

Ye num'rous sects
which all declare
"Lo Christ is here,
Lo Christ is there."
Your stronger proofs
divinely give
And show me where
the Christians live.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
O, Savior, where?"
I heard the cry,
and then I heard:
"Here is My Church
where men still dare
To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.' (Jer. 6:16) 'And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in' (Isa. 58:12)."

Vol. 6

LEBANON, MISSOURI, JANUARY 1, 1933.

No. 1

G. C. BREWER'S REVIEW OF "THE CUP OF THE LORD"

ANSWERED BY J. D. PHILLIPS. No. 1

Brother G. C. Brewer, an editor of the Gospel Advocate, Nashville, Tenn., has offered his readers three lengthy editorials in issues of September 1, 8, and 15, 1932. I shall, the Lord willing, review his articles in a series of articles in the Old Paths Advocate. The following is his preface:

"THE CUP OF THE LORD."

A good brother in Texas has sent me a thirty-seven-page booklet bearing the title that is used as a heading for this article, with the earnest request that I review it in the Gospel Advocate. The author of the booklet is J. D. Phillips, of Montebello, Calif., and he argues, or thinks he does, that only one cup (vessel) should be used on the Lord's table and each member of the congregation should drink from this one cup. Of course the tract contains nothing but quibbling, and it is distasteful to me to analyze and expose such attempts at argumentation, but the brother assures me that some of his own people are deceived by this seeming show of learning and logic and he wants help. In the hope that I may give him the needed help, I here give brief notice to the tract.

I learned to admire Bro. Brewer several years ago when I read his tract in answer to O. E. Payne's book entitled "Instrumental Music is Scriptural." Before I read Brewer's tract I was of the opinion that Paul's use of "psallo" and "psalmos," two Greek words rendered "sing" and "psalm," carried with them the idea of a mechanical instrument to accompany the singing. Brewer's tract completely upset Payne's book. Since reading it, I have been thoroughly settled on the music question.

In his review of Payne's book, Brewer was fair: he gave his readers precisely what Payne offered as proof. But in his review of "The Cup of the Lord" he gave his readers hardly a line of what I actually said. This is not fair; and I hope the honest-hearted readers of the G. A. will send for my tract and read it carefully. It is free. Please send postage. My reviewer's unfairness is further evident from the fact that he resorts to the sectarian dodge, namely; If it is the truth, distort it a little and meet the distortion; if you cannot do that ridicule it in some way; if you cannot do that, throw trash over it and keep the readers from seeing it.

I cannot think of being dishonest with my brother's review. I am giving his articles verbatim et literatim. For the sake of clearness, I will give one paragraph at a time; then let my reply follow. But I know that you cannot get the force of what is in my pamphlet unless you read it for yourself. If you want the truth, you owe it to

yourself to read the pamphlet reviewed. I believe that if you will do this, you will decide that my reviewer is only a Goliath trying to cope with a David. I beg you to read the pamphlet.

He starts out by saying that my tract "contains nothing but quibbling," and that "it is very distasteful" to expose my "attempts at argumentation." And yet he takes up more than his usual editorial page in three successive issues of the Advocate. This is an unintentional compliment, considering how great a man he is. The truth is all we want. In my reply, I hope to set forth the truth in such a way that "the wayfaring man, yea, fools, shall not err therein." "Great is the truth, and mighty above all things, and will, at last, prevail."

1. Contention. In the years gone by all congregations used from two to six or eight cups or glasses on the Lord's table. No thought or importance whatever was given to the number of vessels used. The size of the congregation determined the number. Then, when we began to use the individual cups, some people, with no reason except a sentimental reason—a prejudice against anything new or different—began to object. Then, in seeking Scripture proof to sustain their objection, they discovered that the record says our Lord took "a cup" (singular), and they insisted that we should use only one drinking vessel. It was pointed out that we had been using two, four, six, etc.; but the objectors, to be consistent, now declared that we had been wrong all the time, and we must henceforth use only one cup. They never would have thought of this if it had not been for the introduction of the individual cup. But now there is a distinct "one-cup" faction, with its paper, literature, preachers' list, and other paraphernalia, to our disgrace and shame.

It is not true that "all congregations used from two to six or eight cups" in the communion. Hundreds of congregations have never used more than one cup. F. L. Rowe fought the use of cups, in 1910, as the files of the Leader will show. J. W. McGarvey, one of the greatest scholars we ever had in our ranks, did the same. The files of the Christian Standard will show this. Winifree, author of one of the best books on the prophecies, fought the use of more than one cup in the communion, as the files of the Firm Foundation will show.

Neither is it true that "No thought or importance whatever was given to the number of vessels used." In a book entitled "The Gospel According to St. Luke, With Notes Critical and Practical, By M. F. Sadler, Rector of Honiton and Prebendary of Wells," we read (p. 563) of "The Cup After Supper"; "This cup is the New Testament in My blood" (Luke 22:20). This is virtually the same as the words recorded in the two first synoptics (Matt. and Mk.), "This is My blood of the New Testament." Only we gather from it the exceeding importance of the chalice. It contains the

Lord's blood."

Bishop Lightfoot, the peerless scholar and exegete, universally recognized as one of the best, if not the best, authorities on Hebrew and Greek, says: "As it is here said of the cup, This cup is the New Testament in My blood; so it might be said of the cup of blood (Exod. 24), That cup was the Old Testament in the blood of Christ" (Lightfoot's Works, vol. 2, p. 260).

"St." Ambrose (died A. D. 307) says, "We receiving of one loaf and of one cup, are receivers and partakers of the body of the Lord" (L. IV. ch. 4).

Ignatius (died A. D. 107, just one year after the Apostle John's death) says, "There is . . . one cup to (show forth) the unity of His (Christ's) blood" (Epistle to Philadelphia).

Kurtz says, in Lange, "A fellowship among guests at a table united as brethren in Christ, whose union is symbolized by the wine contained in one cup."

It is not true that the brethren who believe in the use of one cup in the communion have out a "preacher's list." However, if we did, it would not be "to our disgrace and shame" any more than the list published by Bro. Brewer's paper, which excludes the names of the preachers that favor mechanical music in the worship. I do not recognize Bro. Brewer's divisions. Yet I oppose every innovation, whether it be practiced by the "digressive" brethren, or by the "loyal" brethren.

He admits that the introduction of the "individual cups" had something to do with starting a contention. Why, then, did they introduce them? Do they rejoice in division? He further admits that the "individual cups" practice is "something new," and since Webster shows an innovation to be "something new," it follows, as a logical conclusion, that his individual cups practice, with the law that binds it, is an innovation!

But what he says amounts to nothing unless he can prove that—What the congregations used "in years gone by" is Scriptural. He is no better off than the brother that advocates mechanical music in the worship and goes to the Old Testament, or to what the "congregations used in the years gone by." Neither is he any better off than the Romanist who advocates "auricular confession" and goes to what the "congregations have used in the years (several centuries) gone by," as proof.

And the Romanist, by the same "hook," can prove each congregation should have a priest over it. This, too, was practiced by most "congregations in the years gone by."

The Romanist cannot take his Bible and read in it of the Catholic priesthood, nor of auricular confession. Neither can a "digressive" take his Bible and read in it of mechanical music in the worship. Neither can Bro. Brewer take his Bible and read in it of a plurality of cups in the communion. In every reference it is the singular word "cup," a translation of the Greek, *poterion*, which means "a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer).

Yes, your practice (and the contention it calls forth) is a "new thing," as you admit. A "new thing" in religion is something that is not in the New Testament, and James A. Allen, once editor

of the G. A., says, "Anything that is not in the New Testament ought not to be anywhere else." Alexander Campbell, Thomas Campbell, and Moses E. Lard say the same. A greater has said: "Who-soever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God" (2 Jno. 9). And Paul says, not to become "wise above that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6).

Digressives have always sought out new things with no thought whatever as to whether they are Scriptural. They get their music, their sprinkling, and their infant baptism first (and because they want them) and before they get their arguments by which they seek to justify them. And when questioned about them, they appeal to the Bible, not because they expect to find them there, but because the people generally expect to find in the Bible what they do; and because they can make no head-way as Protestants without pretending to have Scriptural authority for what they do.

And so it has been with the cups brethren. And it is astonishing what excuses and subterfuges they have resorted to. Their arguments are as fallacious and puerile, as contradictory and vague, as sophistry can conjure up.

And by these digressions, we now have the "individual-cups" faction, the "two-or-more-cups" faction, and those who still stand for "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6)—"the cup" or "a cup," of the Bible. And all this in the very face of our Lord's prayer for His followers "that they be one, that the world may believe" and the apostle's injunction that we all "speak the same thing" and that "there be no division" among us, and knowing, or at least, should know, that no Christian walks worthily of his vocation unless he endeavors to "keep the unity (henotees, from *heis*, *henos*, one) of the spirit in the bond of peace" (John 17; 1 Cor. 1; Eph. 4).

Who can thus betray his Lord? We need to examine ourselves. "Lord, is it I?" And will they stop at "individual cups"? No; for already "unleavened bread" is only an "incidental," they say. See G. A., Sept. 15, 1932, p. 1021. Extremes meet. Perhaps "many cups" will finally lead to "no cup." The Catholics tell us that "the blood is in the body" (loaf), so they have the priest to drink all the wine! The pope has the priest to drink all the wine because it "saves time" and because "some feel a disgust at all drinking from one chalice," as can be seen by consulting their Catechism. Our brethren use "two-or-more-cups" and "individual-cups" for the same reasons. And there they go—on to "Mystery, Babylon the Great" (Rev. 17). The Catholics had been on the job with their innovations for centuries before they had as many innovations as our brethren now have. And old Bro. Tant, one of our cups brethren, continually warns us, saying, "Brethren, we are drifting, drifting, DRIFTING; and will soon be like the churches about us." (Continued).

When in need of any kind of commercial or publication printing, write Laycock Printing Company, Jackson, Tenn. They are equipped to serve you and will appreciate your business.

WALKING IN NEWNESS OF LIFE.

No. 1.

We have been shown by the New Testament "If any man is in Christ he is a new creature." 2 Cor. 5:17. By virtue of being "a new creature in Christ" it necessarily follows that those who are in Christ should "walk in newness of life," just as a married person is expected to live the married life.

It may be well to notice where to walk the "new life" (or live it). In Col. 2:6 it may be seen where to walk, "as therefore ye received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in him." We are informed by the above teaching all who have "received Christ (the anointed) Jesus (Saviour) the Lord" (law giver) should "walk in him" (not out of him). Those who are "In Christ are new creatures" hence, have died to sin or the world. Ro. 6:7:10:11. Thus they are to "follow his (Christ's) steps." 1 Pet. 2:21. "Looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith," etc., Heb. 12:2; "wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of a heavenly calling, consider the apostle and High Priest of our confession, even Jesus, who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also was Moses in all his house." Heb. 3:1:2. By "looking unto Jesus and considering him as our apostle and High Priest" we will be "walking in him."

Moreover, "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another and the blood of Jesus, his son, cleanseth us from all sin." 1 Jno. 1:7. To "walk in the light" is to walk in Christ because he is "The light of the world." Jno. 8:12. Not only "The Light," but "the true Light, even the light which lighteth every man (Jew and Gentile) coming into the world." Jno. 1:9.

If the disciples of our Lord should "walk in Christ" as directed the reflection of the light (Christ) will be so vivid and radiant its expansion may be seen throughout the whole world. It could then be truly said of the children of God, "Ye are the light of the world," Mt. 5:14, and are "walking as children of light," Eph. 5:8, that ye (we) may become blameless and harmless, children of God without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom ye are seen as lights in the world." Phil. 2:15.

Furthermore, God's people are to "walk in truth." 2 Jno. 1:4. Christ is "The Truth," Jno. 14:6, therefore, God's people are to walk in Christ.

We are to walk in "The narrow way." Mt. 7:14. Lk. 13:24. Christ is "The Way," Jno. 14:6, therefore, we are to walk in Christ.

The disciples of Christ are to "walk in newness of life." Ro. 6:4. Christ is "The Life," Jno. 14:6, therefore, the disciples of Christ are to walk in Christ (not in and after the world).

"Broad is the road that leads to death and thousands walk together there;

But wisdom shows a narrow path, with here and there a traveler.

Deny thyself, and take the cross, is the Redeemer's great command;

Nature must count her gold but dross if she would gain this heavenly land.

The fearful soul that tires and faints, and walks the way of God no more.

Is but esteemed almost a saint, and makes his own destruction sure.

Lord, let my hope be not in vain, create my heart entirely new;

This hypocrites could never attain,

This false apostates never knew."

Joseph Miller,
1004 North Lambert Street,
Brazil, Indiana.

NOTICE TO DELINQUENT SUBSCRIBERS

We regret very much to drop anyone's name from our mailing list, but unless you renew at once, or notify us to continue your paper, we shall be compelled to discontinue the O. P. A. to your address. Many subscriptions expire with this issue. Look at top of page 3, to see if your paper is marked, "time expired," and if so, please renew at once. Invite others to subscribe with you, or maybe, you can send the paper to a friend for a year. —H. L. K.

S. J. Gay, Bayfield, Colo., Dec. 10, 1932.—While reading the report of Bro. Vandanam as given in the December issue of the O. P. A., it made me wonder just how many brethren actually realize the conditions in parts of our own country. The people in this section are just as destitute of the knowledge of God as are those in India. From what I can learn the people of Bayfield, Ignacio, Durango, and Aztec, New Mex., have never had an opportunity to hear the true Gospel preached in their towns. I doubt if there has ever been a loyal gospel preacher in this section. There are two school houses, where I have been invited to preach, but I have no way of conveyance to and from them. I had planned to hold a meeting in this town during the holidays, but our baby and I have both been sick, so I will not be able financially to hold it until at a later date. The last preaching that I did was at Farmington Glade school house, in New Mex. It was the first time the gospel was ever preached there, but I baptized two and had a good interest. Pray for us. Success to the O. P. A. and all loyal brethren.

EXPLANATION

Bro. J. D. Phillips requests that we discontinue his name with the "Editorial" on page 4, giving as his reason that he does not think he deserves to have his name appear in such conspicuous manner. We are granting the request by discontinuing the "Editorial." —H. L. K.

SISTER KING'S CONVALESCENCE

We are very thankful to God that we can report to the readers that Sister King is doing exceedingly well considering the seriousness of the operation, which she has undergone. She is now able to be up and to eat almost anything she wants. Thanks to all who have shown so much interest in her welfare by making inquiry about her condition and by writing words of encouragement and sympathy, and for your prayers in her behalf.

—H. L. K.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant, Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year \$1.00
Single Subscription six years \$5.00

Printed by Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

POLICY OF THIS PAPER

1. To judge no man's loyalty to his God by his loyalty to the paper.

2. To "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." (Jude 3). And thus complete the restoration started by the Campbells and others a century ago.

3. To oppose every departure from the word of God in faith and practice; avoiding at the same time undue stress on any one sin, to the exclusion of others. We expect to wage a war of uncompromising hostility against every sin both in and out of the church.

4. To make the paper an open forum, insofar as the issues being discussed are considered vital to the welfare of the church and the salvation of the soul.

5. To give the readers a balanced periodical, thus making it beneficial to both saint and sinner.

6. To manifest the spirit of Christ in dealing with all issues and controversies, thus avoiding personal thrusts and abusive language. We ask all our writers to say nothing in the columns of the paper that they would be ashamed or afraid to say in the day of Judgment.

7. To make field reports a special feature. Therefore, we insist that all preachers and leaders of the loyal congregations send in reports and announcements regularly; thereby encouraging others in the work.

8. Finally, to be true to the charge that God has given us; to glorify Him in all that we do or say; to urge upon all a closer walk with God; realizing that we have never dying souls to save, and to fit them for Mansions in the sky.

Signed:

J. D. Phillips
Homer L. King

H. C. Harper
Homer A. Gay

Remarks

Since we have added so many new names to our mailing list since we published the first issue a year ago, containing the above "policy" of the paper, I think it proper to give a reprint as we begin a new volume of the paper, so that all may not lose sight of the object of the paper. I wish

to call special attention to Nos. 2, 3, and 6. I can see no reason for changing the policy as stated above for 1933, and I hope that the writers will strive to abide by it.
—H. L. K.

FROM THE FIELD

James R. Stewart, Eola, Texas, Dec. 8, 1932.—I closed a series of meetings with the sound brethren, in Fort Worth, the 20th of November, embracing two Lord's days. The crowds were small, but it seemed that all enjoyed the meetings. One was baptized and one restored. Bro. Gay and I preached at the home congregation last Saturday and Sunday. Had good crowds each service, especially the Sunday night service. We expect to conduct a series of meetings here Christmas week.

Jesse E. James, San Antonio, Texas, Dec. 1, 1932.—Bro. G. B. Harrell and I have just recently arranged for a debate with the "pastor" of one of the S. S. churches here, on the cups question. Bro. Bob Musgrave is to represent those favoring the use of one cup, while James O. Rails is to represent those favoring cups in the communion. We do not know just when the debate will take place, but we are expecting it in the near future.

O. B. Perkins, Gilpin, Ky., Dec. 1, 1932.—I have just returned home from (I was about to say, a discussion, but my opponent didn't come). I had signed propositions with J. E. Wooldrige (Methodist) on the work of the Holy Spirit and on water baptism, but he failed to show up, and when I went to his home he flatly refused to meet me at this time, but promised to meet me next July. Here is a sub. for the O. P. A.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla., Dec. 2, 1932.—I have just returned home from Hollister, Okla., where I have been working for the past seven weeks. While there I met with the Carter Congregation, near Fredrick, Okla. I found some good brethren there, and I expect to return next August for a series of meetings. Bro. Hagens is able and a good man.

W. C. Rice, Mountain Home, Ark., Nov. 22, 1932.—I am very busy working and preaching Saturday and Sunday at different points. I had a fine trip to, near Carthage, Mo. Had large crowds and fine attention. I heard Bro. W. G. Roberts one night, in Springfield, Mo. I preached at the Ball school house over last Lord's day. Had large crowds, and one was baptized and one restored.

J. D. Phillips, Montebello, Calif.—The meeting at Hughson, Calif., closed Nov. 20, with one restoration. This was the first gospel meeting ever held in that community, but there are prospects for building up a good congregation. I promised to assist them again as soon as possible. About a dozen members meet each Lord's day to "break the loaf," in the home of Bro. W. E. Murry. I

shall, the Lord willing, leave for Texas some time in Dec. or not later than Jan. 1.

Homer A. Gay, Eola, Texas.— Leaving home Nov. 4, I preached that night at Lampasses to a nice crowd, and spent the night with that good man of God, J. I. Grantham. Bro. J. R. Stewart made this trip with me. From here we went to Waco, continuing over two Lord's days, baptizing one. The crowds were small, but the brethren seemed to think we had a good meeting, and asked us to return next year. Bro. Stewart left me at Waco, and went to Fort Worth for a meeting. I went from Waco to Bethel, near Temple, preaching one night, where I have held many meetings. The visit was a real treat to me, as I met so many old friends. I enjoyed a day with Bro. I. G. Hayes, a faithful gospel preacher. My next stop was at Hamilton, where I have labored much. In spite of the cold weather, we had a fair crowd. I reached home Nov. 16, and found the family well, and the church doing fine. I am thinking of making another trip into Missouri and Indiana next summer.

From Canada

Harpree, Saskatchewan Canada
November 25, 1932.

Mr. Homer L. King,
Lebanon, Mo., U. S. A.
Dear Bro. King:

In October we sold our goods and started on the way for Gothenburg, Nebraska, but were unable to gain admittance into the U. S. A., on the account of not having any promise of support from a congregation. As a result we proceeded to the above address. The congregation here is the only one I know of in Canada, that does not have a Sunday School or a system in which the women answer questions in the assembly. The brethren are faithful in their Lord's day attendance, and many have grown spiritually since I was here last.

In the very recent past there has been virtually a famine in these parts; consequently financial conditions are not at all good. Of course, I presume that similar conditions obtain elsewhere. In the meantime, however, the work in Gothenburg waits. I am wondering whether in traveling the past season, you have come across a congregation, that might support a work as above for a short time. If not, do you know of a faithful preacher in the vicinity, who should be financially able and who would undertake to do the work?

According to what Bro. Geo. Moore (Gothenburg) has written me, there are a number of brethren in his vicinity, who have either gone in with the sects or are indifferent regarding the worship of the Lord, but who might be roused and rallied to the Standard. Bro. Moore is not only anxious to see this work go ahead, but is ready to do all he can himself. The principal thing is that the work ought to be done. Now, I am willing to undertake the task, but under the above conditions as stated am not able. If circumstances cannot be arranged so that I can get to that field, I would like to see someone else go. I am not per-

manently settled here, and would be willing to go most anywhere, but on account of immigration laws could not cross the boundry line, without promise of support.

For the present please send my copy of the O. P. A. to the above address instead of Fairview, Alberta, Canada. I shall try to get subscriptions while here.

May the Lord's good favors always be yours,
—L. L. McGill.

Remarks

Who will help Bro. McGill to get located in the mission field at Gothenburg, Nebr.? If you can do anything for the work there and are willing to do it, write me or Bro. McGill at once, telling us just what you are willing to do. A man of Bro. McGill's ability should be able to accomplish much in that field as described by Bro. Geo. Moore. I do not know of a faithful gospel preacher in that state. It certainly needs and deserves one sound preacher, and Bro. McGill seems to answer the description, or I am no judge.

—H. L. K.

"THE DOCTRINE OF THE NICOLAITANES"

What is the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes? Twice has Jesus said in his letter to the churches, "I hate the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes." They taught, according to the best information we have, that Christians might conform to the world somewhat; that it would be better for the cause of Christ for them to do so; that, for the heathen's sake, they should not be too particular; that they might go to the temple of the idols and bow and worship (or seem to worship) with the idolaters; that they might partake of the offerings to the idols, and be on good terms with the idolaters, to get them to meet with them and hear the gospel preached. And then, hearing the gospel, they would be converted and become Christians. And, of course, the persons converted to the Lord among the heathen would still go, as taught by the Christians, in the way of the idolaters around them, and it was a compromise between Christianity and idolatry. Jesus said he hated it then, and I am satisfied that he hates it now. Sometime since, while I was assisting in a meeting during the Christmas Holidays, a brother said to me, "I think you would have more influence in the community, and do more good in the meeting if you would go out to their Christmas tree." We must keep up with the times, you see, in order to get a hearing from the world. It has been argued by some that it is no harm to go to the little amusements of the neighbors around us, to these little plays or parties and such like. When a Christian is led off into these things, he will find, when he comes to himself, that they are only stepping stones to greater evils. Better heed Paul's admonition when he said, "shun the very appearance of evil." But it has been said, "In Rome we must do as Rome does." It has been said that Paul taught this, but he never hinted it. I know he said he became all things to all men. "To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law (being not with-

out law to God, but under the law to Christ) that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak, became I as weak, that I might gain the weak; I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the Gospel's sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you." Paul did not say that he conformed to their practice: he only became as a Jew to the Jews, by using the Jewish scriptures in showing them that they were wrong and Jesus was the Christ. He only became as under the law by using the law in all its types, and showing them that they pointed to Christ; and, in this way, fought them on their own battle-ground.

To those that were without law, that acknowledged no law as given by Moses, did not believe the Jewish scriptures, Paul never quoted the Jewish scriptures; he did not use the Jewish scriptures among the Gentiles to convert them; he did not make his appeal to those scriptures at all, but said, "your own poets condemn you," while he was at Athens. To the weak he became as weak; that is, he used great plainness of speech that all might understand him. In reading after Paul, do you feel that he conformed to the world around him? Was it for being as the Jews were, in his preaching, that he received forty stripes, save one, at five different times? Was it for conforming to the customs of the Gentiles that they threw him among the wild beasts? Was it for saying that those that were under the law were right, that they abused him and beat him with rods? No; it was for saying they were wrong, by meeting them on their own ground and using their own arguments against them. Then, let us never be guilty of practicing the thing that Jesus declared he hated; but "ask for the old paths, wherein is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

—H. C. Welch.

BAPTIZO; BAPTISMA

Under the heading "Sound Speech" Daniel Sommer has this to say in the Review of March 15, 1932:

The word baptized, even when used in quotation marks, is erroneously used when reference is made to sprinkling, even as the word rantized would be erroneous if used with reference to baptism, even if used in quotation marks. Immersion and sprinkling are so distinct that they should not be used interchangeably, even if used in an accommodative sense. Therefore, when referring to those who think they have been baptized because they have been sprinkled on, we should say so, but not say of them—"who have been 'baptized' otherwise." To this I add that the accuracy of "sound speech" requires we should not forget to mention also that acceptable baptism requires it shall be done by the authority of Christ and into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." But the writer under review seems not to have considered any of this. Nor did he consider that the expression "for the remission of sins" (in Acts 2:38) should be modified by the words "unto" and "into," as later translations of that scripture require, and as "sound speech that cannot be con-

demned" demands.

But this is not all that should be stated in this connection. When I began to study this question of baptism critically I read "Campbell on Baptism" and found he followed a Baptist theologian named Carson (as I now recollect) and declared the Greek "baptidzo" was and is a specific word with a specific meaning, and that meaning was and is to "dip, plunge, immerse." But when I later read the "Campbell and Rice debate," and still later read the "Braden and Hughey Debate," I learned "baptidzo" was used in a considerable variety of connections in Greek literature, and I began to doubt on that subject. Finally a clear-thinking brother said, "The word baptism means a state or condition, however that may be accomplished." Then I examined the definitions and uses of that word and concluded it meant an overwhelmed condition, and that means that its general or generic meaning is overwhelmed, whether that condition is accomplished by a pouring, an inundation or overflowing, or by strong drink. Therefore I was compelled to conclude that Carson and Campbell, and all others who followed them or adopted the doctrine that the word "baptidzo is a word of specific meaning," except incidentally, were and are wrong. It is a word of generic meaning, and that meaning is an overwhelmed condition, which may be accomplished by a variety of specific actions or conditions; for the apostles were baptized by the Holy Spirit when they were overwhelmed by it, and Jesus was baptized by his sufferings when he was overwhelmed by them.

And it should be "considered" that "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" is in the command (Mt. 28:19) to the one who does the baptizing; and since Sommer claims that this was to the Apostles of Christ exclusively and not to us, he might tell us by what authority he baptizes.

And it should be "considered" that "in (epi or en) the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 2:38) is in the command to the one being baptized and signifies "reposing one's hope on him, Acts 2:38"—Thayer, p. 94. And it should be "considered" that the phrase translated "for the remission of sins" signifies "to obtain the forgiveness of sins, Acts 2:38"—Thayer, p. 94. Hence McGarvey (New Commentary on Acts of Apostles) well says, "Peter's purpose in the expression (eis aphesis amartion) was not to indicate the mere fact that baptism brings one to remission, but to state the blessing in order to the attainment of which his hearers were to be baptized. In other words, he states a motive for the act." (p. 261) And the scholarship of the world stands back of Thayer, that the phrase is telic, that is, a phrase expressing purpose—they were commanded to have this purpose. "Unto" is antiquated (See any good dictionary). And while the phrase is telic, and "eis" is best expressed in English for such a phrase by for, in order to, with a view to, or the infinitive with to, as in "to obtain," yet "into" is clearly implied, for as Dill says, "The entrance 'into' a state or condition may be presented to the mind as the purpose or end of our actions." (See Handbook on Baptism, p. 344). And this figurative

force depends, of course, on the literal definition of the word.

And it should be "considered," even if it takes another "critical" examination, that the Greek verb baptizo is a specific word, meaning to immerse; and immerse is a correct English rendering in the New Testament. Dare Sommer deny this? Because Sommer does not know the difference between the metaphorical use of a word and the meaning of a word, is no reason why we should let his blunders go unnoticed. The metaphorical force of a word is always backed by the literal definition. This you find in the baptism of suffering; baptism in the Holy Spirit, etc. And the definition of a word can always with propriety be substituted in syntax for the word. And **baptisma** means an **immersion, submersion**.

Let Sommer produce the scholarship that will back up his assertions here. He wants us to take his *ipse dixit*, but he is just a smatterer when it comes to scholarship.

Let Sommer produce the real scholars that will say Campbell and Carson were wrong if he wants us to believe it.

Those who wish to investigate this matter can find in "Handbook on Baptism" (Gospel Advocate, Nashville, Tenn.), "The Form of Baptism" (Christian Standard, Cincinnati, O.), or send ten cents to the office of the *Old Paths Advocate*, Lebanon, Mo., for a review of Sommer on Baptism. H. C. H.

SHOULD CHRISTIANS PRAY FOR THE SALVATION OF SINNERS?

If a member of a sectarian or denominational church be asked this question, his answer will invariably be in the affirmative. Confronted with the question, "Do members of the Church of Christ believe that Christians should pray for sinners?" he would as invariably say, "No! Emphatically no!" And perhaps, "They do not even believe in prayer!"

Why do they feel this way about us, the Church of Christ? The only logical answer that I can think of is that it is because we do not ask God to set aside His law and save the sinner independent of obedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

I believe that all Christians should pray for the salvation of the sinner; but, in accordance with the will of God, as it has been revealed in His last will and testament. The beloved Apostle Paul, in writing to young Timothy says: "I exhort, therefore, that first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks be made for all men." —I Tim. 2:1. Since we must pray for all men, it is evident that we are to pray for the sinner. I will even say that I do not believe that a man can be a real Christian and not pray earnestly for the salvation of the sinner. Prayer is the sincere desire of the heart. —Romans 10:1. Also, "from the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." So, if the Christian has the sinner's salvation at heart he will express his desire in humble prayer to God. The apostle Paul, in speaking of Israel, his brethren in the flesh, says: "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they might be saved." —Romans 10:1.

The Bible does not only teach that we are to pray for the lost, but it teaches how we are to pray. Surely, Paul's prayer for Israel was that they might accept Christ as the Messiah and obey His gospel and be saved.

In the prayer of Christ as he hung on the cross, dying for the sins of the whole world, we have an example of the saved praying for the sinner. His prayer was, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." —Luke 23:34.

Such a prayer was offered up for the very people that were putting Him to death. Was His prayer answered? Yes. On the first pentecost after the ascension of Christ, the Apostle Peter who held the keys of the Kingdom stood before some of the very same people that Christ had prayed for here. After being told how that they had crucified their own Lord and Savior, they cried out, "Men and Brethren, what shall we do?" The inspired answer was, "Repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins." —Acts 2:38. About three thousand accepted the Gospel and were saved. Hence Christ's prayer was answered, but it was answered in accordance with God's law, or by their accepting the Gospel that was able to save. —James 1:18.

Another inspired example of the efficacy of the Prayer of a Christian for a sinner is that of Stephens. While he was being stoned to death, he prayed, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." —Acts 7:60. Was this prayer answered? Yes. There was a young man of Tarsus, named Saul, who consented to his death, and was a vile persecutor of the Church, making havoc of it. We learn in Acts, ninth chapter, that while on his way to Damascus, a great light shone around about Saul and he heard a heavenly voice, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" In answer to his terrified inquiry as to who the speaker was, he was told, "It is Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." Then he was told to send for Ananias, a preacher of the Gospel who would tell him what he must do. When Ananias arrived, he told Saul to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins calling on the name of the Lord. —Acts 22:16.

So, again, we find that the prayer of a righteous man in regard to the salvation of sinners was answered, but in accord with God's will. Thus the prayer of the Christian for the sinner, to be effective, must be in accord with what is revealed as the will of God. To ask God to set aside His law, and save the sinner without obedience or without effort upon his part is an abomination in His sight.

—O. B. Perkins,
Gilpin, Kentucky.

HONOR ROLL

The following persons have our thanks for their co-operation in securing subscribers for the O. P. A.: J. D. Phillips 4; John B. Hall 2; L. I. Ooley 2; J. E. Tidwell 1; O. B. Perkins 1; Homer A. Gay 1; L. G. Park 1; C. H. James 1.

Let Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn., handle your printing. Their prices are reasonable, quality is high and service is unsurpassed.

GOD'S ELECTION OF GRACE.

Doubtless God chose Abraham because he was a man of Faith and Obedience. Having chosen him, He chose his seed after him. His seed was not chosen for their faithfulness, until we come to Christ. But God made oath to Abraham, to bless his seed.

Not that God is any respecter of persons. But God had to use somebody, and nobody was worthy. The Jews were as good as anybody, and somebody had to start the work which God wanted done. So, unto them First, God gave his lively oracles, and to the Jew first, he showed all long-suffering, and to the Jew first he gave the Messiah.

But God's intention was that thru Abraham and his seed should all the families of the world be blessed. They were to be a Missionary people. They were not to be a selfishly separate people. Even the Temple was built for "a house of prayer for all nations." Solomon's prayer included the Gentiles in its scope.

When the family of Israel became a narrow, and self-centered people, God scattered them among the nations, so that "Moses had everywhere them that preached Him, being read in the Synagogue every sabbath day." So, even the Synagogues were intended for centers of Missionary work among the Gentiles.

So God made the Jews his own people, by grace, and for grace, world wide in its intention. But when Jesus came unto "his own," and his own received him not, he turned to the Gentiles, not because the Gentiles were a better people, but because he had to turn to somebody, and use somebody for missionary effort.

It is to be supposed that the first Gentile converts were such as God saw would be faithful and obedient. But the Gentiles have proved just as recreant to duty, and to the purpose of God, as the Jews. They, in turn, have become narrow and self centered, and have persecuted and despised the Jew.

God is about to turn back to the Jew again. Not because they are better than the Gentiles, but because God has to use somebody, and the Gentiles have proved to be unfaithful. Besides, God made an oath to the "fathers" of Israel, which he has not forgotten. It is God's election.

Were the Jews better than the Gentiles, and are they now? "No, in no wise, for we have before proved, that both Jew and Gentile are all under sin." "So then, It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God who showeth mercy."

Let the Gentiles understand that God did not choose them because of any superiority in them. The first chapter of Romans pictures the horror of their iniquity, and unworthiness. Let the Jews realize that God did not choose them for any superiority in them. The second and third chapters of Romans shows them to be guilty of "the same things."

"But, I would not have you ignorant of this mystery, lest you should be wise in your own conceits, that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." "For there shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and

shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." "And so all Israel shall be saved." "They are beloved for their Fathers sakes."

"Not for your sakes do I this, saith the Lord God, be it known unto you: be ashamed and confounded for your own ways, O house of Israel!" "I do not this for your sakes, but for mine holy name's sake." "As touching the Election, they are beloved for their fathers' sakes." "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

But "many are called, but few are chosen." Salvation is not by grace Alone. You may have all manner of "gifts" and be "nothing." The general calling is wide, and is of Grace. But only a willing hearted, surrendered life, faithful unto death, is "chosen" of God, in the end.

Paul Hays, Fresno, Calif.

CUP OR CUPS

(By Z. T. Winfree, deceased, from F. F., 1913)

Should one cup or more than one be used in the communion? Brother H. C. Harper and Brother L. J. Killion have been considering this question, and I wish now to say a few things on the subject.

I will assume that the readers of the Firm Foundation have noticed the discussion, hence I shall simply call your attention to Brother Killion's last article, of the date June 10, 1913, and then go to the word of God, as more profitable to quote, and to abide in. The word says: "And he took the cup." Mark 14:23. "And he took the cup and gave thanks." Luke 22:17. "Likewise also the cup after supper, saying This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Luke 22:20. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" 1 Cor. 10:16. "Ye can not drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils." 1 Cor. 10:21. "In like manner also he took the cup when he had supped, saying this cup is the New Testament in my blood." 1 Cor. 11:25. "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. 11:26. "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. 11:27. "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." 1 Cor. 11:28.

Here any one can see that we have multiplied instances where the Lord himself and the Apostle Paul spoke of "the cup," "this cup," and "that cup." But there is not a single precept or line for the cups, these cups, or those cups. And we cannot in good, commonsense, say that the cup, this cup, or that cup means that more than one cup was sanctioned in the communion by the Lord or by the Apostles afterward. Paul says on this matter: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." 1 Cor. 11:23.

Hence we have every "Thus saith the Lord" restricting the number of cups to be used in any one congregation at one service to be but ONE.

Can you send us one or more subscriptions for the O. P. A. Your help is always appreciated and you are supporting the good work by so doing.

"Lo Christ is here,
which all declare
Lo Christ is there."
Your stronger proofs
divinely give
And show me where
the Christians live.
Ye num'rous sects

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
O, Savior, where?"
I heard the cry;
and then I heard:
"Here is My Church
where men still dare
To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.' (Jer. 6:16) 'And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in' (Isa. 58:12).

Vol. 6

LEBANON, MISSOURI, FEBRUARY 1, 1933.

No. 2

HOME TRAINING

In writing our caption we indicate a much neglected and much needed practice. Against fathers and mothers who have failed to train their children, may be laid a charge of a great deal of the present day sin and crime. Few things are more needful and few things are more neglected than child-training in the home. Solomon said, "Train up a child in the way he should go, And even when he is old he will not depart from it." Hence the going astray that we see amongst the rising generation must be due in great measure to the lack of parental training. This unfortunate condition exists to some extent because people have not been taught and as the Word of God is our Perfect Guide in the home training, let us study it to learn our duty toward God, our fellowman and growing youth.

Fathers as heads of their houses must take the lead. "And ye fathers provoke not your children to wrath; but nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord." In all matters pertaining to the family, woman is man's helpmeet. "She shall be saved through her child-bearing if they (woman and children) continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety."—I Tim. 2:15.

Hence that she has part in the training of the children is only too evident. See also II Tim. 1:5; (cf. Prov. 31:10-31). To this extent the Christian's life is Patriarchal. However the Mosaic Order succeeded the Patriarchal. Some features of the latter were included in and some excluded from the former. The law of Christ superseded all. The old (both Patriarchal and Mosaic) were done away with, except such features as God saw fit to include in His new order of things. The relationship of man and wife and family was restored as at the beginning. (cf. Gen. 3:16 and Matt. 19:3-9; I Tim. 2:11-15). Consequently we may say that the religion of Jesus Christ is a coupling together of the antitypes of the Patriarchal and Mosaic orders with some similarities and many new commandments. (cf. I Cor. 14:34; Eph. 6:1-4; John 13:34). The whole system of acceptable service is embodied in the New Law or New Testament. Under it, two institutions are approved by God in this dispensation; these are the Home and the Church. The Patriarchal religion pertained to the family. The Mosaic religion was national. The two are combined in Christ. Christianity is the religion of the family and of the Kingdom or Church. And as the boundaries of the Kingdom or Church are to be extended including all the earth, the Christian order of things is to be world-wide.

The home and the church are distinct and separate from each other in their various capacities and functions. (I Cor. 11:22, 34). The Church has her duties and rites to perform in a public way. The home has functions to enact in a private capacity. One cannot substitute for the other and still please God any more than one individual can substitute for another in certain capacities. The home is the private training school for the individual family. In it in certain respects we prepare for the greater service in the church. The Church is the public training school for working of these two organizations we shall be fitted for the eternal home in the everlasting kingdom of our God and of His Christ.

Of any single factor the commandments of God himself have the greatest influence upon children. In support of this consider his instructions to the Israelites, "thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up," etc. Deut. 6:7-9; cf. II Tim. 1:5. The persistent continuance in this course will impress the heavenly precepts upon the young minds. As the Christian's theme is "Salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth," we needs must talk constantly in our home about God's Word and the winning of souls. In such an atmosphere the impressionable minds of youth will be influenced toward heavenly things.

Under the Patriarchs the religion pertained entirely to the individual family: Of which each male member offered up sacrifices. Gen. 4:1-4. Under the Mosaic Economy it pertained to the nation or congregation. Under the latter no one could offer up sacrifices at his own home, but only through the priest, where the priests were at the tabernacle. Deut. 12:1-14, 21. There, were offered morning and evening sacrifices. Under the New Covenant all Christians are priests, and all mature males are authorized to offer up spiritual sacrifices, holy, acceptable to God. I Pet. 2:5. This may be done anywhere that the priests are. John 4:20-24; I Tim. 2:8-15. And especially at that place we call home—the place where we are morning and evening. In every true Christian Home will be offered morning and evening, readings of God's Word, prayers, etc. to the honor of God and for the blessing of the family. There is nothing in any home that will tend more to awe and control children than family worship entered into by the parents in Spirit and in Truth. Neglect of this very thing has brought about the down fall of many, and a return to the practice will go

along way toward bringing about a return to spirituality as God would have it.

Not only will family worship bless the training of children, but it will do much toward the development of much needed teachers, deacons, elders and evangelists, "If a man knoweth not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?" I Tim. 3:5. It is only too evident that this course is intended: that when men have developed their own homes, then are they fit for developing the church of the Lord. And especially will the influence of this bi-daily family worship edify and draw closer to God the younger members of the family.

In company with this influence, the children should be brought to the assembly of the Church—at least upon the First Day of the Week—but better yet to all meetings. And when children are well trained in the homes, they will know how to conduct themselves in a graceful and becoming manner in the assembly. Too often this phase of training is neglected to the detriment of the children and to the discomfort of others. It is sin for children (or anyone) to destroy the spiritual solemnity of the worship in the assembly of the Lord.

Blessed are the man and woman who have many children trained in the fear of the Lord. Their children will rise up and call them blessed. Their brethren, friends and neighbors too will praise them. Their praise shall endure unto many generations. Sela.

—L. L. McGill.

COMING OUT IN THE OPEN

Some of our preaching brethren have been rather slow and reluctant about coming out in the open on some of the questions which have troubled congregations during the past few years, but we rejoice when brethren muster up enough courage to speak out and show their colors. No doubt there are a number of others who have been keeping quiet just as the ones we are about to let speak out. If so, come on out in the open, and let us know where you stand. Here is our hand, brethren; we welcome you into the fight for righteousness and primitive Christianity. We need you and you need us.

Here is the good news sent in by Bro. Gay:

Bro. E. J. Smith, of Crowell, Texas, writes under date of November 21, 1932, that he has always been a one cup man, but has waited and prayed that the cups people would not cause any trouble. He says, "I have kept out of the fight on that question, not that I feared anything, but I was in hopes that these brethren would cease to pervert the word of God and let the truth reign, but as it is very plain that they will grow worse and worse; I am ready to defend the truth on that subject as well as on baptism, and will do so without the least fear of defeat." Bro. Smith is a good man and a good debater. He also states that he did not know there was such a paper as the O. P. A., until I sent him a copy. I feel that he will be a real co-worker with us.

Under date of Nov. 25, 1932, Bro. A. McFaden, of Winters, Texas, writes me: "Yes, Bro. Gay, I

am with you on the cup question and all other Bible truths. I do not like the way the brethren who favor two or more cups are acting about it. I am afraid for them. May God have mercy on them. Bro. J. H. Stewart gave me two copies of the O. P. A.; the first I have seen. I like it fine. I shall make my reports through the paper, and do all I can for and through it; even though I cannot now subscribe for it."

Bro. McFaden also is a good man and a good preacher, but he has not been preaching very long. He recently lost his little four year old girl, and is very sad.

He further writes, "I preached at Ballinger, Texas, last Lord's day, the 20th inst., and the Lord willing, I shall preach here next Lord's day. The church here is doing fine. When I came here last July, things looked bad. I preached seven nights, and four were baptized and three restored. The rest of the brethren then determined to do something for the Lord."

Then while I was at Waco, I met old Bro. W. L. Long, who lives there. (J. D. Tant baptized him in 1887, and he began preaching that same year). He told me that his final conclusion was that the cups were no more authorized by the Bible than the organ or the S. S., or any of the other societies. He is old and feeble now, but is much help to the sound congregation, where he worships each Lord's day.

—Homer A. Gay.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Look at top of page three to see if your paper is marked "Time expired," and if so, please renew at once. If you do not have the money now and want the paper, notify us to that effect. I know that financial conditions are bad everywhere, but that is the very reason you should renew your subscription to the only paper of its kind. Act now! Do not delay! We must press the battle in Jesus' name. We cannot afford to lose the ground we have gained. Others are waking up and coming to our rescue—the light is breaking!

—H. L. K.

"WHY I SMOKE" SCRIPTURALLY ANSWERED

1. "Because I like it."

Ans. "And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passion and the lust thereof" (Gal. 5:24). "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Col. 3:17). "Christ shall be magnified in my body" (Phil. 1:20).

2. "I like to be sociable."

Ans. "Go forth unto Him without the camp bearing His reproach" (Heb. 13:13). "Ye adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God; whosoever therefore would be a friend of the world maketh himself an enemy of God" (Jno. 4:4). "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing" (2 Cor. 6:17). "She (all) that giveth herself to pleasure is dead while she liveth" (I Tim. 5:6). "My little children, guard yourselves from idols" (I Jno. 5:21).

3. "Because I don't believe it does me or anybody else any harm."

Ans. "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good" (Thes. 5:21). "We walk by faith and not by sight" (2 Cor. 5:7). "Faith cometh by hearing the word of God" (Rom. 10:17). "Look therefore carefully how ye walk, not as unwise but as wise, redeeming the time because the days are evil; wherefore be ye not foolish but understand what the will of the Lord is" (Eph. 5:15-17). "There are good works that are evident, and such as are otherwise cannot be hid" (1 Tim. 5:25).

4. "It soothes my mind."

Ans. "Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee" (Eph. 5:14). "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ and make no provisions for the flesh to fulfill the lust thereof" (Rom. 13:14). "Be sober, be watchful (alert of mind)" (1 Pet. 5:8).

5. "It is no one else's business, just so I please myself."

Ans. "Ye are not your own, ye were bought with a price, glorify God therefore in your body" (1 Cor. 6:19, 20). "Let each one of us please his neighbor for that which is good unto edifying, for Christ also pleased not himself" (Rom. 15:2). "Wherefore if meat (smoking) causeth my brother to stumble, I will eat (smoke) no more forevermore, that I cause not my brother to stumble" (1 Cor. 8:13).

(Smoking is a carnal lust, crucify it, ere it enslaves you).

—EVOLDNARAEFNI.

HONOR ROLL

The following persons have our thanks and appreciation for their co-operation in securing subscribers for the O. P. A.:

L. M. Morgan—5; Homer A. Gay—3; H. N. Johnson—2; L. H. Fletcher—2; R. H. Peel—1; Grace Chisholm—1; Lewis Musgrave—1; L. D. McDonald—1; A. W. Fenter—1; H. L. Reagan—1; Herschel Massie—1; Wm. I. Holler—1; Mrs. Donie Trott—1; Mrs. Verdie Poteet—1; Paul Hays—1; E. A. Brown—1; John L. Reynolds—1. E. F. Gannon—1.

Let us have your name next time; you and others need the paper, and we need the money for the printers.

DONATION FUND

Wm. I. Holler ----- \$1.00

THE EXCEPTION IN PRAYER

With one exception most anything by any author on prayer is correct. On this one thing denominationalism is wrong, and the teaching is becoming prevalent in the churches of Christ. It is that any position in prayer is acceptable to God, and standing is the popular attitude. In view of this let us carefully consider:

(1) That nowhere in the Bible has God taught His people to stand in prayer.

(2) That God has taught His people to kneel:

(a) By precept, Psalms 95:6; Is. 45:23; Rom. 14:11; Phil. 2:10.

(b) By example, 1 Kings 8:54; 55; (Kneel with hands uplifted to pray, stand to bless—give thanks, dismiss with blessing); 2 Chronicles 6:13, 14; 1 Kings 18:42; 19:18 (even idolaters kneel before their idols); Ezra 9:5, 6; Dan. 6:10; Matt. 17:14, 15; Mark 1:40; 10:17; 15:19 ("Bowing their knees worshipped Him"—showing in worship the knee is bowed and not simply "bow our heads" as is becoming the preachers' orders to the congregations); Luke 22:41.

(c) By implication, Matt. 26:39; Mark 14:35; Luke 22:41; 1 Corinthians 14:23-25.

(3) That hypocrites stand in prayer, Matt. 6:5; Luke 18:10-14 ("Justified rather" does not mean justified, but that he was more justified than the other because of his humility).

(4) That Mark 11:25, "when ye stand, praying," refers to moral standing with God and not to standing upright on the feet, is shown by every passage in which this defective Greek verb is used in the New Testament: Romans 14:4; 1 Cor. 16:13; Galatians 5:1; Phillipians 1:27; 4:1; 1 Thessalonians 3:8; II Thess. 2:15.

(5) That Christians are under the last commission of Christ to the apostles: Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15, 16; Luke 24:45-49; John 16:13; Acts 1:8; 2:1-4. This is the beginning of the church of Christ. With the Holy Spirit to guide the apostles into all truth, they now begin to carry out the commission to teach Christians to observe all things that Christ had commanded them to observe. And under the last commission all the truth as taught by the Holy Spirit through the apostles on position in prayer is: Acts 7:60; 9:40; 20:36; 21:5; Ephesians 3:14; 1 Timothy 2:8. Kneeling with hands uplifted to God is all the truth as taught by the Holy Spirit through the apostles on the position of the body in prayer. Only those who kneel with hands lifted up observe 1 Cor. 14:40. Those who stand in prayer reject the teaching of the Holy Ghost, refuse to follow the example set by Christ and the apostles, and substitute their own teaching and example instead.

(6) That we must follow the example set by the apostles to be Christians: 1 Cor. 4:15, 16:7; 23; Phil. 1:27; 3:16-19; 4:9; 1 John 4:1-6; 2 John 8, 9.

