which has for its final purpose the building of the kingdom of God. Nor do I criticise the arrangement so long as it is a private enterprise in which every Christian works as a servant of Christ, even though its various channels of revenue empty into one "pocket." I challenge him to deny that the "Review" with all of its departments is a "religio-secular" institution; that the book-store connected with it is a secular business, advertising and selling the goods of secular firms.

Question 7.—I believe men should follow Christ and be guided by the New Testament. Neither do I believe that because a thing is religio-secular it is after the Roman Catholic example.

9.—The New Testament says what is found in 1 Tim. 5:1.

10.—This question has already been answered. But I have this much further to say: In entering this discussion my respondent made himself equal with me as a disputant, but if he is begging for mercy because he has been preaching and debating as long as I have been living let him say so.

11.—None whatever.

12.—Yes.

Now I ask the reader to turn back and read 11 and 12 and decide the motive prompting these questions. Why did he, and "elder" in Israel, ask them?

ORIGIN AND PURPOSE.

In 1899 my wife and I began to talk of coming west sometime and starting a "Bible school" and our hearts were fully set on the thought. About two years later brother R. C. Bell entered the plan, and still later the other three brethren. From day to day our

Why, then, hasn't the Lord provided for it as SOMMER-ARMSTRONG DISCUSSION. He has the church, so that it might be self supporting.

plans materialized till, sooner than any of us expected, the Lord opened up the way in this great and needy field. This is our origin. This oral agreement entered and developed step by step is all that binds us together today.

Let my respondent face our origin and show the sin in it. If he knows anything in our origin that I have kept back let him expose it.

In my third reply I fully established the righteousness of our purpose, asking six direct questions. These questions with my argument stand unchallenged.

Brother Sommer is a fine debator *by himself*—he can assert more and prove less than any debator I have ever noticed.

Now I ask him how that school that Christians may band themselves together to teach should originate, and what should be their purpose in their Bible teaching? Would their school be religio-secular?

THE CHART.

After Brother Sommer's experience with Rhodes' chart at Odesa, Mo., he and his moderator tried hard to rule it out at Hale, Mo., as "out of order." Now he introduces it himself. Perhaps he thought he could manage it better this way, for he dreads it, and I do not wonder that he does.

Was the chart designed to show that the school and the journal are identical? Certainly not. It was designed to show that the organization is the same in principle. Brother Sommer in his exposure proves the very point the chart was made to demonstrate. He shows that man and the donkey are the same, in principle, in their animal organization. Nobody believes the school and the Review are identical, but he who fights one because of its organization must fight the other.

QUESTION No. 8.

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

Several years ago E. A. Elam, now an editor of the Gospel Advocate, discussed the Missionary Society question with J. A. Minton of Bells, Tenn. Minton is a good debater naturally and in this discussion his most plausible work was done by comparing the Society with the Gospel Advocate and the Nashville Bible School. He tried hard to prove the three—the journal, the school, and the Missionary Society, to be the same in principle. Christian church people, so far as I know, have always contended that the company formed to publish and edit a journal to preach the gospel is the same in principle as the Missionary Society, yet my respondent has never been disturbed by this comparison. Neither have we been disturbed by any comparison Missionary Society advocates may have made of our school and the Society. The school is not like the society in a single respect in which I oppose the society.

Webster says: "Society" means "The relationship of men to one another when associated in any way; companionship; fellowship; company." "A number of persons associated for any temporal or permanent object."

"Organize" means "To arrange or constitute in parts, each having a special function, act, office, or relation; to systematize; to get into working order."

"Organization" means "The act of organizing; the act of arranging in a systematic way for use or action."

"Institute" means "To set up; to establish," "to begin, to commence, to set on foot."

"Institution" means "The act or process of instituting," "that which is instituted or established," "an established or organized society or corporation."

I have given these definitions that we may not be prejudiced against good words or deceived by false teaching. Every class in our school is a "society," an "organization," an "institution." Every business firm in your town is a "society," an "organiza-

Then it is a mixture and Jesus says ye cannot serve two

tion," an "institution." And if run by Christians should be run to the glory of God. Why, my brethren, because a thing is a society, an organization, an institution, it is not necessarily wrong!

The Review, the Missionary Society, and our school are all human societies, organizations, institutions, having for their chief purpose the glorification of God. The Missionary Society and the Review claim to be wholly religious, while our school makes no such claim but is simply a business institution that does not differ in its work from any other literary school in the world save in the amount and character of the religion it teaches. Every school in the world intentionally teaches Bible truths to its students, except the schools conducted by infidels and these inoculate their students with their deadly heresies.

Every school in this country leaves its religious stamp on its students. Higher Criticism and evolution are infusing their venom into the religious world through the schools of the land. The child returns to his home with his religious cast of mind molded by the school he attended. It is not a question whether parents will send their children where they will be surrounded with religious influence and teaching, for they cannot avoid this unless they put them in schools of infidels and there have them inoculated with the infidel's religion. The question is whether they will put them under the influence of schools whose religious influence and teaching is mixed with sectarianism, digressionism, Higher Criticism and evolutionism, or whether they will place them in schools where the religious influence and teaching is as pure and unmixed as loyal Christians can make it by teaching the Bible itself faithfully and diligently daily to its students.

Thus we find that the Review more nearly resembles the society than the school does. For it is not only a human institution organized to preach the gospel but like the society "claims" to be wholly religious. *Thus he indorses human*

If my objection to the American Christian Missionary Society were that its final purpose is to build up the kingdom of God, I certainly should never lift my voice against it again.

I have some serious objections to the Missionary Society. It seeks to control all the churches in its territory, presuming to be *up the* *to build* *to be better*

admitting the human to be better, stronger and above the divine.

the centralized power and authority of the churches—the congress of the churches, the seat of government.

It is an incorporated body with its self-made constitution and by-laws, in which men may buy life-long memberships and even life-long director-ships (if they have the cash) that subordinates the churches of Christ and presumes to speak and legislate for them. It selects the Missionary for the field, employs him, sends, and supports him, thus supplanting, over-riding, and snowing under, the churches in their missionary work. *In short, the American Christian Missionary Society invades with a high hand the very domain of God.* Brother Sommer should be ashamed to compare a private school established by Christians to this society with its high-handed rebellious crowd simply because these Christians teach the Bible to their students.

Our school has no more control of the church at Odessa, to say nothing of the other churches of America, than a dry goods store or a farm run by the same Christians would have.

The school is not like the society in a single thing that the same likeness cannot be found to exist between the "Octographic Review" and the society.

Neither is there anything common to the school and the society that should not be common to every Christian's business. I say that no Christian has a right to enter a business that does not have for its chief end the advancement of the kingdom of God. Brother Sommer makes another of his rash statements when he says that no argument can be made against the missionary society that can not be made against the school.

April 24, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER'S SIXTH ESSAY.

In his Fifth Reply my respondent asks me to "name one new thing" that I have "learned since October, 1906." In response I state that I have learned this: B. F. Rhodes and J. N. Armstrong, as debaters, are more discourteous, more offensively personal, more reckless in regard to common veracity, and more irreverent in their use of Scripture, than I previously thought they were. I have learned that in their determination to defend their college idol, they have offered themselves as living sacrifices to the father of falsehood. If their "institutionism" could be defended by truth it would prove itself to be right. But as it requires its advocates to make constant use of falsehood, and other unfairness, in order to make a show of defense in its behalf, it is certainly an unscriptural institutionism.

In my Fifth Essay I presented, in condensed form, Prof. Rhodes' comparison between the REVIEW and the College, and exposed it by presenting a comparative view of man and a donkey. Having done this I said, "If Prof. Rhodes' chart, which seems to be endorsed by Prof. Armstrong, proves that the REVIEW and the College are of the same order of enterprises, then my 'exposure' proves that a man and a donkey are of the same order of animals." In response to this Prof. Armstrong says: "Was the chart designed to show that the school and the journal are identical? Certainly not." The reader will notice that in this reference to the chart, and my exposure of it, Prof. Armstrong passes from the expression "same order of enterprises," to the word "identical," and then fights the *identity* idea with a bold denial. This is a sample of his style, but this is not all. My respondent says of me: "He shows that man and the donkey are the same, in principle, in their animal organization." I pronounce such a statement *untrue* and *absurd*, and I leave the reader to judge whether I offered that which "shows" anything of that kind.

But here is more on the same subject. My opponent says: "Nobody believes the REVIEW and the school are identical, but he who fights one because of its organization must fight the other."

But Prof. Rhodes and Prof. Armstrong both contend that they "are the same" in principle, for they both contend that they "are the same" "in organization," and Prof. Armstrong now contends that they "are the same" even as man and a donkey "are the same, in principle, in their animal organization." The reader will now understand that Prof. Armstrong contends that the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW and the Odessa College resemble each other "in organization" even as man and a donkey resemble each other "in their animal organization."

Wood, B.S. Sommer

THE CONTRAST PLAINLY VIEWED.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Man is a biped. | 1. A donkey is a quadruped. |
| 2. Man is partly carnivorous. | 2. A donkey is strictly herbivorous. |
| 3. Man has feet of flesh and bones. | 3. A donkey has horny hoofs. |
| 4. Man's language is natural and artificial. | 4. A donkey's language is strictly natural. |
| 5. Man bears the image of his Maker. | 5. A donkey does not bear the image of his Maker. |

Yet man resembles the donkey "in animal organization," even as the REVIEW resembles the college "in organization;" that is, according to Prof. Armstrong. And, as every proposition implies its negative, it follows that the REVIEW DOES NOT resemble the college in question any more than man resembles the donkey! This settles the "organization" question, and shows that all efforts on the part of the Odessa professor to show that the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW and the Odessa college are alike "in organization" result in showing that they are NOT MORE ALIKE THAN A MAN AND A DONKEY ARE ALIKE "IN ANIMAL ORGANIZATION." In view of this, whenever the readers may wish to consider the difference "in organization" between the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW and the Odessa college, let him consider that Prof. Armstrong has admitted that they are the same in principle, even as a man and a donkey are the same in principle in their animal organization. Here I rest the question of "anal-

ogy," or resemblance, which has been alleged to exist between the REVIEW and the college, except to add this: Man and the donkey are both of Divine CREATION; the REVIEW is of divinely authorized IMITATION; while the religious college is wholly a humanly-devised INNOVATION.

I am pleased with the progress which has been made thus far in this discussion. In my First, Second and Third Essays I set forth the money question as involved in this controversy in an impersonal manner. In the latter part of each of those essays I stated my conclusions in syllogisms, or logical forms of reasoning, which remain unassailed except by personal thrusts, scurrility and misrepresentation. *It seems Prof. A. has nothing to*

Then, in my fourth essay, I set forth the question of business investments in that which I designated, "A Clear View of the Whole Matter." And what I then set forth stands the test, even of unscrupulous criticism. In a comparative view I thereby showed that a proper business investment by Christians is THE OPPOSITE of the investments made in religious colleges and missionary societies as far as effect on the church treasury is concerned. In so doing I showed that all pleading for religious colleges because of the lawfulness of proper investments, by Christians, in farms and other business enterprises that are scriptural, is a subterfuge. *advis*
about
the
treasury

Then, in my Fifth Essay, I set forth, in a comparative view between man and the donkey, an exposure of the folly of comparing the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW in organization with the religio-secular college in organization. That exposure has drawn from my respondent an admission which shows that he regards the REVIEW and his college in sameness of organization as he does a man and a donkey "in their animal organization!"

I now propose to make an exposure of a supposed aphorism, or self-evident truth. In a letter dated October 6, 1906, addressed to W. W. Otey, my respondent says of himself, "I have a right to call on Christians to help me do anything that I can't do myself, if it is right for me to do it." This supposed aphorism has been repeated in one form or another by certain college advocates, as a justification for their begging. But instead of being designated an

aphorism it may be regarded as a REPTILISM, for it is a declaration which conceals one of the deceptions of "that Old Serpent, called the devil, and Satan, who deceiveth the whole world." Here is the promised exposure in a single sentence: **THAT WHICH PROF. ARMSTRONG SAYS IS HIS RIGHT IN REGARD TO ASKING FOR HELP, WOULD, IF ADOPTED BY ALL OTHER CHRISTIANS, MAKE THEM ALL A SET OF BEGGARS—EACH BEGGING OF THE OTHER.** From this conclusion there is not the slightest opportunity for escape, and, for a position which, if fully adopted, would make all Christians beggars, and thus would make them a disgrace to the name of Christ, there is not the slightest decent apology. It is unscriptural, unreasonable, dishonorable, disgraceful. God never gave a man a right to do anything that is **WRONG**, and certainly for the entire church to become a set of persistent and shameless beggars would be **WRONG**.

But this is not all. Prof. Armstrong's basis of begging is that he intends to do good, for he has begun a school enterprise **FOR THE PURPOSE** of teaching his pupils in the Bible. But suppose a Christian should begin a farming enterprise **FOR THE PURPOSE** of teaching his farm hands in the Bible, would he, on that account, have a right to beg the Brotherhood for money to help him pay for his farm, and enable him to erect buildings on it? Again, suppose a Christian should start in a blacksmithing enterprise **FOR THE PURPOSE** of teaching his apprentices in the Bible, would he, on that account, have a right to beg the Brotherhood for money to help him to buy land, erect suitable buildings, and put suitable machinery into his blacksmith shop? On this principle I might proceed in regard to all other departments of business, but could not make the absurdity of what I am exposing more evident to the reader's mind. Prof. Armstrong has deceived himself and others with the **SERPENTINE SENTENCE** which I have quoted from his letter to Brother Otey, of October 6, 1906. In the paper falsely-called "Primitive Christianity," bearing date January 12, 1905, Prof. Armstrong likens his enterprise to "a Christian's farm" and to a "Christian's blacksmith-shop," and argues in its behalf on that basis. But what would be the general

conclusion concerning a Christian who would begin a farming enterprise **FOR THE PURPOSE** of teaching his farm hands in the Bible, and of the blacksmith who would begin a blacksmithing enterprise **FOR THE PURPOSE** of teaching his apprentices in the Bible, and then would beg for all the money that he would need to pay the debts that he would make in beginning such an enterprise? I am satisfied that the general conclusion would be that such a Christian would act an unscriptural, unbusinesslike, absurd, foolish, ridiculous part, and would be left to bear the disgrace of his foolishness. Many would conclude that he intended to enrich himself by begging. I am satisfied likewise that the general conclusion will be the same concerning Prof. Armstrong and his school-teaching enterprise as soon as the brethren will have reflected concerning it as their common sense will enable them to reflect. I am sure they will conclude that Prof. Armstrong's position and reasoning, if generally adopted, would make the members of the churches of Christ a set of **SHAMELESS BEGGARS**, and a **SET OF BUSINESS FOOLS**.

But this subject is not exhausted. I have been told how the Odessa school originated and asked to show "the sin in it." I answer by inquiring, What would be the general conclusion if an acceptable preacher should turn aside from his work as preaching during most of his time, and begin farming **FOR THE PURPOSE** of teaching his farm-hands in religion, or would spend most of his time in blacksmithing **FOR THE PURPOSE** of teaching his apprentices in the Bible, and then, on that account, beg money to buy land, erect buildings, and purchase equipments, and threaten persons with perdition if they did not give to him, and deed all such property to himself? In the light of this question we can understand the "sin" of about a half-dozen preachers settling down at Odessa, Mo., for the purpose which they profess to have in view. We can understand, also, that if the example of those preachers is right, and should be generally adopted, *then every Christian may project an enterprise to teach persons in the Bible, contract debts to establish it, beg money of every other Christian to pay those debts, have all the property deeded to himself, and*

then threaten persons with perdition if they do not give money to help pay for that property.

My confidence in the common sense, business judgment, and scriptural knowledge of my brethren, is such that I am persuaded that after reading the foregoing conclusion, and considering it aright, they will, with one accord, decide that the religio-secular college established at Odessa, Mo., is an UNSCRIPTURAL ENTERPRISE, and is worse than the Missionary Society. In his Fifth Essay Prof. Armstrong sums up his arraignment of the A. C. Missionary Society by saying, "It invades with a high hand the very domain of God." BUT WHAT DID PROF. ARMSTRONG DO WHEN HE THREATENED THOSE WITH PERDITION WHO WOULD NOT GIVE TO HIS COLLEGE?

But there is another reason for regarding that college as unscriptural which should be considered with care. Having disposed of the question of MISUSING THE LORD'S MONEY, and of making a mistake in COMPARING THE ORGANIZATION of the religio-secular college with that of the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW, and the questions of PURPOSE, and of BEGGING, and of THREATENING WITH PERDITION, I now ask the reader to consider this: THE COLLEGES IN CONTROVERSY DEAL ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY IN UNFAIRNESS, AND OFTEN DEAL IN POSITIVE FALSEHOOD, IN MAKING THEIR DEFENSE WHEN CRITICISED.

1. To confine attention to my respondent's writings, I mention that instead of following my example in the beginning of this debate and writing impersonally, or, at least, respectfully, he became grossly and offensively personal, even likening me to a cowardly "dog."

2. Instead of stating my positions in my own words, he has almost invariably stated them partly or wholly in his words, and for some reason has always misrepresented them.

3. Instead of showing wherein I had been guilty of the unfairness he alleges in answering his question, he charged that I was guilty of "dodging" and followed his charge by more of the same kind.

4. He asked me near the beginning of his Fourth Essay to take

his questions "one by one and answer them." I did so, for I copied them by number and answered them. Instead of following my example he simply referred to most of my questions, grouped them, and gave his answers, such as they are. This was not according to the GOLDEN RULE.

5. When convicted of carnality and scurrility he neither explained nor apologized, but said he committed himself to God who "judgeth righteously," yet showed that he was not willing to wait for God's judgment, but said I was guilty of making "false charges."

6. In the first part of his First reply he says, "According to my respondent's position, every dollar not needed to pay Cæsar, and to supply real needs of a man's dependent ones, must be placed in the Lord's treasury on the first day of the week or it must be given to the poor." Then in the first part of his Fifth reply he says of me, "This has been his ridiculous contention for five years. Disciples may invest in land, drugs, dry goods, lumber and groceries, but they may never have money enough on hand to build a school-house." These two representations of me exclude each other, and they are both STRICTLY FALSE. The former representation excludes investments beyond taxes and a bare living; the latter says I allow investments in many things, but deny an investment in a "school-house!" I refer the reader to my First and Second Essays in which I acknowledge that Christians may be "rich" in the things of this world, and only affirm that a faithful observance of the divine doctrine of "equality" will not allow sufficient money to be in any Christian's hands "long enough for that one to think of founding with that sum a religio-secular school." But turning to those essays and reading with care any one can see the gross misrepresentation which my opponent has made, and then, by careful comparison, he can see that his misrepresentations exclude each other. Thus it may be seen that my opponent is so determined to defeat me that he makes a misrepresentation of me and fights it; then makes a contrary misrepresentation and then fights that!

7. According to the definitions given of the word "Institution" in his Fifth Essay, my respondent was guilty of gross falsehood

*Sommer's 5th and 6th Essays are sufficient
within themselves to defeat
Armstrong in all he has ^{said} and may say*

74

SOMMER-ARMSTRONG DISCUSSION.

when he said in the paper falsely-called "Primitive Christianity," for January 12, 1905, "I want first of all to emphasize the fact that our work is a school, and not a religious institution." But I need not say more about my opponent's lack of regard for truth. In answer to my charge on that subject he says of himself, "God is my judge so I make no defense." In thus writing my opponent, by implication, admits what I have said concerning his disregard of "common veracity."

In his Fifth Reply my opponent says. "I challenge him to deny that the REVIEW, with all of its departments, is a "religio-secular" institution, that the book-store connected with it is a secular business, advertising and selling the goods of a secular firm." In answer to this challenge, I DENY THAT THE REVIEW IS MORE SECULAR THAN THE BIBLE IS.

In my Fifth Essay I stated this: "The REVIEW'S defense of its existence is as widely separated from the defense which the college makes, as truth is separated from error. I challenge my respondent to enter a comparison on this question." That challenge remains unnoticed.

I have not space to review Prof. Armstrong's answers to my questions, but request the reader to do so with care, and contrast his treatment of my questions with my treatment of his. Yet I need to deal with one declaration of Prof. Armstrong in regard to my tenth question. He declares, near the middle of his Fifth Reply, "In entering this discussion my respondent made himself equal with me as a disputant." I pronounce this declaration an UNMITIGATED FALSEHOOD, and here is the proof: In my letter to him dated December 20, 1906, I referred to his refusal to affirm his "real position fully," and then stated, "This places you below Catholics, Presbyterians, Methodists, Mormons, Christian Church preachers, and even below infidels, in regard to conviction, candor and courage."

April 30, 1906.

SOMMER-ARMSTRONG DISCUSSION.

75

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S SIXTH REPLY.

I have enjoyed every minute I have spent in this discussion, and it is my daily prayer that God may use me for all that I am worth to his holy cause.

With my whole heart I believe that this discussion involves the freedom to teach God's word in the every day walks of men, and not only so, but it involves the principle of regulating God's children in their individual work.

It is for the truth's sake that I am in the discussion. I am willing—anxiously willing—to make any reasonable sacrifice of personal preference and judgment for union. It is the work that is dear to me, and I am trying hard to get a discussion of the essential principles. Thus far my effort to do this has been a failure, for Brother Sommer continues to avoid the issue and to use his space in discussing incidents, circumstances and accidents. There are essentials to the work, things that are common to all Bible schools of which I know anything. Since my respondent opposes them all, why doesn't he discuss these things? He is afraid to pitch his tent on the common ground and fight the battle there.

I call you to witness that I have entreated him to show the sin in our "band" and he is as silent as the grave concerning it. He asserted that our purpose is wrong. In my third reply I established beyond all doubt that our purpose is scriptural. The proof offered, and the six direct questions asked, stand unexamined, yet in his last essay he says the question of purpose is settled. Yes, it was settled so firmly in my third reply that it cannot be uprooted without destroying the New Testament.

My respondent compared our school to the Missionary society. In my last reply I took up this phase of the question and discussed it at length showing the foolishness of the comparison. Instead of refuting my argument he courageously (?) repeated his charge that the school is worse than the Missionary society.

I ask you to search his essays for one single paragraph of proof against our "band," our purpose, or our origin. Assertions will be found to abound but he offers no proof to sustain them. If

Salvation depends on his
gift to the school.

proofless assertions could make a thing wrong, our school would have been convicted and demolished long ago.

Brother Sommer is laboring hard to convince you that I have no regard for "common veracity," that I am an "unmitigated" falsifier, in short, that I am a liar and "know" that I am an "innovator."

He cannot meet the argument offered and to kill its influence as much as possible he assails my character and the character of Rhodes. If he is not careful at this point he might strengthen the conviction that is already in the hearts of many that he is not opposed to the work but to the men that are doing it.

Now suppose I were a liar and knew myself to be a "genuine innovator," would this prove that it is wrong for Christians to build these schools? Again, suppose I had taught error on the subject of giving and had threatened people with perdition, would this show that it is wrong to have Bible Schools? If every man now engaged in Bible school work were a false teacher, I would say down with the men but let the good work go on.

My simple suggestion that, though the school did not depend upon a gift, somebody's salvation might be one of the things that makes our school worse than the Missionary society that stands for federation of the Churches! I should be willing to submit the article in which this wicked "threat" is found to the English teacher of any reputable college, and let him decide whether there is a *vestige* of "threat" in the sentence. A Christian must use his cash where he believes it will do the most for God, and if he believes that he can accomplish more for God by using it in a school than any other way, his salvation would certainly depend upon his gift to that school.

But after all what does my teaching on giving have to do with the college question?

My respondent devoted two type-written pages to my "aphorism" taken from Otey's letter. If I be very wrong in believing that, since we are slaves of a common master, brethren working in a common vineyard, Christians seeking first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, we are free to call on one another to help

in doing anything that we may be doing to advance the kingdom of God, does this condemn Bible schools? Suppose I be wrong in believing with my *whole* heart that it is right for Brother Fujimore to call on Christians to help him pay for his farm; that it is right for a Christian to call on the brethren to pay \$12,000 for a paper; that it is right for a Christian to call on other Christians to help him buy his home, as Brother Sexton did in the Review—suppose I be wrong in believing all these things to be right—how does my belief affect the College question? Suppose I be a "common beggar" and a "business fool," does this make it wrong to teach school and to teach the Bible in this school?

All of this is off of the subject and manifests Brother Sommer's fear of the issue, but it fills space.

If I were as unkind as Brother Sommer I could call his constant struggle for subscribers and his weekly appeals to his subscribers to buy his books "begging." If I had been kept up by the body of Christ as my respondent has, I should be ashamed not to be ashamed of accusing brethren of "begging" because they had made a few appeals for help to do a work they could not do by themselves. The Church of God has paid \$12,000 for a religious-secular concern that is "dedded" to him. This concern with all of its channels of revenue including its book-store, is his. Since he has *insinuated* more than once that we are selfish and mean in our use of money placed in our hands I must make this standing offer to him: There are five of us to divide the profits of our school-work and there is but one pocket-book, so he says, in his work; now, we will turn all of our profits into the "one pocket" and take the profit that is now going into that pocket and divide it by five.

Our school property can never be used as personal property for this would make us criminals before God and our brethren. I am poorer to-day, personally, than when I went into the school. Were I to die to-morrow, my wife would be poorer than she would have been had I died the day before the school began. This is true of every one of the five. But all of this is off of the subject. I am sorry that Brother Sommer continues to trifle with the readers. At least one-half of his last essay was on such matters. Again I say he owes you an apology.

BROTHER SOMMER'S DONKEY ARGUMENT.

I reply to Brother Sommer's donkey argument by asking a single question: Could the man oppose the animal organization of the donkey because he has four feet so long as the man himself has two?

HIS CHANGES.

My respondent's first three essays were extracts from his tract written when he had no objection to institutionism, the purpose or the origin of these schools. But after fighting money and name for six years he came out on *entirely new* grounds. The "new institution" now became the trouble, and when I showed that he himself admitted all of the institutionism that we have, he claimed that I had perverted and distorted his admission about the "band" since his school could be run without taking a dollar out of the Lord's treasury or withholding a dollar from it. I stated in reply to this that several of the schools that he opposes are doing this very thing. In his next essay the trouble was no longer the "new institution," but the "origin" of that institution. In reply to this I set forth our origin and asked him to show the sin in it. Here it is:

1. We are preachers that have turned aside from preaching to teach school.
2. We have "begged" money.
3. We have contracted debts.
4. We hold the deed to the school property.
5. We have "threatened" people with perdition.

I deny that we have turned aside from preaching to teaching, for every one of us, save one, was a teacher before he was a preacher and that one was clerk of his county till he came into the school. Only one member of our faculty has ever given anything like all of his time to evangelistic work. I began teaching in the public schools when I was nineteen years of age and have been in the school-room as teacher or student every year since that time. I have turned aside from my teaching to do all the preaching I have ever done. Surely our origin is 'alright at this point! But who

appointed Brother Sommer to look after me in this matter any-how? *Male abuse*

He is a meddler in other men's matters—a busy-body. He has no more right to regulate me in this matter than he has to name my baby.

Men do well to attend to their own business. Do you believe that Brother Sommer has a greater right to stop me from teaching and put me to preaching than he has to stop you from farming and put you to preaching? If so, who gave him this right?

For six years he has been legislating for God's children on the subject of money. He has taught that every Christian must put into the Lord's treasury or give to the poor saints every dollar above a living and taxes or be in the place of the man who kept five dollars overpaid him in a business transaction. He placed almost the entire brotherhood under the sentence of "robbers of God" simply because they did not see fit to give as he directed. After teaching like this for six years he now says that Christian may put any amount of the Lord's money in hogs, cattle, land, etc., as a steward of the Lord. He says I misrepresent him in this matter. Here are his very words: "Faithful obedience to the divine doctrine of 'equality' will place all of the Lord's money in the Church treasury or in the hands of the Lord's needy ones."

No, I do not misrepresent him, but that he has changed his position on the money question is as certain as the sun rises in the east.

Our second sin in origin, according to Brother Sommer, is "begging." In my fourth reply I asked him: "Had we come to Odessa, using only the grounds and buildings given us by the town, would you oppose the school anyway?" He answered: "Yes. The origin.....was unscriptural." Had we done this we should never have made a single appeal for help, yet our Brother says one of our sins in origin is our "begging."

Our third sin in origin is the contracting of debts. My respondent says we should have been wrong in origin had we used only the property given us by the town, thus contracting no debts, yet the contracting of debts has made our origin wrong!

Our fourth sin, "begging" money with which to buy property

and then deeding the property to ourselves, goes out at the same door, for had we used only the property given us by the town there would have been no occasion to "beg" property to deed to ourselves. Had we used only the town property Brother Sommer says we should have been wrong in origin, yet he makes "begging" property and deeding it to ourselves a part of our sin of *origin*.

Our fifth sin is "threatening" with perdition. Since I have upset this in another place in this article, our origin stands. It is not even dented by the blows (?) it has received.

I want to remind you that every one of the things that he says is wrong in our origin manifests his persistent effort to meddle, to regulate other men in their private life's work.

Why did he bring in all of these things that he himself excluded *from* our origin as being the things wrong *in* our origin. Let me suggest that perhaps it is because he had nothing better to say.

First money, then institution, then origin! He'll have to find a new base next time for I've taken all of these away from him. I beg him to take a stand on something and stick to it at least two articles.

My two questions on the Jerusalem Church still remain unanswered. I have asked them three times and urged answers another time. I now challenge him to answer those questions.

He paid no attention to my answers of his questions, and dodged my challenge concerning his paper and book-store. He dare not deny that he has a religio-secular institution to teach religion. I ask him now for the department in the Bible that is wholly secular. It is a shame that he would reflect on the Bible by saying it is as secular as his paper with its human organization, home department, and advertisements. It is a comment on his regard for the word of God.

In October, 1906, Brother Sommer said all that he had ever said on this college question could be classed under "name" and "money," but in April 1907 he says that this is no longer true, for he did not know the "depths of Satan" then as he does now. I asked him to tell us what he had learned new *about the schools*

since October, and he replied that he did not know B. F. Rhodes and J. N. Armstrong were as bad as they have proved themselves to be! I did not ask him what he had learned about Rhodes and me. I know he has learned that the "striplings" are more able to defend their cause than he, no doubt, supposed them to be. I asked him what he had learned new about *Bible School Work*, and prophesied that when he told us this new discovery it would involve no part of the *institutionism*. Does he not owe it to all of us to tell us what this new thing is that he has discovered in the Bible School work since October, that is so Satanic that it forces his former ground of opposition to a secondary place? I challenge him to put me to shame by naming the thing. He can never do it.

OUR SCHOOL.

From time to time I have placed before you our purpose, our origin, and our institution or band, and not a single effort has been made to refute my work on these matters.

After my respondent had condemned our purpose and our origin, I asked him how the school to which he is committed should originate and what the purpose of the teachers in their Bible teaching should be. I asked if his school would be religio-secular. Since he saw fit to fail to answer these questions I repeat them and challenge him to answer them.

In my last reply I showed that instead of our school being comparable to the Missionary society, it is a business institution, differing from other schools only in the character and amount of the religion it teaches. Our public schools and state schools are dumping grounds for all kinds of religions from the various sectarianisms through higher criticism and evolution up to infidelity. In them you can teach anything in the way of religion save true Christianity. All of these schools are religio-secular and are firmly clasp on their students the broad, compromising religious spirit of this age.

It is not a question as to whether parents will send their children to schools where they will be taught religious principles. The

question for them to decide is the kind of religious principles they want their children taught and under what influence they will place them.

For six years Brother Sommer has been fighting the only schools in America in which the pure religion of the Christ has had unhampered admission and has encouraged the patronage of schools of which he himself says the children "are taught infidelity concerning the Bible in all those institutions of learning." Yes, he has actually encouraged parents to send their children where he himself says they will be taught infidelity concerning the Bible. This is the terrible sin that must be placed at his door.

Perhaps during the last six years a dozen students that have attended state schools through Brother Sommer's influence have been inoculated with their infidelity. Woe to the man whose influence is against the schools that teach the Bible, but is given to the schools that teach infidelity concerning it. As Nathan said to David, so I must say to Brother Sommer: "Thou art the man."

May 9, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER'S SEVENTH ESSAY.

Prof. Armstrong says that he has "enjoyed every minute" that he has "spent in this discussion," Strange enjoyment! He has done but little except to misrepresent truth. Thus far, with very few exceptions, he has avoided using my words in his representations of me, and, in so doing, he has generally misrepresented me. On the basis of his last reply, I charge him with misrepresentations, so gross that they amount to falsehoods, in the following particulars: (1) In declaring that "Bro. Sommer continues to avoid the issue;" (2) In declaring that "Bro. Sommer continues" "to use his space in discussing incidents, circumstances and accidents;" (3) In declaring that his "respondent" "opposes all Bible schools;" (4) In declaring that I am "afraid to pitch" my "tent on the common ground and fight the battle there;" (5) In declaring that he "established beyond doubt that" his "purpose is

It is therefore a sin to send to other schools. This being true we are all doomed for Hell.

scriptural;" (6) In declaring that his "proof offered, and the six direct questions asked, stand unexamined;" (7) In declaring that "the Church of God has paid \$12,000 for a religio-secular concern that is deduced" to me; (8) In declaring that my "first three essays were extracts" from my "tract written" when I "had no objection to institutionism, the purpose, or origin of these schools;" (9) In declaring that "after fighting money and name for six years" I "came out on entirely new grounds;" (10) In declaring that I have "changed" my "position on the money question," though the truth is that I admitted in the first part of my second essay that Christians may be "rich" in the things of this world; (11) In declaring that I am "a meddler in other men's matters—a busy-body," for I am only trying to save the churches of Christ from another college craze with its results; (12) In declaring that I have "taught that every Christian must put into the Lord's treasury or give to the poor saints every dollar above a living and taxes" or be condemned; (13) In declaring that I have "placed almost the entire brotherhood under sentence of 'robbers of God' simply because they did not see fit to give as" I "directed!" (14) In declaring that his two questions on the Jerusalem church still remain unanswered, for those so-called questions were based on a supposition which assumed the point in controversy, and therefore they were not lawful questions, and they annulled themselves by their form; (15) In declaring that I "paid no attention to" his "answers" to my "questions, and dodged" his "challenge," in regard to the REVIEW and something he calls a "bookstore;" (16) In declaring that I "reflect on the Bible" by that which I said in regard to the REVIEW not being more secular than the Bible is, for neither is secular except incidentally; (17) In declaring that the REVIEW has an "organization," for this is not true in the strict sense of the term; (18) In declaring that "in April, 1907," I said it is "no longer true" that all I had said up to "October 1906" could be classed under "name" and "money;" (19) In declaring that I have "insinuated more than once" that he and his colleagues are "selfish and mean" in their "use of money" placed in their hands; (20) in declaring that "not a single effort has been made to refute" what

he has said concerning that which he is pleased to call "our purpose, our origin, and our institution or band."

Prof. Armstrong follows Prof. Rhodes in holding the idea that because I stated last October that all I had written on the college question might be classed UNDER TWO HEADINGS, that therefore I should NOT BE PERMITTED to speak or write, at any after date, UNDER ANY OTHER HEADING against the colleges that I oppose. Prof. Rhodes seemed much annoyed because I discussed ORIGIN AND PURPOSE with him instead of MONEY AND NAME, and when I began to discuss the question of "money" with Prof. Armstrong he soon passed over to something he calls "band" and has been declaring that I "avoid the issue" because I have given but little attention to that which he calls "band." Thus while I persisted in discussing ORIGIN AND PURPOSE he was anxious for MONEY AND NAME, judging by that which Prof. Rhodes said, and by his own report of my discussions with Prof. Rhodes. But now it is "band," "band," "band." In one reply after another he has mentioned his "band."

In regard to all this I submit to the reader that this "band" question is not the issue, as it does not pertain either directly or indirectly to the question of "money" which is now under consideration, and has thus far with the question of veracity, been the issue between Prof. Armstrong and myself in this discussion. Yet I now give attention to it incidentally. In so doing I remind the reader, first of all, that Prof. A. has not given us any evidence concerning his "band" except his own statements, and that, in view of his recklessness in regard to truth on other questions, his statements on this question are received at a discount. Next I inform the reader that in Lexington, the county seat of the county in which the town of Odessa is situated, the following is found on record in the Recorder's office: The Odessa College Company after deeding two acres, more or less, to the buildings thereon, to J. N. Armstrong and others, stipulated thus: "So long however, and no longer than the following terms and conditions, and each and all of them are faithfully kept and performed, to wit: (1) a school conducted by competent teachers, shall be conducted upon

said premises not less than nine school months during each year (2) In addition to the regular college curriculum of studies, the Holy Bible as the only rule of faith and practice, and as the recorded will of God is to be taught. (3) The buildings that are on said premises and those that may be hereafter erected thereon shall be kept insured against loss by fire, storms, and other insurable casualties. Said loss, if any occur, to be paid to said grantees and the trustees hereinafter selected as their successors."

Now, reader, you have before you a copy of the mentioned "band" in its bearing toward a company of property owners. And now I wish to set before you what the "band" of Prof. A. and his colleagues is in their relations to each other. Judging by that which they have done thus far we may safely conclude that their "band" is as follows:

1. They have banded themselves together to beg money of churches of Christ and enforce their begging by threatening them with perdition if they don't give to them.
2. They have banded themselves together to contract debts, and beg more money.
3. They have banded themselves together to teach secular knowledge three-fourths of their time, during nine months of each year, and beg more money.
4. They have banded themselves together to teach pupils one-fourth of their time, and amuse them a part of their time with theatricals, and beg more money—beg it by private letters and public appeals.
5. They have banded themselves together to evade all affirmations that their school enterprise is scriptural, and to misrepresent every one who opposes that enterprise, and even resort to reckless assertions of untruth and make a show of defense.

Will Prof. Armstrong now ask what is wrong with his "band?" If so, I answer that from a gospel view point it is ALL WRONG, for the gospel does not authorize anything of that kind to teach persons in religion. His band is without precept or example or intimation in the gospel. Besides, it is in opposition to every scripture which declares or even intimates in favor of the perfection of the church for religious purposes. Finally, it is in

opposition to every scripture which requires mankind to be truthful, and candid, and honorable, in speech, and requires the church to be in peace.

In one of his replies Prof. A. informs us that his "band" is "weak," as it is simply an oral agreement between himself and his colleagues. But according to his own confession it is a "band" to establish a religio-secular college to teach religion in, and to furnish secular employment for certain school-teachers and preachers, and it is a "band" to beg money to accomplish all this in the name of the Bible, and yet he declares that his college is "not a religious institution." Therefore it is an unlawful "band" however "weak" it may be.

In his last reply Prof. Armstrong says: "I reply to Bro. Sommer's donkey argument by asking a single question: Could the man oppose the animal organization of the donkey because he has four feet so long as the man himself has two?" Yes, he could deny that it is "the same" with his own organization, and this is the point in controversy—the SAMENESS of the religious REVIEW and the religio-secular college in point of organization. But the reader will recollect that I offered five points of contrast between man and a donkey in their animal organization. Prof. A. mentions only one, and, in his question, passes from SAMENESS to LAWFULNESS. This is a sample of his style.

In his sixth reply my opponent says, "Suppose I were a liar, and knew myself to be a genuine innovator, would this prove that it is wrong for Christians to build these schools?" I answer, Yes, for it is wrong for Christians to build anything which makes its advocates and defenders "genuine innovators" and requires them to be "liars" in order to make a show of defense in their reasoning in its behalf.

Prof. A. says in behalf of himself and his colleagues, "I deny that we have turned aside from preaching to teaching * * * I have turned aside from my teaching to do all the preaching I have ever done." If this is true, then why has he been careful to tell the readers of a certain journal that all the men in the "faculty" are "experienced" "preachers," as well as "experienced teachers?" He also says, Only one member of our faculty has ever

given anything like all of his time to evangelistic work." I wonder when did that "member" become an "experienced" teacher! But suppose that all the members of the Odessa faculty are school teachers rather than gospel preachers, then we are left to conclude that certain SCHOOL TEACHERS have projected a college in order to make a place for themselves to TEACH SCHOOL as their chief occupation, and the churches of Christ have been begged and threatened in order to raise money to establish such a school. The more this question is examined the worse it appears! Its defense is ALWAYS WRONG!!

My opponent has several times challenged me to indicate the kind of school I would approve. I did so in the REVIEW for September 25, 1906. Here is what I said:

"If Alexander Campbell had been desirous only of assisting his brothers and sisters in educating their children aright he could have established a good school without pompous, foolish, worldly titles, and he could, thereby, have done much good, without, perhaps, doing any harm. The same may be said of David Lipscomb, J. A. Harding, J. N. Armstrong and others. But just in proportion as the mentioned brethren proposed to arrange a college course like the world has arranged, and graduate pupils with worldly honors, they showed themselves determined to make a bid for popularity with the world."

What I have just quoted indicates the kind of school which I regard as scriptural. Such a school was the "Buffalo Seminary" conducted by Alexander Campbell for several years, beginning about 1818. That seminary was conducted in his own house, and indicated what Christians may do who are not actuated by a love of popularity. While this subject is before our minds I now state that I am in favor of all Christians who are competent to teach, but cannot preach the gospel effectively, or for some reason cannot leave home to do the work of an evangelist, engaging in school teaching, and teaching their pupils in the Bible to the extent that they are able, and may lawfully do so. At the same time, I would insist that all such teachers should have a much stricter regard for truth, and possess better control of their tempers, than several I know who are connected with several of the colleges that I oppose.

I would likewise insist that such teachers should not establish their schools on the supposition that the Church is not the pillar and ground of the truth, nor that the school may be made to excel the Church as a religious institution to take mankind "back to Jerusalem," nor that the school should be a threatening beggar.

My opponent says of me, "It is a shame that he would reflect on the Bible by saying that it is as secular as his paper, with its human organization, home department, and advertisements."

In regard to this I state that I am satisfied with the defeat of my opponent on the organization question. His admission that the REVIEW is as different from his college in organization as man is different from a donkey, is sufficient for his defeat. But he challenged me to deny that the REVIEW is a "religio-secular institution," and I replied to his challenge by saying that it is not more of a "religio-secular institution" than the Bible is. Now he says that this is a "shame." In view of what he says on this subject, I shall be more explicit.

1. The Bible reveals three systems of religion, and three systems of family government or "home department," and three orders of civil government.

2. The orders of civil government are the tribal, the congregation, and the national, and all are largely secular.

3. The history and prophecy recorded in the Bible, especially in the Old Testament, are largely filled with records concerning heathen nations, their wickedness, and their government.

4. The Bible only deals with secular affairs incidentally, and is not three-fourths a secular document.

5. The OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW is "devoted to truth and righteousness as taught by the apostles of Jesus Christ," and is certainly not more secular than the Bible is. Besides, it only deals with secular affairs incidentally, even as the Bible deals with them. In view of these statements of truth, where does the reason for "shame" come upon me because I said that the REVIEW is "not more secular than the Bible is?" My opponent's charge of "shame," like all his other charges, is untrue.

But why does my opponent thus attack me and the REVIEW? Simply because he is trying to show that his college, which is

LARGELY, and CHIEFLY, and ESSENTIALLY secular, is justified because the REVIEW is INCIDENTALLY secular, even as the Bible is! By such reasoning my respondent, I suppose, would conclude that the apostles were secular characters because they, perhaps, wore sandals that were not made by the hands of Christians!

My respondent still informs us of his two questions that he says I did not answer. I quoted them before and exposed them, but here is one of them again.

"If the Church at Jerusalem had 'wealth' that was their 'own' and in their 'power' could they not have used it in the building of a school building, and starting a school without sinning, provided the school itself was right?"

I have said that this is an unlawful question because the last proviso assumes the question in dispute, namely, WHETHER SUCH A SCHOOL IS RIGHT. But as my respondent does not seem satisfied I shall expose it further by repeating the last part of it. "Could they not have used" that wealth in establishing a missionary society, a dance-hall or a brothel, provided such society, such hall, or such brothel, "in itself was right?" Will my opponent still say that I have not answered this question? If so, I can make the exposure of it still more to his discredit.

But here is his other celebrated question. "If these Christians had wealth that they could have used in a school, may not Christians to-day use their wealth in building the right kind of schools?" In answer to this, I state that the proviso in the last part of this question shows that it assumes that which we are in controversy about, namely, THE RIGHT KIND OF SCHOOL. But this has not been proved. On the contrary, it has been denied, and all assumptions to that effect have been confuted. My opponent might as well ask whether the money of the church in Jerusalem might not have been used to build the right kind of a poor house for the poor saints there.

Both of the questions which I have just considered affirm, by intimation, the proposition which my opponent professes to be contending for, namely, "the right kind of schools." Therefore, they both violate a rule which I find on the 370th page of Sir Wil-

liam Hamilton's work on Logic. The rule to which I refer is, "That no proposition be employed as a principle of probation (proof) which stands itself in need of proof."

But why should I further expose my opponent's disregard of Logic or his disregard of truth? Here is his own confession concerning himself and his colleagues, as recently offered to the public in a certain Western paper: "A little later, but still before the arrival of these wicked 'college advocates' a farmer and his wife moved here." In this sentence Prof. Armstrong plainly confesses that he and his fellow "college advocates" at Odessa are "wicked." The word "wicked" is his own, and not a word that he quoted from some one else. Thus his incaution, impulse, passion, lured him to write that which I fear is the truth concerning himself and certain others of his company.

In conclusion, I wish to make a few additional remarks concerning the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW, which is so often and unjustly assailed by my opponent and other advocates of religious secular colleges. Incidentally, and accomodatively, I have suffered myself to make mention of the "organization" of the REVIEW. But in strictness of speech it is not an "organization," for it is owned, nominally, and controlled, by one person, and neither that person, nor any other who assists in gathering the thought that makes it what it is, has the promise of a dollar from it for such assistance. The REVIEW does not have a separate treasury, nor has it been established in order to give to any one secular employment any more than a meeting-house is built for the purpose of furnishing work for a janitor. But the colleges I oppose were established FOR THE PURPOSE OF FURNISHING SECULAR EMPLOYMENT AND SUPPORT FOR CERTAIN PREACHERISH SCHOOL TEACHERS!

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S SEVENTH REPLY.

The truth on any subject does not fear investigation, hence, for more than two years I have greatly desired to see a full discussion of the Bible school question.

There are many who would be glad to give their entire influence for schools to this school work, if they had the truth concerning the matter, and it is my purpose to show every honest heart the absolute and unquestionable righteousness of these schools. It is one of the wonders of this age that anybody would question the right of Christians to establish schools and to teach the Bible in these schools so long as the right to teach school at all is granted to them. For God's own people to see the cream of the rising generation being inoculated with worldliness, with the broad compromising spirit of the present day sectarianism, with "free-thinking," with evolution, with higher-criticism, yea, with infidelity concerning the Bible in "all these institutions of learning" from the district school to the university, and then oppose the only schools in America in which the pure truth of God has unhampered admission is an inexplicable miracle. If my respondent would give his influence against all schools that now exist, his position would be more tenable and could be more easily reconciled with Christian character. With my whole heart I believe that in opposing these schools Brother Sommer becomes an enemy to the purest, cleanest and noblest school-life in the world.

I have noticed in debates that the man who has the wrong side frequently assails the character of his respondent.

Many of the readers do not know *me*, hence, so far as they know, I may be "wicked," a "liar," and a "genuine innovator," but this is not the question in this discussion. It is right, if right at all, for Christians to establish schools and to teach the Bible in them regardless of my character or the character of my respondent, and all fair-minded readers know that this is true. I have not referred to my respondent save where truth demanded it, and I have nowhere reflected on his heart. While I *think* I should have a fine subject in my respondent were I to compare

characters with him, I will not do this. I *will not* be drawn away from the subject and the reader *shall* know that he will not discuss the issue.

I challenge him to take up the questions of origin, of purpose, of organization, of completeness in Christ, of "Religio-secular schools," one at a time and hold to each one till he shows you that I cannot meet his argument. If it be possible for him to stick to one subject through two articles, I *challenge* him to do it. If it would help matters I should *dare* him to do it. I challenge him to prove that I falsified when I said that he would not pitch his tent on the common ground. A school boy can make assertions and call others liars, and Brother Sommer is certainly much given to this mode of discussion (?).

I clearly established our purpose and my proof still stands unassailed. I again entreat my respondent to examine that proof and to answer the six questions I asked. If it would do any good I should be willing to get down on my knees and implore his examination of my work on our purpose and on completeness in Christ. These are essentials. Why doesn't he discuss them? Will he be willing to risk again his reputation as a debater by ignoring these essentials and continuing to prove that he prefers to spend his time on incidentals?

The Review was brought into this discussion because Brother Sommer persists in condemning the school because it is "religio-secular" while he himself has an educational establishment, institution, that he dare not deny is "religio-secular." I do not wonder that he feels the need of defending the Review for the very sword that he has used in assailing these schools has been found to have two edges. In his effort to blunt the edge that is mutilating the Review, he is beating the entire sword into a plow share.

- Brother Sommer has condemned all other papers in the brotherhood, actually encouraging the calling of his paper the "Only Right." On this unkind, unjust basis he actually made an appeal to brethren to work for it. Such a claim of self-righteousness is pharisaical. He has criticised the other papers because they include "worldly advertisements" while he himself advertises continually the goods of the Rex Manufacturing Co., a purely secu-

lar concern that is getting out some sentimental books to sell, and of J. H. Filmore the Willette-digressive song-book dealer. Yet "The only basis on which it (the "religious review") has a just plea for patronage among the apostolic disciples is that it is used to advocate gospel truth, and is free from worldly advertising. O. R. Dec. 13, 1904. "Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel!"

BROTHER SOMMER'S RELIGIO-SECULAR BIBLE.