(7) That the sole purpose of prayer is to present petitions to God—to make our requests known to God (Phil. 4:6), and that when we wish to petition anyone for anything we try to present it in the way that we think it will be most acceptable. How much more careful then we should be to follow the express wishes as taught in His Word and followed by His own Son and the apostles of the eternal, almighty, infinite, omnipresent God, when we come to present petitions to Him.

Presented in love for God and man by,

J. Madison Wright,

2816 Osceola Ave.,

Columbus, Ohio.

Laycock Printing Co., of Jackson, Tenn., are equipped to handle your printing needs to your entire satisfaction—in quality, service and price.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year \$1.00
Single Subscription six years \$5.00

Printed by Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

WORDS OF ENCOURAGEMENT

"Enclosed find my renewal to the best paper in the world. I don't want to miss an issue of this good paper, and I hope to be able to send in a donation soon." —R. H. Peel, Texas.

"I have received, I think, three numbers of the O. P. A. through the favor of someone unknown to me. I do not know of a paper published by those professing to be members of the Church of Christ, that stands for 'the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth'; so if you succeed in so doing you'll be an exception. There certainly should be room for such a paper." —J. Madison Wright, Ohio.

"Have just read the January issue of the O. P. A., and will say, it cannot be beat. Its policy is excellent. I like to pass it on to my friends. May God's richest blessings rest upon you and yours." —H. N. Johnson, Texas.

"I am glad we have a paper and a faithful few who have the ability and courage to expose idolatry and ungodliness in every form. I don't want to miss a copy. The article by Bro. H. C. Welch in the last issue is well worth the price of the paper. As Bro. D. J. Whitten says, 'The most of us have only a dim glimpse of what it is to be a Christian'. With many good articles on Christian culture, some at least will wake up to these duties as soldiers of Christ."

—John L. Reynolds, Calif.

"I think the O. P. A. is a wonderful paper, and I would rather go hungry than to do without reading it. I pray that more and more people will hear and heed the word of God by reading this paper. May God continue His blessings upon you."

—Verdie Poteet, Okla.

Let every one get behind our paper and pull together. It needs you and you need it.

Send in a subscription to the O. P. A. today.

G. C. BREWER'S REVIEW OF "THE CUP OF THE LORD"

ANSWERED BY J. D. PHILLIPS. No. 2

2. Goes to the Greek. The author of the tract says: "When Alexander Campbell wanted to know the truth about baptism, he went to the Greek, and found 'baptisma, immersion, submersion.' When the cup question came up, we went to the Greek, and found the word 'poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel'."

Yes, "Campbell went to the Greek" on baptism, and the sprinklers began to quake, for they saw that their footing was gone. We go to the Greek on the cup question, and "poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel," is so clearly defined that no reasonable person can fail to get the meaning of the word. And it makes the cups advocates quake as much as "immersion, submersion," as the definition of baptism, made the sprinklers quake. There is no footing in either word for the evolutions of the theological skater!

Campbell went to the Greek lexicons because "baptize" and "baptism" are Greek words, and the only place to find them correctly defined and used is in the Greek lexicons and literature. But there was no need on earth to go into the Greek on the cup question. The word "poteerion" means in Greek exactly what "cup" means in English; and if there is any simpleton who does not know that a cup is a drinking vessel, he could consult his dictionary and learn this. What is the advantage in saying "poteerion" instead of "cup"? O, it sounds learned and beguiles the ignorant!

I go to the Greek on every subject that I investigate. "No Version is perfect. For all versions are the works of man, and no work of man is free from blemish. The divine Original alone is that" (Wordsworth, in the Introduction to "The Acts," Greek New Testament With Notes).

Campbell did not "go to the Greek because 'baptize' and 'baptism' are Greek words." Campbell knew that neither "baptize" nor "baptism" is a Greek word! They are Anglicised; and anglicise means "to make English" (Webster). And being English words, they are defined in English dictionaries. And the man who says they are not there defined correctly does not know the a, b, c, of language. Webster defines English words as their current meanings require. Through usage, the English word "baptism" has come to have three or more meanings, such as sprinkle, pour, etc., which is not true of the Greek word, **baptisma**, which means "immersion, submersion." From the very nature of the word it cannot mean to sprinkle or pour in Greek, its root being **bapto**, meaning "to dip." Likewise, through usage, the English word "cup" has come to have five or more meanings which the Greek word, **poteerion**, rendered "cup" in the New Testament, does not have: the Greek word means only "a cup, a drinking vessel." Even though **poteerion** is sometimes used both metaphorically (as in Matt. 26:39) and metonymically (as in 1 Cor. 10:21), the definition is "a cup, a drinking vessel." Both "baptism" and "cup" have meanings in English not inherent in **baptisma** and **poteerion**. The only way, then, to be infallibly safe is to go to the Greek Original, as Campbell and Carson did on **baptisma**, and as we are doing on **poteerion**. It neither "sounds learned" nor "beguiles" us for our brother to expose his ignorance as he has in his review.

But the author of the tract thinks by showing that the word is "poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel," he will have proved that the Lord took a literal vessel and blessed it, etc. Thus he thinks to escape the claim that the word "cup" is used in a figurative sense. But no one who has intelligence enough to go unincarcerated would say that the "fruit of the vine" was not contained in a literal cup or vessel, and that our Lord did not take up this literal cup full of wine when he instituted the memorial. There could be no dispute there between sane people.

Yes, I proved that "the Lord took a literal vessel" filled with "the fruit of the vine" and "blessed it," or "blessed" God for it, and said, "This cup is (estin, a copula of symbolical relation) the New Testament in My blood" (Luke 22:20). And "the word cup" is not "used in a figurative sense," in Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23 and Luke 22:20. Thayer says it is used literally, as "this cup containing wine" (Lexicon, p. 15).

By going to the Greek, I established the fact that the word "cup" in the New Testament always bears the same meaning—and this in opposition to those who teach that—"The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Matt. 26:27 and 'the fruit of the vine' are one and the same." This is the proposition as written, signed, and affirmed by J. N. Cowan, in *The Cowan-Harper Debate*. Alva Johnson affirmed in debate with H. C. Harper, and later with me, that—"The 'fruit of the vine' is 'the cup of the Lord'." True, indeed, the contention was not "sane" (as Brewer admits), but we were called upon to meet it: and did meet it.

Furthermore, any person who knows anything at all about any language knows that you cannot tell whether or not a word is figurative any better from the Greek than from the English. It is not a different word when it is literal and when it is figurative. The English word "cup" is used in both a literal and a figurative sense. Likewise the Greek word "poteerion" is used in both a literal and figurative sense. Yet every time Phillips quotes, "He took the cup," he places after the word "cup" the parenthetical expression, "poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel." He hopes thus to make the reader think that because the word is "poteerion" here, it was a literal vessel, singular in number. But when he quotes, "Drink the cup of the Lord" (1 Cor. 10:21), which he admits is a metonymy, he fails to insert his Greek word with its definition after the word "cup"! Why did he do this? Does he not want his readers to know that the word is "poteerion" in this place? Why did he not quote it after his usual style thus: "Drink the cup (poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel) of the Lord"? In other words, "drink the drinking vessel of the Lord"! O, but he says it is figurative here. Certainly, but it is "poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel." Surely any reader can see that there is no sense in giving the Greek word, as it is the same whether used literally or figuratively. Therefore, all his Greek goes for naught.

Why should I keep inserting the word, *poteerion*, after I had established the fact that the word "cup" in the English versions is always from *poteerion*, and that it is the same word, whether used literally or figuratively, in the Original?—and this in opposition to those who say, with J. N. Cowan, "I know the word 'cup' is often used to name a literal, material, vessel; but I also know that it never means that when used in connection with the Lord's supper."

But to show Bro. Brewer that I am not afraid to insert the word where he correctly says I did not, I here do so: "Ye cannot drink the cup (*poteerion*, a cup, a drinking vessel) of the Lord and the cup (*poteerion*) of devils" (1 Cor. 10:21). We "drink the cup"—drink the drinking vessel—"of the Lord" by drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer).

"By drinking what it contains, and in no other way" (N. L. Clark, in *Clark-Harper Debate*). And when we are told to "drink the cup," *poteerion* is used and it connotes "a literal vessel, singular in number," even though it is used "by metonymy of the container for the thing contained," as Thayer points out. See his *Lexicon*, p. 533. And had the Corinthians been accustomed to the use of cups, and Paul agreed with the practice, he would have used the plural form of *poteerion*, and the translation would have read *cups*. But the fact that Paul uses *poteerion*, in the singular, shows that they used one cup.

Thayer's *Lexicon* points out the passages in which *poteerion* is used literally as "the vessel out of which one drinks"; then the ones in which it is used "by metonymy of the container for the contained"; then the ones in which the writers of the N. T. followed the Hebrew idiom and used it in the metaphorical sense to denote the Savior's sufferings and death. See Thayer, p. 533. See also Robinson's *Lexicon*, under *poteerion*.

I appealed to the living scholars, in such institutions of learning as Yale, Harvard, and Chicago Universities, and quoted them by the dozens, in the tract. Instead of giving his readers what they said, he distorted it and met the distortion! He built a straw man, and knocked the filling out of it! And if you will read the tract under review, you will soon see why he did not let you see what I said, and what the scholars said, and you will see that the Greek does not go "for naught"!

3. Quotes the Scholars. The author of the tract quotes a great number of scholars to sustain his contention, but it is doubtful if these scholars could have even conceived of what his contention is. They answered his questions in regard to the Greek noun, pronoun, and its antecedent, etc. What those scholars say is not questioned by any one, and was not before he interrogated them. They only tell him that when the record says, "He took a cup," it means he took up a literal vessel filled with the passover wine. No one on earth ever doubted that. We could hardly suppose that our Lord took up the fruit of the vine and gave it to his disciples in his hands without any sort of vessel or container. But our author had to appeal to eminent scholars to prove that he did not!

I did not want these scholars to "conceive what" my "contention is." I wanted them to give impartial testimony in answer to my questions "in regard to the Greek noun, pronoun, antecedent, etc." I wanted them to answer my questions on the meaning of the language, without any prejudice, and without any effort, on their part, to argue the question of how many cups should be used, in the communion.

"What these scholars say is not questioned by any one," says Bro. Brewer. Reader, remember this! This is an admission that the Greek word, *poteerion*, means a drinking vessel. And yet, Bro. Brewer proceeds to call it just a "vessel," "pitcher," "vial," "bowl," "jug," "pot," or anything else that it is not! I certainly needed to go to the Greek text, or somewhere, for Bro. Brewer shows that he does not understand the English word "cup"! He admits the exclusive meaning of *poteerion*, even though he does want to evade the force of it by calling it "a vessel." "He took a cup" (Matt. 26:27) does not mean "he took up a literal vessel." A "vessel" is a generic term, and the Greek word is *skeuos*; a "cup" is a specific

term, and the Greek word is **poteerion**. The definition of a word and the word are convertible terms. I dare him deny it. A "vial" is a vessel; likewise a "jug," a "bottle," etc., almost ad finitum. You cannot give the meaning of Scripture that contains **poteerion** by giving "vessel," any more than you can give the meaning of Scripture that contains **baptizo** by giving "sprinkle."

His scholars tell him that the pronoun "this"—"touto" in the Greek—in the expression, "for this is my blood" (verse 28), has as its grammatical antecedent "the cup"—to **poteerion**—but that it by metonymy refers to the contents of the cup. Of course any intelligent person who does not know a Greek letter would understand that. The English is perfectly plain. Read it: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this (cup) is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins." (Matt. 26:26-28.)

Yes, the scholars back me in this interpretation. "This"—**touto**—is neuter gender, and it must, of necessity, refer to "cup"—**poteerion**—which is also neuter. But the reference is, my metonymy, to the contents of the "cup." I went to the Greek scholars on this point because some say that the reference word "this" in "this is my blood" cannot refer to the "cup" that contains the "blood" and that, therefore, the "fruit of the vine" is "the cup." I have met this several times in debate.

Now, while it is perfectly obvious that Jesus took up a literal vessel containing the "fruit of the vine," it is also just as obvious that the material vessel was only an incidental and had no signification whatever in the service. Only the contents of the cup had any meaning. Can any soul believe that Christ gave thanks for a literal, material vessel? Would he have thanked God for this cup had it been empty? Would he have said, "Take, drink," if there had been nothing in the cup to drink? Could the expression, "This (cup) is my blood," have alluded to an empty cup? Could "this" even by metonymy refer to an empty cup? Metonymy is the putting of the container for the thing contained; but if there was no thing contained in the cup, where is your metonymy? Of course, even Phillips does not claim that the cup was empty, but he puts the emphasis and the importance upon the material vessel, and I am only showing that the literal vessel—cup—had no meaning in the institution. If it did, then an empty vessel would have served as well, since it was the cup and not the thing in the cup that he gave thanks for and said "this" is my blood, etc.!

"Only the contents of the cup had any meaning." Who said so? Bro. Brewer. Is he inspired? No. For an inspired answer, go to Luke 22:20. Jesus says, "This cup is the New Testament." "This cup" is from **touto** to **poteerion**—literally, "this the cup"—in Greek, and F. R. Gay, professor of Greek in Bethany College, says, "The demonstrative **touto** shows the reference to be to a definite, material, cup." Robert H. Pfeiffer says the language means that the literal cup, or drinking vessel, is a symbol of the New Testament. Thayer says on page 15 of his Lexicon that the meaning of Luke 22:20 is, "This cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood, an emblem of the New Testament." Bro. Brewer says, "What these scholars say is not questioned by any one, and was not before he interrogated them." Very well, then. "The cup"—drinking vessel—has a meaning "in the institution"; it is a symbol of the New Testament. The wine in the cup cannot be a symbol of the New Testament, for it is a symbol of the blood of that Testament. Here are two great men: G.

C. Brewer and Christ. They differ. Choose between them! With me it is "Speak, Lord; Thy servant heareth."

No; he would not have thanked God for an empty cup, nor would the empty cup have represented His blood. Nor does wine apart from the cup represent His blood. Nor does an empty cup represent the New Testament. The wine must be in the cup for either to have any meaning.

The cup—literal vessel—had no more meaning than did the plate, platter, or vessel upon which the bread or loaf was lying when Jesus took it and broke it. Did Jesus break the loaf and hand a piece in his bare hands to each of the disciples, or did he place a portion upon each disciple's individual plate? Which way was it done?

Mark you, there is no "it" in the Greek or in the Revised Version in reference either to the loaf or the cup. This is where Phillips blunders seriously. It does not say that Jesus blessed the loaf and gave "it"—the loaf—to his disciples. It says he gave to the disciples, which means, of course, that he gave them of the loaf and told them to eat of the loaf. He gave them each a portion of the loaf. Likewise he gave thanks for the cup "and gave to them" (it does not say he gave it to them) and told them to drink of it. Drink of what? Of that which he gave to them, of course. He gave to them the cup—that which they were to drink, and that which was his blood of the covenant poured out. He gave to them each a portion of the cup—the fruit of the vine—just as he gave each a portion of the loaf. He gave them that which they were to drink. Could they drink a vessel?

There is nothing said about the loaf being on a "plate, platter, or vessel" of any kind. The loaf is what Christ said was His "body." He broke the loaf, and gave it to them, and told them to break it, as He had done, for He said, "this do." No mention is made of the manner in which He gave the loaf to them. Hence, we may put it on a platter or plate, if we so desire. No Scripture is violated if it is passed without being in a vessel.

But let us see Bro. Brewer pass the wine without a vessel to contain it! (There will be more said about the cup and its symbolism, later).

The Greek idiom does not require the expression of the pronoun for "it" after "He gave," in Matt. 26:27; but it should be supplied to make the sense complete. Where is your translator who dares put a plural after "He gave"? As well try to find one who dares put in "sprinkling" for baptism.

There is an "it" in the Greek where **poteerion** is used. For, "they all drank out of it" (Mark 14:23) in obeying the Savior's command, "You must all drink out of it" (Matt. 26:27). And "it" here has, as its antecedent, the word "cup" just preceding; and hence "He gave it"—"the cup"—to them, this being the meaning of the Greek idiom. Most translations so read. And it is Bro. Brewer that "blunders seriously," by ignoring the idiom.

He admits that **poteerion** always means "a cup, a drinking vessel"; then contradicts himself by saying, "He gave them the cup—that which they were to drink, and that which was His blood of the covenant." True, He "gave to them the cup," but "the cup" is not His blood: the "blood" was in "the cup." What they were to drink was in "the cup." And they drank "the cup" by drinking "what was in the cup" (Thayer). Sure, they could "drink a vessel" by "drinking what is in" the "vessel," as Thayer points out.

Cruden says: "The master of the feast took a cup of wine in his hand, and solemnly blessed God

for it, and for the mercy which was then acknowledged; and gave it to all the guests, of which every one drank in turn". See also "Hebrew Literature." (Continued).

FROM THE FIELD

J. L. Musgrave, Hot Springs, New Mex., Jan. 10, 1933.—I have moved from Wichita Falls, Tex. to this place to do some mission work. There are only a few loyal members here, but I believe we can build up a pretty fair congregation by persistent effort. There was a division here over the S. S. last spring, but I have hopes of getting the honest hearted ones to give up the S. S. innovation for the Bible way of worshipping God. Note the change in my address.

W. T. Taylor, Lometa, Texas, Jan. 7, 1933.—I would like to hold some meetings next summer. Thus far my time has not been engaged, hence can arrange meetings for anytime in July or August. I notice that Bro. Moore, of Gothenburg, Nebraska, is still trying to get a preacher in there. Bro. Geo. Masser, of Abilene, and I tried to arrange to spend two months in that field last year, but failed. I hope that Bro. McGill may be able to come to his rescue. Keep all the preachers busy, and watch the cause prosper.

E. A. Brown, 1516 W. 25th St., Fort Worth, Texas, Jan. 12, 1933.—The only congregation of the Church of Christ, in Fort Worth, contending for the Bible oneness, meets at 1520 W. 25th St. Take Rosen Heights bus down town, going north; get off at Prairie St. We will be very glad to have loyal brethren visit us or to worship with us. We would be glad to have an evangelist locate here, but he must have a "good report." Hope the paper is supported, for we need it very much.

W. C. Rice, Mountain Home, Ark. Dec. 14, 1932.—My trip to the Ball school house resulted in one baptism and one restored. We had large crowds and fine attention. The meeting at Shady Grove school house, embracing two Lord's days, resulted in one being restored and a little band promising to meet each Lord's day for worship. I hope to help them as often as I can. I enjoyed being at Center, near Carthage, Mo., over last Lord's day. There is a fine band of brethren there.

Homer A. Gay, Eola, Texas, Jan. 2, 1933.—Brother Jim Stewart and I have just closed a good meeting here at home. While there were no additions, we believe that much good was accomplished. We believe it is much better to spend the holidays in a series of meetings than in worldly amusements.

James F. Thomas, Gilpin, Ky., Jan. 14, 1933.—The little band of faithful members at Oak Grove continue to attend Lord's day worship despite the cold weather and muddy roads. It is encouraging to see young folks interested in the work

of the Lord, when there are so many worldly amusements and pleasures of sin to tempt them: Strange as it may seem, we do not have a Sunday School to draw these young folks. We just study the word of God out of His Book, and the men do all the public teaching. All seem to be satisfied. I believe if someone should undertake to operate a S. S. here, the most of the members would stay away from it. Pray for us that nothing of a divisive nature may be introduced. I preached at Sardis, in Pulaski County, last Lord's day. This is an old congregation, about seventy years of age, but it is seemingly just about dead, in spite of the fact that they are trying to operate a S. S. However, I am going to visit them again, as I believe there are some honest hearted ones among them, and possibly, I can by the scriptures show them the light. I expect to send in my renewal and other subs. to the paper soon.

Donie Trott, Munday Texas, Jan. 10, 1933.—I cannot see to read the paper myself, but I manage to get someone to read a part of it to me. I am delighted with the last issues. I have been trying to get some subs., but surely is a hard matter as about all seem to think they are too poor; never stopping to think that all they have really belongs to the Lord, and that they should be willing to give a part of it to Him and His cause. However, I have succeeded in getting one new name and will try to get more. I am hoping and trusting that I can get my eyes treated so that I may be able to do my own reading and writing. I have been sick, too, lately, but thank the Lord, I am some better again. Pray for me, dear brethren, and I hope and trust that this finds all of you well. Very best Christian love and wishes to all.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Jan. 16, 1933.—The congregation here is doing real well. The attendance and attention is exceptionally good for the winter months. It is very encouraging to see the young men, who were baptized during the series of meetings last fall, taking an active part in the public teaching and reading. Last Lord's day after-noon I was called to conduct the services at the burial of Sister Engle, near Buffalo, Mo. She died of influenza. Sister King seems to be still improving in health, thank the Lord. Now, what are you doing, preaching brother? Or what is your home congregation doing? Let us hear from you.

LITTLE PATRICIA JEAN HOLIFIELD

This little girl was five years old October 16, and went home to be with the Lord about 7:15 A. M. Sunday, January 1. She was the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Chester Holifield, of Montebello.

The ailment which caused her death is described in medical terms as acute hemorrhagic purpura and is quite rare. A blood transfusion was given but Patricia passed away while it was in process.

Funeral services were held at the Moritz Chapel. Bro. J. D. Phillips conducted the services. In terment was made in Rose Hills Memorial Park.

When we consider the fact that we are now entering the time of the pouring out of the seven bowls of wrath upon all of God's enemies, causing the "troubulous times" of prophecy, and that God's own are likely to suffer to some extent from the effects of these "plagues," it gives us some consolation to know that Little Patricia has gone on to be with the Lord.

"Jerusalem, my happy home!
When shall I come to thee?
When shall my sorrows have an end?
Thy joys, when shall I see?"

Bro. and Sister Holifield have our sympathies in their sorrows. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord"! —J. H. Sharp, Montebello, Calif.

REPLY

I believe it would be well for every member of the body of Christ to read daily the prayer our dear Saviour uttered just before his betrayal, until they can realize the overwhelming force of his yearnings, the soul stirring depth of his pleading that his followers might be one; a desire and longing so great that it rose above even the thought of the awful agonies that he must shortly endure and become the keynote of his entire prayer, being mentioned five separate times in that one petition. God forbid that stubbornness, pride, convenience sanitation or any other thing or thought should ever prompt us to do anything that would interfere with the fulfillment of that prayer. But to the answer to the questions, which I will give by number.

1. Christ picked up the cup containing the fruit of the vine.

2. The cup and wine represented the new covenant of his blood.

3. I honestly think the Saviour had both the cup and its contents in mind. In the command, "Drink ye all of it," the preposition used is "ek," from or out of, so that "drink ye all from or out of it" is a perfectly correct rendering. Yes, the thing they drank was the fruit of the vine and the thing which contained the fruit of the vine was a cup; also the thing that cleanses us from sin is the blood of Christ and we drink it from the New Covenant. The query about cups being made of the fruit of the vine does not render my argument absurd, it only shows an absurd lack of knowledge of the ordinary use of language. I am not denying that the thing they drank was the fruit of the vine, but the scriptures assure us that it was in a cup, mentions but one cup and I now ask Bro. Paden what scripture he relies on to prove that when the Saviour said cup, he did not mean cup? It is easy to assert that the cup had no significance, but I and others want something more than assertion.

5. What Jesus told them to divide among themselves was the fruit of the vine, which was contained in the cup, and the very fact that he told them to divide it among themselves, is proof positive that he did not divide it before passing it to them.

6. No, the cup of which Jesus said he would drink was not a literal cup, nor did he literally drink anything.

7. Yes, I see some likeness of the Lord's death in the cup as well as in the fruit of the vine. The Lord's blood was poured from a container—his body—and his body has some significance to me as well as his blood and his body was one. Thank you, brother, I think you have strengthened my argument appreciably. If he cannot find both cup and contents in the scriptures, I cannot account for his blindness, for Jesus mentions both in plain language. Now, to sum up the whole matter, permit me to say that I have never yet found any one who would say that one cup is not scriptural; Brother Armstrong would not say it, nor do I believe Bro. Paden will; then, as there is universal agreement that the communion can be scripturally observed with one cup and brethren can always be found who cannot be convinced that more than one is authorized, why insist on more than one, if we love the brethren as Christ did, and desire the unity of the body as fervently as he? The Bible does not say Jesus had no reference to the cup, therefore I fear to add that to what it says. G. A. TROTT.

(A. W., June 11, 1922).

A WEIGHTY ARGUMENT

In one of the volumes of the old Millennial Harbinger there is a conversation (or perhaps imaginary dialog—I do not recall which) between a Christian and a venerable Jewish rabbi. The Christian asks why the Jews, if they are God's people, have suffered so greatly throughout the many centuries of their history. The rabbi replies that "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth," and that Israel's sufferings always came upon them from the hand of God. "What was the cause of Israel's captivity?" "The scriptures declare that it was due to the sin of idolatry." "Was that a very great sin?" "It was the greatest they could commit," answered the rabbi. "Was that the reason the punishment was so fearful?" "Undoubtedly." "After their return from the captivity did they go back into idolatry again?" "No, never again," said the rabbi. "The description Josephus gives us of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans represents that destruction as more awful than the former, when Nebuchadnezzar took the city; and how the nation was driven out and scattered over all the world. Is his account substantially correct?" The rabbi admitted that it was. "Was not that the greatest judgment that ever fell on your people?" "It was." Then the sin that called forth such a judgment must have been a very grave and terrible one, even greater than idolatry?" "It would seem so." "What was that sin?" The rabbi did not profess to know. "If Jesus of Nazareth was truly their Messiah and the Son of God, and they rejected and crucified Him—would not that account for that catastrophe and the age-long rejection and affliction of that people since?" The rabbi does not answer—Have the leaders of Israel ever considered this unanswerable question?

—R. H. Boll, in W. and W.

Let Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn., do your printing. They will appreciate your business.

Ye num'rous sects
which all declare
"Lo Christ is here,
Lo Christ is there."
Your stronger proofs
divinely give
And show me where
the Christians live.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
O, Savior, where?"
I heard the cry,
and then I heard:
"Here is My Church
where men still dare
To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.'" (Jer. 6:16) "And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in" (Isa. 58:12).

Vol. 6

MARCH 1, 1933

No. 3

THE NAME "CHRISTIAN"

In the "Leader" of October 8, 1929, appears the following from the pen of Bro. F. L. Rowe.

"Mr. Edison married a devout Methodist girl. Her father was the leader in the big Methodist Church in Akron, Ohio. She was a member of my class in high school in good old Akron. She was graduated a year ahead so that she could marry Mr. Edison, who was twenty years or more her senior. She was a very excellent Christian girl."

If I understand the teaching of the Book, the name "Christian," is a name that belongs exclusively to the members of Christ, who are the "Children of God." The name "Christian" is derived from Christ, and expresses kinship to Christ. Since no one is a child of God until they have been "adopted" into the family of God, It follows that none but the children of God can establish their claim to kinship to Christ. Hence there is only one class of people on Earth who have a Scriptural right to wear the name "Christian."

"Even unto them, will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off.

"And thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name." (Isa. 56:5,—62:2). These passages teach us that God proposed to call his followers by a 'new name; one by which they had never been called; one "better than of sons and of daughters" and an "everlasting name."

"And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch."—Acts 11:26.

The name "Christian" appears but three times in the entire Scriptures. The above passage contains the first mention of this name, and beyond any shadow of a doubt, it is the "New Name," by which the children of God were to be called. Regardless of all claims to the contrary, none but the children of God have a legitimate right to the name "Christian"; and none but the true followers of God have a divine right to apply this name to themselves.

The next mention of this name is found in Acts 26:28. "Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." Paul replied: "I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am except these bonds."

Who was Paul? An apostle, a preacher of Christ. What was he? A Christian. What was

he doing? Though bound with chains, and being on trial for his life, he was evidently trying to persuade King Agrippa and others who were present, to become Christians.

"Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian."

Who is a Christian? A Christian is one who knows Christ, and who loves him, and obeys him, who loves what he loves, and hates what he hates, who follows in his steps, who is related to him by adoption into the family of God, who wears his name, who loves his Church, supports his cause, and denies himself and follows on, day and night—through joys and sorrows,—hopes and fears,—smiles and tears.

Agrippa did not take the step that would have made him a Christian.

He rejected the only 'way' in which any one can become a Christian.

No one, not even a King can be a Christian until they have been 'adopted' into the family of God." And no one can become a member of God's family until they "repent," "confess," and are "baptized for the remission of sins." "Buried with Christ by baptism into his death, and raised to walk in newness of life." Then, and not till then is one a Christian. Then, and not till then does one have a divine right to wear the "New Name."

The third and last place the name "Christian" is mentioned is in I Pet. 4:16.

"But if a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this name." Look! Who is that man standing before King Agrippa? "Paul the aged." Look again. He is bound with chains. Look closer. He shows evidence of hardship, toil, trouble and persecutions. What is he doing? Glorifying God as a Christian. Fearlessly he stands before the great King Agrippa and his courtiers. Though bound, he was not ashamed. Humiliated though he was, he boldly stood before them all and preached the gospel of Christ; with such eloquence and power, that Agrippa said, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian."

Sooner or later both those who are Christians and those who are not, will have to face the Great Judge.

What will you do my friends, when you stand in the presence of the Almighty God, with the guilty knowledge that you have never complied with the gospel requirements that would entitle you to wear the "New Name."

Hear the Lord of Heaven: "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write up-

on him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God: And I will write upon him my new name." Rev. 3:12.

Dear friends, you are here today; tomorrow you may be in "torment." Today your eyes behold the beauties of the natural world; tomorrow you may open them on the awful mysteries of Eternity. Today you hear the voices of this world; tomorrow you may hear the despairing cries of the damned. Today your heart is alive to the joys and sorrows of this life; tomorrow it may be in the icy grip of death.

"Almost persuaded, Jesus is near,
Almost persuaded, Sinner do you hear?
Almost persuaded, Harvest is past.
Almost persuaded. Doom comes at last!"
Ira B. Kile, Sistersville, W. Va.

CLIPPINGS AND COMMENTS

A few who are standing for "the Faith of the Gospel" have not yet "passed on." And to read the following from the pen of Brother C. M. Pullias in the G. A. of January 12, 1933, under the title "The Spirit of Christ," makes one think of the spirit of the early preachers of the "Restoration," when preachers "shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God." There is very little of "the spirit of Christ" in the pulpit or in the pew today. As one says, "The pastor, who is apparently in perfectly good humor with the devil, and the devil with him, virtually advises the young people to 'put the love of God in your heart and sin all you want to.'" Again: "The church has just raised the white flag and surrendered to the devil, that's all."

"The Spirit of Christ"

"The Spirit of Christ is the most talked of and the least understood of almost any Bible subject. It is usually understood to mean to compromise with error and contend for nothing—either to agree with everybody and everything or be quiet and take no issue.

"Christ was the greatest controversialist that ever lived. He never allowed an error to pass unchallenged if it had anything to do with human life and destiny. He never waited to be challenged; he challenged. And yet there are those who think a man is not Christlike who would challenge anybody in error today. But those who have the Spirit of Christ are never too timid to oppose error and condemn those who teach it. The Spirit of Christ will tolerate no innovation and wink at no sin. The Spirit of Christ clings tenaciously to things that are written. When Christ was tempted of the devil in the wilderness, he met every temptation with 'It is written.'

"To do anything in religion without Bible authority is not the Spirit of Christ. People are led by the Spirit only as they mind the things of the Spirit, and the things of the Spirit are those things the Spirit reveals in the Bible. To do anything the Spirit does not teach is not being led by the Spirit. The Spirit of Christ is mani-

festly lacking in any case where the work and worship of the church is not according to the things written in the New Testament. It is not 'progression' to deviate from the work and worship of the church as revealed in the New Testament."

Comments

Brethren (and this includes preachers) who prate about "the spirit of Christ" as a refuge to keep from meeting the errors of their "innovations" on the "work and worship of the church as revealed in the New Testament," or who are led by the influence of such innovators to talk "the spirit of Christ" to keep those who are standing for "the Faith of the Gospel" from bombarding the strongholds of Satan held by such innovators are, in fact, "enemies" to the cause they profess to champion. They make "peace" a refuge of lies and a boost for the devil. Satan will rage when his armor is pierced or his strongholds demolished, and we may expect him to resort to every means attainable to have the darts of truth and "the sword of the Spirit" parried or stopped; and he succeeds quite well in getting some "loyal" brother to let the brethren know that brother so-and-so has the truth and he does not fail to tell it—but—well—but—"He just hain't got the spirit of Christ, and we better get Brother Blarney or Brother Compromise or Brother Sweetspirit to preach.

When we started the Apostolic Way twenty years ago, we realized, as Brother Trott expressed it, that we had "a Herculean task of cleaning the Augean Stables." But soon Brother Sweetspirit and Brother Compromise and Brother Hypocrite—yes, and Brother "Spirit-of-Christ," turned the filth right back into the stables while others were turning it out.
—H. C. Harper.

PURITY OF LIFE

"Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man can see the Lord" (Heb. 12:14). All who have put on Christ, and have tried to live a Christian life really understand what a task it is, but if we serve God, we must "lay aside every weight and the sin that doth so easily beset us" (Heb. 12:1).

I know that we are living in a time of much evil, and there are many temptations to allure the minds of both old and young, hence we must follow closely our Guide lest we go astray. Brethren, I now wish to state some plain facts. Our trouble is in the main with the older members of the church. When fathers and mothers will visit places that are questionable or unbecoming for Christians, conducted by worldly people, they are leading the younger ones into sin. Shame! We even hear members of the church talk about being at such places with their children, and then contend that it is all right just because they were there, thereby adding sin to sin. Just because members of the church attend such places, or engage in some things, does not make such right. Instead of that making the thing right, it only causes the church member to become "spotted,"

and God will take vengeance on all such. Hear James, "And to keep himself unspotted from the world" (Jas. 1:27). It must be admitted that we cannot keep ourselves "unspotted" from the world while we indulge in the things of the world, or live like the world. If the church would follow the things of the Spirit, the cause would grow.

Son or daughter may be invited to the wrong places, and what shall we do about it? "Oh, just take them along," says one. Yes, and then all will do wrong. Better read, I Jno. 2:15, 16, 17; Gal. 5:19-21; Gal. 6:7, 8; and then explain what the "world," as here mentioned, is.

The proper thing to do, if we should get lonesome and want to go somewhere, is to visit in some Christian home where we may sing and study the Bible, or talk of spiritual things. In this way we may keep ourselves pure. The Christian life is a life of activity and service, and remember that Paul says, "It is appointed unto man once to die, and after death the judgment" (Heb. 9:27). May we let our lights shine.

—E. H. Cavin.

THE TIME OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Four counts of time may be found in the Bible, from noon to noon, from midnight to midnight, from evening to evening, from daybreak to daybreak. Only with the last one are we concerned. In changing from the Sabbath to the Lord's day we have this explanation in the gospel: Christ crucified rested, the last Sabbath day kept by the command of God, in the grave, and His followers prepared spices and ointments for embalming His body," and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment" (Lu. 23:56). "In the end of the Sabbath" (Matt. 28:1), "When the Sabbath was past" (Mark 16:1); the Revised Version has "late" and "after," which two versions are harmonized thus in Greenfield's Greek Lexicon, "Opse Sabbathon," late in the Sabbath, i. e. after or at the end of the Sabbath," making it clear that it must be after the Sabbath before the first day can begin else two days the seventh and first would be going on at the same time, hence the harmonized Version read, "At the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn into the first day of the week" the women started for the sepulchre (Mt. 28:1), when it was yet dark (Jno. 20:1), and arrived there at the rising of the sun (Mark 16:2), the word "came" in the original including both the starting and the arriving. Sometime between dawn into the day, daybreak, and the rising of the sun, the angel descended from heaven, rolled the stone away, and Jesus arose early the first day of the week (Mark 16:9). It was not the first day till it dawned into the day, and the grave was empty at sunrise, and it is definitely stated that Jesus arose early on the first day of the week. So all the Scriptures harmonize in making the Sabbath end at the dawn of the first day and the dawn was the beginning of the day which when fully come was the first day of the week. Matt. 28; Mark 16; Luke 24; John 20 record the events of this day and the evening following. John 20: 19 calls the evening following the first day the evening of the first day of the week. This makes

Sunday and Sunday night, the first day and the night following, from dawn till dawn Monday, the Lord's day. So Mat. 28:1; Jno. 20:19 contain God's count of what constitutes Christianity's sacred day. God charges us to preach the Word (2 Ti. 4:1, 2), and with this plain word before me, I could preach nothing else than dawn marks the end of the Sabbath and the beginning of the first day of the week and the night following is the evening of the first day of the week.

This accords with the account of the day of Pentecost (which was the first day of the week, Lev. 23:15, 16—counting from the day following the weekly Sabbath of the Passover seven Sabbath days, 49 days, the day following is the first day of the week, the fiftieth day, Pentecost, the Greek word fiftieth). When the day "was fully come" they were assembled at one place, and after the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the assembling of the multitude and hearing them speak in all the tongues of earth, Peter says it is but the third hour of the day, showing that Pentecost began with the light of that day. (Acts 2:1-15).

It is in accord with Acts 20:7-11. They met on the first day of the week to break bread, which could not have been before dawn and be on the first day of the week, and, in the absence of any statement to the contrary we conclude they did what they met to do. Paul preached and the meeting continued till midnight, Sunday night. At midnight Eutychus fell out of a window and killed himself. Paul brought him to life. And while the excitement was quieting down he broke bread, and as he alone is named we conclude that he alone ate, and having refreshed himself he continued his speaking till daybreak, the beginning of Monday. Every other passage in the New Testament harmonizes with the obvious teaching of these passages.

At South Solon, Ohio, this Summer, the disciples met in an upper room on the first day of the week to break bread and they broke bread as they met to do. I spoke till dinner time. They had brought food for all who should come and we ate dinner. Then I spoke in the afternoon. Five confessed Christ. We went to a creek and had service there and baptized them. We returned to the hall and had supper, and I spoke till 9 o'clock that night—the night of the first day of the week—Sunday night. Had I been the apostle Paul, and they knew they would see my face no more, I am satisfied the audience would have gladly remained till daybreak, Monday. But I would have wished to break bread by midnight to give me strength to continue speaking till daybreak. This is almost a duplicate of Acts 20:7-11. The whole church met to break bread as a religious act, hence to eat the Lord's Supper. Verse 11 says nothing about any but Paul breaking bread, which makes it a common meal. The above is the position the gospel takes on the time of the Lord's day.—J. Madison Wright.

Have you sent in your subscription to the O. P. A.? Your support in any way will be greatly appreciated.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant, Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year \$1.00
Single Subscription six years \$5.00

Printed by Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

BROTHER HOWTON PASSES

Many will remember reading, about three months ago, Bro. Jackson Howton's "Parting Message to The Church" in the O. P. A. Brother Howton died November 14, 1932, at the home of his son, J. F. Howton, Littlefield, Texas, where he lived the past two years. He was 78 years of age at the time of his death.

Bro. Howton was one of the few who found the "old paths wherein is the good way," and he walked therein. He loved the Lord and was not ashamed of His word, and was well informed therein. He was true to his convictions, leaving the results with the Lord. It is not so difficult to get on the Rock, but it takes a man of integrity to stay there. Bro. Howton died, "standing on the promises of God." When his body and spirit are reunited in the morning of the general resurrection, I feel certain that he will be given a place at the Father's right hand. In view of this, the trials, persecutions and the disappointments of this life, which he so faithfully endured, will not be worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in him.

His body was laid to rest in the cemetery at Blanket, Texas, near his old home. Bro. D. D. Rose conducted the funeral service.

Let us all strive to meet Bro. Howton in those Heavenly Mansions, where "parting messages" will never be written, and where sin and sorrow can never come. —H. C. Welch.

Route 6, Box 12, Cleburne, Texas.

Remarks

We regret very much the passing of this dear old saint, but we trust our loss will be Heaven's gain. I never had the pleasure of meeting Bro. Howton, but I learned to love him through others and correspondence. We are delighted to learn that he died in triumphs of a living faith. We extend our sympathy to the bereaved ones.

—H. L. K.

Let Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn., do your printing. They will save you money.

G. C. BREWER'S REVIEW OF "THE CUP OF THE LORD"

Answered By J. D. Phillips. No. 3.

4. How Did Our Lord Give the Fruit of the Vine to the Disciples? Did our Lord hand the literal vessel to each disciple and tell him to take a drink out of this vessel, or did he pour a portion of the contents of that vessel into each disciple's individual cup and tell him to drink? Of course the "one-cup" brother just thinks he knows that Jesus passed the same literal cup to each disciple and told him to drink out of it. But he does not know any such thing. The one-cup hobo just assumes that it was done that way and then affirms with all the assurance and vengeance of his capacity that we must do the same thing in the same way now! It is a pity to ruin his cocksureness, but he has run out of bounds by making his assumption a law and by attempting to force all to obey it. He must be brought down.

The Inspired Record says He gave them "poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel," and told them to drink out of it. The professor of Greek in De Pau University, located at Greencastle, Indiana, says *Piete ek autou pantes*, of Matt. 26:27, which reads "Drink ye all of it" in the King James Version, should read, "You must all drink out of it." The *Emphatic Diaglott* reads, "Drink all of you out of it."

He did not "pour a portion of the contents of that vessel into each disciple's individual cup," as Bro. Brewer suggests might have been the case. We know that one vessel was there and that it was a drinking vessel—"poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer). The idea that more than one vessel was there is an assumption—nothing more. And those who use more than one cup have nothing but this assumption as a foundation, and thus they "become wise above that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6)—a thing that is fearfully condemned. And when you make your "assumption a law" as the cups advocates have been doing, you certainly "run out of bounds with your assumption." If I "must be brought down," as you say; why do you not put up a little proof of your cups contention, and thus bring me "down"? Yes, why? Is it because you know there is no such proof? Yes. Like the Irishman's flea: "When you go to catch 'im he ain't thar."

The New Testament does not say how this cup was distributed among the disciples. We know that they all drank of the contents of one cup, or vessel, but that they all drank out of this one vessel is an assumption that is baseless. The guests at my table drank water from the same pitcher and coffee from the same pot today. "Pitcher" and "pot" are both singular. There was one pitcher and one pot. Now, will the reader assume that each guest drank out of the same vessel? That would be just as logical, just as sane, as to assume that all the disciples drank out of the same literal vessel from which Christ gave them the fruit of the vine. Our hostess gave us each of the pitcher to drink. She poured some of the contents into a separate glass for each individual. There is not a man living who can prove that Christ did not do the same thing at the passover and at the Lord's Supper. There is more evidence that he did than that he did not.

"The New Testament" does "say how this cup was distributed among the disciples," your statement to the contrary notwithstanding. It says, "And they all drank of (Greek: *ek*, out of) it" (Mark 14:23). See *The Emphatic Diaglott*, by Wilson. See Thayer, articles *pino* and *ek*.

And when the Lord commanded them, saying, "You must all drink out of it" (Matt. 26:27), He told them how to "divide" the contents of "the cup." Thayer says "the cup" here is "the vessel

out of which one drinks." All the scholars quoted in the tract under review say it is used literally. Robert H. Pfeiffer, curator The Semitic Museum, Harvard University, says, "Ek means 'out of.' Matt. 26:27 has a literal meaning (drinking out of a cup)."

Illustration: In Luke (22:17, 18) we read: "And he received a cup (poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel), and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this (this cup, poteerion, a drinking vessel), and divide it among yourselves." This was the passover cup, to be sure; but the point is, How was the cup divided among them? Did they divide the literal vessel by cutting it into fragments or by grinding it into powder as Moses did the golden calf? Of course, no one, not even J. D. Phillips, will contend that they divided the material cup. But they did divide the cup (poteerion) in some way. They divided the contents, of course. But how did they do this unless each disciple had a cup or glass into which his portion was poured? How did each get his portion when it was divided? They were still at the same table with the same vessels and the same loaf and same fruit of the vine when the sacred supper was instituted. If the content of the passover cup was given to them in their individual cups, how do we know that the content of the Lord's Supper cup was not given to them in the same way? We do not know.

Thayer says, "Pino ek with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks, ek (out of) tou (the) poteerion (cup)" (Lexicon, p. 510), citing 1 Cor. 11:28, "Let him drink out of the cup," as an example.

All the scholars quoted in my tract uphold the idea that each disciple present was commanded to drink out of the same cup (Matt. 26:27) and that each did drink out of the same cup (Mark 14:23). Each drank out of the one cup, as commanded; and this is how they "divided" the cup "among themselves." The Living Oracles N. T. and the Twentieth Century N. T. read: "share it among you." The lexicons uphold this rendering, the Greek word for "divide" being *diamerisate*, "share you."

In the time of our Lord it was the custom of the Jews in any religious gathering to all drink out of the same cup. This can be learned from any Jewish literature of that age that deals with Jewish customs. The Jews, in observing the passover, used four, and sometimes five, cups, at intervals; but each guest drank from each cup. Our Lord used one cup in the communion, at its institution, and all were commanded to drink out of it, and all drank out of it.

Your whole contention that individual cups, or even two or more cups, may have been used in the institution of the communion, rests on an "if." We know one cup was used. You do not know that more than one cup was used. And since "We do not know," as you admit, why do you not accept the way that every one knows is safe, and thus do your part to heal the wound caused in our Lord's body, the church, by the introduction of cups? I had rather be the man that pierced Christ's side, while He was on the Cross, than the one who tears asunder His spiritual body, the church, by his humanisms.

It is not true that 1000 persons drink coffee, or soup, out of the same drinking-vessel, and that is what we have agreed that *poteerion* means.

Yes, they drank "water from the same pitcher, and coffee from the same pot." But your guest never—not one of them—drank out of the pitcher,

not did any drink out of the pot. "Must one put his lips to a cup to drink out of it?" This was put to the Lexicographer of The New Standard Dictionary. He answered: "Certainly, one must put one's lips to a cup to drink out of a cup."

The New Testament does "say how they divided the contents the cup," as I have shown. The "fruit of the vine" was in a cup when He told them to drink it. And He said, "You must all drink of it" (Matt. 26:27). "Of" here is a translation of *ek*, which means "out of," and Thayer says, "*ek* with a genitive of the vessel out of the cup" (Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:28), as an example.

(In next month's Old Paths Advocate the preposition, *ek*, and its grammatical usage will be thoroughly discussed. J. D. P.).

FROM THE FIELD

Walker H. Horn, Galveston, Texas, Feb. 9, 1933.—Since coming here we have started a congregation at Texas City, and I am laboring with the church at Houston. There is much work to be done in this part. My present address is 3120 Ave. P½.

Thomas S. Stark, Hemet, Calif.—We have recently moved here from Hagerman, N. Mex. As there are only a few members of the church here, we shall worship in a private home. Brethren passing our way are invited to stop over and worship with us.

J. Y. Morgan, New Castle, Texas.—We now have eighteen members of the church, who attend the services regularly, at California Creek. Bro. Pursley preaches here the fourth Lord's day, and Bro. E. F. Morgan the second Lord's day. We are no longer bothered with the S. S. and cups innovations, or advocates. Here is my renewal to the O. P. A. and, Homer, you may tell those Missouri folks that these Texas dollars are certainly hard to get now days.

Homer A. Gay, Eola, Texas.—Since last report I have preached at the Rock school house, near Menard, the 14th and 15th ult. Had nice crowds and good attention. The congregation is small, but sound in the faith. The 21st ult., Bro. James Stewart and I visited the church at Ft. McKavett, and preached over Lord's day. Had good crowds and a fine time. It seems that the cups advocates have had a hold on this section, but it now seems that some of the brethren are waking up to a realization of the situation. Last Lord's day we were with the home congregation, and we had one of the best meetings we have had for some time. There were 45 who communed. Our number has been increased by Bro. Miller's moving back from Mereta. We have services each Lord's day at 10:30 a. m. and at 7:30 p. m.; song practice each Wednesday night.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper Snodds, Fla.
J. D. Phillips Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year \$1.00
Single Subscription six years \$5.00

Printed by Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

BROTHER HOWTON PASSES

Many will remember reading, about three months ago, Bro. Jackson Howton's "Parting Message to the Church" in the O. P. A. Brother Howton died November 14, 1932, at the home of his son, J. F. Howton, Littlefield, Texas, where he lived the past two years. He was 78 years of age at the time of his death.

Bro. Howton was one of the few who found the "old paths wherein is the good way," and he walked therein. He loved the Lord and was not ashamed of His word, and was well informed therein. He was true to his convictions, leaving the results with the Lord. It is not so difficult to get on the Rock, but it takes a man of integrity to stay there. Bro. Howton died, "standing on the promises of God." When his body and spirit are reunited in the morning of the general resurrection, I feel certain that he will be given a place at the Father's right hand. In view of this, the trials, persecutions and the disappointments of this life, which he so faithfully endured, will not be worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in him.

His body was laid to rest in the cemetery at Blanket, Texas, near his old home. Bro. D. D. Rose conducted the funeral service.

Let us all strive to meet Bro. Howton in those Heavenly Mansions, where "parting messages" will never be written, and where sin and sorrow can never come.

—H. C. Welch.

Route 6, Box 12, Cleburne, Texas.

Remarks

We regret very much the passing of this dear old saint, but we trust our loss will be Heaven's gain. I never had the pleasure of meeting Bro. Howton, but I learned to love him through others and correspondence. We are delighted to learn that he died in triumphs of a living faith. We extend our sympathy to the bereaved ones.

—H. L. K.

Let Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn., do your printing. They will save you money.

G. C. BREWER'S REVIEW OF "THE CUP OF THE LORD"

Answered By J. D. Phillips. No. 3.

4. How Did Our Lord Give the Fruit of the Vine to the Disciples? Did our Lord hand the literal vessel to each disciple and tell him to take a drink out of this vessel, or did he pour a portion of the contents of that vessel into each disciple's individual cup and tell him to drink? Of course the "one-cup" brother just thinks he knows that Jesus passed the same literal cup to each disciple and told him to drink out of it. But he does not know any such thing. The one-cup hobbyist just assumes that it was done that way and then affirms with all the assurance and vengeance of his capacity that we must do the same thing in the same way now! It is a pity to ruin his cocksureness, but he has run out of bounds by making his assumption a law and by attempting to force all to obey it. He must be brought down.

The Inspired Record says He gave them "poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel," and told them to drink out of it. The professor of Greek in De Pau University, located at Greencastle, Indiana, says *Piete ek autou pantes*, of Matt. 26:27, which reads "Drink ye all of it" in the King James Version, should read, "You must all drink out of it." The *Emphatic Diaglott* reads, "Drink all of you out of it."

He did not "pour a portion of the contents of that vessel into each disciple's individual cup," as Bro. Brewer suggests might have been the case. We know that one vessel was there and that it was a drinking vessel—"poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer). The idea that more than one vessel was there is an assumption—nothing more. And those who use more than one cup have nothing but this assumption as a foundation, and thus they "become wise above that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6)—a thing that is fearfully condemned. And when you make your "assumption a law" as the cups advocates have been doing, you certainly "run out of bounds with your assumption." If I "must be brought down," as you say; why do you not put up a little proof of your cups contention, and thus bring me "down"? Yes, why? Is it because you know there is no such proof? Yes. Like the Irishman's flea: "When you go to ketch 'im he ain't thar."

The New Testament does not say how this cup was distributed among the disciples. We know that they all drank of the contents of one cup, or vessel, but that they all drank out of this one vessel is an assumption that is baseless. The guests at my table drank water from the same pitcher and coffee from the same pot today. "Pitcher" and "pot" are both singular. There was one pitcher and one pot. Now, will the reader assume that each guest drank out of the same vessel? That would be just as logical, just as sane, as to assume that all the disciples drank out of the same literal vessel from which Christ gave them the fruit of the vine. Our hostess gave us each of the pitcher to drink. She poured some of the contents into a separate glass for each individual. There is not a man living who can prove that Christ did not do the same thing at the passover and at the Lord's Supper. There is more evidence that he did than that he did not.

"The New Testament" does "say how this cup was distributed among the disciples," your statement to the contrary notwithstanding. It says, "And they all drank of (Greek: *ek*, out of) it" (Mark 14:23). See *The Emphatic Diaglott*, by Wilson. See Thayer, articles *pino* and *ek*.

And when the Lord commanded them, saying, "You must all drink out of it" (Matt. 26:27), He told them how to "divide" the contents of "the cup." Thayer says "the cup" here is "the vessel

out of which one drinks." All the scholars quoted in the tract under review say it is used literally. Robert H. Pfeiffer, curator The Semitic Museum, Harvard University, says, "Ek means 'out of.' Matt. 26:27 has a literal meaning (drinking out of a cup)."

Illustration: In Luke (22:17, 18) we read: "And he received a cup (poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel), and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this (this cup, poteerion, a drinking vessel), and divide it among yourselves." This was the passover cup, to be sure; but the point is, How was the cup divided among them? Did they divide the literal vessel by cutting it into fragments or by grinding it into powder as Moses did the golden calf? Of course, no one, not even J. D. Phillips, will contend that they divided the material cup. But they did divide the cup (poteerion) in some way. They divided the contents, of course. But how did they do this unless each disciple had a cup or glass into which his portion was poured? How did each get his portion when it was divided? They were still at the same table with the same vessels and the same loaf and same fruit of the vine when the sacred supper was instituted. If the content of the passover cup was given to them in their individual cups, how do we know that the content of the Lord's Supper cup was not given to them in the same way? We do not know.

Thayer says, "Pino ek with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks, ek (out of) tou (the) poteerion (cup)" (Lexicon, p. 510), citing 1 Cor. 11:28, "Let him drink out of the cup," as an example.

All the scholars quoted in my tract uphold the idea that each disciple present was commanded to drink out of the same cup (Matt. 26:27) and that each did drink out of the same cup (Mark 14:23). Each drank out of the one cup, as commanded; and this is how they "divided" the cup "among themselves." The Living Oracles N. T. and the Twentieth Century N. T. read: "share it among you." The lexicons uphold this rendering, the Greek word for "divide" being *diamerisate*, "share you."

In the time of our Lord it was the custom of the Jews in any religious gathering to all drink out of the same cup. This can be learned from any Jewish literature of that age that deals with Jewish customs. The Jews, in observing the passover, used four, and sometimes five, cups, at intervals; but each guest drank from each cup. Our Lord used one cup in the communion, at its institution, and all were commanded to drink out of it, and all drank out of it.

Your whole contention that individual cups, or even two or more cups, may have been used in the institution of the communion, rests on an "if." We know one cup was used. You do not know that more than one cup was used. And since "We do not know," as you admit, why do you not accept the way that every one knows is safe, and thus do your part to heal the wound caused in our Lord's body, the church, by the introduction of cups? I had rather be the man that pierced Christ's side, while He was on the Cross, than the one who tears asunder His spiritual body, the church, by his humanisms.

It is not true that 1000 persons drink coffee, or soup, out of the same drinking-vessel, and that is what we have agreed that *poteerion* means.

Yes, they drank "water from the same pitcher, and coffee from the same pot." But your guest never—not one of them—drank out of the pitcher,

not did any drink out of the pot. "Must one put his lips to a cup to drink out of it?" This was put to the Lexicographer of The New Standard Dictionary. He answered: "Certainly, one must put one's lips to a cup to drink out of a cup."

The New Testament does "say how they divided the contents the cup," as I have shown. The "fruit of the vine" was in a cup when He told them to drink it. And He said, "You must all drink of it" (Matt. 26:27). "Of" here is a translation of *ek*, which means "out of," and Thayer says, "*ek* with a genitive of the vessel out of the cup" (Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:28), as an example.

(In next month's Old Paths Advocate the preposition, *ek*, and its grammatical usage will be thoroughly discussed. J. D. P.).

FROM THE FIELD

Walker H. Horn, Galveston, Texas, Feb. 9, 1933.—Since coming here we have started a congregation at Texas City, and I am laboring with the church at Houston. There is much work to be done in this part. My present address is 3120 Ave. P $\frac{1}{2}$.

Thomas S. Stark, Hemet, Calif.—We have recently moved here from Hagerman, N. Mex. As there are only a few members of the church here, we shall worship in a private home. Brethren passing our way are invited to stop over and worship with us.

J. Y. Morgan, New Castle, Texas.—We now have eighteen members of the church, who attend the services regularly, at California Creek. Bro. Pursley preaches here the fourth Lord's day, and Bro. E. F. Morgan the second Lord's day. We are no longer bothered with the S. S. and cups innovations, or advocates. Here is my renewal to the O. P. A. and, Homer, you may tell those Missouri folks that these Texas dollars are certainly hard to get now days.

Homer A. Gay, Eola, Texas.—Since last report I have preached at the Rock school house, near Menard, the 14th and 15th ult. Had nice crowds and good attention. The congregation is small, but sound in the faith. The 21st ult., Bro. James Stewart and I visited the church at Ft. McKavett, and preached over Lord's day. Had good crowds and a fine time. It seems that the cups advocates have had a hold on this section, but it now seems that some of the brethren are waking up to a realization of the situation. Last Lord's day we were with the home congregation, and we had one of the best meetings we have had for some time. There were 45 who communed. Our number has been increased by Bro. Miller's moving back from Mereta. We have services each Lord's day at 10:30 a. m. and at 7:30 p. m.; song practice each Wednesday night.

J. D. Phillips, 252 So. 4th St., Montebello, Calif.—Two families, who, for the past eight months, have not worshipped with us, have, since the debate at the Siskiyou Street Church in Los Angeles, come back to that congregation and are worshipping there now. Three families from the S. S. church in Glendale have taken their stand with us and will meet at Siskiyou St. in Los Angeles and at Montebello. Some families have recently moved here from Texas, and will worship at Montebello. Two were immersed and one restored at the Siskiyou St. church last Sunday night, Bro. N. E. Kellems doing the baptizing. I have recently held a mission meeting at Hughson, Calif. About fifteen faithful Christians meet for worship in Bro. W. E. Murry's home. From there, I went to Taft and preached twice. I will leave for Texas in the near future. Address me at Littlefield, Texas, care J. V. Speights.

Clyde Penner, Vanzant, Mo.—We are getting along very well here with the worship on Lord's days. There are a few who attend regularly, while some are indifferent. Glad to hear of the good work going on elsewhere. Bro. Homer A. Gay writes us that he thinks he can assist us in a series of meetings next summer.

Abilene, Texas, Feb. 12, 1933.—I wish to say that Bro. Geo. J. P. Masser, of Abilene, should be kept busy preaching the gospel, and I am not alone in this view. Bro. J. H. Ohlhausen, of Guian, Tex., said of a sermon he heard him preach, "That could not be beat by anyone in the brotherhood." Bro. L. Spencer, of Abilene, said, "Bro. Masser has preached some as fine sermons as I ever heard." Bro. Rodgers said of a sermon he preached at Lytle Cove, Texas, "It was the finest sermon I have ever heard in this house." Bro. Masser stands for the Bible only, and is highly endorsed as a preacher and a debater.

(Note: The one who sent in the above failed to sign his name, and I am unable to tell by the handwriting. —H. L. K.)

T. E. Smith, Rt. 1, Wesson, Miss.—Brother H. C. Harper held our meeting again this year at New Salem church, and Brother Maynor held the meeting at Auburn, Miss., baptizing 27, and we look for much good yet to result from these meetings. It is generally conceded that Brother Harper did some of the best preaching that has ever been done in this part of Mississippi. He knows the Book, and he can tell it in a plain way. There is no "uncertain sound" in his preaching, and he leaves no more to be said on a subject when he has finished. Brethren should see to it that he is kept busy all the time for the following reasons:

1. He is true to the Book. 2. There is not a stronger man in the brotherhood. 3. He is humble, and always ready to hear what others may say. 4. The Cause we all love, so well will suffer when such men are not kept on "the firing line" to face the enemies of righteousness.

We are planning on building a large tabernacle and having Brother Harper with us again next

year, and perhaps another preacher.

Bro. J. D. Whitten, of Stockdale, Texas, was also in meetings in this county. He seems to be unsettled on some very important points of doctrine that are necessary in "keeping the Unity of the Spirit" in the bond of Peace." (Eph. 4; John 17) No unity is pleasing to God but that which is secured on the Word of God, backed by "A 'Thus saith the Lord'." May the Lord help us ever to "Earnestly contend for The Faith which was once for all delivered to the saints." (Jude 1).

W. J. Harris, Brookhaven, Miss.—The writer is in this field, preaching as he has opportunity. The brethren here are standing by me and I am trying to help them with the message of Truth. The churches all seem to be trying to get lined up on the word of God as the basis of Unity. And I enjoy working with them to this end. These people are well-to-do, and are standing by the cause of Christ with much zeal. The young members are being developed in the church work, and we may look for a united brotherhood here if all continue to unite on the Bible with a "Thus saith the Lord." To God be all the praise.

GETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Reply To Homer Gay.

Well Homer you will have to get the record straight before you can keep it straight, and at present you are a long ways off.

When Brother Gay promised an account of the debate, I knowing that he does not tell the truth, suggested that Phillips and Hayhurst give their own arguments. I felt that this was fair to all parties and would insure a correct report of the debate. However both Gay and Phillips refused this but agreed that they would be glad to publish my report. So here it comes. We shall see how eager they are to publish it.

Before beginning the report proper I must notice Gay's misrepresentations of it.

Gay says that after the first session some of Hayhurst's brethren showed an ugly spirit, etc. Yes Homer, they were my brethren but they were on your side of the question! One of them came threatening to expose me. Had his representative done a satisfactory job of exposing me, this little episode had not occurred. Again one of my brethren got up and harranged me before the crowd, and when I offered to shake hands with him he refused before the audience. This is but a sample of what happened there but it is enough to indicate the cup of which they had been drinking. And too, it shows who manifested an ugly spirit, and who tried to help their man.

Among those whom I was told argued their side were Homer Gay and Ira Grantham, and Gay is still at it putting things in his paper that never happened!

In one article, short article, I find misrepresentations. His first statement that H. O. Freeman started the church at Eola is more false than true, for Perry Johnson had as much to do with it as did Freeman, and other members had a hand. His last statement (to date) that Phillips made

about two arguments to Hayhurst's one is as false as any ever made in Eden or out.

Gay's report of the preachers is untrue. He gives as one of the preachers present W. H. Gill. Is brother Gill a preacher? Ask the people of Eola. But F. R. Keele is a preacher of considerable note, one who has held meetings with such men as D. D. Rose, one of the most outstanding brethren of this part of the country, and he was at the debate but Gay leaves his name off of the list. Does somebody say he overlooked brother Keele? Well, if he cannot see a fact as big as a man, how can he be expected to see an argument?

Gay tells his readers that Hayhurst said it would take a loaf 20 feet square to wait on 3000 people. This is one of Gay's big windys; Hayhurst said nothing of the kind. And that Barrel of wine is one of Gay's inventions trying to help Phillips out. Neither did Hayhurst leave Jerusalem. The first time I meet Homer on this subject (Homer doesn't meet us in debate; he is a "Gouger" working on the side) I shall meet him in Jerusalem. And he will have to admit that the Jerusalem congregation had a plurality of drinking cups, or he will have them drinking out of that barrel that he has told you about. If he admits a plurality of cups for the Jerusalem church, he has admitted a plurality for all other large churches, and lost his plea for the unity of the one cup.

Since Homer is making a test of fellowship of this matter, we are forced to debate it, and if he ever gets up courage enough to meet us, any of us, he will find us camped in Jerusalem, and with the Bible as proof.

L. W. Hayhurst.

REPLY TO L. W. HAYHURST

It is against the policy of this paper to publish such harsh, ugly statements as brother Hayhurst's article contains; but, that the readers of the O. P. A. may see the spirit upon which the cups advocates thrive, we have published Bro. Hayhurst's article just as it came from his hand and heart.

Hayhurst "knows that Gay does not tell the truth." I am sure our readers appreciate that information from H. Bro. Hayhurst CAN tell the truth, for in his entire article I manage to find ONE true statement, and I shall not overlook that one.

He did not realize what a blotch he was making out of the debate until he began to see it in print, and you can see by his article that he is suffering.

Bro. H. and every one who were present knows that he did NOT suggest that he and P. should report their arguments. But H. would have it that Phillips and I would not allow Phillips to report but would be glad for Hayhurst to report—you were "seeing things" weren't you, Ikey? The truth of the matter is Phillips challenged you to repeat the debate with him in writing, but you laid down under his challenge, and you know it, and that challenge is still hanging over your head.

Among those who manifested a bad spirit just after the first session were two of Ikey's main stand-by's and I can name them. I know nothing

of any one "threatning to expose Ikey," however there is plenty of "exposing" that could be done besides on the cup question. Yes, one of my brethren "harranged" you after you had slanderously accused a good brother of being withdrawn from, and then tried to keep him from making his defence, and that brother of mine tried to borrow your Bible, and you would not let him have it. Then you offered to shake hands with him but would not say on what you wished to shake.

"I was told that Gay and Grantham argued the Cup question" —You KNEW that we argued the question without being told. We have both argued it for years.

"I was told" seems to be a star witness with Ikey. "I was told" that Bro. Hayhurst looked like a country kid in the second grade as compared to P. "I was told" by W. S. Boyett, (a S. S. and cups preacher), and a number of others that the debate was too one-sided to be interesting; that P. made any way two arguments to H.'s one.

You could have saved those "nine misrepresentations" if you had just had the "courage" to meet Doug in a written debate. It is much easier to say some things than it is to prove them. Why didn't you give some proof?

Everybody around Eola (except the members of the church of Christ who are withdrawn from) will tell you that H. O. Freeman started the church in Eola.

And, now, here is his ONE true statement: "F. R. Keele is a preacher, and I left out his name when I named the preachers present." By some means I or the printer left out Bro. Keele and also Van Bonneau. But Bro. Keele is A one cup man and told me at the close of the debate that he was well pleased with the defence P. had made.

As to Bro. Gill being a preacher I am willing for the people of Eola or anywhere Bro. Gill has lived for the past 40 years to say whether he is a preacher. Although Ikey hates Bro. Gill worse than he does a rattle snake; yet he does not hate him half as bad as he DREADS him.

Now notice his statement—"Gay tells his readers that Hayhurst said it would take a loaf 20 feet square to wait on three thousand people." This is a fair sample of Hayhurst's truthfulness and correctness (?). Phillips showed that H.'s Jerusalem crowd was too big for him. They had 3000, then 5000 more; and that history states there were at one time 30,000 Christians in Jerusalem. And H. contended they all met together to "break bread." Now get your November issue of the O. P. A. and look with me on page 6. "P. showed that the Bible says they 'broke bread from house to house'" (Acts 2:46)—He further showed that Hayhurst's Jerusalem assembly would have to have a 30 gallon cup to contain the wine while thanks are given and a loaf about ten feet square."

"Does somebody say he over-looked this?" Well, if he cannot see the difference between a loaf "ten feet square" and a loaf "twenty feet square," "how can he be expected to see an argument. Now talk about somebody's "big windy," will you? Everybody knows they had a big crowd at Jerusalem, but did they ever all meet in one

body to "break bread?" And if they did, did they use more than one cup? Give us the Bible before you ask us to believe it. The Bible says they "broke bread from house to house," (Acts 2:46).

He has much to say about "Homer doesn't meet us in debate," and "if I ever get to meet Homer," etc., etc. Now, that comes with bad grace from a man who admitted publicly at Eola that he had been running from Doug Phillips for two years.

Bro. Hayhurst, Dad used to tell me there was no use to feed old Grey as long as she had plenty of corn in her trough. Now, you still have "plenty of corn" with Phillips' challenge hanging over your head. Take care of P. and then ask for some one else. But, if you are willing to admit that Phillips is just too much for you and you want somebody nearer your size, I'm your buddy, and you will not have to chase me to Jerusalem to catch me either. You will find me camped at Eola, Concho Co. Tex. U. S. A., and the Bible will still read, "they broke bread from house to house," and "they all drank of it."

Now, Bro. Hayhurst, we have given space for your "big windy" article, and if you want the folks to have some more of your "twenty feet square's" etc., just open up the columns of the A. W. or the Church Messenger, and the O. P. A. guarantees you equal space.

This is but a sample of what happened at the debate, but it is enough to indicate the cup of which Hayhurst has been drinking.

Yours for the whole truth,

Homer A. Gay.

Get your neighbors and friends to subscribe for the O. P. A. Let everyone push the good work.

WORDS OF ENCOURAGEMENT

"I have just looked over the February number of the O. P. A., and I think it certainly is fine. I believe every issue gets better."

—Homer A. Gay, Texas.

"Here is our renewal to the O. P. A. We certainly enjoy reading it."

—Walter W. Bray, Okla.

"I wish I could do more for the paper, but times are so hard, it is difficult. I am glad you are able to do the work you are doing. May the Lord be with you and prosper you in your undertakings throughout life is the prayer of your humble brother."

—John T. Chambers, Ind.

"Here is my renewal and a small donation. I think the paper is fine and doing a good work. I am glad others are coming out in the open."

—A. A. Patterson, Okla.

"Find enclosed one dollar for the O. P. A. Don't fail to send me every issue. I highly esteem the paper, especially, because it finds space for combating all innovations. We are having a hard fight in this part."

—Chancer I. Hill, W. Va.

"Enclosed find one dollar for my renewal to the O. P. A. I don't want to do without it. I hope that it will live long and do much good."

—Mrs. G. M. Boss, Ind.

"Here is my renewal to the O. P. A. We think the paper gets better all the time."

—J. V. Seights, Texas.

"Here are two dollars for the O. P. A. I like the paper just fine."

—Rupert Cobbs, W. Va.

"In fact the O. P. A. is too good for one to miss a single issue, if possible to avoid it. It is steadily growing better. We are blessed with some extraordinary editorial work in its columns. Let me say, Bro. King, without flattery, that you have been doing some writing which is being felt by the thinking ones, who read its columns. In fact, all of the editors have done a work from its very infancy that we should appreciate, and too, the contributors have been wide awake with their trenchant pens."

M. H. Northcross, Fla.

"When You Need PRINTING You Need Us!"—is the slogan of Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn. Anyone who is in need of printing service would do well to write to this firm. They will give you a square deal and appreciate your business.

HONOR ROLL

The following persons have our thanks and appreciation for their co-operation in securing subscribers for the O. P. A.:

J. D. Phillips 5; Homer A. Gay 2; Clyde Penner 2; J. V. Seights 1; L. C. England 1; Chancer I. Hill 1; M. H. Northcross 1; Mrs. N. M. George 1; Rupert Cobbs 1; R. E. L. Taylor 1; Hershel Massey 1; Oswald Hodges 1; Mrs. A. B. Coble 1; Chas. T. Cook 1; A. A. Patterson 1; J. Y. Morgan 1; John T. Chambers 1; James R. Stewart 1; Walter W. Bray 1; Dr. Kate Vaughn 1.

Donations to O. P. A. Fund

A. A. Patterson ----- \$1.00

A WRITTEN DISCUSSION

In the April issue of this paper we expect to publish a discussion on the wine question by Brethren H. C. Harper and A. J. Trail. All or about all of the issue will be given to the discussion. These good brethren have agreed to pay for this that you may get it all together, and too, it will get it out of the way for other important matter. We have much copy in the office for publication, and we ask all the writers to be patient, leaving it to us to select the time to use your articles.

—H. L. K.

Ye num'rous sects
which all declare
"Lo Christ is here,
Lo Christ is there."
Your stronger proofs
divinely give
And show me where
the Christians live.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
O, Savior, where?"
I heard the cry,
and then I heard:
"Here is My Church
where men still dare
To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.' (Jer. 6:16) 'And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in' (Isa. 58:12).

Vol. 6

LEBANON, MISSOURI, APRIL 1, 1933

No. 4

HARPER-TRAIL DISCUSSION

Proposition I: It is Scriptural to use grape juice as the drink element in the communion. H. C. Harper affirms; Dr. A. J. Trail denies.

Proposition II: It is Scriptural to use fermented grape wine as the drink element in the communion. Dr. A. J. Trail affirms; H. C. Harper denies.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Terms of proposition: *Scriptural*, that which comports with the teaching of the Scriptures. *Grape juice*, the drink element produced by the grape vine. *The drink element*, the liquid to be drunk in the communion. *The communion*, the institution set forth in I Cor. 10:16, 17, I Cor. 11:23-34; Mt. 26:26-29; Mk. 14:22-25, and Lk. 22:17-20.

The original language setting forth this drink is: "*tou gennematos tes ampelou*," which the King James version renders, "the fruit of the vine."

Tes, the, before *ampelou*, vine, denotes a species of vine; and the species here indicated is the *grape* vine, designated in Scripture as "the vine," Gen. 49:11; Mal. 3:11; John 15:5, et al.

Gennema (*gennematos*, *gen.*), rendered "fruit" here, is a *drink*. It is defined: a. *the offspring, progeny, of men and animals.* b. *the fruits of the earth, products of agriculture, tes ampelou* (of the vine), Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

This brings us face to face, as the lexicographer points out, with the very Scriptures of our proposition, setting forth and defining the drink element used in the communion, the thing produced by the vine, which was the thing they drank.

The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine was the drink element used in the communion, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

Grape juice is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine. (by definition.)

Therefore, grape juice was the drink element used in the communion.

H. C. HARPER.

FIRST NEGATIVE

In accepting Bro. Harper's propositions which he sent me for discussion I told him that I believed the first proposition should read, It is Scriptural to use unfermented juice of the grape in the communion. But most people understand that grape juice means the unfermented product and grape wine means the fermented product. I also told him that if he would refer me to the Scripture that authorized the use of unfermented juice of the grape in the communion, I would be glad to

acknowledge my appreciation and gratitude for what he had done for me.

I like Bro. Harper's first effort to prove his proposition. He seems to want to be pointed and to use as few words as possible to prove his point, but I cannot accept his article as the truth on the subject and will have to give my reasons for not accepting. I agree with Bro. Harper that *gennema* in the original is properly rendered product but I cannot agree with him when he said, "Therefore grape juice was the drink element used in the communion."

I saw a woman working up some grapes not long ago. She bruised the grapes, rubbed them through a colander and separated the seeds and the hulls from the pulp and the pulp was thin enough to drink for I drank some of it. She canned some of this for making pies. She then had three distinct products of the grape, the hulls, the seeds and the thin mixture of the pulp. Then she separated some of the pulp from the juice. She made marmalade of this pulp and canned the juice. She then put a small amount of juice in a jar to ferment and make wine. Now she has three more products of the grape, the marmalade, the canned juice and the wine, making six distinct products of the grape.

The Savior said, "This fruit (product) of the vine." Now Bro. Harper will you please refer me to the Scripture that tells which one of these products the Savior took out of the passover, in the night in which he was betrayed, and said, "This is my blood."

Bro. Harper, will you please tell me how I may know that the product that was in that cup that the Savior referred to when he said, "This is my blood of the covenant." was grape juice, unfermented?

Incidentally will you, if you have time, please tell me how I may know that the vine referred to by the Savior was the grape vine?

A. J. TRAIL.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

If the Doctor will deny that *grape juice*, the fruit (*gennema*), offspring, product, of "the vine," is an *unfermented product*, I will submit an analysis by a competent physicist in proof that it is.

He says he agrees with me "that *gennema* in the original is properly rendered product," but can not agree with me when I say, "Therefore, grape juice was the drink element used in the communion."

But logically he admits this, my conclusion, when he admits my premises whether he says so or not. Here is my major premise:

"The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine was the drink element used in the communion; as set forth in the

Scriptures." Will he deny this? He has not done so.

My minor premise is: "Grape juice is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine." Will he deny this? He has not done so. Hence his talk about not admitting my conclusion is simply jejune.

He asks how I know "the vine" was the grape vine. I said, "Yes, the, before *ampelou*, vine, denotes a species of vine; and the species here indicated is the *grape* vine, denoted in Scripture as 'the vine,' Gen. 49:11; Mal. 3:11; John 15:5, et al." Will he deny this? He has not done so.

Moreover, I pointed out the fact that "the fruit of the vine" here denotes a *drink*. Will he deny it? He has not done so. Hence it does not denote "pulp" nor "seeds" nor "hulls". And this is not all that it does not denote.

She "canned the juice."

Question: Was what she canned "the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine"?

Question: Was what she canned *fermented*?

You "drank some of it." Question: In so doing did you drink "the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine"?

She then put a small amount of the juice into a jar to ferment and make wine." And did she get this *fermented* wine as Aaron said he got his *calf*? (Ex. 32:24) Or did she do something else in making this *fermented* wine, as Aaron actually did in getting that *calf*? (Ex. 32:4) Give us the details. Tell us what is now in it that was not in it when it came as a *product* of the vine that makes it *fermented* wine now.

Yes, tell us what produced those things, seeing that they are not products of the vine. The vine produced what the lady canned. Dare you deny it?

We know what drink the Savior used in the communion just as we know how to baptize—by the meaning of the language used by the inspired penman to set forth these things. The Savior referred to the one he named, and the one he named is the drink produced by the vine. You admit that the *fermented* drink was not made by the vine, for she took what the vine made and "set it away to ferment and make wine."

Please answer my questions, and refute my syllogism if you can. Since this argument sustains my proposition, it is useless to submit others.

H. C. HARPER.

SECOND NEGATIVE

I do not want to deny that *grape juice* is an unfermented product of the vine. I said plainly that the woman had six distinct products of the vine and named grape juice as a product of the vine.

I still say I cannot agree with Bro. Harper when he says therefore grape juice was the drink element used in the communion.

It seems to me that there is lots of "jejune" in Bro. Harper's second affirmative. Let us do a little of Bro. Harper's reasoning and see how even Bro. Harper will take it.

When sap is rising in vegetation, in the spring, cut a grape vine and this sap will flow freely. A brother told me yesterday that he had caught as much as a half gallon from one vine in a day. Now this is the product of the vine. Nothing else could produce this same sap but the grape vine. This product is a liquid and can be drunk.

Now hear Bro. Harper's logic. This is a product of the vine. "The product of the vine was the drink

element used in the communion as set forth in the Scriptures." Therefore this sap is the drink element used in the communion.

Now Bro. Harper, you say; that I admit that the fermented drink was not made by the vine. I deny this statement. I do not admit any such thing. You want to know what was done to that that was made wine. It was simply poured into a jar and let run its natural course and it made wine. Aaron's calf was made by heating it. This grape juice was preserved in this state by heating it and canning. There has to be something done by human beings to keep it from running its natural course and becoming wine. The Savior had some water poured into a jar and it came out the best of wine (*oinos*). This grape juice was poured into a jar and it came out wine. Now Bro. Harper, which process is more like the Savior and which is more like Aaron's calf? Bro. Harper, you started this! I did not.

An inspired man said, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." If Bro. Harper will refer me to the Scripture that authorizes the use of grape juice in the communion, I will be glad to acknowledge my mistake. He talks like he has other arguments. If he has, he ought to come with them for such arguments as he has been using will never convince any thinking person that grape juice was the drink element used in the communion. So Bro. Harper give us the Scripture that authorizes the use of grape juice in the communion. I want the reader to notice how he answered the question, how may we know that the vine referred to by the Savior was the grape vine? I think I will have a use for it later. Get down to business and tell where to find the Scripture that authorizes the use of grape juice in the communion, and we will publish it so every one can read it.

The reader will realize that Bro. Harper's saying a thing is "jejune" does not make it so anymore than his saying grape juice was the drink element used in the communion makes it so.

A. J. TRAIL.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

The Doctor will not deny that *grape juice* is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine, and is unfermented. Here it is—

1. The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine was the drink element used in the communion, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

2. Grape juice is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine. (by definition.)

3. Therefore, grape juice was the drink element used in the communion.

Hence, if his saying that he does not admit my conclusion when he admits my premises, is not "jejune" (language that does not refute the argument) what is it? It amounts to nothing in the face of his admission.

This argument, unrefuted, proves my proposition. But I shall give him another chance. He still has left the smoke and the ashes of the vine.

His "sap" will not stand the test. The standard lexicon, in defining *gennema*, says: "b. the fruits of the earth, products of agriculture, *tes ampelou* (of the vine), Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18."

I have called his attention every time to the fact that the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine of these Scriptures de-

notes a *drink*. With his "sap" he is simply grabbing at straws. Now see—

1. The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine is a *drink*, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

2. "This sap" is not a *drink*, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

3. Therefore, "this sap" is not the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18. (Neither are: hulls, seeds, pulp.)

He said she "canned the juice." And he admitted the vine made this juice. Again he said, "She then put a small amount of the juice in a jar to ferment and make wine." Then this fermented wine was not made by the vine, else it would have been fermented wine when she "canned the juice." This he can not refute even if he does not admit it. He can not refute physical facts. He now says, "It was simply poured into a jar and let run its natural course and it made wine." Forsooth! Again he says, "This grape juice was poured into a jar and came out wine."

And Aaron said, "I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf." (Ex. 32:24) And now the Doctor says, "It made wine." Yes, "fermented wine." Yes, "it" did. But what was "it"? Surely not "the vine," for the vine has no connection with the contents of the "jar" now. Yes, we want him to tell us what "it" is that made wine, "fermented wine." And we do not want him to fail to answer this.

As a matter of fact Aaron "fashioned it" (the calf). (Gen. 32:4) And as a matter of fact, "Right here is where man steps in and stops the process of nature." "Nature never prepares an alcoholic drink." (J. A. Culler, Ph.D., Professor of Physics.)

No; you "started this." You showed that it was not "fermented wine" when she "canned the juice" which the vine made. This was still to be made wine. And you say, "It made wine." Now tell us what "it" is. Is "it" a locus-pocus of an indefinite "it"? Or is this making of fermented wine done by a well-known process and a well-defined agency?

Yes; the Savior performed a miracle: turned water into wine. And "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster Bible, Christian Life Edition.)

I'll try to be with you when you get to those Scriptures that point out the *grape* vine as "the vine," to see that you keep the record straight. I have repeatedly cited you to the Scriptures that authorize grape juice as the drink element in the communion. And you have admitted the proof in admitting the premises. You now have more "business" than you can dispose of in this syllogism. This is not a case of "Harper's saying a thing"—it is an argument unrefuted. Let others do their own judging. It seems you are not "convinced" neither can you refute the argument.

H. C. HARPER.

THIRD NEGATIVE

No, I will not deny that grape juice is the product of the vine. I will not deny that the juice pressed out of the green leaves of the grape vine is the product of the vine, nor will I deny that the sap is the product of the vine. And I do not believe that Bro. Harper will deny it. Surely not.

I do not believe that it is necessary to say *gennema* *tes ampelou* every time we want to say product of the

vine. I believe people will now know that we are talking about the product of the vine.

But Bro. Harper does not believe that sap of the vine is the drink set forth in the Scriptures Mat. 26:29 etc. I do not believe it either. I was only trying, in as mild a way as I could, to show Bro. Harper what a ridiculous argument he was making with his major and minor premises and his syllogism. But you believe that sap of the grape vine was the drink element used in the communion just as strongly as I believe that grape juice, unfermented, was the drink element used in the communion.

Listen again to some of Bro. Harper's reasoning: "The product of the vine is a drink as set forth in the Scriptures, Mat. 26:29, etc. 2. This sap is not a drink as set forth in the Scriptures, Mat. 26:29, etc. 3. Therefore this sap is not the product of the vine as set forth in the Scriptures, Mat. 26:29." Now let us put the words grape juice in place of sap and the conclusion will be the same. I do not believe that grape juice is the product of the vine as set forth in Mat. 26:29. The Greek word before product is *touto* (this), hence we have this product of the vine; showing that the Savior meant to specify a certain product of the vine, and in this little discussion, we are trying to find which product of the vine the Savior referred to when he said, "This product of the vine." I am denying that grape juice is the product of the vine as set forth in Mat. 26:29. Bro. Harper is affirming that grape juice is the drink element used in the communion as set forth in the Scriptures Mat. 26:29, but Bro. Harper has not referred us to a passage of Scripture that even touched on the subject. Bro. Harper has assumed the very thing that he is to prove. Who would have thought that Bro. Harper would have done a thing like that?

Bro. Harper is denying already that wine is the product of the vine and seems to want me to affirm that it is the product of the vine before my time to affirm. It is my time to deny now and your time to affirm. When you get through with your affirmative you will have plenty of time to deny. So get busy now and point us to the Scripture that says Christ or the inspired apostles used or commanded to be used grape juice in the communion and I will never go into the affirmative but will spend my time in trying to correct my mistake.

A. J. TRAIL.

FINAL AFFIRMATIVE

Proposition: It is Scriptural to use grape juice as the drink element in the communion.

Proof: Major premise—The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine was the drink element used in the communion, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18.

Minor premise—Grape juice is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine. (by definition.)

Conclusion—Therefore, grape juice was the drink element used in the communion. And I do not assume the thing to be proved.

In trying to refute this argument, the Doctor makes reckless assertions, assertions he does not believe himself.

His sap (whether in the leaves or not), hulls, seeds, and pulp are no more the *gennema* of these Scriptures than are water and cornstocks. And when he substitutes *grape juice* for *sap* in his argument, it is his "ridiculous argument," not mine; for they are not equivalent.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay Eola, Texas.

Publisher

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year \$1.00
Single Subscription six years \$5.00

Printed by Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

lent terms. And the same is true of his sap, seeds, hulls, and pulp.

He says he is "denying that grape juice is the product of the vine as set forth in Mat. 26:29. Yes, but his denial does not meet the argument. Grape juice answers every requirement in the definition of *gennema* here, and the standard lexicon cites these very Scriptures in defining *gennema*. And he admits that grape juice is a "drink" and is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine. In fact "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage," as I have shown. Hence grape juice is the *gennema* of the vine as defined and these Scriptures cited by the lexicographer. And this is the drink pointed out—"foutou" (this) in the text here. And when the 20th Century version translates these Scriptures "this juice of the grape," they are backed by the highest scholarship in New Testament Greek. And the Doctor's denial in the face of the argument he can not refute, amounts to nothing. And if these Scriptures that set forth the drink element in the communion "do not even touch the subject," then *baptizo* does not touch the form of baptism, and language means anything one pleases or fancies.

He can not overthrow my premises, and my conclusion logically follows—that "grape juice was the drink element used in the communion."

The Doctor admits that the vine made the "juice." And he said, "She put a small amount of the juice in a jar to ferment and make wine."

Then the vine never made this fermented element.

"The effect, therefore, of fermentation is to change entirely the character of the substance upon which it acts."—J. D. Steele, Ph.D. (Here is that famous "it" again, "it" that makes fermented wine.

"Grape juice is a product of nature, but wine is a product of decay."—J. A. Culler, Ph.D.

"... each (fermented wine and cider) containing, as one product of fermentation, more or less of the inebriating alcohol."—Steele.

"Alcohol is a poison."—Coller.

Toxin (poison) is from the Greek *toxikon*, hence "intoxication by drinking fermented wine."

Yes, the Doctor "started this," and it was my task to give it attention. And I hope he will now get to "it." What is "it"? "It made wine," yes, fermented wine.

No new matter should be introduced in the final negative.

Lovingly,

H. C. HARPER.

FOURTH NEGATIVE

I notice that Bro. Harper is still contending that his major and minor premises and his syllogism proves positively that grape juice was the drink element used in the communion as set forth in the Scriptures Mat. 26:29 etc. Bro. Harper says; "In trying to refute this argument, the Doctor makes reckless assertions, assertions he does not believe himself." Well, I surely didn't know that. I thought I believed every assertion that I made, and I possibly never would have known any better, if Bro. Harper hadn't told me. But Bro. Harper does not believe that sap is any more the *gennema* (product) of these Scriptures (Mat. 26:29 etc.) than "water and cornstocks." I do not believe it either. But I do not believe that grape juice is any more the *gennema* of these Scriptures than I believe sap is.

I wondered why in Bro. Harper's first affirmative, that he said, in giving the definition of Scriptural, "That which comports with the teaching of the Scriptures." I didn't say anything because I thought I might learn something. But I am suspicious now that he wanted to fix it so that he could make it appear that his reasoning was comporting with the Scriptures.

I cannot accept Bro. Harper's reasoning as a foundation on which to risk my eternal salvation. I would not risk my own reasoning. Walking by reasoning is not walking by faith. Such a course is positively against the teaching of the Scriptures. If Bro. Harper will read the fifth verse of the third chapter of Second Corinthians, he will find this language. "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God." (A. V.) "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to account anything as from ourselves but our sufficiency is from God." (R. V.) "Not that we are qualified of ourselves to reason anything as from ourselves, but our qualification is from God." (Wilson's Emphatic Diaglot.)

I think I had a compliment but it was not intended for one. I thought I could see that sentiment was growing in favor of the use of individual cups in the communion. I therefore made a little talk on the subject. At the close of the services a lady came to me with an open Bible and her finger on a certain passage and said, "You won't believe anything unless you read it yourself." I pleaded guilty. She said, "Don't you see it says 'That Cup'." I said, "Yes, I thought that was what I said." She said, "Well, you have four cups here." I said "No, the four cups were here when I came here, if there were forty-eight members, there would be as many drink from one cup as in the night when the Supper was instituted. We have four rows of seats here and a cup for each row. I do not think the way we have it here destroys the communion. I do not think the object of using four cups is to correct a mistake the Savior made, but, if you want to do so, I will be delighted to just have one cup and then there can be no doubt as to its being Scriptural." That is what I have been trying to get Bro. Harper to do. When he refers me to the Scripture that says grape juice unfermented, was used in the communion I will believe it, and the lady said that I would not believe it unless I could read it for myself and I pleaded guilty.

Bro. Harper says that sap and grape juice are not

equivalent terms. I knew that before Bro. Harper told me, but they are both produced by the vine and they are both liquids and Bro. Harper says grape juice is the drink element of the communion because it is a drink and a product of the vine. I wanted to know which one of these liquid products of the vine was used in the communion, but Bro. Harper would not point me to the Scripture that told which one.

A. J. TRAIL.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE *which*

Terms of proposition. Scriptural, that is contained in the Scriptures. (Webster) Scriptures, the books of the Old and New Testament or either, the Bible (Webster) Communion, the institution that was instituted by Jesus Christ "in the night in which he was betrayed," the Lord's Supper.

The thing to be proven in this proposition is that fermented grape wine was the drink element used when the Savior instituted the Lord's Supper. The proof to be of any value must be Scriptural and to be Scriptural it must be contained in the Scriptures.

In studying the Scriptures from first to last, we find the first account of this institution in the 26th chapter of Matthew. In this chapter we find this language, "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover? And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master sayeth my time is at hand: I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them and they made ready the passover. (Mat. 26:17, 18, 19)

"And as they were eating (this passover that the disciples had made ready) Jesus took bread, and----" And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins: But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom." (Mat. 26:27, 28, 29)

We learn from this Scripture that Jesus took this cup while they were eating this passover that the disciples made ready. Now if we can find what the disciples made ready when they made ready the passover, we will know for sure what the Savior used when he instituted His Supper. If you will read Numbers 15:3 you will learn there that the drink offering to be prepared for a one lamb feast whether a burnt offering, a sacrifice, or one of their set feasts, is the fourth part of an hin of wine (3 pints). The word used for wine here in Hebrew is *yayin*. *Yayin* in Hebrew means wine fully and completely fermented. There is a Hebrew word which means grape juice from the time it is expressed from the grapes until it is completely fermented and becomes *yayin*. This word is *tirosh*. See Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, page 973. The Savior referred to this wine (*yayin*) as the fruit. (*gennema*) product of the vine. Bro. Harper flatly denies this. I now let the Savior and Bro. Harper fight this out while I stand on the side of the Savior always contending that the Savior did and said the right thing.

A. J. TRAIL.

FIRST NEGATIVE

1. There is no evidence that the Savior referred to the "drink offering" (the liquid to be poured on the sacrifice, not to be drunk) of Numbers 15:5. Would a

command to *pour* kerosene on wood be a command to *drink* kerosene? No; and I still say, "The Savior referred to the one he named"—the *gennema* of the vine, the *drink produced by the vine*. (Matt. 26:29.) and "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster.) And *grape juice is a drink produced by the vine*. "Sap" of the vine is not a drink. Yes, you "can drink sap." So can you drink carbolic acid; but neither is "a drink." Why not go to the language in which the ordinance was given? As well go to the Old Testament for "sprinkling" when Jesus instituted baptism, using *baptizo*. Running from what the Savior "did and said" is standing on his "side" as the disciples did at his arrest. (Mt. 26:56.)

2. Again: "The use of wine at the paschal feast was not enjoined by the law." (Smith's Bible Dict. by Peloubert.) "There is no divine authority for use of wine at all, fermented or unfermented, at the Passover." (The Bible and Wine.) Here is a chasm you will never cross.

3. "Yayin is the extract from the grape, whether simple grape juice unfermented or intoxicating wine." (Fausset's Bible Cyclo., p. 722.) Hence even if you could find "a drink (*yayin*) in the passover in the Scriptures, it would still devolve on you to prove by the Scriptures that it was "fermented grape juice." And here is another chasm you could not cross.

I now introduce my syllogism in rebuttal: 1. The fruit (*gennema*) of the vine was the drink element used in the communion, as set forth in the Scriptures, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18. 2. *Grape juice* is the fruit (*gennema*) of the vine, by definition. ("Grape juice, the drink element produced by the grape vine." (See my definition of terms.) 3. Therefore, *grape juice* was the drink element used in the communion.

The Doctor complained because I used "reason" with my Scriptures; but he misapplied the Sacred Text he used to condemn such a course. We find the apostles and others constantly "reasoning" in proof of propositions stated or implied.

How about that "it," Doctor, that "it" that *made* "fermented wine"? Now is a good time to get at "it." for "It made wine," you said. You are now in the affirmative, and we are expecting you to "refer us to the Scriptures that authorize" "fermented grape wine" in the communion. I do not see where you have used either reason or Scripture to support your proposition that "fermented grape wine" was used in the communion.

H. C. HARPER.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

It seems strange to me that good, clever, religious people will resort to the means they do to prove their point, or rather to keep people blinded from seeing the truth on a subject that involves the plain teaching of the Scriptures.

Listen to what Bro. Harper says, "There is no evidence that the Savior referred to the "drink offering" (the liquid, to be poured on the sacrifice, not to be drunk). Num. 15:5.

If that is an argument the sectarian world have it on us. They say, "Baptism is non-essential" and prove it by saying, "There is no evidence to that effect in the Bible." Of course, Bro. Harper can say this if he wants to, but I surely would be afraid to make a statement like that about a plain passage of Scripture as Num. 15:5. Given by the mouth of Jehova himself.

When I saw this statement, of Bro. Harper's, I actually got the Bible and turned to the passage to see if the word, poured, or the phrase, not to be drunk, was connected with that passage of scripture anywhere.

The idea of some man accusing Jehovah of calling an element a drink offering and it "not to be drunk"! Can even Bro. Harper imagine Jehovah calling a thing a drink offering and it "not to be drunk"? That's no "chasm to cross over"!

Bro. Harper goes to Fausset for authority to prove that yayin in this Scripture does not mean fermented wine but he cannot prove it by Fausset. Fausset said it meant completely fermented grape juice. There is a word in Hebrew that, if Jehova had used instead of yayin in giving this law and Bro. Harper had shown to me that he so did, I would have given up the discussion long ago and would have acknowledged my mistake. This word is *tiros* and means grape juice not completely fermented. "Hence it may be said that *tiros* applies not only to the 'must' in the wine vat but to 'new wine' before it has fully matured and become yayin." (Hasting Bible Dictionary Page 973) If Fausset is right in saying that, "yayin is the extract from the grape, whether simple grape juice unfermented or intoxicating wine." How could it be that *tiros* represents the freshly expressed grape juice until it went through the fermentation and became yayin? How could it become yayin, when it had been yayin all the time?

Bro. Harper seems to be anxious to find expressions in literature that would misrepresent this plainly given law by Jehova and make it appear that it doesn't mean what it says. If Bro. Harper should find 10,000 men who would say that there was no law given for the drink offering in their set feasts for one lamb, I would not believe it. For Jehova said plainly, "-----or in your solemn feasts-----and the fourth part of an hin of wine for a drink offering shalt thou prepare. Num. 15:3, 5. This looks very much like a law that they should follow when they took possession of the land of Canaan.

Bro. Harper keeps wanting to know about that "it". I didn't think that it was worth space to talk about that "it". The antecedent of that "it" is grape juice which anybody can see. Then grape juice made wine and became yayin the *gemma* (product) of the vine that the Savior took out of the passover and said "This is my blood." Now this is all there is to that "it."

M. C. Kerfces said that every word used in any of their set, or solemn, feasts was a word that indicated something that would take possession of the brain also in 1 Cor. 11:21 the word for drunken meant something that took possession of the brain.

I was once corresponding with a man who believed that grape juice unfermented should be used in the Lord's Supper. When I quoted 1 Cor. 11:21 he said that the reason they got drunk was because they had drunk so much grape juice that it fermented in the stomach, made wine and they became drunk. I did not even reply to this. It seems the poor fellow did not even know that the process of digestion was much shorter than the process of making wine.

A. J. TRAIL.

SECOND NEGATIVE

"Drink offering. The pouring of a small quantity of wine on the daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb." (Bible Dictionary by Holman.) It is not the

number of times you read, but the intelligence with which you read, that makes it profitable. If you had read the translation of the Bible—the whole Bible—by that prince of Oriental scholars, Ferrer Fenton, you would not have blundered here, for you would have found it "a pouring," as the Hebrew denotes. The "drink offering" of the King James translation is no more confusing than their "meat offering" of the 9th verse is, in which no "meat" was used. But the "meal offering," as Fenton and the Revised have it, makes it clear.

You certainly know that the "paschal lamb" was not "the daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb," with which the "drink offering" (a pouring) went. And if it is not true that "The use of wine at the paschal feast was not enjoined by the law" (Bible Dictionary), and "There is no divine authority for the use of wine at all, fermented or unfermented, at the Passover" (The Bible and Wine), just find the Scripture that enjoins it. This chasm is still before you, Doctor.

Nobody denies that there was a law given for a "drink offering" (a pouring). But all your talk about wine, yayin, or *tiros* is gratuitous since you find no drink enjoined in the Bible at the Passover. And when you are ready to deny that "Yayin is the extract from the grape, whether simple grape juice unfermented or intoxicating wine" (Bible Cyclo.), I am ready to meet you. And this chasm is still before you even if you could find "a drink" (yayin) enjoined at the Passover.

That "poor fellow" you mention makes me think of another poor fellow who advocated fermented wine. He said, "I hear that they have discovered a grape vine in California that produces fermented wine." I replied, "Show me."

"It made fermented wine." "The antecedent of 'it' is grape juice." I say again, "Show me!" I have grape juice in my house all the time, and it never made "fermented grape wine." Never!