To sustain his illogical, irreverent, position that the Bible is as "religio-secular" as the Review, Brother Sommer refers to the history of Israel and the "records of heathen nations." Though the Old Testament is God's word, written by the Holy Spirit and dedicated by blood that typified the blood of Jesus, the editor of the "Only Right" has recklessly classed its sacred history as secular. Neither does he stop at the Old Testament, but invades the New Testament, that book that is dedicated by the very blood of Jesus, and includes its history as secular matter. Thus the Book whose every lesson we have been taught to love and trust as divine turns out to be as "secular" as a journal whose every writer is fallible and weak—whose every article is more or less imperfect! I repeat that it is a shame that Brother Sommer would go on record in this debate saying that the Bible, our infallible guide to heaven, is so largely secular that an imperfect infallible journal is as sacred. Especially so when this journal has a "Home Circle" department filled with stories and clippings from magazines and papers edited by Catholics, Seventh-day Adventists, prohibitionists, and others, and gives so much space to secular advertising. There is another interesting fact connected with this recklessness. Heretofore Brother Sommer has taught that one of our sins is the misusing of the sacred name Bible, and lo! the very book to which it is regularly applied is "religio-secular!"

THE "DEPTHS OF SATAN."

Since October, 1906, my respondent has discovered such "depths of Satan" in this school work that his five-year-old opposition had to take a secondary place. This is the third time that I

have urged him to reveal these depths to us. I have said he could never do it—I repeat that if his very life depended upon it, he could not name *one new thing* concerning the origin, organization, and purpose of this work.

“WHAT IS THE MATTER WITH OUR ORIGIN?”

Our origin stripped of our “begging” and of our contracting debts, has been assailed by my respondent. When I called for the sin in our origin he named five things, neither one of which was in the origin he opposed. I ran him from this and in his last essay he occupies entirely *new* ground. He is now opposing us because we give degrees to those who take certain courses! What is the matter with our origin? Why is Brother Sommer so easily run?

My respondent styles these degrees “*pompous titles*.” This in another of Daniel Sommer’s judgments that is endorsed neither by the dictionary nor by common usage. He stoutly affirms that we make the bestowal of these “*pompous titles*” as a bid for worldly popularity. This affirmation further manifests his persistent disposition to judge hearts and to dictate to God’s children about their private affairs. Who appointed him to enter into the secret counsel-chambers of my heart and of the hearts of my co-laborers to find out our “determined” purpose in conferring these degrees? How does he know that in conferring these degrees we are “determined to make a bid for popularity?”

Daniel Sommer dares to judge where only God has a right to judge.

My respondent has a big job on his hands when he undertakes to regulate all Christians in this matter of “bidding for popularity.” How far will he allow fathers and mothers to follow the fashions of this age in dressing their children, in furnishing their homes? That beautiful white dress that the daughter wears on commencement morning appeals far more to her pride than does the “*pompous*” degree conferred upon her. Where will my respondent draw the line?

The time has been, perhaps, when it was a rare honor to have

a degree conferred upon one but that time is passed. Since graduates, degrees and diplomas have become almost as common as almanacs, the honor has become common and instead of framing the diploma to-day, it is usually locked out of sight in a trunk. But what do these degrees mean, anyhow?

They merely certify that the possessor has completed a certain course outlined by the school he attended.

John William Smith A. B. is merely a short way of saying: John William Smith has completed

4 years in English.

4 years in Latin.

4 years in Greek.

3 years in Science.

2 years in Mathematics.

2 years in Hebrews.

Now, how much pomposity is there in saying John William Smith, A. B.? When Brother Sommer starts his school, he has my free consent to confer degrees, or not as he may deem wise and right.

OUR “BAND.”

Finally my respondent has noticed our “band” and his effort is a disgrace to him. In the deed from which he quotes are some conditions on which the town of Odessa granted the college property to us and on which we received it. The town wanted a school conducted in the building. It also wanted the building insured against fire, while we wanted to teach the Bible to our students. We knew that our purpose to teach the Bible must be well understood beforehand so we made it an item in the deed in order that the town could not stop our work.

Now why did Brother Sommer quote from this deed? Does he mean that it is wrong for Christians to receive property by deed and to include in the deed the conditions on which they receive and use the property offered to them?

After quoting from the deed he then names five things as being our band, not one of which pertains to the *band* but to the *purpose*

of the band. In setting forth the purpose of the band my respondent bears false witness against his brethren in Christ at every stroke. Our band was not formed to contract debts. Neither was it formed to "beg" money. We believed the brethren would help us and they have. When our band was formed we expected to contract no debts, but as the work progressed it seemed better to do so. Perhaps we made a mistake in contracting the debts. If so it is no more than all men, except (?) Daniel Sommer, do.

Brother Sommer has based his main attack against us upon our appeals for help. Even so, after the brethren have paid \$12,000 for his paper and when he "begs" continually for money to pay himself for the writing and the printing of tracts—gospel teaching. Not only so, but after the Review has appealed to brethren for money to pay for Brother Fujimore's farm and for Brother Sexton's home. This is a shame! Especially since the Review still practices such "begging." This very week there is an appeal for money to buy Brother Timmons a horse. People who think see these things.

MY JERUSALEM QUESTIONS.

My respondent has at last touched gingerly the questions I have been urging him to answer for so long. He misquotes the first question, substituting "The Church at Jerusalem" for "The Disciples at Jerusalem." In answering the second one, he talks about the money of the church, while my question pertains to the wealth of individual Christians. These changes affect the meaning of my questions.

I deny that my questions assume that the schools for which I am contending are right in themselves. They assume that it is possible for Christians to have a school that is right in itself and that is all they do assume. While I did not dream of my respondent's denying this, it does seem that in his evasive answer he does so.

I doubt if there be a man in the universe that knows what Brother Sommer does believe about schools. I doubt whether he himself knows. Notice, will you, his answer to my first question:

"Could they not have used that wealth in establishing a missionary society, a dance hall, or a brothel, provided such society, such hall, or such brothel, in itself, was right?" What does such a question mean? Does Brother Sommer mean to class all schools on the level with the dance hall and the brothel? Does he mean that, regardless of the kind of school, the Christian has no more right to put his money into it than a brothel? Does he mean that as there are no brothels right in themselves so there are no schools right in themselves? Certainly the disciples of any place may use their money in building the right kind of poor-houses!

But what is the matter with these questions? I challenge my respondent to say, "Yes, a Christian may put his money into the right kind of schools, or No, he may not do so." I don't care which destruction he chooses, either answer ruins him. In his evasion he has made himself almost criminal by placing the school-room on a level with the brothel. He must answer these questions or the reader *shall* know that he will not.

THE BUFFALO SEMINARY.

In the remote past, Brother Sommer has at last found one scriptural school! But it took the money of a Christian to provide a house and grounds for this school. I judge, too, that this house was a good deal larger than was necessary for "his (Brother Campbell's) own family," or this "seminary" was very small. Since there must have been of necessity some "brick and mortar," seats, black-boards, etc., "piled up," my respondent goes on record as endorsing the "piling up of brick and mortar" for equipping a scriptural school. Of course, the amount piled up depends on the size and needs of the school. If somebody should be sufficiently interested in such a school as to build "his own house" and give it to teachers, as Brother and Sister Potter did at Bowling Green, Ky., and as this town did for us, surely no one will object to such interest being shown to scriptural school work. Not only so, but it certainly would be as scriptural to appeal for help to provide needed accommodations for such a school, as to appeal for money to buy Brother Sexton's home, Brother Fujimore's farm, or

Brother Timmon's horse. Again, Brother Sommer's theory is ruined by his own admissions, for in them there is all the origin, organization and purpose that I am contending for. This scriptural school settles forever the "misuse of the Lord's money." Again and again the shifting sand has crawled from under his feet until he himself has been constrained to explain his seeking new "ground" by discovering the "depths of Satan." Now, Brother Sommer says that even "preacherish teachers," if for "some reason" they cannot leave home, may "band" themselves to teach secular branches and the Bible. Potter Bible College, Beamsville Bible School, Nashville Bible School, Gunter Bible College, Tokyo Bible School and Western Bible and Literary College, and like schools, stand out, by his own admissions, as bright as the new-made dollar.

I beg to ask again: When Christians band to teach the Bible and secular knowledge, is their school "religio-secular?" What should be their purpose in Bible teaching? My respondent has talked much about "religio-secular schools to teach religion." I now challenge him to tell us the difference between teaching the Bible and teaching true religion. I have said that I believe that in no other way could we go back to Jerusalem so fast as by teaching the Bible daily in school from the primary grade to graduation. I believe this yet. Had I said, In no other way do I believe we can go back to Jerusalem so fast as by teaching the Bible daily to the children in the home, no one, save Brother Sommer, would think I made the home, as a "religious institution," excel the church.

My respondent may slander us by calling us "beggars," "liars," "innovators," and lovers of popularity, he may criticise us for contracting debts, but thanks be to God that the righteousness of Christians to establish schools in which they may teach God's holy word to the youth of the nations has been established.

May 23, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER'S EIGHTH ESSAY.

I have been careful to quote my opponent's exact words in representing him, and have exposed many of his fallacies, and have convicted him of many misrepresentations so gross that they may be designated falsehoods. As a result, my readers will not do themselves injustice if they will believe what I say concerning my opponent's last reply, even if I do not take the time to present all the proof. **THAT REPLY CONSISTS OF SUICIDAL TRUTH, FALSEHOOD, FALLACY AND FOOLISHNESS.** I shall give a specimen or two of what I mean by each of the daring words in the foregoing statement.

1. My opponent says, "The truth on any subject does not fear investigation." This is true, but it is suicidal to Religio-secular College advocates, for they, with one accord, have evaded affirming a proposition which would result in a "fair investigation" of the controversy which they have introduced. Moreover, to their shame they have proposed to discuss the subject in controversy without a proposition covering the origin, purpose, use of money, and name, of their institutions.

2. My opponent says, "For more than two years I have greatly desired to see a full discussion of the Bible School question." This statement is an unmitigated falsehood if we may judge by his evasion of an affirmative proposition which would insure a "full discussion" of that "question," and by his proposal to discuss it in "five" short essays from each disputant.

3. My opponent says of himself, "I may be 'wicked,' a 'liar,' and a 'genuine innovator,' but this is not the question." Here is more falsehood. "The question" is whether the Religio-secular College to teach religion, and to furnish secular employment for certain preachers, IS AN INNOVATION. And I think the reader is already convinced that it is an innovation, also that my opponent has shown a serious lack of regard for common veracity in his efforts to defend it, and has reasoned like a "genuine innovator." Moreover, in his effort to defend the Odessa church in a certain Western journal he plainly confessed himself to be a

"wicked" man when he used the expression these "wicked 'college advocates.'" The word "wicked," in that expression, was not quoted, but was a word of his own choice, and he applies it to himself and certain others.

4. Prof. Armstrong asks, "Does he mean that as there are no brothels right in themselves, so there are no schools right in themselves?" No. But I mean to show the force of his proviso in his question about establishing a school at Jerusalem. He said, "provided it was right to establish such a school." I meant to show his contemptible fallacy in begging the question in controversy, by using it in a proviso, and as a basis for an argument. But this is not all. There are many schools that are right in themselves. But we are discussing WHETHER IT IS RIGHT FOR CHRISTIANS TO ESTABLISH RELIGIO-SECULAR SCHOOLS TO CONFER POMPOUS TITLES, TO EXCEL THE CHURCH IN TEACHING RELIGION, AND TO FURNISH SECULAR EMPLOYMENT FOR CERTAIN PREACHERS.

5. Prof. Armstrong says, "If it would do any good I should be willing to get down on my knees and implore his examination of my work on our purpose and our completeness in Christ. These are essentials. Why does he not discuss them?" This I designate "foolishness," in view of the fact that I introduced and discussed those questions in my oral discussions and was then censured by my opponent, and was afterwards censured by Prof. A. in several papers. Because I insisted on discussing them, also the question of ORIGIN, instead of MONEY and NAME. And now while discussing the MONEY question he censures me for not discussing PURPOSE and COMPLETENESS in Christ.

6. My opponent says, "I have noticed in debates that the man who has the wrong side frequently assails the character of his respondent." I leave the reader to judge who began the assailing of character in this discussion, and that without cause, also who has forfeited his character in order to make a show of defense for his cause.

7. My opponent further says, "I have nowhere reflected on his heart." In response I remind the reader that in his Third

Reply my opponent likened me to a cowardly "dog," that "shows great bravery so long as" "a strong fence" "is between him and the traveler, but when the open gate is reached he loses his bristles, sobers down, wags his tail, and barks very deliberately." Yet he says, "I have not reflected on his heart." This reminds me of Isaiah 44:20.

8. In most, or all, of his replies, Prof. Armstrong offers this declaration as argument, or as filling: "With my whole heart I believe." But I dispute the declaration. He cannot "believe" without testimony. In order to be truthful, he should say this: WITH MY WHOLE DETERMINATION I ASSERT.

But, as I wish to make this essay my last on the money question I shall not expose more of my opponent's suicidal truths, falsehoods, fallacies, and foolishness, which he offered in his last reply. My readers know that I measure my words, and they know also that my opponent is a reckless asserter. Therefore they have reason to believe me when I say that the unexamined parts of his last reply are like those I have examined, if not worse. For instance, his declaration that I advertise "continually the goods of the Rex M'f'g. Co." is a reckless assertion, but it is such as is necessary in his unscriptural cause.

And now in conclusion of that which I wish to present on the money question I offer an article which was published in the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW for Sept. 18, 1906. As I intend this essay to be my last on the money question I trust that my opponent will observe the restrictions which our agreement has imposed on him in his reply. Here is the article to which I refer:

In continuing my proposed octographic review of the educational controversy I shall quote two paragraphs from the journal whose name means primitive gospel, or gospel of Christ.

The little town of Odessa, situated forty miles east of Kansas City, in the bluegrass regions of Missouri, has about two thousand inhabitants. It offered to deed to us (the faculty) its commodious two-story brick college building if we would bring the school there. A satisfactory school has never been maintained in this building since its erection several years ago, hence the anxiety of the town to place the building in the hands of those who will maintain a

first-class school. We decided to accept this offer and the deed to the college property is now in our possession and contains the following section: "The property conveyed by this deed shall be used only for a school in which, in addition to the regular college curriculum, the Bible as the recorded will of God and as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice shall be taught as a regular daily study to all who shall attend said school."

Remember that the school is a certainty whether you help or do not help. The starting of the work does not depend upon your gift, for God's hand is not short; he has other servants that he can stir up to furnish the means needed to begin this work and we believe that he will do it. Your salvation may depend upon your gift, but the school doesn't. If you have means in your hands and are a servant of God, it is God's money, and to be a faithful servant you must use it where you believe it will do the most toward building up the kingdom of God. Our school is located in one of the greatest missionary fields in the United States. There are but few loyal preachers in the state and a very few loyal churches and so brethren of more favored conditions should bend their energies to help plant a permanent influence for the cause of God in this great north and west. We appeal to brethren to lay this work on their hearts and prove the sincerity of their love for Christ and his cause by helping to support it. It is not like supporting one meeting, but it is planting a "colony" from which influences will be constantly radiating for God. It is an abiding work. There is no way of estimating what such a school will accomplish in ten years of work. I do believe that there is no work open to the disciples to-day so great and so lasting as the teaching of God's word to the young as they grow up into manhood and womanhood. In no way do I believe can we "go back to Jerusalem" so fast as to teach the Bible daily to the children in our schools, from the primary work up to graduation.

The foregoing paragraphs were published "October 27, 1904," and deserve deliberate attention, especially as they are from the pen of the president of the institution named "Western Bible and Literary College." I shall therefore consider them in their order.

1. The author of those paragraphs indicates that five men, professing to be apostolic disciples, entered into a solemn compact with the secular corporation, known as "The Corporation of Odessa, Mo.," to teach pupils in "the Bible as the recorded will of God, and as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice," as a regular daily study "to all who shall attend said school." That is to say, five men, four of them preachers, entered into solemn agreement with a certain secular corporation to this effect: *If you will give us certain property for a school, we pledge ourselves that "the Bible as the recorded will of God and as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice, shall be taught as a regular daily study to all who shall attend said school."*

Talk about the hireling clergy! Here it is in a well-developed form!! And what may we expect from men who enter into an agreement with a secular corporation to teach pupils in the Bible "as a regular daily study?" Such an exhibition of the disposition of the hireling is more than embryonic. It is full-fledged. CLERGYMEN NEVER DID WORSE THAN TO HIRE THEMSELVES TO THE WORLD TO TEACH MANKIND IN RELIGION.

2. Reader, consider the third sentence in the second paragraph of the above-given quotation. The president of the mentioned college says, "Your salvation may depend on your gift, but the school doesn't." This implies that the mentioned school is so certainly in the divine favor that those who refuse to give to its support may be lost! Suppose that all disciples would do their full duty, by way of giving, as the Lord has directed in his word, and, as a result, would not give to the Odessa school, still the implication, of the sentence under review, is that they may be lost because they do not give to that school!! The president of the Odessa institution does not intimate that those persons may be lost who don't do their full duty in giving *as the Lord directs*, but he does intimate that his readers may be lost if they don't give to help the Odessa school, and thus give *as the Lord does not direct!* In order to appreciate what has just been stated, we should consider the following, as it appeared Jan. 12, 1905, from the same writer:

I want first of all to emphasize the fact that our work is a *school*, and not a *religious institution*.

The case then stands thus: The president of a certain college threatens his readers by an intimation that their "salvation may depend" on giving to a certain school which is "not a *religious institution!!*" I question whether any Romish priest, bishop, cardinal, or pope, was ever guilty of greater audacity!

But read again the following:

If you have means in your hands and are a servant of God, it is God's money, and to be a faithful servant you must use it where you believe it will do the most toward building up the kingdom of God.

Reader, the foregoing declaration does not allow Christians to use any of their means for their own support, nor for the support of their dependent ones, if they have any, nor does it allow them anything with which to pay their taxes. Look at the declaration again, and consider what it says:

If you have means in your hands and are a servant of God, it is God's money, and to be a faithful servant you must use it where you believe it will do the most toward building up the kingdom of God.

According to this declaration, all the money in the possession of every Christian belongs to the Lord, and EVERY CENT of that money must be placed where the one who has it in hand believes it will do "the most toward building up the kingdom of God." Now, reader, bear in mind that the two declarations which I have just commented on are placed together in the article under review. Let us, then, look at them together.

Your salvation may depend upon your gift, but the school doesn't. If you have means in your hands and are a servant of God, it is God's money, and to be a faithful servant you must use it where you believe it will do the most toward building up the kingdom of God.

Now, we should consider what J. N. Armstrong, President of the Odessa college, thinks in regard to doing "the most toward building up the kingdom of God." Here is what he says:

Our school is located in one of the greatest missionary fields in

the United States. There are but few loyal preachers in the state, and a very few loyal churches and so brethren of more favored conditions should bend their energies to help plant a permanent influence for the cause of God in this great north and west.

The "loyal churches" and "loyal preachers" are not "a permanent influence for the cause of God in this great north and west;" that is, according to this writer. But the Odessa school which "is not a *religious institution*," is such an influence!! Here we find that the preachers of Christ, and the churches of Christ, in Missouri, are ignored, as not being "a permanent influence for the cause of God," but a secular, human device is declared to be "a permanent influence" for the Lord's cause!!!

But read again from Prof. Armstrong's pen.

We appeal to the brethren to lay this work on their hearts, and prove the sincerity of their love for Christ and his cause by helping to support it. It is not like supporting one meeting, but it is planting a "colony" from which influences will be constantly radiating for God. It is an abiding work.

Reader, Paul declares in 1 Tim. 3: 15, that "the church of God" is "the pillar and ground of the truth," but Prof. Armstrong ignores what Paul says in that scripture, and by implication, declares that the Odessa college, which he says "is not a *religious institution*," is "the pillar and ground of the truth." He says it is "a permanent influence for the cause of God," is "planting a colony," is "an abiding work," and "is not like supporting a meeting!" No. Supporting a meeting for preaching the gospel of Christ, which often results in establishing a church of Christ, is not "a permanent influence," nor "an abiding work," nor like "planting a colony," but the Odessa school, which "is not a *religious institution*," excels the church in all these particulars: that is, according to Prof. Armstrong, of the Odessa school!!

But this is not the end. We should now consider the following from the same writer:

There is no way of estimating what such a school will accomplish in ten years of its work. I do believe that there is no work open to the disciples to-day so great and so lasting, as the teaching of God's word to the young, as they grow up into manhood and

womanhood. In no way do I believe we can "go back to Jerusalem" so fast as to teach the Bible daily to the children in our schools, from the primary work up to graduation.

Here the family and the church are both ignored. If all parents would do their full duty, and all churches would do their full duty, toward teaching children, yet all that they might do would not enable us to "go back to Jerusalem," "so fast" as may be done in a school which "is not a *religious institution*;" that is, according to the notion of the President of the Odessa college!!

Reader, what may be expected from the teaching that may be done by such a man, and his associates, who are supposed to be under his control? What is the difference between the sin of "innovationism" which has caused a defection from the churches of Christ, or even the sin of "church federation," and of higher criticism," which sins have, together, divided the mentioned defection—I say, what is the difference between those sins, and the sin of ignoring both the family and the church, and at the same time teaching that a school, which "is not a *religious institution*," is SUPERIOR to both the family and the church in the work of "going back to Jerusalem," and "in building up the kingdom of God?" And what shall we say of the religious journals which have, for the sake of money, advertised such an institution, and have opened their columns to its advocacy?

Prof. Armstrong says, "There is no way of estimating what such a school will accomplish in ten years of its work." Here again that Odessa Professor is wrong. He is so nearly always wrong that the exceptions in his favor are scarcely worth mentioning. I say THERE is a "way of estimating what such a school will accomplish in ten years of its work." Alexander Campbell founded such a school in 1840, and taught his pupils about one hour each day in the Bible. In 1849 he had accomplished so much that a man-made missionary society was organized, of which he was made president! As a result the churches of Christ were divided, and, in course of time, the Christian church defection was established! As a further result that has been accomplished, the plea for oneness in Christ was discarded, religious war was introduced, and has been waged, for near or about a half century!!

Finally, the Christian church defection has been divided, and many, in both parties, are going in the broad way which leads to destruction!!! Thus, by considering the history of the past, we may estimate what may be accomplished by such a school as that, established at Odessa, "in ten years," and even in fifty years. We may make our estimate in view of the fact that its President is so infatuated with his work, which he says, "is not a *religious institution*," that he sets it ABOVE the family and the church, which are divine institutions, and threatens his readers with perdition if they do not give to the support of his human institution!!!

Reader, here I again pause, but not because I have fully set forth the unscripturalness of the Odessa institution, nor the audacity of its President in magnifying its importance above both the family and the church of God. Words would fail me if I should attempt to portray fully the mistake of establishing a college to teach pupils in regard to religion, advertising that college as a "Bible" institution, and yet declaring that "it is not a *religious institution*," but, at the same time, implying that it is superior to the family and the church of God in advancing the cause of true religion, and that those will be lost who will not support it!!! Such an institution *beggars description* in its introduction, and in its out-workings, among churches of Christ, especially as its name—"Bible and Literary College"—disarms criticism, in many disciples, and leads them to suppose it is a blessing to the church. But they should remember that "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." (2 Cor. 11:14.) DANIEL SOMMER.

June 6, 1907.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S EIGHTH REPLY.

Brother Sommer's Eighth Essay is a signal failure though, no doubt, he is doing his level best. A man of Brother Sommer's ability would never play the "school-boy's" part that he is playing could he do better.

I am glad for the fair-minded, truth-loving readers of this dis-

cussion to judge whether I am an "unmitigated" liar. I am glad for them to judge who is being unkind and unchristlike. If my respondent were an unscrupulous lawyer, I could understand his constant heart judging; but for a Christian, a developed Christian, an aged Christian, to treat brethren as he treats his brethren that differ from him is hard to understand.

Not only does he never refer to me as "brother," but he also disfellowships D. W. Nay, one of the most Godly men in all this country. Throughout the oral debate Brother Sommer addressed Brother Nay as "Mr. Nay." Such treatment of a brother should not be tolerated by the great brotherhood of Christ. He should be *severely* rebuked by the church until he corrects himself in this matter.

I have said, have repeated, and now repeat again that Brother Sommer has bragged behind his Chinese wall as only he can brag. This statement assails him as a debater. A man may be very sincere and honest and yet be "afraid" except behind the fence. I have been full of care to reflect on him in no other way than polemically.

Had I known that Brother Sommer meant to discuss every incident, accident and circumstance connected with each individual Bible-school, I should not have suggested five articles apiece as the limit to this discussion. It was my intention to discuss the essential principles of the work and I knew it would not take long to do that. We have *always* been willing to discuss the issue. The correspondence that led up to this discussion will make interesting reading and I hope to be able to offer it in tract form to the readers of the debate.

"THE HIRELING CLERGY."

I have entreated Brother Sommer, especially in my last article, to take up the essentials of this work. In reply to this entreaty he sent me an article written before he had discovered the "depths of Satan" in this work! He stamps us as hired clergymen simply because we put into the deed a restrictive clause—a clause that guarantees our freedom to teach God's word to our students. We are represented in Brother Sommer's criticism as offering in-

ducement to get this property, the inducement being that we pledged ourselves to teach the Bible to every student. I do not believe I mis-represent Brother Sommer when I say he *knows* this is not fact. In the first meeting with the citizens we felt obligated to explain the kind of school we proposed to establish. We carefully explained that every student would be required to study the Bible, and told the gentlemen that they would consider the proposed school denominational. They seemed not to care for this, but that we might always be free to teach the Bible and might be safe in investing in other property, we required the clause our brother criticises to be put in the deed. In proof of the fact that this town would be better pleased with our school should we discontinue our Bible work, I shall tell you a statement that came to our ears last year during the school year. It was said in this town that it was thought that we came here to build up a school but that it appeared that we came here to build up the "Campbellite" church. I do not say that Brother Sommer intends to misrepresent us, but the fact remains that he does so.

But suppose it were true that the teachers of Western Bible and Literary College did hire themselves to this town, would this affect the righteousness of Bible-school work? Does the fact that some preachers *hire* themselves to preach the gospel make it sinful for other preachers to preach the gospel?

Suppose our faculty is composed of hired clergymen, does that make it wrong for Brother Jones and other Christians to start the Beamsville Bible-school in Canada? Is this "hired clergy" argument against the *work* or against the *men*? Potter Bible College, Nashville Bible School, Gunter Bible College and Beamsville Bible School have no "hired clergy." What is the matter with them?

According to our agreement we are discussing our differences on the "college question." This involves no one of the schools in particular, but the righteousness of the work itself—the principles upon which the work rests. While there are incidents, accidents, circumstances and mistakes connected with all of them that I should like to change, these things are, at best, matters of judgment and I am set for the defense of any of these schools.

I should change the Review in some of its incidents but I am

ready to defend the principle on which such an institution stands. If my respondent were not fighting the *men* in this Bible school work, the fight would be over.

MY DOCTRINE ON GIVING.

In my Sixth Reply I explain my "wicked threat" concerning giving. In all honorable discussion men are allowed to explain their own language, but this seems to make no difference with my respondent. He ignores all explanation and argument and comes back with "you *did*." This is very commendable (?) in a man of his age and ability! All he says this time on the threat makes more manifest his defeat.

"Audacity" means, "Reckless daring; presumptuous impudence—implying a contempt of law or moral restraint." Had my respondent merely said that I manifested "audacity" it would have been rash, harsh, and wholly untrue; but to say "I question whether any Romish priest, bishop, cardinal, or pope was ever guilty of greater audacity!" is too severe, too radical, and too extravagant for the just mind to accept. In the face of such recklessness of speech his claim that he "measures" his words is almost beyond endurance to the careful reader.

The statement that my teaching interferes with the Christian's sacred duties of supporting his family and paying his taxes is another baseless assertion. When a man pays his taxes or supports his family according to God's direction, he is using this means where it will do most for God. For a man to think otherwise is high-handed presumption. Brother Sommer could surely see these things if he would think a little. There is no excuse for such blunders.

THE PERMANENT WORK.

Here again my respondent manifests his established character for getting out of a man's writing exactly what the man did not dream of putting into it.

Let me illustrate what I meant. Last winter Brother John E. Dunn came into this country and did some fine preaching in a meeting at Sedalia, Mo. This meeting was good work and I heartily

*Why, then, could not
the Elders at Sedalia look
after and rebuke you? etc. and
thus make you
give
up
that
better
etc.
p. 212*

endorse it, yet, I do not think it was as permanent as it would have been could Brother Dunn have moved his family to Sedalia and lived and worked among the people, thus casting his lot with them and working out from Sedalia building up the church throughout the country. I should much prefer helping to support some godly preacher to live and preach the gospel in a field than to support this man in holding one meeting. There are six families in our faculty. All of these families live for the one purpose of building up the church of God. The location of the school in this country cast the lives of these men and their families here. Their interests and obligations for the kingdom of God are chiefly here. All the work done is carefully looked after, making it permanent work. Realizing this, I spoke of the fact that he who helped this work would be helping to locate all of these workers in a needy field. This is all that I meant by my "permanent and abiding" work. nor have I changed my judgment concerning the matter. I believe it is better to support this work than to support one meeting but God forbid that I should ever say anything that would discourage the holding of one meeting, or the preaching of one Bible lesson. May I never be so unchristlike as to "ignore" a gospel preacher or a church of our Lord Jesus Christ. I am sure that nothing I have ever said can be fairly so understood.

MY LAST REPLY.

The article to which I am replying totally ignores my last article, the article to which it is supposed to be an answer. Notice carefully for yourself and see that this is true. I verily believe my respondent is afraid to venture an answer to the many things being placed before him. Every time he has ventured on "new" ground he has found his predicament worse and worse. Haman erected a gallows on which to hang Mordacai, but the gallows prepared for the Jew was used to hang the man that caused it to be erected.

Behind his "wall" Brother Sommer has been weaving a rope for five or six years. This rope which he himself has woven is now hanging him. For years he has seemingly been having a fine

time debating by himself, but now he has been dragged from behind the "embankment" and forced into battle, and has found the only chance of safety to be in ignoring every point made and continuing to debate by himself.

My respondent began this discussion, you remember, with installments of his verbose, illogical tract. Finally, I induced him to leave the tract and he has been slipping, sliding, stumbling and falling in every article since. In this last one he leaves my article untouched, and falls back into his "Octographic Review" of the matter. Such ignoring of his respondent's essay and such running and jumping would never be done except in self-defense.

THINGS STILL IGNORED.

My respondent, a student of the Bible for forty years, has gone on record in this debate saying that the Bible, the every word of which has been written by God's own spirit and every page of which has been stained with blood, holy atonement blood, is as secular as a human institution of learning, all of the teaching of which is done by fallible men; an institution that advertises gospel teaching for sale and that "begs" its students (readers) to buy this gospel teaching at a price that brings a nice profit into its "pocket-book"; yea, an institution that advertises the goods of the Rex Manufacturing Company and of J. F. Filmore. It is a shame that brother Sommer should reflect on the word of God in this manner, yet since he has done so, why is he so quiet on the subject now? Where is his religio-secular Bible? He has dropped it like a hot iron. This is well if he realizes his mistake; yet if this be the case he has not done his duty till he tells the readers of this discussion that he has done so.

Where are the "depths of Satan?" Since October, 1906, my respondent has "seen a vision," "dreamed a dream," or in some other way had revealed to him such "depths of Satan," that it forces his five or six years' old position to the back-ground, yet he ignores my pleading. The "depths" are secret. You, dear reader, must take his "ipse dixit" as proof that they exist. I insist on Brother Sommer's telling us why he doesn't tell us. I

ask him again to reveal the depths. Unless he reveals them or acknowledges them to be creatures of his own imagination, they shall be thorns in his flesh to the close of the debate. Let me whisper to you that the reason he does not tell us this "new thing" is that he knows when he does I'll show that he knew it all before October.

I ask again what is the matter with our origin. When I pressed him to tell us the sin in our origin, he named five things, no one of which was in our "sinful" origin. My respondent knows he has lost every time he has ventured. This is why he doesn't name the "depths of Satan." He is afraid.

Where is our band? What has become of the "pomposity" displayed in our bestowal of "pompous titles?" The Jerusalem questions, too, are again turned loose. My respondent refuses to tell Christians whether they may put their money into the right kind of schools. I challenge him to say "yes" or "no." If he does not do it I promise to tell why he is afraid to do either one.

Then, where, Oh where is Buffalo Seminary, that scriptural school? I showed that the gap through which Brother Sommer brought this school was large enough to bring every Bible school known to me. It lets in the origin, the organization, the purpose, and the piling up of the necessary "brick and mortar." I showed it was as scriptural to appeal for help for this scriptural work as it is to appeal for help to buy Fujimore's farm, Sexton's home, or, as was recently done in the Review, Timmon's horse. All of this is ignored.

MORE UNANSWERED QUESTIONS.

When Christians "band" together to teach both the Bible and secular knowledge, is their school religio-secular?

What should be their purpose in Bible teaching?

What is the difference between a school to teach the Bible, as well as other branches, and a school to teach true religion, as well as other branches?

Brother Sommer has been fighting against God and His truth.

June 14, 1907.

SECOND SERIES.

DANIEL SOMMER'S FIRST ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF APPLYING SACRED NAMES
TO THINGS OF HUMAN ORIGIN.

"For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Rom. 15:4. "And the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die: it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations: and that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean." Lev. 10:8-10. "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and the profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them. . . . Therefore have I poured out mine indignation upon them; I have consumed them with the fire of my wrath: their own way have I recompensed upon their heads, saith the Lord." Ezek. 22:26, 31.

These several scriptures taken together set forth the following facts: 1. The Old Testament was written for our learning. 2. The Jewish priests were required to put difference between the holy and the profane, the unclean and the clean. 3. In course of time the Jewish priests failed to do as God required, but profaned God's holy things, and, for that reason, with others, God poured out upon the Jews his indignation. Then by referring to Lev. 22:14, 15, we may learn that if the holy food which was to be eaten by priests was at any time eaten by any one else than a priest, or one of the priestly family, such food was thereby profaned. Finally, by reading Matt. 12:5 in connection with Num. 28:9, 10, we may learn that even a technical violation of the sacredness of the sabbath was called *profaning* the sabbath. When all this, which has just been presented, is scripturally considered, we cannot

be otherwise impressed than that Christians—the New Testament priesthood—should be very careful not to misuse anything that is holy or sacred by applying it to anything that is of human origin.

"For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning." Rom. 15:4. "And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi [my husband]; and shalt call me no more Baali [my Lord]. For I will take away the names of Baalim [the plural of Baal] out of your mouth." Hosea 2:16, 17.

As the name Baal means lord it was justly applied to God, and it seems that God did not object to it except by reason of its association with a heathen god. But because of such association he proposed to take it out of the mouth of his people. This shows that God's regard for names is such that he requires not only that a name shall be *right in itself*, but that it shall be of *right association* in order to be acceptable to him. He requires *right* names, *rightly* applied, and of *right* association.

"Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning." Rom. 15:4. "I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy loving kindness and for thy truth: for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." Ps. 138:2. From this we learn that which should cause Christians to tremble at the thought of applying a sacred name, found in the word of God, to anything of human origin. The name of God is the highest name in the universe. In Deut. 28:58 we learn that to the Jews his name was spoken of as "this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD." Yet David, who testified, saying, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue" (2 Sam. 23:2), plainly said of God, "THOU HAST MAGNIFIED THY WORD ABOVE ALL THY NAME." In the light of such scripture, which Paul declares was "written for our learning," certainly nothing less than the grossest ignorance or irreverence, or both, will permit any one to apply a sacred name—a name peculiar to the word of God—to anything of human origin.

"Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning." Rom. 15:4. "He sent redemption unto his people: he hath commanded his covenant forever: holy and reverend is his

name." Ps. 111:9. Here we find the words "holy" and "reverend" applied to the name of God. In the New Testament we learn that Christians are called "holy brethren," and a "holy nation." (Heb. 3:1; 1 Pet. 2:9.) But we do not find in the New Testament the words "holy" and "reverend" applied to any humanly given names, nor to human beings as such. This side of the New Testament, however, we find those words applied to the Pope of Rome, and the word "reverend" has been adopted by multitudes of preachers who have followed the Pope's example. Apostolic disciples have always refused to follow that example, regarding it as irreverent and presumptuous. But if it be irreverent and presumptuous to apply the sacred name "reverend" to a being that was created in the image of God, and claims to be renewed in the image of Christ, what must it be to apply the words *Bible*, or *gospel*, or apply *the way, as used in Matt. 7:14, to an enterprise, or a thing wholly of human origin?* Does some one say, the word "reverend" is applied to the name of God, while these other words are not, and that makes a difference? If so, we say to that one in the language of David, "THOU HAST MAGNIFIED THY WORD ABOVE ALL THY NAME." If this language of David concerning God is not the end of the controversy, on this phase of the subject before us, then divine testimony is of no value.

But some man will say that the word *Bible* is from the Greek *biblos*, which simply means *book*, and was never by any inspired writer applied to the entire collection of sacred writings, but that such application of the word *biblos* is wholly of human origin.

Let us examine this with care. Christ is called "The Word," and "The Word of God." John 1:1, 14; Rev. 19:13. Christ said, "He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken the same shall judge him in the last day." John 12:48. Paul said, " whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning." Rom. 15:4. Again: "These things happened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition." 1 Cor. 10:11. We also read, "For as many as have sinned without law

shall also perish without law, and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." Rom. 2:12.

By the foregoing scriptures we learn the following divinely stated facts: 1. Christ is called the Word of God. 2. Those to whom the words of Christ have come or shall come, will be finally judged by his words. 3. The words of Christ, and thus the New Testament, taken in the light of the Old Testament, will be the standard by which those will be judged who will have had access to both the New Testament and the Old. 4. The Old Testament will be the standard by which those will be finally judged to whom it was specially given, and who lived and died while it was in force.

Now, in the light of what has just been submitted, let us consider Rev. 20:12. "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." Here we find the Greek word *biblos* twice used in a form of the plural of that word and applied by the apostle John to those books out of which, or by which, *the dead will be finally judged*, and those books we previously learned consist of *both the Old Testament and the New*. What now becomes of the assertion that *no inspired man ever applied the word biblos to the entire sacred writings, and that such application of the word Bible is wholly of human origin?* Like all else that is said against the truth, *it is strictly false*. Yet such an assertion seems to be the Gibraltar of defense behind which those endeavor to shelter themselves who apply the word *Bible* to things of human origin. But, as we have seen, it is a deceptive and thus an insecure shelter. In Rev. 20:12, the word "biblos" is found in its diminutive form, but that does not affect the argument made here.

Still, some man may say that in Acts 19:19, Luke applied the Greek word *biblos* in the plural form to bad books. In answer we state that this is true. But as people are known by the company that they keep, so words are known by the connection in which they are found. The books mentioned in that connection were doubtless books of "curious arts." The word *biblos* is not in itself more sacred than the word *baptismos*, yet the connection

in which each word is found determines its sacredness, and we have learned that the word *biblos*, in its diminutive form, is divinely applied in Rev. 20:12, to the entire sacred writings, by which those to whom they have come, and finally will have come, shall be judged in the last great day. Last of all, it is true that those to whom the sacred writings have come, have, by unanimous consent, designated them by the word *Bible*. Thus we find that the word *Bible* is a sacred word, that is, it is sacred in both *divine* and *human* application.

What shall we say then of those who have applied the word *Bible* to religio-secular institutions of learning? Certainly we do them no injustice when we make the following statements:

1. They have failed to learn what is written in the Old Testament on the subject of putting difference between the holy and the unholy, the sacred and the profane, or secular.

2. They have failed to learn that the Holy Spirit said through an Old Testament writer that God had magnified his word above his name.

3. They have adopted a principle which will prevent them from consistently rejecting the title "Reverend" for preachers, or any other sacred title which the apostasy has applied to men.

4. The application of sacred names to things of human origin, and as proper names by which to designate them, can only have a show of defense by such false reasoning as is commonly called "special pleading," and which dishonors both the head and heart of any professed Christian by whom it is adopted.

5. Those who have applied the word *Bible* to institutions of learning that are chiefly secular should answer this question: In thus applying the word *Bible* did they use it in the sense of the "books" mentioned in Acts 19:19, or in the sense of the "books" mentioned in Rev. 20:12? But they will not answer this question. It exposes their false reasoning. So it should be answered for them. They *did not* apply the word *Bible* to their human institutions in the sense of *bad Bibles* or *bad books* mentioned in Acts 19:19. Then they *must* have used that word in the sense of Rev. 20:12. But in that sense it is applied to all the sacred writing. This leaves them no escape from the charge of having applied

a sacred name to a thing of human origin. What is worse, they have applied the sacred name *Bible* to a thing of human origin which is *chiefly secular*. If this be not *misusing* a sacred name, *making light* of a sacred name, and *falsifying* in so doing, then what is it? Or what should such use of a sacred name be called?

June 28.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S FIRST REPLY—NINTH ARTICLE.

The Greek words "biblos" and "biblion" are used indiscriminately by the Holy Spirit to refer to any kind of book or writing. The uses of these words are as well fixed as are the uses of the word "book" in English. They were the common words for our words "writing," "bill," "book," etc.

Rhodes stated in the oral discussion that he had examined the word "biblion" in thirty-one places in the Greek Testament, and that he found in fifteen occurrences it is strongly probable that it refers to some part of the sacred writings; in three, it is not certain as to what it refers; "and in eleven cases the word most emphatically does *not* refer to the sacred writings, or any part of them." These facts were stated both at Odessa and at Hale, and stand in the published discussions unnoticed and unchallenged by my respondent. Hundreds of people went away from these debates wondering why Brother Sommer did not examine these stubborn facts.

If the Holy Spirit's example—approved example—in eleven instances did not leave the Greeks free to use this word as He used it, when may we follow His example? Not only so, but the Holy Scriptures are *nowhere* called "biblion" by the Holy Spirit, so far as we know. Brother Sommer, himself, has never cited but one passage, and no living being knows certainly what "biblia" refers to in that passage. It may refer to the Scriptures and it may not. This shows how hard up my respondent is for *one* passage to help him out of his strait. But suppose it could be shown that this passage is one example of the Spirit's referring to the whole

Bible by this word, would this help him out? Has not the Spirit used the same word again and again to refer to things of human origin? Then what is to be gained by taking this passage (Rev. 20:12) and dogmatically affirming that "biblia" here refers to the Bible?

QUESTIONS.

1. Did the Holy Spirit apply this word "biblos" and the diminutive of it, "biblion," to other things than the Bible?
2. If so, would not this example guarantee to Greeks the right to apply this word to other things than the Bible?
3. When and how did this word get to be a sacred word?
4. Did the Holy Spirit ever limit the use of this word to the Holy Scriptures?
5. If so, where is his teaching?
6. If not, by whose authority do you limit it since the Spirit himself used it indiscriminately.

I ask my respondent to answer these questions in his reply if he does nothing else.

"BIBLE."

Our word "Bible" is an English word, and, as such, has an established use as a noun, meaning the Holy Scriptures, the Old and the New Testaments combined. Smith's Bible dictionary says this usage began in the fifth century. Men, uninspired men, have made this usage: There is not a vestige of divine authority for it. Like all English, its meaning has been established by use. It is also used to mean the sacred writings of the Mohammedans, etc. The word is also used with a descriptive force. Its use as an adjective is as well established as its use as a noun. Hence, we have the following expressions: "Bible work," "Bible class," "Bible maps," "Bible writers," "Bible teachers," "Bible readings," "Bible societies," "Bible schools," etc. "Bible school" is the only one of these expressions that I have heard challenged as "sacrilege." What makes the difference? Where is the scripture that sets it forth?

When Brother Klingman and others announced their "Bible

reading" at Detroit, my respondent was very enthusiastic in his commendations of the work and encouraged the "preachers" to attend, as if this reading were a kind of *preacher-maker*. He said there would be no excuse for preachers not being able to read the Bible in Greek and Hebrew, and use good English in teaching it. I affirm fearlessly that no young man could have begun these languages and accomplished, in the time allotted, the results promised in the announcements, without giving three-fourths of his time to the study of English, Hebrew and Greek. So my respondent believes it is entirely scriptural and far from "sacrilege" to call a reading in which students must spend two-thirds or three-fourths of their time studying languages a "Bible Reading."

Strange to say, although Brother Sommer has charged against us in his last essay that we are unscriptural in our use of the word "Bible," and that we are thereby guilty of sacrilege, in the oral debate he said: "His college is partly religious, and if he had only used his English aright I would not have quarreled with him about the name Bible. That is one reason I have not been saying much about that."

Now we have it. Our unscripturalness and our "sacrilege" is a mistake in English. This is the first time that I have ever known a Bible teacher of nearly forty years' experience to teach that to make mistakes in English is unscriptural and is making light of "sacred" things. Can it be possible that he is guilty of teaching that mistakes in English are sinful? As he admits that our use of the word "Bible" is only a mistake in English and had we avoided this mistake he would not have quarreled with us about the name "Bible," why does he send to me an essay of two or three thousand words on the "unscripturalness" of our use of this word? Why did he not say it was an essay on our ignorant use of English? Why does he say by this essay that the word "Bible" is one of the "sacred" names and that it is unscriptural to apply it "to things of human origin?" Does he mean that our school is of divine origin? If not, and the word "Bible" is a "sacred" name, even more sacred than the very name of God, and must not be applied to anything but divine things, how is it that in applying it to our

school our mistake is only an error in English? Here he is again stabbed to death by his own knife.

For five or six years he has waged a heavy war against his brethren in Christ, whose only sin, except the misuse of the Lord's money, was the unscripturalness, the grave sacrilege, of misusing this divine, this sacred name in applying it to a "religio-secular" school. And lo, it is only a mistake in English! This error in English is one of the things of which we are guilty and on account of which guilt the churches of God, both at Odessa and at Hale, were exhorted to withdraw their fellowship from us. All these years Brother Sommer has been binding respecting the use of this word "Bible" where God has not spoken, where the Bible is as silent as the grave, and where all the occurrences of the word from which we get our word Bible establish the right of the free and indiscriminate use of the word. If he can be made ashamed as a debater he should hide his face after such conduct. Remember, that although he labors hard in his last essay to show that the sacred (?) word "Bible" is to be applied only to sacred things or things of divine origin, in the oral discussion he said, by way of excuse for not saying more on the name, that in applying it to our school we only make a mistake in English. This teaching on the "name"—this daring to legislate for God's children, to bind where God has not bound and to speak where the Bible is silent—when viewed in connection with its author who quit school forty years ago that he might learn to study, and who claims to be such a "critical student," is thoroughly astonishing. His absolute and irredeemable defeat is made manifest by his continued contention for a point already surrendered. My respondent's last essay is numbered "I." This means a new line of work has been begun notwithstanding the unfinished condition of the old. My seventh and eighth replies stand untouched. My respondent does not so much as mention the eighth one. He bragged of his courage and his longing to get hold of the "college advocates." He even intimated that these people would not discuss the question for lack of courage and candor, and lo! when brought face to face with "boys," he ignores every essential of the work and cannot be pulled into a discussion of the issue. He even ignores whole arti-

False

cles. He is surely unable to meet the argument placed before him.

1. The proof offered for the justification of our purpose and the six direct questions asked stand in their completeness. Not an effort has been made against my line of argument.

2. When our origin was assailed, I established the scripturalness of it, and my respondent dropped it like a hot iron.

3. Our work was called a "new institution" unheard of in the New Testament. I showed that we have no more institution or organization than the same Christians would have to have to edit a paper, etc., and this work stands practically unassailed.

4. Our "band" was assailed, but when a reply was made to this my respondent dared not touch it again.

5. All through these years this school-work has been assailed because it is based, so say the opposers, on the assumption that the Church is not the ground and pillar of the truth, and that we are not complete in Christ. I showed that our work did not interfere with our completeness in Christ but exalted this completeness, and the Church more than the opposers of this work, because they were continually speaking of the "two" divine religious institutions, thus making the home a religious institution on a level with the Church. With all my work on this essential ground, he has never concerned himself although I have begged him to do so, and he now leaves the field leaving all this unfinished work behind him.

6. I carefully explained my teaching on giving, my awful "threat," my awful teaching about my "permanent" work. All of this stands untouched. Why doesn't he show wherein my explanations are short or cease to accuse me at these points?

7. I have showed that our appealing for help is in harmony with the spirit of Christianity and that the Review people indorse it by appealing for Fujimore's farm, Sexton's home, and Timmon's horse. So far as we know my respondent has not even read what I have said on this line; still we are stamped in this debate as business fools and common beggars. He should offer an apology or admit that the Octographic Review people have done wrong in being the same kind of "fellows."

8. My questions on the individual wealth of the brethren at

Jerusalem stand unanswered, and in his evasion of them he has placed every school-room in the land on a level with the "dance-hall" and the "brothel." He has thus far refused Christians the blood-bought right to put their money into schools that are right in themselves.

9. My respondent has gone on record in this debate saying that the word of God is as "religio-secular" as an institution established and conducted by human beings—an institution in which everything done is done by fallible hands. He calls it "sacrilege" when others apply the word "Bible"—a word that fallible men apply to the Word of God—to other than divine things; yet he can take the very Word of God itself and declare to hundreds of readers in this age of higher criticism, this age when children "are taught infidelity concerning the Bible in all these institutions of learning," that the Old Testament is largely secular history and that the New Testament history is also secular. WHAT IS SACRILEGE? Any man who holds my respondent's position about "religio-secular" things must feel the water boil around him, but he should not allow his strait to induce him to reflect on God and his word. This reflection should be removed. More unfinished work.

10. Since October, 1906, Brother Sommer claims to have discovered the "depths of Satan" in our work, yet he has failed to reveal these "depths," and tell us why his former primary ground became secondary. He seems to have learned that the safest plan is to keep quiet on some matters even though to do so requires the ignoring of whole articles.

11. When my respondent talked about the terrible, wicked (?) "religio-secular college to teach persons in religion," I pressed him with these questions: When Christians "band" together to teach both the Bible and secular knowledge, is their school "religio-secular?" What should be their purpose in their Bible teaching? What is the difference between a school to teach the Bible as well as other branches, and a school to teach religion as well as other branches? He stoutly refuses to give his attention to these questions but continues to condemn a school "to teach persons in religion," while approving a school to teach the Bible. This is

makes the school a much better institution through which to teach the Bible than the church of the living God.

SOMMER-ARMSTRONG DISCUSSION.

125

cowardly! He also said that our school was established to furnish secular employment for certain preachers. Again he has made a baseless assertion. It would not be bad to establish a school for such a purpose, no worse than to establish a farm or any other honorable work for it. Our school does furnish us work, much work, hard work, and some of it is "secular work" yet I should as soon a man would accuse me of helping to start a protracted meeting to give me a "job." Since I have been in the school I have spent about four months each year in the evangelistic field and the cash received has always been double, or more than double, that received for my school work. Yet I do not doubt that my teaching of God's word in the school is more regular, more systematic, more far-reaching and more permanent, than the same time spent in the field; hence I am here. Although Brother Sommer seems to think it is such a terrible thing for preachers to have "secular employment" opened to them, he says the Review has furnished work and support for his family for years. I should not think of intimating that the Review was established for that purpose! No, Western Bible and Literary College was not established to give us a "job" as my respondent unkindly insinuates. Let him quit his insinuations and finish this work that he has passed over.

THINGS ESTABLISHED.

That Christians neither have to put all their surplus money in the treasury on the first day of the week, nor give it to the poor saints; but may be stewards of the Lord and may keep any amount of this money and use it where they believe it will do most for the Cause of Christ. This right, which is denied Christians in my respondent's first essay, enables Christians to build and establish banks, hardware stores, etc., and to enlarge their business as they deem wise. It makes them able to build schools for themselves and others!

In Buffalo Seminary, that scriptural school, we find property and school equipments—all necessary piled up "brick and mortar"—employed by a Christian. If Brother Campbell could thus employ his means, all other Christians have the same right. This

Suppose he runs out of soap, hence this re-hash again

is all that has been contended for concerning the use of money in these schools. Without doubt, the principle that allowed \$100 to be used in starting Buffalo Seminary would allow the adding of more equipments as the school needed them. This is a great point gained.

It has also been established beyond question that Christians starting a school may "band" together to teach both the Bible and secular knowledge. These last points admit the whole school—origin, organization, purpose, and enough of the Lord's money to "pile up" necessary "brick and mortar."

Why does this debate continue? *Because we have made a mistake (?) in English in naming the school, and because we grant degrees!!*

July 9, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER'S SECOND ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF APPLYING SACRED NAMES TO THINGS OF HUMAN ORIGIN.

"For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it." Isa. 28:20. Thus an Old Testament prophet was instructed to write concerning a certain false confidence of ancient Israel, and thus we may write concerning the false reasoning of certain men connected with modern Israel. On no subject is such reasoning more certainly insecure and insufficient than in regard to applying sacred names to things of human origin.

"Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?" Rom. 2:22. But what does the word "sacrilege" mean? The Greek word translated "commit sacrilege" literally means "to despoil temples," and in Acts 19:37, one form of that word is translated "robbers of churches" in the Common Version of the Sacred Text. The word, therefore, means to misuse or make light of sacred things, and consequently means a desecration of sacred things, as when Belshazzar used sacred vessels for drinking wine. (Dan. 5th chapter.) This being understood, we now inquire, What

is it but sacrilege to apply the name *Bible*, which is of sacred application and association, to a religio-secular institution of learning wherein probably three-fourths of the time is given to that which is strictly secular? If such application of that name be not making light of a sacred word—misusing that word—desecrating that word—then what would or could be? In other words, if the word *Bible* may be applied to an institution which is *chiefly* secular, then why not apply it to institutions *wholly* secular? If the word *Bible* may be used to represent what is *much* secular why can it not be used to represent what is *more* secular? If one lesson a day in the *Bible* in an institution of learning makes it a "Bible School" or a "Bible College," then why will not one lesson a week in the *Bible* have the same effect? In answer to such question no response can be made, except what is strictly arbitrary or the result of perverseness. Divine revelation, the right use of reason, and the proper exercise of moral sentiments will each fail in every effort at response to the forgoing inquiries. But subterfuge, fallacy, the cuttle-fish policy—*these* must be the resort of those who would make a show of defense for having applied the word *Bible* to an institution chiefly secular.

As an illustration of false reasoning in behalf of such misuse of the *Bible* as that which we are now considering we mention again the reference previously made to Acts 19:19. It may be supposed by some that because Luke applied the Greek word *biblos*, from which we have the word *Bible*, to *bad books*, therefore the name *Bible* is not a sacred name, and may be justly applied to an institution of human origin. In opposition to this we have stated that "sacred application and association" determine the sacredness of names. Besides, we inquired whether the word *Bible*, when applied to a school or college by certain brethren, was used in the sense of Acts 19:19, where it is applied to *bad books*, or in the sense of Rev. 20:12, where it is applied to *all the Sacred Writings*? To this question there are but two possible answers, either of which will prove fatal. To say that the word *Bible* when applied to a school or college was used in the sense of *bad books* would be at once false and absurd. To say that it was used when applied to a school or college in the sense of *all the Sacred Writings* exposes

the fallacy of referring to Acts 19:19. Even if the word *biblos* in the Greek Testament were used a thousand times with reference to bad books, yet if those who applied the word *Bible* to a school or college *did not then and there use it in that sense*, then it is nothing less than subterfuge, fallacy, sophistry, or cuttle-fish policy to refer to Acts 19:19, and such reasoning is dishonorable in an ordinary man, to say nothing of a professed Christian.

"Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?" Thou that abhorrest misusing the name "Reverend," dost thou misuse the word *Bible*? Thou that refuses a title applied to God or Christ in the Sacred Text, dost thou apply a title applied to the entire Sacred Text to an institution that is chiefly secular? Thou that sayest that men should not misuse sacred names, dost thou misuse a sacred name? Thou that sayest that a man should be honorable, dost thou use sophistry?

"But be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon earth: for one is your Father, who is in heaven." Matt. 23: 8, 9. The words "master" and "father" are both applied in scripture in a secular, or an earthward, sense, yet in a spiritual sense they become *sacred by association*. The same is true of the word *Bible*. Call no man *master*, and call no man *father*, in a spiritual sense, is a command, and when extended in its scriptural bearings it forbids that we should call any human being *Reverend*, and that we should call any human institution *Bible*. If this be not admitted then a special prohibition may be demanded in order to rule out every special evil, and if the prohibition be not given then the evil may be supposed to be not designated, and thus not proved to be an evil. Such has been the position of innovators upon the truth in all ages. They say—*What is not forbidden as wrong is to be tolerated as right*. This is the position, which must be assumed by those who apply the word *Bible* to institutions of learning that are chiefly secular, or they must confess that such application of the name *Bible* is wrong.

But this is not all. If a sacred name may be justly applied to a thing of human origin, then is the relationship between things and names abolished, and a *name* of human origin may be justly

applied to a sacred *thing*. In other words, if the word *Bible* may be applied to a *religio-secular school*, then the name *Paul* may be applied to the *church of God*. If not, *why not* except that it is forbidden? Again, if the word *Bible*, without modification, may be justly applied to that which is only one-fourth *biblical*, then the word *Christian* may be justly applied, without modification, to that which is only one-fourth *Christian*. Moreover, if the spending of one-fourth of the time of pupils in a school with the *Bible* makes it a *Bible school*, then the spending of one-fourth of the time of pupils in studying Greek would make it a *Greek school*. On the same principle, we could have a school named from any other study on which pupils might spend one-fourth of their time! But if the chief or leading characteristics of a school be not those which should determine its name, then the relationship between a *characteristic name* and *the thing which it characterizes* is ignored. But this is neither more nor less than to ignore that important, heaven-born something called TRUTH. When truth is defined—correctly defined—it must be declared to be the exact relation between the *sign* and the thing *signified*, whether that sign be a *word*, a *phrase*, a *clause*, or a *sentence*. But no one will be bold enough to say that the names "Bible School" and "Bible College" express the exact relation of those names to that which they signify when applied to institutions of learning which are three-fourths secular!! Thus to supply the word *Bible* to religio-secular institutions of learning is not only *sacrilegious*, but it is a *violation of truth!!!*

But some man may say that the catalogue of such schools clearly mentions the several courses of secular study therein set forth, and thus there is nothing misleading about the name. In answer to this we state that should I receive a catalogue titled "Nashville Commercial School," or "Potter Business College," and then should find upon examination that three-fourths of the courses of study required would be *strictly Biblical*, or at least *religious*, what would be my conclusion? *Misnomer!* I would exclaim. I would pronounce it a *misnamed institution*. Who could blame me? Besides, if I were disposed to be severely just I might say something about the intelligence and honesty of educators who would send out a catalogue which carries a considerable contradic-

tion between its *title* and its *contents*. But even such titles for such catalogues would be susceptible of a better explanation than those that we are now considering. For the teachers in a commercial school, three-fourths Biblical, could quote in their favor. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge," and again, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Prov. 1:7; Ps. 111:10. But no such quotations could be made in favor of the secular departments of a so-called "Bible School." There is no scripture which says, The study of Greek, Latin and Mathematics is the beginning of religion!

"*Hearken Sinners!* I have a book which every sporting man should read. Two hundred and sixty-eight pages chuck full of good things and no nonsense. Send 50 cents to the Rover Publishing Company, and get the book by return mail."

The foregoing was an advertisement purporting to have appeared at intervals in certain city papers. Its author would send to all who ordered the book a small copy of the New Testament! No one will say that his advertisement was not *strictly true*, yet everyone will say that it was a *falsehood* because it was misleading. The New Testament is a book "which every sporting man should read," and it is "full of good things and no nonsense." Thus the advertisement and the book advertised were in perfect harmony. Still, as it implied that it was specially for "sporting men," it was misleading—*intentionally* misleading. Of course, if assailed on this point, the author of the mentioned advertisement could plead that Christ said, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Matt. 9:13. But even such a plea could not be made in favor of the evident lack of truth that there is in calling a religio-secular school a "Bible School" or a "Bible College."

What shall we say then concerning those who have applied the word *Bible* to religio-secular institutions which are about three-fourths secular and one-fourth religious? We may safely make these statements:

1. They have misused the name Bible so as to be guilty of a species of sacrilege.

2. They have misnamed their religio-secular institutions so seriously that they have violated truth.

3. They have admitted a wrong principle which makes it inconsistent for them to reject the title "Reverend" for the names of preachers, or to reject the misuse of any other sacred title.

4. They can only make a show of defense of their misuse of the word *Bible* by such reasoning as will dishonor their profession as Christians.

5. Impulsive, passionate, unscriptural reasoning, accompanied by flagrant and false personal charges seem to be the chief reliance of those who have thus far tried to defend the application of sacred titles to human institutions.

July 21, 1907.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S SECOND REPLY—TENTH ARTICLE.

In the beginning of this discussion I wrote three articles before Brother Sommer so much as referred to my work. Those three articles were never really answered. My seventh, eighth, and ninth articles also stand unanswered, the eighth and ninth not having been so much as referred to. This means that six out of nine articles stand practically untouched. It seems to me to be a pity that he who has bragged so much of his courage (?) and stamped his opponents as cowards should act so cowardly in time of battle. I have taken up every one of his articles in order and answered every argument; I have riddled everything he has put forth and he has not dared to "patch" a single thing. Instead of making a "noble fight" he is making a cowardly, disgraceful "run." I do not believe that he can show in the annals of history such a course as his own on the part of any other disputant from Roman Catholics down to digressives. This discussion is a "record breaker." Since he is the champion opposer of this school work, the very father of the objections to it, his failure is surely not due to his weakness but to the weakness of his cause. We must not expect him to do the impossible.

He admits summer to be in the negative, yet he had to take the affirmative and why?

begging at the feet of none
False

"THE NAME."

Falsely Had my respondent been fair and honorable he could not have sent as a reply to my last article a portion of that presumptive, assumptive, verbose tract. This portion of the tract is based on the assumption that the word "Bible" is sacred. This is the very point to be proved. I have begged him to give us his authority for making this word sacred but he ignores every entreaty at this point. I asked six direct questions and begged him to answer them if he did nothing else. He pays no attention to these questions. He is afraid to attempt to answer them, for to answer them would expose everything he has ever written on the "name." Anybody can debate by himself. My respondent's position on the "name" is a disgrace to a debater that quit school to learn to think. In my last article, to which his last installment of tract is a pretended reply, I showed that his whole position rested on human tradition; that he was legislating for God's children. I repeat the charge. Brother Sommer has entered the very domain of God and dared to walk where God only may walk. He has violated one of the most sacred principles of the church of God: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent." "If any man speaketh, speaking as it were oracles of God." I Peter 4:11. Let him name his Bible authority for his legislation concerning "biblos" and "biblion." If he doesn't do it, the Church should repudiate it and call on him to give up his false teaching. He says the word "Bible," a word not mentioned in our English Bible, a word never applied to the holy writings till the 5th century, is a "sacred name." Who made it so? Does the fact that men, uninspired men, have done a thing for hundreds of years make that thing "sacred?" Brother Sommer is the first mortal that has dared to attach sacredness to this word. I challenge him to show where any man before him, inspired or uninspired, godly or ungodly, has charged men with "sacrilege" for applying this word to things of human origin. He is the father of the doctrine. If Brother Sommer may legislate concerning the use of the word "biblion," what hinders me from legislating concerning "baptismos?" Where is the end of such human legislation as this when

once it is embraced by the Church? He who winks at such legislation for God's children approves of highhanded presumption in the Church of God and allows to go unrebuked, a sin that would, carried to its ultimatum, undermine the blood-bought liberty of God's children and make them bond-servants of men.

The Greek word "biblos" means: "A written book, a roll or scroll." "Biblion" means: "A small book, a scroll . . . a written document; a sheet on which something has been written." These are the meanings given by Thayer in his New Testament lexicon.

Let us examine the Holy Spirit's use of these words.

1. "As it is written in the biblo of Isaiah, the prophet." Luke 3:4.
2. "In the biblo of Moses." Mark 12:26.
3. "In the biblo of Psalms." Acts 1:20.
4. "The biblos of the generation of Jesus Christ." Matt. 1:1.
5. "Brought their biblous together and burned them." Acts 19:19.
6. "Whose names are in the biblo of life." Phil. 4:3.
7. "Give a biblion of divorcement." Matt. 19:7.
8. "Write a biblion of divorcement." Mark 10:4.
9. "Could not contain the biblia." Jno. 21:25.
10. "Bring . . . the biblia." II. Tim. 4:13.
11. "A biblion written within and on the back." Rev. 5:1. See also verses 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9.
12. "What thou seest write in a biblio." Rev. 1:11.
13. "The heaven departed as a biblion." Rev. 6:14.
14. "The biblia were opened." Rev. 20:12.
15. "Written in the Lamb's biblio of life." Rev. 21:27.

Here are fifteen divine uses of these words and ten of them refer to other things (books and writings) than the Bible; four of them refer to portions of the Bible; and no man knows to what the other one refers. Brother Sommer dogmatically and unreasonably affirms that in this passage (Rev. 20:12) the word refers to the entire Bible. Should I grant this there is nothing, absolutely nothing, gained for his position. He makes the affirmation, however, without a vestige of proof.

B. W. Johnson, in his "People's New Testament," says: "The books (Rev. 20:12) are opened—the records that contain all the deeds of men."

"The Bible Commentary," by Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, says that "the books" (Rev. 20:12) are "the books" of God's remembrance, alike of the evil and the good (Psalm 56:8; 139:4; Malachi 3:16), conscience (Romans 2:15, 16), the Word of Christ (John 12:48), the law (Gal. 3:10) God's eternal council (Psalm 139:16).

Matthew Henry, in his "Commentary of the Bible," says: "The books were opened. What books? The books of God's omniscience, . . . the book of the sinner's conscience, . . . and another book, . . . the book of the scriptures."

"The Bible Commentary," by Bishops and other clergy, says: "Observe not 'the books' as below, but indefinitely, such as are spoken of throughout scripture as the register of all human actions—Ps. 56:8; Isaiah 65:6; Mal. 3:16)."

If a thing can be established by the scriptures and by divine examples, it is now fixed that the Holy Spirit has used these words indiscriminately, applying them to all kinds of writings, records and books, both human and divine, both good and bad.

The prohibition concerning "father," "master" and "teacher" in the passage referred to by our brother, is not concerning the sacredness of the words themselves. These words are among the most common of the language. They are among the first words of the child's vocabulary. These words have never been limited to a sacred use by the Holy Spirit. The sacredness and the holiness belong to the persons and things and not to the words. It is the *having* of another father, master and teacher in the sense in which God and Christ are father, master and teacher, that is sinful. The Word of God itself is sacred and holy, and woe be to the man that does not so regard it and treat it. When one reads the Bible he should feel that God is speaking to him, and with profound reverence he should listen to every word, remembering that God blesses the heart that trembles at His word. But has God given a "name" to the Holy Book and bound it upon his children? Has he sanctified this word, limited it to the one service? If he has

not, let every mouth be stopped. Brother Sommer is attempting to bind a special name for God's book, and is charging sacrilege upon God's children if they dare to disregard his "ipse dixit."

Strange to say, too, the word Bible (this word Brother Sommer dares to sanctify) is nowhere found in our Bibles. It is purely an English word coined hundreds of years after every word of the Bible was written and after every inspired man was dead. The "Columbian Cyclopaedia" says this name "Bible" was given by Chrysostom in the fourth century. Smith, in his "Bible Dictionary" (there, I am guilty (?) of "sacrilege" because I have applied the "sacred" and "holy" word "Bible" to a thing of "human origin"—a dictionary) says: "The application of this word to the collected books of the Old and New Testament is not to be traced further back than the fifth century. . . . And when this use of the word was established in the East it was natural that it should pass gradually to the Western Church. . . . The choice of it, rather than of any of its synonyms by the great translators of the scriptures, Wyklyf, Luther, Coverdale, fixed it beyond all possibility of change." Brother Sommer has gravely and seriously charged his brethren with sacrilege because, he thinks, they have violated this tradition of men. He has made strife, alienation and discord in the Church of God.

SOMMER'S OWN DOCTRINE.

In 1903, Brother Sommer said in regard to the naming of things: "Let sacred things be called by sacred names, secular things by secular names, and mixed things by mixed names." We have a "mixed" school, that is, in our school we teach both the Bible and secular knowledge; we have, also, a "mixed name"—"Western Bible and Literary College." We gave our school this name because, in our judgment, it set forth the work we do. Our name is exactly in harmony with my disputant's own doctrine, although when our school was given its name, I did not remember that he had ever made such a statement. Notwithstanding our name is in harmony with his own doctrine, he arraigned us at Odessa and at Hale for being "unscriptural in name." I am

now replying to his second essay on the name, and in both of them we are charged with "*sacrilege*" because we have applied a "sacred" name to a thing of human origin. Has Brother Sommer forgotten his teaching at this point? If he stands by it he endorses our name. If he wants to retract let him say so; otherwise he stands convicted of contradicting his own teaching; he is mixed on the name question and is an unsafe teacher on the subject. He endorses our name and then charges us with sacrilege for using it. As late as the oral discussion at Hale (page 157), when pressed on the name he said: "If he had only used his English aright, I would not have quarreled with him about the name "Bible." He endorses our name as late as the Hale debate, save in a point of English, but now we are guilty of sacrilege!!! His failure to find any objection to our name (save a mistake in English) in the Hale debate surrenders his foolish doctrine concerning the "unscripturalness of applying sacred names to things of human origin." Does the adding of the word "Literary" in our name make our school of divine origin? Is not our school still a "religio-secular" school? Is not the word "Bible" in our name, in spite of the word "Literary" applied to "College," and is not the college a human institution? Now look at him! Are you not sorry for him? He has surrendered the whole matter, and if he has the courage he will confess his wrong and correct, so far as possible, the trouble he has caused in Israel by it. God hates the man that sows discord among His people. Brother Sommer has been doing this very thing for six years, yea, for seven, over what he himself now calls a mistake in English. "Oh shame, where is thy blush!"

There is another important fact involved in this surrender that I want to emphasize. While I am not obligated, so far as this debate is concerned, to defend the other schools with respect to their names—I mean "The Nashville Bible School," "Potter Bible College," "Beamsville Bible School," "Gunter Bible College," etc., for this is not an essential feature of the work—I am obligated to defend truth always. The word "Bible" in these names is used exactly as we have used it. There is not a grammar class in the country that has learned to analyze simple sentences, that does

not know that the word "Bible" in the expressions "Potter Bible College" and "Western Bible and Literary College" is applied to "College" in both cases exactly alike. It inevitably follows that if we have used the word correctly (save in a point of English) the other brethren are free from sacrilege. I want to say this *strong, loud and long* for truth's sake. Brother Sommer may condemn the brethren of these other schools concerning their names because they do not by these names indicate as fully the work done as a "mixed name" would do, but if he is kind and just he will say he thinks they make a MISTAKE and not that they VIOLATE TRUTH. Not only so, but if he is just, he will admit, too, that he has been guilty of endorsing the same mistake in the brethren at Detroit in that he approved of the name "Bible Reading" for their work. If the brethren violated truth in saying "Nashville Bible School" because the name did not indicate that there was secular work done in the school, even so did brethren at Detroit violate truth because the name of their work did not indicate that two-thirds or three fourths of their work was secular, yet my respondent endorsed that name. Why is it wrong for the brethren at Nashville to fail to indicate by name the secular work they do but right for the brethren at Detroit? In this debate he has surrendered his doctrine on the "Lord's money" and now he surrenders the name proposition. He himself has endorsed everything in name that we have.

In Oct. 1906 Brother Sommer said that all the objections he had ever urged against our work could be classed under two heads, "money" and "name." These two objections have been completely undermined, so he has had to make a change. This change had to be explained and his explanation is that he has discovered new sins in the work—"depths of Satan"—and though I have pressed him hard he will not tell us what these sins are. I entreat him again to expose these "depths."

August 2, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER'S THIRD ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF APPLYING SACRED NAMES
TO THINGS OF HUMAN ORIGIN.

"I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." Isa. 42:8. "Thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." Psa. 138:2. Let the foregoing statements of the Old Testament, which were written for our learning, be reverently considered, and then we must conclude that when those statements were made God was certainly jealous for his *name* and for his *word*. This conclusion is justified by the following directions and precautions which were given to the Jews: "Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee. But ye shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves. For thou shalt worship no other God: for the Lord whose name is jealous is a jealous God." Ex. 34:12-14. But the Israelites, afterwards called Jews, disregarded the precautions which God gave them on this subject. One of their Kings married many strange women, who turned his heart away from God. Then the kingdom was divided into two kingdoms or houses of Israel. Finally both of those kingdoms, at different periods, went into captivity, one to remain about two hundred years, and the other to remain seventy years. Their entire history was written for our learning and shall we refuse to learn thereby that God is jealous for his *name* also for his *word* which he has *magnified above his name*?

But some man may say, "I can't see *any harm* in calling a school where the Bible is in any measure taught, by the name 'BIBLE SCHOOL.'" In answer we state that some people say that they cannot see *any harm* in sprinkling water on an infant, nor in asking adults to bow at a mourner's bench. But we tell them that those who would serve God acceptably must "walk by faith, not by sight." 2 Cor. 5:7. Next, we tell them that doing the divine will is not a question of *how things appear to us*, especially

while ignorant of God's word on the question involved, but "what saith the scripture"? If there be no harm in calling a man an *honest man* who is three-fourths of his time *dishonest*, and no harm in calling a man a *sober man* who is three-fourths of his time *drunk*, and no harm in calling that a *wheat farm* which is three-fourths covered with a crop of *yellow corn*, and no harm in calling that a *dry goods store* while three-fourths of its business consists in selling *whiskey and beer*, then is it no harm, from the viewpoint of truth, in calling that a *Bible School* or *Bible College* which is three-fourths devoted to *secular learning*? But, as we have previously learned, the untruthfulness and consequent unjustness of such names for such schools do not constitute the only viewpoints from which the so-called "Bible School" and "Bible College" should be considered. But the application of the word *Bible* to such schools is a *misuse of a sacred name*, which involves a *principle* that opens the flood-gate for nearly all manner of looseness and irreverence in the use of sacred titles. The extreme to which Rome and her daughters have gone must then be admitted. A man may then call himself "reverend," "ambassador," "witness," "apostle," or by any other name which describes only one-fourth, or even one-tenth of his real character. But the assumption of high titles is one of the marks of the apostasy, and shall apostolic disciples pursue a course which will give them one of those marks?

"Bible things should be called by Bible names." This was one of the wise sayings adopted early in the 19th century by those who endeavored to restore the New Testament order of things. That saying implies that things not strictly Bible things should not be called by Bible names. This is the suggestion of common sense; it is the demand of common honesty; it is a requirement of truth; and *it is the teaching of God's word*.

What shall we say then of those who have applied the word *Bible* or the word *gospel* to an enterprise of human origin, and which is largely devoted to secular things? They have gone contrary to common sense, common honesty, common truth, and the Bible. Common sense suggests that all things be named according to their characteristics, common honesty demands it, common truth

requires it, and the Bible commands it, saying, "Wherefore, putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor"; and again, "Lie not one to another seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds." Eph. 4:25; Col. 3:9.

But suppose that some man would call an enterprise of human origin "The Way," and refer to Matt. 7:14, as divine authority for so doing. He might as well call his enterprise "The Gospel of Christ" and refer to Rom. 1:16 as divine authority for so doing, or he might call it "The Resurrection and the Life" and refer to John 11:25 for authority, or he might upon the same principle call it "The Way, the Truth and the Life" and refer to John 14:6 for authority, or he might as reasonably call his enterprise "The Christ," or "The Son of the Living God" and refer to Matt. 16:16 as authority.

But some man may say that there is no more harm in calling a paper by such a name than there is in writing an article under such a name, and certainly it would be lawful to write on "The Way," "The Gospel of Christ" or under any one of the other headings just named. In answer we make the following statements:

1. The idea of naming a paper "The Gospel of Christ" should frighten the man who entertains it.

2. The idea of naming a paper "The Christ" or "The Son of the Living God" ought to paralyze the brain that holds it.

3. The name of a paper is a *proper name*. So is the name of a *school or college*. But the heading of an article is a *prepositional phrase* as it always implies a preposition before it. As an illustration take the heading of this series of chapters. We might have written under this heading: "The Unscripturalness of Applying Sacred Names to Things of Human Origin." But the word "Concerning" would have been implied. The same is true of all other headings of articles or chapters of a series. Therefore the heading of an article is a *prepositional phrase* while the name of a periodical is a *proper name*. At the same time the name of a journal is a proper name, and is *intended* to be descriptive of its characteristics or contents. The one who cannot understand this

much, or understanding it will not confess it, is outside of the domain of reason.

"And what shall I more say? For the time would fail me to tell of" all the historians and reformers who have called "the church of God" which consisted of "the churches of Christ" by the name "Christian Church," and of those who have given human names to divine things and divine names to human things. "Young Men's Christian Association" is the name of a popular institution which has a building in many cities. In going through one of those buildings we found a bowling alley and poolroom, a gaming table, and other devices which are as widely separated from Christ as darkness is from light.

Nor is this all. Sectarian churches generally like to be called "Christian Churches," and the same is true of all churches which have entered into a defection from those churches of Christ which are struggling to maintain apostolic simplicity. Truth has been reproached and condemned while error has been commended and advanced by being misnamed. Christ was called "Beelzebub," and Paul was called "babbling" the pope is called "Father" and his priests are called "Reverend," while schools chiefly secular are called by the name "Bible School" and "Bible College." But enterprises of human origin, whether chiefly secular or chiefly religious, are not divine and thus cannot be regulated by the word of God. Such enterprises may be presumptuously named after God's word, but the president of a so-called "Bible College" and the principal of a so-called "Bible School" are not, in such capacity, really Bible characters and cannot be controlled by Bible teaching. Even an editor of a paper, whether wholly or only partly religious, seldom remains a Bible character very long. If he be a Christian when he begins he not unfrequently permits the editor to absorb or discard the Christian. Then a passage of scripture, even correctly applied, has no more weight with him when he goes wrong than one of Aesop's fables would have. We have had observation on this subject and know whereof we affirm. The editor who remains a Christian will reverence every scripture justly brought to bear against him when he goes wrong, but the

one in whom the Christian is engulfed in the editor is both blind and deaf to scripture, which is brought against him.

What shall we say then of religious things and characters of human origin? They cannot be controlled by the word of God and are destined to evil. They cannot be corrected, cured, nor saved by inscribing on them Bible names. Sooner or later they will be known by their fruits and will go to their own place. Then the inappropriateness of their Bible names will be known and read of all men. "For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it." Isa. 28:20.

But some man will say, "How about the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW?" In answer we state that it is justified by the example of inspired men writing letters to Christians, and this example is sufficient. Inspired men *wrote* the truth as well as *preached* the truth, and their example is as strong for Christians to *write* the truth to their fellow mortals as it is for us to *preach* the truth to them. Inspired men preached inspired sermons and wrote inspired dissertations and letters. If the fact of their *preaching* is an example for us to follow so is the fact of their *writing* an example for us to follow. Then as the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW is a private, personal enterprise it cannot be justly classed with public institutions, especially with those that are partly secular, or with those on which a sacred name has been unscripturally inscribed as their proper title. The name OCTOGRAPHIC is *scriptural* because in harmony with scripture—every scripture which enjoins truth—but it is not a *scripture* name because it is not found in scripture.

But some man may ask, Did you not for a time publish a journal which you called *The Helper*, and is not that a scripture name? In answer we state that near or about a dozen years ago we published twelve lectures, and called the magazine in which they were sent forth—"The Helper." We intended the name "Helper" to be used in the ordinary sense of *lending aid* or *rendering assistance*, and thus referred to no scripture as designating its meaning. If we had referred to Heb. 13:6, which says, "The Lord is my helper," then we would have shown that we meant the name of our magazine to be used in the sense that the

Lord is spoken of as our "helper." But in the absence of such a reference it seems to us both common sense and common honesty would require that no one should charge us with having intended that our magazine should have a Bible name, nor charge us with giving it a Bible name. But when an editor calls his paper "The Way," and quotes what is said in Matt. 7:13, 14, of the narrow gate and narrow way to indicate the sense in which he intends that the name of his paper shall be regarded, then both common sense and common honesty *demand* that he should be held responsible for giving his human enterprise a Bible name. Moreover, it needs only to be stated that such an editor has made a *misuse* and a *misapplication* of a Bible name. The word "way" in Matt. 7:14 refers to *the way of life* or *the gospel*, and in John 14:6 the Savior said of himself, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." This shows that Christ, who is the gospel in person, calls himself *the way*. In the light of all this we have stated, and now repeat, that to use the words "The Way" as a name for a human enterprise is *misusing* or *making light* of, what is sacred, and this is *sacrilege*. This may be *denied*, but it will not *remain denied*.

That which has just been submitted in regard to the names of certain journals is simply offered by way of illustration, and as a further illustration take the name "Primitive Christianity." Though this name, as such, is not found in the Sacred Text, yet the word "Christianity" has in it the name of Christ, and "Primitive Christianity" as an expression, means the gospel of Christ, theoretically and practically, as revealed in the New Testament. This being true, it needs only to be stated, in order to be understood and admitted, that the name "Primitive Christianity" is not appropriate for any human enterprise. Moreover, to apply that name to such an enterprise is presumptuous and irreverent, if not sacrilegious. Reader, "Consider what I say, and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." 2nd Tim. 2:7.

Aug. 21, 1907.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S THIRD REPLY—ELEVENTH
ARTICLE.

I believe every fairminded reader realizes the cowardly part my respondent is playing in failing to notice my work in this discussion. He owes it to me to do it, for he entered a *written* contract to discuss with *me* the college question; he owes it to the reader, for the reader wants the truth. If the time-worn tract that he continues to contribute as his part of this discussion were logical and well-written, his conduct would be shameful, but since it has scarcely a logical argument in it, this cowardly repetition of it casts a double portion of shame on him. Of course, his course shows clearly his crushing defeat, but my respondent is wise enough to know that it is not manifested as clearly to many readers as it would be were he to take hold of my criticisms and attempt to expose them. He is acutely conscious of being in the "frying-pan" and he prefers it to the "fire." It is impossible now for him to examine fairly my criticisms of his work on the name, and for the sake of the reader I want to prophesy a little: Brother Sommer knows that he will have to say something about my work before the debate closes, and when he can stay behind the "wall" no longer, when "shot and shell" have battered down his "wall" till he is forced to show himself, he will refer to my criticisms in a kind of *wholesale* way, lump them all together and with his baseless assertions try to make the reader believe he has answered them. *Watch him.* Is he discussing the question for the ignorant, the prejudiced, and the non-thinking, those who will accept his assertions, his "ipse dixit," about any matter and be fully assured that it is as Daniel Sommer says because Daniel Sommer says it is? Is he wasting his time on this character of mind? I am writing for the "more noble," the thoughtful, the truth-searchers, those who are anxious to know the truth and to walk in it. I believe there are many such people among the readers of the O. R. These honest-hearted people want to see the "other side." It was for the sake of such hearts that I desired the discussion. I saw that it was impossible to get before

the O. R. readers in any other way and I thank God for this chance and pray that he may guide me in all that I may say.

My respondent's position on the name is the most untenable, unreasonable, doctrine a sensible man could advocate. I should as soon attempt to defend infant baptism. The very best he can ever offer in support of his unseasonable doctrine is his *own* philosophy, for he has not a vestige of proof for it. Not only is it contrary to all Bible teaching, but, as I have stated again and again no man before my respondent ever dared to bind this doctrine of "sacred names." Let him name the man, inspired or uninspired, that ever accused men of sacrilege because they used such expressions as "Bible Reading," "Bible student," "Bible work," "Bible class," "Bible collar," "Bible maps," "Bible Dictionary," "Bible history," "Bible Society," "Bible association," "Bible store." No expression in the English language is more common than such expressions, and yet the "sacred name" (made sacred by Daniel Sommer) is in these expressions applied to things of human origin—the very thing that my respondent is so loud in condemning. Let him name the passage that condemns such usage. Again and again I have begged him to name the passage that "sanctifies" the word Bible, that is, that limits it to a "sacred" use. Can he name the passage? Why doesn't he do it? One passage that has the word Bible in it will end this debate. Nay verily, my brethren, the very word that he makes such ado about is not found in all the sacred word of God. It is sad to see men who have stood for years on the doctrine "Where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent" surrender this sacred principle, but this is exactly what my respondent has done. It is to be deeply lamented that brethren will encourage and even fellowship Brother Sommer in his effort to bind this humanism on the Church. I now entreat him for the third time to give us his *Bible* authority for condemning me of sacrilege.

In his last article he condemns us for going "contrary to common sense, common honesty, common truth and the Bible," yet he does not mention *one* passage in all of that article that mentions the word Bible, neither is there a single passage that has

*is this
nasty*

one syllable concerning the use of *any* word. Western Bible and Literary College is the name we chose for our school. It seemed necessary to give the work a name, and we tried to select that name that would most nearly set forth the work done. Therefore, since we teach the regular literary branches, we call it a "literary" school; but since we emphasize the study of the Bible as we do in the Odessa College, we call our school "Bible and Literary" because those words literally define the two great branches of work done in the school. This is our reason for naming our school as we did and he who assigns other reasons exalts himself to be God and becomes a judge of the hearts of men. I appeal to every reader, to every unprejudiced mind, to know wherein we, in this name, go "contrary to common sense, common honesty, common truth, and the Bible." Wherein are we guilty of the lying of which he accuses us? Although we were arraigned both at Odessa and at Hale for our unscripturalness in name, he himself admitted in the Hale debate that we were guilty of nothing in name but a mistake in English! He also said in the discussion at Hale that this tract was written before our school was established and that that portion of the tract devoted to "name" was not against our school. He said emphatically that had we used our English aright he would not quarrel with us about our name, yet all of the work he has done in this present discussion on the "name" has been from that portion of the tract not against our school. Cowardly conduct! I cannot conceive of how a Christian can accuse brethren who have merely made a mistake (?) in English of sacrilege, of dishonesty, and of lying, yet this is the character of work I have to deal with from my disputant; and he the champion of those who oppose the work! Although he is renowned for ability and praised for the "masterly manner" in which he "handled his side of the affair," and although he was and is debating with a "stripling," this is the muddle into which his "masterly manner" has led him. I am persuaded that it would have been a more "masterly manner" and a more Christianly manner had he, when pressed at Odessa for his objection to our name, said openly and boldly that he had no objection to our name, save in a point of English, and held to

this position throughout the discussions, both oral and written. Instead of doing this he promised sometime to show our unscripturalness as to name and contented himself with his bold arraignment of unscripturalness, thus striving to leave the impression on the minds of young and old that we were unscriptural in name. This is some of his "masterly manner" and his "noble fight." For him, after such an effort to deceive the people and leave false impressions on their hearts, to accuse others of dishonesty and lying is *too* "masterly! "With all his fairness" (?), with all of his courage (?), and with all of his assurance that his opponent is "always wrong" (?), why didn't he commend us for being right in name and thus correct the impression that he and his collaborators have made on the minds of many disciples all through this country. There are hundreds of them that believe we brethren at Odessa are wrong, scripturally wrong, because we have the word "Bible" in our name. Brother Sommer has been the chief factor in making this impression and was the man of all men to clear it up, and Odessa and Hale were the places of all places where a general clearing up could have been made. Why didn't he make it? Again he fell with all of his "masterly manner." But this is not all, the debates closed at Odessa and Hale with a bold arraignment of our unscripturalness in name, and with a promise from my respondent to expose our wrong in the written discussion, when at that very moment he believed us to be wrong in name in a point of English only. Nor is this all, now that he is under promise to do something on the name, he has sent me in disregard of everything that I have said in criticism of his work three articles from the tract that was written years before our name lived and that he himself said was not against our name.

I now know why he would not discuss the name in the oral debate. He would have been ashamed to make his speeches (three in succession) in utter disregard of everything his respondent might say. He could not have faced his audience in such a "masterly manner." Had he had the courage to do so it is probable that his audience would have hissed him off of the floor, but in a written discussion his audience is absent and cannot see his blush of shame, neither can it demand its rights in the case.

*Begging
the
question
and
lying*

My respondent's last article is almost entirely off of the subject being against the names of papers etc. It is chiefly against the use of such words as "gospel", "way", "Christianity", etc. Such legislation once begun is endless, but my respondent will have enough to do if he will kindly notice my criticisms of his work without bringing in such foreign matter.

All thoughtful people can readily see that there is nothing in Brother Sommer's contention over names, hence, it is useless to further burden the reader with such foolishness. Until he notices my complete over-throw of all he has said on the name I am going back to the subject. It is sinful to confuse the minds of the untaught and to disturb the peace of God's family over such a matter. He has completed his own ruin by his own statements: (1.) In 1903 he said, "Let sacred things be called by sacred names, secular things by secular names, and mixed things by mixed names." (2.) In Feb. 1907 he said "If he had only used his English aright I would not have quarreled with him about the name 'Bible.'" (3.) In Aug. 1907 he said "that those who had applied the word Bible to an enterprise of human origin were dishonest, guilty of sacrilege and of lying."

What will he say in September?

As I have said from the beginning, it is for the sake of truth that I am in the discussion. I believed that I held the truth on the subject, and I was anxious that it be set before the champion of the opposers that it might be tested. You remember that in the very beginning I made a strong effort to define the issue. I tried hard to get my respondent to name the issue, but he refused to do it and said that I was trying to make the issue less than it really was.

It is the *work* for which I am contending. I care nothing for incidents and accidents connected with it, but am willing and more than willing to make any reasonable sacrifice of judgment and preference even concerning the name. I say again I stand for the work itself; for schools that hold a high standard of morals, that are Godly in their influence; for schools that make respect and reverence for God and faith in him the ground of all morality, virtue, and goodness; for schools that make this moral

and spiritual training of the young the final object of all work; Brother Sommer and all of the men that stand with him on this question have for seven years bitterly opposed all the schools in the world that stand for these things, and have given their influence for the same number of years to schools that teach "infidelity concerning the Bible." In this age when fathers and mothers are more ambitious to educate their children than ever before, and when the young themselves are more determined to be educated, it is terrible that a man of Daniel Sommer's influence should give all of his influence in the matter of schools to the devil, yea, there is no excuse for such a sin against this generation. For seven years he has been an *enemy* to the fathers and mothers, to the boys and girls, and to the homes of this land, and a friend to "all these institutions of learning" in which the young are inoculated with infidelity concerning the Bible.

I have tried my best to get him to take up the things that are vital to the work, but he steers clear of such matters. Why does he do it?

QUESTIONS UNANSWERED.

"3. If the Jerusalem disciples had 'wealth' that was their 'own' and in their 'power', could they not have used it in the building of a school building and the starting of a school without sinning, provided the school in itself was right?" About six times he has been pressed to answer this question, but he has evaded it in every reference to it. This is a straight-forward question and assumes nothing but that there are schools that are right in themselves. Brother Sommer *did* finally admit the truth of this fact, so why doesn't he say "Yes, Christians may put their money into schools right in themselves" or "No." I don't care which he says, for either answer slays him and he knows it. If he says "yes" there is absolutely no difference between us on the money question, for we all believe that Christians should not put their money into schools wrong in themselves. If he says "yes" then Christians may build all of the schools that they believe they need provided they build the right kind of schools. This allows Christians to "pile up" all of the "brick and mortar" that these

schools need, hence, all of his talk about its being wrong for Christians to use their money to establish schools is so much "smoke" and "dust." If he answers the Jerusalem question by saying "No," he turns the starting and building of all schools into the hands of sinners. God's children cannot own and run a school, neither can they send their children to school where they have to pay tuition, for it is wrong for them to put money into schools. This dilemma caused him to evade the Jerusalem questions.

But there are many other unanswered questions. Among them are:

1. When Christians "band" together to teach both the Bible and secular knowledge is their school religio-secular?
2. What should be their purpose in the Bible teaching?
3. What is the difference between a school to teach the Bible and other branches of knowledge, and a school to teach true religion and other branches of knowledge?
4. What are the "depths of satan" that have been discovered since Oct. 1906?

I have also begged in vain for answers to the six questions on the words "biblos" and "biblion." In my third article I requested in vain that he take up and answer one by one the six questions on the purpose with which Christians may work. In addition to these things my respondent has four articles, whole articles, that he has not touched. I am sorry that Brother Sommer has allowed his work to pile up on him like this for it is impossible for him ever to catch up with it.

I have begged my respondent to examine and overthrow if possible my work, but he will not because he cannot. I understand now why the O. R. closes its columns against this truth.

Brother Sommer cannot meet these things and the people shall know it!

Sept. 4, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER'S FOURTH ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF APPLYING SACRED NAMES TO THINGS OF HUMAN ORIGIN.

Before beginning my reply to that which my opponent has said on the Name question I shall give some attention to his "eighth reply", which was supposed to end the discussion of the Money question.

He said, "I am glad for the fair-minded, truth-loving readers of this discussion to judge whether I am an 'unmitigated' liar." In response to this I state that I have carefully avoided applying the word "liar" to my opponent, though I think that is the designation which the apostle John would apply to him. Neither have I used the word "wicked" concerning him. But he has applied both of those words to himself and to certain other college advocates. I suppose he knows the real character of himself, also of his associates. The worst that I have said concerning him is that his disregard for truth has suggested to my mind, Isaiah 44: 20.

My opponent persists in slandering me by charging against me what is untrue, yet persists in calling me "brother." He ought to read Proverbs 10: 18.

He says, "Throughout the oral debate Bro. Sommer addressed Bro. Nay as 'Mr. Nav.'" But he is wrong again. The printed debate, on 150th page, gives me credit for saying, "Bro. Nav." But I confess that when I designated him "brother" it was not intentional." The Savior does not require me to address a man as "brother," who persists in disregard for truth and is a slanderer.

Prof. Armstrong says of himself, "We have always been willing to discuss the issue." But our correspondence, both in public and in private, shows to the contrary. He should have said, We have always been disposed to EVADE the issue. He knows that he would not AFFIRM his position, nor has he yet done so.

Prof. A. also says, "I do not believe I misrepresent Bro

Sommer when I say he *knows* this is not fact," and again, "I do not say that Bro. Sommer intends to misrepresent us", These two statements do not jingle as harmoniously as marriage bells, yet I regret that I can not return the compliment found in the latter of them.

He also says, "It was thought that we came here to build up a school, but it appeared that we came here to build up the 'Campbellite' church." As my opponent does not deny the foregoing, nor intimate that it is not correct, I shall let it stand as a just charge against him, and on the basis of it I charge that he deceived certain persons at Odessa, also a part of the Brotherhood elsewhere. The former were led to suppose that his chief idea was a school, and the latter supposed that his chief idea was the Church of Christ. But a college-church or a church-college was that which he aimed to establish after the order of Alexander Campbell's work when he began to be a CONFORMER, and laid the foundation for the Christian Church defection among disciples by establishing a religio-secular college.

Prof. A. asks, "Is this 'hired clergy' argument against the WORK or against the MEN?" It was originally against the "work" but it has resulted in being against the "men" also, because they have shown themselves to be "wicked" men and "liars", in the estimation of Prof. Armstrong. Such, at least, is his confession concerning them, or a part of them.

He says, "According to our agreement we are discussing our differences on the 'college question.'" In response to this I state that thus I began by sending three impersonal essays, to my opponent, but in his replies he assailed me personally, and in the third one of them he likened me to a cowardly "dog."

He further says, "The statement that my teaching interferes with the Christian's sacred duties of supporting his family and paying his taxes is another baseless assertion." But this is what he declared in the *P. C.* of Oct. 27, 1904: "If you have means in your hands and are a servant of God, it is the Lord's money, and to be a faithful servant you must use it where you believe it will do the most toward building up the kingdom of God." This declaration is between a threat of perdition against those

who might not be disposed to give to support his college, and an appeal in behalf of his college. Such a declaration implies that the money a man needs to support his family and pay his taxes is "the Lord's money," which is NOT TRUE, and in such connection it implies that to give to the Odessa school is the only sure way to do "the most" good for "the kingdom of God." The reader should turn again and read his article, as I quoted, in my Eighth Essay on the Money question.

Under the heading "Permanent Work," my slanderous opponent tried to explain what he meant by speaking of his school as a "permanent work", and in so doing he passed from the SCHOOL AS SUCH to THE INFLUENCE of the professors and their families in the place where the school would be established. I pronounce this an after-thought, and a subterfuge, and I ask, What becomes their "permanent" influence during vacation when they are, near or about, all absent from the college? Yet in the same paragraph where I find this explanation I find also the following: "I believe it is better to support this work than to support one meeting." Thus, in the very paragraph where he makes his explanation he confesses what I have charged against him, namely, that, in his estimation, his school is "better" than the Church of God in regard to work! But this is not all. In the latter part of his Ninth Reply he says, "I do not doubt that my teaching of God's word in the school is more regular, more systematic, more far-reaching, and more permanent than the same time spent in the field, hence I am here." This is more than I ever charged against my opponent, and shows that he exalts his humanly-devised method of teaching the Bible in the Odessa school far above the divinely-ordained preaching of the gospel; that is, if he means that he preaches the gospel while in the field. But I strongly suspect that his time spent in the field is chiefly spent in behalf of his college. Yet his implication against the divinely-ordained preaching of the gospel remains, and the truth of my charge is confirmed.

My slanderer says, "The article to which I am replying totally ignores my last article." But the reader may turn back and see that in the beginning of my Eighth Essay I exposed eight of

my opponent's errors as set forth in his Seventh Reply. Is it any wonder that he confesses himself to be a "liar" and "wicked?"

In order to say something against me, my opponent has stated of the Bible, "the every word of which has been written by God's own spirit." I pronounce this statement untrue, and I need not go out of the New Testament for proof. See the 7th chapter of Paul's First Letter to the Corinthian brethren. There are only two verses in that chapter which Paul attributes to the Lord, and all else in it he says he wrote "by permission," and "not of commandment." No wonder that Prof. A. applies to himself the words "liar" and "wicked." To this I add, that if I should adopt my opponent's method of reasoning against the REVIEW, by which he tries to prove that it is secular, I might say that the Bible, in its incidentals, such as type-setting, printing, etc., is more secular than is the REVIEW.

My slanderous opponent, who confesses that he is "wicked" and a "liar" asks, "Where are the 'depths of Satan' ", to which I referred, and challenges me to tell where they are. I answer that when I began to write against religio-secular colleges I did not suppose that those who advocated them would be so determined to defend them that they would disregard common veracity in order to make a show of defense for them. I did not suppose that their chief advocate would confess that he and his colleagues are "liars" and are "wicked."

He says of me, "My opponent refuses to tell Christians whether they may put their money into the right kind of schools." But I have not refused anything of that kind.

He also says, "I showed it was scriptural to appeal for help for this scriptural work as it is to appeal for help to buy Fujimori's farm, Sexton's home, or, as was recently done in the REVIEW, Timmon's horse." I answer that he has not yet shown that his work is "scriptural" and he would not affirm that it is "scriptural." To help a poor man to support his dependent family is a scriptural work, especially when that poor man is a preacher of the gospel of Christ, but to help men to establish an institution which they imply is "more permanent" than the

Church, and which will tend to prevent them from preaching the gospel of Christ much of their time, is NOT A SCRIPTURAL WORK.

Prof. A. closes the "reply" under consideration with this charge: "Bro. Sommer has been fighting against God and his truth." I deny the charge. I have only been skirmishing with men whose chief defender says they are "wicked" and are "liars."

Here I pass from my opponent's Eighth Reply, but not because all its inaccuracies have been exposed. A man who confesses that he is "wicked" and a "liar" cannot be fully exposed. Time, space, and powers of human speech, are not sufficient to do him full justice.

Now I shall give attention to my slanderous opponent's First Reply to that which I have offered to him "concerning the unscripturalness of applying sacred names to things of human origin."

He began that reply by stating that, "The Greek words 'biblos' and 'biblion' are used indiscriminately by the Holy Spirit to refer to any kind of book or writing." In response to this I state that, if this be true, then all that Prof. Rhodes said in his last speeches at Odessa and Hale about the difference between "biblos", and "biblion" was only the bluster of a demagogue. I answered his bluster in a single paragraph, as found on the 158th page of Skirmishes, and only regret that I did not, in my speech as there reported, designate him as a demagogue. To this I now add, that my present opponent's endorsement of that bluster proves that he likewise is a demagogue.