I Corinthians: "drunken (King James), "filled" (Living Oracles), "gorged" (Ferrer Fenton); but even if "intoxicated," it was at "his own supper."

1. The drink produced by "the vine" was the drink used in the communion. 2. "Fermented grape wine" is not a drink produced by "the vine." 3. Therefore, "fermented grape wine" was not the drink used in the communion.

Please define "fermented grape wine" of your proposition. "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster.) Will you deny this? Give us "the process of making wine." Is fermented wine "a manufactured product"? and is this product identical with what "the vine" makes?

H. C. HARPER.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Bro. Harper says, "It is not the number of times you read, but the intelligence with which you read, that makes it profitable." Good, I believe you are surely right one time. May I add that what you read has something to do with it also? If Bro. Harper, in place of reading what "that prince of Oriental scholars" said had been reading what that Prince of men said about the man of God being completely furnished unto every good work by the Scriptures, with intelligence and had believed every word of it, he—maybe—would not have made such an awful blunder about the drink to be used in the communion. When he read, "And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready

the passover." (Mat. 26:19) and had not known what they made ready when they made ready the passover; he could confidently have said that the Scriptures will tell me.

Then he could have turned to Rom. 15 and read verses 4, 5 and 6 and found this language, "For whatsoever things were written afore time were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope; Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like minded one toward another according to Christ Jesus; That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." He could have remembered that something had been written afore time about the passover for his learning. He could have found the law given for all of their set feasts that they should follow when they got possession of the land of Canaan. He could have found that the passover feast was a set feast set for the fourteenth day of the first month of the year. He could have found that it was a one lamb feast. He could have found a special law given for both meal and drink offerings of this feast. Then we could, by following this, be like minded according to Christ Jesus (marg. note After the example of) and with one mind and one mouth glorify God even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Well Bro. Harper, have I gone and "misapplied the sacred text" again? We never can be like minded according to your syllogism Bro. Harper, never.

But Bro. Harper likes what men say about it (some men) seemingly better than the plain teaching of the Scriptures. Let's see how he will like this. "When the Hebrew ate flesh, he ate bread with it and drank wine and when he offered flesh on the table of his God, it was natural that he should add to it the same concomitants that were necessary to make up a comfortable and generous meal." (Hastings Bible Dictionary p. 812)

"The underlying idea of this, by far the commonest form of sacrifice, was that of sharing a common meal with the deity." (H. B. D. p. 812)

I once heard a Jew, who said he was reared by the orthodox Jew family. He said his mother had told him that their family ancestors had been true to the Jew's religion for nearly five thousand years. He showed how the food was arranged and the places occupied by the family respectively. He said there were three cups of wine on the table (I wondered if they were pint cups because the law said they were to prepare three pints) When he came to the disposal of the third cup, he said the father took it in his hand and addressed his youngest son. In this Jew's remarks he gave as a reason for them having wine was because wine had always been a sign of happiness. I think it would have been better if he had said, it was because Jehovah had commanded it. This Jew was giving a lecture on the passover.

Bro. Harper, I have tried so hard to make you see that this law was given the same for their set feasts and burnt offerings, etc. I do not know whether I will fail or not. You have acknowledged that it was a law for their burnt offerings and I cannot see why you cannot see that that law applies to their set feasts also when the set feasts is as plainly named and specified as their burnt offerings.

Bro. Harper, if Jehovah had wanted to make it plain that they were to prepare wine, fully and completely fermented; what terms could he have used that would have made it plainer than the terms he did use here?

What word could he have used that would have expressed the idea better than the word "yayen"?

A. J. TRAIL.

THIRD NEGATIVE

Is a command to *pour* carbollic acid on a sore a command to *drink* it, Doctor? "*Drink offering*. The pouring of a small quantity of wine on the daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb." (Bible Dict.) This is not wine to be drunk, no matter with what sacrifice it went. But you should know that the "daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb" was not the passover lamb. And when I read it "a pouring," I read the word of God; and I challenge you to refute it. Now bring on the Hebrew if you please.

Are you going to refuse to define "fermented grape wine" of your proposition and answer my questions, as the rules of honorable discussion demand? 1. Please define "fermented grape wine." 2. What is "wine, fully and completely fermented," and how do you tell it is such wine? 3. By what authority do you make "fermented grape wine" mean "wine, fully and completely fermented"? You say "tirosch" may denote fermented grape wine. 4. Why, then, do you reject *tirosch* in the communion? (When you tell me what you mean by "wine, fully and completely fermented," and how you know it is such wine, I may be able to tell you the word to denote it.)

When you "apply" any Scripture to show that wine to be drunk was enjoined at the passover, you "misapply" it, Doctor. Your task is worse than one to "look for a needle in a haystack," for in your case there is no needle in the stack. You seem to realize this now, for you have gone to Jewish tradition after telling us "The proof to be of any value must be Scriptural and to be Scriptural it must be contained in the Scriptures." 4. Why do you think it "better" if that Jew had falsified by saying, "because Jehovah had commanded it," instead of what he did say, when neither you nor the Jew can find the command? And Hastings plainly indicates by what he says that it was not commanded, too. If you're going to take tradition, change your proposition; and I'll meet you on it, too.

Israel entered Canaan without wine (Ex. 29:6) on the tenth day of the first month (Josh. 4:19), and just four days later ate the passover (Josh. 5:10). 5. Did they have a "drink offering" with this lamb?

I find many things "afore time" for our "learning," Doctor; and one thing is, that wine to be drunk at the passover was not enjoined by divine authority. And I can "confidently" rely in the Scriptures for this. And I can "confidently" go to the Scriptures (Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18) for the drink used in the communion, "as Jesus had appointed them," where I find *genemai* (offspring, product) of "the vine" was used. And I know that "fermented grape wine," an alcoholic product, is not produced by "the vine." It is physically impossible. And you admit that *grape juice* is a *drink produced* by "the vine." Hence *grape juice* was the *drink* used in the communion, as set forth in these Scriptures. And if you will stay with the Scriptures, we can agree.

6. Does "the vine" produce a poison? 7. Can "fermented grape wine" be produced without yeast? 8. Is yeast a leaven? 9. Is "fermented grape wine" a "manufactured product manipulated by yeast fermentation?"

The Hebrew word that does not include unfermented wine is *yainharelek*. (The Bible and Wine, p. 6) "*Yayin* is the extract from the grape, whether simple grape juice unfermented or intoxicating wine." (Bible Cyclo. by Fausset, p. 722.) "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster, Teacher's Bible.)

1. The drink produced by the vine was the drink used in the Communion. 2. "Fermented grape wine" is not a drink produced by the vine. 3. Therefore, "fermented grape wine" was not the drink used in the communion. You can not refute this, yet you will not agree with it. Why? If it is not the truth, expose it if you can. Evidently you can not or you would do so.

H. C. HARPER.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Bro. Harper told of a "poor fellow" that told him that he had heard that they had discovered a grape vine in California that produced fermented wine, and you wanted to be shown. You do not have to go to California to see that sight. Just come to McMinnville, Tenn. and I will show you the vine and the wine (*yayin*). I have more than a dozen grape vines that produce that very kind of wine. If you want to get some of these vines, I will give you the names of them. One variety is the Latie, another Concord, another Moore's early, another Martha Washington and another the Campbell. These all produce wine. I will explain and in so doing I will answer all your questions that you seem to be so anxious about. I gathered some grapes from these vines. I then squeezed the juice out with my hands and strained "it," (that wonderful "it") into a crock and let "it" set four days (Bro. Harper please keep up with that "it"). The Hebrew let it set from 4 to 7 days. I then strained "it" into a common half gallon jar, filling the jar from one-half to two-thirds full and then put a top on with a good rubber under it. There has not been a thing put in this jar except what the vine produced.

"It is ordained in the Mishna that new wine cannot be presented at the sanctuary for a drink offering until it has stood for at least forty days in the fermenting jars." (Hastings B. D. p. 974. I watched the process of this "it" that was in that fermenting jar, and just about the time and sometimes a few days before the forty days were up "it" quit fermenting. Not a bubble was seen to come up after this. At this point "it" ceased to be "tirosh" and became "*yayin*". This is wine fully and completely fermented.

I remembered at this point that David Lipscomb said, "Good clever people spend time and much research and ingenuity in striving to fix up a theory that will banish fermented wine from the Lord's table. A few will take the position under stress of the evil of intemperance, but the consensus of the learned and the common sense of those who study the Bible hold to the idea that it was fermented wine is free from leaven. The fermentation works out the leaven."

Webster's Unabridged Dictionary says that leaven is anything that ferments or is destined to ferment.

I know that grape juice ferments. I know that Bro. Harper knows that grape juice ferments. I know that Bro. Harper knows that no leaven should be found in their houses during the seven days of the feast of the passover according to the law of Jehovah.

"Honey was excluded along with milk from the altar on the ground that both were liable to fermenta-

tion (see also leaven)." H. B. D. p. 813.

Now Bro. Harper, will you please tell us what you do to that "it" (grape juice) to keep it from fermenting and give us the Scripture for the procedure? Also please tell us where the Savior got that grape juice in the night in which he was betrayed and said of it that it was his blood of the covenant?

It is too plain for people to miss seeing it, that grape juice unfermented was not the drink element used in the communion as set forth in the Scriptures, Mat. 26: 27, etc.

To have used grape juice in the set feasts would have been to do something positively forbidden by the Scriptures. Hence I will not take grape juice under any circumstance in the communion. I would be afraid to do so.

"Bagster said grape juice was used as a beverage." What in the world has that to do with the communion?

"Wine is a poison." Paul wanted Timothy to poison himself. Did he? I have just looked up the word in Greek and it is *oinos* (wine) not *gleukous* (grape juice).

It seems that Bro. Harper cannot see that the Hebrew was eating his meal while he was offering to his God the same that he was eating. "The Hebrew offered to God the things with which his own table was furnished." H. B. D. p. 817.

"When the Hebrew ate flesh, he ate bread with it and drank wine." H. B. D. p. 812. When the Hebrew was eating the paschal lamb he was eating flesh.

Bro. Harper says that there was no law given for a drink in the passover either fermented or unfermented. That does not prove anything for his grape juice theory. The Savior was living under the Mosaic Law and I do not believe he would have presumed to have added anything to that law before it was fulfilled and nailed to the cross. He said that He came to fulfill it. Then we know that the Savior kept the law when he was eating the last passover. Where can we find a passage that looks more like a law to that effect than Num. 15:5?

Paul, in giving instructions to the Corinthians concerning this institution that the Savior established "in the night in which he was betrayed," said, "For I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you -----" Now while these Corinthians were eating this bread and drinking this cup that Paul says the Savior told him about and he told the Corinthians about, they got drunk, and the Savior said of this very drink that it was the fruit, *genneima*, product of the vine. Bro. Harper, I believe the Savior knows better than you as to whether this is the product of the vine or not. I am still standing on the side of the Savior contending that he knows best. But Bro. Harper wants to get out of this by saying that some translations use the word "filled" or "gorged" in place of drunken. Of course, they were filled or gorged on intoxicants. I believe that Bro. Harper knows this. If he will read Eph. 5:18. "And be not drunken with wine wherein is riot but be filled with the Spirit," he can plainly see that the Greek for drunken here is the same as the Greek for drunken in 1 Cor. 11:21 and the word translated filled in this verse is a different word.

In correcting this conduct of the Corinthians Paul did not say now brethren, I told you the Savior used grape juice and, if you had done as I told you, you would not have become intoxicated. He didn't even hint at such a thing.

Bro. Harper does not believe that the use of the word "yayin" by Jehovah in Num. 15:1,5 proves that completely fermented wine was meant by this command. It seems that Jehovah understood that somebody would reason as Bro. Harper has and in repeating the law for preparing a meal and drink offering for a one lamb feast, Num. 28:7, he used the word "shekar" which means strong drink, but if, Jehovah had not used the word "yayin," we could not have known what the wine was made from, but when Jehovah specified that this strong drink was yayin, we know that yayin is strong drink made from the juice of grape and grapes grow on grape vines.

This is why I wanted the reader to notice how Bro. Harper answered the question, How may we know what kind of wine was referred to by the Savior when he said "fruit of the vine?"

Bro. Harper "has grape juice in his house all the time." He has to do something unknown in the Mishna (the law of God to the Jews) "It may be stated at this point that no trace can be found among the hundreds of references to the preparation and use of wine in the unfermented state." Hastings B. D. p. 974.

Bro. Harper has one more chance to repeat his syllogism. But it will not compare with the plain teachings of the Scriptures.

A. J. TRAIL.

FINAL NEGATIVE

I showed that "The use of wine at the paschal feast was not enjoined by the law," not to "prove anything for grape juice," but to expose your futile effort in going to the O. T. for a drink element in the passover. You stumbled over "drink offering," contending it was "wine to drink," but when you came to "Drink offering. The pouring of a small quantity of wine on the daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb," you fell flat. This does not "look like wine to drink" any more than carbolic acid to pour on a sore "looks like" carbolic acid to drink. When I wanted "anything for grape juice," I went to the Scriptures giving the ordinance "as Jesus had appointed them," and found it *gennema* (offspring, product, fruit) of the vine, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18, a drink produced by the vine, and I stood with the Savior.

You bring up "drink offering" in the *Mishna* of Jewish traditions; but this does you no good. We are not debating the *drink offering*, and no matter what its character was. And of the thing we are debating "The proof to be of any value must be Scriptural and to be Scriptural it must be contained in the Scriptures," as you said. I will say, however, that the *Mishna* was not "the law of God" to anybody. Nor is the relish of these traditions by Hastings a guide for any man who wants the word of God for his faith and practice. These traditions are as full of absurdities as "a dog is of fleas." They also "ordain" that it is the duty of a man to get drunk at the feast of Purim. (Talmud. Fol. 7.) Christ's most scathing rebuke of the Jews was for following their tradition. The Jew had no more right to violate God's law by taking at the passover "things with which his own table was furnished" than we have to do the same thing at "the Lord's table." And I will further say that if honey and milk were excluded from the altar "on the ground that both were liable to fermentation," so would all flesh be, for it, too, is "liable" to fermentation. (See World Book; Life of Pasteur and Hygienic Physiology by Steele. "The legs of

the lame are unequal."

Webster speaks of *leaven*, not things that may be leavened. His "leaven" is active as "anything that ferments;" inactive as "destined to ferment." Grape juice is not leaven. You should read more carefully.

Fermentation does not "work out the leaven," yeast. (Britannica, Vol. 28, p. 719; Col. Cyclo, p. 32; Life of Pasteur, p. 85; The Bible and Wine, p. 16.) You are now face to face with physical, demonstrated facts, Doctor. Hence, to use such an element on the altar or at the passover would violate the law of God. (Ex. 12:8; Lev. 2:11.) "Fermented bread" (Smith's B. D., p. 179) and "fermented wine" are both produced by yeast, a leaven. "All fermented liquors are artificially produced (see p. 132); these (ferments, yeast) also cause the 'rising' of bread." (Steele, p. 301).

Yes, your vines "all produce wine." But it is "unfermented wine, simple grape juice," even *yayin*, for "Yayin is the extract from the grape, whether simple grape juice unfermented or intoxicating wine." (Bible Cyclo. by Fausset, p. 722.) *Fermented wine, alcoholic wine, intoxicating wine* are terms that mean the same thing; and your vines do not "produce that very kind of wine." And if "There has not been a thing put in this jar except what the vine produced," there would be no "fermented wine," for no yeast, no "fermented wine."

"Yeast is the ferment which causes alcoholic fermentation." "It consists of microscopic plants." (Steele, p. 133.) "These germs, parasitic vegetations, called yeast, are the cause of fermentation." (Life of Pasteur, p. 85.) "Alcohol is produced by a process called fermentation, which is caused by very minute round plants called yeast." (Lippincott, Book II, p. 33.) You did not see "it" (yeast, not grape juice, Doctor), but it "got there just the same." Had you kept it out, you would still have had "what the vine produced," but not "fermented wine." You "put a top on with a good rubber under it." "Right here is where man steps in and stops the process of nature." "Nature never prepares an alcoholic drink." (Lippincott, Book II, p. 33.) "This minute being (yeast) produces the transformation which constitutes fermentation by breathing the oxygen of the substance to be fermented, or by appropriating for an instant the whole substance, then destroying it by what may be termed the secretion of the fermented products. The effect, therefore, of fermentation is to change entirely the character of the substance upon which it acts." (Steele, p. 132.)

No sane man will deny that "the vine" produces "simple grape juice," "unfermented wine." Hence, it can not produce such a product as "fermented wine," a product entirely different in character. As well might you expect "grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles," or a fountain to "send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter." (Mt. 7:16; Jas. 2:11.) And "Wine was preserved in its unfermented state." (Inter. Ency., Art. wine.) "In our Lord's time there was an ample supply of unfermented wine, 'the fruit of the vine.'" (The Bible and Wine, p. 18.) "Unfermented wine, the juice of grapes, was valued in Palestine as a beverage." (Smith's B. D., p. 320.) "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster Bible, p. 117). See also Pliny, Book XIV, ch. 19; Inter. Ency. Vol. 28, p. 3097; Steele, p. 133; Life of Pasteur, pp. 85, 113, 285. (The *Mishna* is not "the only pebble on the beach," Doctor.) There was plenty of this "fruit of the vine" for the Savior in the commun-

The Hebrew word that does not include unfermented wine is *yainthareleh*. (The Bible and Wine, p. 6) "*Yayin* is the extract from the grape, whether simple grape juice unfermented or intoxicating wine." (Bible Cyclopedia, by Fausset, p. 722.) "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster, Teacher's Bible.)

1. The drink produced by the vine was the drink used in the Communion. 2. "Fermented grape wine" is not a drink produced by the vine. 3. Therefore, "fermented grape wine" was not the drink used in the communion. You can not refute this, yet you will not agree with it. Why? If it is not the truth, expose it if you can. Evidently you can not or you would do so.

H. C. HARPER.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Bro. Harper told of a "poor fellow" that told him that he had heard that they had discovered a grape vine in California that produced fermented wine, and you wanted to be shown. You do not have to go to California to see that sight. Just come to McMinnville, Tenn. and I will show you the vine and the wine (*yayin*). I have more than a dozen grape vines that produce that very kind of wine. If you want to get some of these vines, I will give you the names of them. One variety is the Latie, another Concord, another Moore's early, another Martha Washington and another the Campbell. These all produce wine. I will explain and in so doing I will answer all your questions that you seem to be so anxious about. I gathered some grapes from these vines. I then squeezed the juice out with my hands and strained "it," (that wonderful "it") into a crock and let "it" set four days (Bro. Harper please keep up with that "it"). The Hebrew let it set from 4 to 7 days. I then strained "it" into a common half gallon jar, filling the jar from one-half to two-thirds full and then put a top on with a good rubber under it. There has not been a thing put in this jar except what the vine produced.

"It is ordained in the Mishna that new wine cannot be presented at the sanctuary for a drink offering until it has stood for at least forty days in the fermenting jars." (Hastings B. D. p. 974. I watched the process of this "it" that was in that fermenting jar, and just about the time and sometimes a few days before the forty days were up "it" quit fermenting. Not a bubble was seen to come up after this. At this point "it" ceased to be "tirosh" and became "yayin". This is wine fully and completely fermented.

I remembered at this point that David Lipscomb said, "Good clever people spend time and much research and ingenuity in striving to fix up a theory that will banish fermented wine from the Lord's table. A few will take the position under stress of the evil of intemperance, but the consensus of the learned and the common sense of those who study the Bible hold to the idea that it was fermented wine is free from leaven. The fermentation works out the leaven."

Webster's Unabridged Dictionary says that leaven is anything that ferments or is destined to ferment.

I know that grape juice ferments. I know that Bro. Harper knows that grape juice ferments. I know that Bro. Harper knows that no leaven should be found in their houses during the seven days of the feast of the passover according to the law of Jehovah.

"Honey was excluded along with milk from the altar on the ground that both were liable to fermenta-

tion (see also leaven)" H. B. D. p. 813.

Now Bro. Harper, will you please tell us what you do to that "it" (grape juice) to keep it from fermenting and give us the Scripture for the procedure? Also please tell us where the Savior got that grape juice in the night in which he was betrayed and said of it that it was his blood of the covenant?

It is too plain for people to miss seeing it, that grape juice unfermented was not the drink element used in the communion as set forth in the Scriptures, Mat. 26: 27, etc.

To have used grape juice in the set feasts would have been to do something positively forbidden by the Scriptures. Hence I will not take grape juice under any circumstance in the communion. I would be afraid to do so.

"Bagster said grape juice was used as a beverage." What in the world has that to do with the communion?

"Wine is a poison." Paul wanted Timothy to poison himself. Did he? I have just looked up the word in Greek and it is *oinos* (wine) not *gleukous* (grape juice).

It seems that Bro. Harper cannot see that the Hebrew was eating his meal while he was offering to his God the same that he was eating. "The Hebrew offered to God the things with which his own table was furnished." H. B. D. p. 817.

"When the Hebrew ate flesh, he ate bread with it and drank wine." H. B. D. p. 812. When the Hebrew was eating the paschal lamb he was eating flesh.

Bro. Harper says that there was no law given for a drink in the passover either fermented or unfermented. That does not prove anything for his grape juice theory. The Savior was living under the Mosaic Law and I do not believe he would have presumed to have added anything to that law before it was fulfilled and nailed to the cross. He said that He came to fulfill it. Then we know that the Savior kept the law when he was eating the last passover. Where can we find a passage that looks more like a law to that effect than Num. 15:5?

Paul, in giving instructions to the Corinthians concerning this institution that the Savior established "in the night in which he was betrayed," said, "For I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you ____." Now while these Corinthians were eating this bread and drinking this cup that Paul says the Savior told him about and he told the Corinthians about, they got drunk, and the Savior said of this very drink that it was the fruit, gennema, product of the vine. Bro. Harper, I believe the Savior knows better than you as to whether this is the product of the vine or not. I am still standing on the side of the Savior contending that he knows best. But Bro. Harper wants to get out of this by saying that some translations use the word "filled" or "gorged" in place of drunken. Of course, they were filled or gorged on intoxicants. I believe that Bro. Harper knows this. If he will read Eph. 5:18. "And be not drunken with wine wherein is riot but be filled with the Spirit," he can plainly see that the Greek for drunken here is the same as the Greek for drunken in 1 Cor. 11:21 and the word translated filled in this verse is a different word.

In correcting this conduct of the Corinthians Paul did not say now brethren, I told you the Savior used grape juice and, if you had done as I told you, you would not have become intoxicated. He didn't even hint at such a thing.

Bro. Harper does not believe that the use of the word "yayin" by Jehovah in Num. 15:1,5 proves that completely fermented wine was meant by this command. It seems that Jehovah understood that somebody would reason as Bro. Harper has and in repeating the law for preparing a meal and drink offering for a one lamb feast, Num. 28:7, he used the word "shekar" which means strong drink, but if, Jehovah had not used the word "yayin," we could not have known what the wine was made from, but when Jehovah specified that this strong drink was yayin, we know that yayin is strong drink made from the juice of grape and grapes grow on grape vines.

This is why I wanted the reader to notice how Bro. Harper answered the question, How may we know what And of vine was referred to by the Savior when he said "fruit of the vine?"

"It may be stated at this point that no trace can be found among the hundreds of references to the preparation and use of wine in the Mishna of any means employed to preserve wine in the unfermented state. It is even improbable that with the means at their disposal the Jews could have so preserved it had they wished. (Pro. MacAlister's statement as to the impossibility of unfermented wine at this period)"

gism. But it will not compare with the plain teachings of the Scriptures.

A. J. TRAIL.

FINAL NEGATIVE

I showed that "The use of wine at the paschal feast was not enjoined by the law," not to "prove anything for grape juice," but to expose your futile effort in going to the O. T. for a drink element in the passover. You stumbled over "drink offering," contending it was "wine to drink," but when you came to "Drink offering. The pouring of a small quantity of wine on the daily morning and evening sacrificial lamb," you fell flat. This does not "look like wine to drink" any more than carbolic acid to pour on a sore "looks like" carbolic acid to drink. When I wanted "anything for grape juice," I went to the Scriptures giving the ordinance "as Jesus had appointed them," and found it *gennema* (offspring, product, fruit) of the vine, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18, a drink produced by the vine, and I stood with the Savior.

You bring up "drink offering" in the Mishna of Jewish traditions; but this does you no good. We are not debating the drink offering, and no matter what its character was. And of the thing we are debating "The proof to be of any value must be Scriptural and to be Scriptural it must be contained in the Scriptures," as you said. I will say, however, that the Mishna was not "the law of God" to anybody. Nor is the rehash of these traditions by Hastings a guide for any man who wants the word of God for his faith and practice. These traditions are as full of absurdities as "a dog is of fleas." They also "ordain" that it is the duty of a man to get drunk at the feast of Purim. (Talmud. Fol. 7.) Christ's most scathing rebuke of the Jews was for following their tradition. The Jew had no more right to violate God's law by taking at the passover "things with which his own table was furnished" than we have to do the same thing at "the Lord's table." And I will further say that if honey and milk were excluded from the altar "on the ground that both were liable to fermentation," so would all flesh be, for it, too, is "liable" to fermentation. (See World Book; Life of Pasteur and Hygienic Physiology by Steele. "The legs of

the lame are unequal."

Webster speaks of *leaven*, not things that may be leavened. His "leaven" is active as "anything that ferments;" inactive as "destined to ferment." Grape juice is not leaven. You should read more carefully.

Fermentation *does not* "work out the leaven," yeast. (Britannica, Vol. 28, p. 719; Col. Cyclo, p. 32; Life of Pasteur, p. 85; The Bible and Wine, p. 16.) You are now face to face with physical, demonstrated facts, Doctor. Hence, to use such an element on the altar or at the passover would violate the law of God. (Ex. 12:8; Lev. 2:11.) "Fermented bread" (Smith's B. D., p. 179) and "fermented wine" are both produced by yeast, a leaven. "All fermented liquors are artificially produced (see p. 132); these (ferments, yeast) also cause the 'rising' of bread." (Steele, p. 301).

Hastings B. D. p 974

no "fermented wine," for no yeast, no "fermented wine."

"Yeast is the ferment which causes alcoholic fermentation." "It consists of microscopic plants." (Steele, p. 133.) "These germs, parasitic vegetations, called yeast, are the cause of fermentation." (Life of Pasteur, p. 85.) "Alcohol is produced by a process called fermentation, which is caused by very minute round plants called yeast." (Lippincott, Book II, p. 33.) You did not see "it" (yeast, not grape juice, Doctor), but it "got there just the same." Had you kept it out, you would still have had "what the vine produced," but not "fermented wine." You "put a top on with a good rubber under it." "Right here is where man steps in and stops the process of nature." "Nature never prepares an alcoholic drink." (Lippincott, Book II, p. 33.) "This minute being (yeast) produces the transformation which constitutes fermentation by breathing the oxygen of the substance to be fermented, or by appropriating for an instant the whole substance, then destroying it by what may be termed the secretion of the fermented products. The effect, therefore, of fermentation is to change entirely the character of the substance upon which it acts." (Steele, p. 132.)

No sane man will deny that "the vine" produces "simple grape juice," "unfermented wine." Hence, it can not produce such a product as "fermented wine," a product entirely different in character. As well might you expect "grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles," or a fountain to "send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter." (Mt. 7:16; Jas. 2:11.) And "Wine was preserved in its unfermented state." (Inter. Ency., Art. wine.) "In our Lord's time there was an ample supply of unfermented wine, 'the fruit of the vine.'" (The Bible and Wine, p. 18.) "Unfermented wine, the juice of grapes, was valued in Palestine as a beverage." (Smith's B. D., p. 320.) "Unfermented wine seems to have been in common use as a beverage." (Bagster Bible, p. 117). See also Pliny, Book XIV, ch. 19; Inter. Ency. Vol. 28, p. 3087; Steele, p. 133; Life of Pasteur, pp. 85, 113, 285. (The Mishna is not "the only pebble on the beach," Doctor.) There was plenty of this "fruit of the vine" for the Savior in the commun-

ion when all heaven was put away; and there was plenty for Timothy without his taking "intoxicating wine," with its toxin, poison in which is "riot." (Eph. 5:18.)

I Cor. 11:21. I showed that this condition (whether gorged or intoxicated) was effected at "his own supper." It reads, "Every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken." Paul corrected some things and said, "The rest will I set in order when I come." (Same ch.)

You could not answer my questions and hold your teaching; hence would not touch them. And you would not define "fermented grape wine," the principal term in your proposition, for you knew you could not limit it to "wine, fully and completely fermented," which you tried to make *yayin* mean, and which you want and think you have as soon as the *bubbling* ceases. But this is not so. "Wine, fully and completely fermented," is "dry wine" (Steele, p. 134), and this is not obtained until the *yeast* in the "quiet" fermentation (which follows the bubbling, or tumultuous, fermentation) has devoured all the sugar, and this may take years.

Oinos. Both *Yayin* and *tirosk* are translated *vinos*, and it may be used for either fermented or unfermented wine. And *shekar*, "sweet drink," *yayin*, *tirosk*, *gleukos* (Acts 2:13) are used for either kind of drink.

Gennema. But Christ used *gennema* to express the communion drink, making it what "the vine" produces. It does not produce an alcoholic drink. It does produce a drink, grape juice, "unfermented wine." And having the Scriptures for this, Mt. 26:29; Mk. 14:25; Lk. 22:18, all can unite on it, and "Speak where the Bible speaks."

H. C. HARPER.

FREE COPIES

Free copies of the Harper-Trail Discussion may be obtained by writing Dr. A. J. Trail, 225 E. Main St., McMinnville, Tenn., or the Old Paths Advocate, care Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.; if you will send enough to pay the postage.

NOTE: We yet lack five or six dollars as my part of paying for the publication of this discussion, and I am asking those who wish to help me meet this, to send a donation to the office of the paper, addressing Homer L. King, Route No. 2, Lebanon, Mo. —H. C. HARPER.

P. S. I now have time to be out preaching. Should anyone desire my services, write me at once at Sneads, Fla.

H. C. H.

SOME THOUGHTS ON UNITY

O. B. PERKINS.

Today we hear much of Unity. Considering this, the fact that it is, for the most part, non-existent, seems singular. I am often made to wonder why this state of affairs exists. In any other domain except that of religion we find that when those interested desire unity, it is speedily achieved.

I believe that the facts will warrant my saying that the cause for so much division lies in the efforts of the very ones advocating unity. Most every preacher speaking or writing on the subject introduces something which instead of healing the wounds already existing, causes still more division. I do not expect any lasting unity in the Church as long as every preacher in the Brotherhood continues formulating new doctrines or hobbies and introducing them as essentials. Many times these

have not an element of truth in them, and yet the Church is divided and its influence handicapped just because the preacher has a pet theory concerning which he must discourse in every sermon. I agree with Brother Paul Hays that the hobby of rightliving should be ridden more.

The Apostle Paul plainly says that we must "avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law for they are unprofitable and vain."—Titus 2:9. Hear Paul again, in his first letter to the Church of God at Corinth: "Now, I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no division among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."—I Cor. 1:10. As the Apostle was guided by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit he surely knew just what means would bring unity at Corinth. I believe that the same principles applied now will be conducive to the same results. The first thing he mentions is that ye all speak the same thing. The Apostle Peter makes it very plain as to what should be said. "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God."—I Peter 4:11. This is equivalent to the motto of the Restoration, "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent." But, how far we have digressed from the command and the motto!

If a man honestly seeking the truth asks me a question and I give him an answer contrary to one which he has received from another member of the Church of Christ, is there not distrust planted in that man's mind? And untold harm done? Let us all speak the same thing and speak as the oracles of God speak. Doing this, we are to be able to answer any question asked; and be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment.

Another thing which causes much division in the Church is the lack of brotherly love. Of course, we say we love each other, but do we? To illustrate take the home that has been divinely appointed by God. The man and wife love each other with love that is sincere and divine. Very often, they differ; but the love which they have for each other causes them to reason on any difference that might arise and also, to forgive and forget real or imaginary injuries or wrongs. Will the Church do this? No. They lack love which has long since been declared to be the greatest Christian attribute. Love will bring about unity in the home, among the nations, and in the Church of God. "Let brotherly love continue (Heb. 13:1) and thus heal some of the bloody wounds in the Church."

Let Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn., handle your printing needs. They will treat you right and will appreciate your business most heartily.

"Vice is a monster of so frightful mien
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
But seen too often face to face
We first endure, then pity, then embrace!"

"Help me to watch and pray
And on Thyself rely
Assured if I my trust betray
I shall forever die."

Don't forget to speak a good word for the Old Paths Advocate. It needs your good will and support.

Ye num'rous sects
which all declare
"Lo Christ is here,
Lo Christ is there."
Your stronger proofs
divinely give
And show me where
the Christians live.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
O, Savior, where?"
I heard the cry,
and then I heard:
"Here is My Church
where men still dare
To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.' (Jer. 6:16) 'And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in' (Isa. 58:12).

Vol. 6

LEBANON, MISSOURI, MAY 1, 1933

No. 5

CHURCH DISCIPLINE

Without church discipline it is impossible to have a pure church. "Evil companionships corrupt good morals," and "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." In other words, when a little wickedness is allowed, soon the whole church will be corrupt.

Without church discipline it is impossible to push onward and outward conquering the foe as God has commanded. Even with a peerless leader like Joshua, the children of Israel were repulsed at Ai, because of sin in the camp. Josh. 7:12. And when we behold a congregation of the Lord that is not conquering the enemy, we must conclude that there is disobedience somewhere within. Either a presumptuous sin has nullified all effort, or else lack of faith (which is sin in itself) has stifled the labors or dwarfed the efforts of the righteous servants of God.

But when there is sin in the church the congregation as a whole becomes responsible for its existence. To the church at Thyatira Jesus said, "But I have this against thee, that thou sufferest the woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess, and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols." Rev. 2:18-29. Because that church in its congregational capacity "suffered" or fellowshipped that evil woman, the Lord Jesus held it against them.

Therefore in order for us to be right before God and to obtain his blessings, it is necessary that we assume our individual and congregational responsibilities and put into practice the discipline which God has ordained for his church. If we fail in this respect, the entire assembly of the Lord will soon become so contaminated with sin and cursed with shame, that our candlestick (influence) will be removed, and the Lord will spew us out of his mouth. (cf. Rev. 2:5; 3:16).

If the necessity for discipline be realized let us next consider the divine method of putting it into practice.

1. The first move is by an individual and that action consists of prayer. "If any man see his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall ask and God will give him life for them that sin not unto death; John 5:16 (cf. James 5:16) In view of this scripture it is necessary for anyone who has knowledge regarding a sin committed by a brother, or a sister in the church to pray for such. We are not authorized to pray that they may be saved in their sins, but that they may turn from their sins. Think of the influence of a righteous

prayer! Abraham's petition for Sodom would have saved the entire wicked city, had ten righteous been found therein. See also James 5:16-18. Surely there is enough righteousness in the average brother or sister in Christ to obtain favor with God for their salvation! If there were no forgiveness with God, who would or could repent, and if the Lord were to mark iniquities who could stand? Ps. 130:4. Too often the tendency is to despise the fallen one, and instead of helping him or her out of their unfortunate condition, such are kicked and tramped further into the mire. When those conditions obtain, we need to change our view point. Jesus said, "why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam (of light) that is in thine own eye?" Matt. 7:3. That beam of light is nothing less than a wrong point of view. So long as we have a wrong view point, we cannot see clearly to cast out even a mote (a small speck of dust). In administering justice we need first of all to clean up our own back yard, then shall we see clearly to help the brother remove the dust from his.

Many times the foregoing puts a quietus upon every effort for discipline. But why should we stop because we must begin at home? Having a clear conscience and a proper point of view, let us not stop but press on to accomplish the will of God.

When we have cast out the beam and become right before God individually, let us consider the other fellow's plight. In sin, he or she is lost eternally. Remember—"he who converted a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death." James 5:20. Like our Father in heaven we must desire the salvation of the sinning soul. That zealous apostle Paul said, "Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass, ye who are spiritual restore such a one in a spirit of gentleness, looking to thyself lest thou also be tempted." Gal. 6:1. Our object in enacting discipline should be to save the sinner as well as to preserve the purity of the church.

When any of us have been wronged, we (the wronged) must ask for the wrong to be righted, before God will accept of OUR worship and service to him. Matt. 18:15. The same principle holds with regard to the one in the wrong. Matt. 5:23-32; cf. I Thess. 5:14-17. Therefore it is imperative that both parties be reconciled or he who is in the wrong and will not repent must be disfellowshipped by the church. Let us always approach our brethren in a spirit of gentleness and meekness, "for a brother offended is harder

to be won than a strong city, and such contentions are like the bars of a castle." Prov. 18:19. Nevertheless we will remember that, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die," and "he who converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death."

2. "And if thy brother sin against thee, go show him his fault between thee and him alone; if he hear thee thou hast gained thy brother." Matt. 18:15. If a brother has sinned against the whole church, has he sinned against thee? Why not? Thou art a part of the church. And if he repent when thou hast shown him his fault, unless it were a public sin, why need the matter go any further? If he turn and repent we should cheerfully forgive. Rom. 12:8; Matt. 18:21-35. Public sin requires public reproof or rebuke (cf. I Tim. 5:2), but—will the righteous desire to make a public example? or will they do so unless absolutely necessary? (cf. Matt. 1:19 and Prov. 25:9, 10.)

3. Perchance the erring one will not hear thee alone: then proceed with the next step. "But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established." Matt. 18:16. Witnesses are necessary for proof. Under the old law, two or three witnesses were essential before a man could be stoned to death physically. Under the new law, two or three witnesses are essential before one may be separated from the church (or stoned to death spiritually). (cf. I Tim. 5:19). In the presence of these witnesses, there is hope that the brother may be won, and if he is, why need the matter be made known to any one else? When he repents, let us cheerfully forgive.

4. But—"if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church." This is the final effort before withdrawing from the disorderly. Surely he will hear the whole church!

5. But "if he refuses to hear the church let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the Publican. Verily I say unto you, what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Matt. 18:18. When justice has been done, that sentence of separation from God and his people becomes bound in heaven. In other words, were the disfellowshipped member to die in that state he would perish eternally. The consequences are awful to contemplate, but where one is impenitent, "Thine eye shall not pity." God's will must be done.

6. At this stage again, prayer is authorized, with a promise that it will be answered. Matt. 18:19, 20. We must not pray that God should save any in their sins, but rather that the fallen might come to repentance and live. And let us restore such in a spirit of gentleness and meekness. II Cor. 7:8-16; 2:5-11; Gal. 6:12.

7. How often shall we forgive after repentance? Verily, as often as one repents, let us forgive from the heart, and receive him into full fellowship again. Why not? How can we say we have forgiven from the heart, if we do not receive into full fellowship and companionship and love again, the one who has repented? Woe unto the unfor-

giving! Matt. 18:21-35. "Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy. Matt. 5:7. Beloved, let us be long-suffering toward all.

On the other hand, the impenitent shall not be forgiven, no not so much as to eat with them. II Thess. 3:6, 14; I Cor. 5:11. "And it shall be, that every soul that shall not hearken to that prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people." Acts 3:23. God's word teaches that physical death and eternal destruction will be the eventual punishment of the incorrigible. May the Lord help us to do his will, diligently, humbly, meekly, prayerfully and lovingly.

8. If there be none to watch over the flock and to give their lives to prayer and the ministry of the word, (cf. Acts 6:2; I Tim. 4:13-16), how can the church prosper or spread the knowledge of God abroad in the whole earth? Truly, some must watch on behalf of the souls, else many will be lost. Heb. 13:17; Jesus, the model shepherd, lost but one.

L. L. McGill.

G. C. BREWER'S REVIEW OF "THE CUP OF THE LORD"

ANSWERED BY J. D. PHILLIPS, No. 4.

Continuing our review of the Phillips tract, we observe:

5. "Drink Ye All of (ek, out of) It." Last week it was shown that the New Testament does not say that Christ gave it—the cup—to the disciples, but that he gave to them that which they were to drink. It was also shown that no one can say just how each individual received his portion—whether he took it into his mouth from a common cup or whether he first received it into his own separate cup. Even if they did all drink out of the same vessel, it no more makes that binding upon us than that fact that they reclined at the table makes it necessary for us to recline at the table when we partake of the emblems. But the author of the tract says that they all drank from, out of, the same vessel, and he bases an argument upon the preposition "of," which is "ek" in the Greek. He says that "ek" means "out of," and therefore they all drank out of one cup.

It was not "shown" "last week" that "the New Testament does not say that Christ gave it—the cup—to the disciples." You ignored the Greek idiom which requires an "it" after "He gave," in Matt. 26:27, and you assumed that He did not give them the cup, but that He "gave to them that which they were to drink"—"the fruit of the vine." Of course, He gave them "the fruit of the vine," but He gave it to them in what the N. T. calls *poteerion*, and this word means "a cup, a drinking vessel."

Neither was "it shown that no one can say just how each individual received his portion." Christ gave the cup to them, saying, "You must all drink out of (ek) it" (Matt. 26:27); and "they all drank out of (ek) it" (Mark 14:23). "Ek with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks" (Thayer), "the vessel out of which one drinks" being *poteerion*, "a cup, a drinking vessel," as he points out. Paul says so in so many words—"Let him drink (pino) out of (ek) the cup (*poteerion*)" (I Cor. 11:28).

When you prove that they "reclined at the table," it will then be time for you to try to make an argument from it in favor of your cups law! They reclined at another supper.

A sufficient answer to this is the fact that they all drank of that which came out of the same vessel which the Lord took up when he gave thanks. At some hotels a thousand persons each day drink soup or coffee out of the same boiler or pot, but they all use different cups in drinking.

Yes, each disciple drank a part "of that which came out of the vessel (cup) which the Lord took up when He gave thanks." But how did they do it? "Let him drink out of the cup" (1 Cor. 11:28). This is part of what Paul "received from the Lord" (1 Cor. 11:23). Here is what he received from the Lord: "You must all drink out of it" (Matt. 26:27); and "they all drank out of it" (Mark 14:23) — "drink out of the cup" (1 Cor. 11:28).

The "boiler or pot" from which soup or coffee is taken and poured into a bowl or cup is not "the vessel out of which one drinks" as is "poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel." Your "answer" is not an answer, and is not "sufficient" for your cause.

At this writing I am away from home and do not have access to any of my Greek lexicons, but, fortunately, I have a Greek Testament with me, and I can illustrate the uses of "ek." Of course "ek" does mean out of, from, etc., but, like all other words, it has different uses with these meanings as a basic idea. It not only signifies out of, as from the interior of a place, but it has to do with origin, cause, source, supply, etc. To eat of (ek) the bread certainly does not mean to eat out of the bread.

Take the following references where the word "of" is from "ek" in the Greek and try substituting the phrase "out of" in each place, and see what nonsense you get: "I shall not drink henceforth of (ek, out of) this fruit of the vine," etc. "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of (ek, out of) the bread, and drink of (ek, out of) the cup." (1 Cor. 11:28.)

Thayer answers his blundering on ek, citing the very Scriptures Bro. Brewer uses. He says, "of the supply out of (from) which a thing is taken, given, eaten, drunk, etc." Under this he cites eating ek the loaf and drinking ek the well, etc. It is only in this sense that you and your guests drank coffee or water from the same pot or pitcher.

Yes, ek may denote "from the inside to the outside," i. e., "out of." It may also denote source, origin, supply, etc. Hence, we eat of the loaf (ek, with supply, Thayer, p. 191), not "out of" as an ignoramus might say. And the disciples drank ek, out of, the cup (Mk. 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:28), it being "the vessel out of which one drinks" (Thayer, p. 510).

He admits that poteerion does mean "a cup, a drinking vessel." A "pot", a "pitcher," or a "boiler," does not mean "a drinking vessel," and hence he is throwing dust when he seeks to confuse his readers by using them. He betrays his ignorance of language, that's all. It must make Calhoun, Baxter, Hardeman, Boles, et al, smile (or frown) to read his review. Better put him in the Grammar School.

Suppose we take the title of our author's tract and put "out of" for "of": "The cup of the Lord"—"the cup out of the Lord." Does the quibble on "ek" need any further attention?

This is the worst blunder I have ever seen from any one. And it came from a big man—from G. C. Brewer! You better read that Greek Testament of yours. There is no ek in "The cup of the Lord." Here is a transliteration of the Greek: poteerion Kurion—"the cup of the Lord." No ek

there, my brother! You make more antics on ek than any sectarian ever made on eis (ice). And down you go!

When we drive the sprinkler from his hiding-place, and expose his every effort to sustain it by the Bible, he throws up his hands and exclaims, "Oh, it is a non-essential, anyway: baptism never saves anybody!" But I expected better things of my brother. He has "thrown up the sponge," for he says, "Even if they did all drink out of the same vessel, it no more makes that binding upon us than the fact that they reclined at the table makes it necessary for us" to do so.

The brethren are on the job with their substituting, just like the Catholics did. Bro. Boles says in the Gospel Advocate of Sept. 15, that the fact that the disciples used "unleavened bread" does not bind us to the same practice. Some say blackberry juice or watermelon juice will answer the purpose of "the fruit of the (grape) vine." And it may not be "many moons" until meeting "on the first day of the week to break bread" (Acts 20:7) will be only an "incidental." Some of the music brethren have already reached this conclusion. The Romanist says we can commune in one element—the loaf, only. And a pedo-baptist excuses his sprinkling, thus: "As to the giving of the bread only to the laity, they may think that, in what is merely ritual, deviations from the primitive mode may be admitted on the ground of convenience, and I think they are as well warranted to make this alteration as we are to substitute sprinkling in the room of the ancient baptism." Extremes meet. Will "many cups" finally lead the brethren to no cup, as is the case with the Catholic laity? Brethren, whither are we tending? (More next month).

DELINQUENT SUBSCRIBERS

Look at top of page three, and if your paper is marked "Time Expired," you should renew at once. Brethren, this is no time to drop the paper; we need your co-operation and support now more than anytime since we began the publication. "Times are so hard," you say; that is the very reason you should renew. Some write us, "Discontinue my paper until I get able to send you the dollar," but that doesn't lighten our burden in the least. We had rather continue your paper with your promise to pay as soon as you get it than to drop you. Remember the publisher and others are giving their time freely without one cent of pay that you may receive the monthly visits of the paper. It does seem that you could sacrifice at least one dollar a year to keep it going in the good work. May we count on you?

—H. L. K.

Alneer McFadden, Winters, Texas, April 10, 1933.—Bro. Homer Gay preached here over the second Lord's day inst. We had a nice crowd and one restoration. The work here is progressing nicely. The worship is carried on according to the Scriptures. I go to Bradshaw next Lord's day. I still have some time for meetings this summer. I am in the fight for the truth—the whole truth.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year \$1.00
Single Subscription six years \$5.00

Printed by Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

"WHAT MEANETH THIS?"

Acts 2:12.

This question was propounded on the day of Pentecost by those who seemed not to understand what they had seen and heard, hence, they asked, "What meaneth this?"

Thus it is right to inquire into things spiritually. That is, "Seek and search and find out wisdom." Eccl. 1:13.

It is quite a common thing for brethren in preaching, writing, and reports to use the expressions, "We worship according to the primitive order;" "New Testament order;" "Ancient order of things;" "According to the Bible;" "According to the Book;" etc.

The above phrases have, and are being used by denominational preachers (Sectarian), as well as by preachers and other members of the Body of Christ. Therefore, it is high time to begin to inquire, "What meaneth this?" Or, "What meaneth then this bleating of the sheep in mine ears?" 1 Sam. 15:14.

King Saul had the impiety to say (as many do now), "I have performed the commandment of Jehovah." 1 Sam. 15:13. As far as I am aware, all religious people, as King Saul did, allege that they have and are, "Performing the commandments of Jehovah." Hence, we are confronted by the above question, "What meaneth this?"

Do the utterances, "We worship according to the primitive order," and "We worship according to the New Testament order" mean the same order? Do the assertions, "We worship according to the ancient order of things," and "We worship according to the Bible," "According to the Book," etc., mean the same order? Or, "What meaneth this?"

There seems to be as many so-called orders (ways) of worship among the disciples of Christ as there are names for the worship. The most of the congregations worship according to custom or customs, then call it "Primitive order," "New Testament order," "The ancient order of things," "The Bible order," "The Book order," etc. All declare, as King Saul did, "I have per-

formed the commandment (or commandments) of Jehovah."

When preachers and others announce that their congregations worship "According to the New Testament order," "Primitive order," "Ancient order of things," "Bible order," "The Book order," etc., we should insist on those who thus assert to tell how they worship and what they do. Just to say, "We worship according to the primitive order," "New Testament order," "Ancient order of things," and so on, and not tell what "The New Testament order" is, and how it is to be done, is misleading for the very reason that those congregations that use breads, cups, and have the preacher or preachers take all of the time in the worship, prayer or prayers before "The teaching, fellowship, and breaking of bread (loaf)" and other customs they practice, also affirm that they "Worship according to the New Testament order," etc.

Moreover, denominational churches (Sectarian) claim they "Worship according to the New Testament order." Therefore, it is important when churches hold that they "Worship according to the New Testament order" that they state how they worship and what they do in the worship.

Some imagine just so they use one cup that this will atone for all the rest of their unscriptural teaching and practice.

Yours for "The Old Paths"—No more — No less.