Prof. A. says, "The Holy Scriptures are nowhere called 'biblion' by the Holy Spirit so far as we know. Bro. Sommer himself has never cited but one passage, and no living being knows certainly what 'biblia' refers to in that passage." In response to this, I, first, call attention to its extravagance. He says, "no living being knows." This includes men and angels, and, even, God and Christ! J. N. Armstrong proposes to speak for every "living being" both human and divine, finite and infinite!! Prof. Rhodes said of that word, "In fifteen occurrences it is strongly probable that it refers to some part of the Sacred Writings." In

response to him I shall first take three occurrences of it, as found in Luke 4:17-20. In those verses reference was made to the book of the prophet Esaias. Prof. Rhodes, as quoted by Prof. Armstrong, says, "It is strongly probably" that these references refer "to some part of the Sacred Writings"! I suppose that he means that "it is strongly probable" that the book of Isaiah is "some part of the Sacred Writings"! Prof. Armstrong endorses what Prof. Rhodes says, and on the basis of it makes thrusts at me. I am pleased that he has endorsed it, for I now propose to expose it, and in so doing I shall expose the recklessness of D. W. Nay, in giving his endorsement to Prof. Rhodes as an exegete, in his report of Skirmishes in the paper called "Primitive Christianity." Those three men shall now be exposed as reckless asserters concerning Greek, and as falsifiers concerning a question of Biblical truth.

I have two Greek concordances of the New Testament before me, and I give from them every instance that they record of the use of the word "biblion." "Matthew 19:7, to give a writing of divorcement. Mark 10:4, to write a bill of divorcement. Luke 4:17, delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias, and when he had opened the book. Luke 4:20, he closed the book. John 20:30, which are not written in this book. John 21:25, could not contain the books. Galatians 3:10, all things which are written in the book. 2nd Timothy 4:13, bring . . . the books. Hebrews 9:19, sprinkle both the books. Hebrews 10:7, in the volume of the book. Revelations 1:11, what thou seest write in a book. Revelations 5:1-5, 7-9, on the throne a book was written . . . who is worthy to open the book . . . was able to open the book . . . worthy to open and to read the book . . . hath prevailed to open the book . . . he came and took the book . . . when he had taken the book . . . thou art worthy to take the book. Revelations 6:14, the heaven departed as a scroll. Revelations 17:8, whose names were not written in the book. Revelations 20:12, the books were opened, and another book was opened . . . which were written in the book. Revelations 21:27, written in the Lamb's book. Revelations 22:7, 9, 10, 18, 19, sayings of the prophecy of this book . . . which keep the sayings of this

book . . . words of the prophecy of this book . . . plagues that are written in this book . . . things which are written in this book."

Here we find two instances in which the word "biblion" refers to "a writing of divorcement", which was authorized by the Sacred Writings, as given by Moses, and by reason of being thus authorized it became a "sacred" writing. See Matthew 19:7; Mark 10:4. And in one instance it is used in the sense of "scroll" in general, but in that instance it is used as an illustration. See Revelations 6:14. But with these exceptions, and the possible exception of 2nd Timothy 4:13, I affirm that the remaining twenty-seven instances CERTAINLY refer to "the Sacred Writings", or to some part of them. Moreover I affirm that in Revelations 20:12 the word "biblion" in its plural form, certainly refers to the ENTIRE SACRED WRITINGS.

I challenge Prof. Armstrong to meet me on the foregoing affirmations and to break them if he can. In order to provoke him to this good work for his cause I pronounce Prof. Rhodes an unscrupulous witness on this question, and designate Prof. Armstrong and D. W. Nay, as reckless encomiasts of an unscrupulous witness. My argument to show that the word "books" in Revelations 20:12, certainly refers to the Sacred Writings, I set forth in my first essay of this subject, and it has not yet been confuted by my opponent. It remains unchallenged, except by reckless assertions of a reckless asserter.

My opponent offers to me five questions. Four of them are based on the supposition of an affirmative answer to the first. But as I give a negative answer to the first the others do not need to be answered. Here is his question: "Did the Holy Spirit apply this word 'biblos' and the diminutive of it, 'biblion' to other things than the Bible?" I answer that the word "biblos" is so applied once (Acts 19:19), but not the word "biblion", except by way of illustration, or in regard to something authorized by the Bible, like a bill of divorcement. To this I add that these exceptions do not prevent the words "biblos" and "biblion" from being sacred words any more than the fact that the names "Theos" and "Kurios"—God and Lord—are applied to earthly objects

prevents them from being sacred names. THE SACREDNESS OF NAMES IS DETERMINED BY THE SACREDNESS OF THEIR RELATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS, AS WELL AS ORIGIN.

My opponent says, "Now we have it. Our unscripturalness and our 'sacrilege' is a mistake in English." But he is liable to say anything that recklessness may suggest. He should remember that he is to defend the names "Bible School" and "Bible College" even when applied to the institutions at Nashville and Bowling Green. He has challenged me to "discuss the issue" without regard to incidentals. As I now do so on this question he dodges behind the mixed name which he gave to his institution because of my criticism on the subject of names.

After misrepresenting me in regard to my position on a certain question Prof. A. said, "This is cowardly". The reader knows who has acted the cowardly part in this discussion—the one who has affirmed his position or those who would not affirm theirs.

But read the following from my opponent: "For five or six years he has waged a heavy war against his brethren in Christ, whose only sin, except the misuse of the Lord's money was the unscripturalness, the grave sacrilege, or misusing the divine, the sacred, name in applying it to a 'religio-secular' school, and lo! it is only a mistake in English."

Reader, the space to which I am confined will not be sufficient to expose all the errors in the foregoing sentence. And, perhaps, I ought not to expose them because, as a sentence, it admits that the college-builders that I oppose have made a "misuse of the Lord's money," and that such "misuse" is a "sin," and that they have been "misusing" the name Bible, and that this also is a "sin". Notice, my opponent does not say alleged "misuse", nor alleged "sin", but he confesses the "misuse" and the "sin" without modification. Such is his English. But this is not all. He says of me, "He has waged a heavy warfare against his brethren in Christ." This means ALL of "my brethren in Christ", and this implies that they are ALL college-builders and advocates. Notice,

he does not say, some of "his brethren in Christ", but "his brethren".

Reader, what can be done with such a reckless writer? As he is president of a college I believe that I should hold him to strict account for his English, and thus charge that in this unguarded sentence he has confessed that he has made a "misuse" of the Lord's money which has been under his control, and has misapplied the name "Bible," and that in so doing he has been guilty of "sin", and even of "sacrilege". Thus by his reckless use of English my opponent has confessed that he has been guilty of "sin" and "sacrilege". No wonder that he previously confessed that he is "wicked" and is a "liar".

All else that he says against me in his First Reply on the Name question I affirm is like unto that which I have exposed, namely, UNJUST AND UNTRUE.

Since writing the foregoing, I have been requested by Prof. Armstrong to send my essays to him at Bowling Green, Ky., care of Potter Bible College. This intimates that I shall henceforth have Prof. J. A. Harding, father-in-law of Prof. Armstrong, in this discussion. Read John 18:12, 13.

Sept. 10th.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S FOURTH REPLY—12th ARTICLE.

I deeply regret the manner in which my respondent once more dares to come from behind his "wall". I am sorry that the debate must be stained with the article to which I am now replying, for almost every paragraph of it is stained with the words "liar," "wicked," "slanderer," "slandorous," "demagogue," etc. In short, the first half of it is a very bitter personal attack on me. My respondent took advantage of the accidental slip of my pen or the mistake of the printer in failing to indicate in my use of the expression "wicked college advocates" that this is the character imputed to us, and has made a determined effort to get the reader to believe not only that I am a man of mean character, but also that I am a self-confessed mean character. Why friends, I would

not walk to the gate to change the faith of any man that could believe that I intended to apply the words "liar" and "wicked" to myself, for he would show himself weak in his mental makeup. NO, I have never feared that one single reader would believe that I really intended to give my own judgment of my character.

Brother Sommer has from his fourth article been calling me a liar, and in this last one he goes so far as to say that I in calling him "brother", hide my hatred for him with "*lying lips*". More than once he has accused me of "unmitigated falsehood". Now, I do not know what an "*unmitigated*" falsifier is unless he be a liar, yet because I used the plain old-fashioned word itself in referring to the character he has tried to prove to be mine, he attempts to take advantage of it. Many times in this debate my respondent has gone right into my heart and judged my secret thoughts. If he were an unscrupulous lawyer, a mean political schemer, I could understand his abuse of my language; but as he has been for many years a student of the Bible and a follower of the meek and just Jesus, his course is inexplicable. I refer to these matters to show Bro. Sommer's ugliness as a debater and also his weakness. He has no truth to present so he spends his time fighting me personally.

At one time my respondent tried to make the reader believe that we were "hirelings" to the town of Odessa, that the work we were hired to do was to teach the Bible, and that our pay for this service was a deed to our college property. When I explained that this wholly misrepresented us and the town, and that the town would be better pleased with us were we to quit teaching the Bible, he took up my explanation and, assigning words to me that I did not use, made a determined effort to show that we had deceived the town in our Bible teaching. How is it that we have deceived the town concerning our Bible teaching when they "hired" (?) us to do this work?

Again, I have explained carefully what I meant by my "permanent and abiding work", and "my (?) doctrine of giving". I have emphatically stated that I did not mean by anything I had said to ignore the Church of God, to detract in any way from the everlasting influence of one meeting, nor had I intended in any

way to exalt the school above the Church of God. God forbid that I should ever do such things. In honorable discussion when a man explains his language that puts an end to all misunderstanding about it. I ask the reader to read again my explanation. In my last face to face talk with brother Sommer I told him that I never expected to write anything on the school question that he would not abuse. He must answer to God for his abuse of my language. To say that we exalt the school above the Church, that we in any way contrast the school with the Church, that we established the school because of any supposed deficiency of the Church, or because we deny that the Church is the "pillar and ground" of the truth and that we are complete in Christ, is as "far from the truth as hell is from heaven." He who continues to make these charges against us after he sees my explanation of these matters is either unjust to us or he can't understand plain language and needs forbearance because of his weakness.

Finally, at length, and at last, my respondent has "touched" again the "depths of Satan", but he still seems to find the "depths" not in the schools themselves, but in the *men*. Oh, that brother Sommer had started this school work! But I cannot let him off yet from his "depths" for he said last year as late as October that all he had ever said in his opposition to the Nashville Bible School, Potter Bible College and Western Bible and Literary College, etc., could be classed under the two headings, misuse of the Lord's money and misuse of the word "Bible". At this time he had written against this school work for six years and had written a whole tract against it—He claims to have held the same position for thirty years. In Oct. 1906 the Nashville school had been at work for fifteen years, and had been publishing a catalogue for twelve or thirteen years in which the history, origin and purpose of the school was set forth. These books were sent free to any one who desired them. Potter Bible College, a sister school presided over by the man that had been superintendent of the Nashville school during its first ten years, had been established for five years. In its published catalogue its work and purpose were fully set forth and the informed know they were identical with the Nashville. Western Bible and Literary College had been living for one year

and at that time we had been charged with exalting the school above the Church, with making the school more "abiding" and "permanent" than the Church of God, with teaching that the school could carry us "back to Jerusalem" faster than the Church and the home, with threatening men with perdition if they did not give to this "man-made" "machine", and the Lord only knows with how much more "wickedness". These things had all been weighed in the ballances of the "ONLY RIGHT", yet in the face of all this the two mistakes were on "money" and "name"! But brethren, since Oct. brother Sommer has seen a "vision" or dreamed a "dream" in which great "chasms", "secret cells", and "council chambers" have been laid open to him, thereby revealing new things, new sins, "depths of Satan", concerning the "origin" and "purpose" of these schools. We *must* have the new light, the new things learned about the origin and purpose of these schools since Oct. 1906. I am sorry to have to expose my respondent like this but I must press these matters for truth's sake. He is tied hand and foot with his own rope. He cannot move. While he has learned some new things since Oct., one of them being the feeling of a defeated man, he has *not* learned one new thing about the purpose and origin of these schools.

Certainly, I believe with my whole heart that "my teaching of God's word in the school is more regular, more systematic, more far-reaching, and more permanent, than the same time spent in the field." Why, this is my reason for being in the work. I could not have stayed in it during all of these years had I not believed so. Brother Sommer remarks that this "shows that he exalts his humanly devised method of teaching the Bible in the Odessa school far above the divinely-ordained preaching of the gospel." How, I wonder? He talks as if we had some "humanly-devised method" that we use in teaching the Bible in school that we don't use in home, in shop, in meetings, etc. This is foolishness! I teach the Bible in school just like I do out of school. If brother Sommer would visit one of these schools he might learn something about them. No, my confidence in the golden opportunity shows nothing but my judgment as to the matter. This is another sample of his twisting of language.

Worse than ever on the Jerusalem question! My respondent now claims that he has not refused to tell Christians whether they may put their money in the right kind of schools. Where has he told them they may? Now, I call upon him to quote from his articles any statement that tells Christians they may put their money in the right kind of schools—schools right in themselves. Even in this very article you cannot tell except by guess whether he thinks they have the right or not. *Let him be plain!* I want Christians that have placed their money in these schools to know that all this disturbance about misusing the Lord's money is so much filling, that the whole question is: "Is the school right in itself?"

OUR "BEGGING".

Lo! our "begging" is alright if it be for a scriptural work. It is alright to appeal to Christians to help buy a farm, home, horse, cow, pig, or chicken for a poor man. In other words, it is alright to appeal to Christians to help me do anything that I cannot do alone provided the thing I am doing be right. In still other words, that "aphorism" that brother Sommer "exposed" in his sixth essay he now embraces.

THE NAME.

The "Appendix" before and after the published discussion at Odessa and at Hale proves conclusively that brother Sommer is still smarting over the lashing he received. He can now pronounce Rhodes a "demagogue" if he choose, but the fact remains that Rhodes demolished him on the name proposition and that the people saw it.

I want to examine for a little while my respondent's answer to my first question on the greek words. Here is the question: Did the Holy Spirit apply the word "Biblos" and the diminutive of it, "Biblion" to other things than the Bible? Here is his answer (?): "The word 'Biblos' is so applied once (Acts 19:19), but not the word 'Biblion', except by way of illustration, or in regard to something authorized by the Bible, like a bill of divorcement". If this is not a clear evasion of facts, there never was one. "By

He continues to cast reflections
on those who may stand by
the truth with Sommer on this
question.

164

SOMMER-ARMSTRONG DISCUSSION.

way of illustration"! What does he mean? It actually seems that my respondent is writing for the weak-minded—for people that will accept anything he says without thought or investigation. He is certainly not very complimentary to you readers. "The heavens was removed as a scroll when it is rolled up". What is the illustration? Why, just as a "scroll"—a roll of paper or parchment—is rolled up and put away, so John saw the heaven rolled up and taken away. He used a familiar fact to make clear what he saw. What was this fact? The rolling up of a sheet of paper, any roll of paper. Absolutely the word "biblion" in this passage (Rev. 6:14) is as general in its use as our expression "sheet of paper". When Jesus said the kingdom of heaven is like a "fish-net" is the fish-net any less real? Does using a fact in illustrating some other fact make the known fact any less a fact? Does the using a fact in illustration make that fact go into thin air? *Certainly not.* Then what is there in my respondent's "by way of illustration"? Absolutely nothing except that with an ignoramus it might hide the truth. It seems to me that he would be ashamed for thinking people to see him make such an effort.

His other exception is a signal failure also. Examine it with me: "Bill (biblion) of divorcement was authorized by the sacred writings . . . and by reason" of this "it became a 'sacred' writing". Grant for a moment that this reasoning may be correct, does that change the fact that in this passage the Holy Spirit did apply the word to another thing than the Bible? Is this "bill", "writing" (biblion), any part of the Bible? Certainly not! Then, here is another case where the Holy Spirit applied the word to another thing than the Bible. My question was: Did the Holy Spirit apply this word to other things than the Bible? Why didn't he answer my question? Why did he dodge?

But what about that reasoning that makes the "bill" a "sacred" writing? Is everything the Bible authorizes to be done "sacred"? The Bible authorizes Christians to maintain good works (honest occupations) for necessary uses (wants). Farming is an honest occupation so, according to brother Sommer's reasoning, farming is a "sacred" work. Raising and selling hogs is an honest occupation, and so a "sacred" work. School teaching is

In his 8. first Essay on this
subject he referred to Acts 19:19
where biblos is applied to
bad books. see p. 117

SOMMER-ARMSTRONG DISCUSSION.

165

an honest occupation, so school teaching is a "sacred" work. So it is with every honest calling in the world. If my respondent's reasoning be true, there is no secular work for Christians. In trying to evade truth, plain truth, truth that the careless thinker ought to see, he ties himself hand and foot with other truth. He has made a desperate effort to make every one of the Holy Spirit's uses of this word refer to the Bible or to some portion of it, but there are three cases that so indisputably refer to other books, papers, and writings, that he is driven to acknowledge the fact. Those cases, however, must be put out of the way of his theory, so he goes to work and the result is a very peculiar production from the view point of interpreting language, and a clear effort to get rid of a stubborn fact. Again, I press upon him my questions, not five, but six! If he does not answer them, they shall stand against him at the close of this debate.

HIS THIRTY CASES OF BIBLION.

According to my respondent's own exegesis, there are three cases of the thirty that do not refer either to the Old or to the New Testament, or to any part of them. Then the case is made out, Daniel Sommer being witness, that the Holy Spirit did apply this word to other things than the Bible. *But were they secular*

We know the "books" in John 21:25 were never written, for John says *should* the "other things" (than those written) be written, clearly indicating that they were never written. This is one of my respondent's twenty-seven certain (with a big *certain*) cases, yet it is absolutely impossible for this occurrence of the word to refer to the Bible or to any part of it. The "book" in Rev. 5:1-5, 7-9 was a book in the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. It was written "within" and on the "back", and was "closed sealed with seven seals". These seals were broken and John tells us in the sixth chapter and in the eighth chapter what was revealed by the breaking of the seals. So far as we know, no man save John ever saw that book. It is certain that it was not the book of Rev., for Rev. was only in process of writing at the time that "book" written "within" and on the "back" and

*or false-
hood*

*or bad
books.*

*This
book
being
in
heaven
could
not
have
been
bad.*

"sealed" was seen by John. Here are seven more of his "certain" cases. Two other cases are references to the "book of life". Certainly the record of the saved, the book in which their names are written, is not the Bible, so, counting my respondent's own three cases, we have thirteen cases out of his thirty that cannot refer to the Bible. I have met his bold affirmation and it is broken. Although he has pronounced Rhodes an unscrupulous witness and Nay and me "reckless asserters" and "falsifiers", it is absolutely certain that this word was applied to other things than the Bible.

OUR "MIXED NAME".

Brother Sommer is the wrong man to suggest the hiding idea, for he has been hiding behind his wall builded years ago ever since this debate began. According to his own doctrine, our name is alright save in a point of English. Was his statement at Hale a slip of the tongue? Does he want to take it back? He ought to take one of his statements back, for in the face of the one just given he charged us with unscripturalness as to name. God will hold him accountable for making the impression both at Odessa and at Hale that we were wrong in name, indicting us with sin at this point, and promising to expose us at some future time. I don't wonder that his published report needed (?) a before and after appendix. The real need is repentance. It is cowardly in my respondent to accuse me of hiding behind a "mixed name" when all of my defense of the names "Bible School" and "Bible College" stand unnoticed. I am always ready to defend the scripturalness of these names but in the mean time, I shall not let my respondent forget that our "sin" and "sacrilege" at Odessa is only a mistake (?) in English.

MY "REQUEST".

I do not know when my respondent wrote "the foregoing", save it is dated Sept. 10, but that request was sent him in July when my wife closed our home in Odessa and went to Bowling Green to visit her mother. Since June I have been preaching and I had the articles sent to my wife that I might receive them

promptly in the field. Though most of my articles this summer have been mailed at Bowling Green, because my wife, to accommodate brother Sommer, has spent enough valuable time practicing on the typewriter to copy my articles for me, not one of them was written there. So far as I know brother Harding does not know that I have received these articles by way of Bowling Green. The best help I have had in this debate has been Daniel Sommer himself. He has woven the rope with which I have tied him hand and foot, and forged the hammer with which I am beating him to death. He needs to fear himself above all other men in this discussion.

Sept. 25.

DANIEL SOMMER'S FIFTH ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF APPLYING SACRED NAMES TO THINGS OF HUMAN ORIGIN.

In this essay I propose to notice my opponent's second and third replies on this subject. But before so doing I wish to state that when I began my discussion of the Money question with him I sent to him three essays that were strictly impersonal in style. In response he sent to me three replies that were strictly personal, the last of which was offensive, and even scurrilous, in its style. The reader will recall that he likened me to a cowardly, bluffing, "dog" that barks ferociously behind a strong fence, but loses his bristles when he comes to an open gate. In view of this my opponent was responsible for all the personalities introduced into our discussion of the Money question.

Now I wish to state that, in the beginning of our discussion of the Name question, I sent to my opponent three impersonal essays. In response to them he has sent to me three replies, all of which are offensively personal, and the second and third of them are scurrilous. I quote a few of his expressions concerning me. "He is making a cowardly, disgraceful run;" "a disgrace to a debater;" "his foolish doctrine;" "the cowardly part my respondent is

Armstrong's reply expressions

playing;" "this cowardly repitition;" "a double portion of shame on him;" "cowardly conduct;" "such foolishness."

In order to appreciate the foregoing, the reader is here informed that in a letter to me, dated "January 3, 1907", my opponent wrote after this manner: "And although I am but a babe in Christ and entreat you as a father in Israel." The reader should also consider that Paul wrote to a young preacher thus: "Rebuke not an elder, but intreat him as a father." (1 Tim. 5:1) Yet in the face of his own confession that I am "a father in Israel", while he is "but a babe", and Paul's injunction against rebuking an elder, my opponent inflicts upon me the scurrility to which I have called the reader's attention. He seems to be so determined to besmirch me that he disregards his own confession, and a direct command of Paul, likewise his own religious profession, and the most ordinary respect for himself as a man. His style is not only scurrilous, but is slanderous, and, therefore, diabolical. I intreat him to repent of it, and henceforth to deal with that which I set forth for him to consider, and to cease trying to besmirch me.

My opponent declares, near the beginning of his second reply on the Name, that I "never really answered" his first "three articles" on the money question. Then he declares that his "seventh, eighth, and ninth articles, also, stand unanswered, the eighth and ninth not having been so much as referred to", by me. I deny each of the foregoing declarations of my opponent, and pronounce them untrue. Moreover, I am ready to risk the correctness of my position, and my honor as a man, on the truth of this denial. I CHALLENGE MY OPPONENT TO SAY THE SAME CONCERNING HIS POSITION AND HONOR.

My opponent also declares for himself in his second reply on the Name, "I have taken up every one of his articles in order and answered every argument; I have riddled everything he has put forth." I deny these declarations also, and pronounce them untrue. Moreover, I am ready to risk the truth of my position, and my honor as a man, on the truth of this denial. I CHALLENGE MY OPPONENT TO SAY THE SAME CONCERNING HIS POSITION AND HONOR.

My opponent also declares, in referring to me, "I have begged

him to give us his authority for making this word (Bible) sacred but he ignores every entreaty at this point." This declaration I also deny, and pronounce it untrue. Moreover, I risk the truth of my position on the correctness of this denial, and CHALLENGE MY OPPONENT TO SAY THE SAME FOR HIMSELF. I have not ignored what he offered, but have simply done that which every affirmant has the right to do, namely, present his affirmative argument before he considers his opponent's objections. But this is not all. The reader will find in each of my impersonal essays a discussion of the very question which my opponent says I have ignored. Moreover, I have given considerable attention in those essays to objections that I anticipated would be urged. I CHALLENGE MY OPPONENT TO DENY THIS AND RISK HIS POSITION AND HIS HONOR ON HIS DENIAL.

My opponent says that the name "Bible" is "a word not mentioned in our English Bible", and on that basis tries to overthrow my argument in favor of the sacredness of that name. This is like the sprinkling sectarian who declares that the word "immersion" is "not mentioned in our English Bible", and on that basis tries to overthrow all that is said in favor of immersion. My opponent also says of the word "Bible" it was never applied to the holy writings till the 5th Century. This implies that the English word "Bible" was applied to the holy writings in the 5th Century. If he will find that English word that far back I shall give up the discussion. What does my opponent mean? He argues against the sacredness of the English word "Bible" because it is not found in the English Bible, and then admits that it was applied to the holy writings six or seven hundred years before the English language, as such, came into definite existence! My opponent seems to have a genius for blunders.

Prof. Armstrong says to me, "I challenge him to show where any man before him, inspired or uninspired, godly or ungodly, has charged men with 'sacrilege' for applying this word to things of human origin." In response to this I challenge my opponent "to show where any man," before Alexander Campbell, ever declared that the New Testament disciples would have been guilty

of "sacrilege"—robbing the church—if they had dared "to transfer to a missionary society, or Bible society, or education society, a cent or a prayer." He can not meet this challenge, but that does not prove that Alexander Campbell was not right when he thus declared. On the contrary, disciples of Christ generally believed, for many years, that he was right in that declaration, and all apostolic disciples thus believe even to this date. Innovators do not, and my opponent is among them, for he professes to believe that the church should support "educational societies."

My opponent inquires, "If Bro. Sommer may legislate concerning the use of 'biblion' what hinders me from legislating concerning 'baptismos'?" In response I inquire, What does my opponent say when "baptismos" is applied by affusionists to sprinkling and pouring? Does he say they are all right, or all wrong, in making such application of that word to things of human origin? Is it not falsehood, and even sacrilege to apply "baptismos" to "rantismos"? I CHALLENGE HIM TO ANSWER.

All that my opponent says about the Holy Spirit's use of "biblos" and "biblion" I shall pass over, at this time, by saying that his list is incomplete, and therefore unfair. In my fourth essay on this subject I offered a complete list of the uses of the word "biblion," and at a later date I shall consider what may be said concerning what I then offered, likewise concerning "biblos." I may write somewhat on that subject near the end of this essay.

My opponent says of the words "father", "master", and "teacher", "these words have never been limited to a sacred use by the Holy Spirit." But he is wrong again. They have been thus "limited" when used in a RELIGIOUS SENSE. The same is true of "biblos" and "biblion," "theos"—God—and "kurios"—Lord.

That which my opponent designates "Sommer's Own Doctrine" is this: "Let sacred things be called by sacred names, secular things by secular names, and mixed things by mixed names." This is right, and I have never varied from it. But my opponent is bound to defend the names "Bible School" and "Bible College," as applied to institutions that are three-fourths secular.

He has challenged me to discuss the "real issue without regard to incidentals," and here is the "real issue" on this question, namely, the falsehood and sacrilege of applying the word Bible to institutions of human origin, and that are three-fourths secular. My opponent KNOWS he cannot defend such application of the name "Bible", and he can only escape a confession of wrong, at this point, by acting the part of a slanderer and thus the part of a diabolical character. One phase of his slander on this question is found in his reference to the work that was proposed to be done in Detroit, Mich. My opponent and certain others have been guilty of sufficient falsehood concerning that work to send them all to perdition. The work that was proposed there was strictly intended to help persons to understand the Bible, and not for any secular calling.

In the conclusion of his second reply on the name Prof. A. says of me, "His explanation is that he has discovered new sins in the work—'depths of Satan'—and though I have pressed him hard he will not tell us what these sins are." Here is another of Prof. Armstrong's reckless and false statements. I have plainly shown many times that these "new sins" consist of his reckless falsifying, and I now add that they consist also of scurrility in style.

My scurrilous opponent began his third essay on the name question by offering to me this sentence: "I believe every fair-minded reader realizes the cowardly part my respondent is playing in failing to notice my work in this discussion." In response to the foregoing I state that I chose to offer to my opponent three impersonal essays without noticing what he said in response. I did the same in my discussion of the Money question. I did not aim to please him, nor shall I now attempt to do so. His style indicates that he has been angry ever since this discussion began. I regard him as the most ill-tempered, waspish, scurrilous, opponent that I have ever had, not excepting B. F. Rhodes and J. A. Harding. To be an advocate of the colleges that I oppose seems to require everything that is discourteous, reckless, false and slanderous.

I again remind the reader that on the money question I sent to my opponent three impersonal essays and that in response to

them he became grossly and scurrilously personal. Then on the name question I have sent to him three impersonal essays, and in response to them likewise he has become grossly and scurrilously personal. Therefore my opponent is responsible for all the personalities introduced into this discussion, and upon the cause he represents rests the shame of all the unpleasantness resulting from those personalities. Instead of quoting what I say, and responding to it, as I am doing with reference to him, he prefers to make his own erroneous statements of my position, and then will combat those statements. In correcting his erroneous statements I need to expose him personally, and, as a result, much unpleasantness has been introduced. **BUT HE WOULD HAVE IT SO.** And I request the reader to hold him, and his cause, responsible for it all.

If I could divest myself of all reverence for truth, of all courtesy toward my opponent and my readers, and of all respect for myself, I might adopt Prof. Armstrong's style and write thus: I think every fair-minded person who will read this discussion will see the cowardly part my opponent is acting. He is like a cowardly dog that will bark ferociously behind a strong fence till he comes to the open gate and then he loses his bristles. I do not wish to impeach his motives, but I feel sure he knows that he has made an ignoble failure in this debate, and is now acting the coward to cover his failure. He has not answered a single argument I have offered, and several of my essays he has not even touched. Look at him! Don't you pity him? He has bragged and swaggered as he only could. I have shattered everything he has said and he has not even tried to patch the fragments of his broken arguments. He ought to be ashamed of himself to occupy the position of president of a college, and to place his name on his catalogue with A. B., A. M., attached, and yet to act such an ignoble part. The college that he presides over ought to be ashamed of him, and the Brotherhood with which he professes to be connected should discard him if he does not repent. O shame, where is thy blush?

But if I should adopt such a style I would be like Prof. Armstrong, and this discussion would be like a fight between two

skunks, in which each would try to stink the other to death. I cannot afford to adopt such a style, and I reprobate it in my opponent. If he is not destitute of a sense of decency I may hope that he will henceforth abandon it.

Instead of examining with care, what I said in my impersonal essays on this subject, my opponent has passed over these essays with a few unjust assertions, and in the last part of his third response on the Name question he has gone back to our discussion of the Money question, as if not satisfied with his work in discussing it. I do not blame him, yet I do not intend to follow him.

Prof. Armstrong has endorsed the position of Prof. Rhodes on the name question, and here is what Prof. Rhodes said: "The word is *biblion*, I have examined this word in thirty-one places in which it occurs in the Greek Testament. In fifteen it is strongly probable that it refers to some part of the sacred writings. In three cases it is not certain to what it refers. Two of these cases are found in the 12th verse of the 20th chapter of the book of Revelation, and in eleven cases the word most emphatically does not refer to the sacred writings or any part of them, and in no case can it be shown that a sacred writer has ever applied this word to the whole collection of sacred writings." I pronounce the foregoing from Prof. Rhodes incorrect, and designate it the testimony of a prevaricating witness. As Prof. J. A. Harding is now united with Prof. Armstrong, I suppose, in this discussion, I draw the lines between those two professors and myself on this subject at the point of that which Prof. Rhodes said, as I have quoted from him. And I now state that with the exception of its use in Rev. 6: 14, where it is used as an illustration, and is translated by the word "scroll," the word "*biblion*" is, in every instance of its occurrence in the New Testament, used as referring to some part, or to all, of the sacred writing, or to a sacred writing of some kind. As for the word "*biblos*"; I here state that its use in the New Testament always refers to a sacred writing. Even in Acts 19: 19, reference is made to the sacred writings of the heathen, for they conjured by the name of their imaginary gods.

I challenge Prof. Harding, who is president of a college near Bowling Green, Ky., and Prof. Armstrong, who is president of a

college at Odessa, Mo., to meet me on the foregoing statements concerning "biblos" and "biblion."

Prof. Rhodes did not admit that the word "biblion," as found in the New Testament, certainly refers to any part of the sacred writings, but said that it is "strongly probable" that in fifteen instances it does refer to those writings. This prevaricating testimony I charge upon Professors Armstrong and Harding until they repudiate it. Prof. Rhodes also said that it is "not certain" in regard to the meaning of that word in "Rev. 20:12," and that "in no case can it be shown that any sacred writer has ever applied this word to the whole collection of sacred writings." I pronounce Prof. Rhodes a false witness on each of these points, and declare the same concerning Professors Armstrong and Harding until they express themselves to the contrary. Do they endorse the entire testimony of Prof. Rhodes concerning the use of "biblion"? This is the question which I challenge them to answer. If they do not repudiate his testimony I shall hold them responsible as endorsers of it, and let them all go down together.

October 11, 1907.

J. N ARMSTRONG'S FIFTH REPLY—THIRTEENTH ARTICLE.

In our new home in the pretty town of Las Vegas, New Mexico, I begin with a glad heart my thirteenth article in this discussion. In each article I feel more and more delighted because of this God-given opportunity to teach the truth. Being fully assured that we held the truth I was glad to present our work in contrast with brother Sommer's misrepresentation of it. I have never engaged in any work, I think, with more genuine delight, and this delight has increased at the rate of geometrical progression as I have seen truth triumph over error.

If you will extract from my respondent's last essay his *challenges, denials, assertions*, and the futile effort to make me responsible for his *manner* in this debate, there will be absolutely nothing left though the essay is claimed to be an answer to *two* of my

*False
ing left
articles
Can't he tell the truth?*

In the first of these articles to which the essay you have just read is a *professed* reply, I emphasized the fact that all of my respondent's "impersonal essays" were based on the very thing to be proved, namely, that the word "Bible" is a sacred word. I have shown that his whole position on the name rests on human tradition and hence he is legislating for God's children. I repeat that he has entered the very domain of God and dared to speak where God only may speak. He has violated a most sacred principle of the Church: "Where the Bible speaks we speak, and where the Bible is silent we are silent." I have repeatedly called on brother Sommer for his Bible authority for his legislation concerning the "sacredness" of the word "Bible," but he gives not a vestige.

I showed in my first article on the name that the word "Bible" like other English words has its established use. I gave eight expressions in which the word is used with a descriptive force and applied "to things of human origin." But my respondent has, as I predicted he would, in a kind of wholesale manner answered (?) my articles, thus managing to ignore all of this work.

Brother Sommer now virtually confesses that no man before him ever taught this doctrine, hence no man can believe it without being a Sommerite. The teaching is no higher and no older than he. The best justification he can make is that some other uninspired man has followed the same course. It is bad enough to misrepresent the living but to misrepresent the dead as my respondent has Campbell is too bad. Campbell had *no* right to teach anything that had not been taught before him, neither has Daniel Sommer. I challenge my respondent again to name a man before his day inspired or uninspired, that ever accused God's children of "sacrilege" for applying the words, "Bible," "biblion," and "biblos" "to things of human origin."

This is his doctrine. Let him prove it to be Bible doctrine, or the church of God must repudiate it. He can't do it and his reference to Campbell is his self-confessed failure. I press him that even the most careless reader may see that he has exalted himself to be a legislator among God's people; that he binds where God has not bound; that he has gone onward and has not abode in th-

teaching of Christ; that he is guilty of adding to the word of God. The end of such legislation is not yet, for in his last essay he adds another "sacred" word, "baptismos," to his list. Certainly, it is wrong to make "baptismos" mean sprinkling, but not because "baptismos" is a sacred word, not because it is "sacrilege" to apply "sacred names to things of human origin," but because the word does not *mean* sprinkling. He who teaches that "baptismos" means sprinkling, teaches humanism; he who teaches that it is sacrilege to apply "biblion," "biblios," and "Bible" to things of human origin, teaches Sommerism, pure and simple.

Brother Sommer says he passed over all I said about the Holy Spirit's use of "biblos" and "biblion" because my "list" was "incomplete and therefore unfair." I did not claim to give all the occurrences of these words, but fifteen of them. Out of the fifteen the Holy Spirit applied the words to other books and writings than the Bible ten times. This is why I gave them. Why is my "list" unfair? This is another effort to get rid of the crushing effect of truth. I could wish that he would acknowledge his mistaken position and be a "hero in the strife," but few men are great enough to do this.

Notice that my respondent's *bold* and *bragadocio* affirmation in his fourth article on the name concerning the use of "biblion" in the New Testament has been enlarged in his fifth by "or a sacred writing of some kind." When this *enlarged* affirmation is met he will enlarge his "borders" again or become ridiculous before the reader.

I deny that the words, "father," "master" and "teacher" are limited to a sacred use. I may apply the word "father" to anything that is in any sense a father even down to a thought. Neither is the word "father" limited in the *religious sense* to God only. Paul was father to the Corinthians in a religious sense and they were his children. See 1 Cor. 4:14, 15.

I am as free to use the words, "father," "master," "teacher," "lord" and "god" as I am other English words. If a man has another object of worship than the true God, I am perfectly free to apply the word "god" to it. Christ called the Devil the father of the Jews. A man may give his heart's chief devotion and ser-

vice to his business and thus his business becomes his *god* and his master and I commit no sacrilege in applying these words to a thing of human origin—his business. There is absolutely no such doctrine in the Bible as this brother Sommer advocates and these efforts of his are a drowning man catching at a straw.

BROTHER SOMMER'S DOCTRINE.

"Let sacred things be called by sacred names, secular things by secular names, and mixed things by mixed names." In my respondent's last essay he says: "This (doctrine) is right and I have never varied from it." Again he endorses the name "Western Bible and Literary College" as he did at Hale when pressed for something on the name.

I repeat that, so far as this discussion is concerned, I am not *bound* to defend the names "Bible School" and "Bible College" because these names are incidents and not essentials, but in the very article that he claims to have answered I defended these names because I wanted to show these brethren clear of "sacrilege." In that very article I asked: "Does the adding of the word 'literary' in our name make our school of divine origin? Is not our school still a 'religio-secular' school? Is not the word 'Bible' in our name, in spite of the word 'Literary' applied to 'College'—a human institution?" Why doesn't my respondent answer these questions? I press them on him again. When he answers them, these names will be defended, for if it be wrong to apply the name "Bible" to a thing of human origin, either our name at Odessa is wrong or our school is of divine origin.

My respondent passes over all of my work in defense of these names and then acts and talks as if I were "hiding" behind his idea of a "mixed" name and refusing to defend them. Then when I call attention to his cowardly conduct he complains. I believe it is *right* for me to show his failure to meet me honorably in this discussion, and I should feel *guilty* were I to fail to do it. To have been *just* his replies should have followed my articles in orderly succession, for in no other way could the average reader compare the work of the disputants and glean the truth so well. In his

published report of the oral discussions he tried to cover his defeat with appendices and in this discussion he is trying to hide it by his *manner* of following me. I believe the truth demands that I show this, and I propose to do it.

I am neither "mad," "waspy," or "angry" but speak forth the words of truth and soberness. Though it is true brother Sommer has accused me of lying, perhaps, more than a dozen times, and has been ugly in many other ways, this has not disturbed my temper the least bit. I expected it and prepared for it. I knew he was a skillful workman at the job. If he doesn't want me to expose his cowardly conduct, let him forsake it.

A CHALLENGE TO HARDING.

In my respondent's last essay he boldly challenges J. A. Harding. Why challenge Harding when he is discussing with me? What *chance* or *right* has Harding to meet this challenge? Here again Brother Sommer has acted the part of the cowardly school boy that throws his snowball and rushes into the house shutting the door behind him. Harding has not seen *one* article of this discussion, neither will he, till he reads it in the published form. I have not consulted with him concerning this debate for one second, although in a time of need he is the first man to whom I should turn, neither do I expect to consult him concerning it, for I anticipate no need. I know my respondent's defeat would be more easily borne if it were being accomplished by "*men*" but he must take it from "*boys*" this time. He is trying hard to get the readers to believe that Harding is "united" with me in the discussion with absolutely no grounds for such an effort.

GONE BACK TO MONEY.

Yes, I emphasized again the truth concerning the money question that brother Sommer has for six years illogically and unreasonably crowded into the school question, because he himself referred to it in the article to which I was replying. In that article he claimed that he had not refused to tell Christians whether they

may put their money into the right kind of schools. I emphatically declare that he has never said whether or not this right belongs to Christians. I entreated him in my last article to quote his language in this discussion that makes him plain at this point and he says in reply that he is not going back to the money question. I shall now press him for the quotation. His teaching for six years has forbidden it. He has declared that it is a financial impossibility to build the necessary buildings for one of these schools without robbing God. This doctrine is taught in his first essay in this discussion and illustrated by the robber who kept five dollars over-paid to him in a business settlement. In that essay he declared that the doctrine of "equality" taught in the New Testament "faithfully observed by disciples of Christ during the first half of the 19th century would have made the building of Bethany College *impossible*." This means that if Christians had used their means as the New Testament directs they would have had no means with which to equip a school, right or wrong.

If this misrepresents my respondent, I have given him a chance to clear it up by asking the Jerusalem questions. These questions have been pressed upon him in various forms from the opening of this discussion. What makes him afraid of them? I can answer them with a big YES, Christians may build as many such schools as their best judgment may direct and equip them according to the same rule. But let my respondent make such an answer and it kills his money theory as "dead as Hector." He knows it will do it. Up to October, 1906, he had no objection to these schools save in point of "money" and "name" and found fault with scribes for accusing him of opposing the work on other grounds, claiming that they misrepresented him.

It is true that he has discussed "depths of Satan" since then "in these schools" but when pressed to reveal the "depths" they have been found to be not in the schools as such but in some of the men connected with them. This means that he still has no objection to the *school work as such* save in "money" and "name."

WHAT IS THE MATTER WITH US?

Our name at Odessa is approved by brother Sommer. He also admits the banding together to teach school. Then, if Christians may put money into schools right in themselves, where is our "sin?" Here it (?) is!

We have established a private school in the starting and continuance of which we have kept ourselves free as Christians to train our students to be *truthful, honest, pure, clean, unselfish, self-sacrificing, faithful to parents, just, kind, thoughtful and considerate of others, believers in God and Christ*; in other words, we have kept ourselves free to teach the Bible to these students. This Bible teaching is our sin (?). If we were to exclude from our work the Bible teaching we should be regarded by our opposers as sinless in the matter. We could have our daily chapel service in which we sing praises to God and offer him our morning thanks—offering and prayer, and we could by our Christian walk (the most forcible way to teach) teach the Bible to our students and no one would find fault with us. You may pray in school, sing in school, live the Christ-life in school, but you *must* not take the Old Book itself and teach the lessons it contains direct from it. To do this is "*devilish*," "*innovationism*," "*higher-criticism*," "*THE MOST DANGEROUS PHASE OF INFIDELITY* that now endangers churches of Christ."

Less than a month ago a preacher, one of the opposers of our school, said to me that even after a private school was established, it would be wrong for its teachers to organize Bible Classes in it. He expressed his regret that brother Sommer had ever admitted the teaching of the Bible in school. This same teacher told one of our students that if we would take the Bible-teaching out of the Odessa school he would not oppose it.

While admitting a school to teach the Bible as well as secular knowledge, brother Sommer himself has made much ado about establishing "*religio-secular schools to teach persons in religion*." These words have been used by him till they have become a stock expression. To show its *vanity* I have pressed upon him these questions that I now repeat to him:

1. When Christians band together to teach both the Bible and secular knowledge is their school "*religio-secular*?"
2. What should be their purpose in their Bible teaching?
3. What is the difference between a school to teach "*persons*" the Bible and other branches, and a school to teach "*persons*" in true religion and other branches?

These questions are in the very article to which my respondent claims his last essay is a reply. Why miss them? Echo answers, "Why".

DANIEL SOMMER'S SIXTH ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF APPLYING SACRED NAMES TO THINGS OF HUMAN ORIGIN.

I propose in this essay to set forth and consider every instance of "*biblos*" and "*biblion*" found in the New Testament. With the best Greek Concordance, perhaps, in existence, before me, I proceed with my proposed work.

BIBLOS.

1. "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ." (Matt. 1: 1.) In this instance the word "*biblos*," here translated by the word "*book*," certainly refers to a part of the sacred writings.
2. "Have ye not read in the book of Moses?" (Mark 12: 26.) Here again the word "*biblos*" certainly refers to a part of the sacred writings.
3. "As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias." (Luke 3: 4) Certainly the word "*biblos*" in this scripture refers to a part of the sacred writings.
4. "David himself saith in the book of Psalms". (Luke 20: 42.) Here likewise the word "*biblos*" certainly refers to a part of the sacred text.
5. "It is written in the book of Psalms". (Acts 1: 20.) The word "*biblos*," as here used, certainly refers to a part of the sacred writings.

6. "Written in the book of the prophets." (Acts 7:42.) Nor is there any doubt about the certainty of the reference in this instance.

7. "Brought their books together and burned them." (Acts 19:19.) The reference was here made to certain sacred books of the heathen, at Ephesus, who turned to the Lord. The sacred writings of the Spiritualists are such works as those issued for the purpose of teaching the curious art of Spiritism, and the same was true of the heathen. An intimation to this effect is found in the record given of certain vagabond Jews in Acts 19:13. In Chambers' Encyclopedia the word "exorcism" is first defined as "conjunction in the name of the gods". This being true, we are forced to the conclusion that the books of those who used "curious arts" at Ephesus, when Paul was there, were of their sacred books. They were bad books, yet they were sacred to those who believed in them, even as the books which teach Spiritism are.

8. "Whose names are in the book of life." (Phil. 4:3.) That which is here designated "the book of life" is certainly a sacred writing, for it is a divine volume.

9. "Blot out his name out of the book of life." (Rev. 3:5.) The "book of life" here mentioned is certainly a divine book.

10. "Not written in the book of life." (Rev. 13:8.) The word "biblos" here also refers with certainty to a divine book.

11. "Found written in the book of life." (Rev. 20:15.) The certainty of the reference in this instance also must be admitted.

12. "Take away from the words of the book of this prophecy." (Rev. 22:19.) Nor is there any doubt that the word "biblos" in this instance refers to a part of the sacred text.

13. "Take away his part out of the book of life." (Rev. 22:19.) The certainty of this reference to a sacred writing cannot be questioned.

The foregoing instances are all that I find. Young's Analytical Concordance sets forth the same, and, I may, therefore, safely say that the instances given are the only instances of the word "biblos" in the New Testament. To this I may safely add that these instances all have reference to the sacred writings found in the Bible, or to some other sacred writing. In view of this, what become

of the denials and assertions of Professors Harding and Armstrong? Prof. Harding has, for years, been denying that the word "biblos" has anything sacred in it as used by the Holy Spirit. Prof. Armstrong began his first reply on the Name question by declaring, "The Greek words 'Biblos' and 'Biblion' are used indiscriminately by the Holy Spirit to refer to any kind of book or writing." But the reader can readily understand that Prof. Armstrong was wrong in thus declaring. The declaration referred to is another of his reckless assertions, and it blasts his pretensions to scholarship, and acquaintance with scripture. He is neither a scholar nor a good scripturist. The same is true of Prof. Harding. Both of those professors lack the care and cautiousness, deliberateness and discrimination, necessary to scholarship in science, literature, or the Bible.

BIBLION.

I now propose to examine every New Testament instance of the word "biblion", the diminutive of "biblos", and to show that, in every instance, it refers to a sacred writing, except when used as an illustration in Rev. 6:14, and is translated by the word "scroll."

1. "To give a writing of divorcement." (Matt. 19:7.) In Deut. 24:1-4 the Lord certainly authorized such a writing, and when once made it was a sacred writing that the Lord required to be sacredly regarded.

2. "To write a bill of divorcement." (Mark 10:4.) The word "bill" in this instance, as in Matt. 19:7, is a translation of "biblion"; and refers to a sacred writing, as certainly authorized in Deut. 24:1-4.

3. "Delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias." (Luke 4:17.) Here the word "biblion" certainly referred to a part of the sacred text.

4. "And when he had opened the book." (Luke 4:17.) Here again the reference is certainly to a part of the sacred writings.

5. "He closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister." (Luke 4:20.) Nor is there any doubt about the certainty of the reference in this instance.

6. "Which are not written in this book." (John 20:30.)

Reference is here certainly made to John's record of the gospel, and, therefore, to a part of the sacred writings.

7. "Could not contain the books that should be written". (John 21:25.) In this instance reference is certainly made to the volume that would have been made if all the works of Jesus had been fully recorded, and such volume would have been a part of the sacred writings.

8. "All things which are written in the book of the law." (Gal. 3:10.) In this instance reference is certainly made to the writings of Moses, which are a part of the sacred writings.

9. "Bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments." (2 Tim. 4:13.) Here the word "biblion", in its plural form, is translated by the word "books", and as Paul did not have any use for secular books of any kind the conclusion is certain that he must have referred to some part of the sacred writings. Paul was not dealing in, nor using, nor making, secular books, and all inferences on that side of the question are absurd.

10. "Sprinkled both the book and all the people". (Heb. 9:19.) Here the word "biblion" is certainly used with reference to the book of the law.

11. "In the volume of the book it is written". (Heb. 10:7.) The word "biblion", in this instance, refers to Ps. 40:6, 7, and, therefore, refers with certainty to a part of the sacred writings.

12. "What thou seest write in a book". (Rev. 1:11.) John wrote what he saw and, as a result, we have the last book in the Bible, which is certainly a part of the sacred writings.

13. "On the throne a book written within and on the back side". (Rev. 5:1.) The account given in the chapter referred to shows that the book here mentioned was certainly a sacred writing.

14. "Who is worthy to open the book." (Rev. 5:2.) Here the reference is again certain.

15. "Was able to open the book". (Rev. 5:3.) Here also the reference is certainly made to a sacred writing.

16. "Worthy to open and to read the book". (Rev. 5:4.) The reference here also is certainly made to a sacred writing.

17. "Hath prevailed to open the book". (Rev. 5:5.) Nor

is the reference in this instance less certain, for it refers to the same book mentioned in preceding verses.

18. "He came and took the book". (Rev. 5:7.) Here is another certain reference to a sacred writing.

19. "When he had taken the book". All that has been previously said of the word "biblion", in previous comments in this connection, is certainly true of that word in this verse.

20. "Thou art worthy to take the book". (Rev. 5:9.) The use here made of "biblion" is certainly the same that has been previously mentioned.

21. "Whose names were not written in the book of life". (Rev. 17:8.) The book of life here mentioned is certainly a sacred book.

22. "The books were opened". (Rev. 20:12.) The kind of books that were opened is certainly indicated by the fact that the dead will be judged by that which is written in those books. Jesus said, "The word that I have spoken the same shall judge him in the last day". (John 12:48.) Again: Paul said, "As many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law". (Rom. 2:12.) These scriptures show with certainty that the word "books", in Rev. 20:12, refers to the sacred writings, both Old Testament and New.

23. "And another book was opened which is the book of life". (Rev. 20:12.) That "the book of life" is certainly a sacred writing will not be denied.

24. "And the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works". (Rev. 20:12.) Here is a certain reference to the entire sacred writings commonly designated "The Bible". The Old Testament will be used as the standard for judging those to whom it was offered, and the New Testament will be the standard for judging those to whom it will have been offered. That which Prof. Armstrong quoted from certain commentators about the books that will be opened, and out of which mankind will be finally judged, consisting of records of the deeds of mankind, is a low grade of religious fiction. Besides, it is fiction that is contrary to the verse which makes mention of those books. That verse ends with the expression "according to their works". In view of this, all those who contend that the

books that will be opened will be records of the works of mankind would have us to read that verse after this manner: "And the books of their works will be opened, and they shall be judged out of the books according to their works." This would mean that their works will be the standard by which they will be judged, or that mankind will be judged BY THEMSELVES AS STANDARDS. But this is nonsense in itself, and is contrary to John 12:48, and Rom. 2:12, and every other declaration in the Bible which makes mention of the written word of God as a standard by which to measure mankind.

25. "Written in the Lamb's book of life": (Rev. 21:27.) Here is another certain reference to that which is certainly a sacred writing.

26. "The sayings of the prophecy of this book": (Rev. 22:7.) Here the reference is certainly made to a part of the last book in the Bible.

27. "Who keep the sayings of this book": (Rev. 22:9.) In this instance the reference is certainly to a part of John's own writings, and, therefore, a part of the sacred writings.

28. "The sayings of the prophecy of this book": (Rev. 22:10.) Here, also, the reference is certainly made to a part of the sacred text.

29. "Words of the prophecy of this book": (Rev. 22:18.) Here again the reference to a book of the sacred text is certain.

30. "The plagues that are written in this book": (Rev. 22:18.) Nor is the reference here made less certain than in any other instance that we have considered.

31. "The things which are written in this book": (Rev. 22:19.) Here is the conclusion of the use of the word "biblion", by the Holy Spirit, in the New Testament, and its use is certainly made with reference to the last book in the Bible, which is certainly a part of the sacred writings.

In view of all that has just been set forth the reader is prepared to appreciate the testimony of Prof. Rhodes, which has been endorsed by Prof. Armstrong, and which I may justly charge against Prof. Harding. Prof. Rhodes says, "The word is *biblion*, I have examined this word in thirty-one places in which it occurs in the

Greek Testament. In fifteen it is strongly probable that it refers to some part of the sacred writings. In three cases it is not certain to what it refers. Two of these cases are found in the 12th verse of the 20th chapter of the book of Revelations, and in eleven cases the word most emphatically does not refer to the sacred writings or any part of them, and in no case can it be shown that a sacred writer has ever applied this word to the whole collection of sacred writings. Not one can be shown."

Now, reader, what do you think of Prof. Rhodes as a professed scholar, scripturist, and Biblical exegete? And what do you think of D. W. Nay and J. N. Armstrong, who have highly endorsed him? Those endorsements were as undeserved as they were unmeasured. Prof. B. F. Rhodes is hereby proved to be an unfaithful witness, a reckless asserter, and a bold bluffer. I could wish that I had taken my Greek Concordance with me to Odessa, and that I had exposed him on the platform before his admirers, but as I did not, and he was then suffered to escape, I now have the privilege of exposing him and Prof. Armstrong, and D. W. Nay at the same time. In connection with them I think that I have Prof. J. A. Harding also involved in this exposure. This is all for the best in behalf of the cause of truth as it is involved in the college question we are now considering. Those four men have been bold and blatant, disrespectful and untruthful, in their attempts to defend the colleges that I oppose, and to besmirch me because I oppose them, and it seems appropriate for them all to go down together. They have all adopted the style of innovators in their reasoning, and have thereby shown to the Brotherhood, that has read after them with care, that they are genuine innovators in an incipient stage.

I feel that my work is now done, on the Name question, except to expose the frothings and vaporings that may yet be offered from my opponents. THE ARGUMENT IS ENDED. When Prof. Rhodes, and his moderator at Hale, united in the denial that the Odessa College had been a beggar, I repeated my charge and emphasized it. THEN I PROVED IT BEYOND ALL CONTROVERSY. My proof was admitted by my opponent and he was silenced on that question. Now in this discussion the sacredness of

the name "Bible" has been denied, and I have been ridiculed for declaring that it is sacred. But I have repeated my affirmation on this question and have proved it, beyond reasonable controversy, by examining every occurrence of the Greek word "biblos", and its diminutive "biblion". In so doing I have shown the certainty of their application to sacred things in every instance, except when "biblion", was used as an illustration. This settles the question of the sacredness of those words in their adoption by the Holy Spirit, also in their relation, application, and association, as found in the New Testament. My charge of "unscripturalness", and even of "sacrilege", is, therefore, proved beyond reasonable doubt. The Greek word translated "sacrilege" means "robbing temples", or robbing God of that which belongs to him, and thus means a desecration of sacred things. This is the offense of which my opponents have been guilty in applying the word "Bible", from "biblos" or "biblion" to institutions of human origin, and which are three-fourth secular, especially as they propose in those institutions to rob the church of a part of its glory.

Since writing the foregoing I have read again my argument in my first essay on this subject. I find in that argument all that is necessary to convince those who are wrong by conviction in regard to the sacredness of the word "Bible". But those who are wrong BY DETERMINATION belong to another class. Those who make up that class need to be knocked down and trampled upon by fact, truth, and argument. They need to be so overwhelmed that they will not have the face to gainsay any further, and even then they will not be convinced, but will spend the remainder of their lives disgorging their hatefulness against those who have exposed them. The advocates of the colleges that I oppose seem to be of that class, even as innovators among disciples are. If they were wrong by conviction they might be convinced by facts, truths, and arguments which cannot be overthrown. But they have, generally, reasoned themselves into a false position, and are determined to make a show of defense for it, regardless of truth and righteousness. Thus it has been, thus it is, and thus it will be, with those who are WRONG BY DETERMINATION.

I wish my readers to do themselves the justice, and do me the

favor, to turn back and read my impersonal essays, as found in the beginning of my discussion of this subject. By so doing they may assure themselves in regard to my remarks concerning the argument in those essays. As my memory serves me those essays were first published in the REVIEW four or five years ago, and were afterwards published in tract form. But all the investigations that have since been made of the subject discussed in them have not caused me to desire to change a sentence in them. No wonder, then, that they exasperated my opponent.

In conclusion I state that all charges of change, and of inconsistency, on my part, which my opponents have made against me, in regard to the college question, are as unreasonable as the ravings of a maniac generally are. I became convinced that religious colleges are wrong while I was at Bethany College, W. Va., over thirty-five years ago, and soon afterwards expressed myself in public concerning them. Since then I have never changed on that subject, except to become more intense in my convictions. I have not denounced them, thus far, as institutions of secular learning, but have insisted that their relations to the church have made them wrong in themselves, and their history shows that they are wrong in their influence. There was a time when I did not think it wrong to patronize them, but since I have seen their outworkings, especially as their chief advocates are unscrupulous in their defense, I do not believe that any one who desires the welfare of the church of Christ should patronize them in any measure or degree. Neither do I believe that any church of Christ should employ any preacher who advocates them, or tries to defend them.

November 14, 1907.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S SIXTH REPLY—FOURTEENTH ARTICLE.

Brother Sommer now claims that his "work is done." "THE ARGUMENT IS ENDED." Did I not say that he would never answer my articles? Five articles have been placed before him on the name and they practically stand untouched. Yet his work is DONE. Never would Daniel Sommer pass over whole articles if he knew what to do with them. Everybody knows it is not characteristic of the man and can only be explained on the grounds that they disarm him. Mr. McCalla in his debate with Alexander Campbell came to the debate with his speeches already written and regardless of Campbell's argument read them. McCalla knew that he could not meet Campbell in an honorable manner, neither could Daniel Sommer have made even a *show* of defense in this discussion in any other way than in ignoring my work.

We are all well aware of the fact that brother Sommer could wish to change the results of the oral discussion, but it is too late. This wish for his concordance is another effort to excuse his failure in that battle. No doubt he expected to bull-doze the "boys" and have but a breakfast spell of it, but even if he did, for the sake of truth and of those that went away disappointed in him, he should have prepared to teach the truth. Anyhow, a man that has held a position for thirty years and that has persistently studied it for six years with the care, thoughtfulness and experience of which my respondent boasts should have been able to meet a boy. The reader must remember there is a big difference between boasting behind a Chinese wall and meeting an opponent. We saw he was passing through a great ordeal of suffering, and had he only intimated what his trouble was we should have relieved him even at the risk of the destruction and ruin of *poor* (?) Rhodes "before his admirers."

To make a show of defense and to hide, if possible, my irrefutable work on the use of "biblos" and "biblion" brother Sommer uselessly fills his space and burdens the reader with forty-four occurrences of these words in the New Testament. Thirty-one of the

forty-four he had already given and at that time he himself made four exceptions to his affirmation that the word "biblion" always refers to the sacred writings. He then took it upon himself to explain away the four and in this effort made himself ridiculous but pitiable to the thinking reader.

When I exposed his futile effort to get rid of the four exceptions, he ignored my exposure and made another effort to crowd every one into "a sacred writing". This time he gets them all into references to sacred writings but *one*. Don't you intimate, however, that DANIEL SOMMER has made any changes or that he has learned anything new. Perhaps, if he will dig up some old concordance in his library or in some second-hand book store in Indianapolis and make one more effort he certainly can get in the *wee one* that has been left out in the cold. If he should succeed (?) as well in his third effort as he did in his second one, he certainly would get it in.

May God pity the man who is so wedded to his theory that he will twist, squirm, guess at and even abuse God's holy word to sustain it; who loves his theory more than he loves truth. My respondent is persistently fighting facts—facts as plain as the nose on a man's face. It is deeply lamentable, and should be a solemn warning to every young man especially. Be careful, be sure you are right before taking a position, for few men are great enough to acknowledge they are wrong.

According to my respondent's own testimony there is one case in the New Testament in which the word "biblion" is used by the Holy Spirit to refer to no kind of sacred writing. "And the heaven was removed as a *biblion* (a scroll) when it is rolled up." Rev. 6:14. In this case the word refers to any sheet of paper. It is unquestionably put to common use. The Holy Spirit's use of this word *one* time in a common way (not sacred) leaving no prohibition is an *approved* example and is as good to follow as if it had been repeated a dozen times. He who legislates otherwise, legislates against the divine example. My respondent must show his authority for his teaching, or remain under the charge that he binds where God has not bound and that he is not abiding in the

He is down right mean

See p. 208

word of the Lord. Jesus says, "If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples."

I have called on my respondent from the beginning to show his Bible authority for his legislation. He has virtually confessed that he has none, that no inspired man ever taught it.

While *one approved apostolic* example is sufficient, there are others. There is "bill (biblion) of divorcement". Matt. 19:7, Mark 10:4. This was an instrument of writing granting the right to husband and wife to separate. It was written, every word of it, by men—uninspired men—and was no more a "sacred" writing than is every marriage license issued in this country.

Then there is that notable case in Acts 19:19 where my respondent has the Holy Spirit applying a "sacred" name to those vile books because the *people* regarded them as sacred. Surely the Holy Spirit was very respectful to their wicked works to take a word, a "sacred word," that always applies to a "sacred writing"—a writing from God in contradistinction to the writings of men—and apply it to those vile books. Why, Brother Sommer's very contention is that it is unscriptural to apply "Sacred names to things of HUMAN origin" "!!!!!" Were those books that were so wicked that they had to be burned of divine origin? Now look at him! Assuredly books that originated in the wickedness of human minds have applied to them by the Spirit of our God this holy (?) word.

My respondent ought to quit fighting us and fight the Holy Spirit.

My dear reader, you may be assured that DANIEL SOMMER would never flounder like this if he were not in trouble. He sees and he is in terror lest you may see, also.

ALMOST THE ENTIRE BROTHERHOOD CAST OUT.

Worst of all Bro. Sommer uses this foundering as a basis to exhort a few brethren to withdraw their fellowship from all those who advocate or try to defend this school work. I am glad to believe that these brethren for whom the exhortation is meant have too much of the spirit of Christ and love his word and his Church

Bible & people have already made the divide

too well to follow this sectarian speech. While a few brethren think we who advocate this work are in error most of them know that the great body of disciples whom I represent in this debate are as loyal in their hearts to God, his word, and his Church, as they themselves. They know well that true hearted souls have been wrong and that it is the duty of us all to show forbearance and long-suffering towards one another and they are glad to do it. They love us and we love them. They have enough of the spirit of our master to be able to differ from brethren and yet love them. They are also kind enough and humble enough to believe that they themselves *might* be wrong.

I know that my respondent and a very few other preachers are so blinded by their party spirit that they would be willing to rend asunder the body of our blessed Redeemer over the matter. Indeed they have advocated the "making of it an issue" before this unkind speech of brother Sommer's. Thanks be to God the brethren love the peace of God's children more than they do partyism. Should I meet a church that would not "employ" a preacher simply because he opposes this school work. I would call it sinful discrimination of God's children. I have never felt the least alienated from any brother in Christ because he opposes the school work. I have condemned the dogmatic, "pitch-fork" style in which the opposition has been waged for I deplore it. It is no way to show a man his error by making a desperate effort to convince the world he is as mean as infidels, that he is desperately wicked, that he is beyond all redemption. I have never seen but three or four kind-spirited, Christ-like articles written against the work. While even these articles misrepresent us, fight a straw man, they were kind and from the writers' stand-point just. I commend the spirit of these articles. They manifest hearts that have been with Jesus. Two of these writers I am glad to mention because I appreciate their kind opposition. One of them is A. M. Morris and the other is I. D. Moffitt. I have never met either of these men but I believe they are both loyal to God. I am sure from what I have heard that I more nearly agree with them in their general teaching than I do with some who stand firm for the school work.

Such a spirit as is manifested in my respondent's exhortation

*Beginning
folly
suppose
athly*

followed would leave the church of God "bleeding at every pore"; would make a thousand petty sects of the blood-bought church. I am sure that the great brotherhood of Christ with all of its differences is too "fitly framed and knit together" by brotherly love to fail to condemn severely this schismatic spirit of my respondent. Many of you, both for and against the school, would suffer your eyes pucked out before you would allow it. It has been my purpose from the beginning to increase union and peace and I pray that God may use this discussion to cement more closely the hearts of his children. I believe he will do it.

IS IT A QUESTION OF EATING MEAT?

In my first article in this discussion I said that the question we are discussing involves the right of Christians to teach God's word; and I here add that it involves the sacred duty, the blood-stained *obligation to teach* that word. To give way to the opposition would be to surrender principle.

Peace,
peace,
where
there is
no
peace

I believe there is not a man among us from the gray-haired fathers of the work down to the boys that would not gladly give up his mere preferences in the work for peace among brethren. But it seems that nothing but a complete abolition of the work itself will suffice and to give way to this is to sin against God, his truth, and his Church. Paul did not have to "eat meat", but I must make and use opportunities to teach God's word, for it has pleased God by "the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe". I Cor. 1:21. "I am debtor both to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish. So as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome". Rom. 1:14, 15. "No man can come to me, except the father that sent me draw him: and I will raise him up in the last day. It is written in the prophets and they shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard from the father, and hath learned, cometh unto me." Jno. 6:44, 45.

My child, your child, Greeks, Barbarians, Americans, Mexicans, Japanese, Chinese, yea "every creature" must be taught to be saved.

Not only so but God has committed this responsibility to the disciples of Jesus. Neither has he entrusted it to a few "ministers of the Gospel" but to every disciple of the Christ from the least even unto the greatest.

When persecution scattered the first church "they therefore that were scattered abroad went about preaching the word". From this church went out thousands of missionaries. Every field to which they went was a destitute field, but they went out with their hearts aflame with love for Jesus and each one felt that it was his business in the world to save souls. The black-smith, the farmer, the tent-maker, each one worked at his trade seeking and making every opportunity in his power to teach the word: So much was this true that in thirty or forty years the gospel was preached to the known world.

The opposition to the school work given way to would hinder disciples from making opportunity to teach the word of God in business; it would drive it out of the school-room, the shop, etc.

One opposer wrote: "The Bible, and not a mixture of secular and divine is what we are contending for." Another wrote two articles against the mixing of the secular with the divine. A little more than a month ago still another said to me that it is wrong to teach the Bible "in school" and he regretted that Brother Sommer admitted that this is right. One of our opposers in preaching in Kansas City, I am told, said it is alright to teach the Bible in school but it must be made secular to do it. The idea of a Christian's making the blood-sealed will of our Lord Jesus Christ secular is repulsive to all Bible teaching.

Brother Sommer himself has made much ado over "religio-secular institutions to teach persons in religion". On page 12 of his tract he considers, not the misuse of the Lord's money, not the misuse of the name "Bible", but the "history of religio-secular institutions whether built by the Lord's money or not". "Whether," says he, "the religious instruction imparted has predominated over the secular, or the secular has been greater than the religious, yet the result has been the same. . . . They may all be justly called trees which have from first to last been bearers of evil fruit."

He, too, is one of the "we's" that condemns a "mixture of secular and divine", declaring that such a tree always bears evil fruit. But since he has admitted that it is right to teach the Bible in school I judge that he, like the Kansas City man, would carry the Bible through some secularizing process preparing it for the school-room.

According to the opposition, the Bible must be made secular before the teacher may teach it to his students, for were he to teach it as the divine will he would have a "religio-secular" school which always results in evil. Again I say, the opposition to this work forbids the teaching of God's word in school and this principle surrendered to forbids it in all other daily walks of men.

Put such a question as this on the grounds of eating meat? Nay verily! Give way to opposition that hinders my teaching the word of God to any creature anywhere? Not for an hour. To do it would be to stun our consciences and place the axe at the very root of the progress of the Church of God. As Thomas Campbell said when his right to teach the word of God was obstructed: "What!

is it possible that I live in a land where reading the scriptures and giving religious instruction to the ignorant is a penal offence? Can the word of God be thus bound and the proclamation of the Gospel be thus fettered in a Christian land? Is it possible for me to remain in a place where, under any circumstances, I am forbidden to preach a crucified Saviour to my perishing fellow-beings?"

Every day that I have taught in Bible-school work I have done it because it offered the most effectual opportunity possible to me to teach God's word. Feeling the obligation to make every opportunity possible to teach the Bible, we opened a private business in Odessa leaving ourselves free to teach God's word. This business, our school, has no more connection with the Church than Fuji-more's farm, Sexton's home, or Timmon's horse, to help pay for which the "Review" has so earnestly "begged" the Church of God.

When I came to New Mexico I felt the obligation to make opportunities to teach the word of God, hence, I am offering to teach Mexicans English free of charge. My chief purpose is to open an opportunity to teach the religion of Jesus to these benighted people.

He that would hinder me from making such opportunities would hinder me from duty. Nay, verily, my brethren, it is not a question of eating meat but a question of discharging a sacred obligation and he who opposes it is responsible for all strife, alienation, and disturbance of peace that the opposition may occasion. Should there ever be division over teaching the Bible in school, the opposers would be wholly responsible for it.

"Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye."

November 26, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER'S SEVENTH ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF APPLYING SACRED NAMES TO THINGS OF HUMAN ORIGIN.

I have before me Prof. Armstrong's fourth and fifth, so-called, replies on the Name Question. I shall give attention to them both in this essay.

He begins the fourth by saying, "I deeply regret the manner in which my respondent once more dares to come from behind his 'wall.' I am sorry that the debate must be stained with the article to which I am now replying, for almost every paragraph of it is stained with the words 'liar,' 'wicked,' 'slanderer,' 'slanderous,' 'demagogue,' etc. In short, the first half of it is a very bitter personal attack on me."

The reader knows that on the Money Question I sent to my opponent three impersonal essays. But he did not reply to them in an impersonal manner, but used scurrility. Then I sent to him several essays, on the Name Question, that were strictly impersonal in style. But in response to them he again used scurrility. While writing on the Money Question, I exposed his offensive style and thrust upon him some of his own expressions. I have done the same on the Name Question. In so doing I have followed the example of the Savior and his apostles, and am satisfied with the style of my part of this discussion. I have charged against my opponent

"refuse" to do anything is to say "I will not do it." I have indicated more than once what the right kind of schools is, and do not intend to spend more time on that subject. I am not engaged in establishing schools to do the work of the church, nor any part of it.

Prof. Armstrong says, "Lo! our 'begging' is all right if it be for a scriptural work." He thus represents me, but, as usual, does not state what I said. Well, I tried to get him to affirm that his school is a "scriptural" institution. But I could not induce him to do so. I now charge that he either does not believe that his school as a "work" is a scriptural institution, or that he has not the courage of his convictions.

In the latter part of the essay under review Prof. Armstrong ventures on the Name Question, and says, "The fact remains that Rhodes demolished him on the Name Proposition and the people saw it." I respectfully submit to the reader of my "Skirmishes" with Prof. Rhodes that "the Name Proposition" WAS NOT DISCUSSED IN THEM. I endeavored to discuss the Origin and Purpose of certain schools and Prof. Rhodes, instead of meeting what was offered to him, confessed that he "could not take it all down," and thus evaded it. But he ventured to introduce the questions of Money and Name, neither of which did I really discuss with him. As a result I only made a few statements in regard to these questions in my discussion with Prof. Rhodes. Can not the reader see that Prof. Armstrong is a reckless asserter, who has not the slightest regard for common veracity, in this discussion? Like Prof. Rhodes, he is determined to besmirch me, regardless of truth.

In view of the foregoing exposures, how much confidence can my reader have in my opponent's comments on the Greek word "biblos" and "biblion"? And how much confidence can he have in any man who seldom quotes a sentence from his opponent, and who writes in this style: "I refer to these matters to show my opponent's ugliness as a debater, and also his weakness. He has no truth to present so he spends his time fighting me personally." "He is either unjust to us, or he can't understand plain language and needs forbearance because of his weakness." "He is tied

hand and foot with his own rope. He can not move." "He has learned the feeling of a defeated man." "This is foolishness." "This is another sample of his twisting of my language." "Then when I call attention to his cowardly conduct." "He tried to cover his defeat with appendixes". "If he doesn't want me to expose his cowardly conduct, let him forsake it".

In the light of the foregoing I request the reader to turn back and read Prof. Armstrong's expression of "genuine delight", as found in the beginning of his 5th reply on the Name Question. The quotations that I have given of his style are from his 4th and 5th replies on this subject, and in the midst of these untruthful, and, therefore, slanderous, charges he said he felt "more and more delighted", and felt "more genuine delight". According to this I have made one success in this discussion; that is, I have given Prof. Armstrong an opportunity to "feel more and more delighted" and to have "more genuine delight"! He even says that "this delight has increased at the rate of geometrical progression"! The Savior says, "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh", and what must be the condition of a man's heart who will write such slanders, as I have quoted, when he feels "genuine delight"? I know that I have made severe statements against Prof. Armstrong in regard to his errors, but EVERY ONE OF THEM IS TRUE. In order that I might not even appear to misrepresent him I have quoted his words with care in every instance in which I have attempted a response to them. He, on the contrary, has seldom quoted my words, has nearly always misrepresented me, and then has tried to overthrow HIS MISREPRESENTATION of me. In view of this I have ceased to call him my "respondent". He is simply my "opponent", who is engaged in opposing his own misrepresentations of me.

In regard to his charge against me of "cowardly conduct", I would like to know on what it is based. Did the Confederate Army show "cowardly conduct" when it came North under Gen. Lee, and tried to chase the Federals in their own country? Or, did the Federal Army show "cowardly conduct" when it went South, and chased the Confederate Army in its own country? These questions are easily answered in the negative. Well, I am

the one who is DOING THE CHASING, in this instance, and I have been chasing men who have never shown sufficient courage to arrange a line of battle by affirming that THEIR COLLEGE IS SCRIPTURAL. In view of this, who has shown the "cowardly conduct"? The reader can judge.

Just here I am reminded that a certain preacher has said that we ought not to have discussed without a proposition. He might as well say that the Northern Army should not have gone South to fight those who were in rebellion against the Federal Government of the United States, but should have arraigned itself on the "Mason & Dixons' Line" and waited for the Southern Army to come within its reach! The Southern people had established another government, separate from the "Federal Government" and they wished to be "let-alone", and so certain classes of Southern people have established another government in the form of a religio-secular college, separate from the Divine Government, as that government is seen in "the Church of God", and they wish to be "let alone." Therefore, some one needs to GO AFTER THEM, for this rebellion also MUST BE PUT DOWN, and the Southern people who are loyal to Christ will, of themselves, rise up and help to put it down as soon as they will behold its evil effects. One of those evil effects is that its leaders evade affirming that it is scriptural, another is that they seem to glory in misrepresentations, and reckless assertions of falsehood. For instance, my opponent stated that every word of the Bible is indited by the Spirit of God (I quote from memory) I denied his statement, and referred to the 7th chapter of 1st Corinthians in proof.

Again: My opponent challenged me to show where any other man had taught that it is "sacrilege" to apply the word Bible to such an institution as he presides over. In response I showed that A. Campbell declared that to "transfer" "a cent or a prayer" to an "educational society" is to "rob the church of its glory", and "sacrilege", first of all, means to "rob a church". Now, my opponent says that I "misrepresent the dead". How did I misrepresent him? I proved by A. Campbell's own words that the Odessa school, as an "education society" is a sacrilegious institution, and this covers the Name Question, and answers his challenge found

near the beginning of the so-called "reply" which my opponent wrote when he felt so much "genuine delight". Can we apply the name "Bible" to a SACRILEGIOUS INSTITUTION without making a SACRILEGIOUS USE of the word "Bible"? No. Then my opponent's challenge has been answered.

But see the following from my opponent: "Campbell had no right to teach what had not been taught before him, neither has Daniel Sommer." According to this assertion Campbell "had no right" to denounce a missionary society, "neither has" J. N. Armstrong.

My opponent has introduced the terms "Sommerite" and "Sommerism" in order to help him in his waspish style of stinging me with unjust reflections.

Prof. A. says, "I have not consulted with him (Harding) concerning this debate for one second". I ask Prof. Armstrong if he will risk his reputation as a man of veracity on this denial. I have been credibly informed that he had asked Prof. H. before the discussion began if he would conduct it for him if he could arrange it with me. Was not this information correct?

Prof. A. also says of one of his wrong inferences: "This means that he still has no objection to the school work as such save in money and name." I pronounce such a conclusion ridiculous in view of my discussion with Prof. Rhodes in regard to the Origin and Purpose of such school work, also the novel reading imposed in it. Prof. Armstrong is the most reckless, and unscrupulous writer that I have ever known. His recklessness suggests to my mind that which a certain writer said of his opponent being a "splinter from the butt-cut of total depravity".

My opponent says, "We have kept ourselves free to teach the Bible to these students." He should have added, *And we have taught them sufficient ungodly fiction, and entertained them with sufficient theatricals, to overbalance all of the Bible we have set before them.*

Near the close of his fifth article on the Money Question my opponent repeats three questions which he says I missed, and seems to think there is something significant in the fact that I did not notice them in my preceding essay. Yes, there is some-

thing significant in that fact. I regarded them as UNWORTHY OF NOTICE. They are vaporings but I now condescend to notice them in order to satisfy him.

1. "When Christians band together to teach both the Bible and secular knowledge is their school 'religio-secular'?" I answer, *yes*.

2. "What should be their purpose in their Bible teaching?" I answer, their purpose should be to teach their pupils aright, and not to counteract the truth they set forth by imposing on them ungodly fiction and theatricals.

3. "What is the difference between a school to teach 'persons' the Bible and other branches, and to teach 'persons' in true religion and other branches?" I answer that the expression "the Bible," may mean *the whole Bible*, and the expression "in true religion," may mean only *one item* of such religion.

Now what is there in such questions that I should fear them? I have never used the expression "religio-secular" as a term of reproach, but simply to tell the truth, and in contradistinction from the falsehood couched in the names "Bible School" and "Bible-College" as designations for schools that are three-fourths secular. I hate falsehood, and I hate a "liar", especially a religious "liar".

Since writing the foregoing I have received Prof. Armstrong's sixth pretended reply to me on the Name Question. I find in the first part of it about six large manuscript pages of vapping and frothing, though I might designate the effusions on those pages by a worse name. Here is a specimen of them: "Never would Daniel Sommer pass over whole articles if he knew what to do with them." Let the reader turn back and see if I have passed over "whole articles" without response. That the reader may understand why I use the expression "vapping and frothing" with reference to Prof. A., I state that one day I asked him if he had read my tract on the "right hands of fellowship." He sprang toward me with his hand clenched, and with violent gesticulation said, "NO, and I wish you to KNOW that I haven't the PATIENCE to read any such STUFF." I can see that same style in all his pretended replies to me.

On the seventh page of the manuscript before me I find the statement that the bill of divorce, written by divine authority "was no more sacred writing than is every marriage license issued in this country". In response I state that words fail me to express how utterly and wickedly reckless I regard the foregoing declaration. Many marriage licenses "in this country" are issued to persons who have not been scripturally divorced from former companions in marriage, and such licenses are permissions for adultery. Yet Prof. A. says that a divinely ordained bill of divorce "was no more a 'sacred' writing than is" such a marriage license! Think of such a writer posing as an educator, and even as a president of a college! If an institution should be established to teach a reckless disregard of truth I would think that Prof. A. should have charge of that institution. I again say that the bill of divorce which God authorized Jews to give and keep with sacredness was A SACRED WRITING. The reckless and untruthful statements and illustrations of my opponent can not blot this out of the reader's mind.

My opponent refers to the word "biblion" in Rev. 6:14, where it is translated by the word "scroll" in the Common Version of the Sacred Text, and says, "In this case the word refers to any sheet of paper. It is unquestionably put to common use." I DENY THESE STATEMENTS. My opponent is now in the last ditch of his desperate struggle to show that the Holy Spirit used the Greek word "biblion" in a common use, and he is now destined to be driven from that ditch. When the Holy Spirit through Paul referred to an unwritten sheet he used the word "membrana", translated "parchments", in 2nd Timothy. 4:13. And when the Holy Spirit through John referred to an unwritten sheet he used the word "Xartes", translated by the word "paper". See 2 John, 12 verse. Thus the word "biblion" even when used is an illustration, is against my opponent, and favors my proposition that this word, as used in the New Testament, is always applied to A SACRED WRITING. My opponent is a genius in blundering.

Dec. 11, 1907.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S 7TH REPLY — 15TH ARTICLE.

SOME THINGS WE KNOW.

1. That "biblion" and "biblos" are applied by the Holy Spirit to portions of the Bible.
2. That "Biblion" and "Biblos" are applied by the Holy Spirit to other "divine writings" than the Bible.
3. That "biblion" is applied to "bill of divorcement", an instrument of writing every word of which was written by uninspired men hence, was no more a sacred writing than every marriage license issued to marriageable Christians in this country. WE also know that if this "bill" were sacred because the Bible required it, honest occupations would be sacred, also, because the Bible requires christians to profess them.
4. That "biblos" is applied in Acts 19:19 by the Holy Spirit to books of human origin.
5. Brother Sommer knows (?) that one of the "biblia" (books) in 2 Tim. 4:13 is "an unwritten sheet" that Paul especially wanted. See his last article.
6. That "biblion" is applied by the Holy Spirit to scroll "in general" in which occurrence its use is *not sacred but unquestionably common*.
7. We know that this use of "biblion" in Rev. 6:14, the use that Brother Sommer himself says is "general", is an *approved* apostolic example and is as good to follow as if it were repeated a thousand times.
8. We know that such expressions as, "Bible maps", "Bible history", "Bible Society", "Bible House", "Bible Store", "Bible business", "Bible sales", "Bible Dictionary", "Bible School", "Bible College", and "BIBLE AND TESTAMENT CATALOGUE" (See O. R. Dec. 10, 1907, "Office Notes" page 8) are among the most common expressions in our language and that the practice of thus applying the word "Bible" "to things of human origin" is about as old as the applying of it to the Scriptures. Both practices are of human origin, both stand or fall by the same authority.

Even the O. R. office advertises its business by a catalogue called "Bible and Testament Catalogue". I wonder (?) if the O. R. is guilty of "sacrilege" because it has now applied the "sacred word Bible" to a human book?

9. We know that brother Sommer approves of our use of the word "Bible" in Western Bible and Literary College except in point of English, though we apply the word to "college", a thing of human origin.

10. We know that brethren, in the names "Bible School" and "Bible College", do no more than apply the word "Bible" to "School" and "College", things of human origin, hence, if our application of the word is free from sacrilege, so is theirs.

11. We know that brother Sommer has been begged from the beginning to give *divine* authority for his legislation but that he has not done so, hence, it is a clear case of binding where God has not bound.

MATTERS IN MY RESPONDENT'S LAST ARTICLE NEEDING REPLY.

Brother Sommer's reference to the conversation he had with me concerning his tract on "Right-hand of Fellowship" is incorrect both as to my manner and my speech. I said in a very earnest way: "I have not time to read a whole tract on a subject that is not once mentioned in the Bible."

MY respondent desires to know if I am ready to risk my reputation on my statement that I have not consulted brother Harding concerning this discussion. Really, friends, I don't care so much about my reputation, but I am especially interested in my character. What I have said concerning brother Harding I say again. I have not consulted with him *one second* for I have had no need to do so. MY respondent's information is incorrect, long before the oral discussion I wrote to Harding to know if, should *we* decide to ask him to conduct our side of the debate, he would represent us. He replied: "With great pleasure". My respondent declared that Harding had united with me in the discussion. I replied that I had not consulted with him for one second about it. The context shows my meaning.

But why bring all of this into *this* debate? A man that has truth to present would not spend his time on outside matters. I freely admit that there are defects in this school work and that mistakes are made by all of the schools, but I do not believe there is a truth in the universe against the work itself.

a contra dictions and an admission
 I deny that we teach "ungodly fiction" and entertain our students with "theatricals". Every christian in the United States that sends his children to school — any school — has them taught as much, and usually more, "ungodly fiction". Our school entertainments are not a circumstance to the entertainments given by other schools. This criticism is against every school in the civilized world and every patron of them. For seven years Brother Sommer has encouraged parents to send their children to schools that teach this same "ungodly fiction" and entertain to a degree that we could not conscientiously do, and last, but, by no means least, teach infidelity concerning the Bible.

PERSONALITIES.

what a lie.
See P. 191
See P. 210
 It has been my principle to steer clear of defense of myself save where it seemed the truth was suffering. I am sorry for a man that cannot control his carnal nature any better than brother Sommer does. He takes advantage of every statement that can be twisted or abused. His last article is a shame to the religion he professes. I have done my best to be just to him in every matter. Perhaps I have sometimes failed but I have never questioned his regard for "common veracity". I have attributed everything along this line to mistakes and weakness. I have tried hard to see a good heart behind every action. I have never judged his heart, mental reserves, etc., for such things do not belong to honorable discussion or to righteousness. Brother Sommer's unkindness hurts the cause of Christ and hurts him, it does not hurt me.

In his last article he accused me of being a *deliberate deceiver* in my business dealings with men. If we had stolen the property at Odessa this fact would in no way affect the work for which I am contending. Yea, if it could be proved that every teacher in

Bible school work is a deliberate deceiver, a thief and a robber, it would not affect the righteousness of the principle of the work. Brother Sommer has reflected on me as a man, teacher, preacher, and christian. Time and again he has said that I have violated everything in the Bible against falsehood. According to him I am a "demagogue", a "slanderer", a "falsifier", and a "deliberate deceiver." He has judged my mental reservations, my intentions, and my purposes from the fourth article in this discussion. Although he declares that he has not referred to me as a member of the church he withdrew his fellowship from me and now disowns me as a respondent. I am "simply" his "opponent". Brother Sommer must answer to God for his harsh, unjust treatment of me as a man and a christian. Before he knew anything of me scarcely he rejected me as a christian. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these, my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me". If I be a christian at all, though I be the least and most unworthy, in rejecting me he rejects Christ.

MY QUESTIONS AND BUFFALO SEMINARY.

I have pressed the religio-secular questions upon my respondent by repetition in nearly every article for eight months. At last he declares them unworthy of his notice. Just as he treated my Jerusalem questions so he has treated these. The Jerusalem questions stand evaded today because fair answers to them upset his money theory root and branch. If his life depended on it he could not quote from one of his fifteen articles a plain unequivocal statement that christians have a right to put their money into schools right in themselves. For six years he has charged christians with robbing God because they help this school work. Think of it — men and women who by hard work barely make enough to care for dependent ones are charged with robbing God. not because the school is wrong, but because they have "misused the Lord's money." It has been established in this debate beyond all doubt that it is none of brother Sommer's business where Christians put their just-earned money as long as the thing in itself is right, and his contention makes him a meddler of other men's matters.

My respondent's answer to my questions on religio-secular schools is an honor (?) to him. He has made much ado over "religio-secular schools to teach persons in religion". On page 12 of his tract he says: "Whether the religious instruction imparted has predominated over the secular, or the secular has been greater than the religious, yet the result has been the same . . . they (religio-secular schools) may all be justly called trees which have from first to last been bearers of evil fruit". On page fourteen of his tract he says: 1. Christ says that a tree is known by its fruit. 2. The fruit of religio-secular schools has been more evil than good throughout the gospel age. 3. Therefore such schools are more evil than good in the gospel age". Beloved friends, all of this is repeated in this discussion and yet he claims he has never opposed "religio-secular schools" "as such", or used the expression "religio-secular" as a term of reproach.

He is here not only judging S. B. but the hearts of all the O. R. readers. p. 208

The O. R. readers all understand the phrase "religio-secular schools to teach persons in religion" to be a term of condemnation and reproach. They all know that brother Sommer admits that christians may band together to teach the Bible and other branches. In his last article in answer to my question he admits that his approved school would be a religio-secular school to teach persons aright in the entire system of religion—"the whole Bible"—notwithstanding the solemn warning of the history of eighteen centuries, he now says it is alright for christians to band together to establish a "religio-secular school". A Philadelphia lawyer could not untangle him here. Now you see why these questions have been persistently shunned for eight months. I do not wonder that some of brother Sommer's co-laborers are dissatisfied with the "masterly manner" in which he handles his side of the case, and that some preacher thinks he should not have discussed with the "boys" without a proposition. MY respondent may boast of invading the enemies' country but the readers of this discussion know who is being chased. Do not forget from this on that Brother Sommers believes it is right for Christians to band together to establish "religio-secular schools to teach persons in religion", notwithstanding their history declares (?) them

all to be trees of evil fruit. I want to tell you a little more about the school that Daniel Sommer endorses. I want you to see how unjust he has been to Alexander Campbell, and how defenseless he is in his opposition to our school work since he indorses Buffalo Seminary.

Richardson says in his Memoirs of Campbell: "Aware of the great importance of obtaining the assistance of instructed and cultivated minds in the work to which he was devoted, he (A. Campbell) determined in the beginning of this year (1818) to open a seminary, chiefly for young men, in his own house, and to take charge of it himself. He hoped to be able thus not only to be able to confer a benefit upon the neighborhood in giving to the youth a better education than they could otherwise obtain, but also to have the opportunity of preparing some young men for the ministry of the word.

"Mr. Campbell did not find the institution to meet entirely his wishes in that particular which was to him the most desirable. From the religious instruction given, he could still hope much for the future of those who had been placed under his charge; but he did not find among them much inclination toward the ministerial office.

" . . . He had a much higher object in view than merely to prepare young men for secular pursuits, and greatly desired to see some of them disposed to consecrate their lives to the cause of truth".

"Although he had always plenty of pupils . . . he found that it did not subserve to any great extent . . . the chief purpose for which he had established it, which was the preparation of young men to labor in behalf of the primitive gospel". Memoirs of A. Campbell, vol. 1, pages 491-510 and vol. 2, page 48.

This school employed an equipped building sufficient to accommodate its students. Alexander Campbell or some other christian paid for this house and its furnishings, hence, to represent Campbell as opposing christians' using their money for such an educational society misrepresents the dead. Did Campbell mean that the young men who attended Buffalo Seminary and paid their board and tuition to support this educational society were roh-

bing the Church of its glory? Did Campbell ever rob (?) the Church by praying for this educational society? Remember that Buffalo Seminary has been endorsed in this debate as a scriptural school, yet this school took the most powerful young preacher in America out of the field at a time when there were few true preachers. Although both Campbell and his father were "preacherish school-teachers" who followed (?) the "Roman Catholic example in regard to religio-secular schools" their school is heartily endorsed by brother Sommer. In spite of the fact that this school was the outgrowth of a much-felt need of this "preacherish teacher" for helpers in the kingdom of God, and his chief and final purpose in establishing it was to prepare "young men to labor in behalf of the primitive gospel", my respondent has never thought that Campbell in establishing Buffalo Seminary reflected on the Church, or implied that the Church is defective as a teacher of religion; that God's plan for building up his kingdom is defective; or that he ignored Paul's teaching to Timothy that the Church is the "pillar" and "ground" of the truth.

Now what do you think? In this very debate brother Sommer has condemned the Bible school work:

1. Because christians have erected necessary buildings for it. He approves this in Buffalo Seminary!!!
2. Because it is "religio-secular" school work "to teach persons in religion". He approves this in Buffalo Seminary!!!
3. Because it takes (?) preachers out of the field. He approves this in Buffalo Seminary!!!
4. Because our origin implies (?) a deficiency in the Church. He approves the same implication (?) in Buffalo Seminary!!!
5. Because our chief and final purpose is to train hearts and minds for God. He indorses this in Buffalo Seminary!!!
6. Because our work is designed (?) to make preachers. He endorses this avowed purpose in Buffalo Seminary.

Brother Sommer approves in Buffalo Seminary *absolutely everything* that he has condemned in our school at Odessa save our pompous titles (?) and our appeals to christians to help the work. Since, in approving Buffalo Seminary, he admits the

*a relig-
ious
insti-
tution
then*

scripturalness of our work, he grants the right to appeal to Christians to help it.

Again every grain of sand has shifted from under his feet, leaving him as powerless as a babe to extricate himself from the depths of his defeat. Some men may still oppose Western Bible and Literary College but Daniel Sommer cannot do it, for no man can approve Buffalo Seminary and condemn our school work.

We have established our school, says my respondent, on the supposition that the Church is not the pillar and ground of the truth; that the Church is imperfect as a religious teacher; that the school is the pillar and ground of the truth. He says we ignore the Church and the family by setting the school above both; we have established a school that robs the Church of its glory and have ignored Paul's teaching that God must be glorified through the Church. Brother Sommer goes so far as to say: "Words would fail me if I should attempt to portray fully the mistake of establishing a college to teach pupils in regard to religion", yet he endorses as scriptural the school that A. Campbell established with the chief purpose that we claim for ours and more.

Now what do you think? Really it does seem that the "depths of satan" are not in the schools themselves but in the men who are doing the work. Again I say, O! that brother Sommer had started this work.

Dec. 21, 1907.

DANIEL SOMMER'S EIGHTH ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF APPLYING SACRED NAMES
TO THINGS OF HUMAN ORIGIN.

In the beginning of this essay, which I intend shall be the last of my series on the Name Question, I wish to repeat that which I stated near the close of my preceding essay, namely, "I have never used the expression 'religio-secular' as a term of reproach". On the contrary, I have simply used it to tell the truth, and in contradistinction from the falsehood couched in the names "Bible School" and "Bible College" as designations for schools that are three-fourths secular. I hate falsehood, and I hate a liar, especially a religious liar. Therefore I could not consent to apply the names "Bible School" and "Bible College", as certain college projectors, and other college advocates, have applied them, without explanation. As a result I adopted the expression "religio-secular", and all intimations that I have used it in a reproachful sense are incorrect, and are contrary to all my writings on this subject. I refer the reader to my first essays on this subject for evidence of that which I have just stated. In view of this the reader can judge that my opponent, in this discussion, has been guilty of vaporing on this subject unworthy of any one except an embryonic innovator, who is president of a, so-called, "Bible and Literary College".

My opponent, in a waspish manner, has, several times, endeavored to sting me with the incidental remark that I made in my skirmish at Hale, Mo., with Prof. Rhodes, about the name of his school. I was not discussing the Name Question there, but, as Prof. Rhodes introduced it, I said, in an incidental manner, "If my opponent had not violated English Grammar, in naming his institution, I would not have quarrelled with him about its name", or I used words to that effect. To this I now add that if the school at Nashville, Tenn., and the college near Bowling Green, Ky., had been designated "Bible and Literary School", or "Bible and Literary College", I do not suppose that

I would have thought to offer such criticisms as I have offered on the Name Question. For, such names would have indicated some regard for truth, and would not have implied a deliberate attempt to deceive. But when I began to write against the mentioned institutions of learning the word "Literary" had not been injected into the name of any one of them. Therefore, I wrote against the falseness of such a name as well as against that which I designated its "sacrilege". My opponent has passed over my charge of falsehood, on this question, without a word of response, as my memory now serves me, and he has denied that the word "Bible" is a sacred word. My proof, on this point, also his denials and subterfuges, are before the reader. But in his fifth attempt at response on this subject my opponent declares of himself, "I repeat that, so far as this discussion is concerned, I am not bound to defend the names 'Bible School' and 'Bible College' because these names are incidents and not essentials". If my opponent had reversed the foregoing declaration, he would have told the truth. The entire discussion, on this question, originated *by reason of those names*, while the distinctive part of the name of the Odessa institution is a *mere incident*.

But as my opponent has tried to show that my declaration — "mixed names for mixed institutions" — justifies the name "Western Bible and Literary College" I shall now show that it does not. If he had named his institution "Religio-Secular College" or "Religious and Secular College" he would have made use of a name that would not have been, in any respect, misleading. The name "Biblical and Secular College" might be admissible if the instructors in such an institution would all be *Biblical* men, and not innovators, on the one hand, nor hobbyists on the other. But the name "Bible and Literary College" besides its violation of Grammar, is defective and misleading, for it does not indicate that any instruction is given in any department of science in the institution to which it is applied, nor that it is in any respect a business college. Now, what becomes of the ecstasies which Prof. Armstrong has seemed to feel over my statement that "mixed institutions should be called by mixed names"? In the foregoing I have shown that all his efforts to show that

I endorsed the name of his college are on the order of common nonsense, and when coming from the president of a college deserve a worse definition. My statement that "Mixed institutions should be designated by mixed names", does not endorse defective names, misleading names, nor incorrect names, of any kind. Therefore, that statement DOES NOT endorse the name "Western Bible and Literary College" as applied to a certain religious, literary, scientific, and business school that has been established at Odessa, Mo. In view of this the reader can see that Prof. Armstrong's repeated declaration that I have endorsed the name of his institution, "excepting its grammar", is strictly incorrect, as is nearly all else he has said in this discussion.

In the last of my preceding essay I stated that I would drive my opponent from his last ditch on the Name Question, and the reader can judge whether I did so when I exposed him by showing that a sheet that had not been written on was, by one inspired man, designated "Membrana," in 2nd Tim. 4:13, and, by another, was designated "Xartes", in 2nd John 12th verse, and not "biblion" in either instance. But I now recollect what may be called a "gully" in which Prof. A. has endeavored to hide himself, especially in his sixth effort at reply on the Name Question. After writing about one-third of that so-called "reply" he referred to Acts 19:19, and then expressed himself thus: "Why, Bro. Sommer's very contention is that it is unscriptural to apply 'sacred names to things of HUMAN origin' ". In answer I state, Yes, that is my contention, but I did not say anything about things of SATANIC origin. Heathen idolatry and conjury were both of Satanic origin, and are still of such origin. Things of such origin do not enter into this discussion from the view point of logic, and shall not enter into it in fact, except on the condition that my opponent will confess that his college is of Satanic origin. Three classes of things exist in this world, namely, those of Divine origin, those of Satanic origin, and those of human origin. We are discussing some of the last of these, and such of them as exist in the form of religio-secular colleges to do a part of the work of the church, and to furnish secular employment for certain preachers. Such things, or institutions, are strictly of

human origin, and in regard to dignity, are below the swine, for the swine is of divine origin. In view of all this we can easily understand the reason that the Holy Spirit applied the word "biblos" to the books of "curious arts" of the heathen at Ephesus, even while intending to use that word in a sacred sense. The heathen conjured by the names of their gods, and their books of "curious arts" were among their religious, or sacred, writings. My opponent asks, "Were those books that were so bad that they had to be burnt of divine origin?" In response I state that this question has in it two wrong implications; first, that those books "had to be burnt"; second, that they were of "divine origin". Why ask such a question? Simply to place me in an unfavorable light. I have not contended that those books were of "divine origin", and the New Testament does not state that they "had to be burnt", any more than that the church at Jerusalem "had" to have a community of goods. The community of goods at Jerusalem, and the burning of books of "curious arts" at Ephesus, were both *voluntary* on the part of believers in Christ, if we may judge by the silence of the divine record.

Here I am reminded that in the fifth of my opponent's attempts at "reply" he tried to break the force of that which I offered to him about the words "theos"—God—and "kurios"—Lord—by writing thus: "If a man has another object of worship than the true God, I am perfectly free to apply the word 'god' to it". In response to this I now state that such use of the word "god" would still be in a SACRED SENSE for it would be applied to AN OBJECT OF WORSHIP. But my opponent will not say that his college is an object of worship, for that would bring him under certain condemnation from another view point. Thus in whatever direction he turns he entangles himself, and thereby shows that he is utterly incapable of sitting in just judgment on his own performances, or that he is utterly unscrupulous in regard to common veracity. Yet after writing his self-entangling tirade he says, "My dear reader, you may be assured that DANIEL SOMMER would never flounder like this if he were not in trouble. He sees and he is in terror lest you may

see also". This, I think, will provoke a smile in every reader who is capable of smiling over a pretender's folly.