Joseph Miller,
1004 North Lambert Street,
Brazil, Indiana.

SPECIAL OFFER

LOOK! From now until January, 1934, to new subscribers, the Old Paths Advocate for only fifty cents! In order to increase our reader list and secure funds to meet our obligations with the printers we are willing to make this special offer. Here is a splendid opportunity for brethren to do some mission work. You can think of some of your friends whom you would like to see converted to the truth, then why not send them this paper for eight months for only this small amount. Do not lay this aside and forget about it but act today.

—H. L. K.

HONOR ROLL

The following persons have our thanks and appreciation for their co-operation in securing subscribers for the O. P. A.:

J. E. Tidwell—3; O. C. Mathews—2; C. C. Rowdon—2; Homer A. Gay—2; Sam Finto—1; M. T. Beaman—1; B. F. Wetzel—1; J. E. Spear—1; A. H. Pinegar—1; A. H. Pinegar—1; Mrs. L. M. Pond—1; Thos. S. Stark—1; T. C. Hawley—1; James F. Thomas—1; A. J. Bond—1; Fred Parish—1.

DONATIONS TO O. P. A. FUND

O. C. Mathews \$1.00
Mrs. L. M. Pond \$1.00

Send your printing work to Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn. They will treat you right.

FROM THE FIELD

J. C. Moore, Rte. 8, Waco, Texas, April 11, 1933.—The church at Waco is doing fine, and we are growing all the time. Bro. Homer A. Gay, of Eola, will, the Lord willing, begin a series of meetings here the last Lord's day in May, continuing for two weeks. I do not like to do without the paper and will renew as soon as I can.

W. C. Rice, Mountain Home, Ark., March 15, 1933.—I am very busy, laboring with my hands and preaching between times all I can. I go into Ozark County on the 17th inst. for a few days. I have promised to hold a mission meeting at Bradleyville, Mo. soon. I hope to be able to go anywhere I am called within a few days now.

James Stewart, Eola, Texas, Mar. 9, 1933.—We are having a very interesting meeting, with Bro. J. D. Phillips doing the preaching. There have been three restored to date. I closed a good meeting at Ogden, Feb. 26. Baptized two and restored one. All seemed to enjoy the meeting.

G. A. Cornfield, Marion, La., March 17, 1933.—I see I am the only colored preacher who takes the O. P. A., but I think it is fine. I was the first colored Christian in this part, but I have built up a congregation of about forty members, and we have two other small congregations about eight or ten miles away. I would do more for the cause if I had the help. I have been expecting to go into Miss., and preach to my people, but arrangements have not been made yet.

Homer A. Gay, Eola, Texas, April 10, 1933.—Since last report I have preached at the Ellis school house, in Menard County; also at Winters, the home of Bro. A. McFadden, a sound gospel preacher and a fine man. He plans to spend the summer in evangelistic work, and any congregation desiring his service will make no mistake in calling him. If sound congregations would use only sound preachers they will thereby avoid much trouble. Bro. J. D. Phillips closed a series of meetings here the 12th ult., which resulted in three additions. Crowds and interest were fine, and the church seems to be in much better condition now. I am receiving many calls for work in the North, and I plan to start for that section late in August.

Thos. S. Stark, 223 Lathem Ave., Hemet, Calif., March 18, 1933.—Since my last report we have discontinued the so-called Bible study, and are now worshipping God as the Bible directs. It has been a hard fight for me, but as we are to "put on the whole armor of God," I feel that I have just done my duty in the service of the Lord. We started with six members, but have grown to sixteen, hence we think something has been accomplished. We meet in the Girl Scout's building, San Jacinto, Calif., at eleven o'clock a. m. We

invite sound brethren who may be passing this way to worship with us, or if preachers we would be glad to have them preach, but they must stand out against all innovations.

Chas. Rowdon, Rivera, Calif., Feb. 23, 1933.—While in Tennessee, visiting my father we had the pleasure of meeting Bro. J. E. Tidwell, of El Dorado, Ark., and the pleasure of hearing him preach. He preached a week at the S. S. Church of Christ. Considering the weather the crowds were good. From here we went to the Alabama school house, near Ethridge, Tenn., continuing a week, resulting in two baptisms, two restored and a congregation established. This is the only sound congregation in this part of the state. They will be very glad to have sound brethren visit and worship with them.

Tom E. Smith, Headton, Okla.—The congregations at Pike City and at Headton are increasing in interest and in numbers. We have secured Bro. Homer A. Gay for our meeting this summer. We hope he will be as good as the Missouri Homer. I have arranged to assist in the Pike City meeting, also a number of other meetings this summer. Thanks for the sample copies of the O. P. A. I am placing them where I think they will do the most good. I hope to send in some subs. soon.

S. J. Gay, Albuquerque, New Mex., April 11, 1933.—I began a series of meetings at the above place the 9th inst. and expect to continue two weeks. This is a mission point, and the work is being arranged and carried on by Brethren G. L. Hogland and Anderson, of this city. They have leased a building at fifteen dollars per month for a year, for a place to conduct the meetings and worship. They are to be commended for their loyalty and liberality, as this will be quite a burden on them. If any one should desire to help them in a financial way it would be appreciated. We desire the prayers of the brotherhood that our labors be not in vain. All sound brethren passing this way are invited to stop and worship with us. Preaching brethren who are not advocating innovations are invited to labor with us. We hope to establish a good congregation here before we leave, and I hope to secure some subs. for the paper in the near future. Those desiring to get in touch with these brethren should address G. L. Hogland, Clerk's Box, Albuquerque, New Mex.

"THE CUP OF THE LORD, A Great Cloud of

Witnesses Giving the Exact Meaning of the New Testament Language in Reference to the Communion-Cup Question," is a 37-page booklet written by J. D. Phillips, of 252 So. 4th Street, Montebello, Calif. The booklet is free for the asking and the postage (about four cents per copy). Since the booklet was put out at a great sacrifice, those who order copies should, if possible, send a donation, regardless of how small the amount, to help bear the financial burden. Only a limited supply left. Address the author.

J. D. Phillips, Montebello, Calif.—The Montebello church seems to be in better condition spiritually than it has been in for years. We are making a special effort to actually worship God in our song service. Most congregations have appeared to think the song service is for the purpose of entertaining the first ones that arrive at the place of meeting while the others are coming. We now sing "psalms, hymns and spiritual songs" (Col. 3:16), and are getting away from the jazzy, hop-skipity-jump kind that disgrace the song services of so many congregations. I recently spent two Sundays with the church at El Centro. From there I went to Hot Springs, N. Mex., where I assisted Bro. Lewis Musgrave in a mission meeting. He is developing into a fine young preacher, and is anxious to learn. I was with the church at Enochs, Texas, last Lord's day and preached a sermon on the necessity of completing the restoration of primitive Christianity. I will be in Texas for about four months, and can hold meetings in either Okla. or Texas during the spring. Address me at Littlefield, Texas.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., April 15, 1933.—I have not been able to get out any to speak of this winter, due to wife's poor health. Since we last made mention of her condition in the paper she has been very poorly, and we felt certain we would be compelled to go back to the hospital and may yet, but I am thankful to report that she is some better the last few days. Remember us in your prayers, brethren. The congregation here is doing better than the average, I think. We have much for which to be thankful. I baptized one here since last report. Let us have your reports, brethren. We ask all to rally to the support of the paper during these trying times.

PASSED ON

Bro. W. R. Beesley, of Vanzant, Mo., was born March 21, 1856; departed this life April 5, 1933, being seventy-seven years and fifteen days of age.

In 1877 he was united in marriage to Rachel Elizabeth Crain. To this union were born four daughters, one of whom preceded him in death. He is survived by his wife, three daughters and eight grand children, all of whom live in Douglas County.

At the age of twenty he obeyed the gospel, spending many years in the service of his Master. He had gained a wonderful knowledge of the Bible, being able to quote more of it than many preachers. His ability to defend the truth privately was surpassed by few.

The writer was called to speak words of comfort to the bereaved ones and words of warning to the living.

—H. E. Robertson.

STARK

The death angel has sounded its trumpet again. This time in the home of Brother and Sister James K. Stark, of Brawley, Calif. Little Maxine responded to the call.

She was born March 3, 1929; died March 14, 1933. Funeral services were conducted at the Evergreen Cemetery, El Centro, where her body was "sown" to await the resurrection morn. Much sorrow in this community prevails as a result of her passing, however we are certain she has gone on to be with the Lord.

The writer tried to speak words of comfort to those who gathered to pay their last respects. May God richly bless and comfort the bereaved ones in this hour of sorrow. Let not your hearts be troubled, ye believe in God; believe also in me: in my Father's house are many mansions."

J. L. Musgrave, El Centro, Calif.

WHERE CHRIST HAS NOT GONE

(Matt. 28:19, 20)

"Go ye therefore, teach all nations."

I.—Our Christian duty: It is our Christian duty to see that the rest of the world receive the benefit of the light which shines to us through the Book of God. Christ commands us to "Go (ye) into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation." (Mark 16:15, 16.) And Paul's aim was to preach the gospel where Christ was not already named. (Romans 15:20, 21) The Godless world needs those who will show it the living Christ, the Christ who died on the cross, "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world" to save humanity. (John 1:29).

Enlarging mission work:—To enlarge mission work, whether it be at home or abroad, we must do and practice certain things.

- 1—Pray—Luke 2:10.
- 2—Preach; declare the whole counsel of God. (Mark 16:16).
- 3—Encourage missionaries with good, newsy letters.
- 4—Read at least one missionary book. (Life of Livingston).
- 5—Keep in touch with others striving to enlarge the work.
- 6—Circulate one or more missionary volumes.
- 7—Show the missionary teaching of the New Testament.
- 8—Show the practice of the first Church of Christ, etc.

II—Whether or not you have read Bro. B. D. Morehead's booklets on "Where Christ has not gone," the citing of facts in Christless lands, from which source I base this writing, you should have some knowledge concerning these people.

We in America do not realize how much we owe God for all our blessings. Even in these times of travail we are far better off than these people. The authorities from whom Bro. Morehead, missionary of Japan, quoted, make it very plain concerning conditions where the light has not as yet shone.

Is it any wonder, then, why they are so dark? Once the true light has shone within their souls, their every being responds to it, but not until then. And we find that the backward places are those that are dark. You can read of conditions in these lands in several books.

To me the world, religiously speaking, is divided into two main parts; the one—Christian: bright, progressive, looking forward, lending a helping hand; the other, dark, reserved, living in the long ago, refusing to go forward. The Lord sent Philip to preach in the desert, when he might have been preaching to large crowds in Samaria or Jerusalem. He was sent of God. The church's responsibility does not end at home. There is work to be done abroad where Christ has not gone.

Philip was sent where he was needed most. Quoting from a missionary in far-off China, as quoted by Bro. Morehead, we have this:

"Every field has its advantages and disadvantages. We have not found, after some experiences in interior work, that the people look down upon us or our Message because we do not understand all of their language or customs.

"There is practically no such thing in China as a sparsely populated district, although one can walk miles without seeing a house. When one looms in sight, it isn't just a house, it is a whole village of them. Farming is carried on, yes, but the farmer goes out in the daytime and gets back to his village by night. This is because of the dangers from roving bands of robbers.

"The mud houses of the villages are so arranged that it is hard for one unfamiliar with them to find the way in uninstructed. In size their farms are nothing to compare with ours in America. If a man has half an acre, he has a farm. The larger towns are market towns, or one might call it the business section, for in the market towns all commercial business is carried on. Each market town has outlying villages which are the residential sections. There are no stores in the villages, there are no houses of ill fame, no saloons or gambling houses. All such are located in the market town. Every third day is market day when the farmers from the villages bring their wares to town, sell and buy, dissipate and gamble. It is impossible to know just how many people live in these places, no one knows. Some will set the figure at ten thousand, and that varies up to fifty thousand or more,—each individual's idea about it.

"The majority of the market towns are walled cities, but most of them have outgrown their walls. It is said that in the old days of the kings, walls were necessary for protection because of numerous wars, which reminds one greatly of Bible times. It would seem to us that the walls need enlarging if wars have anything to do with it. But since those days, methods of warfare have changed in China, too, as well as in the rest of the world."

III. Those who go — missionaries: Many are the reports concerning these lands, and they come from good sources. Who are better fitted to carry the gospel than they who have given up father and mother, sister and brother, yes, their very homes? They must blaze the trail "Where Christ has not gone."

Are they to be forgotten, they who support the Word of God "through thick and thin," who oftentimes die on the field of Christianity for its sake;

they who forsake their own nets to be fishers of men? They should never be sent, if such an attitude is to be taken! Christ's words concerning their going forth would never have been uttered if they were not to be fulfilled and in the way He planned. Need I say that they would rather live and die there, where they have done the most good, where their tears are the bitterest, where their children's children are born? From the "four winds" they go; to darkest Africa and the beat of the tom-toms; to China; to Japan and the cherry blossoms; to India, to Latin America they go. God's adventures, arm in arm, and as sure as God watches them from on high, they are bound to succeed.

IV. As a final thought, let us think on these things and look forward to the results that shall come if we send workers into the vineyard of our Lord. Let us look "on the other side of the fence" and learn "how the other half lives." These people are in darkness of sin and ignorance, in a deep sleep and must be awakened by the message of the gospel of Christ, and "after Christ's coming, they shall be gathered from the four winds—from one end of Heaven to the other."

We do not know when He cometh, for he says "In an hour that ye think not the Son of Man cometh" (Matt. 24:44). Those who have been perseverant unto the end, who remembered his neighbor in time of hunger or thirst, in time of sickness and despair, whether he be white, red, yellow, or black, shall be gathered into the fold of God. Those who did not remember his neighbor, even with a silent prayer, shall be cast out into the outer darkness. God will surely remember us if we remember others in their time of need.

By a native of Brazil,
Alfonso Bueno,
905 Clinton Ave.,
Ottumwa, Iowa.

CLIPPINGS AND COMMENTS

The Spirit of Christ.

The Spirit of Christ calls things by the right name whether it is liked or not. Christ called the Pharisees "hypocrites" because they were. As a result, they persecuted him. The Spirit in the apostles was to "convict the world of sin." The Spirit in the apostles never failed to condemn and to convict the sinner. Those today who would be such diplomats as to side-step an issue and say nothing that would cut the errorist to the heart cannot claim the Spirit of Christ. Contrast the preachers in New Testament times with the preachers of today. Must one be passive, affable, agreeable, non-combative, a pacifist, to have the Spirit of Christ? Certainly not. Jesus cleaned the temple twice. He said, "My house is a house of prayer, but you have made it a den of thieves." When the disciples heard it, they remembered that it was written, "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." Had Jesus left error alone, he would have lived. But the Spirit of Christ can-

not leave error alone. Perhaps present-day preachers are afraid they will be "eaten up" if they oppose all error! [No, brother, they fear the collection plate will return empty.] Jude said, "Contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." This verse exhorts us to contend earnestly for what is taught. The Spirit of Christ never contends for anything not taught, but uncompromisingly contends for things that are taught.

—C. M. Pullias, in G. A., Jan. 12, 1933.

Comments

Enough said. "What shall the harvest be?" Please post. —H. C. Harper.

THE KING JAMES VERSION

By W. T. Taylor.

Lest there be a misunderstanding in the minds of the uneducated, I will say a few things in behalf of the King James Version of the Holy Scriptures.

This version, though imperfect, is considered the standard among English-speaking people. We accept this standard and all of our preachers use it; while some of them, in their writings and debates, refer to the errors in it and appeal direct to the Hebrew and Greek, the languages of inspiration. This is legitimate and right. We cannot make any version an absolute standard because there are mistakes and imperfections in all of them. Our appeal, then, should be to the original languages, used by the Prophets and Apostles,—the Hebrew and Greek.

That there are many spurious words and statements in the King James Version will be denied by no well informed man. Yet, in the happy providence of God, it is a well-known fact that these spurious words do not effect nor change the plan of salvation. So, as far as the plan of salvation is concerned, these spurious readings are unimportant. Translators may becloud and obscure that plan, but God has not allowed it to be destroyed.

If the scholars that made the King James Version had translated the word —BAPTIZO—used by the apostles, all the controversy over the action of baptism would have been avoided. In that case, we, perhaps, would never have heard of sprinkling for baptism outside the ranks of Catholicism. This is not the only error in the version that is partially responsible for erroneous doctrines and practices in religion.

So, my brethren, don't get excited and conclude that a preacher is an infidel because he appeals direct to the languages of inspiration—Hebrew and Greek—to clarify a passage obscured by the translators. Instead of such being a sign of infidelity, it is a sign of fidelity to God and His blessed word.

We ought to rejoice when an appeal is made direct to the language used by the apostles—the Greek—after learning that Christ and the apostles taught in that language. From now on, I propose to study the Scriptures in the inspired Greek tongue.

NOTICE! Since the first article in reply to G. C. Brewer appeared in the O. P. A., several

brethren wrote me requesting me to put this out in tract form, after it has appeared in the paper. There seems to be a strong demand for this, and as the first edition of "The Cup of the Lord" will soon be exhausted, there being about seventy copies left, I would like, very much, to put out a tract in reply to Brewer. But I have not yet recovered, financially, from the effects of publishing the tract reviewed by Brewer. For this reason, I cannot possibly put out another one now. But if any brother, or a number of brethren, wish to put the reply to Brewer in tract, I shall be glad to write an introductory article and give the MSS. free, and assist in circulating it. This would be a good work, as the Gospel Advocate refuses to let me reply to Brewer in its columns—they will not so much as publish a reply to Brewer's misrepresentations! If interested, address: J. D. Phillips, Littlefield, Texas.

CESSATION OF MIRACLES

As to the time when the miraculous dispensation ceased, we can only remark that the power of working miracles, which belonged preeminently to Christ and his apostles, and, in inferior degrees, to many other Christians in the Apostolic age, subsided gradually. After the great object of supernatural works was accomplished in the establishment of the Christian religion, with all its sacred truths, and its divinely appointed institutions, during the life of Christ and his apostles, there appears to have been no further occasion for miracles, and no satisfactory evidence that they actually occurred.—Prof. Wood, Andover Theological Seminary.

CHISM-PHILLIPS DEBATE

The brethren with whom I fellowship, in Lorenzo, Texas, and the brethren with whom Bro. J. W. Chism fellowships at a nearby place, have arranged with us to investigate two questions at Lorenzo some time this year. Bro. Chism affirms:

"The Scriptures teach, that, When the church comes together to teach the Bible, that, the assembly may be divided into classes, and that women may teach some or all of these classes." I deny this, and affirm this one:

"The Scriptures teach, that, When the church comes together to teach the Bible, that the assembly must be taught in one group (i. e., without dividing into classes) by men teachers only, one speaking at a time." He, of course, denies.

He also affirms that two or more cups or drinking vessels may be used in the communion. I deny this, and affirm that we are limited to the use of one cup.

The brethren at and near Lorenzo will arrange the time. If interested, write: E. H. Cavin, Lorenzo, Texas.—J. D. Phillips.

"I have read the Bible morning, noon and night, and have ever since been the happier and better man for such reading."—Edmund Burk.

Ye num'rous sects
which all declare
"Lo Christ is here,
Lo Christ is there."
Your stronger proofs
divinely give
And show me where
the Christians live.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
O, Savior, where?"
I heard the cry,
and then I heard:
"Here is My Church
where men still dare
To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.'" (Jer. 6:16) "And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in" (Isa. 58:12).

Vol. 6

LEBANON, MISSOURI, JUNE 1, 1933

No. 6

MISSIONARY WORK

"Lo I am with you always even unto the END of the world." So said Jesus, and since the world is yet standing, our Lord is still with us in carrying the message of Salvation. To Ezekiel, the prophet, the Lord said, "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman" * * * "If thou givest him (the wicked) not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thy hand." See Ezek. 3:16-21.

The preachers of the Gospel have this spiritual responsibility, and yet it rests upon the whole church as the pillar and support of the truth. I Tim. 3:15.

Thousands upon thousands of priceless souls are hurtling into the pit of destruction without any warning: and we, the church of the Lord Jesus Christ are responsible.

Hundreds of preachers are preaching for congregations who support them merely because they like to hear them preach. Thousands of dollars are spent in this way that should be devoted to spreading the Gospel in the "regions beyond." I Thess. 1:8-10.

It is true that preachers have some reason for catering to congregations that pay wages. Let a man start out to carry the message of salvation to some new parts and almost immediately his support ceases! Brethren is this what God intended? The Church's duty is to conquer the world. We are God's nation for this very purpose. We, who are preachers have an especial task to perform, and Moses-like we grow weary. (Read Ex. 17:8-16). We may hold up our hands for awhile, but for how long? When Moses' hands were lifted up, the Israelites prevailed against the enemy. When his hands, through weariness, were down, the enemy prevailed against Israel. So Moses sat upon a great stone and Aaron and Hur held up his hands until the going down of the Sun. Thus Israel prevailed against the enemy. In like manner, when the preachers are builded upon the Great Foundation Stone, Christ, and their hands are lifted up and supported, the Church will be led on to victory, until our day, the Christian age, is past. But when the faithful leaders' hands are unsupported they become weary and fall to their sides:—result—Satan's forces win the day.

Read the book of Acts and take note: Peter and the other apostles said, "It is not fit that we should FORSAKE the word of God and serve tables" * * *

But we will continue steadfastly in prayer and in the ministry of the Word." Acts 6:2 & 4. Now note when these men were following this course, how "the number of the disciples multiplied." See Acts 2:41; 6:1, etc. The young, uninspired preacher Timothy was told to give himself wholly (entirely) to reading, to teaching, to exhortation. I Tim. 4:13, 15. How could he give himself wholly to this work, if he should labor with his hands? "No soldier on service entangleth himself in the affairs of this life." II Tim. 2:4. What soldier on service in the armies of this life ever engage in farming, merchandising or any other profession? For a preacher to engage in any profession or business of this life is a hindrance to the Gospel. He should be giving his time to prayer and the ministry of the Word. Who supplies the shells, food and equipment for the modern soldier in the nation's army? Even so, the nation or church of the Lord is the pillar and support of the truth. The soldier must suffer hardship in fulfilling their tasks. II Tim. 2:3. And in this they become an example to the rest of the church. I Tim. 4:12. Therefore in following their examples the whole church will suffer hardship in order that the Gospel may be spread.

Think of the thousands of souls perishing for want of spiritual food! ONE soul is more precious in the sight of God than all the material world. In other words did we own the whole world and then spend it in winning one soul, the labor and cost would not be too much. I verily believe that it is impossible for a Christian to continue rich in this world's goods and ever enter Heaven. Matt. 19:23, 24; Luke 18:18-25. It is by SPENDING his wealth in God's service that he will gain admittance to the holy of holies. Furthermore by dispersion he will have treasure in the Eternal Home. The more anyone spends in the Lord's work, the greater one's everlasting reward. Many a man turns away from following Christ because of great possessions, great business opportunities, or the prospect of suffering hardship and disappointment. Many a preacher fails in his duty in the mission field for similar reasons. Through such failures leanness of soul results. (cf. Ps. 106:15).

On the other hand when Peter said to Jesus, "Lo we have left all, and followed thee; what then shall we have?" Jesus said unto them, "Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And EVERY ONE that hath left houses, or bre-

thren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or children, or lands for my name's sake, (and the Gospel's Mk. 10:29) shall receive a hundredfold, (here in this life. Mk. 10:30) and shall inherit eternal life." Matt. 19:23-30. We have our Savior's example "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus-Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich." II Cor. 8:9. If we give in Christ's service we have a promise that, "he that supplieth seed to the sower and bread for food shall supply and multiply your seed for sowing and increase the fruits of righteousness." II Cor. 9:10. Those who through weakness or inability stay at home, watch the baggage and supply the food and ammunition, inherit equal eternal reward with those in the front line trenches. This is the just law of the righteous. (cf. I Sam. 30:21, 23-25; Phil. 4:15-17). That great apostle Paul so taught that those who had sent him support had fruit increase to their account. Heaven's bank pays the surest interest. It never goes broke. No thieves can break into it. It's treasures never consume away. Moreover past delinquencies may be made up. Old accounts may be reopened and added to. "By mercy and truth iniquity is atoned for, and by the fear of Jehovah men depart from evil. Prov. 16:6.

Individuals and congregations have failed in their duties in the mission field in the past, but they may make up for past omissions by increasing their future gifts. The Church as a whole is falling down badly, but if she acts at once she has yet opportunity to rise before it is too late.

God said to Israel, "Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye rob me, even this whole nation. Bring ye the whole tithe into the storehouse, that there may be food in MY house, and prove me now herewith, saith JEHOVAH of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it." Mal. 3:9, 10.

Too often Christians spend practically all for their own personal desires or obligations or to please some other fleshly minded beings, and if there is a trifle left the Lord can have that. But why slave forever for fleshly-self or the Egyptians and Babylonians? Now that his judgments are upon them, take God's sword (His word) and break off their yoke. Be free to serve God and build the walls of Zion. Moses said, "Not a hoof shall be left behind." All was for God's service and their needs. Ex. 10:26. The first-fruits belong unto the Lord. Our first obligations and debts are to him. In Christ—the first portions of Christian's incomes are due to God. The Israelites were obliged to give a tenth. We Christians are under obligation to give how much? Why less? Why the same? Why not more? When Christians are giving as they ought and Preachers are fulfilling their calling the Gospel will be spread in the thousands of hamlets and corners of the earth where it never has been heard.

At most our time is short. The day of judgment draws nigh. Soon the trump will sound and the Lord will appear. If we have faithfully performed our part to glorify God by living righteously and spreading his truth, we shall hear

his welcome plaudit, "Well done." If not he will say, "depart."

The letter of Paul to the Phillippians is full of commendations. Regarding them he had little to find fault. They were faithful in sending to his need in the mission field and their hearts were with their treasure. When Christians are liberal with their means in the Lord's work their lives usually conform toward the divine standard. When giving they are laying up treasure in heaven—a useless effort if they do not live righteously.

The church at Smyrna was poor, yet Jesus said they were rich. If faithful unto death, they were to receive a crown of life. Who would not rather be poor on this earth and receive the Saviour's commendation, than to be rich in this world and to hear the Lord say, "Depart ye cursed? (cf. Matt. 25:31-46).

"Give me neither poverty nor riches (O Lord)
Feed me with the food that is needful for me."
—Prov. 30:8.

L. L. McGill,
Harpree, Sask, Canada.

G. C. BREWER'S REVIEW OF "THE CUP OF THE LORD"

Answered by J. D. Phillips, No. 5

G. One Loaf and One Cup.—The author of the tract says that in using one loaf and one cup we show the unity of Christ's body. Christ's body is one, of course, and Paul says that "we being many are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread." Phillips says: "A loaf" (Matt. 26:26) is explained by Paul (1 Cor. 10:17) to be 'one loaf' (heis arton). 'A cup' (Matt. 26:27) is explained by Ignatius to be 'one cup' (Page 24.)

Yes, "one loaf" (1 Cor. 10:17) is a symbol of the church's unity. "Because there is one loaf," says Paul, "we ought to consider the whole congregation as one body." So reads the Living Oracles N. T. One "cup" shows forth "the unity" of Christ's blood. So taught Ignatius in the first and second centuries.

It is a pity to disillusion any one who has made such exhaustive research, but the truth of all this lies on the surface in the language of Paul and of Ignatius. A few questions will enable all to see it.

If you can "disillusion" me with the truth, go to it, brother, for the truth is what I want. "The truth shall make you free," says Christ.

When Paul said, "we being many are one bread, one body," did he mean the disciples at Corinth composed this one bread, one body, or did he mean that all Christians compose this one bread, one body? Were the disciples at Rome, at Ephesus, at Troas, at Philippi, etc., also a part of this one bread, one body?

Yes, Paul meant to teach that each assembly in Corinth (if there were more than one assembly there) should have "a loaf" and "a cup," for that is the way our Lord delivered it to him, and the way he delivered it to Corinth. See Matt. 26:26-28; 1 Cor. 11:23-28. Rome, Ephesus, Troas and Philippi each had "a loaf" and "a cup," and to each assembly the loaf and the cup symbolized unity.

Well, when Paul said in the next clause, "for we all partake of the one bread"—one loaf—did he mean that only the disciples at Corinth partook of the one bread—one loaf—or did he mean that all Christians partook of the one bread—one loaf? Did the children of God at Corinth partake of one bread, and the children of God at Rome partake of another

bread, and the children of God at Philippi partake of still another bread, or loaf? Was the loaf that they ate at the different places a different loaf? Certainly not; they all—all God's children—then and now—partook and partake of the one bread—one loaf—and drink of the one cup. But any sane person knows that the brethren at Corinth and at Rome did not eat from the same literal loaf—same piece of bread—or drink out of the same literal vessel on the first day of the week. They had a loaf and a cup at Corinth, and a loaf and a cup at Rome, and yet they all ate the one loaf and drank the one cup. The number of literal loaves and literal cups used had nothing at all to do with it. It is now one loaf and one cup with the disciples of Christ all over the world. They may be in ten thousand different places and may use a million different literal pieces of bread and literal cups, but they all partake of one bread and drink of one cup.

All Christians in an assembly should, and, in apostolic times, did, "partake of that one loaf" (1 Cor. 10:17). Macknight pointed out the fact, a century ago, that when *arton* has a numeral before it should be rendered "loaf," not bread. Thus we read "five loaves," not five breads; three loaves, not three breads; "a (one) loaf" (Matt. 26:26), not a bread. From the very nature of a loaf, two or more congregations, a hundred miles apart, cannot partake of the same loaf. They can, and do, partake of the same kind of a loaf, but not the same loaf.

The language of Ignatius quoted in the tract shows that this is his meaning also. (See pages 24-29.) He says: "Take ye heed, then, to have but one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup to (show forth) the unity of his blood," etc. And as quoted on page 29: "For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and his blood which he shed for us is one. One loaf is broken for all, and one cup is distributed among them all." And again: "Wherefore let it be your endeavor to partake all of the same holy Eucharist. For there is but one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the unity of his blood."

Ignatius speaks of "one Eucharist." Paul describes it as "that which the Lord delivered unto" him. 1 Cor. 11. Bro. Brewer's "eucharist" is another, and different thing.

Notice here that Ignatius speaks of one Eucharist each time, which means one Lord's Supper. He did not want those to whom he wrote to have a different, a corrupted or divided, Lord's Supper. All the disciples to whom he wrote ate of one bread and drank of one cup even though they were in different congregations thousands of miles apart. Notice also that he speaks of "distributing" the cup. Did they distribute a literal cup? How? By grinding it to powder?

The context in which Ignatius' language occurs indicates that he means that all in an assembly were to eat at the same table, each drinking of the one cup, and eating of the one loaf. To use loaves and cups in each assembly is the very token of division. Bro. Brewer's interpretation destroys the literalness of the symbolism, as indicated in both the N. T. and Ignatius, and substitutes a mystical idea that leads to a nullification of all symbolism, and the necessity therefor. If a plurality of loaves and cups symbolize the "one Eucharist" and "one loaf" and "one cup," then away with our opposition to trine immersion, and the advocacy of "one baptism."

Yes, each church had "a loaf" and "a cup." The word "church" is used in the local sense to denote a single congregation; it is used in the general sense to denote the entire body of Christ, composed of all Christians. The record does not say nor imply that all "churches of Christ" partook of the same loaf and the same cup. The Bible provides for "churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16), and it provides for "a loaf" and "a cup" for each;

but it does not provide for loaves and cups, for each. This is what Paul meant, and what Ignatius meant.

Regarding Ignatius, Phillips tells us that he was ordained Bishop—a capital B—Bishop—by the apostle Peter. Ordained Bishop of what, please? Was he simply one of the bishops of a local congregation—the only kind of bishop the Bible knows anything about—or did Pope Peter ordain him Bishop of a province or a metropolis? There is very little known of Ignatius, and this Peter ordaining him Big-B Bishop is a Roman Catholic fiction. But Phillips is willing to swallow the hierarchy in order to appear to sustain his hobby. What do men care for a monstrous ecclesiasticism or the usurpations and corruptions of popery when they are wedded to a silly hobby? All Pharisees in all ages will strain out gnats and swallow camels.

Of course, "bishop," when applied to Ignatius, should begin with a small "b." This mistake was made by a copyist, who made several copies of the manuscript of the tract before it was finally printed. The printers followed one of her copies, and thus they used the big "B" when it should have been the little "b." Bro. Brewer ought to thank my copyist for making this mistake, for about the only point he has made in his review is based on her mis-type.

But his remarks about the big "B" proves nothing against his being an elder, bishop, or overseer. Whether it was Peter that ordained him (as history says), or some one else, amounts to but little so far as the argument is concerned. It is enough to know that he was an elder while several of the apostles were living.

The "Cyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," p. 434, says, "Ignatius of Antioch, one of the Apostolic Fathers, martyred early in the second century (A. D. 107, to be exact J. D. P.), at Rome. He was bishop of Antioch for forty years." 40 from 107 leaves 67, and hence, if he was bishop at the time of his death, he must have been ordained about the year 67. Continuing, the same work says, "He prefaced his quotations with 'it is written,'" thus showing his love for the truth. Again, "The central idea of the Epistles of Ignatius may be expressed in the words 'One Faith'." Again, "The Eucharist is with him the center of Christian worship."

But there is yet another angle to this one-bread and one-cup symbolism. The tract says that the one loaf—one literal piece of bread—and one cup—one literal drinking vessel—show the unity of Christ's body. But Phillips and his misguided co-operants—do they break the one loaf into different pieces and put the pieces upon separate plates before they are passed to the audience? If so, does that destroy the symbol of unity? If not, why would it destroy the symbol of unity to pour the fruit of the vine into different cups before it is passed to the audience? Why? If it is necessary for all the members to sip the wine from the rim of a single cup, why is it not necessary for all the members to pinch or bite from the edge of a single piece of bread? There is one loaf, you know. If you can divide the loaf into two or more portions and still have one loaf, why can you not divide the cup into two or more portions and still have one cup? Why?

The tract speaks of "one loaf," but "one loaf" does not mean "one literal piece of bread," as you claim. No, we do not break the loaf into sections and put each on a separate plate. This is more of your digressive foolishness. This would be the very token of division. The N. T. requires each to break the loaf. Hence, the disciples of Troas "came together to break bread" (Acts 20:7), not to watch some one else break it! "The loaf

(Continued on page 6)

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year \$1.00
Single Subscription six years \$5.00

Printed by Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

PREACHER WANTED

Where? In almost every congregation of the Church of Christ there is a strong demand for a preacher—he is really wanted; but there are certain “musts” and “must nots” in the qualifications demanded by certain individuals, if not by the congregations as a whole. Here they are:

He must be well qualified in Bible knowledge and be ready to answer all Bible questions promptly, but he must not waste time in studying when he could be at work, for he must “earn his bread by the sweat of his brow.”

He must be ready to answer every call, wait on the sick, help the needy, conduct funerals, attend every church meeting or service, and preach at all the near-by places; yet while so doing he must be neat in his personal appearance—not look like a tramp; but he must not buy good clothes, nor spend his money for a car, tobacco, coffee, nor good eats (the brethren just have to have these things).

He must do the work of the elders and leaders, in that he must visit all the unfaithful members to see why they were not at church, and he must visit the outsiders, talk with them and get them to attend the services; settle differences between brethren, execute discipline (if there is any); but he must not buy a car for his conveyance as that would be extravagant, especially if he should go in debt for it, for the brethren just couldn't help pay for it, since they must pay for their car, radio, tractor, new house, etc., etc. Well, in fact, the preacher should learn to be economical anyway.

He must own a home of his own, for the brethren can't be bothered with keeping him, nor furnishing him a house or paying his rent. He should make his own living, however he must not keep chickens, cows, pigs nor horses, as someone would be expected to take care of them while he is away.

He must be married, for if he isn't he will be “flying at the girls”; but he must not have a wife or family as they would hinder him in his work. His wife must not go with him; she should stay at home and look after things there, but if she

doesn't go with him she is not interested in the work he is doing and is just not a preacher's wife anyway.

He must not go away from home to preach and leave his wife and family, but he must not preach at home, as he knows too much about folks and will hurt someone's feelings.

Moreover, he must be able to live and care for his family on hot air and hard knocks and should be very thankful for it.

Now, if some of the Bible colleges will set us a “tray” of this variety of “eggs,” we guarantee there will be a ready demand for the “youngsters” just as soon as they are “hatched,” for we “old fellows” are just too old and stiff to make the grade.

—Homer A. Gay.

APPRECIATES LESSONS

I have enjoyed very much some of the articles which have appeared in the columns of the O. P. A., such as “Parable of The Tobacco Seed” by Bro. Welch, the little poem, “I never Have,” and Bro. Gay's advice to the young folk, which appeared months past. I can appreciate these lessons on the use of tobacco, since I used the weed myself for twenty years before I saw the evil effects of it. I am very thankful that I had the pleasure of associating with such men as Brethren H. C. Harper, Homer L. King, Elbert Patterson, and J. D. Phillips, as they helped me to see the error of my way.

About two years ago I decided to throw off the shackles of bondage, for I then realized that I was a slave to tobacco. I can now say with thankfulness that I am free from the enslaving habit. It was quite a task, but, brethren, I have long since learned that it takes an effort to accomplish anything worthwhile.

Trusting that I may pass some good on to others, I am giving the twelve reasons why a young man should not use tobacco, which I copied from the “Library of Health.”

“1. It hinders growth, injures mind and health. 2. It makes slaves. 3. It does not help a boy in his life's work. 4. Many lines of business prohibit its use. 5. There are six kinds of poisons in cigarettes; viz., arsenic, creosote, nicotine, opium, saltpeter, and tonka flavoring. 6. It impairs the memory and prevents advancement in studies. 7. Creates unnatural thirst, and may lead to the drink habit. 8. Affects the eye, ear, nose, taste, and also the heart. 9. May cause annoyance, discomfort, or distress to others. 10. It costs more than a boy can afford to pay, to have his nerves and health ruined. 11. It is useless, expensive, and does more harm than good. 12. It is filthy and defiles the body.” (See 1 Cor. 6:19, 20; 2 Cor. 7:1).

—Tom E. Smith,
Healdton, Okla.

DONATIONS TO O. P. A. FUND

T. F. Thomasson \$1.00

Send in your subscriptions for the O. P. A. now.

A PECULIAR PERIOD

2 Tim. 3. "This know also that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy; etc."

Here the apostle mentions some of the things which cause perilous times, but remember that Paul is writing about the church and spiritual things; not the political powers of this world. Certainly we are experiencing these very conditions in the church of today. These very characteristics are portrayed in the membership today. The church is certainly passing through one of the most trying times of its history.

From the beginning until in the third century there was a great persecution against the church, but today it is persecuted from without and from the religious wizards of the church within. Some of the members are being overcome and deceived by the cunning devised fables of these wizards, who have borrowed their ungodly ideas from the religious wizards of this world.

In the Firm Foundation, Dec. 20, 1932, is an article, "The Local Church and Her Educational Task," by Jesse P. Sewell. He states, "I'm writing about the church and not the Sunday School or any other kind of society." Here is a plain admission by Bro. Sewell that the Sunday School is no part of the church, but is a society.

In the Apostolic Way, Oct., 1932, is an article by J. N. Cowan, entitled, "Love and Fight." Bro. Cowan says, "I am still fighting the Sunday School and the Individual cups brethren." He further states that in his earlier days he fought the Instrumental music brethren.

It seems to me that these brethren who advocate the use of two or more cups in the communion would be honest about their unscripturalness, and just say that two or more cups is the fashion or custom of society, as Bro. Sewell did of the Sunday School.

But says one, "some of our biggest preachers say use two or more cups." Yes, and some of the biggest preachers say use the class system of teaching, others say use instrumental music in the worship. Shall we take the big preachers for our guide? If so, why not take all? But what do you mean by big preachers? Of course, you mean men of much publicity—not scholars. For no scholars admit the early church had instrumental music, Sunday School or other societies, nor two or more cups in the communion. Can't you see that all of these things are on a par? Still the church is enduring these grievous things. These are some of the major evils, and there are many minor evils, but all sprang from the same source, and came as a result of certain individuals possessing the characteristics mentioned by Paul for the last days.

For Christian purity,
—James E. Tidwell, El Dorado, Ark.

When you need anything in the printing line Laycock Printing Co., of Jackson, Tenn., suggest that you communicate with them. They assure you they appreciate your business and will treat you right.

FROM THE FIELD

S. J. Gay, Bayfield, Colo., May 10, 1933. — I closed a meeting at the Holland school house, near Mountainair, N. M., the 7th inst. The attendance and interest were good throughout. Here are two subs, for the O. P. A.

W. C. Rice, Mountain Home, Ark.—Within the last month I have been to five different points, preaching from two to four sermons over Saturday nights and Lord's days, and working through the week at home. Three of those places were mission points. I have more such calls than I can fill. I expect to begin a meeting at Bradleyville, in Taney County, Mo. soon. There are but four or five members there, and they have had no meeting for several years, being poor in this world's goods.

J. L. Musgrave, 334 S. 10th, St., El Centro, Calif. May 10, 1933.—The church at El Centro is getting along fine. Two have been baptized recently. The Seventh Day Adventists have been sowing their false doctrine in this part, having deceived some into keeping the seventh day holy. We challenged them to defend their doctrine, but they said they didn't believe in debating. I delivered a sermon over the radio on this question, and it is reported that three families have changed as a result. I expect to begin a meeting at Somerton, Ariz., May 14, and from there to Maricopa, Calif., beginning June 3. From there back to Texas for two or three meetings; then to Roswell, N. M. and Greenfield; then back to Calif. in September. On with the good work!

Geo. Masser, Abilene, Texas.—Please allow me space in your paper to say that my time for this year is not all taken. I would be glad to hear from those wishing my services in meetings this summer, as I wish to be busy in the services of the Lord.

L. L. McGill, Harptree, Sask, Canada, May 4, 1933.—On March 27, I baptized one. Closed a two weeks meeting in Harptree, April 9, without visible results. I go to Hexagon School District the 7th inst. The people in this part are sparsely settled, and it is difficult to reach out without means of travel, but a brother has offered to drive me farther afield when his crop is seeded, and so I hope for meetings in some new fields where prejudice is not so strong.

T. F. Thomasson, Lake Arthur, New Mex., May 15, 1933.—The churches here are doing nicely. We have started a new congregation at Artesia, which is very promising. I hope to send in a full report of the work here soon. Here is my sub. and a dollar for the paper fund. (Thanks a lot, Bro. Thomasson, H. L. K.) I am handing out the samples where I think they will do the most good.

H. C. Thomas, Marietta, O.—A few copies of the O. P. A. have been handed me by a good Bro. Kile, and I have carefully read them. I am glad to learn of a paper with brethren back of it, who stand firm for the Bible and it alone. True we are not expecting a perfect paper with no fault at all. The Bible is the perfect guide, but we can join heart and hand with you and all others who are trying to get back to the truth as taught by Christ and the inspired writers of the New Covenant.

J. C. Falkner, Wesley, Ark.—I have not been a subscriber to any kind of publication for four years, but you may send me the O. P. A. for six months. I have experienced many ups and downs, but I am still in the fight for the right. It has been pretty hard to keep the work going in this part, but we still stay on and have not digressed. Division has about ruined everything here. "The day will declare it," but it will be too late. Have taught three singing schools this winter.

Frank Cobbs, Spring Hill, W. Va., April 17, 1933.—The church at Mallroy is getting along fine. There will be a debate here between Bro. C. I. Hill (Church of Christ) and Asa A. Scarberry (Presbyterian), on the creation of man, beginning May 11, and continuing until the 14th. (I am sorry this reached me too late for May issue. All matter intended for publication in next issue should reach the office not later than the 15th of each month. —Publisher).

Mitchel Lummus, Fouke, Ark.—We are expecting to try to establish a congregation at Attaway, but there are such a few of us and all poor in this world's goods, that it looks hopeless. We are very much in need of a mission meeting here in order to get started out right. I wonder if some loyal preacher will be able to assist us? Possibly some loyal congregation will be able to finance it. Remember, we are not looking for a preacher who is advocating some innovation. We can meet with a congregation that uses some of the modern innovations, but refuse to do so. If interested write me as above.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.—In the main the work here is moving along nicely. No, Bro. King is not preaching here every Lord's day. There are three preachers who live here, but we do not monopolize all the time on Lord's day. We just take our places with the brethren who teach and await our turn. I do not believe that any one man should monopolize all the time on Lord's day, where others are able and willing to teach. By allowing the prophets (teachers) to speak two or three, one at a time, we are developing some splendid leaders and teachers.

Due to conditions at home, especially wife's poor health, I am not expecting to begin the evangelistic work until about the first Lord's day in July, which will be at either Fouke, Ark., or Lampasas, Texas. Then to Atlanta, Texas near the middle of July, then to other points in Texas.

Subscribe for the O. P. A.—Do it now!

FRIENDS OF PAPER, NOTICE!

By the time this reaches you we will be about thirty-six dollars behind with the printers, and while they have been real nice and lineant with us, we cannot afford to ask them to carry us any great length of time. Hence, it just means that if you do not do more for the paper in sending in subs. or donations, we shall be compelled to miss the July issue in order to catch up with our finances. I do not like to miss an issue, neither do I like to go in debt. I am willing to do the work on the paper in my weak way, but I am unable to finance it, brethren. It is up to you. Do you want the July issue? If so, get busy soliciting subs. immediately. Let all renew promptly. Promises are fine, and you have been promising to do something for the paper, but remember, brethren, promises will not pay the printing bills. We must have action now!

—H. L. K.

BACK TO HOSPITAL

I am sorry to report that wife is not getting along as she should, and we are expecting to start back to Kansas City, May 22, to see if anything more can be done there to relieve her of her suffering. We have waited and prayed that she might get better without it, but it now seems the best thing to do. Remember us when you approach the Throne of Grace in the name of Jesus.

—H. L. K.

HONOR ROLL

The following persons have our thanks and appreciation for their co-operation in securing subscribers for the O. P. A.:

H. C. Thomas—2; S. J. Gay, 2; J. J. Reese, 1; J. C. Falkner, 1; Frank Cobbs, 1; Joseph Miller 1; T. F. Thomasson 1; W. E. Hall 1.

G. C. Brewer's Review of "The Cup of The Lord"

(Continued from page 3)

which we break" (1 Cor. 10:16). Your idea that Jesus broke the loaf into halves, or that He broke it into individual pieces, is out of harmony with both reason and revelation. We follow the Scriptures on this, as on other matters.

Here is another thought that should have great weight with the author of the tract; it is exactly on his plane. When our Lord gave thanks for the loaf, he broke it. Paul says we break the loaf. (1 Cor. 10:16, 17.) And according to Paul in 1 Cor. 11:24 in the King James and some other translations, our Lord said, "This is my body, which is broken for you"; hence, the breaking of the loaf before it is given to the disciples is symbolical of the breaking of Christ's body. (No bone of his body was broken, but the skin was broken and the flesh lacerated and mutilated, and in that way the body was certainly broken.) Now, when Christ gave them the cup, he said: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins." This . . . which is poured out. If we break the loaf to indicate the breaking of his body, why should we not pour out the wine in order to indicate the pouring out of his blood? In fact, did not Christ pour it out to them as he uttered that sentence? Why not assume that he did and then contend for the assumption?

Yes, our Lord broke the loaf, and "the breaking of bread," like our "taking tea," is used, by idiom, of eating. And the leading linguist of Harvard University says "He broke" means that He "broke and ate," of the loaf. It is a form of the Hebrew idiom, *paras lechem*, and this from the Aramaic

perith lechem, and this from the older Aramaic basac, each of which means "to break, and eat."

A learned Jewish Rabbi of Kansas City, told me that the Orientals, from time immemorial, have considered that to eat the same loaf together and to drink from the same cup, in a social or religious service, signified an agreement, a compact, or covenant, and united them as one body. Christ evidently alludes to this idea in Luke 22:20 and 1 Cor. 11:25. Paul, perhaps, alludes to it in 1 Cor. 10:17.

It is true that the King James Version and a few Greek MSS. (but not the best ones) read, "this is my body which is broken for you" (1 Cor. 11:24), but the meaning is "This loaf signifies (Greek: esti) my body which is broken for you."

The fact that the disciples "came together to break bread" (Acts 20:7), shows that it was not already broken into fragments, and that more than one leader "broke the loaf." By breaking the loaf as commanded, the breaking of Christ's body is sufficiently symbolized, and by passing it all together, to those present, the unity of His body, and of the church, is symbolized, and yet "the disciples break" it for themselves. Thus the word of God is satisfied, by doing "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6).

The wine in the cup signifies His blood "which is shed"—"is poured out"—and this is all the symbolism that is necessary. If the Book said to pour it out of one vessel into another, we would do it. If it said He poured it into other vessels as He said "This my blood which is poured out," we would do that. But this is another one of my brother's assumptions—an assumption that lacks Scriptural support. (More later).

INFANT BAPTISM

The 9th, 22nd, and 26th chapters of Acts record a case of conversion but it was a man—not an infant. For those who observe I would suggest in this connection that all New Testament converts were baptized, and that only converts were authorized to be baptized. This disqualifies the babies.

But it is urged that in Acts 16 there are two cases of baptism both including whole families, and that surely some infants were in them. This at best would be only a probability, and people should not risk their souls in eternity on probabilities. But in Lydia's case it is not probable that she had any babies, for she, being of Thyatira, was several hundred miles from home. This distance from home, and the slow and inconvenient means of travel, and the peddlers trade knock out the probability of her having an infant. But turning to the Bible we see that those in her house were comforted by Paul, a preacher. No infants here.