In the latter part of my 6th essay, on this question, I said of the colleges that I oppose, "Neither do I believe that any church of Christ should employ any preacher who advocates them, or tries to defend them." The reader should remember the foregoing and read again my opponent's tirade in his 6th effort at response under the false heading, "ALMOST THE ENTIRE BROTHERHOOD CAST OUT". He charges me with "floundering", and then says, "Worst of all Bro. Sommer uses this floundering as a basis to exhort a few brethren to withdraw their fellowship from all those who advocate, or try to defend, this school work". Such is the beginning of about three large pages of manuscript concerning his confidence in the Brotherhood's possession of "the Spirit of Christ", and that those whom he represents are "loyal in their hearts to God". At the same time he represents me and certain others as "so blinded by their (our) party spirit that they (we) would be willing to rend asunder the body of our blessed Redeemer over the matter". In response to all this I invite the reader's attention to the following:

1. "The Spirit of Christ" is indicated by this declaration: "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up". See Matt. 15:13. I submit to the reader's decision whether the kind of college that I oppose is not a plant which the "heavenly Father hath not planted".

2. In his article titled "The Church at Odessa", published last March or April he stated, "Sin is so malignant that even a 'sin of ignorance' must be atoned for". That statement, when applied to the gospel age, is Roman Catholicism. The idea that we can "atone for" our sins is not in the gospel, but is a fundamental doctrine of Rome. This indicates the *loyalty* of Prof. Armstrong! But I shall have more to offer on this subject at a later period in this discussion.

3. In the last part of the article just referred to Prof. A., after offering a tirade against Bro. W. G. Roberts and myself, declared, "The church at large will be guilty if it condones the sins of these men". In this declaration I find the implication

that Bro. Roberts and I must be disfellowshipped in order that "the church at large" may not be guilty of our alleged "sins". Besides, Prof. A. has the reputation of having boasted that several churches in Iowa had withdrawn fellowship from a certain brother because of his opposition to the college business. This indicates my opponent's love of unity.

In the latter part of his 6th attempt at reply Prof. A. declares that his college business is not a question like that of "eating meat" sacrificed to idols. In response I state that I agree with him in one particular. "God hath created" the mentioned meats "to be received with thanksgiving of them that believe and know the truth". (1st Tim. 4:3) But this religious college business is of HUMAN INVENTION, and, as far as origin is concerned, it has not, as I previously stated, "the dignity of a swine".

All other parts of the pretended reply, to which I have just referred, have been answered, in former essays, and the reader can understand that those parts are only repetitions of former frothings, which seem to be offered to fill space.

I now call attention to my opponent's so-called "7th Reply". Under the heading—"Some Things We Know" he says, "That 'biblion' and 'biblos' are applied by the Holy Spirit to portions of the Bible". In response I state that this is an improvement over the testimony of Prof. B. F. Rhodes, which Prof. A. has hitherto endorsed. Prof. R. says, of "biblion", near the bottom of the 74th page of "Skirmishes"; "In 15 (cases) it is strongly probable that it refers to some part of the sacred writings". Now Prof. A. says, "We know" that it is "applied by the Holy Spirit to portions of the Bible". This is quite an improvement. But this is not all. My opponent also states, "We know" "that 'biblion' and 'biblos' are applied by the Holy Spirit to other 'divine writings' than the Bible". Here is a two-fold confession:

1. "The Holy Spirit" has applied those words to "the Bible";
2. "The Holy Spirit" has applied those words "to other 'divine writings'". These statements cover about all that I have contended for in proving my proposition. First, I have contended that the words under consideration, in one form or another, are, by the Holy Spirit, applied to the *entire sacred writings*. This my op-

ponent denied near the beginning of his first attempt at reply on the Name Question. Here are his words: "The Holy Scriptures are *nowhere* called 'Biblion' by the Holy Spirit so far as we know". But now he says, "We know" "that 'biblion' and 'biblos' are applied by the Holy Spirit to . . . the Bible". This is all I have contended for on this question, for the expression "the Bible", when taken at its full value, means the entire sacred writings. *Well done for my opponent.* He seems about *half-converted*.

But here is more on the same subject. He declares that the words "biblion" and "biblos" "are applied by the Holy Spirit to 'other divine writings' than the Bible". This is exactly what I have contended for, especially when used to designate "a sacred writing", as I have stated concerning "a bill of divorcement". Such a bill was divinely authorized, and was divinely commanded to be sacredly observed, though, as a writing, it was not any part of the Bible. If my opponent had stopped here I would have said he is fully converted, and I might give to him the right hand of fellowship.

But in his 3rd item under "Some Things We Know" my opponent, I regret to say, shows signs of backsliding, for he declares that the "bill of divorcement" "was no more a sacred writing than every marriage license issued to marriageable Christians". In a former attempt at reply he said, It "was no more a 'sacred' writing than is every marriage license issued in this country". But the reader recollects that I exposed his error by showing that some marriage licenses were permissions to commit adultery. Now he is more cautious, but is again destined to exposure, for every marriage license issued in this country is in conception, origin, and execution, *strictly human*. But the "bill of divorcement", authorized by the Jewish law, was *strictly divine* in conception and origin, and was *divinely required* to be sacredly observed. In view of this the reader can see that the *mentioned license*, and the *mentioned bill of divorcement* should be *CONTRASTED*, and not *COMPARED*. They are *OPPOSITES* rather than *RESEMBLANCES*.

My opponent also says that "one of the 'biblia' (books) in 2nd

Tim. 4:13 is 'an unwritten sheet' that Paul especially wanted". Here is a bold, bare, assertion contrary to the record. Paul, in 2nd Tim. 4:13, made mention of "the books" that he desired by the word "biblia", and of the parchment or "unwritten sheets" by the word "membrana". **MY OPPONENT KNOWS THAT HE IS NOW CONVICTED OF ERROR, IF HE KNOWS ANYTHING.** In my preceding essay I showed that "membrana", and "Xartes" are the two Greek words that are used by the Holy Spirit to designate "unwritten sheets", while "biblos" and "biblion" are the words used to designate "the Bible", and "other divine writings". This is my affirmation concerning "biblos" and "biblion", and this is my opponent's admission in the beginning of his 7th attempt at reply. Here I might rest this case.

But my opponent intimates that I admit that there is truth in his position because I use, in the REVIEW, such a notice as this: "Bible and Testament Catalogue". He might as well say that I admit there is truth in heathenism when I use the words "Sunday", and "Monday" because those names are based on heathen deities. But if the mentioned "Catalogue" is three-fourths devoted to secular things, then I would be guilty of both falsehood and sacrilege. For instance, if, in such a "Catalogue", I should even venture to advertise all the books that are offered in the REVIEW office I might be regarded as a deliberate liar and a sacrilegious person.

A lack of space forbids that I should notice much farther my opponent's assertions, vaporings, frothings, ravings — as they appear to me. I am perfectly satisfied with my examination of the Name Question, and of the Money Question. Of course, I deplore the introduction of personalities into this discussion, but remind the reader that I did not introduce them, nor have I used them concerning one that I regard as a brother. But my opponent introduced them and has used them against one whom he professes to think is a brother! The reader can, therefore, see that if I have used personalities I have been consistent in my use of them, while my opponent, who has seemed to delight in using them, has been grossly inconsistent. Besides, he has put his worst construction on my severity, and has charged such construction on

me. In this also he has been inconsistent, and worse than inconsistent.

Near the beginning of his 6th tirade Prof. A. says of me: "No doubt he expected to bull-doze the 'boys' and have a breakfast spell of it", and then adds that I "should have been able to meet a boy". In regard to all this I state that the word "bull-doze" is slang, as we may learn by consulting good dictionaries, and slang speech should not have any place in this discussion. The word "boy", as used in the last of the foregoing sentences from my opponent, is without quotation marks. This means that Prof. A. acknowledges that Prof. Rhodes is a "boy". Then as he was regarded as the best one the college could furnish for the occasion, in the discussions at Odessa and Hale, the reader can understand the value of that college. Prof. A. has my consent to call B. F. Rhodes a "boy", and he might even designate him an impudent "boy", and tell the truth.

My opponent, in his 7th tirade, says that my information is "incorrect" in regard to his alleged consultation of Prof. Harding. It may be, and I would cheerfully accept his denial as a correction if he had previously shown a strict regard for truth. But consider this: My opponent denies my version of his remark about his refusal to read my tract, on the "right hands of fellowship", and gives this as his version: "I have not time to read a whole tract on a subject that is not once mentioned in the Bible". But in Gal. 2:9 Paul makes mention of "the right hands of fellowship", and this fact shows the recklessness of my opponent. He not only denies what I say, but denies what Paul says. My opponent seems to have a genius for errors. He is so nearly always wrong that a correct statement from him seems unintentional.

Prof. A. declares in his 7th tirade, that my criticism in regard to the "ungodly fiction" imposed at Odessa "is against every school in the civilized world and every patron of them". But this declaration is another evidence that my opponent is utterly reckless in regard to truth in this discussion. There are thousands of technical schools which do not offer to their pupils even one chapter of "ungodly fiction", and there are many patrons of

literary schools that take a select course in order to avoid the "ungodly literature" that is offered in them: Is not the reader convinced that my opponent does not deserve confidence in anything that he says in this discussion? Consider this also, as found next to the specimen of recklessness that I have just exposed: "For seven years Bro. Sommer has encouraged parents to send their children to schools that teach this same 'ungodly fiction'". But what have I said that has had a bearing in this direction? My writings show that I have encouraged the "home student" more than any one else in regard to study, and have referred to the lamented L. F. Bittle as an illustration.

But read this also: "If it could be proved that every teacher in Bible school work is a deliberate deceiver, a thief and a robber, it would not effect (affect) the righteousness of the principles of the work". This is Roman Catholicism pure and simple. It is the doctrine of "official grace" regardless of moral character. This implies that "a thief and a robber" may project and conduct an institution that the Church should accept and support!

Prof. A. says I accuse him with being "a deliberate deceiver". I deny the charge as he states it, and ask my readers to read again that which I said on this subject, and they will see that I wrote conditionally. His writings on this subject seem to me but frothings and ravings, and I think they will seem thus to the honest reader. I shall not have opportunity to expose his next attempt at response, but the reader has seen sufficient to know that it will be incorrect from beginning to end, except when Prof. A. unintentionally admits what is true.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S EIGHTH REPLY—SIXTEENTH ARTICLE.

Brother Sommer's last article comes as a reply to three of my articles. He scrapped through these, choosing a sentence here and there, leaving the arguments untouched. He has passed silently over much in my articles to which, I am sure, the readers would like to hear his answers. Every O. R. reader knows that it is not characteristic of the man to pass over things put before him with-

out answer. There is but one explanation for his doing so in this case. He does not know what to do with them, hence, he calls as little attention as possible to them by passing silently over them.

(1) In my respondent's second article in this discussion, he says: "They (religio-secular schools) may all be justly called trees which have from first to last been bearers of evil fruit." The intelligent may judge for himself whether or not this is "reproachful". Although brother Sommer has declared for more than six years that they are all, every one of them, evil trees, he now endorses the planting of such trees by Christians. "How is he going to fix it?" *He can't fix it!* It converts his history argument into so much filling.

(2) It is no disgrace for a man to confess unguarded statements. All of us make such statements, and especially under distressed circumstances like those under which my respondent labored when he "incidentally" endorsed our name. Of course, brother Sommer sees that in this endorsement he has surrendered the whole contention, for even the school children know that the word "Bible" is applied to college in our name exactly as it is in the name "Bible College". In both cases it is applied to a thing of human origin. No wonder my respondent would like to slip that incidental endorsement back in doors. If he really wants to do so, let him say so in plain speech.

(3) For our name to be beyond the pale of criticism, my respondent's criticism, it should be: "Western Biblical, Literary, Scientific, Mathematical, Oratorical, Musical, Commercial, and Physical-cultural college": Not only so, but should it at any time seem wise to add to our work Manual Training or Domestic Science our name must be changed to indicate the addition or imply (?) a deliberate attempt to deceive. *I tell you, his doctrine on the name has gone to seed!*

(4) It matters not whether I am in a "ditch" or in a "gully", whether those books had to be burned or put out of the way in some other way, the fact remains that the Holy Spirit applied the word "biblos" to books of human origin in Acts 19:19. Brother Sommer tries to get the Spirit out of sacrilege (?) in the case by saying, He was "intending to use the word in a sacred

sense". Just notice the dodge at this point! The word is too sacred (?) to be applied to anything of human origin, but it is *alright* to apply it to things of *Satanic origin!* I really think that I should rather own that I was wrong than to go on record in such a shape.

(5) I have never intimated that men could "atone" for their *own* sins, neither have I ever implied that the church should withdraw fellowship from brother Sommer or any body else concerning the matter of which he writes. I know brother Sommer and brother Roberts sinned against the church at Odessa and against the teachers of the school, and that this sin should not be overlooked by the brother-hood.

I deny that I ever "boasted that several churches in Iowa had withdrawn their fellowship from a certain brother because of his opposition to the College". I never heard of it before, neither do I believe any church has ever made such wicked discrimination of brethren.

(6) Right hands of fellowship as an induction into the local church is not mentioned in the Bible. This is the subject discussed in his anonymous tract.

(7) Who wrote that catalogue of the O. R.'s book-store? The sacred (?) word Bible has been applied to it, and twelve times in it the word is applied to things of human origin. **MY, WHAT A HEAP OF SACRILEGE!**

THE CHURCH OF GOD.

About two thousand years ago God established in the city of Jerusalem a government over which he placed his child, clothed with all authority in heaven and in earth, as head. God "raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also that which is to come, and he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all" Eph. 1:20-23.

"For in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it was the good pleasure of the father that in him should all fullness dwell". Col. 1:16-19.

Thus was fulfilled the prophecy of Daniel: "In the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." Also the prophecy: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace."

Every Christian in the world is a citizen of this institution, for the "process" that made him a Christian also made him a citizen of the divine government. Every subject of this kingdom is a *bought* subject. He belongs to God, body, soul, and spirit; time, talent, and means. Every obligation of his life must be discharged in the name of his ruler, as a bond servant of God, for the Lord's sake. To serve otherwise is to dishonor Christ and rob God of glory.

"Whatsoever ye do, work heartily, as unto the Lord, and not unto men . . . ye serve the Lord Christ." Col. 3:23, 24.

"Whatsoever ye do in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." Col. 3:17.

"Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be the glory in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations for ever and ever. Amen." Eph. 3:20, 21.

The church of God is commensurate with the needs of man for the purpose for which it was established. It is founded in the wisdom of God and with its infallible head is perfect and complete. The very thought of improvement is an impeachment of God's wisdom; high handed presumption; unbelief. The attempt to improve on God's arrangement is as insignificant and as

foolish as a fire-fly's attempt to help the sun to shine. In Christ "are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden . . . and in him ye are made full (complete)", "furnished completely unto every good work." See Col. 2:3-10; 2 Tim. 3:16, 17.

Any institution that in any way interferes with, detracts from, or rivals the church of God is sinful; an exhibition of ignorance of God's word or of unbelief in God and in his institution.

The church of the living God is the *only pillar and ground of the truth*; the *only* channel through which, in honor and glory to God, the manifold wisdom of God may be made known to the world; the nursing mother of every principle of morality and spirituality in the world. The Christian that would teach *one* lesson of common honesty, truthfulness, or purity of life, save as a fruit of faith in God and Christ dishonors God and his institution. All of these virtues apart from faith in God, Christ, and the church, are "white-washed sins" in the sight of God. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

All of this talk about "two institutions, the home and the church", is deceiving the people and dishonoring God. These scribes need to be taken aside and taught the way of God more accurately. I challenge my respondent to show the father and mother's right, scriptural right, to teach their children one truth of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, heaven, hell, honesty, truthfulness, kindness, gentleness, unselfishness, and "the bond of perfectness", love, save as Christians, in the name of Christ, and as bondservants of God.

What is it then? Fathers and mothers train their children in the way they should go simply as servants of God, as members of His church. It is the church through these members training the children of the country as literally as it is the church training the children of the community in the Bible classes on Lord's day morning in the meeting house. In both instances it is the church of God fulfilling its mission in the world, teaching the truth. The most effectual way in which the church has done its teaching has been by individual Christians, while working at their own charges, seeking, making, and using, every opportunity to teach the word of life. I believe I can safely say that the bulk of the teaching has

What the matter with the man anyway

It seems he has wanted to make this absurd and silly argument till he thought he could not resist.

always been done in this humble way before God. Indeed the greatest and keenest sacrifices and most effectual services have always been rendered in this individual way. The New Testament as clearly approves this individual service as it does the service of the local church, and both services glorify God "in the church". The church is just as literally and truly the institution in which to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, wait upon the sick, visit the widows, wash the disciple's feet, sing, pray, give thanks etc., as it is to teach the word of God. The Christian that does any of these works in the name of any other institution robs God of his glory. When the Christian feeds the beggar at her door in the name of Jesus, she is as truly doing "church work" as when she sits in the assembly and sings praises to God, and the church as truly feeds the beggar as if it had taken one dollar out of its treasury for the work. Not only so, but this woman as truly glorifies God "in the church and in Christ Jesus" as if it had been done otherwise. If it were not so, the thousands of kind acts done, the thousands of sacrifices made, the thousands of untiring hours spent with the suffering, and the thousands of lessons taught, by thousands of Christians as bond servants of God, in the name of our blessed Lord, would be dishonoring to God. Think of the thousands of books, pamphlets, leaflets, tracts, and papers that, by individual effort, have gone out into all parts of the world. There is not, I presume, a "religious" paper in the brotherhood that does not owe its existence chiefly to the efforts and sacrifices of individual servants of God who did their work for Christ's sake. The same can be said of thousands of local congregations. They owe their existence to the work of individual Christians who often worked in want to build them up. This church work? The finest in the world! This glorifying God in the church? Most assuredly!!

But some of those writing against the school, by the expression "in the church" really seem to mean between the walls of the meetinghouse; others seem to mean in the local assembly. These men write as if the only work that glorifies God "in the church" is work done in and through the local body. Every time a Christian enters his closet to pray he must do it as a member of

It is a violation of all rules of honorable C. to introduce new arguments in the closing speech on a proposition as A. has done here.

the church of God. He cannot pray otherwise. Every family that assembles for worship must do it "in the church" for there is no other institution in which they can glorify God. In every chapel service in school, those engaging must do it as members of the church of God.

No citizen of the government of Christ has a right to take on himself any relation to men in which he cannot work as a servant of Christ, and as a bond-servant of God. I should be far from working in a school, shop, office or factory in which I could not work as unto Christ, for the Lord's sake, and as a member of the divine government.

We teachers in our school have kept ourselves free to teach our students to be kind, gentle, loving, honest, truthful, clean, thankful, respectful to parents, reverential to God, His son, His Book, and His church, all of which teaching must be done to the glory of God "in the church". Every lesson that we teach of which the church is the "pillar and ground" (which is every lesson from faith in God to every moral and spiritual lesson in the Bible) we teach as bond-servants of God and as members of his church as truly as does the father who teaches his child the religion of Jesus.

What is the matter with our school that teaching in it disqualifies us to teach morality, purity of life, faith in God, etc.? Teachers in other schools teach many of these lessons. I challenge my respondent to show from the Bible the Christian's right to teach *one* of these lessons save as a Christian, a member of the church of God.

Our school differs from most other schools in the kind and amount of religion it teaches. All teach morality and religion. *All are "religio-secular"*. While we teach in our school reverence for God and his word, most other schools teach irreverence and infidelity concerning the Bible; we teach the God of the Bible, they teach the god of evolution; We teach the Bible of the Holy Spirit, they teach the bible of higher-critics; we teach the pure and simple religion of the Christ, they teach sectarianism; we exalt the church of God as the only church of Christ, they honor all churches as churches of Christ.

The principle that hinders our teaching the Bible will forbid the singing of a song, the praying of a prayer, or the teaching of a single lesson of morality in school. It will drive every lesson of religion and morality out of the school room. Put such a question on the ground of "eating meat"? *God forbid!* He that would hinder me from teaching any lesson taught in the Bible, would hinder me from duty to God and men.

We established our school because we believe that the young people of this country need a *pure, clean school*. It differs from other schools in its life as one man may differ in his life from another man, but it belongs to the class "school" and has no more connection with the church than the Christian's farm or the Christian's paper.

It is, indeed, a stupid Christian that does not see the damning influence and tendency of the schools of this age. Most of them are nothing more than infidel strong-holds. West Point is no more directly training men for the U. S. army than many of these schools are training the youth for perdition. How parents can dare to place their children in this strong current of wickedness, and under the influence of this popular infidelity, is a wonder to a Bible student. They pray "Lead us not into temptation" and then place the unfixed in character, and untried in temptation into temptations that not one in a hundred can resist. What God will do with parents who thus sin against their children I do not know. I am glad Christians everywhere are awakening to the great wrong and danger to which children are exposed at this point and that the awakening is tending toward God. I pray that thousands of others may be awakened to duty by this discussion.

In November I received a letter from a Christian on the Pacific coast who writes as follows: "I am puzzled to know just what is best to do with him (his oldest son) . . . He is about seventeen now and I am sure that you know that this is just the danger point in a young man's life. He is . . . above the average spiritually, . . . and not wanting him in these infidel schools I consented for him to keep at work. . . . I am in receipt of a letter from brother Harding offering him an opportunity to work his way. . . . I dislike for him to go

so far from home but . . . I know, you know the kind of schools here except they are worse here than east, as regards infidelity and also wickedness in general". Another Christian writing me in Oct. says: "I want to educate my boys in such a school (Bible school) . . . and if we don't get one here I expect to go where I can". This is also a voice from the Pacific coast. God speed the day when there will be such a school in every state in this great country that children may be offered literary training under safe influences. I should rather fight the pure food law enacted to remove danger from the stomachs of this country than to fight the effort that seeks to purify the food for the minds of its people. The influence of the general school life is far more pernicious and undermining than impure food.
Jan. 21, 1908.

DANIEL SOMMER'S FIRST ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE INCOMPETENCY OF MY OPPONENT AND CERTAIN OTHER PRETENDERS.

My first charge of incompetency, on the part of my opponent, is based on the course pursued by him in each of his attempts at response to me in the foregoing parts of this discussion. I mention a few particulars.

1st. He has avoided stating my position in my own words, in nearly every instance.

2nd. In attempting to state it in his own words he has, with scarcely an exception, misrepresented me.

3rd. Having stated his misrepresentation of my position he has spent most of his time in this discussion combating those misrepresentations, instead of combating my real position.

4th. He has violated 1 Timothy 5:1, and every other scripture which enjoins courtesy, by his introduction of personalities and ridicule. Beginning with his 2nd or 3rd effort, at response, he has persisted in the same course, with but slight exception, even into the midst of his last. One of his objectionable methods has been to place an intense and unjust construction on my severity

towards him, and then to charge such construction against me. By this method the words "wicked", "liar", and certain others, have stained the discussion of the Money Question and of the Name Question.

My second charge of incompetency, against my opponent, and certain others of his pretensions, is based on the errors found in certain catalogues which they have offered to the public. The catalogues of an institution of learning, especially of an institution whose president boasts of thoroughness in all departments in which he pretends to give instruction, ought to be a model of accuracy. But, several years ago, when I examined certain catalogues of a certain institution established near Bowling Green, Ky., and of the institution at Odessa, Mo., I was so amused at its curious errors that I wrote a few pages which I intended for a tract. But they were never sent forth in tract form, and I now adopt them as a part of my proof of the incompetency that I charge against my opponent and certain other pretended educators.

"CURIOUS ARTS."

Two documents, with pretentious titles, have been sent to me at my request. One of them is titled, "Announcement and Catalogue, Potter Bible College, 1905-1906, Bowling Green, Kentucky." The other is titled, "Year Book of the Western Bible and Literary College, of Odessa, Missouri." The first mentioned document indicates that the president of the institution it advertises is "J. A. Harding, A. M." The other document records that the president of the institution at Odessa, Mo., is "J. N. Armstrong, A. B. A. M."

As many of my readers may not know what "A. B." and "A. M." mean, I state that "A. B." means *arts bachelor*, or "Bachelor of Arts," while "A. M." means *arts master*, or "Master of Arts." The title, "Bachelor of Arts," is bestowed on any one, of either sex, who takes a certain course of instruction in college, and receives a diploma, or certificate of proficiency. Then the title, "Master of Arts," is generally given to those who take a year of what is designated "Postgraduate work," which means a year in

certain studies supposed to give a finishing touch to the education previously received. Therefore, the title, "Master of Arts," implies all that is involved in "Bachelor of Arts," and one year more of collegiate study. As memory serves me I have, in only one instance, seen the titles "A. B. A. M." attached to a man's name, and that instance is in the case of "J. N. Armstrong," the president of the college at Odessa, Mo.

After setting forth the foregoing explanations, I wish to make a few statements which are applicable to both of the documents now under review.

1. It needs only to be stated, in order to be admitted, that for disciples of Christ to desire pompous, worldly titles, is an indication of worldliness.

2. Both of the documents, now under examination, magnify the college so as to imply that it is "the pillar and ground of the truth," and only make mention of the Church of God in an incidental manner.

3. Both documents are an exhibition of ignorance concerning the correct use of English; also of ignorance concerning right reason and divine revelation.

4. The literary course, indicated in both documents, requires much reading and study of fiction, and therefore trains pupils in worldliness.

In regard to the first and second of the foregoing statements I only wish to say that for disciples of Christ to desire pompous, worldly titles, is an indication of that phase of worldliness called *pride*, and deserves to be rebuked whenever exhibited by them. Then for disciples of Christ to magnify a human institution of learning so as to imply that the Church of the living God, as the divine institution, is incapable of training men for teachers in the church, is an exhibition of irreverence, as well as of ignorance, in regard to the Bible.

But as J. A. Harding and J. N. Armstrong profess themselves to be *masters of arts*, I shall now examine their latest and best exhibitions of their "arts." The reader needs not to be surprised if I should find some "curious arts," in "Announcement and Catalogue [of] Potter Bible College." The second sentence on page seven of this document reads thus:

"He taught before entering college, while at college, and nineteen years since, twenty-two years in all."

This sentence says, "He taught . . . nineteen years since," and I submit, to every grammarian, who reads this paper, that President J. A. Harding, A. M., has here used the "past tense" for the "present perfect," and thus has said, "He taught since," instead of saying, "He *has* taught since." That is to say, he has made the simple past tense cover *three periods*, the last of which brings the mind to the *present*. This ignores the so-called "present perfect tense," as set forth in Rigdon's grammar, which Prof. Harding has adopted in his school, and is an exhibition of his ignorance in regard to common English.

On the ninth page of his catalogue I find the following:

"It is axiomatically certain that the Creator of all things, the omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent God, is the most capable of all beings of writing a book for man. God alone is perfect in knowledge."

The expression, "axiomatically certain," is pleonastic, and bombastic. An axiom is a self-evident truth, and, therefore, is a certainty. Hence to say "axiomatically certain," is equivalent to saying, *certainly certain*, or *truly true*, or *surely sure*.

But this is not all. The declaration, "God alone is perfect," shows that "President J. A. Harding, A. M." does not know the difference between the words "alone" and "only." The former means *isolated*, as "John *alone* can solve the problem," and is very different from this:—"Only John can solve the problem." "John alone," means John when isolated, and may imply that when John has some one with him he may not be able to solve the problem, or that he does not need any help to solve it. But the expression, "Only John," does not have any such implication. Now, what did President Harding wish to say—that only *God*, that is, God, to the *exclusion* of every other being, "is perfect in knowledge," or did he mean that God, *when isolated* from all other beings, and *without help* from any other being, "is perfect in knowledge"? The reader can easily decide, and, in deciding, can judge that the mentioned president of the mentioned college,

does not know the difference between the word "alone," which means *isolation*, and the word "only," which means *exclusion*.

I find the mistake which has just been exposed repeated in the third sentence on the page already designated. Besides, I find about a half-dozen other mistakes on that page, which a want of time, and space, will not permit me now to expose.

On the tenth page I find this:

"From these considerations it is intuitively certain."

Reader, the word intuition means "native perception," as contradistinguished from every process of reasoning. Therefore it is often said that "woman's intuition enables her to reach correct conclusions without a process of reasoning." But here is a college president titled, "Master of Arts" who presents a dozen or more truths, and then says, "From these considerations it is intuitively certain"!! He might have said *inductively* "certain," yet even that would have been pleonastic, for the word "considerations" implies the idea of induction when followed by the word "certain." But the declaration, "From these considerations it is intuitively certain," is a contradiction of terms. It is like saying, From this process of reasoning it is a certain intuition! Such a sentence would be both illogical and unrhretorical.

But this page of curiosities should not be dismissed without further notice. "Paul made tents that he might live," says this "Master of Arts." But in the ninth chapter of Paul's first letter to the church at Corinth is found a different doctrine. He declares in the 6th verse of that chapter that he had "power to forbear working," and in the 18th and 19th verses he says that he worked in order not to "abuse" his "power in the gospel," and that he "might gain the more." Thus it seems that this "Master of Arts" does not hesitate to misrepresent an inspired apostle, as well as ignore the rules of correct English. Here I pass from this page of curiosities, though I have not exposed all its errors.

On page fourteen I find this curiosity:

"The work of these two years is never intrusted to a tutor, since they are the important years of the course."

What are the other years? Are they not "important," or are they *unimportant*? "They are the *most* important years of the

course"—*this* is what an ordinary specimen of humanity would have said. But "President J. A. Harding, A. M.," says "They are the important years of the course," and thereby implies that the others are *not* "important"! He seems to be a master of "curious arts" in his use of English!!

Passing over a considerable number of curious errors of various kinds, I find, on the sixteenth page, the following:

"Without such a knowledge it is impossible properly to understand the divine word."

Here we learn that "President Harding, A. M." does not know the meaning of the word "understand," and, therefore, he uses the expression, "properly to understand the divine word"! Is it possible to "understand" "the divine word" *improperly*? Prof. Harding thus implies, and such an idea implies that we may "understand" other documents *improperly*. According to this the discrimination between "understand" and "misunderstand" is discarded! Reader, my acquaintance with Prof. Harding has convinced me that a *misunderstanding* often serves him better than an *understanding* of a word, a sentence, or a truth.

But read the following:

"The cost of the excursion to us is very little."

The foregoing curious little something is on the sixteenth page. Prof. Harding was writing about the annual excursion from Bowling Green to Mammoth Cave, but instead of saying, "The cost of the excursion is very little to us," or "To us the cost of the excursion is very little," he says "The cost of the excursion to us is very little." Reader, what do you think of that? Isn't it something wonderful to be a "President" of a college, and a "Master of Arts"? This "Master of Arts" does not seem to have learned that words, in their relations to each other, are artful somethings, and if not continually watched they will make him appear like a dealer in "curious arts." Instead of informing his readers about the cost of an excursion to "Mammoth Cave" he informs them concerning the cost of "the excursion to us"! Who, what, or where, is that "us," to which the mentioned excursion is to be taken?

But it is under the heading—"Terms"—that I find the rarest

curiosities, in this book of "curious arts," when viewed in the light of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and the Bible. On page twenty-one I find the following specimen of "arts":

"For board, lodging, lights, and tuition boys are charged fifty dollars per term; girls fifty-five dollars per term. These payments (\$50.00 for boys and \$55.00 for girls) are due on the first day of each term, namely, on September 26, 1905, and on January 30, 1906."

How many boys, and how many girls, will be accepted on the above-mentioned "terms"? We are informed that "boys" will be charged "fifty dollars per term," and "girls" "fifty-five dollars per term," but we are left to guess the number on each side of the house! Any ordinary specimen of humanity would have written the word *each*, in such a sentence, and, thus, would have declared explicitly that which "President Harding, A. M." has left to inference. What privileges a "Master of Arts" can arrogate to be his own!

But read the following curious sentence:

"Washing can be got at a cost of from one to two dollars per month."

This is a slight improvement over President Harding's sentence concerning "washing" in his previous catalogues. In several, or all, of them, he expressed himself thus:

"Washing can be got at about a dollar per month."

But my criticism on that sentence may have reached him, and for that reason, or some other, he has enlarged and modified his "washing" terms, but the awkwardness of the sentence remains the same. In two, at least, of his previous catalogues he indicated that his students were to *take in washing!* Notice the following:

"Dinah, how do you support your children since your husband's death?" "I gits washin' to do, sah." "Where?" "Up at de college." "For how much?" "I gits washin' to do, at about a dollar a month for ebery student."

In thus expressing herself, Dinah would show more clearness, and completeness, of expression, than did "President J. A. Harding, A. M.," for Dinah would thereby state the sum for each student. But look at the sentence of this "Master of Arts" even

in its improved form. The expression, "washing can be got," is the expression of the one who gets the washing to do. It is like saying, "Work can be got," which means WORK CAN BE OBTAINED! In this view of the meaning of the word "got" let us consider this: Work can be *obtained* at a cost of a dollar a day! This is a contradiction of terms, except on the supposition that the worker pays for doing the work! To say, "Work can be got *done* at a cost of a dollar a day," is clearer than if the word "done" is omitted, but its awkwardness makes it an abominable sentence, to be scorned by all who delight in correct English, and are not engaged in philological jugglery.

As a substitute for the above-given burlesque on President Harding's scholastic pretensions, I offer the following: *The cost of washing is from one to two dollars a month, for each pupil.*

Here I turn from the catalogue of the so-called "Potter Bible College," but I assure the reader that I do not turn from it because I have considered all its curiosities. On the contrary, if I could command time for amusement I might write much more, reviewing its curious violations of rules of righteousness. Its author boasts that he has spent thirty-two years in school—twenty-two as a teacher. Yet, strange to say, his catalogue indicates that he is incapable of writing common English with accuracy! His performance in his catalogues is a burlesque on his educational pretensions. In ancient Ephesus the gospel caused many who used "curious arts" to burn their books, and I would advise Prof. J. A. Harding, Master of Arts, to burn his catalogues, and then to send for A. M. Morris, W. S. Gibbins, or some other man, who never entered college, as a student, to teach him the right use of English, before he attempts to write any more documents of any kind. Those that I have seen from his pen suggest what a certain writer said about "a slimy eel, while yet in its native mud, lifting its head aloft, like the serpent of old, with words of pretended wisdom in its mouth." Such a performance, on the part of an eel, would be a reproach on the educational pretensions of this age. The same is true when a president of a college exhibits disregard of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and scripture,

in every catalogue that he sends forth, and yet declares himself to be a "Master of Arts"!

If J. A. Harding could be justly classed with young men I might apologize for his mistakes because of his proximity to the cradle, and if he could be classed with old men I might apologize for him by reason of his proximity to the grave. But he is in the midst of his mature manhood, and should be held to strict account.

It is the duty of every disciple of the Lord Jesus to let the truth be known concerning the so-called "Bible Colleges," which are serving Satan's purpose, in causing another division in the Church of God, also concerning the empty pretensions of the men who are presiding over some of them. It is our duty to show that such institutions are established without divine authority, and that they are in opposition to such authority. As a result they are of a church-dividing order of things. But this is not all. They are, in some instances, conducted by men who seem scarcely fit to teach a common school, if we may judge their scholarship by their catalogues.

But the catalogues which Prof. Harding has sent forth are not the only evidences that he gives of his capability with reference to "curious arts". Here is the first paragraph of a speech delivered by him at Odessa, Mo., as reported by Ex-Prof. Don Carlos Janes, and printed in a journal called "Primitive Christianity":

"I have only one theme — that of success. I would not be satisfied with a world. If I had one I would want another and if I had that I would want sixteen more. Aspire to stand at the top. If you reach the point where there is no higher place, build one. The one who is the most successful pleases God most. Success is to obtain the good will of God. To succeed more is to have the good will of God more; to succeed most is to have the good will of God most. Jesus is successful in this way."

Reader, here is a bunch of curiosities or "curious arts", which is made up of rare gems. Ex-Prof. Janes says that the report he made of the mentioned speech is "imperfect". I regret that he could not give to his readers a *perfect* report of that speech, for then we might have seen rarer gems than we now behold. But let us examine such as we here find. Prof. J. A. Harding, presi-

dent of the so-called "Bible College" near Bowling Green, Ky., says that he has "Only one theme—that of success. . . . The one who is the most successful pleases God most. Success is to obtain the good will of God. To succeed more is to have the good will of God more; to succeed most is to have the good will of God most. Jesus is successful in this way."

Reader, if the foregoing declarations are correct, then many scriptures will need revising. Instead of, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant"; we should read, "Well done, thou good and" SUCCESSFUL "servant." Instead of, "Thou hast been faithful over a few things" we should read, "Thou hast been" SUCCESSFUL "over a few things". Then the saying of our Savior, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life"; should read, "Be thou" SUCCESSFUL "unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life". But as we can not revise the word of God to suit these curiosities, we should designate them a slander on Jesus, and an expression of worldliness which rivals the outworkings of greed manifested by the worshipers of mammon.

But this is not all. Prof. Harding says, "I would not be satisfied with a world. If I had one I would want another, and if I had that I would want sixteen more".

In Proverbs 30:15, 16 we read this: "There are three things that are never satisfied, yea, four things say not, It is enough: the grave; and the barren womb; the earth that is not filled with water; and the fire that saith not, It is enough". But if the Solomon who wrote the Book of Proverbs had heard the speech of Prof. Harding at Odessa, Mo., Dec. 7, 1907, he might have learned that the president of a so-called "Bible College" "saith not, It is enough". Talk about covetousness, ambition, greed, foolishness—here is an expression of all of these evils that excels all that was ever manifested in this direction by all the Alexanders, Cæsars, and Napoleons, of ancient and modern times, if we may judge by their histories, and suggests a rivalry of the ambition of his Satanic Majesty, the devil, when he waged war in heaven. Moreover, SUCCESS as a standard of measuring is a Satanic doctrine, and is as widely separated from FAITHFULNESS TO

GOD as a standard of measuring, as earth is separated from heaven, or as hell is separated from the Throne of God.

When Prof. Harding addressed the students at Odessa he should have measured his words with scrupulous care, but instead of so doing he indulged in recklessness of speech which beggars description. He was so extravagant in his declarations that decent English is not sufficient to describe them. If I should designate them as impulsive, rash, reckless; foolish, I would feel as if I had only intimated in the direction of their real unreasonableness and unscripturalness, when measured by the New Testament. The Savior said, "Blessed are the meek," but Prof. Harding declares that which implies, Blessed are the ambitious, and even Blessed are they who are foolishly ambitious. Why would a frail, short-sighted, impulsive, specimen of humanity wish for "one" world, and then "another" if he had "one", not to speak of "sixteen more"?

Reader, I have shown to you that Prof. J. A. Harding, president of the so-called "Bible College" near Bowling Green, Ky., is crooked in English, and, in one respect, foolish in doctrine. But this same professor was, if we may believe his testimony, one of the men with whom this so-called "Bible College" idea originated. And in view of such an origin of that idea, should the Churches of Christ accept it as all right? Not until they deny the doctrine of Job when he said, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one". (Job 14:4); also the doctrine of Jesus, "If any man shall add unto these things God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." (Revelations 22:18)

I have written the foregoing comments presuming that the report made by Ex-Prof. Janes, though "imperfect", is not the *opposite* of the statements which Prof. Harding set forth in his speech at Odessa last December. I am, therefore, confident that I do not misrepresent the man whose speech I criticise. Notice the following from another paragraph of that speech: "If you are more devoted than Abraham (and why should not you be?) God will do more for you than he did for Abraham". I pronounce such a declaration utter recklessness for three reasons: (1), It is impossible for any human being to be more faithful to

God's commands than Abraham was; and (2), It ignores the gifts and callings of God to official position; and (3), The promise, "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed", referred to Christ, and it would be impossible for God to pronounce upon any other human being than Abraham such a blessing, not to speak of something "more". But what does Prof. Harding care for truth in that which he says? He would not be satisfied with "one" world nor with two, but if he could get two worlds he would want "sixteen more"! What can you expect of a man who would wish eighteen worlds? And what shall we think of the Nashville School, the Bowling Green College, the Odessa College, and the Beamsville (Ontario) School—all of which, in some measure, owe their existence to such a specimen of humanity as Prof. Harding is?

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S SEVENTEENTH REPLY.

THE QUESTION DESERTED.

There are six or eight of my articles containing essential matter that my respondent has left almost, or quite, untouched, and now sends to me an article about 4000 words in length on matters that do not touch the question. It seems to me that I have read somewhere of a "one-premise logic". Brother Sommer's last article is a brilliant manifestation thereof. "J. A. Harding is an incompetent man, therefore, it is wrong for Christians to establish schools in which to teach the Bible." There is not a good work in the world in which incompetent men do not engage, so according to this logic every good work is bad. It would even prove that it is wrong to establish Churches of Christ!

Brother Sommer has been forced from position to position from the time I stirred him from his tract until now. Every position has been taken from him, and now, deserting the whole question, he has gone off on a "tangent".

Most assuredly do I believe the displeasure of God rests upon the man that abuses the language of another as Brother Sommer abuses the language of those from whom he differs. Although it has *nothing whatever* to do with this debate, he has introduced and

mercilessly abused Brother Harding's speech at Odessa. Had the readers of this debate heard that speech, ninety-nine out of every hundred would have *heartily endorsed it*. You would have thought you had never heard a more powerful speech. I have heard many men make Chapel talks to young people, but I have never heard a man that could come so nearly calling every speck of man-hood in a boy out of him, thus inspiring him to be all that God would have him be. Brethren must not forget that even preachers, though unconsciously, it may be, are sometimes ruled by the green-eyed monster—Jealousy.

This last article is a direct attack on J. A. Harding against whom hundreds of Christians believe Brother Sommer to have a personal grudge of long standing. It is too bad that he would seek revenge in this debate for wrongs he thinks Harding has done him. God has a way to settle difficulties between brethren and it should be followed.

I have tried hard not to inflame the ill-feeling my respondent seems to have against Harding, but in spite of my care here is a whole article on Harding—nothing but Harding. Harding's competency has absolutely nothing to do with the question, so why introduce it here? Does my respondent use this occasion to give vent to his ill-feeling?

Had brother Harding a chance, and were he disposed, these two father's in Israel could have a bloody battle over English and nine-tenths of their readers would not know which was right. For my part, I do not propose to discuss English with my respondent, though his ado is over minor matters some of which are unquestionably right. Excuse me, for time and space are too precious to waste when hungry hearts are looking to this discussion for truth. Excuse me, brother Sommer, you can't decoy me. You yourself said "the Bible shall be the only standard of appeal for authority, so why did you introduce Rigdon's Grammar? Are you tired of the Bible as the standard?"

ALL writers and speakers make mistakes in English. Even my respondent in writing rules for this debate, made the same mistake four times on one short page. It looks as if it were a mistake because of ignorance, but I should rather think he was

"recklessly careless". Even in his criticisms of Harding he has made school-boy mistakes.

If brother Sommer wants to stoop to this kind of work—strife-making wrangling—his account must be to God. I am determined to give myself to the discussion of the question.

WHY WE ARE DEBATING WITHOUT A PROPOSITION.

Some sympathy has been aroused for my worthy respondent because he has been so "handicapped" and "embarrassed" by being "compelled to affirm a negative" in this debate. All who have kept up with the affair see his need for sympathy, but he needs none because of his "handicapped" position. Men are prone to blame others for their own failures. Much has been said by brother Sommer himself about our refusing (?) to affirm our real practice. Others have received the sweet (?) strain and sung it with melody in their hearts; thus our cowardice (?) has been sung far and wide. My respondent has declared us to be a set of the biggest cowards in Christendom. Were he to say we are common thieves he would not misrepresent us more than when he says we will not affirm our practice.

what about D. W. Gray and others who have written in the O. R. on the subject can't tell the truth at all.

"But what are the facts about the matter, anyhow?"

More than six years ago Potter Bible College, near Bowling Green, Ky., was established, and with this school began a terrific charge, a furious battle, that has raged from that day to this. The Review has held an open door to all who wanted to "butt in". Regardless of matter or spirit the gates have been wide open to anyone who would show the "depths of Satan" in us, but every window has been barred and every door locked against the other side. From behind the Chinese wall the one-sided battle has continued to rage. Unsuccessful efforts were made from time to time to get an even-handed discussion, but my respondent and his co-laborers insisted upon thrusting propositions upon us that none of us could conscientiously affirm. I should as soon affirm that "the Devil is good" as to affirm propositions offered to me by Daniel Sommer. Because we would not let men who do not know our work state our practice, they have dogmatically

affirmed that we would not affirm it. We have an inalienable right to refuse to affirm any proposition that we do not believe, yea, it is our duty to do so. Every one of these propositions that I have seen involves the very question in dispute, calls on us to affirm the very thing to be proved. A foundation of solid rock (?) for saying we WILL NOT affirm our practice!!!

When our school at Odessa was announced, the battle behind the wall increased in fury. Every opposer that could wield a pen "buted in" and told the O. R. readers how mean (?) we are and how sinful (?) our work. We thought it best for the cause of Christ to let this all go unnoticed, for the spirit and manner that characterized the battle was, for the most part, bad. For two years we bore the "pitch-fork" attack, chiefly personal, but by this time some christians in the West that did not know us began to look with suspicion on us and wonder if we were as wicked as they had heard we were. This state of affairs induced us to make another effort to get an even-handed discussion, that the truth might not suffer. I thought every window

In Oct. 1906, I wrote a short article setting forth our work as I know it to be, and sent it to the O. R. office. In this article I stated our readiness and willingness to affirm our practice. Brother Sommer replied in a very ugly way, using nearly three columns. My proposition was ridiculed and my "ignorance" and "dullness" commented on. Instead of my proposition he offered two:

1. "It is scriptural to use a part of the Lord's money to establish schools that are three-fourths secular, and largely ungodly, in order to afford certain preachers an opportunity to teach pupils in certain parts of the Bible."
2. "It is scriptural to use the word 'Bible' in naming schools that are three-fourths secular, and largely ungodly, and to use fallacies in advocating them, and then, refuse to consider what is said against them, and divide the Church of God in contending for them," With confidence my respondent added: "If Prof. Armstrong is disposed to 'affirm his practice' let him affirm the foregoing propositions, for they set forth the practice of himself and others."

and every door was closed against them. D. W. Gray

1. I was called on to affirm that it is scriptural to use God's money in establishing schools that are "largely ungodly".
2. To affirm that it is scriptural to "use fallacies in advocating" these "ungodly institutions".
3. To affirm that it is scriptural to "refuse to consider what is said against" these "ungodly" things.
4. That it is scriptural to contend for these "ungodly" things unto the dividing of the Church of God.

Brethren, these are the only propositions Daniel Sommer ever offered to me. Do you wonder why this debate had to be conducted without a proposition? In the language of my respondent I say: "The reader understands why we cannot agree on a definite proposition", though it is not "because the advocates of such colleges, as are in question, *will not*, and *WILL NOT*, and *WILL NOT* affirm their real position."

I also proposed in my article, "If a proposition cannot be agreed upon, we are willing, if time and place can be agreed upon, to discuss the question with Bro. Sommer without a definite proposition." Brother Sommer accepted the proposal to debate without a proposition and to our surprise *chose* to lead in the discussion. He voluntarily took upon himself the "embarrassing position" of "affirming a negative". He actually "handicapped" himself all the way through by *electing* to lead. When I proposed a debate without a definite proposition, I expected to lead. Why not? But why was my respondent so quick to "handicap" and "embarrass" himself "by affirming a negative"? His treatment of my affirmative argument throughout this debate explains, I believe, why he "jumped up" so quickly and said, "I'll lead". HE WAS AFRAID FOR US TO LEAD!!!

MORAL AND RELIGIOUS TRAINING INSEPARABLE.

There has been much advice given by the opposers of our work concerning the teaching of morality in, and the exclusion of religion from, the school-room. In a few words I want to show you the impossible character of the advice.

Religion is the very soul of morality and morality is one of

the most cherished purposes of religion. The two are as inseparable as the tree and its fruit. Every system of morality that lifts up men must be impregnated and vitalized by religious principles. A people's moral life is never higher than its religious life. An individual in a community may have a purer moral life than his religious life would inspire, but his moral life is a derivative of the religion of his country. The moral corruption of Greece and Rome was the natural result of their religions. To improve a peoples' morals we *must* improve their religion. To attempt to teach morality on other basis is vain. It is building on sand. History fully sustains the statement that no religion except that of the Bible has ever been sufficient to produce and support a pure and elevating system of morality. God is the only Author of religion and morality, and any system of morals that ignores the "Supreme Source" of right and duty dishonors God and brings corruption to men. A system of morals based on any other authority is as false as a system of religion based on other authority. All effective moral training must be based on a true knowledge of God, must be vitalized by the principles and influences of His religion. There is no inspiring and restraining influence on human conduct so great as the fear of the ALL Seeing Eye. The consciousness that "Thou God seest me" is one of the greatest vanquishers of temptation.

White in his "Elements of Pedagogy" says: "The exclusion of all thought of that Omniscient Eye from school training would be like shutting out the light of the sun and substituting the glimmer of candles." Again he says: "If it be conceded that effective moral training is the central duty of the public school, it must also be conceded that whatever is an essential means to such training should have due place in its instruction and discipline." "To what extent," says he, "can religious motives and influence be used in public schools?" After discussing this question and approving a "practical means" he adds: "In view of the imperative need of the most vital moral training possible in our schools, this *necessary* use of religious influence should receive universal approval. The great majority of American schools are religious without being sectarian, and it is high time that this fact was more

universally recognized. . . . I share Mr. Huxley's serious perplexity in seeing how the needed measure of religious influence in our schools can be secured without the presence of the Bible; and yet, to this end, its formal and stated reading may not be essential, since there are other ways in which its vitalizing truths may be brought home to the conscience and the life."

Horace Mann, in speaking on the basis of effective moral training in school, says: "There is not a faculty nor a susceptibility in the nature of man . . . that will ever be governed by its proper law, or enjoy a full measure of the gratification it was adapted to feel, without a knowledge of the true God, without a sense of acting in harmony with his will and without spontaneous effusions of gratitude for his goodness." He further says: "Devoid of religious principles and religious affections, the race can never fall so low but that it may sink still lower; animated and sanctified by them, it can never rise so high but that it may ascend still higher."