Acts 18 tells of the conversion of many, but the Bible says they heard, believed, and were baptized, verso 8. No babies here. Neither is there in the jailor's case, for to them Paul spake the word and they—the whole household—believed.

Acts 19 records the conversion of about twelve men, but no babies. They heard spake, spake with tongues and prophesied, Acts 19: 6-7.

In all the cases of conversions made by the

Apostles, under the Holy Spirit and recorded in the New Testament (conversions numbered into the thousands) not a case of infant baptism is even hinted at.

17. The Holy Spirit guided the Apostles into all truth. This truth is handed down to us in the New Testament, but it does not contain a case of infant baptism, therefore infant baptism is not of the truth. And whatever is not of the truth should be discarded.

18. In as much as infant baptism is not in the doctrine of Christ, it is a dangerous thing to practice it. For, "Whoso 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." 2 Jno. 9.

19. Children who are baptized without their knowledge or consent have no belief, nor repentance, nor choice in the matter, hence do not yield themselves in it; it is forced baptism. The Lord requires us to yield ourselves to Him. Rom. 6:13. Then can you not see that infant baptism does not measure up to God's requirements? And will you persist in holding onto a thing that you see is not scriptural?

With all these facts before us we conclude, because we must, that infants are not Gospel subjects, cannot qualify for baptism, and therefore cannot scripturally be baptized; and our plea is to do all things according to the scriptures. To all honest hearts we extend the invitation "Come let us walk with the Lord in the light of His Word while we may, for the day passes.

L. W. Hayhurst.

Christianity is more than doctrine. Christianity reaches farther than worship. Christianity is life,—that holy thing which Jehovah God breathed into man at his creation.

Paul tells us some of the manifestations of the Life. They are: Love, Joy, Peace, Longsuffering, Kindness, Goodness, Faithfulness, Meekness, Self-control. Peter adds: Knowledge, Patience, Godliness, Brotherly Kindness, Virtue. A composite of these is a characteristic of the Life, as God breathed it into man at his creation.

Paul warns us against Satan's counteractants of these Christian virtues. They are: Fornication, Uncleaness, Lasciviousness, Idolatry, Sorcery, Enmities, Strife, Jealousies, Wrath, Factions, Divisions, Parties, Envy, Drunkenness, Revellings, and such like.

How do these work? Take, for instance, the first mentioned in the two catalogs,—Love and Fornications. A person may have a form of Love abounding in his heart, and at the same time be a Fornicator. The sin of Fornication will counteract the virtue of Love. In fact the mildew of Fornication will blight the whole catalogue of Christian Graces. But, contrarywise, one Christian Grace, or even all Christian Graces, cannot counteract one Satanic Disgrace.

Thus it is that it is infinitely harder to live a Christian Life than to live in sin. The Christian must be clean throughout, not just in spots. Doctrine and Worship must be backed up with a true Christian Life abounding in the Christian Graces, and entirely free from the Satanic Disgraces. — World Evangel.

WALKING IN NEWNESS OF LIFE

No. 2

How walk in "newness of life?" It is just as needful to know how to walk as it is to know where to walk.

Walk, or walking, in this sense has to do with our manner of life, or conduct. Thus we have the command, "By that same rule let us walk." Phil. 3:16.

The foregoing indicates how to "walk in newness of life." The above "Rule" is nothing more nor less than the New Testament which is to govern God's sons and daughters in the teaching and practice prescribed therein. Read 1 Cor. 2:5, 4:6. 2 Ti. 3:16:17. Rev. 22:18:19.

It is said "and as many as shall walk by this rule, (New Testament) peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel (people) of God." Gal. 6:16. It is recorded that the children of Jehovah are to "walk by faith," or "live by faith." 2 Cor. 5:7. Gal. 3:11. That is, we should believe and obey whatsoever has been taught and bound by Christ and his apostles. Mt. 16:19. 18:18. Jno. 20:23.

This walk is to be "in love." Ro. 14:15. Eph. 5:2. Solomon tells us, "Love covereth all transgressions." Prov. 10:12. See 1 Pet. 4:8.

To "walk in love" means to love God and keep his commandments. 1 Jno. 2:5. 5:1-3. Thus, "Doing all things in love." 1 Cor. 16:14. Hence, we are to "walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye (we) were called, with all lowliness and meekness with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love." Eph. 4:1:2.

Moreover, we are to "walk as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil." Eph. 5:15:16. Must "walk worthily of the Lord unto all pleasing, bearing fruit in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God." Col. 1:10.

The walk must be "becomingly toward them that are without, and may have need of nothing." 1 Th. 4:12.

"Walk after his commandments." 2 Jno. 1:6. "Walk in wisdom toward them that are without redeeming the time." Col. 4:5. "Walk humbly with thy God." Mic. 6:8. "For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, (Jews and Gentiles) instructing us to the intent that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world." Titus 2:11:12.

"So then, as we have opportunity, let us work that which is good toward all men (Jews and Gentiles) and especially toward them that are of the household of faith."

"Are you walking in his footsteps
as he bids you daily do,
Do you follow near the Saviour,
with Him constantly in view?
In the sunshine and the shadow,
in the darkness and the light,
Are you pressing in your journey
To the Land of pure delight?"

JOSEPH MILLER,
1004 North Lambert Street,
Brazil, Indiana.

"The women commanded to be silent in the church (1 Cor. 14:34) were inspired women."—J. C. McQuiddy, in G. A., Feb. 21, 1924.

"Turn to 1 Cor. 14:34. This epistle was written about the year 58 or 59. The possession of a spiritual gift would carry with it the right to use that gift. The Spirit would not work against himself by forbidding the exercise of one of his gifts. This forces the conclusion that gifts were not bestowed upon the women and that this lack of spiritual gifts is what made it 'shameful for a woman to speak in the church,' and 'permitted them not' to speak."—Ira C. Moore, in Leader, June 24, 1924.

Here are two opinions, and one right the reverse of the other. Both can not be right; and both may be wrong. It is enough for any God-fearing woman to know that God has said: "As in all the churches of the saints, let your women keep silence in the churches." To my mind, both these brethren are mistaken as to why God so commanded, and the correct answer is more fully stated in 1 Tim. 2:12. Be that as it may, every woman that respects God will respect his command, regardless of what man says. —H. C. H.

CULLINGS AND COMMENTS

The Spirit of Christ

The Spirit of Christ "reproves" and "rebukes" as well as "exhorts." It is unsparing in its denunciation of evil. The most scathing and denunciatory things in the Bible are the words of Christ. He said the Pharisees were like whited sepulchers outside, beautiful, but inwardly full of dead men's bones. He said they compassed sea and land to make one proselyte, and made him "twofold more the child of hell" than themselves. Compare this spirit with the sentiment against plain teaching today.

The Spirit of Christ is always definite and clear, and is no respecter of persons. With it no denomination is recognized and no clan or faction indorsed. It seeks no compromise with those who have gone away after the "doctrines and commandments of men." It never plans hypocrite in a friendly pretense. Paul said, "By the grace of God I am." Just so the Spirit of Christ will act in us today. May the word of Christ dwell in us with all wisdom and that we be filled with his Spirit. C. M. Pullias, in G. A.

Comment: Amen and amen. H. C. Harper.

"Be sober, be watchful; for your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist, steadfast in your faith."—Peter.

"For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but having itching ears, they will turn their ears away from the truth, and turn aside to untruth. But be thou soberminded in all things: suffer hardships: do the task of an evangelist: make thy ministry complete."—Paul.

"He that continueth to the end shall be saved."—Christ.

The O. P. A. needs your support. Will you do something for it by asking others to subscribe for the paper.

Ye num'rous sects
which all declare
"Lo Christ is here."
Lo Christ is there."
Your stronger proofs
divinely give
And show me where
the Christians live.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
O, Savior, where?"
I heard the cry,
and then I heard:
"Here is My Church
where men still dare
To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.' (Jer. 6:16) 'And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called. The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in' (Isa. 58:12).

Vol. 6

LEBANON, MISSOURI, AUGUST 1, 1933

No. 8

THE MIXED MARRIAGE QUESTION

Just before the flood in the days of Noah, when the population of the earth was on the increase, "the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose." As a result the Lord said, "My spirit shall not always strive with man."

Furthermore ever since there has been sons of God versus children of men, God's command has been, "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers; for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity? or what communion have light with darkness? or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? and what agreement hath a temple of God with idols? for we (Sons of God Gal. 3:26, 27) are a temple of God; even as God said, I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God and they shall be my people. Wherefore, come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord and touch no unclean thing; And I will receive you, and will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to me sons and daughters, Saith the Lord Almighty. II Cor. 6:14-18; cf. Deut. 7:3; Ex. 34:16; Josh. 23:12, 13.

If ever there was a yoke it is the marriage tie, that usually lasts for life. It 'hitches' two people together "for better or for worse." Usually they expect that state to be "for better," else they would not enter it. But when one pulls for the Lord's cause and the other for the world, are they working well together in the yoke? When one goes to the Lord's assembly, and the other to some worldliness, is that team work? Truly, such a state is for worse and not for better. Eventually the stronger will win, and in most cases that is the unbeliever, for the very act of giving in to marriage on the part of the Christian is a manifestation of victory for the worldling. I have known the sectarians to boast of a great victory over the Lord's disciples when one of their members married a disciple. What a shame to the Lord's spiritual house!

What have a believer and an unbeliever in common that they should desire to marry? Since the Spirit of God dwells in the Christian, and the spirit of the world in the non-Christian, their spiritual minds have nothing in agreement. Therefore the only mutual relationship between them is the fleshly, and that becomes in the eyes of God (to say the least) akin to adultery. But adultery defiles the temple of God. (The Christian) "Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from

God? and ye are not your own." I Cor. 6:19. "Quench not the Spirit" is another command to be observed. I Thess. 5:19. For if men quench (put out) the Spirit of God by sin and resistance to his will, it will cease to strive with them. When the Spirit of God goes out, the house is left vacant; the evils of the life of sin will enter seven-fold, and the latter state will be worse than before conversion. (Matt. 12:43-45). The spirit says, "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers." If we fail to give heed to this command, we quench the spirit. The Father said, "my spirit shall not always strive with man." Also Paul said, "know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I then take away the members of Christ and make them members of a harlot? Or know ye not that he that is joined unto a harlot is one body? for the twain, saith he, shall become one flesh. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit." I Cor. 6:15-17. Since the above has been said about becoming one flesh with a harlot (one type of sinner), why is it not applicable concerning any type of sinner? No matter whether a marriage ceremony has been performed or not, it is unlawful for a Christian to be joined to anyone outside the body of Christ. "For we are members of his body." The human body is a type of Christ's body, the church. The members of the human body are joined naturally, and so also are the members of the body of Christ. It is unlawful for our members to be joined to any sinner except in the case of those already married before conversion. I Cor. 6:12-24. "Ye are not your own for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body. I Cor. 6:20. Concerning a condition that may arise in a family of unbelievers, when one has been converted to Christ subsequent to marriage, the apostle gave us a rule that they may live together—but that is an entirely different proposition from a believer deliberately marrying one outside of Christ.

It has been known for an unbeliever before marriage to promise repentance and baptism after marriage, but years have rolled by and the promise is not fulfilled. Now the family is coming on and the unbeliever is worse than before. What must the yoked-disciple think? Alas! Brother, Sister, better be sure your prospective mate is converted to Christ before entering upon any contract whatever.

For my part I cannot see why a disciple of the Lord should "keep company" with any one outside of the fold. With the first step in acquaintance, duty demands an effort to convert the "outsider," and if that fails no further encouragement

should be given. We ought to look for beauty of character. Worldly wraps and graces never last. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," and all the necessary things of life shall be added—including wife or husband. Never marry outside of Christ. A widow is free to marry whom she will only in the Lord, I Cor. 7:39, how much more those who have had no experience in matrimony.

Unfortunately many of the church today are mixing with the world by marriage, business ties and sociability. Some of the salt is losing its savor. "As were the days of Noah, so shall be the coming of the Son of Man. For as in those days which were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage" — Jesus did not find fault with the lawful use of these necessities, nor did God in the days of Noah. But surfeiting and drunkenness and marrying unbelievers (sons and daughters of men) will be the downfall of the sons and daughters of God if we take not heed.

After the return from the Babylonian captivity it was found that some of the Jews had married women of the nations, "and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews language, but according to the language of each people, (said Nehemiah), and I contended with them, and cursed them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, saying, ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters for your sons, or for yourselves. Did not Solomon King of Israel sin by these things? Yet among many nations was there no king like him, and he was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel: nevertheless even him did foreign women cause to sin. Shall we then hearken unto you to do all this great evil in marrying foreign women?" Neh. 13:23-27. Not only did Nehemiah condemn the practice, but also Ezra the scribe grieved exceedingly because of this intermarried condition, and would not be pacified until they had agreed to separate from the unbelieving. Read Ezra 9 and 10.

"Now these things happened unto them by way of example; and they were written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the ages are come." I Cor. 10:11.

"Ye are the salt of the earth," said Jesus to his disciples. When Christians become entangled with the world in marriage, business ties etc., they have lost their savor (preserving power), and if all come to that condition, there is nothing to restrain the Lord from destroying the earth, "as in the days of Noah"; only he is going to use fire this time instead of water.

Brethren, let us be lights in the world in this matter. Our salvation and that of others (especially the younger generation) depends on it.

L. L. McGill.

DONATIONS TO O. P. A. FUND

Homer A. Gay	\$2.00
N. C. Hayes	.25

IDOLATRY

The apostle Paul tells us that he that worships idols worships demons. This suggests that idolatry is the devil's own religion. The Devil being the greatest power in the universe, next to God Himself, Idolatry is the most to be expected, and the most dreaded of all the influences, either open or insidious, at his command.

The largest sect of (so called) christendom is permeated with idols, pictures and images. All Protestantism is being leavened by it. Witness the pictures, and 'moving pictures,' of Christ, and angels, and 'saints' and apostles. The 'Church of Christ' is no exception to this increasing propaganda of Satan.

The first of the ten commandments deals with, and prohibits the making of any likeness of anything that is an object of worship. Not even a likeness of the true and the living God was to be tolerated, on pain of death. God showed no 'similitude' of himself, lest men be tempted to imitate, and learn to reverence the same.

Several times, in the Old Testament, the making of such pictures and likenesses, is forbidden, independent of the mention of consequent worship. What is the purpose of such pictures, if it is not to increase 'reverence' for the thing pictured. Then, what will be the influence on the lives of impressionable childhood, where 'cards' and leaflets are increasingly used?

The Old Testament is full of exhortations to annihilate, and obliterate, all pictures and idols, not only from their own worship, but from the nations about them. We ought to be making a fearful tirade against these things in the church, and out of it.

It is not Catholicism that is the 'beast' of Revelation. The Beast is Paganism. The Woman that rides the Beast is Pagan. Paganism is the Beast, whose deadly wound is to be healed, and all the world shall 'wonder', at its recovery. And Paganism is Idolatry.

The fables, and mythology, that is being taught in our schools, are not from Catholicism (as many suppose), but they are Pagan. They antedate even Christianity. The growing spirit of Atheism is not Catholic, but Pagan. The Divorce, and destruction of the home life, now rampant, are not Catholic, but Pagan.

The Beast will ultimately (with his ten horns) unseat, and destroy the Whore, because Satan has Paganism in mind, as the chief desideratum. Satan and his demons will shortly be cast down to the earth, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time. And because 'he who worships idols, worships devils,' Satan and his fallen 'spirits' will inspire the world with idolatrous propaganda, and idolatrous pictures and images, chief among which is an image of the Beast, himself.

The Beast will 'kill with the sword' all those who refuse this homage. But God will say, 'If any man receive the mark of the Beast, he shall receive his punishment in the Lake of Fire; where they have no rest day or night, forever and ever'. Rev. 9:20; 14:10.

Brethren, we are facing Satans worst, and God's worst, if we do not call a halt. Wherefore, beloved brethren, flee from Idolatry! The Seventh Day Adventists are the most inconsistent people on earth, because they revere the ten commandments, and yet revel in Pictures. Their literature teems with pictures of Christ and 'holy characters.' One of their latest 'Signs of the Times' is emblazoned with a full picture of Buddha.

Faithfully yours,
Paul Hays, Fresno, Calif.

GOOD-BYE, SUNDAY SCHOOL

Dr. Case, of Columbia university, tells Religious Education Association conference at Cincinnati that Sunday Schools are ineffectual and out of date and proposes that they be withdrawn from the religious curriculum of the churches.—The Pathfinder.

Of course, they must go, for Jesus said, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." (Mt. 15:13.) And again: "Woe unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh!" (Mt. 18:7.) —H. C. H.

FAINT YET PURSUING

When Gideon had, by the help of God, put the Midianites to flight he knew then that God was with him. And he saw the necessity of pressing the fight. And so we read in Judges 8:4, "And Gideon came to jordon, and passed over, he, and the three hundred men that were with him, faint, yet nursing them."

I have always felt like Gideon about the Lord's work. I believe we should be willing to make a sacrifice for the cause, and should press the fight for the right.

I know of several preachers who could be useful in the field, but they haven't the time. They intend to, but they never do carry out the intentions. There seems to be something always in the way.

A part of Gideon's army were afraid to fight, and it may be that is what is the matter with some of us. If we wait for every thing to be just right we will never do any preaching.

Just now as, perhaps, never before every true gospel preacher is needed in the field. We are gaining ground, and while the enemy is on the run we should "pursue them." I have determined that this year I will put in every day that I possibly can in preaching the gospel.

I have preached at several places near home—going mostly at my own expense. Have said marriage ceremonies, conducted funerals, preached, taught singing, visited the sick, petted (or pitied) the pouting, and so far this year have gotten one congregation to start to worshipping the Lord every day of the week.

It took some of the courage of Gideon and that of Paul to do this work, but the Lord has been good to us.

We started this year with the car old and nearly bare-footed, no money, and but few clothes, but

by the help of the Lord we are still pursuing.

While many have failed to get work, I have chopped wood, built roads, tanks, a cistern, worked on the highway, built a barn, helped to build a grainery, and worked in the rock quarry. All of this has enabled us to keep going and preaching the gospel.

At this writing (June 8th), I am in a meeting in Ft. Worth, Texas., trying to lead some wayward soul to Christ. Wife and children are with me, helping in the work. Also Bro. Tom E. Smith, of Healdton, Okla., is with us here. He is leading the singing and is a true yoke-fellow in every way.

We are faint, yet pursuing.

Homer A. Gay.

LOGICAL DEDUCTION FROM CUPS MEN

We CUPS men, reason that; for fear the exemplified one cup way in the Lord's feast will become universal in the Church we'll say; we're not bound to that way. Then we'll bind upon the Church the cups way that suits us. This won't subvert binding rules where Christ bound none, as none like unto our cups way is exemplified. Albeit our flagrant refusal to follow Christ as Paul insists we should by; "keeping the ordinances as I delivered them to you" will show up, but we care not to have everything precisely as it's exemplified, as small refractives of the law don't hurt. Howbeit my teaching; "to keep our opinions and preferences out of the worship" is set aside, which teaching I think is of superlative value to the Church. Yet that's of small concern to us compared to having our way for convenience sake. Then rather than not to have our way, we'll make a clean sweep of that tedious cup way by charging those one cup folks of making rules where Christ made none. Such camouflage will be fudging some but it will assuredly give prestige most favorable to our much cherished un-exemplified way.

Very Un-truly Yours,

CUPS MEN.

B. M. Massengale.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Preachers and church leaders, we are delighted to receive your good reports and articles for publication in the O. P. A., but we wonder if you really work for subs. and donations for the O. P. A. while in these good meetings. Do you realize that your hearty co-operation is needed now, possibly, more than at any time since we began the publication? You must show an interest in the welfare of the paper before you will impress others with its importance, and if you expect to secure subs., you must talk the paper. Is the paper worth anything to you and the cause you espouse? If so, show your appreciation by soliciting subs. for it. If all will really work we shall not be compelled to miss another issue. Brethren, may I count on you? Let us press the work! We were very sorry we had to miss the July number, but you just failed to send in sufficient funds to pay the printers.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant, Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year \$1.00
Single Subscription six years \$5.00

Printed by Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

THE TIME OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

Opportune to the "The Time of the Lord's Day"—O. P. A., March No.), comes the answer to the following objections. Obj. (1) "No one can break bread any hour of the first day of the week. . . . It is man's opinion that any hour of the day will do. . . . There is no record of any one breaking bread in the assembly of disciples except Paul, Acts 20:7-11. . . . He forbade eating meals in the assembly (I Cor. 11:20-22). Therefore he ate the Lord's supper. . . . Paul's example at Troas tells us that the day and the hour to break bread was upon the first day of the week at midnight."

Ans. To know what we can and cannot do, we must take all the New Testament says. The sum of what it says is the truth. What does it say on the subject of breaking bread? Matt. 26:17-30; Mark 14:12-26; Lu. 22:7-20; Jno. 13:1-31; Acts 2:42; 20:6-11; I Cor. 5:7. 8: 10:16, 17; 11:17-34; Heb. 10:25. The sum of what these scriptures say is God's answer to the question, when shall we break bread in memory of Christ's death? The day but not the hour is given. Then any hour of the first day of the week is acceptable to God.

"But, Paul partook of the Lord's supper at midnight at Troas." This is your opinion but not what the Bible says. It says the disciples came together to break bread on the first day of the week. The next statement is Paul preached and continued preaching until midnight. The reason given for his stopping then was not to partake of the Lord's supper, but because of an accident. When night came they had the place of meeting well lighted with many lights so what happened was easily seen. Eutychus, sitting in a window, listening to Paul's long preaching went to sleep and fell from the third story and killed himself. This broke up the assembly. Paul went down and brought him to life. Paul, and Paul alone, is named as coming up and breaking bread and eating, (the way of expressing a common meal, Acts 2:46). By this time the assembly having convened he spoke till day break. To say all the disciples ate with him is to say what God does not

say. This God forbids. To say he ate the Lord's supper alone conflicts with verse 7 and Matt. 18:20. To say he ate a common meal in the assembly which he forbade at Corinth is to say what the Bible does not say:

(1) It does not say the assembly was convened when he ate, (2) I Cor. 11:20-22 states they made a common meal of the Lord's supper. Instead of eating their meals to satisfy their hunger at their own houses they made a feast of the Lord's supper to satisfy hunger; one division in the church had eaten and drunken by the time another division in the church had arrived, and they were hungry. Such eating Paul forbids. Paul's example at Troas shows what Christians now do, that we can meet on the first day and break bread in memory of Christ, then hear preaching, disband the assembly partake of refreshments, come together again and hear preaching. This is what Paul's example at Troas teaches, but it does not teach us to eat the Lord's supper at midnight. Obj. (2) "The Jewish Passover was eaten at midnight, and Christ instituted the supper at midnight." Ans. The Jews were told to kill the Passover lamb on the 14th of first month at sundown (Duet. 16:6, 7) and cook and eat it that night (Ex. 12:6-8), but no hour for eating it is named. Christ did what the law said. When He instituted the Lord's supper at the Passover He named no hour when it should be eaten. He did not say, as in the Passover, it should be eaten at night.

Obj. (3) "God passed over the Jews at midnight. Christ is our passover and comes for us at midnight." Ans. They were commanded to eat the Passover and be ready to leave Egypt after God passed over at midnight. Our passover Christ was slain for us at midday, and He says no one but His Father knows when He shall come again (Matt. 24:36; Mk. 13:32); One secret not even the righteous Christ knows; but when He comes at even, midnight, cock crowing, or morning (Matt. 24; 27-46; Lu. 17:24-36), that two will be grinding at a mill one (the just, Jno. 5:28, 29; I Thess. 4:16, 17) will be taken, the other (the evil, Jno. 5:28, 29; Rev. 6:16, 17) left; two shall be working in a field one taken the other left, two shall be sleeping in a bed one taken the other left. Those working in the field show it will not be the Lord's day, nor midnight, in the part of the earth where they live when Christ comes. The just one taken from the bed asleep will not be eating the Lord's supper when He comes.

Midnight does not come at the same hour over all the earth. When it is midnight in one part, it is midday in another, even in another, cock-crowing in another, morning in another. Christ does not say His faithful ones will be breaking bread when He comes.

Obj. (4) "Jesus and Paul and Peter associate this memory service with His coming. Matt. 24:28. . . . I Cor. 11:26. . . . II Peter 3:3-10. . . . The cry is made at midnight behold the bridegroom cometh. . . . so let us keep the feast and . . . be patiently waiting for Him to come on the first day of the week at midnight." Ans. Read Matt.

24:28 with Rev. 19:17, 18, 21. Clearly this supper is not the Lord's supper. Paul does not say in I Cor. 11:26 we shall be eating the Lord's supper when he comes. It is fulfilled if His followers continue to eat of it each Lord's day till He comes. Peter says nothing about the supper when Christ comes in II Peter 3:3-10; but if we are meeting each Lord's day to break bread, living holy lives seven day a week, are teaching our children the New Testament from childhood and as soon as they can believe and obey Christ admonish them to "save themselves" (Acts 2:38-40), are supporting preachers with our money in preaching the gospel to the lost, doing all good works, as named in the Bible, then we can say we are patiently waiting for Christ to come. Hence, II Pet. 3:11-18 tells us what to do to be "wise virgins" when the cry shall be made "behold the bridegroom cometh."

Obj. (5) "The Bible says breaking bread is eating the Lord's supper and the word supper means it is to be eaten at night." Ans. The New Testament was written in Greek. The Greek word means: "Deipnon, a meal, or meal time; the principal meal whenever taken; the chief meal answering to our dinner." (Liddell and Scott Gr. Lexicon). "Originally breakfast, but latterly supper, a meal, food, meat, victuals." (Groves). "A morning repast; dinner, Pradium (breakfast, dinner, lunch); in N. T. Supper the principal meal of the Hebrews, and taken by them in the evening, food, feast, banquet." (Greenfield). "Dinner, feast, supper. (Strong). The meaning of the word does not say when it shall be eaten. It is impossible for all to eat it at the same hour of night. There is no Scriptural reason found for it. To make laws for God's church where God has made none is presumption and dangerous. (James 4:12; Rev. 22:18).

J. Madison Wright,
2816 Osceola Ave.
Columbus, Ohio.

MARRIED

Phillips-Freeman.

The Friends of Bro. J. D. Phillips, and they are scattered over more than thirty states, will be glad to know that at last he has some one to take care of him.

The girl undertaking this great task is Miss Edith Freeman of Eola, Tex., a splendid Christian girl. She is the daughter of Bro. and Sister H. O. Freeman, of this place. Bro. Freeman is the founder and one of the elders of the church here.

Bro. Phillips and Edith were quietly married in the home of Bro. F. R. Keel in San Angelo, Tex., Tuesday morning, May 30, the writer officiating.

The Old Pathes Advocate wishes for them a long, happy and useful life.

Homer A. Gay.

FROM THE FIELD

J. L. Musgrave, 2315 Grant St., Wichita Falls, Texas, July 10, 1933.—I closed a series of meetings embracing one week, at Eagle Bend school house, recently. Eight were baptized and two restored. I expect to begin a series of meetings at Ogden, Texas, July 15.

W. W. Leamons, Trinity, Texas, June 24, 1933.—Since last report we have had six baptisms here. I am now busy in meetings. Expect to leave soon for Arkansas, where I expect to hold meetings at Advance, Martin Springs, Genoa, and other points.

L. G. Park, Council Hill, Okla., June 12, 1933.—I just closed a good meeting with the home church. Five were baptized and several others almost persuaded. Had good attendance and interest considering the busy crop time.

James R. Stewart, 758 Sycamore St., Abilene, Texas, June 8, 1933.—Please note the change in my address as given above, from Eola, Texas. Since last report I have preached at the following places: Bradshaw, Moro, Lytle Cove, Pascha, and Eola. Also closed a good meeting at Ellis school house, the 21st of May. Results were four restored. Due to wife's poor health we were compelled to come home. As soon as she gains a little strength she will go to the hospital for an operation. Pray for us.

W. E. Murry, Hughson, Calif., May 30, 1933.—The church at this place is doing fine. We had all-day services last Lord's day. I talked at the morning service and Bro. Terry in the afternoon. We had one confession and baptism, and we had three baptisms the last month. We invite all traveling brethren to stop over and worship with us. On with the good work!

G. B. Harrell, Floresville, Texas, June 16, 1933.—I expect to begin a mission meeting, near Fouke, Ark., the first Lord's day in July. I understand the meeting is to be at Attaway, and any assistance from anyone will be appreciated. From here I go to Havana, Ark. for the third Lord's day in July. Brethren in reach of these places are especially invited to attend.

Dan E. Anderson, Route 1, Box 583, Albuquerque, New Mex.—We meet every Lord's day here at 506 No. Broadway. The congregation is very small, but we have visitors occasionally. We hope to be able to get some more loyal brethren to locate here and help in the work. If anyone knows of loyal brethren who would like to locate here please advise them to correspond with the writer or Bro. Geo. L. Hogland, 1817 E. Tijeras Ave.

W. C. Rice, Mountain Home, Ark., July 11, 1933.—I left home last Saturday for Canter, near Car-

thage, Mo., and remained over Lord's day. Had good crowds and attention. This leaves me at Bradleyville, Mo., for four nights. I was here in short meeting in May, and I hope some good was accomplished. However, the cause here is very weak, as a result of sin and sectism. I go next to Bee Brach, Ark. for two meetings. Next I hope to hold a mission meeting, near Mount View, Mo.

J. D. Phillips, Littlefield, Texas, June 9, 1933.—Since last report I have held successful meetings at Eola, Reynolds, near El Dorado, Lampasas, Troy, Cleburne, Hamilton, and Gatesville, all in Texas. I am to begin at Lorenzo tomorrow, and from there to Monday. From there to Healdton, Okla. for a short meeting, and from there to Council Hill, Okla. for two weeks. Next to Wesson, Miss. to assist Bro. Harper in meetings. Then to Kinston, Ala. for two meetings. Will have time for some meetings in Georgia or Carolinas this fall. On with the good work!

J. L. Musgrave, 2315 Grant St., Wichita Falls, Texas., June 6, 1933.—I am now in a meeting at Taft, Calif. Due to the rains almost every day the crowds have been small, however, we hope that they will improve as the rain lets up. I had a pleasant debate with Allen A. Sage (Adventist), at El Centro, Calif., on the Sabbath question. It continued but one night, but we have signed up for a ten days debate at the same place the latter part of September. Sage is highly esteemed among his brethren, and should be able to defend the Saturday keeping if anyone can.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla., July 6, 1933.—Bro. Homer A. Gay closed a very successful meeting here July 2. The results were fifteen baptized and five confessed their faults. Most of those baptized were young folks. Bro. Gay certainly knows how to preach the Gospel. He is uncompromising, yet presenting his lessons in such a manner that will not justly offend anyone. It was estimated that from four to five hundred people heard him each night. The church has been much strengthened, and we are looking forward to great things for the Lord. We shall do our utmost to bring these babes up in the right way that they may grow to be strong in the Lord. And, too, we want to train up the children who have not reached the age of accountability so that they will obey the gospel in due time. Let us press the work!

James E. Tidwell, El Dorado, Ark., June 18, 1933.—I am now in a meeting with the home congregation, having very good crowds and attention. Expect to leave next week for a meeting at Plain Dealing, La. The second week in July I go to Garland City, Ark.; the third week in July at Laneville, Texas; the fourth week at Mt. Gapp, Texas, near Rusk, for a meeting and debate with the Baptists. The first two weeks in August I am to be at Teague, Texas; the third week at Hamburg, Ark.; the last six days at Star City. The first three weeks of September at Lawrence-

burg, Tenn. in meeting and a debate with Bro. C. R. Nichol, on the Sunday School and cups questions; the last week in a meeting at Suvanna, La. I shall announce the rest of my work at a later date as it would require so much space to give all. My meetings thus far have been quite good, but in some respects they have been rather dull. I hope that the rest of my work will be more encouraging. Brethren desiring to correspond with me may write me at the above places on the dates specified. I stand for the work of the Lord as "it is written."

James R. Stewart, Abilene, Texas, July 7, 1933.—My wife is doing fine since the operation, and I am back in the work again. While she was in the hospital I held a mission meeting at Cedar Gap, about fifteen miles out of town. The results were twenty-two baptized and fourteen restored. Sixteen of those baptized were Baptists and two were from the Methodists. One of the Baptists was president of the B. Y. P. U., while another was a lady S. S. teacher. This leaves the Baptist church badly confused. Was very thankful that wife was able to be with me the latter part of this meeting. Bro. Clarence Snodgrass and my brother, T. F. Stewart, have been doing some fine work at this place recently and have baptized several, making about fifty members in all. They are working with much zeal and believe in following the Bible plan, using only one cup in the communion, as well as following the Bible in all other work. We are leaving today for Brown County, where we expect to continue about ten days. We go from there to Ft. McKavett; then to Winters; and then to Oklahoma for some work. I expect to go this fall into Arizona and California for some work. If any should desire mv services in this section, you may write me at 749 Willow St., Abilene, Texas. Let us work while it is day.

James T. White, Box 324, Lometa, Texas, June 12, 1933.—I am to meet Bro. Bob Musgraves in a four days discussion at Lometa some time during the latter part of July; the exact date not having been set. Should anyone be interested you may write me for the exact date. We are to discuss the manner of "breaking the bread." Bro. Musgraves is to affirm that the one presiding at the table must break the loaf into two or more pieces before it is served to the other members, and they must eat of the broken pieces in order to have scriptural communion. I deny the above and affirm that the loaf should be broken and eaten by the one attending at the table, and then passed on to the other members, each breaking and eating, without having been broken into halves, is scriptural communion. I am hoping and praying that we may soon come to a scriptural and uniform way of communion by all of God's children and that it will not be in the far distance.

G. B. Harrell, Floresville, Texas, July 16, 1933.—I began a meeting near Fouke, Ark., the first Lord's day in July. This was a mission point,

but our efforts were not in vain. I am very glad to announce that Bro. J. R. Goldman, of Fouke, confessed his faults, renewing his obligations as a Christian, and is now ready to answer calls for meetings. Now brethren, if you need a sound gospel preacher to hold you a meeting and wish the job well done, please give Bro. Goldman a chance. As for his ability, it is unexcelled, and you will make no mistake in calling him. Not only did we rejoice to see him come back to his first love, but our hearts were made glad when his good wife made the confession and was baptized before I left. We all rejoiced to have Bro. J. E. Tidwell, of Eldorado, Ark., with us the last night of the meeting. It was my first time to meet him, but he impressed me as a true yoke-fellow. He needs no introduction to the brotherhood. We are at this writing beginning a meeting at Havana, Ark., making the fourth one here for me. I would like to be kept busy in the Master's work all of the time.

L. L. McGill, Harptree, Sask, Canada, June 6, 1933.—As there are very poor prospects here at present to accomplish much in the Lord's work, and I am anxious to be busy in His service, I would like to go down to the U. S. I have information that we can cross if a number of individuals or a congregation in the U. S. will undertake that we should not become a public charge, however it would not be necessary to state the exact amount of support promised. This promise is necessary because mother, wife and I are citizens of Canada. Do you (Bro. King) think the brethren where you are would undertake this responsibility, or a part of it, and send me the necessary statement? Because of my teaching regarding the "one cup" etc., brethren here are shutting me out and not helping as they were. I am writing to Nebraska, Oklahoma and Arkansas regarding meetings.

Remarks

Yes, the congregation here is willing to undertake a part of the responsibility in helping Bro. McGill across the line into the U. S., where he will be able to accomplish more in the Vineyard of the Lord. However, we are unable to carry the load alone. We are willing to contribute to the extent of around ten dollars per month, and that means that other congregations will have to cooperate with us if we are to have this gifted co-worker with us. I have never heard Bro. McGill preach, but if he preaches like he writes, he can do the job well. Let us hear from congregations immediately that are willing to have fellowship in this good work. Write me what you can give at once.

—H. L. K.

Homer L. King, Rte. 2, Lebanon, Mo. Due to wife's serious condition I have been unable to leave home to hold the meetings at Lampasas and Atlanta, Texas, and I may be forced to call off the next, near De Leon, Texas. I am just as sorry as I can be that I had to disappoint my brethren in this way, but I felt it my duty to stay nearby the one who has stood by me so loyally and faithfully for nineteen years.

"THE WORLD'S FAIR"

This seems to be the latest inducement to attract people from about every corner and quarter of the earth and in about all avocations of life.

"The World's Fair" may mean worldly people originated it and own it. It could indicate that it is for all people. It might signify that the whole world is represented there in some particular, or it may evidence that all mankind has an interest in it. However it is or may be, we admit it is of the world, therefore, it is "The World's Fair."

No doubt many who claim to be Christians have, are and will attend "The World's Fair." I have already heard some remark "That it only costs two or three dollars a day to attend." Should they be requested to contribute "two or three dollars a day" to support the cause of Christ it would be quite an offense to them. The most of the brethren and sisters have money to get about whatever they want (not what they need), then if an appeal is made for aid to promote the Lord's cause they exclaim, "Depression—hard times and poverty." But they manage to have money for vacation trips, tobacco, autos, fine homes, furniture, clothing and plenty of fine eats, but very little, if anything, for the Lord. A good many of them will not subscribe for a religious paper by avering "they are not financially able," but at the same time may be taking a secular journal costing six or twelve dollars per year.

It will be surprisingly strange if there are not many excuses offered by the brethren and sisters who go to "The World's Fair" as to why they went. Probably the most to be seen at "The Fair" is the ingenuity of weak mortals which is all to pass away. Thus we read: "All things are full of weariness, man cannot utter it; the eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor the ear filled with hearing." Eccl. 1:8.

One of old hath asked, "Wherefore do you spend money for that which is not bread? And your labor for that which satisfieth not? Harken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good and let your soul delight itself in fatness." Isa. 55:2. Here are two marvelous questions propounded by the God of Heaven, and rebound, "Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? And your labor for that which satisfieth not?" The above gives rise to our Savior's teaching in Jno. 6:27: "Work not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you, for him the Father even God hath sealed." Verse 35 concords as follows: "Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life, he that cometh to me shall not hunger and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." Then, "Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness." 2 Tim. 2:19. This means to be separate from unrighteousness, thus, "lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven where neither moth nor rust doth consume, and where thieves do not break through nor steal, for where thy treasure is there will thy heart be also." Mt. 6:20:21.

The children of God should live above the world by keeping themselves unspotted from the world. Jas. 1:27. We should remember that Jesus "gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of this present evil world, according to the will of our God and Father." Gal. 1:4. John declares, "We know that we are of God and the whole world (even 'The World's Fair') lieth in the evil one." 1 Jno. 5:19.

Our Lord said, "The world cannot hate you, but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that its works are evil." Jno. 7:7. "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." 1 Jno. 2:15. James gives the following, "Ye adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever therefore, would be a friend of the world maketh himself an enemy of God." Jas. 4:4.

From the foregoing we learn that Christians are not to tamper with the world.

"Purer in heart, Oh God, help me to be,
Teach me to do thy will most lovingly,
Be thou my friend and guide,
Let me with thee abide,
Purer in heart help me to be."

Joseph Miller,
Brazil, Indiana.

BACK FROM HOSPITAL

We took Sister King to the hospital in Kansas City, May 22, as was stated in the June issue of this paper; only to be told by her physicians, who operated last November, that nothing more could be done by operations to relieve her, and that it was just a matter of time. At this writing she is confined to her bed, undergoing severe suffering, and I doubt if she will be alive by the time this reaches you. This has certainly been a trying time on me, being the worst trouble of my life. When you pray remember me and the children.

—H. L. K.

HONOR ROLL

The following persons have our thanks and appreciation for their co-operation in securing subscribers for the O. P. A. Is your name here? If not may we have it next issue:

Irvin R. Boss; 3; W. F. Cogburn—3; Ira B. Kile—3; J. D. Phillips—2; S. J. Gay—1; Herschel Massie—1; B. F. Chastain—1; Willard Ruebush—1; Mrs. A. B. Coble—1; H. E. Robertson—1; Alma Russell—1; D. F. Cogburn—1; Mrs. L. C. Asplin—1; R. H. Peel—1; Ira Lee Sanders—1; Ryan Bennett—1; Homer A. Gay—1; Carlos B. Smith—1; Thomas Shaw—1.

NO MIDDLE GROUND

There is no middle ground between the word of the Lord and human device. We are, therefore, uncompromisingly opposed to all things not taught by the apostles of Christ in religion. Anything the Lord did not teach through his apostles,

and the New Testament church did not practice, is to be regarded as intolerable. "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth: that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ." This will put an end to all untaught things which have divided the churches through all the years. No one has a right to write a thing or teach a thing, contrary to this passage, which has to do with human life and destiny. For "whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever; that we may do all the words of this law." Let us never depart from the revealed things, therefore.

—C. M. Pullias in G. A.

If this is the Lord's standard of measurement—and it is,—the preachers and churches may know that they, like the churches in the book of REVELATION, need much repentance before they can be acceptable to the Lord. Why not the preachers start this? Are they making too much from their "merchandise" as it now is to want a change? Are they afraid they will not be popular? Well, the Judge is coming to give "every man according as his work shall be."—H. C. H.

"STICK TO THE BIBLE"

"If Baptists would stick to the Bible, they would go pretty straight, and we would not have all the confusion that now mars our passing history" (Baptist Sword and Shield).

Yes, Baptists should "stick to the Bible." Alexander Campbell discovered this over a century ago. He knew they were a long ways from the Bible. Consequently, he began a Restoration of Primitive Christianity right in the Baptist ranks.

If you will "stick to the Bible" one of the first things you will do is to discard the Baptist name for the name Christian (Acts 11:26; 26:28; 1 Pet. 4:16; Acts 4:12). The next thing you will do is to obey Acts 2:38—"Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." "For" here expresses the purpose of baptism. It is from *eis*, into, unto, with a view to, in order to, in order to obtain.

Baptists, who have been baptized with the Baptist dogma of "remission of sins before baptism" in their hearts, have been baptized "because of the remission of sins" and upon a confession that—"I feel that God has, for Christ's sake, pardoned my sins." This is the very opposite of the command in Acts 2:38. Hence, their baptism is wrong! —J. D. Phillips.

Don't forget to say a good word for the O. P. A. to your friends. We need the support of all lovers of the truth.

When in need of any kind of printing work communicate with Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn. They will appreciate your business.

Ye num'rous sects
which all declare
"Lo Christ is here,
Lo Christ is there."
Your stronger proofs
divinely give
And show me where
the Christians live.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
O, Savior, where?"
and then I heard:
I heard the cry,
"Here is My Church
-where men still dare
To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.'" (Jer. 6:16). "And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in" (Isa. 58:12).

Vol. 6

LEBANON, MISSOURI, SEPT. 1, 1933.

No. 10

KEEP THYSELF PURE

I wish to note a statement or two which appeared in the O. P. A. for December under the caption, "A Pure Ministry."

1. "I know a lot of so-called preachers who are ministering damnation."

This is a terrible utterance, but by no means do I feel that it is lightly made, rather I am afraid it is a soberly stated fact. If so then surely we must all be guilty to some extent. "Reprove, rebuke, exhort" is the duty of every Christian, against all that would defame, and distort the body of Christ. Neglecting this we fail to purge out the old leaven, which being undisturbed carries on its deadly work of corrupting the whole. Can we love God and not obey the above command? Seeing Christians do things that disgrace the Master, and yet not reprove them, can we love them with a pure heart fervently? I say can we ??? Knowing that if they continue in the sin that they are eternally lost. "Reprove not scoffer, lest he hate thee. Reprove a wise man, and he will love thee." Do we believe it? "The ear that harkeneth to the reproof life, abideth among the wise." "He that refuseth correction despiseth his own soul" What about it, brethren?

Then let us do our duty in this matter in love and tenderness with all long-suffering, and when we in turn need reproof let us take it in meekness and in the spirit of Christ, that all may be blessed and Christ honored. "He that turneth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death and shall cover a multitude of sins."

2. "I had rather be noted for being a pure man than for being a big preacher. I had rather go to heaven for raising my boys right, and never preach another sermon, than act the hypocrite, by preaching to other folks' boys, and committing fornication with their sisters."

Yes, "raise my boys right." Well said, brother, and may God speed it a noble work as father's special task. Yes, the boys and girls are the future hope of the church. "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lust will heap to themselves teachers having itching ears." Parents, what are you doing for your children that they may be able to stand fast in such an evil day? Let me say right here it is in your power to save the souls of your children. Their training and future life is in your hands if you will humbly and faithfully in the fear of the Lord, mould their

plastic minds from the cradle to maturity. If you will thus train them, you need have no fear for their future, for Jehovah has said, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." Parents, this is a blessed promise to you. Do you appreciate it? Then give earnest heed to your part of it—yea, haste ye; your time is short, and Satan will grab all the precious moments you lose, and he has many helpers who are all sowing tares. How precious are the moments and opportunities, and how great the issue—ETERNITY.

Right here let us pause: "Can a stream flow above its source?" Dad, Johnny is watching you and is trying hard to walk in your footsteps. Are you walking straight in the fear of Jehovah, on solid ground? Do you want him to do as you have and are doing? Mother, as sure as the sun is shining somewhere, Mary's life will be a copy of your own to a great extent. "The day shall declare it of what sort it is." "Let each one take heed how he buildeth thereon."

"Yea, making it my aim so to preach the gospel, not where Christ was already named, that I might not build upon another man's foundation." If the preachers would follow this example they would not have time to fall into the temptation of sisters and otherwise. It would be quite different from the weekly visits to the big fat churches in a luxurious upholstered car—a lazy time and a well filled purse at the end. What do I see? I see the zealous youth determined to preach Christ out in the highways and byways, setting an example worthy of those many years his senior, but do they follow even then? Oh, no! It is too hard a life, besides the pay is quite poor as a rule, and then churches have to be fed. Oh, yes! "Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock, over which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of God." But this rather looks as though the bishops were to feed the church, does it not? Yes, as it says again that the bishop must be apt (able or good) to teach. But one says supposing there are none able to teach, then what? Perhaps, if there were not so many so-called preachers doing the work of the elders in this respect, the elders might get a chance to practice and thus become apt to teach. "Keep thyself pure."

Oswald Hodges,
Harpree, Sask., Canada.

Subscribe for the O. P. A. Boost it to your friends. We need the support of all.

BEHAVIOR

Behavior and conduct in this connection are synonyms as is seen from 2 Tim. 3:10. "But thou didst follow my teaching, conduct, purpose, faith, long-suffering, love, patience." When a person behaves he is conducting himself aright, or if he is conducting himself aright, he is behaving. When God's children have his love in them, they will behave toward those that are in the Body (church), and those that are out of the body (Church).

We are taught that love "Doth not behave itself unseemly." 1 Cor. 13:5. Gal. 6:10 is in keeping with the above; "So then, as we have opportunity let us work that which is good toward all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of faith." The apostle Paul writing to Timothy said, "But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." 1 Tim. 3:15. This scripture teaches that in the absence of Paul men should know how to behave themselves in the house of God.

The house of God, which is the Church of the living God, does not necessarily mean the meeting house, but has reference to the one body or church. See 1 Pet. 4:17. Heb. 10:23. Eph. 4:4. 1:22:23 Prior to the above teaching Paul had given instruction how the members of the body of Christ should behave. Please read Eph. 4:1-3. Paul alleges, "The Church is the pillar (not pillow) and ground (support) of the truth (gospel)." Then to attempt to support the truth (gospel) in some other way or through some other channel except the Church would be mishavior, for we read, "Unto him be glory in the Church and in Christ unto all generations for ever and ever, Amen." Eph. 3:21. Hence, misbehavior is disorderly conduct. Therefore, a transgression of the divine imperative: "But let all things be done decently and in order, for God isn't a God of confusion, but of peace." 1 Cor. 14:33:40. Preachers nor others should be exhorting, stamping and yelling while the brethren and sisters are singing. The above performance would be confusion and "God is not a God of confusion." 1 Cor. 14:33:40. 2 Th. 3:7.

Christians are to behave at all times and places. 2 Cor. 1:12. 1 Pet. 2:12. Titus 2:7:8 comports with the above: "In all things showing thyself an example of good works, in doctrine showing uncorruptness, gravity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned, that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of us."

Fathers and mothers are taught how to behave toward their children and teach them. Solomon has given the following, "Train up a child in the way he should go and even when he is old he will not depart from it." Pro. 22:6. We see by this teaching that it is the duty of parents to "train" their children, teach them how to live and behave. This suggests what Paul says in Eph. 6:4: "and,

ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord."

Col. 3:21 supports the above. Parents should teach their children to eat and drink at home and not take anything to meeting for them to eat and drink. Notice Acts 2:46. 1 Cor. 11:20:22. These scriptures inform us that we have houses (homes) to eat and drink in. Neither should anything be taken to the worship for children to play with, to amuse themselves and others during the service. While it seems natural for children to play, read Gen. 21:9. Zech. 8:5. Hence, they should be taught to do their eating, drinking, playing, crying, and capering elsewhere and not in the assembly. Moreover, fathers and mothers should teach their children not to be going in and out of the house in time of service and see that they obey orders. Anything unnecessary in the worship detracts from the solemnity, reverence, and sacredness of the occasion.

Before children are old enough to read they should be taught not to be handling the song books and testaments, tearing and messing them up. It might be well to leave the tobacco and chewing gum elsewhere and not leave them on the seats and floor of the meeting house.

"A man is a man when his heart is pure,

And his hands do noble deeds,

He is ever pressing onward,

Up to where the spirit leads."

Joseph Miller,

1004 N. Lambert St.,

Brazil, Indiana.

BRETHREN, NOTICE!

Our paper, "Old Paths Advocate," is the only paper of its kind in the world. No other paper is devoted to a fight against all innovations that set aside the New Testament order of work and worship. It stands for a complete restoration of the ancient order, both in purity of life and purity of worship.

It began its monthly visits in 1928 under the name, "The Truth." The second issue was better than the first, and it has continued to improve until today it is a better paper than at any time during its past history.

No men of financial means have been among its supporters. Its friends have been among the Lord's poor; its editors are poor; its subscribers are poor; its contributors are poor. Not one of its friends can give it a big donation, hence we look to the poor to support it with small donations and subscriptions. It is up to its friends to support it—it's enemies will not. We do not ask or want them to support it. We look to you, the Lord's poor to rally to its cause in these perilous times.

Lovers of truth, you want it to continue the good fight of faith; you want its pleas to restore the primitive gospel and church to continue. You regret to miss an issue, don't you? But Bro. King cannot donate half of his time to the work of the paper and at the same time pay the printing bills out of his own pocket—he is not able.

He gets nothing whatever for his work on the paper; neither do the other editors get anything for their work on it. They do not want you to support them for their work on the paper. They are glad to donate this work for that righteous cause we love. We do not ask or want you to support Bro. King for his work as publisher. He deserves it, but he is glad to donate freely his work that you may be encouraged and edified by reading its pages. How then, can we have the heart to allow him to have to worry over the finances of the paper? Is he not doing more than his share by giving his work on the paper? Have you considered the sacrifice he is making and how little you are making to keep the good work going? Surely not. Can we not all help? Yes. Here is how:

1. We can all subscribe. Even the poorest of the poor can pay a dollar a year for the paper. This is less than two cents per week.

2. We can all show a copy to a friend and ask him to subscribe. Some will not, of course, but many will.

3. Almost everyone can donate at least a dollar, or send the paper to a friend. Suppose you who use tobacco, snuff, or other unnecessary things, count up the amount you spend for these worthless things in a year; then donate half this amount to the O. P. A.

4. If you cannot support the paper any other way, leave off one or more of your news papers for a year and use the money for the furtherance of the O. P. A. We should manifest more interest in the church and the cause of our Lord, than in worldly things. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness"—Christ.

What will you do about it, brethren? We are now behind with the printers, and will have to miss another issue unless you do something immediately.

—J. D. Phillips.

—Homer A. Gay.

FAINT YET PURSUING

We closed the series of meetings at Fort Worth, Texas, June 11.—None were baptized, but there was a fair interest throughout. The brethren and sisters were good to us, and we learned to love them. We hope to go back in 1934 for a two or three weeks meeting. From there we went to Cleburne for two nights, Bro. Smith and I preaching one night each. Here we enjoyed a visit with Brethren H. C. Welch and T. E. McBride. We learned to love the Cleburne church, and hope for better things ahead for them. Leaving there the 14 of June, we returned to Fort Worth, where we visited with Wife's folks for one night.

Leaving out of Texas the 15th of June, for Oklahoma, we crossed Red River, making it into Healdton, where we spent the night with Bro. O. C. Mathews. We enjoyed the rest very much, as it was the first night's rest since June 1. We began the meeting at Healdton, June 16, and continued until July 2. Had good meeting as re-

ported by Bro. Tom Smith. Here we found one of the best all-around congregations we have ever labored with. While there our boy, Homer Jr., wore out an attack of measles, which worked a hardship on us. It is really strengthening to be associated with such men as Walter Bray, O. C. Mathews, Bill Milner, Tom Smith and Bro. Ray, who live at Healdton.

Leaving Healdton July 2, we drove to Sulphur, where we began the meeting that night. Brethren Smith and Mathews went with us, giving us a good send off the first night. Considering the disadvantages we had a good meeting, baptized some and some were restored. There are prospects of a debate with a cups man there in the near future.

From Sulphur we went to Bethel, near Troy, Texas, where we had labored much in the past. We baptized ten and five confessed their faults. Am now (Aug. 11) at home with Bro. McBride in a good meeting. Two have been baptized to date.

In our work with the brethren, I have found some who could take a daily news paper, farm papers and other periodicals, but were not able (?) to take the O. P. A. Others could not take it because it has more than one editor, and yet their church house was strewn with Garnett's snuff advertisements. "Consistency, thou art a jewel." The burden is very heavy for just a few to bear. If all would help a little it would relieve the few. We are faint yet pursuing.

—Homer A. Gay.

STILL WITH US

We are glad to announce to you that Sister King is still with us in the flesh. She has held up remarkably well—better than anyone expected. She has lived three months longer than her doctors expected. However, she is in a very critical condition and very weak at this writing (Aug. 19). Very sorry, but I was unable to get to the meetings at De Leon, and Eola, Texas.

—H. L. K.

HONOR ROLL

The following persons have our thanks and appreciation for their co-operation in securing subs. for the O. P. A.:

W. E. Covey—2; Clarence Young—1; Abe Young—1; J. B. Daniel—1; W. F. Cogburn—1; John L. Reynolds—1.

DONATION TO O. P. A. FUND

J. D. Phillips ----- \$1.00

Abe Young Jr., Rte. 2, Hallsville, Texas, Aug. 8, 1933.—The Church of Christ (Loyal), at Ash Springs, nine miles southeast of Hallsville, Texas, just closed a good meeting with six baptisms; Bro. G. A. Cornfield of Marion, La., doing the preaching. He is a strong loyal gospel preacher, and no one will go wrong in calling him for meetings. He is opposed to all innovations in the Church. He is one in the Church. He is one in the colored brotherhood who stands for a "Thus saith the Lord."

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year \$1.00
Single Subscription six years \$5.00

Printed by Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

G. C. BREWER'S REVIEW OF "THE CUP OF THE LORD"

Answered By J. D. Phillips—No. 6.

Perhaps an apology is due the Gospel Advocate readers for giving so much attention to the quibbling of the "one-cup" advocate; but if they will suffer it, I want to give one more division to the review of the Phillips tract.

Yes, you owe "an apology" to the readers of "the Gospel Advocate," for a thing that advocates the use of cups is not a "gospel advocate," but an "advocate" of heresy. Had you given your readers what I said, instead of your distortion of it, you would have had nothing to say in reply. It is unanswerable.

7. Absurdities and Inconsistencies. The author of the tract contends that the literal cup—vessel—is an emblem or a symbol of the covenant. He bases this contention on the words of Luke 22:20 and 1 Cor. 11:25. "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." He then goes to the scholars again to prove that the word "cup" in these passages is literal. With their help he finally reaches the conclusion that the language means: This material vessel which I hold in my hand is the new testament, or new covenant. He next appeals to the fact that the old covenant was established by blood, and he runs back to Ex. 24:6 to find that Moses put that blood in basins, or bowls, and he contrives to make that mean one basin, or bowl, or cup, and he says that one vessel was the token or symbol of the old covenant. Therefore, both covenants had a literal cup for their sign or symbol. Selah!

I am glad you admit that "with their (the scholars') help he (I) finally reaches the conclusion" that the literal cup is a symbol of the New Testament. Luke 22:20 and 1 Cor. 11:25 expressly say so. "This cup (poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel) is the New Testament in My blood"; i. e., "ratified by My blood." Since "What these scholars say is not questioned by any one" (G. C. Brewer), and since they say the language means the literal cup is (estin, "is", "signifies," etc.) the N. T., the fact is settled.

"In the phrase, 'He took the cup,' cup is used literally" (Edgar J. Goodspeed, of Chicago University). "This cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of My blood an emblem of the New Covenant" (J. H. Thayer, in Greek-English Lexicon, p. 15). "In the expression *touto* to *poteerion*, 'this the cup' (Luke 22:

20), the demonstrative *touto* would cause the reference to be to a definite, literal, cup" (F. R. Gay, professor of Greek, in Bethany College). Again: "This cup (that is, the cup and its contents) represents the New Covenant which is ratified by My sacrificial death" (F. R. Gay). "This cup of wine, symbolizing My blood, I give to you as a token and pledge of a new covenant to be enacted between man and God and to be sealed by the shedding of My blood" (Carl H. Kraebling, head N. T. Department, Yale University). "The cup symbolizes, and is a seal of, the new covenant. 'The fruit of the vine,' then, must symbolize the blood of that covenant" (H. M. Paynter). Remember, "What these scholars say is not questioned by any one" (G. C. Brewer), even though Bro. Brewer contradicts himself by taking issue with them! "Selah!"

Matthew and Mark show clearly that it was the thing the disciples drank, and "this fruit of the vine" of which Jesus said he would not drink until the kingdom of God should come, that was "my blood of the new covenant." The Bible must be understood in the light of all it teaches on a given subject; and when one passage shows in an unmistakable manner what that teaching is, another passage must not be made to contradict it. Of course, Luke and Paul were simply reporting the same events of the same night, connected with the same institution that Matthew and Mark tell us about. Did Christ give us one symbol of his blood according to Luke and Paul and a different symbol according to Matthew and Mark? If so, which symbol shall we accept?

Yes, "the fruit of the vine" is what Jesus calls "my blood of the covenant." Any one knows this. This is what I teach. But that they drank this "fruit of the vine" out of "a cup" is shown by Matthew, Mark, and Paul (Mt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; 1 Cor. 11). And Plummer interprets the language thus: "Drain the cup among yourselves, for I shall never again drink from it." Matthew and Mark emphasize "the blood of the covenant," symbolized by "the fruit of the vine"; while Luke and Paul emphasize "the covenant" itself, symbolized by "the cup" which contains the symbol of "the blood" that ratifies it. This view harmonizes with all that is said on the subject. Bro. Brewer's view contradicts both Luke and Paul.

Paul makes no mention of the vessel that contained "the blood of the covenant" (Exod. 24:8) in Heb. 9, because he was talking about blood. In Luke 22:20, Christ mentions "the cup" as having a meaning. Paul, in 1 Cor. 11:25, says the same, namely: "This cup (drinking vessel, *poteerion*) is the New Testament."

Furthermore, Paul, in telling us about the blood of the old covenant which Moses sprinkled upon the book and all the people and all the vessels of the sanctuary in Hebrews nine, makes no mention of any vessel or container of that blood. Nor is there any mention anywhere of such a cup as having any meaning at all. The record says that Moses put the blood into basins (plural), or bowls, but this was a mere incidental. There is not the shadow of a suggestion that there was any symbolism about these basins (plural). (Ex. 24:6).

The author of the tract admits that the King James Version says "basins" (plural) in this passage, and yet it has to be singular in order to sustain or even to allow his theory. It is not only plural in the King James Version, but it is plural in the Revised Version and all other translations that I have examined. It is also plural in the Septuagint, the Greek Version of the Old Testament. But hear Phillips on this: "The King James Version has 'basins' (plural) where Bishop Lightfoot has 'cup of blood.' As this might lead the unwary to

think that more than one vessel was used to contain the blood of the old covenant, I offer the following observations," etc. Indeed, the unwary might conclude that when his Bible—any translation—uses a plural word, it is to be taken as plural. But not so with a wary man like our author. He can manage a little thing like that! What were his observations? Here is the wisest one—got this: "Those acquainted with the common idiomatical manner of expression in Hebrew and Greek know that the singular form of nouns is often used for the plural, and the plural form is used for the singular." This form the man who has labored desperately and interrogated all the Greek scholars he ever heard of to prove that the Greek word for "cup" in Matt. 26:27 is singular! Sure, it is singular; but now, if his statement about the "idiomatical manner" of Greek is true, we do not know but that it was only the singular form used for the plural. After all, we can take his manner of disposing of Ex. 24:6 and prove that Christ took cups—plural—and gave thanks, etc. He has completely refuted himself. His whole contention may not be idiomatical, but it can be described by a word that has a similar sound.

As to the singular or plural of *aggan*, the Hebrew word rendered "basins" in some translations of Exod. 24:6, Lightfoot, perhaps the best authority on Hebrew that has lived in modern times, says, "As it is here (Luke 22:20 said of the cup, This cup is the New Testament in the blood of Christ; so it might be said of the cup of blood (Exod. 24:6), That cup was the Old Testament in the blood of Christ" (Works, vol. 2, p. 260).

Robert H. Pfeiffer, curator of the Semitic Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., says, "The word *aggan* (basin, cup, goblet) is used three times in the Old Testament: in the plural in Exod. 24:6 and Isa. 22:24; and in the singular in Song of Songs 7:3 (Engl. 7:2). In Exod. 24:6, the text may mean 'in the basins used for this purpose' (generically, but not necessarily in more than one)."

John Chrysostom lived and wrote before the deflection of the Church into Catholicism. He was a great scholar, and a pious and sincere Christian. He takes the same position that Lightfoot takes. With them I agree. He says:

"But what is it which He saith, 'This cup is the New Covenant'? Because there was also a cup of the Old Covenant" (Homily 27, on I Cor.). He continues, saying, "For after sacrificing, they used to receive the blood in a chalice or bowl and so pour it out. Since then instead of bringing in the blood of beasts He brought in His own blood; lest any one should be troubled on hearing this, He reminds them of the ancient sacrifice," the one mentioned in Exod. 24.

I have never interrogated even one Greek scholar to find out whether the Greek word for "cup" in Matt. 26:27 is singular. Any one that knows the a, b, c of Greek knows the word is singular, not only here but in every reference to the communion-cup.

The type should conform to the anti-type in all its essential points. There was one covenant with Israel, called *b'rith*. There is one covenant with spiritual Israel, called *diatheke*. Our word "covenant" is from *con*, "together," and *venio*, "I come." It signifies an agreement, or compact. Among the Orientals, in both Old and New Testament times, drinking wine from the same cup was considered a signature and ratification of an

agreement. In N. T. times, one cup of wine in the communion signified "the New Covenant" ratified by Christ's blood. See Luke 22:20. It does with well-informed brethren today. Pfeiffer says the plural form of *aggan* in Exod. 24:6 does not necessarily mean that "the blood of the (Old) covenant" was in more than one bowl, basin, or cup. Lightfoot and Chrysostom speak of it as "the cup" and "a cup," of blood. "What these scholars say is not questioned by any one," says Bro. Brewer!

Bro. Brewer will not deny that the plural form of "sabbath" (Gr. *sabbatoon*) is used for the singular "week," in Matt. 28:1; nor will he deny that the singular form of the same word (Gr. *sabbaton*) is used for "week," in 1 Cor. 16:2 (Text of Westcott and Hort). Nor will he deny that God's name, *Eloheem* (usually transliterated *Elohim*), in the Hebrew Scriptures, is plural; and that His name, *Yahweh*, the "Four-Lettered-Name" (YHWH), is singular. In Deut. 6:4 both words are used: "Yahweh our Elohim is one Yahweh." Instead of Bro. Brewer's contention being "idiomatical," it is idiotical! He says, "What these scholars say is not questioned by any one"; yet he questions them!

Why did he not give his readers all of my reasons for considering that *aggan* in Exod. 24:6 is used in the singular sense, as per Lightfoot, Chrysostom, Pfeiffer, et al? Oh, he did not want them to see them!

The "bow in the cloud" is the "token of the covenant" that God will not destroy the world by water, as He did "in the days of Noah." See Gen. 9:16, 17. Those who believe this cannot look at a rain-bow without remembering this covenant. Likewise, Christ says, "This cup (of wine) is the New Testament in My blood" (Luke 22:20). No one, having once learned this, can look upon the cup of wine in the communion without remembering God's new covenant with His people. (Jer. 31:31-35; Heb. 9).

H. M. Paynter remarks: "To the believer the stronger word, *huper*, in the room of, is given. The blood-shedding was in their room. And as the sprinkled paschal-blood was a sign to God (Exod. 12:12), so is this. God sees them under it, and so saved. And to them this cup is a refreshing assurance of this fact. And in taking this cup they declare that they have an interest in Him whom God has 'given for a covenant of the people' (Isa. 42:6). In drinking it there is a refreshing assurance that Jesus is theirs, that they are spiritually drinking the blood, i. e., of the new risen life which Jesus gave to God and then received back from God for the 'you,' and that, as a mother nourishes her babe with her own life-blood issued in the form of milk, so Jesus is nourishing them with the blood of His risen life" (The Holy Supper, p. 191).

Moses forbade the drinking of blood, for "the blood thereof is the life thereof" (Exod. 17:11); but no divine covenant could be ratified without blood. Hence, "the blood of the covenant" with Israel was not drunk but sprinkled on the book and the people. Exod. 24:4-9; Heb. 9. But in

the communion "the fruit of the vine" is said to be "the blood of the covenant" (Matt. 26:28), and we are to drink it. And by drinking "the blood of the covenant" out of "the cup" which "is the new covenant" (Matt. 26:27, 28; Luke 22:20; Mark 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:25) we renew our obligation to do all that God commands. And we signify our covenant-relationship with our Lord. And we have communion with our Lord and with each other. But with Bro. Brewer's individual cups he cannot have "communion," or "joint participation," with the saints unless he can have "communion" without the union and "joint participation" without the joint!

There are two things symbolized—the covenant and the blood. Two symbols are, therefore, necessary. The "cup" cannot symbolize the blood. The "fruit of the vine" cannot symbolize the covenant. The "cup," then, is a symbol of the covenant; while the wine in the cup is a symbol of its ratifying blood.

FROM THE FIELD

Geo. A. Moore, Gothenburg, Nebr., August 12, 1933.—If there are loyal brethren in Kingfisher County, Oklahoma, I would like to get in touch with them, please write me as above.

G. A. Comfield, Rte. 1, Marion, La., Aug. 6, 1933.—I have just closed a ten nights meeting with the Ash Spring Church of Christ, near Marshall, Texas. There were six baptized. The church there is the only sound congregation of colored people that I have found. They are satisfied with the Book and won't have anything but the Book.

W. C. Rice, Mountain Home, Ark., August 8, 1933.—After continuing for eleven nights at Bee Branch, with two baptized, the brethren sent me out to a school house about four miles out, in the midst of a sectarian stronghold. We continued for six nights there, with increasing crowds and interest, until the crowd was estimated at about four hundred the last night. Four were baptized and two confessed faults. I wonder why some brethren will give their money to some foreign mission or to keep up some manmade society to do the work of the church, while many of their neighbors are starving for the bread of life. I am to begin at Mountain View, Mo. the 10th inst. I do much preaching in weak places, but I like to do it. We are in perilous times of great distress.

J. L. Musgrave, 2315 Grant St., Wichita Falls, Texas.—August 10, 1933.—I am now with the faithful brethren, near Roswell, New Mex., having splendid crowds and interest. I baptized six yesterday and last night another made the "good confession" and one was restored. To date we have had nine additions, and we are praying that there may be more before we close the 16th inst.

The S. S. and cups brethren at Artesia have challenged for a debate on our differences, but have not as yet selected their man to represent them. We hope that their selection will be as willing to discuss as they seem. It is to be hoped that there are some honest hearted ones who are willing to learn and will give up the S. S. and cups when they see their error. I go from here to Greenfield, Lake Arthur, and Artesia, all of this state, then back to Calif.

J. D. Phillips, Council Hill, Okla., August 12, 1933.—We are now at this place in a series of meetings, but we go to Wesson, Miss., Rte. No. 1, next week, to be with Bro. T. E. Smith in some work in that section. As Bro. Gay has requested that I take some of his work off his hands in W. Va., Pa., and Ky., this fall, we shall try to visit the O. P. A. office and the church there while passing. I wish that I could help Bro. McGill to the U. S. A. I think he will do us good.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla., August 7, 1933.—I closed a series of meetings at Pike City, Okla., near Healdton, July 29, with twenty-one baptized and four restored. Bro. Walter Bray preached over Lord's day, baptizing two more, making twenty-three baptized; which caused much rejoicing in that community. This was my home community, and I have shared their joys and sorrows for the past eleven years. We were glad to have Brethren Homer A. Gay and J. D. Phillips with their families visit us in the meeting. These brethren preached one night each, which was much enjoyed and appreciated. I am now in a meeting with the Carter Congregation, near Fredrick, Okla. Bro. A. A. Patterson is with me, leading the singing.

Lowell Smith, Lawton, W. Va., Aug. 11, 1933.—I am still contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. I held a meeting at Elton, W. Va., with very good interest, but no additions. We have a few good faithful brethren at this place. The church at Warden is not doing as well as we would like due to some contentions, but there are some faithful ones who are holding on. I go next to Red Springs to preach over Lord's day. I like the paper very much and have been much benefitted by reading it, being young in the cause. I hope to do something for it soon. Will some good brother give me some light on Rev. 20?

E. H. Cavin, Lorenzo, Texas, Aug. 15, 1933.—The church here is getting along fine. We wish to announce that we meet in the Presbyterian church house, each Lord's day, at 11 a. m. o'clock. We are trying to keep the commandments as the Lord demands and in that way specified by Him. We invite all true Christians to worship with us at any time. I am very sorry to tell you that our young Bro. R. D. Jackson Jr. passed from this earthly stay August 13, being sixteen years, nine months and fifteen days of age. However we are glad to report that he had been trying to

please his Lord by living the Christian life for three years, and to know him was to love him. May the blessings of God rest upon the bereaved ones.

J. L. Reynolds, Crockett, Calif., Aug. 14, 1933.
—We have services each Lord's day in my house. All brethren in reach of us are invited to worship with us. The paper is getting better all the time. Here is a sub. for it.

THE BIBLE DOES NOT SAY

There are many people who are trying to go to heaven on what the Bible does not say. They seem to be thoroughly satisfied to do things because the Bible says nothing about them. One who travels the highways must be guided by what the official signboards and markers say and not by what they do not say. If one should try to reach his destination by what the signboards do not say, he would never reach it. It isn't what the Bible does not say, but what it says, that is our guide. What it does not say is too uncertain. It does not say so many things. What it says is limited and specific. Those who would keep in the "strait and narrow way" must observe to do all that it says and only what it says. He who ignores what it says imperils his life; for "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God"; and "without faith it is impossible to please him."

(G. A.)

—C. M. Pullias.

Yes, "do all that it says and only what it says." This will restore what the Lord taught through his apostles, and what the New Testament church practiced. And it will take considerable cleaning up on the part of the churches claiming to be churches of Christ before all the spots and wrinkles are out of their soiled robes and they are ready to meet their Lord. But I can not see that they are even trying to get the spots and wrinkles out. Having itching ears, they are heaping to themselves teachers who speak evil of the way of truth.

—H. C. H.

PRAYER, THANKS-GIVING AND DISMISSAL

Remarks: I wish to emphasize in this article two special points; frame of mind and bodily posture, and ere the close, stress other points of interest.

1. FRAME OF MIND: I note first: In acceptable prayer, the heart must be right. David said; "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me." (Ps. 66:18.) Then we must, "Pray in the Spirit" (Eph. 6:18.) This includes due regard for the examples and precepts as well. Then above all; we must be, "a worshipper of God and do his will." (Jno. 9:31.) Then, while prayer is to be offered in the name of Christ, the answer is not contingent upon the name only, but faithfulness to His word as well.

2. BEWARE: We should beware of fads of men having not the Spirit of truth, who end their

prayer by saying; "For we ask in the name of Christ" Thus making the answer contingent upon the name as the only qualifying feature. All Denominations use Christ's name; If its the name only, have they not assurance for an answer? If not, why should you? This is an ever recurring FAD of recent times, practiced by those only who are swift to take a chance and those easily gulled into uncertain ways, by their influence. Such being the superficially taught majority. But a preparation of heart by careful thought upon things pleasing to God irrespective of all vague notions is to entertain the right spirit.

3. "Whatsoever we ask, we receive of Him, because we keep his commandments and do those things that are pleasing in his sight."—(1 Jn. 3:22. "And this is the confidence we have in him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us." (1 Jn. 5:14). So there is more than the name to be considered in true preparation of heart for prayer. The proper frame of mind concedes the divinely exemplified posture of the body as a necessary feature of acceptable prayer, except in emergency, when we may vary from the regular order and feel secure as God requires of no one an impossibility. This is exemplified by Paul and Silas while fast in the stocks. Acts 16:25.

4. BODILY POSTURE: But as under Moses, Priests kneeled with uplifted hands in the assembly prayer; (1 Kin. 8:54. 2 Chr. 6:13. Ezr. 9:5). So in the Church now we are taught that those who lead the prayer are to do the same way. But the assembly under Moses were not all Priests, so they only bowed their heads. (1 Chr. 29:20). But while in Christ, all being Priests are taught to kneel as truly as those leading the prayer, yet they will not, but do as did they under Moses. But Preachers are derelict in this matter and neglecting this truth say, let's humble ourselves to pray. Then squat on their hunkers lest they marr pants, as if a way not of faith could be humble. But this is their own righteousness. To do as the Lord directs is humble. There's no promise in a substitute. (Rom. 10:3.)

5. But the Spirit taught kneeling by saying: "For this cause I bow my knees." (Eph. 3:14). And taught uplifted hands by saying: "that men pray every where lifting up holy hands," (1 Tim. 2:8.) We have an humble example of kneeling at Milltus; "Paul kneeling down, prayed with them all"—having bowed his knees with them all, he prayed." (G. R. B. Acts 20:36.) An instance at Tyre I note where wives and Children are included; "And they all, with wives and children brought us on our way till we were out of the City: and kneeling down on the Beach we prayed." (R. V. Ch. 21:5.) This being done by the Spirits guidance should convince the most obstinate gain-sayer that this is the approved posture in the assembly prayer.

6. INDIVIDUAL: In individual prayer I note Dorcas case. "But Peter put them all forth, and kneeled down, and prayed," (Acts 9:40) he then said; "Tabitha arise. And she opened her eyes"

and sat up. He being guided by the Spirit to kneel and was answered, why assume an unapproved attitude? I note Stephen also, who being guided by the Spirit as was Peter, kneeled down in his agony to pray for his enemies, (Acts 7:55-60.) And we may be assured he was heard. Yes he knew what the Prophet said; "O come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord our maker." (Ps. 95:6). So kneeling is the only approved way, posture.

7. **SHALL BOW:** I will here note Isa. 45:23, as applied under Christ; "As I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me." (Rom. 14:11) This makes bowing the knees imperative to those who will not bow in this time of opportunity. So its weal if you do and woe if you don't, heed the admonition; "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow," while we can. (Phil. 2:10.) Our God wants willing servants only, in His Realm. To ignore the Spirits teaching by varying without due cause, from its precepts and examples is to show disloyalty, when the Lord will give us over to reprobacy of mind.

Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." (Heb. 10:38.) To cease walking by faith is to draw back.

8. **THANKSGIVING:** This phase of the subject consists in Thanksgiving, for all good received from the bountiful giver; food at your table or elsewhere; also, thanks at the Lord's table where thanks only is in order. There seems to be no special bodily posture in thanks-giving. If there were, it likely would have been observed in this instance of Paul at Milita; "He took bread and gave thanks to God in presence of them all: and when he had broken it he began to eat." (Acts 27:35). So, there being no posture, we may sit or stand in giving thanks acceptable to God. Yea, our minds should continually abound with thankfulness for the inexhaustible divine bounties we are the daily happy recipients of. Yet we should kneel before Jehovah to plead for mercy, strength to overcome evil and for sins to be forgiven.

9. **DISMISSAL:** This phase of the subject consists only of final conclusion. In this, we trust that Jehovah having heard our humble petition during service is willing to protect us as we go hence. With this in view, it is only necessary to emulate the examples given, some of which I'll note for convenience and stress their importance in dismissal; "to the only wise God through Jesus Christ to whom be the glory forever, Amen." (R. V. Rom. 16:27.) See also, 2 Cor. 13:14. Heb. 13:20, 21. 1 Pet. 5:10. Jud. 24, 25. This sufficeth for an adequate variety of perfect modes, either one of which may be used as dismissal; "So when they were dismissed, they came to Antioch." Acts 15:30). This shows, the man of God may walk by faith in concluding service as well as in any other item of it.

10. **STANDING ON FEET:** On this phase of the subject, there seems not to be either precept or example. The Hypocrits standing to be seen of men, comports with it most of any I may cite you.

But we are admonished not to "be as they are." (Mt. 6:5.) Then no one would wish to be as the Pharisee or even that Publican, a little better than the Pharisee; "Justified rather than the other." (Lk. 18:11-15). But some seem sure Jesus gave the body posture when He said; "When you stand praying." (Mk. 11:25.) But no one can tell how they stood and if so its not for our example. The Spirit that guided the Apostles into all truth, came after this was spoken and it included prayer in all its phases.

11. The Apostles were of God, said John, "he that knoweth God heareth us." So we must follow them as they follow Christ and have them for our ensamples. (1 Jn. 4:6. 1 Cor. 11:1. Phil. 3:17). This makes the bearings all the more complete, the Apostles being our ensamples in all things, even in suffering which we experience all the more in close observance of the word. (1 Tim. 1:16) "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." (2 Tim. 3:12).

12. These restrictions keep the Church in the bounds of holy writ down thru the ages of time to come. No one can innocently over-reach those bounds. So it behoves us to walk by faith in every department of our Christian life, lest we become straightened in our own selves. (2 Cor. 6:12).

May those who chance to see this correlation of truth and discern its value, see also the folly of letting them slip. So our Lord may overrule for our good bringing us out of the hap-haz-ard way even as conquerers ere the end come. Yours truly for the safe and sure way.

B. M. Massengale.

NO BAPTIST CHURCH IN THE BIBLE

"Find a Baptist church in the Bible. There is no other sort to be found from the days of John and Christ. Name any church you please and it will prove to be a Baptist church when you examine it" (Baptist Gleaner).

Christ called the church "My church," or, to be strictly literal in the translation, "the church of Me," in Matt. 16:18, and this corresponds with Paul's use of the plural, "churches of Christ," in Rom. 16:16 where he alludes to the local congregations; and he calls the Corinthian church "the church of God" (1 Cor. 1:1-3); and he calls the whole body of Christians, or, as Pendleton styles them; "the redeemed in the aggregate," "the church of the first born (ones)" that is, "the church of the sons of God," in Heb. 12:23, and mentions the fact that these "sons of God" are registered in heaven"; and he also speaks of the local assemblies as "the churches of the saints," in 1 Cor. 14:34; yet, strange as it may seem to a Baptist, the Baptist church is not mentioned in the Bible—not even once!—J. D. Phillips.

Don't forget the O. P. A. needs financial support to pay printing bills. Anything you may do for the cause will be appreciated.

Let Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn., do your printing:

Ye num'rous sects
 which all declare
 "Lo Christ is here,
 Lo Christ is there."
 Your stronger proofs
 divinely give
 And show me where
 the Christians live.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
 O, Savior, where?"
 and then I heard:
 I heard the cry,
 "Here is My Church
 where men still dare
 To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.' (Jer. 6:16) 'And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in' (Isa. 58:12).

Vol. 6

LEBANON, MISSOURI, OCTOBER 1, 1933.

No. 11

QUESTIONS

1. When does the Scriptural day begin?—P. W.

The day was twofold. The natural day began at sunrise, and was divided into four watches; the 1st beginning at sunrise and continuing until nine o'clock, the 2nd beginning at nine and ending at noon, the 3rd beginning at noon and ending at 3 p. m., the fourth beginning at 3 p. m. and ending at sunset.

The civil day began at sunset and ended at the next sunset, and in the time of Christ its night was divided into four watches; the 1st beginning at sunset and ending at nine o'clock, the 2nd beginning at nine and ending at midnight, the 3rd beginning at midnight and ending at 3 o'clock, the 4th beginning at 3, and ending at sunrise.—Jewish Calendar.

In Jn. 11:9 we read, "Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in the day? If a man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because the light is not in him."

So we see that the daylight part of the civil (sunset to sunset) day is the natural day. And the night part of the civil day was followed by the daylight part, or natural day.

"We have no evidence that either Jews or Gentiles had yet (A. D. 60) adopted the custom of counting the hours of the day from midnight." McGarvey in Acts.

When it says (Acts 20:7) Paul was "intending to depart on the morrow" (epaurion, "the next day."—Thayer), and he departed the next morning (Acts 20:11), it is evident that "the morrow," that is, "the next day," here was the daylight part of the civil day, that is, the natural day, which was the next natural day after the natural day of the civil seventh day, or sabbath day, which was followed at sunset by a civil day, namely, "the first day of the week," and not that "the morrow," or "the next day," when Paul left, was another civil day. It was simply "the next" natural day, which followed the natural day, that is, the daylight part of the sabbath day just preceding the beginning of the first day, which began at sunset, when the 7th day ended.

Jesus died on the cross at three o'clock (our count) in the afternoon (Mk. 15:34), and was buried that evening on the day of "preparation," that is, "the day before the sabbath." (Mk. 15:42; Lk. 23:54; Jn. 19:42.) The day after the day of "preparation," the Jews came to Pilate and

asked for a guard for the tomb. (Mt. 27:62). The women saw the tomb and how the body was laid. (Lk. 23:55.) They returned, and prepared ointments and aromatics, and rested on the sabbath. (Lk. 23:56.) "The sabbath being passed" (Mk. 16:1; Mt. 28:1), they started to the tomb "at early dawn" (Lk. 24:1), "it being yet dark" (Jn. 20:1), "as it was dawning into the first day of the week" (Mt. 28:1), and arrived there "very early on the first day of the week, the sun having risen." (Mk. 16:1.) But Jesus, "having risen early the first day of the week" (Mk. 16:9), was not in the tomb. It is proote sabbatou, first from sabbath. It is as plainly the first day after the sabbath as his pros sabbaton, or prosabbaton, is the day before the sabbath. (Mk. 15:42.)

The way the Greek in Mt. 28:1 has been translated is perplexing. King James: In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, etc.

Am. Standard: Now late on the sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, etc.

Bible Union: But late on the sabbath day, as it was dawning into the first day of the week, etc.

Berry: Now late on the sabbath, as it was getting dark toward the first day of the week, etc.

Living Oracles: Sabbath being over, and the first day of the week beginning to dawn, etc.

Moffat: At the close of the sabbath, as the first day of the week was dawning, etc.

Goodspeed: After the sabbath, as the first day of the week was dawning, etc.

Anderson: And after the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, etc.

The Greek is: Ophe de sabbatoon to epiphooshouse eis mian sabbatoon Ophe, "after a long time, long after, late."—Thayer. De, "but, moreover." Sabbatoon, "seven days, a week." Or the sabbath. Te, "as." Epiphooskouse, "to grow light, to dawn." Eis, "into." Mian sabbatoon, "first day of the week."

Then we have it: (De) But (ophe) a long time after (sabbatoon) seven days, a week or the sabbath (te) as (epiphooshouse it began to dawn (eis) into (mian sabbatoon) the first day of the week, etc.

The long time after the Sabbath here, was the time from the sunset which closed the sabbath and the first day of the week began until it began to dawn (epiphooskouse) into the first day of the week (eis mian sabbatoon), and those hours of

darkness of the first day of the week must have seemed ages to the waiting, anxious, heart-broken disciples. They "rested" during the sabbath day (Lk. 23:56), and started "at early dawn" (Lk. 24:1), "it being yet dark" (Jn. 20:1), "as it began to dawn into the first day of the week" (Mt. 28:1), and arrived at the tomb very early on the first day of the week, the sun having risen" (Mk. 16:1) and saw the empty tomb.—H. C. Harper. P. S. If anybody has adverse criticism, let it come.—H.

A BAPTIST PAPER ON THE NAME.

By J. D. Phillips.

I judge from the signs of the times that it will not be long till the disciples of A. Campbell will have a revision of Matt. 3:1. The name Baptist in that passage has nearly worried the life out of them. There is no controversy about the name Baptist. The name Christian is doubtful.

—Baptist Sword and Shield.

This Baptist editor is like the Pharisees—he "cannot discern the signs of the times." The Baptists have beat us to "a revision of Matt. 3:1," in their "Bible Union Translation" (first edition): it reads "John the immerser." Thanks, Baptists! This leaves you out of any claims to "the name Baptist," so far as the Scriptures are concerned! We regret, however, that when this excellent translation began to circulate among the Baptists and the ignorant ones, seeing that it gave a deadly blow to the error of naming their little human society the "Baptist church" and using Matt. 3:1 as authority for the name, began to raise such a storm about it, the scholars gave up their correct rendition of baptistes in Matt. 3:1 and restored the word "baptist," and thus catered to the Hot-tentots!

The word baptistes, rendered "baptist" in the Common Version, belongs to the same family of words that baptisma, rendered "baptism," belongs to. The best way to consider baptistes and its correct rendition is to consider this family of words. Turning to page 16 of Knoch's "The Greek Word Elements," we read: "BAPT—bapto, dip; embapto, in-dip, dip in; baptizo, dipize, baptize, baptisma, dipism, bapttime, baptismos, dipping, baptizing; baptistes, dipist, baptist." Although "immersion" is better suited to the English idiom, yet to be strictly literal in the translation, it would be "John the dipper." A church, therefore, that gets its name from this descriptive adjective would be the Dipper church! John was a baptist because he dipped or immersed people, and for no other reason. In that sense I am a baptist, and so is every person that immerses people. There was no church named "Baptist" for sixteen hundred years after John's death. "Search thou on history's pages" and see!

This leaves no Scriptural place for "the name Baptist," and hence it, like the names Mohammedan and Catholic, represents a sect and doctrine of which the Lord is not the founder and author, a noxious "plant which my heavenly father hath not planted" (Matt. 15:13), a "daught-

er" of the old Romish "harlot" (Rev. 17:1-7), and is, therefore, destined to "be rooted up" (Matt. 15:13) in the downfall of "Mystery, Babylon the Great."

"The name Baptist" has never given us a second's "worry." We know enough English and Greek to know that Baptists have been blundering over the matter for centuries. The Baptist church, as such, is not mentioned, by name or doctrine, in the Bible.

"The name Christian is doubtful." Let us see about this. "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" (Acts 11:26). "Called" is from *chrematizo*, and it means a divine calling or naming. The word is so used in many contexts, and the Syriac version so reads. Wordsworth, the learned editor of the "Greek New Testament with Notes," says:

"The word 'Christian' occurs only three times in the New Testament,—here (Acts 11:26), Acts 26:28, and 1 Pet. 4:16. It is used frequently by S. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch and Martyr, ad Ephes. 2:14, ad Magn. 4." Continuing, he says:

"As Ignatius says, Magn. 10, 'Whoever is called by any other name than this of Christian is not of God,' and (ad Rom. 3) 'it is our duty not only to be so called, but to be.' S. Ignatius, who wrote what has just been cited, was immediate successor to Euodius.

THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST.

"Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of him." What kind of a spirit did Christ possess? Many will say He possessed the spirit of meakness, forbearance and longsuffering. But these are attributes of his character, and not his real spirit.

But what kind of a spirit did Christ possess? If you will read the first four books of the New Testament carefully you will see. His life's work was devoted to doing his Father's will, Jno. 6:38. You will also see that not one jot or tittle of the things that "were written in the law and the prophets and the psalms concerning him" passed without being fulfilled. (Lk. 24:44; Mat. 5:17—18). From all this we learn that He possessed the spirit of obedience.

Jesus has taught us what it takes to constitute a spirit of obedience when he sat a little child in the midst of his disciples, and said, "Except ye be converted and become as a little child ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." (Mat. 18:2, 3). The lesson here taught is, except ye be as willing to obey your Heavenly Father as little children are willing to obey their earthly father, ye cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. From this we learn what is meant by the statement "if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of His."

Again Jesus said, "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Mat. 7:21). Today, many are saying Lord, Lord but absolutely refuse to do His will. Why? Because they are following the advice of men who say "It is not necessary to do

this or that just as the word directs; if you make a mistake, that will be alright if you are honest; God will over look it. "Then why did not God over look King Saul's and David's mistakes? It appears from I Sam. 15:12-24, that Saul felt that he complied with the command of God, but he had not, and God did not overlook this error.

Again, King David, surely felt happy for when the cart started with the ark, he set his whole band of musical instruments to playing (2 Sam. 6:1-7). But David soon found that something was wrong, and not until he corrected the wrong obeying God's command, did God bless him in moving the ark (1 Chro. 15:11-15).

Reader, let us investigate; possibly, we are going on in some error that may cut us off forever from the land of rest, hence it behooves us to be sure we are right, seeing that it means so much. (To be continued).

—G. W. Paslay.

REMARKS

The above article appeared in the A. W. of July 1st, 1928.

I want so say AMEN, Bro. Gray. But since the above article was published the "Bride became infected" again. A few of our strong preachers who felt that they had the brains of the brotherhood, quit the "Bride" and also the high way of holiness (for no unclean thing shall pass over it. (Isa. 35), and added a new commandment. The unclean is any thing not taught in the New Testament. And these preachers, Drs. of the Law, wrote a new prescription, thus making the law of God of none effect by their tradition, as Jesus told the Scribes and Doctors of the law.

These said preachers and others began to force the "Bride" to use two or more cups in the communion service, when Jesus and the apostle Paul commanded her to use ONE—"This cup"—"The cup"—"that cup" etc.) So after a long and tiresome effort to heal the afflicted parts, and all to no avail, the true servants of the Lord were forced to admit that the only thing to do was to cut off the afflicted parts again, and thus purify the Bride.

She is slowly, but surely convalescing. And all the parts of the body are becoming more and more aware of the fact that it is dangerous to come in too close contact with infected parts (unsound preachers and teachers) that have been cut off. And also are aware that Jesus said "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood ye have no life in you" (Jno. 6.—"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" (1 Cor. 10).

If the blood is needed, and it is, for "the blood is the life"; so we being weak and Jesus strong; He gave his blood for us, as the strong and willing give their blood in a transfusion. His blood was pure and just right. But the transfusion must be direct. Hence Jesus took the cup and said this is my blood. So when we take the cup and drink we get its benefits direct.

But if the blood is drawn from your body and given to another body, and then drawn from that body and given to mine, neither I nor the Dr. would know if it would help or hinder me.—Ask your Doctor.

Even so, if we take part of the fruit of the vine out of the cup and put into other cups, it is not direct. Paul says in 1 Cor. 11. "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you." Why? They had not been observing the Lord's supper as Paul had commanded them.

Brethren, let's think on these things, and do our part to try to cleanse, purify and heal the "Bride" lest she become faint. She is improving but she needs the attention of us all—all the time.

Submitted in brotherly love,
—Simon J. Gay.

HEALING THE AFFLICTED

Many years ago, the church, or Bride of Christ became infected with the disease known as instrumental music in the worship. Our spiritual doctors worked long and faithfully to cure the malady, but found that the disease had such a deep seat that the life of the beloved Bride was at stake; so the spiritual doctors put on their robes of righteousness and with the sword of the Lord cut off that part that was infected.

This cut off part is now known to us as the Christian church. Since it was impossible for both parts to live, the one containing the spirit healed and lived on, and the infected part went into Sectarianism. It now contains all the spiritual diseases known to the sectarian world.

The Bride of Christ moved on down the stream of time unmolested for a while, but as time went on, she became infected again with a disease known as the class system, or Sunday School.

For many years, the Bride seemed not to realize that she had a deadly disease. At last our spiritual doctors woke up to the fact that the Bride must have attention; so they labored both day and night trying to heal the diseases without another amputation—all in vain. The disease had spread far beyond control.

Again they put on their long robes of righteousness and with the sword of God cut off that part that was infected, for it threatened the life of the Church.

The wound is still very raw but it is healing slowly. The part cut off has become infected with other diseases such as the individual cup, sect baptism, and divorce and remarriages.

M. F. GRAY,
Box 684, Hartshorne, Okla.

Brother W. J. Harris, a preacher whom many of us knew and loved, was, according to a newspaper report, found dead on the R. R. tracks at or near Vicksburg, Miss., some time in June this year. His body was cut in two. It was thought that the train that ran over him caused his death. It is possible, though, that he died from some other cause and that he was dead when the train hit him.—J. D. Phillips.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription, one year \$1.00
Single Subscription six years \$5.00

Printed by Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

THE CONSCIENCE

James F. Thomas,
(John 8:9)

We hear much talk about the conscience of man. We, also, find it mentioned several times in the Bible. It is very important that we know what the conscience is, and the importance of a man's conscience in his life.

The conscience is man's intellectual judge, by which he passes sentence, or decides between right and wrong, and which either condemns or approves his actions. It is very essential that a man follow his conscience. A man who does not follow his conscience is a dangerous person indeed. It is the Judge's conscience that passes sentence; also, the conscience of each jurymen is tried in the rendering of a verdict. So we see it is very necessary that such men be conscientious in order to avoid punishing one too severely, or letting them go after the committing of a grave offense.

People should use their conscience in religious matters pertaining to their spiritual life more than in temporal affairs even. According to the great document known as the Constitution, every man and woman in the United States has the right to worship God as their conscience directs. What a glorious privilege! Nothing else could be right. But let us ask ourselves a question. Does our conscience always direct us aright? Some one tells us that if we believe that we are right, we are right. If reasoning of this kind is logical, why should it not be in temporal matters? A man's conscience tells him that it is right to carry a gun on his person, but when someone sees him, and reports same to the judge, it is not long until he has learned that his conscience directed him wrong. Our consciences are to be the guide, but they must be taught correctly. Of the six hundred different religious organizations in the world, only one is right yet many people in each are as conscientious as we.

Think of Saul, who afterward became Paul. He said that he thought he ought to do many things contrary to Jesus of Nazareth. He held the clothing while Stephens was being stoned to

death. Was he right? He said at a much later date, that he had lived in all good conscience toward God until this day. Surely, he was honest, conscientious, but he was taught by a miracle that he was wrong. Christ appeared unto him, and asked him why he was persecuting Him.

Many people today are conscientious when they call us Campbellites, waterdogs, etc. We should forgive them, for many of them know not what they do. If they would open up their hearts which have been filled with prejudice through the teaching of Satan, by their forefathers, and allow the light of the Holy Scriptures to illuminate them in and through the study of them, they would see, as the aged Brother Paul did that they are wrong; for by the study of the scriptures we learn that Christ built the church. See Matt. 16:18. We learn that it is the church of Christ. See Romans 16:16. In Acts 11:26, we learn that individual members were called Christians. Then in Acts 20:7 we learn that the disciples met upon the first day of the week to break bread, which is something not practiced by another organization under the shining dome of heaven. In Hebrews 10:25 we have a command not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together.

Peter was conscientious concerning the kind of meat that he should eat. A miracle showed him that he could eat any kind of meat, that nothing should be called common or unclean.

The Puritan colony no doubt thought that they were right in executing witches, (so-called) but when they received more enlightenment, the practice was stopped. Formerly, men who had a difference could conscientiously meet and fight a duel in order to settle the matter; but when the leaders of our nation came to a better understanding of right and wrong, such practice was prohibited. Persons could not do this now, and do it conscientiously.

The Hindoo mother who throws her crying baby into the Ganges river, to be swallowed by a crocodile; no doubt has a good conscience; because she does this, believing that in this way only can she appease the wrath of her god. Is she right? No, a thousand times no!! Yet as long as this woman believes this to be right, she would be doing wrong should she do less. "If our conscience condemn us, God is greater than our conscience and he will condemn us also."

We learn that our conscience condemns us, by reading John 8:9: Here the Scribes and Pharisees had brought a woman to Jesus, claiming that she had been taken in the very act of adultery. They wanted to know of Jesus whether or no she should be stoned, seeing that in the law of Moses it was stated that such characters should be stoned. Christ responded by saying, "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone." The record says that they being convicted by their own consciences went out one by one leaving Jesus standing alone and the woman in the midst. This tells us that their own consciences gave each individual life a close examination, and convicted each by showing that all had sinned.

In Rom. 14:22 we learn that our conscience also

makes us happy. "Happy is the man that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth." This, doubtless, means that one must follow his conscience in order to be happy; for if we condemn ourselves by allowing something that our conscience says is wrong, then surely, we are unhappy.

Now, we see that one's conscience must be his guide; also, one must have been taught right for his conscience to be a true discerner between good and evil.

(To be continued)

HONOR ROLL

The following persons have our thanks and appreciation for their co-operation in securing subs. for the O. P. A.:

J. D. Phillips—6; James E. Tidwell—5; Homer A. Gay—4; Sarah E. Brown—1; B. M. Massengale—1; Joseph Miller—1; Lowell Smith—1; Tom E. Smith—1; James McKee—1; Mrs. Verdie Poteet—1; T. E. McBride—1; Walter Bray—1; S. E. Reese—1; A. B. Coble—1; Mrs. L. M. Pond—1; H. O. Freeman—1; G. W. Paslay—1; Ailey A. Kent—1.

DONATIONS TO O. P. A. FUND

B. M. Massengale	-----	\$1.00
Mrs. Verdie Poteet	-----	1.00
J. D. Phillips	-----	.25
Clyde Penner	-----	1.00
Homer A. Gay	-----	1.00

Many thanks, brethren; you have made it possible to publish this issue, by these donations and subs. sent in recently. If we can do as well next month we can balance our books. —H. L. K.

KING

Maybelle Massie, daughter of Jesse and Margaret Massie, was born January 4, 1893, in Laclede County, Missouri, and except for two years in New Mexico, her entire life was spent in her home community.