I have quoted from these authors to show that it is a conceded fact that a religious basis must be laid in every heart before effective moral training can be done, and to show, also, that all schools are "religio-secular". The "perplexity" as to how to obtain this religious base is due to the sectarianism of this age. The base must not be "sectarian", and the Jews of New York have decided that any reference to Christ is "sectarian" and must be excluded. This religious base must be thin enough to include the Jew and liberal enough to include the evolutionist and the higher critic.

If the history of the human family from the garden of Eden until now has demonstrated one thing beyond the shadow of doubt, that thing is that man in a six-thousand-years' effort has utterly failed to establish a system of moral living that has prevented moral rotteness. Every attempt has been crowned with flourishing failure. Man has been as successful in founding religions as in founding moral living. To talk of moral culture apart from God, the faith that overcometh the world, is to show gross ignorance of the universal failure of the past, and unbelief in God and his institution. All history and the Bible declare there is but one

basis of moral life—faith in the God of the Bible; In Jesus, the son, born of the virgin Mary; and in the Bible as the inspired word of God. The higher critic, the evolutionist, and other infidels in the churches and schools are as certainly undermining the morals of this country as they are robbing its hearts of faith. To the extent that this base is forsaken, to that extent will the lust-satisfying life of Greece and Rome be repeated.

"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God: . . . Whatsoever is begotten of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our faith. And who is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" 1. Jno. 5:1—5.

After man had irredeemably failed, God offered a system of moral living and guaranteed success to every one that would accept it. He teaches in the face of man's succession of failures that his plan is the only salvation from moral corruption; that it is the victory that overcometh the world. The world admits that God's system includes the purest, the noblest, and severest morals ever taught. Gibbon of Rome said that one cause of the success of the early followers of Christ was "the pure and austere morals of christians."

The plan embodies the very wisdom of God unto moral living, and is infinitely perfect. I should as soon think of attempting to improve upon God's plan to save men from the *guilt* of sin as to think of attempting to improve on his plan to save men from *moral* corruption.

Beloved, this system of God has been sacredly committed to the Church. It is as distinctly and peculiarly the work of the Church to propagate and establish among men this purity of life as it is its work to offer the blood of Jesus for the guilt of sin. Indeed, to establish right living among men is one of the primary purposes of the Church. Neither can there be found on the earth moral life worth the name save where the Church has borne fruit.

Since the Church is the pillar and ground of this moral life, one as truly robs God of glory when he teaches morality in any other name than Christ's and in the name of any other institution than the Church as he does when he sings, prays, preaches, or feeds the

hungry, in some other name and through some other institution. To teach a different morality, or teach morality from any other view-point than God's, is to impeach the wisdom of God, deny we are complete in Christ, and imply a deficiency in the Church. From these conclusions there is no escape. Truly, through all ages God must be glorified "IN THE CHURCH".

Again, I say, the principle that forbids our teaching the Bible, any lesson of it, in school because it is CHURCH WORK, drives out every moral lesson and turns all moral training and character-building in school over to the Devil and his agents. Christians who continue to oppose our school must advocate (if they advocate schools at all) schools for intellectual training only (impossible schools) or exclude all Christians from the school-room, thus turning the whole business over to the Devil.

In no other way than in that set forth in my last reply on the Church, may Christians continue to teach morality in school without dishonoring God. As bondservants of God they may teach anything that God authorizes the Church to teach. Christians are the only true educators in the world. To recognize an unbeliever as a teacher of the young is a sin against this age, and for a Christian to talk of teaching morality to anybody save as a Church work, in the name of Jesus, is dishonoring to God. Schools controlled by Christians are the only schools in which morality may be taught as God would have it taught. Woe be to the man that fights the only schools in which God is truly honored!

Feb. 4, 1908.

DANIEL SOMMER'S SECOND ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE INCOMPETENCY OF MY OPPONENT AND CERTAIN OTHER PRETENDERS.

I now call attention to a document titled "Year Book of the Western Bible and Literary College" established at Odessa, Mo. On the 7th page of that document, I find these curious sentences:

"Man is born an animal, but is capable of being a god. In every child there is an embryo god and the college is set for the development of this embryo."

Then on the 47th page I find this curiosity:

"We should be educated, that we may be men and women and not mere animals".

Reader, what do you think of all this? If "in every child there is an embryo [embryonic] god," how is it that if children are not educated they become "mere animals"? What becomes of this supposed "embryo" in those who are not educated? Does it shrivel, or decay, till it ceases to exist? Such is the implication when the sentences quoted from the "Year Book" are carefully examined. They imply that all men, and women, who are not "educated" according to J. N. Armstrong's use of the word "education," are "mere animals." This is a contemptible reproach on all who are not educated, according to the mentioned idea, and should be hurled back at its author with indignation by all classes of men and women. Besides, it is positive infidelity concerning the Bible. In Zech. 12:1, we learn that God "forms the spirit of man within him," and the idea that the spirit, formed in mankind, by the divine Father, ceases to exist when it does not receive sufficient secular learning to be regarded as "educated," in the college use of that word—that idea I say is *positive infidelity*.

Nor is this all. The word "gods" was applied in the Bible to certain men by reason of their official character. See Ex. 7:1; Ps. 82:6; John 10:34, 35. But this writer of "curious arts," whose titles are "Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts," declares that "in every child there is an embryo god," and thereby implies that an undeveloped "god" is in mankind by nature. Here is more infidelity!! And here is still more. If children are not educated, then they can not become either men or women, but will be "mere animals"!! How wonderful, and how curious, is the condition of this "President" who is a "Bachelor of Arts," likewise a "Master of Arts"!!!

Before taking our leave of the sentences quoted from the mentioned "Year Book," let us look at them again:

"Man is born an animal, but is capable of being a god. In every child there is an embryo god, and the college is set for the development of this embryo."

Now read the following: "And the serpent said unto the

woman, Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." (Gen. 3:4, 5.)

Now the reader can understand the origin of the doctrine that man is "capable of being a god." That old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan (Rev. 12:9), is its author, and was its first advocate! He urged that doctrine on our mother Eve, in opposition to God's word, and deceived her so that she sinned against God. J. N. Armstrong is now urging that same doctrine on sons and daughters of Eve, and is deceiving some of them! But read the following:

"The philosophical Gospel by John is studied in various ways."

What about the *unphilosophical* gospel by John? Will it be studied? What is the meaning of such an expression? "The philosophical Gospel by John"! That expression concerning the gospel of Christ, as written by the apostle John, is like the learned nonsense which has been written of the "Pauline conception of Christ," the "Petrine conception," and the "Johanian conception." Such writing may interest students of "curious arts," but plain people will hold it in contempt.

Now, I come to a more difficult part of this chapter. My readers are, perhaps, better acquainted with the Bible than with rules of English grammar. Therefore I may find difficulty in enabling them to understand that "J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M." is not a grammarian. Still all my readers are aware that it is not grammatical to say, *they does*, nor *they is*. Yet in the "Year Book" before me, I find such violations of grammar as those just mentioned. For instance, on the eighth page of that document, I find this sentence:

"Not only is the influence of the individual circumscribed by his intellectual development, but also does the power and influence of every nation depend upon the mental development of its subjects."

The foregoing sentence is a curiosity from the viewpoint of rhetoric, and logic, as well as of grammar, and I shall examine it from each of those viewpoints.

GRAMMAR.

Let us look at the latter part of the sentence under examination. We are aware that books on grammar, generally, teach that two nouns, or substantives of any kind, in the singular, when united by the word "and," require a verb in the plural. In view of this, look at the expression, "power and influence." Therein are two words, which may be designated as nouns, or substantives. The word "power" is one of them and the word "influence" is the other. These words are united by the word "and." Therefore, as books on grammar, generally, teach, it is evident that those words, thus united, should have a plural verb, or a verb in the plural form. Yet, "J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M.," writes those words with the singular form "does." Grammar teaches us to say, "I *do*, you *do*, he, she or it *does*; we *do*, you *do*, they *do*." Thus it is that the present tense of the verb *to do*, is conjugated, but the president of the so-called college at Odessa, Mo., places himself on record as ignoring the doctrine of the very author on grammar that he recommends. That author, in his "Grammar for the Common School," says this:

"A verb having two or more subjects connected by *and* must be plural; as, "He and I are brothers."

In opposition to the foregoing rule, "J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M.," says, "but also does the power and influence" instead of saying, *do* "the power and influence." His mistake, when examined by his grammar, is equivalent to saying, *They does!* I don't endorse the grammar he uses, but I convict him of error by its rule on this subject.

RHETORIC.

Grammar pertains to the *form* of sentences, rhetoric pertains to the *sound* of sentences; and logic pertains to the *truth* of sen-

tences. Bearing this in mind, look again at the sentence previously quoted.

"Not only is the influence of the individual circumscribed by his intellectual development, but also does the power and influence of every nation depend upon the mental development of its subjects."

Let us look at that sentence again, and try it by the ear. "Doth not the ear try words?" (Job 12:11.) What advantage is gained by the words, "also does"? Read the latter part of that sentence without them, thus: "but the power and influence of every nation depend upon the mental development of its subjects." This is clear, strong, correct, from the viewpoint of grammar and rhetoric. Therefore, the words "also does," are unnecessary—redundant—incorrect—when measured by rhetoric, which requires the rejection of redundant, or pleonastic words.

LOGIC.

As previously stated, "logic pertains to the truth of sentences." Therefore, the sentence, under examination, is illogical, because it is not true without modification. It is too sweeping in its declarations, for it bases ALL "power and influence" on "mental development." Notice the expressions, "the influence," "the power and influence." Those expressions ignore God's providence, and man's physical health. Read the 127th psalm; also Eccl. 9:11. If "J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M.," had inserted the word "generally" or "chiefly," or "largely" he might have saved his curious sentence, which we have just reviewed, from the charge that it is *illogical*. If that sentence had been written by a youth, we might apologize for it by reason of its author's immaturity, and if it had been written by an old man, we might apologize for it by reason of its author's imbecility. If it had appeared in a newspaper article we might excuse its errors by the supposition that it was written in haste. But it was written by a man, in the vigor of his early manhood, and was written for publication in a document in

which the excellency of English should be set forth. Therefore the severity of dignified justice should prevail against it, and its author should be made to feel emptiness and absurdity of his pompous titles.

Let my readers be patient. I have only begun to uncover curiosities, when the document before me is measured by grammar, rhetoric, and logic. I copy from the eighteenth page of the mentioned "Year Book," the following sentence:

The total expenses for one year for regular literary work in Western Bible and Literary College is:

For young men.....	\$108 00
For young women.....	120 00

GRAMMAR.

Remember, my readers, that grammar pertains to the *form* of sentences, and now look at the *form* of the foregoing sentence. Its author says, "The total expenses . . . is." The word "expense" has a well-marked singular, and plural, form. Therefore to say, "expenses . . . is," or *expense are*, falls under condemnation when measured by grammar.

But this is not all. By omission of the word *each*, or *every*, in connection with "young men" and "young women," the author of the foregoing sentence is obscure in speech. Instead of saying, "For young men (each)," as he does on the opposite page of his "Year Book," he says, "For young men, \$108.00." without indicating the number of "young men." Does some one plead that all can understand what the author of that sentence means? I answer, Yes, and all can understand what a little child means by saying "Me want apple." But that is not grammatical. Neither is it grammatical to say "Expenses . . . is . . . for young men, \$108.00."

RHETORIC.

But let us glance at the foregoing sentence from the viewpoint of rhetoric. Read it over, and try it by the ear. "The

total expenses for one year for regular literary work?" How does the repetition of the word "for" in that sentence impress the ear,—“for one year for regular literary work.” Certainly the repetition of that word is redundant, and offends the ear. Reader, how do you like this: The total expenses *during* one year, for regular literary work, *are* thus and so? But read the following, which I copy from the same page:

“In case your son or daughter spends more than you think is necessary, find fault with *him*, and not with us.”

What does the reader think of that? The words “daughter” and “him” are required to agree. Is not this “A. B., A. M.” a wonderful something? “In case your . . . daughter spends more than you think is necessary, find fault with *him*, and not with us.” This means that the “daughter” is changed in sex, when she spends too much, or that the “son” should be blamed for what his sister spends, or that femininity is to be ignored at Odessa College, or that “J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M.,” who is “president” of the college at Odessa, Missouri, can not write ordinary English with ordinary accuracy!!!

Now let us read near the bottom of the 15th page of this curious “Year Book,” and see the following:

“The papers having uncovered the weaknesses, the teacher is better enabled to fortify against them, and to thus round out his class.”

Look at the expression—“to thus round out his class”—and behold its awkwardness. Do you ask, What is wrong with it? I answer, It violates a common rule for the government of writers in English. That rule is this: “The sign of the infinitive form of the verb should not be separated from the verb to which it belongs, by the insertion of any other word, or words.” But here “J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M.,” has inserted the word “thus” between the word “to,” as the sign of the infinitive, and the verb, “round,” to which it belongs. As a result he has said—“to thus

round out”—instead of saying, “thus to round out.” This may seem like a small matter to those who have never studied English Grammar with care, but it is what newspaper men designate as “splitting infinitives,” and those guilty of it are regarded as un-scholarly. But read the following, which I copy from the 11th page of the curiosity before me.

“Students who should be doing Freshmen are not to be found doing Sophomore work.”

Are you staggered at the idea of students “doing Freshmen,” at a Bible college? They try to “do” them, as it is commonly expressed, at other colleges. Of course, this is not what “J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M.” intended to set forth. He meant doing the work of Freshmen, but by his awkwardness he suggests another idea, causes a jostling of thought, provokes a smile, and forces the conviction that his pompous titles are empty and ridiculous.

Now, I invite attention to something I find on the 7th page, under the heading—“Education”—and wish the reader to consider it.

“Since it is to the intellect that we trace the source of all that is noble and true, the college keeps before its students high ideals of intellectual development.”

Readers, if your life depended on it, you could not tell what the foregoing sentence was intended to mean. It does not state that it is *by* the intellect that we trace *to* the source, nor that it is *to* the intellect that we trace *as* the source. But it says, “Since it is to the intellect that we trace the source.” The word “trace” means “to delineate with marks; to copy (a drawing) by following the lines, and marking them on a sheet; to follow the trace, or track of.” Therefore we may “trace” a stream to its “source,” but what is meant by this statement: “Since it is to the intellect that we trace the source”? As a certain caustic writer said of a certain ungrammatical sentence, “Execrable shape! What art thou?”

Here I pause, and I do so with mingled emotions of pity and contempt. On a majority of the pages of the "Year Book" which I have been reviewing, I find from one to a dozen violations of grammar, rhetoric, or logic, or a violation of the teaching of the Bible. I find much fiction imposed in its literary course, and many pretensions in regard to "thoroughness." At the same time I find that the author of the "Year Book" of the college at Odessa, Missouri, gives evidence that he is not even a good student, and as a result is not a competent instructor.

But, at this juncture of thought, I am reminded of the encomium pronounced on him by the president of "Potter Bible College" near Bowling Green, Kentucky, wherein President Armstrong was a teacher for several years. Here it is:

J. N. Armstrong, Professor of the Greek Language and Literature, and instructor in the Bible, a graduate of the Nashville Bible School, having received the degree of Bachelor of Arts, has taught Greek for eight years; for two years he has also taught classes in the Bible and for one year a class in Hebrew. Professor Armstrong was an experienced teacher before he entered college. He is exceptionally strong, clear, and thorough. He is thirty-three years of age.

I have copied the foregoing paragraph from the 9th page of the catalogue of "Potter Bible College," as issued for "1903-1904." Who pronounced the foregoing encomium? Prof. J. A. Harding, president of "Potter Bible College." Does he understand English grammar? The following sentence will indicate.

Washing can be got at about one dollar per month."

But this curiosity has been exposed, and I need not entertain the readers with it again. Does Prof. Harding know enough to pronounce an encomium on Prof. Armstrong? Yes; but what is it worth?

I have shown that J. N. Armstrong is not capable of writing correct English, and have given an index to J. A. Harding's lack

of English scholarship. If those men can not write correct English, who can trust them in Greek and Hebrew? If I should write concerning those self-constituted educators, what justice suggests, the reader might regard me as harsh. Therefore I refrain from describing them, except to say that they are self-deceived, and are destined to work division in the church in proportion as apostolic disciples refuse to believe the truth concerning them, and refuse to regard them as deceivers.

In the documents which I have examined, in the foregoing pages, there is abundant evidence that their authors don't understand the Bible, and that they don't know how to study the Bible in order to understand it. For instance, "President J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M.," pretends to teach his pupils the Bible. But where does he begin and end? "Joshua, Judges, first and second Samuel, first and second Kings, and first and second Chronicles"—these are the only books of the Old Testament which are advertized in his regular course of study, in the document now under examination. The writings of Moses, the book of Ruth, the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, the five poetic books, and the seventeen prophetic books—thirty-one books in all—are ignored! What can pupils understand of the Old Testament without beginning with Genesis? Who can understand arithmetic, grammar, or history, while ignoring the first and last parts, and only taking a few chapters which intervene? Yet J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M., pretends to instruct pupils in the Bible, but passes over the first five books, and twenty-six other books of the Old Testament!! And this is the man who pretends, and even declares, that pupils are required to be "thorough" in their studies, while in the college over which he presides!!! What does a man know about "thoroughness," who thus trifles with the Old Testament, and who thus trifles with his pupils in regard to it? He seems never to have studied the third chapter of Genesis, or he might have learned that the doctrine which declares that uninspired man is "capable of being a god" is the doctrine of "that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, who deceiveth the whole world."

Possibly some one may inquire, why I have not mentioned the catalogue of the "Nashville Bible School." With reference to

that particular document I have only time and space for a few remarks.

1. Its appearance is so neat that it tends to disarm criticism.
2. I have thought that it may have been written by a man, far advanced in life, and I am not disposed to criticise the performances of the aged.
3. In the Nashville Bible School J. N. Armstrong received his titles, and that is an index to its inefficiency.
4. It requires students to read fiction enough to counteract much of the Bible that is taught in the school which sends it forth, to advertise its courses of study.

In conclusion I state concerning the catalogue sent forth by the "Nashville Bible School," likewise concerning the catalogues sent forth by J. A. Harding and J. N. Armstrong, that each of them requires the study of sufficient fiction to blast the life of every pupil who studies it, and does not afterwards turn from the downward course which it suggests. Fiction, especially Shakespeare's writings, and such like, prepares young people for the theater, and the theater prepares them for perdition. An experienced teacher in a public school in Missouri said to me, not long since, "I have just drilled a class in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, and some of the pupils have begun to inquire of me when that play will be performed in a theater in Kansas City." The experience of that teacher is in harmony with general observation. This being true it may be safely stated that the so-called "Bible" schools and colleges, that we oppose, are engaged in the two-fold work of training pupils for heaven by teaching them the Bible, and training them for perdition by teaching them fiction. This is another phase of Satan's "curious arts" by which he endeavors to deceive and destroy mankind.

Here I take my leave of so-called Bible college presidents, and their catalogues. In so doing I separate from misguided men, and erroneous things. Perfection is not to be found in those who dwell in "houses of clay," yet something better than constant blundering should be expected of those who profess to be Masters of Arts.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S EIGHTEENTH REPLY.

APPEALS MADE IN THE NAME OF CHRISTIANITY.

It has been asked if we do not connect in an unlawful way the schools with the Church and its work "by association, by implication, and by act", in appealing for them in the name of Christianity, and in accepting help thus rendered. Here I desire to emphasize the truth that I have already taught on this point.

"Whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus" Col. 3:17. When a Christian asks other Christians to help him care for his sick wife, get him some wood, buy him a horse, a farm, or a school-house, he ought to ask in the name of Christ. When I respond to such appeals I should be afraid to do it in any other name than that of Jesus of Nazareth. In whose name were appeals made in the Review for Sexton's home, Fujimori's farm, Timmons' horse, and Barkers saw-mill? In whose name did Christians respond to these appeals? Not only so, but did this appealing, responding, and receiving, connect "by association, by implication, and by act, this home, this farm, this horse, and this saw-mill, "with the Church and its work"? Who will squarely meet the issue on these points?"

I don't believe a Christian can give anything—time, strength, thought, love, deeds, or money—that is not the Lord's. The Christian belongs to God, body, soul, and spirit. If he gives anything he must give of God's things. All I am or can be "justly belongs to the Lord" and should be used to his glory. I am glad to help Fujimori buy a farm, Sexton a home, Barker a saw-mill, or Timmons a horse, if these brethren will use these things as means and opportunities to forward the work of God in their hands. If by a farm Fujimori can make more opportunities to teach the gospel to the Japanese and thus build up the kingdom of God, I am glad to help him pay for the farm. But I am just as glad to help brother McCaleb buy grounds and put buildings on them for school purposes, if this school will open to him opportunities to teach God's word that he could not otherwise have. If, through the school and

the farm, these brethren can open to themselves a more effectual door of utterance in that land, I am glad to pray for them, work for them, and give for them, in the name of Christianity.

Again I affirm that I have the "right" and "authority" to ask Christians to help me do *anything* that I cannot do alone, if it be right for me to do that thing. Helpfulness is one of the ground principles of the kingdom of God. "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ."

A strong effort has been made to cause people to believe that the schools are money-making businesses; that the teachers themselves are money-lovers, and have added a "sacred name . . . in order to *get the cash*"; that the appeals for help are based on this and various other schemes of deception; and that those who help in the work are adding to the teachers' personal possessions. Many such unjust reports have been circulated.

Beloved, will you bear with me in a little "foolishness"? While appeals are constantly being made in the papers, in the name of Christianity, that add to the personal possessions of those helped, so far as I know, no such appeals have ever been made for Bible schools. Fujimori's farm, Sexton's, home, Timmons' horse, Barker's saw-mill, and the Octographic Review, are notable cases in which personal possessions have been increased. These brethren own these things as personally and as legally as I own the desk that the students of Odessa gave me last year as a gracious gift. The desk is mine. I can do as I please with it. I appreciate the goodness of these students and should feel that I were a thief were I to use the desk selfishly. But they have trusted me implicitly with it. If Christians want to give Bro. Sommer a gift—a paper—paying twelve thousand dollars for it, I haven't a word to say against it. He can sell this gift or keep it—control it as fully as any Christian can his own farm. If Christians are willing to trust him thus, it is alright. If he betray the trust he is accountable to God. If such appeals are good and such help is scriptural why should *we* be condemned *had* we received such help? Men would not grab at such straws save in an extremity.

Twelve years have I taught in these schools, six at Nashville, four at Bowling Green, and two at Odessa. Five years of this

time I received about thirty five dollars per month, four years less than half of this amount, the other three from twenty to thirty dollars per month. This is how "rich" the school has made me, and no other teacher has received more than I have in proportion to his needs. My salary as a public school teacher when I was a twenty-year-old boy was greater than it has ever been in Bible school work.

Besides the "big salary" that the schools have paid me, I gave more than two hundred dollars in clean cash to help pay for the grounds and building at Odessa. Legally I have no more claim on that property than I have on Fujimori's farm in Japan, and I have as much as any other teacher has. If the teachers in these schools were not willing to teach for one half (often much less) what they could command in other schools, every Bible school would close its doors today. Schools that pay their teachers good salaries have their grounds and building given to them and in addition have large endowments. Most of the teachers in Bible school work would rather make their living after and before school hours than to receive a "fat salary" and be deprived of preaching God's word to the young in these schools. This teaching is so effectual that to turn away from such an opportunity would be to turn to a less effectual door.

"PREACHER-MANUFACTURING COMPANIES."

If possible, the charge that our school is a "clergyman-making" school is the most inexcusable of all the false charges against us. This charge shows almost criminal ignorance, or willful falsifying on the part of those responsible for it.

It not only hurts the man himself, but also the cause he represents, for him to misrepresent his opponent's position. For brother Sommer to stand before our school and say it was a "pastor-making" school was to hurt himself and the truth he might have had, for the students knew he was ignorant or was willfully misrepresenting every-day facts, and in either case could not be trusted for his statements. It characterized him as a man who would, at least, speak positively of things of which he was ignorant.

During the eight years that I was connected with the Nashville Bible School, there was not a Bible class in school that was not for boys and girls, believers and unbelievers, "preachers" and "non-preachers". There was absolutely no difference made in the Bible training between the Christian that expected to farm and the Christian that expected to "preach". The whole influence was against the clergy-laity idea. And, never was this idea combatted more persistently than at Potter Bible College during the four years that I taught in it. Should a man say these schools train women to be public preachers he would not misrepresent the facts more than those who say they train "clergymen."

What I have said of the Nashville Bible School and of Potter Bible College, I say emphatically of Western Bible and Literary College. So closely has the clergy idea been combatted that I have heard in all of these schools vigorous opposition urged in public meetings against such work as that done by M. C. Kurfees, Geo. A. Klingman, and others. I have known young men to come into the schools with their long-tailed coats, their preacher airs and their preacher tones, but invariably, if they remained in the school, they were stripped of their clerical manner of dress, and robbed of their "holy" tone. There are a thousand living eye-witnesses of these naked facts. We were complimented in the oral discussion at Odessa that the preachers that stood for the school were far less clerical in manner, dress, and general appearance, than the preachers who opposed the school.

In our Bible teaching we emphasize the obligation resting upon every Christian to save others, to work for Christ. We stress the fact that every Christian entered the ministry of Christ when he became a Christian, and to that service he owes his powers. The teaching of the Bible just as it makes evangelists, elders, deacons, teachers, house-to-house preachers, home-keepers, in fact, all kinds of workers that are approved of God. It leads every Christian to give his life in the Master's work according to his ability and sphere in life. We emphasize the fact that a man does not have to be anything but a Christian, a New Testament Christian, to please God. This covers the whole ground. If a man does not feel that he must preach to be saved he is not fit to preach the gospel.

Yes, we could have "peace" if we would just endorse any thing and everything taught and practiced by imitators. This

he lacks the first essential. The Christians in these schools advocate the principles that rid the Church of the professional preacher as few other Christians known to me.

My respondent's last two articles, which are a treatise (?) on English grammar, are personal thrusts at Harding and me. Our agreement excludes personalities, and all human standards of appeal. He has, no doubt, forgotten this item. This discussion was intended to be a search for Bible truth. The brotherhood of Christ are anxiously waiting for the pamphlet that is to contain it. Peace and union, love and good feeling among brethren, yea, the very truth of Christ, is involved. Why will brother Sommer trifle with this serious question by trying to turn this discussion into a wrangle over English construction? Does't he want union, peace, good feeling, and love, among brethren? Does he really want to stir up ill-feeling, strife, envy, jealousy, and division? Is he trying to feed the spirit of party and prejudice? Is he ignoring the earnest entreaty of the Holy Spirit to strive to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace? What have I done that brother Sommer manifests such bitter feelings toward me? True, I married Harding's daughter but why should his anathemas against Harding reach unto me? Before he ever saw me and knew but little of me he ceased to call me "brother". Is his bitterness against Harding so deep that he disfellowships those related to him? What does my competency, Harding's competency or Sommer's competency, have to do with the righteousness of establishing Bible schools? No one of us has ever been "bitten by Solomon's dog". There is not a living man that ever heard me lay claim to great scholarship or boast of what I know. I have never heard J. A. Harding boast of his learning. Neither of us ever made the pretensions to learning that my respondent makes. If we had become self-appointed critics, and self-appointed regulators of men and things, I could see some excuse for these personal stabbings. If my respondent were a "fop" just graduated with a "swelled head", I could understand why he constitutes himself a critic of authors and teachers. Beloved, he is irredeemably defeated and unless he were willing to confess frankly his error, there is but one course for him and that is to destroy my personal influence.

These personalities are strong appeals to the ignorant, the prejudiced, and the partisan. With others they can but injure brother Sommer. He has abused some of our writings and you whom he expects to influence by these criticisms have *his word* that our English is bad. He did not write them for those who are able to judge for themselves in matters of grammar. Many of you are *truly* educated in heart, yet you know comparatively nothing about English construction. Brother Sommer knows this and takes advantage of it. He really felt called upon to inflect the present tense of the verb "to do", prefacing it with: "I may find difficulty in enabling them to understand that 'J. N. Armstrong, A. B., A. M.' is not a grammarian. Still all my readers are aware that it is not grammatical to say *they does nor they is.*" He felt called upon to simplify his criticisms to what he evidently considers your limited understanding. There are hundreds of truly educated hearts that want to read this debate that would be lost if their soul's salvation depended on their knowing what is wrong grammatically with "they is". Then were you to place before them such a sentence as: "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.", great would be their confusion. They would see the three words connected by "and" and yet the verb is "is". As I think of my own mother I rejoice that her salvation does not depend on her ability to tell what is ungrammatical with "they is". While she is not scholarly, she has been educated by the great teachers, God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit. Many a mother has said to me since I have been in this school work: "I send him here, not for grammar, but for that better education". Such a mother has a far truer education than many of the scholarly of the land. She realizes that without this "better education" her sons and daughters will not only not be men and women, but will sink so low in sin, disgrace, and corruption, that the state of a "mere animal" would be far preferable. Time is too precious, truth is too powerful, and the salvation of souls is too important, for me to wrangle over English. I frankly acknowledge that we make mistakes. My respondent doesn't have to prove this, it is admitted. If the criticisms brother Sommer offers be samples, we did a good job in the English of our catalog. Everything he criticises, save, per-

haps, two points, can be justified by standard authority, and one of these is, I feel sure, a typographical error. I am rather elated over his exposures. There is not a catalog in print whose grammar is not subject to criticism. Our catalog that has been so severely criticised will compare favorably in its English with the catalogs of the leading schools of the United States. I have before me the latest catalogs issued by Vanderbilt University, Kentucky University, Kansas University, University of Missouri, Drake University, Missouri State Normal, and Kentucky State Normal. Every one of these in stating the expenses of students omits brother Sommer's "each" or "every" just as we do. "Misery loves company" especially when it is select. Such a criticism, friends, only magnifies my respondent's highly developed disposition to find fault of everything done by those whom he personally dislikes.

At Odessa he criticised the sentence, "In case your son or daughter spends more than you think is necessary, find fault with him and not with us", and when a rule was read from a standard author, one of the best English grammar's in print, that justifies our sentence, he said, "He read from Rigdon's grammar a rule which is in itself an absurdity. . . . Any grammar that will give a rule of that kind . . . I say to you is not worthy of your confidence. I have examined Rigdon's grammar . . . and when the proper time comes, I calculate to expose it." "Skirmishes," page 81. Rigdon's rule that caused such an outburst is: "When a pronoun cannot fully represent its antecedent in gender, the masculine pronoun is to be preferred; as 'No boy or girl could do his work better'." I have five standard English authorities on my desk as I write, and every one of them gives this rule or its equivalent. But what cares brother Sommer for these authors? He is the standard (?) of English, and every author that does not agree with him is absurd (?) and ridiculous (?) and he calculates "to expose" him. Should a committee of English scholars be appointed to compare our catalog with others, this committee would have to agree with him or he would "expose" it "sure".

My respondent made a great ado over this sentence: "But also does the power and influence of every nation depend upon the mental development of its subjects." But, what do you think of

this rule? "When the connected subjects are different names of the same thing, or when they name several things taken as one whole, the verb must be singular; as . . . Bread and milk is excellent food." Higher Lessons in English, Reed and Kellogg. Genung's Rhetoric gives an equivalent rule. But what do rules, standards, and authors have to do with my respondent? He calculates "to expose" the last one of them "!!!". Is he not a law unto himself? Are they not absurdities to him? Really, though, these criticisms do suggest the old adage: "A little learning is a *dangerous* thing".

Remember I am not making a defence of our English. I cannot afford to turn away from the Word of God to serve the prejudices of the people, to feed the party spirit, or to take advantage of ignorance. My respondent is playing this part. I have referred to these things to show the part he is playing that the truth may be exalted.

To all who know school matters, my respondent has exposed his ignorance in his ado over "pompous titles". He says so far as he remembers he has never seen the two titles (he means degrees) A. B., A. M. attached to a man's name but in the case of my name. This statement shows carelessness and worse. As a matter of fact, the attaching of the two degrees is right common. "John Carleton Jones, A. B., A. M., Ph. D." is an exact copy, "comma" and all from the latest bulletin of the University of Missouri. In their faculty there are thirty-six names with A. B., A. M. attached just as above. "Frank Strong, A. B., 1884, A. M., 1893, Ph. D., 1897, (Yale)" is an exact quotation from the latest bulletin of the University of Kansas. This is exactly equivalent in the point criticised to the quotation from the bulletin of the University of Missouri, although my respondent in the appendix to the oral discussions tried to hide his ignorance behind a period. In this Kansas bulletin there are twenty-five names with the two degrees attached. "Francis M. Walters, A. B., A. M." is a quotation from the latest bulletin of the State Normal of Missouri, and there are five names in this faculty with the two degrees and the "comma". Kentucky University, according to my respondent's standard, displays more love of vanity than any from which I have quoted. Its bulletin says: "Hall Laurie Calhoun, A. M., B. D., Ph. D. . . .

Graduate of the College of the Bible, 1892; Kentucky University, A. B., 1892; Divinity School of Yale University, B. D., 1902; Divinity School of Harvard University, A. M., 1903; *ibid*, Ph. D., 1903; Williams Fellow of Harvard, 1903-04. Member of the Semitic Club of Harvard, 1902-04; President of Semitic Club, 1903-04. Professor of Hebrew and Ancient History since 1904." Now where is our pomposity? It is excluded. By what school? *Kentucky University to which my respondent sent his own children* "!!!". When facts are as abundant as these and as easily obtained, such a blunder is a disgrace to my respondent's self-made boast of being "exceedingly careful." Brother Sommer manifests gross ignorance of schools and school matters, but if he would be quiet the people in general would not see this ignorance.
Feb. 22, 1908.

DANIEL SOMMER'S THIRD ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE INCOMPETENCY OF MY OPPONENT AND CERTAIN OTHER PRETENDERS.

My preceding essay concerning the "curious arts" of Prof. Armstrong were intended to be the conclusion of my criticisms on his curious writings. But I have before me his so-called "17th Reply", and in it I find more curiosities. The first of them is this: "There are six or eight of my articles containing essential matter that my respondent has left almost, or quite, untouched". This intimates, and even implies, that there are other articles which do not contain "essential matter". But is this what he intended to say? I doubt it; but if he did I shall not dispute his implication. On the contrary, I am willing to state of all his misrepresentations, that they are not "essential matter", except to show that my opponent is an unfair disputant. In regard to the intimation that I have left "almost, or quite, untouched" "six or eight" of my opponent's articles I am willing to abide the reader's decision.

Now let us consider this curiosity which Prof. A. offers his readers in behalf of Prof. Harding: "I have heard many men make Chapel talks to young people, but I have never heard a man

that could come so nearly calling every speck of manhood in a boy out of him, thus inspiring him to be all that God would have him be".

Reader, the foregoing sentence implies that Prof. Harding is not "a man". Notice the declaration, "I have never heard a man". But he has heard Prof. H., yet says, "I have never heard a man". He meant that he had never heard any *other* "man", but he did not say so, and thus implies that his father-in-law is not "a man"!

But this is not all. Prof. A. says of Prof. H.: "I have never heard a man that could come so nearly calling every speck of manhood in a boy out of him, thus inspiring him to be all that God would have him be". According to this curious sentence Prof. Harding is a dangerous talker, for he is capable of "nearly calling every speck of manhood in a boy out of him" and this is certainly damaging. To stir the manhood in a boy might do him good, but to call it "out of him" would certainly do him harm. Parents will generally desire that their boys shall not be deprived of their "speck of manhood", but that it should remain in them, and be stirred to activity. And this, I suppose, is the idea that Prof. Armstrong had in mind, but instead of stating that idea he wrote a sentence which has "a squinting construction", and is a rare curiosity, especially when the last part of that sentence is considered. Prof. A. declares that Prof. H. is capable of "nearly calling every speck of manhood in a boy out of him, thus inspiring him to be all that God would have him be." What a wonderful being this "master of arts" must be! He can inspire a boy to "be all that God would have him be" by "nearly calling every speck of manhood in a boy out of him"!!

But read the following: "Brethren must not forget that even preachers, though unconsciously, it may be, are sometimes ruled by the green-eyed monster—Jealousy". Here is an intimation that I am ruled by Jealousy, and this intimation has been made several times against me by Prof. A. and likewise by Prof. H. But how could I be jealous of either of them? I am sure that neither one of them has any thing that I desire.

But read the following: "For my part", says Prof. A., "I do

not propose to discuss English with my respondent, though his ado is over minor matters, some of which are unquestionably right". I defy any one to say with certainty what idea the sentence just quoted was intended to convey. What "are unquestionably right"? The answer is that "some" "minor matters" that I am charged with making an "ado" over "are unquestionably right." But whether Prof. A. meant that they were "right" before I made an "ado" over them, or after I had corrected them, or whether the principles I announced in my criticisms are "minor matters", the readers can not determine. The ambiguity, and consequent obscurity, of the sentence under review suggests again the idea of "curious arts," as they may consist of philological jugglery.

In an effort to justify himself in refusing to discuss English with me, my opponent asks, "Are you tired of the Bible as a standard?" I answer that the Bible commands me to use "sound speech that can not be condemned", and that I shall "try the spirits". When a critical use of language, or a criticism in regard to language, is necessary to obey those commands I am certainly justified in making use thereof.

My opponent charges that I have "deserted" the question of controversy between us because I have criticised the use of English which I find in certain catalogues, and says that I, "mercilessly abused Bro. Harding's speech at Odessa". I shall cheerfully leave both of these items to the conclusion of the fair-minded reader. All that I have offered against the colleges that I oppose has been to the effect that they are UNSCRIPTURAL. When I prove that their presidents are but educational pretenders, and not genuine scholars, I prove that such pretenders are UNSCRIPTURAL in their published boasts of thoroughness in teaching. In my discussion with Prof. Rhodes I endeavored to show that the mentioned colleges are unscriptural in "Origin" and "Purpose". In the first of my discussion with Prof. Armstrong I endeavored to prove that they are unscriptural in the use made of that part of the Lord's "money" that is expended in establishing them, and in the use made of the word "Bible" in naming them. I am now engaged in an endeavor to prove that the colleges that I oppose are unscriptural in the educational character of their projectors and presidents. My success

in each of these endeavors will be left to honest readers, and whether the question of unscripturalness is "deserted" in the last of these endeavors will, likewise, be left to them.

Now I am prepared to give attention to my opponent's remark about one-premise logic. He represents me as reasoning thus: "J. A. Harding is an incompetent man, therefore, it is wrong for Christians to establish schools in which to teach the Bible". But this is a gross misrepresentation. My opponent forgets that in my first essay on this subject I quoted this language of Job: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one". This language I used for the purpose of indicating to my readers that a *scriptural* institution could not originate with an *unscriptural* man. Then, as Prof. J. A. H. is only a pretender in regard to scholarship, he is an unscriptural man in that particular. Therefore, the colleges that originated with him are unscriptural. This was the reasoning that I indicated, but my opponent seems not to have been able to grasp it, or he may not have been willing to grasp it. In either case he proves himself incompetent to act as projector and president of a college; especially one in whose catalogue boasts of *thoroughness* are made. The Savior declares that the tree is known by its fruit, and I am sure that the catalogue which the president of a college sends forth may be justly regarded as an exhibition of his fruit. Then the old saying, "A stream can not of itself rise higher than its fountain", has its application here.

But my opponent says, "There is not a good work in the world in which incompetent men do not engage, so according to this logic every good work is bad. It would even prove that it is wrong to establish churches of Christ". In response to this I remark, How pitiable is such reasoning on the part of my opponent! I did not contend that certain colleges are wrong because certain subordinate teachers in them are incompetent, but I referred to the fact that the man, or men, with whom they originated, and who are their presidents, are incompetent. But my opponent passes from this fact to a statement which may imply that I am trying to impeach certain colleges because they have incompetent janitors, or tutors! What is worse he then adds, that this "would even prove

that it is wrong to establish churches of Christ". But "churches of Christ" are **AUTHORIZED BY CHRIST**, and thus by him who is **PERFECT**. This settles that question, regardless of incompetency of those who "engage" in establishing them. But the colleges that I oppose are **NOT THUS AUTHORIZED**, but in regard to origin and destiny are as far below the churches of Christ as *human devices* are below *divine institutions*. The reader can see this, and the fact that my opponent has indulged in such reasoning as I have just exposed I urge as another evidence that he is a mere educational pretender, and the college over which he presides, and which originated with him, is **UNSCRIPTURAL**. The honest reader can judge in regard to the weight of such evidence.

Having exposed a few of my opponent's mistakes under his first heading—"The Question Deserted"—as found in the beginning of his, so-called, "17th Reply" I now propose to consider a few that he has made under his second heading,—“Why We Are Debating Without A Proposition”. Under this second heading I find a tirade that causes me to think of my former charge of scurrility against my opponent. As a mild sample take this: "My respondent has declared us to be a set of the biggest cowards in Christendom. Were he to say we are common thieves he would not misrepresent us more than when he says we will not affirm our practice". The honest reader is now requested to consider this inquiry: Who has "deserted" the question in controversy? As my memory serves me my opponent, at a previous date, refused to go into the correspondence between him and myself in regard to this discussion. But he now refuses to discuss with me the question of scholarship, as it relates to the projectors of certain colleges, and virtually admits that which I allege in regard to incompetency, and appeals to our correspondence concerning propositions, which passed between us before this discussion began! Here is another evidence that my charge of incompetency is true.

But this is not all. My opponent, on the same subject, makes these declarations: "Because we would not let men who *do not know* our work state our practice, they have dogmatically affirmed that we would not affirm it. We have an inalienable right to re-

fuse to affirm *any* proposition that we do not believe, yea, *it is our duty to do so*. Every one of these propositions that I have seen involves the very question in dispute, calls on us to affirm the very thing to be proved".

Poor Armstrong! His incompetency in the use of English has here lured him into the truth on this question, and has led him to admit that which he intended to deny. I am sure that the honest reader can see that my opponent has caught himself in the meshes of his own incompetency. Notice, he did not say that every proposition that I offered to him *assumes* "the very question in dispute", but that it "involves" that question, and that I called on him "to affirm the very thing to be proved". What better proposition could an honest man desire, than one that "involves the very question in dispute", and that calls on him "to affirm the very thing to be proved"? I again say, Poor Armstrong!

Reader, the record of our correspondence shows that I proposed to Prof. A. that he should affirm that his college, as it originated and as it exists, is scriptural. But he declined to do so, and offered to affirm that it is scriptural to "teach the Bible" as he teaches it in Odessa college! This was an evident evasion of the real controversy. I had attacked his institution *as such*, and not his *method of teaching*. But he now admits that the propositions I offered to him *involve* "the very question in dispute", and that I called on him "to affirm the very thing to be proved". Besides, he quotes the propositions I offered to him for affirmation, and I submit to the reader that the facts, as evolved in this discussion, as well as Prof. Armstrong's admissions, show that those propositions are correct. The ungodly fiction that is required to be read in the literary course of the Odessa institution shows that it is "largely ungodly", and the honest-reader now knows that my opponent makes use of "fallacies" in advocating and defending that institution. Besides, in my discussion with Prof. Rhodes, I drew from him the plea that the college in dispute was partly justifiable because of the "opportunity" it gave "to teach pupils in certain parts of the Bible". Moreover, I drew from him the plea that those colleges are partly justifiable because they furnish *secular employment* for certain preachers! All this is a matter of record, and

clearly shows that the propositions I offered to Prof. Armstrong, even in their severest parts, are strictly just.

But notice the following from my opponent: "When our school at Odessa was announced, the battle behind the wall increased in fury. Every opposer that could wield a pen 'butted in' and told the O. R. readers how mean (?) we were and how sinful (?) our work".

In regard to that which I have just copied I state that it is unjust in every particular! 1. It implies that I had been fighting behind a wall, and declares that such battle "increased" when the "school at Odessa was announced". 2. It implies that the REVIEW was open to every one who was disposed to write unfavorably of that school, and open for him to publish all that he might wish to set forth. 3. It intimates that the REVIEW published that which charged Prof. A. and others with being "mean", and that their work was "wicked". 4. It makes use of the slang expression "butted in", which should not disgrace this discussion. The facts are as I now state them.

1. The record of the controversy will show that I made three attempts to have a discussion with Prof. Harding, and that he always evaded affirming that his institution is scriptural in origin, name and use of money. That record will show also that I published all the writings of Prof. Harding that I criticised publicly, but that he did not publish half, nor perhaps, even a fifth of that from my pen, which he criticised in his paper. Therefore, he was the man who was "fighting behind the wall"! Besides, Prof. Armstrong could find abundant space to publish unhandsome articles concerning me in certain journals, but could not find space for an article from me. This shows that he also was "fighting behind the wall"!

2. The implication that the REVIEW published all that was said against the colleges that I oppose, or even against the Odessa school, is untrue, and as evidence I quote the following, from a letter that was received from Bro. Jas. Donaldson of Braymer, Mo., and which was suppressed at the O. R. office.

"Now, if persons in need, not able to work, come around begging, and are honest in their statement, it is the duty of Christians

to respond. There is nothing hypocritical or dishonest about it. I can only compare the so-called Bible College to the 'Salvation Army'. If they would come well-dressed and lie around doing nothing to make a living, and come without the drum, or uniform on, and ask or beg for money, how much would they get? Not one dollar. But they put 'Salvation Army' on their caps, and with drum in hand to call the attention of the people they beg in the name of Christianity . . . and by acting the hypocrite they reach the pockets of the people. . . . So these college men—if they would come in a straight-forward, honest way the people would say, You are young, educated and able to make a living, and no money could be had. But they will put the word 'Bible' in front, and hypocritically they will reach the people's pockets".

The foregoing are only a few sentences of that which was suppressed in the O. R. office, and I quote them to convict my opponent of another error. He is so nearly ALWAYS wrong that a correct statement from him seems out of place in his efforts at response to me.

My opponent says of me, "HE WAS AFRAID FOR US TO LEAD"—in these discussions. The reader can judge from my controversy with Prof. Rhodes, also from the controversy I am now engaged in with Prof. Armstrong, that if I had entertained such a fear it would have been justly founded. In the former discussion the questions of Origin and Purpose were considered, contrary to Prof. Rhodes' intention, and in this discussion, everything would have been ruled out if Prof. A. had led in it, except the fact and method of teaching persons in the Bible in Odessa College; that is, if we may judge by Prof. Armstrong's propositions that he offered to affirm for discussion. As a result the real questions between us would not have been considered.

Under the heading, "Moral and Religious Training Inseparable", my opponent quotes from an author named "White" in his "Elements of Pedagogy", and from Horace Mann. But his quotations from those authors, and all that he says with reference to them, are to the effect that the church is NOT SUFFICIENT to teach persons the excellencies of morality and religion, but that SCHOOLS must engage in teaching them in those excellencies!

This assumes the very point of controversy between us. I deny that the church is insufficient to teach morality and religion, and deny that secular schools should be established FOR THE PURPOSE of teaching persons in either religion or morality. These are points of difference between us. These points were clearly delineated, repeated, and emphasized, in both of my discussions with Prof. Rhodes, and the reader of those discussions, likely, recollects the dodging that my opponent did on those occasions. But after all that was then said, and all the exposures of dodging then made, my present opponent, near the end of his 17th so-called, "Reply", expressed himself thus: "Again, I say, the principle that forbids our teaching the Bible, any lesson in it, in school because it is CHURCH WORK, drives out every moral lesson and turns all moral training and character building over to the Devil and his agents".

How dense and intense must be the perverseness of a man who will write thus in the face of all that has been said, and all the facts on record, on this subject! He assumes that not one Christian is engaged in teaching in any secular school, and that not one moral person who is not a Christian, among teachers in such schools, will, or can, exert one particle of moral influence on pupils! This implies that all that physiology sets forth, in school books, against the use of tobacco and alcohol is the work of the devil because it is urged from a physical, and not from a Biblical, viewpoint! Such assumption and implication are but frothings and vaporings of an erratic. Certainly they are not expressions from a well-balanced brain. I think I express the sentiment of all my considerate readers when I say that I would rather for my child to be under the tutorship of a moral man who is not a church member of any kind, but has a strict regard for truth, than under a professed Christian who is as reckless in regard to truth as my opponent has shown himself to be in this discussion, or as Prof. Rhodes showed himself to be in his speeches at Odessa and Hale in his controversy with me. Besides, as I said in my discussion with Prof. Rhodes, so say I now again, I would rather for a child of mine to study ungodly fiction in a worldly institution, and under worldly tutorship, than in a so-called "Bible College", and

under the tutorship of professed Christians. In the former instance I could argue with effect against such fiction, but not in the latter instance.

Near the close of his 17th, so-called, "Reply", my opponent says, "To recognize an unbeliever as a teacher of the young is a sin against this age". What "age" does he mean? He does not state, but we may suppose he means the gospel "age". Yet he is constantly using in his school certain books written by unbelievers, and he designates them as "authority."

But read more from him, "For a Christian to talk of teaching morality to any body save as a church work, in the name of Jesus, is dishonoring to God". How does this harmonize with Prof. Armstrong's celebrated declaration, "We wish it distinctly understood that our school is a *work*, and *not a religious institution*"? He would have us to believe that it is a part of "church work" to establish and conduct a school to teach morality that is "not a religious institution", yet declares that "moral and religious training" are "inseparable"! Notice the confusion. It is "dishonoring to God" even to "talk of teaching morality to any body save as a church work", yet Prof. A. proposes to do this "church work" in a school that is "not a religious institution", though "religious and moral training" are "inseparable"!

Here I am reminded of a man who said that he was mowing grass in a field, and a deer jumped up before him, and ran, and jumped over a fence, and got stuck in a snow drift. "What"! exclaimed a listener, "you were mowing grass on one side of a fence, and deep snow was on the other side—that story doesn't hang together very well"! I am reminded also of the boy whose father had praised him so much that he thought he was "smart", and one day he thought he should show his "smartness". Accordingly, when several of his father's friends were present, he asked this question: "Pa, do goslings suck"?

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S NINETEENTH REPLY.

Only where brother Sommer can abuse language, or take advantage of mistakes, does he attack my work. This writes *his* competency in letters of gold! Though he abused my language to get from under the weight of the propositions thrust upon me, it remains that he has never offered a proposition to me that did not assume the whole ground. Though "involve" is alright, I frankly admit "assume" to be a better choice of words. Though I admit, also, that the word "other" should have been in the sentence referring to Brother Harding, it still remains that my respondent's logic on our incompetency is: J. A. H. and J. N. A. are incompetent men, therefore, the Nashville Bible School, Beamsville Bible School, Gunter Bible College, Tokyo Bible School, etc., are ungodly institutions. My friends, it is a direct fight on the men!

His reference to my teaching on morality is but an effort to break its force. Let him deny that it is dishonoring to God for a *Christian* to teach morality *anywhere* save as Church work in the name of Christ. He hasn't denied it. He won't face the issue here either. In his last article he practically opposes all moral teaching in school from the Christian's viewpoint.

Brother Sommer knows I have no control over any paper. I can not help the fact that by his rough, heart-judging style, he has caused every paper in the loyal brotherhood, save his own, to refuse his articles. He has denounced the last one of them as innovators and committers of sacrilege. In this very discussion he has, in an unchrist-like manner, criticised brother Parmiter and Primitive Christianity. He accuses the Leader-Way of a long continued theft. My chief influence with papers is with these two journals. Brother Sommer has approved of the name "Only Right" for his paper, using this as a basis to get brethren to work for it. Who can wonder that the other papers refuse to have his writings appear in them? He, also, knows that so long as The Way existed as a separate paper, he was allowed equal space in it in any controversy between him and Harding. He knows

again that when the Leader-Way combination was formed, brother Rowe stipulated that Sommer's writings be excluded.

One word about that suppressed communication.—Let brother Sommer show matter that has been, "suppressed" because it sets forth our meanness (?) and his case has been made out. It may be that this communication came in after the O. R. went into its present "suppressing" business. The O. R. readers had grown sick of the continued war and were, no doubt, rebelling against it. It would be interesting to know just *why* that letter was suppressed.

If you will strip brother Sommer's work of his fight against the men and against matters of judgment, there will be nothing left but assertions, abuse of language, and contradictory positions relative to schools. I have showed that there is no issue on the money question unless my respondent hold that it is wrong for Christians to put money into righteous schools. While he has conceded, in a way, that they may use their money thus, he has never dared to say outright that they have this right. He himself gave up the money question in his fourth article, and when pressed for the issue said it is a "new institution". I discussed our institution from purpose out, entreating him to pitch his tent on essential ground. But he has shunned essentials as a man would a viper! To justify himself he said that he was not under obligation to reply to anything I might say. Occasionally, by emphasizing his course, I have forced him to touch with the tips of his fingers my work, but when I ceased my severe urgings he straightway began to write as if he were debating by himself. His published report of the oral discussions is a stain on him as a debater. When the Baptists were getting out the discussion between Drs. Graves and Ditzler they paid Ditzler \$500.00 to edit his speeches, whereas, brother Sommer refused brother Rhodes the requested privilege of editing his own speeches. When Campbell put an appendix to his published debate with Walker, he asked his respondent to reply to it, but brother Sommer inserted twenty-six pages without giving his respondent the slightest chance to reply. He even said that unless one carefully read the work done in this dishonorable way one could not get the merits of the discussion. *Afraid* to leave the

reader to judge impartially from the *naked* discussion! Brave, courageous work "!!!". In the present discussion he has adopted the course of ignoring his respondent. If you will watch the O. R. you may get brother Sommer's reply to these things. *No doubt* he will be very brave (?) behind his wall.

ESSENTIALS IGNORED.

1. My respondent's change since Oct. 1906 *had* to be explained. "Depths of Satan" was the explanation. Brother Sommer has been pressed on every side but he *will* not reveal these depths. The facts are, he does not know *one single new thing*.
2. When he assailed our origin, I showed the five items he opposed were not in our origin. This work has never been noticed, hence, our origin as a whole stands unassailed.
3. When assailed, I vindicated our organization. This vindication stands.
4. By the Savior's life and teaching, I established our purpose; asking six direct questions. When he gets behind his wall, perhaps he will answer.
5. I patiently showed the unlikeness of our school to the Missionary Society. I also showed that every point of likeness between them is commendable in every Christian's business. Ignored completely.
6. I carefully showed that our school exalts completeness in Christ. My respondent prefers to continue the old accusation rather than to examine this work.
7. I proved that Christians must teach all righteousness and morality through the "pillar and ground of the truth" or rob God of glory; that the principle that stops us from teaching the Bible in school, drives every moral principle out of the school-room. More vital work ignored.
8. My respondent boldly declared that all "religio-secular" schools are bearers of evil fruit. I showed that all literary schools purposely teach religion; that the difference between our schools and others in this respect is in the amount and kind of religion taught. These stubborn facts are ignored.

9. I placed Buffalo Seminary before you—its origin, purpose, organization, and “piling up of brick and mortar”. I showed that in approving it my respondent has approved our work in toto. He dropped it as he would a hot iron.

10. I showed that it is as scriptural to appeal for help for a work like Buffalo Seminary as for help to buy Fujimori's farm, Sexton's home, Barker's saw-mill, or Timmons' horse. Again he is quiet.

Beloved, he has ignored origin, band, organization, purpose, completeness in Christ, our likeness (?) to the Missionary Society, the Church as the pillar and ground of the truth, Buffalo Seminary, the fact that all literary schools are “religio-secular”, and many other things. My vindication of our work at every one of these points has been placed before the very champion of the opposition, but he cannot be induced to take hold of these vitals.

NON-ESSENTIALS AND PERSONALITIES.

Instead of standing hard by the issue and discussing these vitals, my respondent has spent his time on incidentals and personalities. He called appeals for the work “begging” and then fought “begging” with the tenacity of a bull-dog, although every one of the schools existed in its entirety as an institution—origin, organization and purpose—before an appeal was made for it. More over, he has admitted in this debate that if the school-work be a righteous work, it is alright to appeal for help. Then, why has he not gone directly to the issue? Think of the two long articles on English construction. Suppose we be incompetent, does this prove that it is wrong for Morris, Sommer, and Otey to band together to teach the Bible and secular branches? Then why spend space on it?

Much time has been spent on our “ungodly” literature. Where is the family that does not read Longfellow, Goldsmith, Milton, Tennyson, Macaulay, Shakespeare, etc.? Where is the home that does not send its children to school where this literature is read? Certainly, it is a difficulty to decide what people should read, and even Brother Sommer and his wife disagree on the subject for

sister Sommer thinks that “Uncle Tom's Cabin” is a good book for Christians and offered it to the O. R. readers for months. Brother Sommer thinks that book not good, but this does not convict his wife of sin. She may be right and he wrong. Who knows? If he, were controlling our school, he could put out this “ungodly fiction” and substitute some other course of reading, but this proves nothing save that our judgment differs as to *what* to read. Why should Bro. Sommers judgment prevail in such things? Is he to be the standard? No, my friends, for six long years he has been a busy-body. He has no more right to meddle in these things than I have to say what books the O. R. book-store shall sell. He has meddled with our entertainments, also,—another matter of judgment, a difficult matter, too. In this matter we do our best but, no doubt, we make mistakes. But, my dear friends, had you noticed that all of these matters are matters of mere judgment concerning which the best Christians on earth disagree? I hope (?) when readers “echo” this debate in the O. R. they will not fail to “echo” this conduct of my respondent. He cannot be persuaded on the issue, pushed on it, punched on it, or pricked on it. I fear he is *stubborn*.

HIS FIRST MONEY POSITION.

1. “Faithful obedience to the divine doctrine of ‘equality’ will place all of the Lord's money in the Church treasury; or in the hands of the Lord's needy ones. 2. With all the Lord's money thus placed there will be none in the hands of Christians for building religio-secular schools. 3. Therefore, faithful obedience to the divine doctrine of equality will make the building of religio-secular institutions by Christians impossible.” According to this position, all school building is absolutely the work of the Devil and his servants.

Without emphasizing the fact that this doctrine makes every Christian in the world that has employed his “surplus”, designated by brother Sommer “the Lord's part”, in any way than in the two ways mentioned by him (Sommer), a robber of God, I pass to the Jerusalem questions. I asked my respondent some questions

one of which is: "If the Jerusalem disciples had 'wealth' that was their 'own' and in their 'power', could they not have used it in the building of a school building and starting a school without sinning, provided the school in itself was right"? Beloved, why does he dread this question? Just because for *six long years* he has taught that Christians must put the Lord's money, their "surplus" above a living and taxes, "into the Church treasury" or "into the hands of the Lord's needy ones"; that Christians that use it otherwise rob God.

While my respondent has been forced to squirm from this position, he has tried to do it without your seeing the change. If he had faced the issue here in his second article, he would have been forced to surrender his six-year-old position. Beloved friend, is it right, is it the privilege of Christians, to put their "surplus" into schools right in themselves? "Yes"! cries every honest heart. Then, where do we disagree on the money question? God's people ought to agree where they can. This does not prove that our school is right, but it does settle the money question and leave God's people in peace at this point.

HIS SECOND POSITION.

After my first three articles my respondent could no longer hold to the doctrine that faithful obedience took *all* the Lord's money out of the hands of individual Christians, so in his fourth article he says that an individual Christian may act "as a steward of the Lord in handling the Lord's means". Every one knows that this is a *radical* change from his syllogistic statements. All of us believe that Christians may as stewards invest the "Lord's money" according to their best judgment. We are agreed, too, that if this school-work be wrong in itself, it is wrong for a steward to use money, time, or talent to build it up. Again, I ask, why all this smoke over the "misuse of the Lord's money"? The only question in the whole matter is, "Is the school-work a righteous work?" *The whole thing hangs here.* For the sake of God, the Church, and the salvation of the world, let us not fight over

words to no profit! God hates the man that sows discord among brethren.

HIS THIRD POSITION.

When brother Sommer heard that brother and sister Potter had determined to furnish the money for Potter Bible College, he wrote them an unsolicited letter saying: "As you have decided to expend means left in your hands by your dear dead for the purpose of education, I have no criticism to offer." In this discussion I asked him if he still had 'no criticism to offer' concerning brother and sister Potter's expenditure and he said: "I would have had criticisms to offer when I wrote to them if I had understood their purpose, as it has been manifested in the institution they established". Now we have it! Brother and sister Potter did wrong (?), not because they withheld money from the Lord's treasury, not because they put it into a school, but because the school in itself is wrong (!) If it could be shown that Potter Bible College were wrong in itself, brother and sister Potter would agree with us that it was wrong to put money into it.

All the strife, alienation, and discord, sown in the house of God on the "misuse of the Lord's money" in respect to these schools lies at the door of my respondent and those who have helped him in this ungodly work. Why didn't brother Sommer simplify this debate by coming directly to the unrighteousness (?) of this school-work? Why did not he begin this debate by setting forth a scriptural school and then showing the difference between that school and ours? Beloved, had he set forth a righteous school and compared our school to it, he would have made the righteousness of our work shine as a new made-dollar. It is an easier job to fight the "depths of Satan" in the men than to face the issue.

HIS NECESSARY POSITION.

Brother Sommer is committed to a school—a school in which Christians may band together to teach the Bible and secular branches. Since this school-work cannot be done without the employment of means, time, and talent, that belong to God, he is

unquestionably committed to the use of "the Lord's money" in school-work.

I want to appeal to every one of you to help cement the Church in your community on this question by showing there is no difference between those who advocate the schools and those who oppose them in regard to the use of "the Lord's money". The battle at this point must cease with all who love the union of God's people. Unite with me, I implore, in an effort to stop this preacher-fight. Remember that when goaded to locate the "depths of Satan" they were found to be, not in the work, but in the men (?). This strikes the tap-root of all of this disturbance. You yourselves know that my respondent has admitted in various ways every essential of the work. Look at his endorsement of Buffalo Seminary!

RESULTS OF THE SPIRIT MANIFESTED BY MY RESPONDENT.

The very spirit which my respondent manifests to such a marked degree is stirring up strife in the house of God over many matters. Even in the O. R. family itself there is, at present, urgent need of peacemakers. Division is "threatened" and brethren are being set at nought. If the factions forming persist in the effort now making, peace will be destroyed. Brother Denney believes that it is wrong for the Church to separate into classes on Lord's day to teach the Bible. A host of disciples stand with him. Brother Sommer believes the classes are scriptural, and a host of disciples stand with him. The brethren who oppose this practice believe brother Sommer is not abiding in the word of the Lord, and brother Denney evidently thinks that if brother Sommer persists he (Sommer) should be withdrawn from. This spirit is the crop from the seed brother Sommer and others of the O. R. have been sowing for years. They are but reaping what they have sown. I do not doubt that there are whole-hearted Christians on both sides of the question of dividing into classes. Here is a time for forbearance, long-suffering, and patience, on the part of all while, in brotherly love, a deep, earnest search for truth is being made.

Again I say, the spirit manifested by my respondent in this debate will make splinters of the Church of God. Think of the divisions in the state of Texas alone, and be wise. There are brethren there who endorse our school work but agree with brother Denney in the contention among the O. R. readers; so brother Denney and these Texas brethren could be one at this point, but could destroy one another on the school question. Texas brethren are setting at nought one another on many questions. Brother Rice is building up a sect over the "order of worship", then, there is the rebaptism question over which so much strife has been caused, and so many brethren set at nought. There is actually Church property in Texas with a restrictive clause in the deed concerning "sect baptism". Now, brother Sommer and I agree on the rebaptism question, the classification of children, the order of worship, etc., but he disfellowships me on the school question. There are half a dozen, or more, petty sects in Texas alone, yet they are all absolutely one on the great principle that "a thus saith the Lord" is necessary to establish any religious practice. They are misunderstanding woefully what Christ has said on these subjects. Here is the Firm Foundation in Texas refusing to publish articles from brethren who believe it is right to classify on Lord's day, and the Octographic Review in Indiana, rejecting articles opposed to this classification. Again, the Firm Foundation would publish anything I might write on Bible-school work, while the O. R. excludes me. All of our offers to give up personal preferences and make reasonable sacrifices on matters of mere judgment for peace have been spurned and mocked. Nothing but our annihilation will suffice the Editor of the O. R., but, beloved, what will *you* do about it? I don't ask you to help the schools or to send your children to them, if you believe they are wrong. Send them, if you will, to state schools where infidelity is taught concerning the Bible, but against my protest. While I must protest, you must answer to God for the influence you place around them. But if you give your influence and support, as my respondent has done for years, to schools that undermine faith in the Bible, that train their students to worship God with instrumental music, etc., you must excuse me. I just can't do it. Brethren, train your children

under such influences if you will, but, God helping me, I shall do all I can to keep you from it, and shall give my whole school influence to those schools controlled by God's children. While your judgment may lead you differently in these matters, do not forget that we are brethren and love the peace of God's house.

DANIEL SOMMER'S TWENTIETH ESSAY.

CONCERNING THE INCOMPETENCY OF MY OPPONENT AND CERTAIN OTHER PRETENDERS.

Reader, I now invite your attention to my last essay in the discussion, through which you have thus far followed me and my opponent. In this essay I shall expose the chief errors in the 18th and 19th pretended replies offered to me by my opponent.

In the beginning of his 18th pretense in that direction he offers somewhat under this heading: "Appeals Made In The Name of Christianity". All that he offers under that heading was set forth and disposed of in a former part of this discussion. But he seems not to be satisfied with that which he then set forth, and he now repeats it in order to "emphasize" it. But he forgets that I also can emphasize. This is the burden of his reasoning:

1. An appeal was made in the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW for Sexton's home; therefore it is right to establish a religio-secular college, which is "not a religious institution", to teach pupils in the Bible, and in ungodly fiction, and to furnish secular employment for certain preachers.

2. An appeal was made in the REVIEW for Fujimori's farm; therefore it is right to establish a religio-secular college, which is "not a religious institution" to teach pupils in the Bible, and in ungodly fiction, and to furnish secular employment for certain preachers.

3. An appeal was made in the REVIEW for Timmons' horse; therefore it is right to establish a religio-secular college, that is "not a religious institution", to teach pupils in religion, and to furnish secular employment for certain preachers.

4. An appeal was made in the REVIEW for Barker's saw-mill; therefore it is right to establish a religio-secular college, which is "not a religious institution", in order to teach pupils in religion, and to furnish secular employment for certain preachers.

The foregoing is the kind of reasoning that my opponent's reference to certain appeals in the REVIEW implies, and I here state that such reasoning is another argument in favor of my charge of "incompetency" which I have made against him.

Under the heading which I have mentioned my opponent informs his readers concerning his self-denials for the sake of his college work. The bearing of all that he offers to us on that subject is this:

"My salary as a public school teacher when I was a twenty-year-old boy was greater than it has ever been in Bible school work"; therefore I am not getting "rich", and it is right to establish a religio-secular college which is "not a religious institution", in order to teach pupils in religion, and to furnish secular employment for certain preachers.

The foregoing is another evidence of my charge of "incompetency" made against my opponent.

Under the heading "Preacher-manufacturing Company" my opponent expresses himself thus: "If possible, the charge that our school is a 'clergyman-making' school is the most inexcusable of all the false charges made against us. This charge shows almost criminal ignorance or willful falsifying on the part of those responsible for it".

In response to the foregoing I state that Prof. J. A. Harding positively declared that the "Nashville Bible School", so-called, was brought into existence in order to develop preachers, and I think his exact language was quoted in a former part of this discussion. Moreover, in his celebrated speech at Odessa last December Prof. Harding told of a boy whom he baptized, in Nashville, Tenn., and then added, "The next night he said he wanted to be a preacher. I told him of the prospective Bible School to be opened in that city, and two years later when it was opened that boy was there". Then he informed his hearers that the boy to whom he referred "studied, and worked, and stumbled, and

grunted along". Then after "two years or more" he became a preacher. What does such testimony mean? When the mentioned boy said he wished to be a preacher Prof. Harding told him of "the prospective Bible School", but did not say a word about the Church as the institution in which he could become a preacher, but it was the "BIBLE SCHOOL" to which he was referred, and then in the so-called "BIBLE SCHOOL" he "studied, and worked, and stumbled, and grunted along" and became a preacher. I ask again, What does such testimony mean? Either Prof. Harding or Prof. Armstrong is a false witness on this subject.

But here is more on the same subject. In a circular titled "Our Scholarship Offer", sent forth from Odessa I find this: "Some brethren of the congregations mentioned above bought a scholarship, and they are now educating a most worthy young preacher of the gospel". What does such testimony mean? I again ask. The reader can judge, and in judging can decide that Prof. Armstrong is a false witness concerning his school! But here I am reminded that Prof. A. simply denies that the Odessa school is engaged in making "clergymen". Yes, and I question whether he ever heard of any one who used the word "clergyman" in his charge against that school. I regard that word as a manufactured foundation for a denial, and a bluster. I charge that the schools that I oppose were CONCEIVED, and BROUGHT FORTH, and ESTABLISHED and SET IN ORDER, for THE PURPOSE of developing preachers, more than for any other purpose, if J. A. Harding has told the truth concerning them, and this implies that THE CHURCH CAN NOT DEVELOP THEM!

In his 17th so-called "Reply" Prof. Armstrong said of himself, "I do not propose to discuss English with my opponent. . . . Excuse me, Bro. Sommer, you can't decoy me". Yet in his 18th, so-called, "Reply" over half of his space is occupied with reference to that subject!

In the beginning of that which he offers on that subject my opponent charges that I have been guilty of using personalities, and then says, "Our agreement excludes personalities and all human standards of appeal". In regard to this I inquire, Why did he not think of that when he likened me to a cowardly dog, also when

he appealed to certain publications in the REVIEW to justify the existence of his college? He was then guilty of using gross and degrading personalities, and guilty of appealing to a human standard. Besides, why did he appeal to Prof. White, and Horace Mann in his 17th, so-called, "Reply"? He is trying to divert attention from his own violations—persistent and gross violations—of our agreement. The same is true in regard to all his charges of my so-called "anathemas against Prof. Harding". The word "anathema" means a curse, and my readers know that I have not been cursing Prof. Harding, but have spoken of him respectfully, though I have exposed his vain pretensions to scholarship because he is one of the projectors of the colleges I oppose. Prof. A. says that he has "never heard J. A. Harding boast of his learning". I answer that he boasted a few years ago of having spent "thirty-two years in the school room", and he has "A. M." attached to his name, which means "Master of Arts". My opponent says of himself, "There is not a man living that has ever heard me lay claim to great scholarship, or boast of what I know". In response I state that he professes to be a "Bachelor of Arts" and a "Master of Arts". Besides, Prof. Harding reported Prof. A's attainments in a boasting manner, as I quoted in my 18th essay.

Now I make two statements which will astonish the reader if he has not already detected that which they set forth.

1. THE EXISTENCE OF THE COLLEGES THAT I OPPOSE ARE FROM FIRST TO LAST A CRITICISM ON NEARLY ALL EXISTING INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING, YET MY OPPONENT RIDICULES ME BECAUSE I REJECT THE ERRORS IN THE TEXT BOOKS USED IN THOSE INSTITUTIONS.

2. HE DENOUNCES THOSE INSTITUTIONS AS NOT FIT FOR CHILDREN TO ATTEND YET QUOTES THEIR CATALOGUES, AND WRITES OF CERTAIN TEXT BOOKS AS "AUTHORITY" IN OPPOSITION TO ME!

As Rigdon's grammar has been quoted against me by my opponent in an effort to defend his misuse of English I would like to introduce at this place, in my essay, eleven pages of manuscript which I have written in exposure of that grammar. But

as I am restricted in regard to space I must content myself with an exposure of his definition of the "use or end" of English grammar. He says, "ITS USE or END is to teach the art of speaking, writing, and interpreting the English language correctly".

My readers may be surprised when I state to them that the foregoing definition of English grammar is almost entirely wrong. But if they will read with care all that I shall offer to them I think they will be convinced that I am correct in my statement.

1. What is a dictionary for? To teach us to spell, pronounce, and define, words correctly, and, therefore, to teach us how to speak, write, and interpret, the English language correctly? Does English grammar teach us in regard to spelling, defining, and pronouncing the words of the English language? NO. Then Mr. Rigdon's definition of English grammar is too extensive, for it invades, and even includes, the entire domain of the English dictionary.

2. Does English grammar teach concerning the doctrine of a sentence? NO. The truth or error of the doctrine of a sentence pertains to the domain of logic, and logic is necessary to be considered in all efforts to speak, write, and interpret, any part of the English language correctly. Therefore, Mr. Rigdon's definition of English grammar is again found to be too extensive, for it invades, and even includes, the entire domain of logic.

3. Moreover, Mr. Rigdon's definition of Grammar invades the domain of Rhetoric. For the correct use of English involves clearness, conciseness, and strength of sentences, and all of this, with much else, pertains, in some degree, to rhetoric. But what does a man know about clearness, conciseness and strength of a sentence who cumbrously declares that the "end" which English grammar has in view is "to teach the art of speaking, writing, and interpreting the English language correctly" instead of simply saying that the "end" to be accomplished by it is to TEACH THE RIGHT USE OF ENGLISH? But even this involves too much, for it invades the domain of logic and rhetoric. My criticism here is on the cumbrous expression, "speaking, writing and interpreting".

The foregoing is not all that might be justly said concerning

Mr. Jonathan Rigdon's erroneous definition of English grammar. But my readers are satisfied that he did not know how to define the science on which he wrote, and, therefore, that he did not understand that science so as to write concerning it correctly. As a result the reader is convinced that my opponent's intimation that I am an erratic because I refuse to be measured by Mr. Rigdon's grammar is not correct. They are likewise convinced that my opponent can not justify his erroneous use of English by an appeal to Mr. Rigdon's work on that subject.

Now I shall give attention to my opponent's "nineteenth" attempt at reply to me. I read it once, and then decided that I would read it again, and, at the same time, mark its misrepresentations, and other errors, by numbers. I found fifty-four of them, without marking everything that I regarded as erroneous in the mentioned attempt. My opponent indicates, by his lack of truth, that he has been under Cretan tutorship, if we may judge by his recklessness. Here are a few specimens of his errors which deserve to be designated falsehoods.

1. "Only where Bro. Sommer can abuse language, or take advantage of mistakes, does he attack my work". In response to this I deny that I have "abused" the language of any one in this discussion, and repel as false the charge that I have done so. My readers can judge between me and my opponent on this question. Then the implication of my opponent that I have not a right to "take advantage of mistakes" that he makes is another error that deserves to be severely designated. I am discussing with a professed "Bachelor of Arts" who informs us that he is also a "Master of Arts", and I have a right to hold him to strict account for all the "mistakes" that he makes. He is a PRETENDER, and my business, in my discussion with him, is to expose his VAIN PRETENSIONS. Yet he complains thus: "Only where Bro. Sommer can . . . take advantage of mistakes, does he attack my work." Reader, this implies that in all points wherein I have attacked my opponent's "work" he has made "mistakes". Well, *this* implication is satisfactory to me, for it is equal to my charge that he has made "mistakes" in all points wherein I have attacked his "work"!!! Thus my readers can see that

my opponent's incapability of using English correctly has caused him to make another confession which, I suppose, he did not intend to make.

2. My opponent says of me, "It remains that he has never offered a proposition to me that did not assume the whole ground". Then he admits that he made two mistakes in his use of English in a former essay—the first in regard to the word "involve", and the second in regard to the word "other". Concerning that which my opponent now states, after his English has been corrected, I make a SQUARE DENIAL. If he had affirmed that the college at Odessa is SCRIPTURAL in origin, purpose, name, and the use of money, I would not have needed to offer him a proposition. On the contrary, I would simply have denied his proposition, and we could have had an orderly discussion. But as he persistently evaded such an affirmation, yet offered to affirm that it is right to teach pupils in the Bible as they were being taught in Odessa College, I then informed him what kind of a proposition would involve the controversy between us. But I never offered to him a proposition which called on him to ASSUME the question in controversy, namely, that his college IS UNSCRIPTURAL IN ORIGIN, PURPOSE, NAME, AND USE OF MONEY, and all statements, implications, and intimations, that I did offer him such a proposition are STRICTLY UNTRUE. All that my opponent offers on this question I charge against him as another evidence of his incompetency to be an instructor.

3. My opponent says, "It still remains that my opponent's logic on our competency is: J. A. H. and J. N. A. are incompetent men, therefore, the Nashville Bible School . . . etc., are ungodly institutions. My friends, it is a direct fight on men"! In response to this I state that the expression "ungodly institutions" has been coined by my opponent. My propositions have been that they are "unscriptural", but my opponent passes from the word "unscriptural" to the word "ungodly" in order to reflect against me. But in so doing he reflects against himself. Yet if he wishes to designate the colleges that I now oppose as "ungodly institutions" he has my consent to do so, for they originated with men who are "ungodly" in their vain titles, empty pretensions, false reasoning, and slander-

ous treatment of an opponent. I have not forgotten that the chief of those men published me to his readers as possessed of "a disordered mind", and I think that in this discussion I have been misrepresented from 500 to 1,000 times by my opponent. Moreover, as a tree is known by its fruit, the fruit is also known by the tree. "A corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit" is a declaration of the Savior, and according to this declaration the colleges that I oppose are evil fruit, for the man who has been published as chief in originating them has been proved to be corrupt, and his son-in-law does not seem to be free from corruption if we may judge him by his performances in this discussion.

4. My opponent says of me, "He also knows that so long as 'The Way' existed as a separate paper, he was allowed equal space in it in any controversy between him, and Harding." In response to this I state that here is a double mistake, which might be designated a twofold falsehood. (1) I don't "know" anything of that kind. (2) On the contrary, I "know" the very opposite to be true in nearly every phase of our controversy. For instance, in his paper for "Aug. 14, 1902", without copying a sentence from my pen, Prof. Harding published an article against me, in which he declared to his readers that I had made against him a "false and injurious charge". Then in his paper for "September 4, 1902", he published another article in which he used the words "wicked" and "damning" in expressing himself concerning a few impersonal statements from my pen. In the same copy of his paper he alleged that I had made a "wicked and slanderous charge" against him, but he was careful to withhold all that I had said, except a few words taken out of their connection. (3) In his paper for "Sept. 18, 1902", he declared that I had made "unjust and murderous assaults" upon the character of certain brethren, but he was careful not to publish to his readers even one complete sentence from my pen. But a want of space forbids that I should refer to more instances of Prof. Harding's unfairness. These that I have referred to are sufficient to show that my opponent is again in error. He is so nearly always wrong that a correct statement from him seems lonesome in his writings. I question whether a more reckless asserter among professors of the

true religion ever disgraced the name of Christ or the foot-stool of God.

5. Prof. A. says, "One word about that suppressed communication.—Let Bro. Sommer show matter that has been 'suppressed' because it sets forth our meanness (?) and his case has been made out". In response I state that he is wrong again. The reason for suppressing a communication was not involved in my opponent's charge, nor in my reply. He charged that the REVIEW was open for any one to say everything that he might wish to say, in regard to the colleges that I oppose and in refuting that charge I copied suppressed matter that was as severe as any that we had published. Therefore my case is made out and Prof. A. is convicted of error on that question, also.

6. But here is another charge. "Bro. Sommer refused Bro. Rhodes the requested privilege of editing his own speeches". This charge likewise is erroneous. B. F. Rhodes did not make any such request as my opponent said he did. On the contrary, he only requested the privilege of seeing the "proofs" or "proof sheets"—I have forgotten which word he used. In response I informed him that the "proofs" were not made till after the type was set, and then we could not admit changes. But I intend to publish the correspondence between Prof. Rhodes and myself on this subject, if I have preserved it.

7. Here is another of the same kind from the same source. "When Campbell put an appendix to his published debate with Walker he asked his respondent to reply to it, but Bro. Sommer inserted twenty-six pages without giving his respondent the slightest chance to reply". In regard to this I state that over six pages of the so-called "appendix" mentioned by Prof. A. consisted of a copy of two of his own articles. Did he wish Prof. Rhodes to have the privilege of replying to them? If not, why make such a sweeping reflection against me? The reader can judge.

Prof. A. says that I "will not reveal these depths" "of Satan" that I charged against him. The reader is aware that I have stated that they consisted in the unscrupulousness of my opponents.

9. My opponent further says that "our origin as a whole stands unassailed. When assailed I vindicated our organization".

Here is a plain contradiction, for the "origin" and "organization" of his college were assailed at the same time as they are inseparably connected. Yet he says of one that it "stands unassailed", and of the other that it was "assailed"! Poor Armstrong!!

10. He states, "By the Savior's life and teaching I established our purpose". I deny the statement, and refer to the record in this discussion for proof of my denial.

11. He states also, "I patiently showed the unlikeness of our school to the Missionary Society". I deny the statement, and refer to the record for proof.

12. Next Prof. A. states, "I carefully showed that our school exalts completeness in Christ". I deny this statement also, and appeal to the record for proof of my denial.

13. Then we find this: "I proved that Christians must teach all righteousness and morality through the 'pillar and ground of the truth' or rob God of glory". I deny that he proved this. On the contrary HE OPPOSED THIS DOCTRINE WHEN I QUOTED IT FROM A. CAMPBELL.

14. We also find this from the same reckless source: "I proved that . . . the principle that stops us from teaching the Bible in school drives every moral principle out of the school room". Here is a two-fold mistake, for here is the implication that some one has been opposing my opponent teaching persons in the Bible in the school room. This is an old dodge, and is as false as anything that the father of lies ever suggested. I have only opposed building up schools that are established FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE of furnishing an occasion to teach pupils in the Bible, for I contend that "Christians must teach all righteousness and morality through the 'pillar and ground of the truth' or rob God of glory". But this is not all. By reference to teaching found in certain text books against tobacco and strong drink I showed that even if the Bible is excluded from the school room, yet that fact would not drive every moral principle out of the school room". But in the face of all this my opponent says, "More vital work ignored".

15. Finally, my opponent says of me, "He has ignored, origin, organization, purpose, completeness in Christ, our likeness (?) to

the Missionary Society, the Church as the pillar and ground of the truth, Buffalo Seminary, the fact that all literary schools are 'religio-secular', and many other things. My vindication of our work at every one of these points has been placed before the very champion of the opposition, but he can not be induced to take hold of these vitals''.

I deny the foregoing paragraph from beginning to end, and charge my opponent with writing ten unmitigated falsehoods in that paragraph, and refer my readers to that which I have set forth in regard to the items he mentions as evidence of the truth of my charge.

Under the heading "Non-essentials and Personalities" my opponent continues to falsify concerning this discussion, and seems to forget that in my essays on "English construction", I showed that he taught in his first catalogue the doctrine of the devil as recorded in the first part of the 3rd chapter of Genesis.

Then he tries to show that I have taken three positions in regard to the Money Question, and with his usual success in slandering, but failure to convict me of error. A brief statement of my position on the Money Question is one thing, and an amplification of it is more. What he designates my 2nd and 3rd positions on that question are but amplifications of the first. That which my opponent says about my so-called "Necessary Position", the reader can understand, by referring to the record, to be a continuation of slanders.

Reader, I have already occupied, and, perhaps, transcended prescribed limits in regard to space, and shall now need to end this essay. In so doing I shall make a few statements.

1. I deplore the fact that Bro. M. C. Kurfees could not serve as my opponent in the discussion of the College Question, and, as a result, I could not have a manly, truthful, careful, honorable, man as a respondent.

2. I deplore the fact that instead of a dignified discussion I have been compelled, as in my discussion with Prof. Rhodes, to engage in chasing a slanderer.

3. I think the honorable reader will agree with me when I

state that I have convicted my opponent of at least a hundred gross misrepresentations, which might be designated by a worse name.

4. I rejoice in the assurance that I have never misquoted, nor misrepresented, my opponent in the slightest particular.

5. I believe that I have exposed all of my opponent's fallacies that I attempted to expose, and have given the reader evidence that if I failed in any instance to expose his fallacy it was only for want of space.

6. I have quoted my opponent's exact words in nearly every instance that I have criticised him, while he has seldom quoted my words, and has nearly always misrepresented me.

7. I have not tried to compliment myself nor flatter my readers by addressing them as "beloved", nor have I appealed to popular prejudices in order to have something to say that would reflect against my opponent.

8. I am satisfied with every phase of this discussion, except that I have not had an honorable opponent.

9. The fact that dishonorable disputants are the only ones that have thus far attempted to defend the colleges that I oppose is a strong argument against them.

10. If there is an honorable man who favors the colleges that I oppose, and will affirm that they are scriptural in Origin, in Purpose, in their use of the Lord's money, and in Name, I challenge him to make himself known to me.

11. If my opponent has a vestige of honor in him I appeal to that vestige to prevent him from offering new facts, new arguments, or new slanders, in his last attempt at reply to me, for I do not wish to lengthen this discussion by replying to anything more.

12. About six years ago I began, with much reluctance, to oppose a certain class of colleges, for they had been projected by men whom I supposed were my brethren. But I have tested six of them, and have proved them to be reckless in regard to truth, on the College Question, and slanderers of me personally. As a result I can not regard them as my brethren, and do not so

designate them except through force of habit in form of expression. My opponent, on the other hand, has professed to regard me as a "brother", but likened me to a cowardly "dog" in his 3rd essay, and to a "bull dog" in his 19th. Between these extremes he has been guilty of much vituperation, and scurrility, toward me personally. In connection with this I mention again his almost incessant misrepresentation of me and the position I occupy. In view of all this I solemnly state that I question whether the sun has even shined upon a greater burlesque on education than when such men as I have referred to arose and offered themselves to the Churches of Christ as educators of their children. In conclusion I appeal to all my readers who have an exalted reverence for the Bible, and regard for truth, who delight in that which is dignified and honorable, to unite with me in opposing those who refuse to affirm that their institutions are scriptural, and who depend on falsehood and scurrility for their defense. I appeal, likewise, to all my brethren to unite with me in daily prayer that God will save his churches from all their enemies, and especially their college enemies.

J. N. ARMSTRONG'S TWENTIETH REPLY.

Many of our warmest supporters protested against our entering the debates with brother Sommer because of his established character for ugliness toward those whom he opposes. We have no reason for debating with him save that we believed the truth was suffering and needed defence. Brother Sommer has gone through the debate in hop-skip-and-jump style, proposing to reply to two or more of my articles in one. His last essay is a sample along this line. I could not help such methods suggesting the school-boy in debate, or the barking dog.

I repeat that since my respondent has lost every position he has taken concerning the school and its work, his only hope now is to destroy my personal influence. By getting you to believe that I am guilty of "unmitigated falsehoods"—falsehoods for which there is no excuse; no mitigating circumstances to soften, to make

Thus A admits that what he calls "the truth" is dawn.

less severe, or harsh; just as bad falsehoods as a man could tell—he hopes to lead you to distrust all I have said. How much better it would have been had he cited a single paragraph in which he discussed the things I said he had ignored, and left the reader to see the "unmitigated falsehood". I uncover this deplorable conduct that the truth may not be held down by it, and that all may see who has made parts of this debate rough, many times my respondent has said and done inexplicable things to me, but I have tried to believe there were mitigating circumstances, and on this ground, I have called him "brother", not to please him, but Christ.

M. C. Kurfees in describing Mr. Russell's conduct in the Cincinnati debate says: "Many of his strongest points are found, when examined, to be simply his assertions. . . . One prominent defect in his method as a debater is his utter failure, in most cases, to examine his opponent's arguments. He does not seem to feel any obligation whatever to do this, and he has his negative speech, in some instances, written out and ready to read before hearing the speech to which it is given as a reply." I want every fair mind to compare the conduct of this champion with the conduct of my respondent, father and champion of the opposition to Bible-school work. Although brother Sommer went into a written agreement with me to "offer objections" to my position, about nine of his twenty essays in this debate were written and in print long before the debate was mentioned. He has thus disregarded "the commonest requirements of public debate, the meeting of an opponent's arguments as presented in the debate". As has been said of Mr. Russell, so I say of my respondent, throughout he has been "conspicuous in his lack of frankness and direct grappling with the opposing argument".

While I believed it to be my duty to press brother Sommer till he was forced to notice my work or show that he *would not* because *he could not refute it*, I have scrupulously guarded myself in every reference to him and have never intentionally reflected on his heart. If I have unwittingly reflected on him, save as a debater, I am sorry for it and ask his pardon now.

COMMENTS ON MY RESPONDENT'S LAST ESSAY.

Faithful obedience to the divine doctrine of equality will take all of the Lord's money out of the hands of individual Christians, *amplified*, means that individual Christians may keep in their own control a part of the Lord's money and, as stewards of the Lord, invest it according to best judgment. *Strange amplification!*

Did Timmons' horse become a religious horse because appeals were made to the Church to buy him? If not, why do appeals to Christians to help our school make it a Church school, a religious institution? Brother Sommer went off on a tangent here to break the force of this reasoning.

I deny that J. A. Harding ever said that the Nashville school was brought into existence to develop preachers, in the common acceptance of that term. The chief purpose in our Bible teaching has ever been to move Christians, boys and girls alike, to work for the salvation of others. Is it wrong for boys who want to preach publicly to go to school? Does it prove that the school to which they go is a theological school? "What does such testimony mean?" That brother Sommer could not meet the irrefutable facts I set forth and has made this effort to cover them.

I do not criticise brother Sommer for rejecting "errors" in text books, but I DO criticise him for renouncing all authors and trying to force every body to his own standard. But, no doubt, "he calculates to expose the last one of them", for he has already written "eleven pages" demolishing Rigdon. Dear me "!!!"

For one to affirm a proposition with one meaning and another to deny it with a different meaning is to debate with out a proposition. With my whole heart I affirm that our school is scriptural, but nobody but an imbecile would affirm this with my respondent's meaning. For him to ask us to affirm it with his meaning is to beg the question, it is to assume the very point to be proved. My respondent has never offered me a proposition that did not call on me to affirm that our schools are "ungodly". He now puts a bold challenge but sees to it that he leaves a "slip-gap". Next time he must meet "an honorable man". He claims to have "test-

ed" six and found them wanting. Truly, had he had Kurfees with his "inexorable" and "faultless" logic, in this discussion, Kurfees would have been the "most dishonorable college advocate" in America.

I did not say that Harding published in *The Way* a long article from Sommer every time he called Sommer's name. No editor does this. A man is not in controversy with one every time he criticises that one. However, every reference brother Sommer cites from *The Way* was concerning a criticism of Harding that appeared in the O. R.—that is, Sommer was the first critic. Did Sommer publish long articles from Harding every time he criticised Harding? If so, he has long since repented and bravely reformed.

On April, 15th., brother Rhodes wrote brother Sommer as follows: "I wrote you March, 25, asking the privilege of proof-reading my speeches in the debate you purpose publishing. I am informed that your stenographer reports that he has difficulty in transcribing his notes to my speeches. Both custom and common justice sanction my request and I am astonished that you have not given your assent to the request ere this. . . . In view of the confessed difficulty of the stenographer in transcribing, unless my request is granted, there will be strong presumptive evidence of an intention on your part to act unfairly. This I do not wish to believe and so shall not attribute any such unworthy motive to you until I am compelled to do so." To this letter brother Sommer replied in a letter dated April, 17, as follows: ". . . We don't get a 'proof' until the type is set, and then we cannot allow changes from the M. S. This indicates that you should have the M. S. of your part of our discussion if there was any need for it by reason of the reporter's inaccuracy. But I do not feel like trusting you with that M. S. Brother W. G. Roberts trusted an innovator with a M. S. and could never get it back. . . ." These letters cry aloud for themselves. I can not suppress a slight curiosity concerning the use made of proof-sheets in the O. R. office.

The fact remains that brother Sommer included twenty-six pages of extra matter in "Skirmishes" without giving brother Rhodes the slightest chance to reply. Although that debate stood

in great need (?) of those appendices, brother Sommer will never outlive the dishonor his act heaped upon him as a debater. It will make him immortal!

Notwithstanding he is forbidden by contract to doctor this debate behind the wall, my respondent in his appeal to the possible "vestige of honor" in me to keep me from using new matter in this article, threatens to be dishonorable himself and add an appendix. And, strange to say, while appealing to the last possible "vestige of honor" in me he himself transcended our agreement in the length of his article by, at least, 1500 words, half as many again as he is allowed! This is strange "honor" but no doubt there are mitigating circumstances. He was trying to help the reader get the "merits of the debate."

BROTHER SOMMER'S TWO "BONES" TAKEN FROM HIM.

Since brother Sommer does not deny Christians the right to build and support righteous schools, there is, as has been shown again and again, no more difference between us on the money question than on the purposes of baptism; yet, for about seven long years, he has been nagging at this "bone of contention", stirring up strife and even bitterness in the family of God over it. I have, also, shown again and again that "biblos" and "biblion" are applied in the New Testament to human books, writings, and scrolls. According to brother Sommer's own testimony, the Holy Spirit did, in Rev. 14:6, use "biblion" in a general sense. In Acts 19:19, it is clear even to the dull that the Spirit applied "biblos" to books written by human hands. Were brother Sommer's doctrine true, the Holy Spirit would certainly be guilty of sacrilege. Again, I have shown that such expressions as, "Bible maps", "Bible Society", "Bible House", "Bible Store", "Bible Dictionary", "Bible Reading", etc., are so common that, with all of brother Sommer's opposition, the O. R. office calls one of its booklets a "Bible and Testament Catalogue"! Why is it right for brother Klingman to apply this word to a "Reading" at Detroit in which Bible, Greek, Hebrew, English, Church History, etc., are taught, but wrong for us to apply it to a "School"? Brother

Sommer would have answered long ago if he could. I have shown again and again that the applying of "Bible" to the Holy Scriptures stands on human tradition, and that brother Sommer makes this tradition of men equal to the blood-stained teaching of God. He who winks at such human legislation approves of high-handed presumption in the Church of God. He who teaches that biblos, biblion, and Bible are sacred words teaches Sommerism, pure and simple.

HIS SCHOOL.

In my first article I gave my respondent's admissions concerning this school work. Now, since his two "bones of contention"—money and name—have been buried, let us look at these admissions again.

1. "Christians may band themselves together to teach secular knowledge. They may teach the Bible part or all the time. They may do this to make a living or as an act of charity." (See O. R. of Aug. 29th., 1905, and of Sept. 5th., 1905)

2. "Christians may band themselves together to teach [in order to teach or for the purpose of teaching] secular knowledge, or the Bible, or both." (See Sommer's fourth essay in this discussion.)

3. Such a school is "religio-secular". (See his seventh essay on the name.)

Well has brother A. J. Peck, one of my respondent's warmest supporters, said that where brother Sommer fell down in the oral discussions was in admitting so much. Even brother Peck can see that brother Sommer admits the whole thing. Many at the oral discussion saw it and were anxious to see him take up his old "bones of contention", but he would not. Now, beloved friends, his "bones" are forever gone and his admissions are stronger than ever. As late as the O. R. of March 27th. 1908 a Christian asks: "Would it be wrong for someone to establish a school wherein our young could secure the very best education, and at the same time have the Bible taught in the school just the same as you would any other study, . . . have such teachers as you would know to teach

the Bible, word for word and dot for dot . . . ? . . . I write this because I hate to send my little boy to the public schools of to-day." To this my respondent answers: "I have placed myself on record as favoring such schools as Bro. White thinks should be established." But after endorsing the work, as such, in his reply to brother White, he makes a severe fight on the *men*. He thinks they are so unworthy, so incompetent, so conceited, and so given to hobby-riding, that all true Christians ought to be discouraged in regard to such schools! This is logic! Such logic as a man gets who quits school to learn to think!

I know you have not forgotten how long and hard my respondent was pressed to reveal the "depths of Satan" before he admitted that this new discovery (?) was not *in the schools at all, but in the MEN*. Brethren, I desire to say with emphasis, *build as many schools like Buffalo Seminary as you want and brother Sommer has no objections, PROVIDED you select the right men to do the teaching. But I give you warning! don't select one of David Lipscomb's or J. A. Harding's "boys". Search and see, can any good thing come out of Nashville or Bowling Green? Get the editor of the "only right" to select your men for you, then only are you safe from his anathemas!*

*How
he
brags!*
If ever a man lost every position he took in a debate brother Sommer has done it in this one. While some of the opposers think that he has admitted too much, that he has hung himself, they ought not to expect too much even of their champion. No man can do the impossible. A man must admit *something* about schools or oppose all school work. If he admit that Christians have the right to teach the Bible in their schools, he must admit our work, for it is as simple as regular school work can be. If he exclude the Bible from the school-room altogether, as A. J. Peck and others do, he drives, as I have repeatedly shown, every moral principle out of the school-room, so far as Christians are concerned, and turns all school teaching over to the Devil and his agents. There is not a literary school in America that does not have for its chief end the building of character, but no Christian can build character, in the school-room or out of it, save as a member of the

body of Christ, as Church work, without dishonoring God and his institution. The Christian is absolutely complete in Christ. The Church is the pillar and ground of all true character building. No matter which way an opposer turns he destroys himself. The brethren who blame brother Sommer for "falling down" have a blind eye, they have not seen the ditch on the other side.

I repeat for the last time in this debate that parents must choose the *kind* of religion they want their children to receive, the kind of character they want established, remembering that wherever they send them, the children drink in a most effectual way, religion from the first day till the last, that their characters are being established by the school they attend.

BUFFALO SEMINARY.

It is very fortunate that a school so far beyond the pale of criticism that Daniel Sommer can endorse it, can be found. We have a historical account of this wonder in *Memoirs of A. Campbell*, Vol. 1. pages 491-510, Vol. 2. page 48.

1. The seed from which Buffalo Seminary sprang was a much-felt need of instructed and cultivated minds in the work of the Lord.

2. It was established to open an opportunity to teach the gospel of Jesus Christ to the young.

3. Its chief purpose was to train hearts and minds for God.

4. It was a "religio-secular school to teach persons in religion."

5. It took the most powerful preachers in America, Alexander Campbell and his father, out of "the field".

6. It employed buildings, grounds, money, time, and talent, that belonged to God.

My respondent says that if "David Lipscomb, J. A. Harding, J. N. Armstrong, and others" had established such schools they "could thereby have done much good". Beloved friends, should you take out of the schools for which I am contending the items mentioned above, not one of them could live another day any

more than a man could live without heart, lungs, liver, kidneys, stomach, and bowels.

I wonder now if brethren who have encouraged brother Sommer in creating alienation and strife in the Church of God do not feel deep regret that such internal war has been waged over matters on which we are a *unit in essentials*. Think of it! the people whom brother Sommer is trying to divide believe with their whole hearts that the Bible is God's revealed will; that it is the all-sufficient rule of faith and practice in all religious work and worship; that every religious practice must be established by an expressed statement of the Bible, a necessary inference, or an approved Apostolic example; that "whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God". In short, he is trying to divide a people who are as nearly one in doctrine and practice as it is possible for true loyal hearts to be; a people who are one on every question in religion save in their misunderstandings of the teachings of Christ. Brethren, it is a shame that we, the only people in the world that stand loyally for God's book, His Church, and His Child, would destroy ourselves over our failure to understand perfectly His word, that we would stab the body of Christ to death fighting for loyalty (?). Could he do it, brother Sommer would lead the O. R. readers, a small company compared to the great body of disciples that advocate the schools, to reject as Christians this body of disciples notwithstanding the fact that it stands with the O. R. family on nearly every other question discussed in the Church of God. Following such a principle every preacher in the Church would build up his individual sect.

In concluding let me say that there has never been a moment in which I have felt "waspy" toward my respondent. His personalities have never angered me. Truly am I sorry for him, for he has ruined himself. If I have turned aside at any time to defend myself, I ask the father to forgive me this wrong. I know I have pressed brother Sommer pretty hard but I have never done it save to make the truth stand out clear. If I have pressed him too closely with the naked facts that I have used, it has been a mistake of the head and not of the heart.

With my whole heart I now commit this book to God. I pray that he may use it, first, to give the truth to hearts that are in darkness; second, to blot out the alienation, strife, and division, that it has been my respondent's effort to work in Israel. May the truth in it shine so clear that all true hearts may see that the bloody battle over this school question has been a groundless fight.

April 24, 1908.

The deed P.P. 84, 85-

W. G. R. withdrawn from
P.P. 218, 219, 225

Prof. Armstrong is driven
to the wall on the word
biblion P.P. ^{116-118, 156, 157, 181-186} 219, 220, 225

Samner says they will forfeit their
discipleship. P.P. 14, 15

Colleges unscriptural and "small evil than
good". P. 17

Colleges "not after Christ", etc. P.P. 28, 29

Armstrong objects to Samner
disfellowshipping them. P. 108. Samner
admits it, etc. P. 151