On the 2nd day of May, 1914, she was united in marriage to Homer L. King, of Lebanon, Missouri. To this union were born three children, two girls and a boy, ranging in ages from nine to eighteen years; viz., Velma Oleta, Nola Florene, and Howard Wayne.

In the fall of 1921 she obeyed the Gospel of Christ, under the preaching of Bro. Homer A. Gay, thereby becoming a member of the Church of Christ at Union. To which faith she remained faithful unto death. Although reared in a Baptist home, she became one of the most loyal and devoted members of the Church of Christ. She was noted for her faithfulness in attending the Lord's day worship, even after she became sick and in a very critical condition, as well as a godly everyday life. She was a home loving and devoted wife and a faithful and loving mother. A vacancy has occurred in the home, church and community that cannot be filled. To know her was to love her.

She departed this life September the 16, 1933, being forty years, eight months and twelve days

of age, after an illness of twentyone months; during which time she underwent a serious surgical operation for cancer of the stomach. Although at times she was subjected to severe pain and suffering, she exhibited a wonderful example of patience and unselfishness, being always mindful of others. She leaves a husband, three children, mother, brother, three sisters, and a host of other relatives and friends to mourn her passing.

We are burdened with grief and very sad and lonely, but we do not mourn even as others who have no hope. We are assured that our loss is Heaven's gain, and that while we cannot bring her back to us, we can so live that we may go to her, for we believe she has gone on to be with the Lord. Were it not for the church and the children, I, too, would be glad to cross over.

—Homer L. King.

"OLD STYLE COMMUNION WARE"

"We have had numerous requests for the old style communion outfit consisting of flagon, goblets and plates. We can furnish them now at the following prices: One-quart silver flagon, \$14.00. Silver goblets \$6.00 each. Nine-inch silver plates, \$5.25 each."—F. L. Rowe.

Remarks

There, I knew it would come, sooner or later! The cat is out of the bag at last. "Old Style Communion outfit," 'flagon,' 'goblets' and 'plates'—New Style Outfit; 'tankard,' 'instantaneous filler,' 'individual cups.'

A few years ago when the churches began to adopt the individual cups, they denied that 'style' had anything to do with it. Here is a sample. "I can safely add that we did not make the change just in order to be in style."—C. F., Feb. 17, 1925.

Had the brother said that "style," "pride," and the devil were responsible for the "change," it would have been much nearer the truth. In an article on the "cups," Ira C. Moore, after "advising" the churches to "adopt" them said: "It is dangerous and very wrong to be anything just for style. So do not adopt them for style." (See C. L. Jan. 6, 1925). A tacit admission that for all of his "superwisdom" he failed utterly to find any scriptural authority for the use of individual cups. Had he been able to produce, either a command, example, or necessary inference for the use of more than one "cup" in the communion he would have had no "twinge" of conscience to prompt him to say,—"do not adopt them for style." And F. L. Rowe advises folks to "keep sweet," while he rakes in the coin by "advertising" and "selling" a lot of superfluous junk to the churches, to be used in the communion, that the Lord did not prescribe, does not require and never authorized. "Style," "pride," "greed," and the devil!

"A certain man named Demetrius, a silver-smith, which made silver shrines of Diana, brought no small gains unto the craftsmen, gathered together the workmen of like occupation, and said, Sirs, ye know that by this business we have our wealth; and ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia,

this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods, which are made with hands. So that our craft (graft) is in danger to be set at naught." Acts 19:24-27.

Those fellows had it in for Paul, because he persuaded the people—"they be no gods, which are made with hands." Demetrius and his bunch were making silver images of 'Diana,' and selling them to those poor heathens—pretty soft! eh? But when they heard Paul declare that "there is but one God," many believed. Of course Demetrius raised quite a rumpus about it. You see, here is where the "rub" come in. "Their business was in danger." A lot of folks are beginning to wonder why F. L. Rowe will not allow space in the Christian Leader for a discussion of the "cup question." Well, here are two reasons why. One is: There is not a man among them.—Rowe included—from the senior editor down; that has the courage and backbone to meet the "issue" with H. C. Harper. The other reason is: Rowe does not want his readers to see both sides of the "cup question." Now here is where the "rub" comes again. Rowe knows very well, that H. C. Harper would persuade many of the Leader readers, "that they be no cups in the Lord's Communion." Hence there would not be much demand for "Old Style Communion Ware," and "New Style Communion Ware." No sir, such graft (craft) would be in danger.

Ira B. Kile, Sistersville, W. Va.

FROM THE FIELD

James F. McKee, Route No. 1, Roswell, New Mexico, Aug. 19, 1933.—Bro. J. L. Musgrave, of Wichita Falls, Texas, just closed a ten days' meeting with the L. F. D. congregation, near Roswell. The results were thirteen baptized and seven restored, and the congregation seemed to take on new life. Bro. Lewis is a fine young man and able, too. We commend him to all who want the truth preached in its purity.

W. C. Rice, Mountain Home, Ark., Aug. 31, 1931.—I closed a fine mission meeting, near Mt. View, Missouri, recently with seven baptized, and their promise to meet each Lord's day as the Bible ordains. Bro. H. E. Jerrel, of Mt. View, will assist them as leader until such time as they can be set in order. Brethren, let us plant the cause in as many new fields as possible. Many are perishing for the bread of life.

H. E. Robertson, Phillipsburg, Mo., Sept. 14, 1933.—Bro. Homer A. Gay and I have just recently closed a fine meeting at the Coble school house, near Vanzant, Mo., preaching alternately. There were but four or five meeting regularly when we arrived September 1. We continued ten days, baptizing five and seventeen confessing their faults. Old troubles which had almost ruined the church were settled, and we left them all

rejoicing. It seems we have some good material there, and I believe they will now grow into a strong congregation. I hope to return within a few weeks for some more preaching.

T. F. Thomasson, Lake Arthur, New Mex., Sept. 12, 1933.—Bro. J. L. Musgrave has held three meetings in the Valley here, with much success. At L. F. D. thirteen were baptized and seven restored; Greenfield, five baptized and one restored; Lake Arthur, thirteen baptized and four restored. Five of those baptized at Lake Arthur were really from the Greenfield community; making ten for the Greenfield church. The meeting at Artesia did not materialize, as we were unable to get a suitable place. Aside from the visible results we believe much good was accomplished. Bro. Lewis is a fine young preacher; true to the Book. Our prayer is that he may continue to be true and humble, ever fighting the good fight of faith in opposition to all innovations which are troubling the churches. The loyal churches here are growing and prospering spiritually, but weak financially. It seems that truth is gaining over innovations gradually.

G. B. Harrell, Floresville, Texas, Sept. 16, 1933.—I have just closed two of the most successful meetings of my life. At Fair Land, near Fouke, Ark., we continued thirteen days, baptizing twenty and five were restored. At the Booker school house, on Red River, we continued six days, baptizing seventeen into Christ. We are now in a short meeting at Woodberry, Ark., with good crowds and interest. Other meeting dates are as follows: Old Smead, Ark., (my old home congregation), Sept. 10; Bellville, Ark., Sept. 30; Healdton, Okla., Oct. 5; Waco, Texas, Oct. 14; then home the last of October. The meetings already held are mission meetings, and I am just barely getting enough to get from one place to another. Brethren, pray for me.

James R. Stewart, 749 Willow St., Abilene, Texas, Aug. 21, 1933.—During the first half of July, I was in a good meeting at Union, in Brown County, Texas. The interest was good, and we baptized five. From there I went to Fort McKavett, where we baptized three, one of whom had been a member of the Episcopal Church for thirty years. Our next, the first half of August, was at Winters, where we baptized eight and three were restored. Two of those baptized were from the Holiness Church. We left them encouraged and doing fine. We closed out at Ramsy, near DeLeon, Texas, August 20, baptizing four and one was restored. The church here is doing nicely in spite of all the sinful acts of the enemy. Thirty-two communed here yesterday besides the visiting brethren. We are now going over to a mission point (Jake Hammond, a few miles away), for a few nights. I expect to start for Arizona and California the latter part of Sept. Should anyone desire my services while in the West, write me at the above address.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla., Aug. 18, 1933.—I closed at Carter, Fredrick, Okla., the 13th inst. without any baptisms, however two who had been meeting with the S. S. brethren took their stand with the sound brethren. Quite a number seemed strengthened for the one cup in the communion and the breaking of the one loaf, hence we feel that our labor was not in vain. We have some good brethren in that congregation, among whom are Tom Hogins, Albert Stone, W. R. Middick, and A. A. Paterson. These brethren would be glad to have other sound brethren locate with them, especially leaders. Should any of the sound preachers be passing that way, they will be glad to have you visit and preach there. You will find them near the school house.

T. E. McBride, Cleburne, Texas, August 31, 1933.—Enclosed find a dollar to pay for this sub. to the O. P. A. We are all surely sorry about Sister King's condition and any other misfortunes that have come to you. It seems rather dark and gloomy to you now, I know, but there is sure to be a brighter day for you if you trust in Jesus and His blessed word. We at Cleburne love you in the Lord.

C. H. Lee, Lebanon, Mo., Sept. 19, 1933.—Our meeting at "Lees Summit," Laclede County, Missouri, is now in its second week. Large crowds are attending and a fine interest is being manifested. But no wonder; the gospel of Christ was what the apostles used to draw the people to Christ, and that is just what Bro. Homer A. Gay is using now. He doesn't seem to think that it has lost any of its power.

No additions up to date but we are hoping for great results ere the meeting closes.

I regret that I am to leave for a meeting in Texas Co., this state, before Bro. Gay closes here. Pray for us.

J. E. Tidwell, Rt. 2, ElDorado, Ark., Sept. 16, 1933.—I have just returned home from a debate with Mart Love, Lawrenceburg, Tenn., on the innovations that are troubling the churches. While there I received a telegram from the church at Marion, La., wanting me to be with them at the earliest possible date in debate with L. M. Musgrave on the class and cups question. I am leaving at this writing for Marion to begin the debate Monday night to continue six nights. We have a good colored congregation there as well as a good white congregation. I hated very much to leave the Tennessee work but I felt obligated to the Marion church, so I left the Tennessee work in the hands of Bro. Perry Burns, whom I converted to the truth on the class, cups and bread breaking questions,—a splendid young preacher. Here are five subs for the paper. Send me some sample copies. On with the good work!

J. P. Burns, Hohenwald, Tenn., Sept. 15, 1933.—The meeting at the Church of Christ, near Ethridge, Tenn., closed last Lord's day. Bro.

James E. Tidwell, of ElDorado, Ark., did the preaching. C. R. Nichol failed to get here for the debate and Bro. M. C. Love represented the class folks. We wish to thank all for their presence and interest throughout the meeting and debate. I was very fortunate in meeting Bro. Tidwell; he has opened my eyes on the class, cups and bread breaking question. Bro. Tidwell knows the old Book and is neither afraid nor ashamed to declare it. Brethren, you can count on me from now on.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla., Sept. 14, 1933.—Bro. Walter Bray and I closed our meeting at Eaves City without visible results, except a good interest. Bro. Homer A. Gay preached two nights in this meeting while on his way to Mo. Some of the brethren who have been meeting with the Pike City church are going to try to establish the cause at Eaves City. Bro. Bray and I are now in a meeting at Zita, an old abandoned oil town. Five have been baptized to date. I preached at Pike City Church Sunday night, September 5, and baptized one.

J. T. Davis, Rt. 3, Grimes, Okla.—I want to locate near a loyal congregation, i. e., a church that uses one cup in the communion, thus following the New Testament. My family have had to worship (?) with a two-cup church for the past four years or not meet at all. What I want is a share crop somewhere in Oklahoma or Texas if not too far east. I would not like to go farther east than Lawton, Oklahoma. If brethren can help me get located, we certainly will appreciate it. Address me as above.

H. O. Freeman, Vancort, Texas, Aug. 29, 1933.—Bro. T. E. McBride, of Cleburn, Texas, held us a good meeting, notwithstanding, we were disappointed because Bro. King could not come. We had splendid crowds, and ten were baptized and two were restored.

Sister Trott writes from Munday, Texas, date of Sept. 18.—"My dear brother, I have been trying to get subs. for our dear paper, but I am pretty much hindered in my condition. However, I am hoping that I can send you a few now pretty soon. I know that things are hard with you every way, but if you have any extra copies of the O. P. A., and will send me a few, I shall use them in trying to get subs."

For the past year or more Bro. S. J. Gay, of 506, N. Broadway, Albuquerque, New Mex., has been doing some good work in north New Mex., and southern Colo. He is a brother to Homer A. Gay, and is sound in the faith and is making a great sacrifice in a real mission field.

T. E. Smith, Wesson, Miss.—The meeting at New Salem church began August 27th, and ran over two Sundays. Bro. J. D. Phillips did the preaching. The visible results were twelve baptisms, mostly heads of families. Bro. Phillips

did some of the finest preaching I ever heard, and is one of the best informed men on all lines of Biblical teaching I ever met. Bro. H. C. Harper has held several meetings for us, and one debate. No doubt we reaped some of the harvest of seeds sown by him, in this meeting. When churches employ such men as Harper and Phillips for their meetings, they will be built up on the solid foundation with all stumbling-stones removed. The best feature of Bro. Phillips' preaching is that he magnifies the Kingdom of God in such a way that people can see the distinction between it and the kingdoms of the world. He showed us that the world-kingdoms are doomed to fall, and that Christ's kingdom, planted on the bed-rock of Jehovah's truth, will "stand for ever." To Jehovah we give glory for this meeting.

J. D. Phillips, Van Court, Texas.—After closing the meeting reported above by Bro. Smith, I came to Kinston, Ala., Bro. W. H. Reynolds' home church, and began a meeting which is now seven days old, and will continue six days longer. Large crowds and intense interest are the visible results thus far. As is my rule, I am teaching the church, first; then the aliens. We hope for some additions before we close. I go from here to Lowery, Ala., where Bro. Harper met and defeated Bro. Grider in debate on the S. S. humanism, to begin there next Thursday night. Some of the Lowery brethren are attending the meeting here, and they assure me that there are good prospects for a fine meeting there. Churches in this field will make no mistake in calling brethren T. E. Smith and W. H. Reynolds for meetings. Bro. Reynolds does lots of mission work at his own expense. He is a very able debater. My recent meeting at Council Hill, Okla., resulted in one baptism and one restoration. On account of a change in Bro. Gay's work, I shall, the Lord willing, go to Ky., W. Va., and Pa., this fall.

W. H. Reynolds, Kinston, Ala.—I held a two weeks' meeting at the Eubank School house, near Pansey, Ala., beginning Saturday night before the fourth Sunday in June. This is a mission point. One lady expressed the desire to obey the gospel, but wanted to be taught a little more as she wanted to be sure of what she was doing. Others seemed to be very much interested. The people of that community, as a rule, are very illiterate and hard to teach, but there are some good people there, and I believe that, by persistent teaching, a congregation can be established. I went from there to Jellico, ten miles west of Dothan, Ala., for a week's meeting. The church there has almost ceased to exist, some of the members having died and others moved away. This is the home of Sister L. A. Glover, who has spent much and is spending more in an effort to get the church restored to a living, working condition. Bro. Clarence Teurman, lamented editor of The Apostolic Way, held two or three meetings there. I go to Ashford, Ala., the 23rd of September for a mission meeting, a place where the

gospel has never been preached. There are prospects of a debate there with a Second Adventist. We are enjoying a feast of good things at the home church in our meeting this week and part of next week with Bro. J. D. Phillips in the pulpit. I think several here will subscribe for the Old Paths Advocate, the true, bold, and aggressive paper, as soon as the cotton crop is marketed.

NOTICE

I expect to begin a meeting at Palestine, Ark., October 20, and continue over two Lord's days. Brethren in reach are invited to attend. As I will pass through Memphis, Tenn., on way to Palestine, if the brethren there or elsewhere in Tennessee desire, I shall be glad to arrange to visit you a few days before or after the Palestine meeting. Write me at my home address. As I have been hindered in the work this summer, I now wish to try to make up as far as possible for lost time.

As Bro. Homer A. Gay is here in a meeting, he has been much help to me in getting the copy ready for this issue, as well as to minister to me in this the saddest hour of my life. I must not leave Sister Gay unmentioned in her untiring assistance of wife's last days on earth.

—Homer L. King.

FAINT, YET PURSUING.

We enjoyed the time we got to stay at home, even though we were very busy. We had a splendid meeting there. Luvilla, our girl, was among those baptized.

We fixed the old car up a little, got our clothes together, and left home Thursday, August 24, spent that night with that old faithful standby, —Frank Stark, at Anson, Texas. Leaving there the next morning we made it through north Texas and into Okla., and on to Healdton, and preached there that night and on until Sunday night. It is always a pleasure to visit Healdton. On Monday and Tuesday nights we attended the mission meeting which brethren Bray and Smith were holding out north of Healdton. Bros. Smith, Ray and Bray are doing a great work in holding mission meetings all around them, and the Church, at Healdton, appreciates them too.

Leaving there Wednesday, August 30, we drove to a log cabin camp, at Afton, Oklahoma where we spent the night. The next day we drove through the corner of Kansas, and on to Vanzant, Mo. We stayed there until September 10, in a meeting, with splendid results. Leaving there Monday we came to the Lees Summit congregation, near Lebanon, Mo., and are preaching here this week.

The fields are white unto harvest, but the labourers are so few. Brethren, who will help to push the work?

The roads are long, and traveling is expensive. but,

"We are faint, yet pursuing."
Yours in hope of eternal life,

—Homer A. Gay.

Ye num'rous sects
which all declare
"Lo Christ is here,
Lo Christ is there."
Your stronger proofs
divinely give
And show me where
the Christians live.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
O, Savior, where?"
and then I heard:
I heard the cry,
"Here is My Church
where men still dare
To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.'" (Jer. 6:16) "And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in" (Isa. 58:12).

Vol. 6

LABANON, MISSOURI, NOVEMBER 1, 1933

No. 12

DESTINY OF THE WICKED

"Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. . . And these shall go away into everlasting punishment." (Matt. 25:41-46.) "And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire. . . And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." (Rev. 20:10-15.) "But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and persition of ungodly men." (2 Pet. 3:7.) "And to you who are troubled, rest with us; when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 Thes. 1:7, 8.) "But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness: indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil." (Rom. 2:8, 9.) "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matt. 10:28.)

The Scriptures teach that the wicked shall suffer an "everlasting punishment," and that, therefore, they never cease to exist. They teach that the wicked are cast into hell and there suffer "an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power," that in that state "the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

There are four words that are of cardinal importance. These are **destruction**, **life**, **death**, and **punishment**. To ascertain their grammatical or historical, and their tropical or figurative meaning is, indeed, indispensable to any correct knowledge of these passages in which they are used. The most palpable error of those whose views of the future state of wicked and impenitent men we are now about to review and examine is, that they generally commence the proof by assuming or taking for granted the very question in debate. For example, they assume that the term **destruction** means the absolute extinction of personal being and existence. If the term **destruction** always

means in sacred usage the absolute extinction of personal existence, then we have, in other words, **personal annihilation**. But when we show that this is not the case, it is plainly seen that their foundation is but an assumption, or a mere begging of the question.

We shall now institute a Scriptural induction and examination of the words **destruction** and **destroy**, as found in the New Testament. **Destruction** is used twelve times in the Common version; namely, Matt. 7:13; Rom. 3:16; and 9:22; I Cor. 5:5; 2 Cor. 10:8 and 13:10; Phil. 3:19; I Thes. 5:3; 2 Thes. 1:9; I Tim. 6:9; 2 Pet. 2:1 and 3:16. Now, of these twelve times in which we have **destruction** in the Common version we have in the original Greek four different words; namely, **apoooleia**, **olethros**, **kathairesis**, and **suntrimma**. **Opoooleia** is found in Matt. 7:13; Rom. 9:22; Phil. 3:19; 2 Pet. 2:1 and 3:16—in all five times in the N. T. **Olethros** is found in I Cor. 5:5; I Thes. 5:3 II Thes. 1:9, and I Tim. 6:9—in all four times. **Kathairesis** is found in 2 Cor. 10:8 and 13:10. And **suntrimma** is found in Rom. 3:16.

Here, then, are four different words in the original and all represented to the English reader by the word **destruction**. Let us now examine each of these four original terms. We shall begin with the first mentioned, which is the chief of these: four, namely, **apoooleia**. This term is found in the N. T. in the noun substantive only, twenty times. Of these it is rendered eight times **perdition**, five times **destruction**, twice **waste**, once by each of the following—**die**, **perish**, **damnation**, **damnable**, and **pernicious** ways. Here are, then, in the Common version eight different renderings of the noun **apoooleia** in only twenty occurrences of the word. And of these it is seen that **perdition** and **destruction** are the most common renderings.

But we have the Greek verb **apollumi**, to **destroy**, from which the noun **apoooleia** is derived, occurring in the N. T. no fewer than ninety-two times. Now, from these ninety-two cases we cannot fail to arrive at a radical conception of the meaning of the word. We shall now classify and enumerate its various significations. Of these the most common is **perish** and **perished**. In this sense it is found no fewer than thirty-two times. It is also found thirty-one times where it is translated **lose** and **lost**, and twenty-seven times **destroy** and **destroyed**; it is once translated **marred**, and once **die**.

Now, as this is the term most frequently used indicative of the destiny of the wicked, it is all-

important that its various acceptations be very strictly observed and considered. Its derivative *aionios olethros* is found in 2 Thes. 1:9, and is translated "everlasting destruction." We have also in I Thes. 5:5 this: "then sudden destruction (*olethros*) cometh," etc. and in I Cor. 5:5, "for the destruction of the flesh," and in I Tim. 6:9, "drown men in destruction."

Kathairesis (2 Cor. 10:4), translated "pulling down," and "destruction" in 2 Cor. 13:10, "edification and not destruction," and "destruction" in 2 Cor. 10:8, "not for your destruction." *Kathairesis* etymologically indicates *pulling down*, and figuratively "destruction." In the latter sense it is found but twice in the N. T.

Suntrimma is found but once, and literally indicates destruction by attrition or breaking down.

We have now exhibited every passage in the Scriptures in which the English words *destroy* and *destruction* are found, and also all the words in the Greek N. T. which are supposed either grammatically or rhetorically to authorize such a translation. It will now be important to notice some other translations of the same words found in the Common version in other places.

First, *apooieia* is applied to waste; for example, "to what purpose is this waste (destruction) of the ointment." (Matt. 26:8; Mk. 14:4.) It is also translated *perdition* in immediate contrast with *olethros*, destruction, showing that *olethros* denotes a still higher sentence than *apooieia*. It is also applied to "pernicious ways," and to "damnable sects" (2 Pet. 2:2), also to "destruction" (Phil. 3:19) in the abstract.

The verb *apollumi* is applied both to persons and things, as are also its derivatives *elethros* and *apooieia*. We find it applied to persons, members of the body, bottles, sheep, soul, body, life, reward, those who take the sword, money, nation, and even to Jesus the Messiah Himself.

Bottles are said by one N. T. writer, as rendered in the Common version, "to be destroyed," and "to perish," and by another the same bottles are said to "be marred." In these cases *apollumi* is found in the original. A sheep that was destroyed or lost is said to live and to be brought back to the fold. A man is said to destroy his life, and again to find it. I am sent, says the Messiah, to the destroyed sheep of the house of Israel. Again, I have come to seek and to save that which was destroyed. The rulers said, "Ask Barabas and destroy Jesus." We also have these: "This my son was destroyed but is now found" and our gospel is hid to them that are destroyed.

Such are a few, and but a few, of the cases in which this word is used so as to demonstrate to the most indiscriminating mind that it can not mean either primarily or generally the absolute extinction of persons and animals which are at one time said to be destroyed and afterwards represented as living; as, "This my son was dead and is now alive; was lost and is found." Such applications of the words *dead*, *lost*, *destroyed*, etc., are of frequent occurrence in the Scriptures. If any one is not able to examine the original, let

him take any good concordance and examine from three to four hundred passages in which some branch of this numerous family of words is found, and there will be abundant proof of the facts here offered. He will see how weak is the effort to make *destroy*, *destroyed*, *destruction* express absolute and utter personal extinction.

It should be stated, however, that many do not pretend to argue that such is the common meaning of the word, but they rely more on what to them is "reason," that is to say, it comports more agreeably with their notion of justice, expediency, and consistency. Some will not allow annihilation, for, say they, nothing can be said to be annihilated. But when pressed, they admit that the wicked cease to be—there is no more a person. Of course, then, he is a nonentity. There is no more a being than there was a man before Adam was created. According to their teaching the wicked exist no more, and this is their annihilation. Let me say in concluding this phase of the subject (1) that this is not a question to be determined by what any man thinks is just, expedient, or consistent, for "the wisdom of man is foolishness with God," (2) that they have not proved, nor can they prove, that "everlasting destruction" means everlasting extinction of personal being; not (3) that simple existence is life and simple non-existence is death. And we shall give some attention in our next to the Biblical use of these all-important terms *life* and *death*.

—A. Campbell. (Selected)

A MODERN QUESTION

Why should all Christians be church members? Adventist in P. T. M.

Reply: And we ask, Can a person be a Christian and not be a church member?

And answer, No. All Christians are church members. Christ immediately after Peter confessed him, saying, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Mt. 16:16) said, "Upon this rock I will build my church." Moreover, he said to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." And just before he ascended to the right hand of God, he told the apostles, "Thus it is written, that Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Lk. 24:46, 47.) And he further said, "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be clothed with power from on high." And he said, "Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you." (Acts 1:8). And he further told them, "Ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence." (v. 5.) "And when the day of Pentecost was now come . . . they were all filled with the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:1-4.) And "Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and spake unto them." (v. 14.) He now preaches "the gospel" (Mk. 16:15); and when

they ask what to do, he tells them, saying, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins." (Acts 2:38.) "They then that received his word were baptized." (v. 41.) They are now saved, as Jesus promised, saying, "Preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mk. 16:15, 16.) And we read, "The Lord added to the church daily those that were being saved." (Acts 2:27). And Peter, after he had been the first to preach the gospel to the Jews, preached first to the Gentiles. And he said, "Brethren, ye know that a good while ago God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." (Acts 15:7.) And he commanded them to be baptized. (Acts 10:48.) They thus obeyed the gospel. Hence, Paul says, "Ye were the servants of sin; but God be thanked that ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine, in which you were delivered (John 3:5); being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6:4, 17, 18.)

Again Paul says, "Buried with him in baptism, in which also ye were risen with him through the faith of the working of God, who raised him from the dead; and you being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he made alive together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." (Col. 2:12, 13.)

And again: "Giving thanks unto the Father, who hath made us meet (fit) to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light, who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of our sins." (Col. 1:12, 13 and Jno. 3:5)

The Lord adds to the church by making a "saint" out of a "sinner." And hence all "Christians" (Acts 11:26; Acts 26:28, 29; 1 Pet. 4:16) are in the church and are put there by the Lord as soon as he makes them "free from sin," and this takes place in baptism, preceded by its gospel prerequisites—"confession" (Acts 8:37; Rom. 10:9, 10; Mt. 10:32), "repentance" (Lk. 24:47; Acts 2:38), and "faith" (Mk. 16:16; Acts 16:16), as we have shown in former quotations.

Now, in opposition to the Lord, men may get up institutions about which the Bible says nothing, e. g., "Second Advent Christian Church," "Methodist Church," "Presbyterian Church," "Congregational Church," "Baptist Church," etc., etc.; and they may make regulations for membership in them. And what will make you a member of one of them does not make you a member of any other. But this is not the Lord's doing, and it is all in plain violation of the revealed will of God—a "Babylon" unmistakably, out of which the Spirit calls those who have entered therein. The Lord tells Paul, when in Corinth, to "speak, and hold not thy peace . . . for I have many people in this city." (Acts 18:10.) And in this sense he has people in Babylon. Denominational sectism is not of God. "Come out of it," says the Spirit. (See Revelation)

—H. C. Harper.

BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT

By J. D. Phillips

In Matt. 12:32 Christ says, "The blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven unto men, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." This, then, is the "unpardonable sin" about which we hear so much and, seemingly, know so little. It is possibly what John calls "a sin unto death." I think the solution of the problem as to what the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is can be solved by a proper understanding of the meaning of the word "blasphemy." To fully understand the meaning of any word it is necessary to get the meaning of each member of the family of words of which it forms a part. Following Hudson's "A Critical Greek and English Concordance" to the New Testament we find there are three words in the family of Greek words from which we have the English word "blasphemy" in the New Testament. We shall give each word separately with its different renderings in the King's Version, as follows:

1. **Blasphemo**, "speak evil of" (Rom. 14:16; Titus 3:2), "revile" (Matt. 27:39), "rail on" (Mark 15:29), "report slanderously" (Rom. 3:8), "defame" (1 Cor. 4:13), "blaspheme" (Matt. 9:3), "speak blasphemy" (Matt. 26:65), "blasphemously" (Luke 22:65), "blasphemer" (Acts 19:37).

2. **Blasphemia**, evil speaking" (Eph. 4:31), "railing" (1 Tim. 6:4), "blasphemy" (Matt. 12:32).

3. **Blasphemos**, "railing" (2 Pet. 2:11), "blasphemous" (Acts 6:11, 13), "blasphemer" (1 Tim. 1:13).

Hence, he who "speaks evil" of, "reviles," "rails on," "reports slanderously" concerning, "defames," "blasphemes," "speaks blasphemy" against, speaks "blasphemously" of—he who is guilty of "evil speaking" against, "railing on"—he who is a "blasphemer" against—the Holy Spirit has committed "the unpardonable sin" and "it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come" (Matt. 12:32).

"Neither in this world, neither in the world to come" can be understood when we learn that the word "world" here comes from the Greek *aión*, which means "age" and is so rendered in Eph. 2:7 and Col. 1:26. Christ was living in the Jewish Age when He used this language, and hence the "this age" refers to the Jewish Age and "the age to come" to the Christian Age or the present dispensation.

The "unpardonable sin," or "the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," should not be confused with the hopeless state mentioned and described by Paul in Heb. 6:4-8 and 10:26-30. Persistent indulgence in any sin that is committed "wilfully" will lead one into a hopeless state (Heb. 10:26) and hence "it is impossible," says Paul, "to renew" or restore such a person "unto repentance" since he has "crucified unto himself the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame." Heb. 6:4-8.

Support the O. P. A. and help us make it better. Send us all the subscriptions you can.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper.....Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips.....Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King.....Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay.....Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King,.....Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant.....Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year.....\$1.00
Single Subscription six years.....\$5.00

Printed by Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

WATCHMEN WHAT OF THE NIGHT?

"The burden of Dumah. He called to me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night? Watchman what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh and also the night: If ye will inquire, inquire ye: return, come." Isa. 21: 11-12.

Again we read in Eze. 33:6-7. "But if the watchman see the sword come and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come, and take away any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand.

"So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me."

Thus we can see the duty of the watchman was very important. They were to sit in the watchtower, an exalted place, and watch for approaching danger. Of course this would require time, attention, courage and zeal. This was not only so, but a very grave responsibility rested upon them. For the welfare of all the people depended on them and their watchfulness:

In Heb. 13:17 we read, "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you."

Paul told the elders of the church at Ephesus to "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.—Therefore watch." Acts 20. Also Peter says:—Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." I Pet. 5.

Now if elders, overseers, or watchmen would awake to their duty of caring for the flock, I am sure that many a fall could be avoided. How many

elders or overseers can tell me how many members there are in their charge? Do you know where they live, how they live at home and abroad? Do they know how to read their Bible, pray, etc.?

Are you an ensample to the flock? If the whole congregation followed you, what kind of christians would they be? What kind of a home would they have, what kind of children would they have, what would be their habits? Do you really watch for their souls? Do you realize that you must give account for their souls? Then what about the books and papers they read, the company they keep, the teachers they listen to, and many other questions we could ask?

The true overseer will stand between the congregation and the wolf:—he will warn the congregation and fight the wolf.

I want to appeal to the leaders of the congregations that you study this subject with me for a few short articles.

Remember, Watchman, what of the night?

—Homer A. Gay.

AN APPRECIATED QUESTION

From Indiana comes the question: "Do any of the editors of the Old Paths Advocate use tobacco?" I answer, No!! Do you ask why? Because there is no good derived from it, for one thing. It has wrecked thousands of people physically, financially, morally and spiritually, for another. It is offensive to many, for another. It is a filthy habit, for another. These are enough reasons, but take the following sober reflection:

A church, suppose, is composed of fifty members. Forty of them use tobacco. (I recently held a meeting for a church, every member of which uses it). They use on an average of \$10.00 each, per year. (Most tobacco-users use twice or three times this amount). They all use, then, \$400.00 worth per year. These same brethren would think that to support Brother Vandanam in his mission work in India would wreck them financially. They usually pay a preacher twenty-five or thirty dollars per year for meetings, and they think that is an enormous amount! At this rate they have starved most loyal preachers out of the field, and I, for one, am going to be forced, for the same reason, to leave it soon. Perhaps others are on the verge of doing the same thing. By using the \$400.00 in the support of the gospel, this same church could hold four meetings a year, part of which could be mission meetings, and support each to the amount of \$100.00. Or, by paying half this amount, they could double the amount of meetings, making it eight.

Most of those who say they cannot help support the gospel are tobacco-users. This is one reason why the Old Paths Advocate gets so hungry. Many who boast of their "loyalty" just have to have their tobacco, even though every righteous undertaking has to stop!! Yet "it is no sin," if they are to be the judges!!

I know one man whose family the church has practically kept up for several months, yet he can

get the money to buy ready-rolled Camel cigarettes!!

Do you wonder why we do not use tobacco? Will you join us in using this money for the cause of Christ? If not, why not? A silly grin and saying, "I like to chew" or "smoke too well for that" will not excuse you in the day of judgment!

—J. D. Phillips.

Remarks

The above is not "milk," but just pure old rancid baking.

—H. E. Robertson.

FROM THE FIELD

J. D. Phillips, Van Court, Texas, Oct. 15.—I preached at Eola over Sunday. Three were baptized. One had been a Baptist from his youth. He is a son-in-law of Bro. J. T. White. I will be in Texas this winter. Those wanting my services may address me as above.

D. E. Stone, Rivera, Calif. — The Montebello church is going strong. Fine crowds at worship. Bro. Sharp and I have gone through Revelation twice in the past few months and the study has been a great benefit to us.

Bro. T. E. Smith, of Wesson, Miss., has been preaching some at the home of an intelligent Methodist friend. He also preaches some at a school house near him by invitation of some Baptists who are interested in the restoration message. The New Salem church where Bro. Smith worships is doing fine.

A few brethren have recently started worship in a private home at Water Valley, Texas. This is the home of Brother Morris who was baptized at Eola recently. We are glad there is a church near him.

The church meeting in the Presbyterian house in San Angelo, Texas, is doing well under the excellent leadership of Brother F. R. Keele.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.—I preached at Pike City, Okla., Oct. 1, and two men made the good confession and were baptized as a result. You may count on me to send in a dollar each month.

C. W. Beavers, Advance, Ark., Oct. 1, 1933. — Bro. W. W. Leamons, of Trinity, Texas, preached a few nights, baptizing two and restoring three at this place. He baptized eight at Martin Springs and restored one. Bro. H. E. Robertson, of Phillipsburg, Mo., conducted a meeting here in July, which improved the spiritual status of the church.

J. P. Drane, Sentinel, Okla.—We have a small congregation here, and we extend to you our sympathy in your trying hour. I preached at New-

castle, Okla. over Lord's day a few weeks past. We had a splendid crowd out. I hope to be able to send in some subs. soon.

W. F. Cogburn, DeLeon, Texas.—Bro. James R. Stewart closed a successful meeting at Ramsey, August 20. The results were five baptized and one restored. The church was much strengthened by the plain Gospel lessons, presented in an uncompromising, yet kind, way. We had good crowds throughout. We now have a young preacher, Bro. George Hughs, living near us, who was baptized by Bro. Gay sometime ago.

J. D. Phillips, Kinston, Ala.—The meeting at Early, near Kinston, Ala., closed with two baptisms, one of whom was a Methodist. I am now (Sept. 22) in a meeting at Lowery, near Kinston, with two baptisms to date; both of whom were Baptists. Others are expected. Bro. W. H. Reynolds has been with me most of the time in this field, he is a "true yoke-fellow" in the work. He is a good man and a good preacher. I go to Wesson, Miss. next, and from there to Ark. and Texas. Until further notice address me at Van Court, Texas, care H. O. Freeman.

D. F. Nichols, 3207 Garnet St., Los Angeles, Calif.—The congregation at 3535 Syskiyou St., this city, is now getting along better than at any time I have lived here (eight years). We are at peace, and it seems that almost everyone is doing all he can. Some who had gone off from us have returned since the Phillips-Musgrave's debate over the manner of breaking the loaf, one of whom was Bro. Beaty, who is a good humble worker. He has a good family, and they will be a wonderful help to us. We appreciate them very much. I think we are now in a position to enjoy a period of peace.

F. K. Reeves, Marion, La., Oct. 2, 1933.—Bro. J. E. Tidwell met L. M. Musgraves in a debate here Sept. 18-22, on the class system of teaching and on the cups question. Musgraves affirmed the class system and cups, while Bro. Tidwell denied. Bro. Tidwell met him on every attempt to defend his unscriptural practice. You need not be afraid to call Bro. Tidwell to meet the enemy on these questions. I expect to subscribe for the O. P. A. soon.

Donie Trott, Munday, Texas, Oct. 10, 1933.—Many thanks for the sample copies of the O. P. A. I handed them out where I thought they would do the most good, and as a result I have gotten three new subs. My dear brother, I hope that His guiding hand will be with you in all you have to do in getting through your difficulties, and I pray for those dear children, who are left without the dearest friend they can have on this earth. May He be their guide, I do pray. I am yet unable to see to read and can do but little writing.

W. C. Rice, Mountain Home, Ark., Oct. 16, 1933.—I closed at Shady Grove with growing interest.

I should have continued longer. At Conditt school house we continued over three Lord's days, with seven baptized and two restored, and they have promised to meet each Lord's day for worship. I will help them all I can. I go next to the Sunny-side school house for a meeting if not hindered.

Jeter E. Whigham, Kinston, Ala., Sept. 30, 1933.—Bro. J. D. Phillips has just closed two meetings near here; viz., at Bethel and at Lowery congregations. One was added at Bethel and three at Lowery. There was a good hearing at both places, and much good in addition to the baptisms was accomplished. He did not mince words in teaching the church to come out of the sleepy, lax condition into which it had drifted. The whole country-side turned out to hear his masterful presentation of the Word. He is a talented teacher, which is evidence of much study, and application to the Word. Certainly the brotherhood is making a great mistake in not supporting him et al in the great work they are doing. Such men should not be forced to "leave the Word of God to serve tables" when the laborers are so few. They should be able to devote their whole time to sowing the seed. I had the good pleasure of hearing Bro. Phillips in three sermons at Lowery and of having him and his good wife a week with us at Montgomery, Ala. It was a pleasure to meet his sterling little wife of a few weeks.

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo., Oct. 18, 1933.—I am just home from a mission meeting, near Lebanon, which continued ten days. Considering everything, I believe it was the greatest meeting of my life. It was in a Baptist stronghold, there being but two members of the Church of Christ there, and they had become inactive or gone in with the sects. The results were twenty-five baptized and the two restored. Nearly all of those baptized were from the Baptists, among whom were the main families and workers of the Baptists, including their S. S. superintendent, secretary and pianist. At the conclusion of one discourse nineteen made the "good confession," right in the face of the Baptist "pastor" and two of their other preachers, but it was too much for them to stand—they walked out of the house. We succeeded in finding a few more members a few miles away who will meet with them, making a congregation of about thirty-five members. Bro. H. E. Robertson will be with them next Lord's day and thereafter as he can until I return from Ark. and Tenn., when I shall expect to return for another effort. On with the good work!

WANTED

We would be glad to have a record in the office of the O. P. A. of all strictly loyal congregations throughout the U. S. A. or elsewhere, giving the name and address of at least one of the elders or leaders.

FAINT, YET PURSUING

We feel that the Lord was good, in that Sister King was spared until we could be with them again. Bro. King and I have been co-workers for years and Sister King and my wife were the best of chums. So we were glad that we could be with them for at least a few days before Sister King had to go to her reward. I had baptized her some twelve years ago and I can truly say that I have never seen one grow more in the Lord in twelve years than she did. "Her children arose up and called her blessed; her husband also, and he praised her. Prov. 31:28. Our hearts go out with love and sympathy to Bro. King, Velma, Nola and little Howard. May God bless, comfort and protect you is our prayer.

We buried Sister King in the New Hope cemetery, Sunday evening, Sept. 17, 1933. A large crowd of sorrowing relatives and friends attending the service, while I, in my feeble way attempted to speak words of comfort to the bereaved ones and words of warning to the unprepared.

We continued the meeting at Lee's Summit sixteen nights. None were baptized but a goodly number of the congregation made their acknowledgments; old troubles were settled, and, we believe the church is now in a fine condition for their meeting which Bro. King is to hold soon. I consider this one of the best congregations in the brotherhood. Bros. C. H. Lee and H. E. Robertson also live there. They are both good men and good loyal preachers. There are also four young men in the congregation who are growing into preachers.

Leaving there the 28th of September, we headed north. We crossed the noted Lake of The Ozarks, also the Bagnal Dam. Those who have never seen this part of the Ozark Mountains have missed some of God's most wonderful handiwork.

Pushing on north we crossed the Missouri river and finally reached our destination — Ottumwa, Iowa, Friday, Sept. 29, and began the meeting that night. Here the brethren have given us a splendid little furnished home to ourselves, and we are well fixed for the meeting. We notice much difference in the ways, customs, etc. in the North and our Southland, however, underneath the outward appearance we find the same heart filled with brotherly love.

We are having nice crowds and good attention, and up to date (Oct. 9) twenty-three have confessed their faults. We are to be here the rest of this week, and then on to Wheatfield and Harrodsburg, Ind., and then turn toward the setting of the sun, through Illinois, Mo., Kans., Okla., and to Texas.

Brethren King, Phillips and myself cannot get to all the states and do all the preaching. Will some more of you loyal preachers make the sacrifice of time and means and go out and try to save lost souls? In all this state (and others) there is not an active loyal gospel preacher.

We are faint, yet pursuing.

Yours in His service,

Homer A. Gay.

CARNAL HABITS

1. Habit implies settled disposition or tendency in life's pursuit. This being true should we not beware of continued worthless use of habit-forming substance to gratify the flesh? For man is a creature of habit either for weal or for woe. He may in life's pursuit of happiness acquire uplifting, ennobling habits by restricted choice, or menial, ignoble habits by unrestricted choice. Whatever course he elects to pursue in life, having thus continued, it's no small task to change, even to break away from a slavish ignoble practice.

2. The fleshly craving of habit-forming plant, drug or fluid; they not being conducive to health, wealth or vigor, anon becomes a vice and an idol. So, sinful against self, fellowman and the Holy Spirit's teaching; "Little children keep yourselves from idols." But we see that; "Covetousness is Idolatry" The slave to this weed then, must be an Idolater. He may run out of food but seldom out of it, if so, he'll replenish it most invariably first of all. (1 Jn. 5:21. Col. 3:5.)

3. "The tobacco weed was introduced into Europe in 1558 and through the influence of Sir Walter Raleigh, smoking it became fashionable in England in 1568." This shows the popular habitual use of it to be a fancy of the world. So, whoever acquires the habit violates divine law; "be not conformed to this world." Those who conform thereto can't be content; "with food and raiment" without it. Neither do they put on the Lord Jesus, but provide for the lusts of the flesh perfecting no holiness in the fear of God. (Rom. 12:2. 13:14. 1 Tim. 6:8. 2 Cor. 7:1.)

4. But again; They're in darkness, serving a fleshly, filthy, pleasure seldom done for its medicinal value. It's misleading in its effects, un-Christian and a blot on character. It's a wanton, uncouth fetter upon mankind whom God made upright, but he has sought out many inventions. The offence, I'm sure, justifies the allegation that it's a travesty on justice to perpetrate upon mankind such an invention; then presume that Jesus who was without sin in this world will look upon it with the least degree of tolerance. Such slaves of the flesh can have no hope of being like our Lord when He comes. For those who have this hope in him; "purifieth himself, even as He is pure. (Tit. 3:3. 1 Jn. 3:3)

5. Common prudence admonishes our better judgment not to engross ourselves in such an inconvenient, discourteous, depreciative, loathsome and selfish habit, if we wish to get the most superlative joy out of life in serving God and our fellowman.

6. Truly no one belongs to Jesus except those; "who have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." Then, it's essential that we clean up; "putting off the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts" if we wish to make our calling and election sure, even as sure as we can. (Gal. 5:24. Eph. 4:22.)

—B. M. Massengale,
1515 E. Belnap St.

A CONTRAST

A Church of Christ employs a preacher to assist in meetings and otherwise. He preaches the truth as far as he goes, but the church becomes filled with strife, envy and division. Many of the brethren take up the tobacco habit, desire for riches, politics, card parties, and some become easily angered, fighting their horses and cows, and even cursing. The women bobbed their hair, painted their faces, spent a good part of their time reading trashy novels, attended the picture shows, bathing (mixed) pools, appearing before men in immodest bathing suits, as well as other questionable pleasures. This church tolerated in the fellowship adultery, and appointed elders (so-called) who did not have the qualifications. Many wonder why such things can thrive with such a good preacher.

Another church employs a preacher to assist them in the work, as mentioned above, but the evils mentioned will not thrive there. If they get in they cannot remain. Instead, love, peace, long-suffering, meakness and other good fruits abound. The women adorn themselves in modest apparel, and are chaste, keepers at home. The men are just, sober and temperate. Do you wonder at this?

Can you tell why this contrast, and do you wish to know why this is? If so, here it is: The first has a preacher who will compromise with the Devil, hence he allows the Devil's works to thrive in that church. Possibly the teachers are the same. While the latter have teachers and a preacher who will not wink at sin, nor compromise with the Devil. They will not allow his works to thrive there.

What we need then is a preacher who will not allow these things of evil to remain unnoticed and uncondemned, and teachers who will fight against sin of every description. If these evil fruits abound in your congregation, you need to have a house cleaning, and it would be well to begin with the preachers and teachers. "Keep thyself pure."
—I. G. Hayes.

PASSED ON

Mrs. Eady Tuttle was born June 23, 1856, and was married to J. M. Tuttle July 16, 1873. To this union were born nine children, eight girls and one boy, all of whom are living except one girl who passed on about twenty years ago.

Sister Tuttle died May 17, 1933. She obeyed the Gospel of Christ in 1886 in Coryell Co., Texas, remaining faithful until death. She always believed that God meant what He said and said what He meant. We believe that such faith will meet the approval of God at the Roll Call of Eternity. The last scripture she quoted was Ps. 22:1. The writer tried to speak words of warning to all present.
—J. W. Trembill.

Note: I am very sorry that the above was not published sooner, but by some means it had been overlooked. Please pardon the delay. —H. L. K.

Let Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn., handle your printing needs.

HONOR ROLL

The following persons have our thanks and appreciation for their hearty co-operation in securing subscriptions for the O. P. A.:

J. D. Phillips—8; D. F. Nichols—5; A. A. Patterson—4; J. Tom Williams—3; Mrs. Donie Trott—3; R. A. Fiscus—2; C. M. Jarrett—2; Homer A. Gay—2; W. F. Cogburn—1; Thomas Shaw—1; A. J. Trail—1; J. L. Musgrave—1; O. C. Mathews—1; D. A. Jones—1; Grace Chisholm—1; Roy Kennedy—1; C. H. James—1; J. L. Reynolds—1; J. C. Hamilton—1; Chas. Rowdon—1; J. A. Mead—1; C. H. Lee—2.

DONATIONS TO O. P. A. FUND

Church at Hughson, Calif., by W. E. Murry	\$5.00
Ira B. Kile	1.25
J. V. Speights	1.00
H. O. Freeman	1.00
Carlos B. Smith	1.00
Chas. Rowdon	1.00
A. A. Patterson	1.00
R. A. Fiscus	1.00
J. L. Reynolds	1.00
W. F. Cogburn	.50
N. J. Cogburn	.50

Many thanks, brethren, for the increased interest you are showing in the welfare of the paper. You have "gone over the top" this time, making it possible for us to balance our books with the printers. Let us keep the good work going. Brethren Phillips, Gay, Tom E. Smith and O. C. Mathews, and possibly others have promised to send in a dollar each month with the name of someone they think would appreciate the paper. How many more will do likewise? H. L. K.

PROTRACTED MEETING

We invite folks to the protracted meeting to hear the gospel by which God saves them. Then at the close of it we cease inviting them when many untaught members cease attendance and perish for want of special teaching; against such as; being easy offended, non-attendance and vile fleshly habits. There's no growth in grace without self-control by the word of God.

This requires Vigilance: "as ye have therefore received Christ Jesus The Lord, so walk ye in Him. Rooted and built up in him and established in the faith." (Col. 2:6, 7.) Now if these first duties are neglected; "God is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish." So He'll spare us for a time and peradventure will give another opportunity to be thus taught and yet make good. But after another elapse of wasted time, the carnal mind having sway, "it bears thorns and briers" obviating the "love to retain God in the knowledge" when He "gives them over to reprobacy of mind." "All who will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." So it behooves us to be faithful.

B. M. Massengale,
1515 E. Belnap St.

FALSE CONFIDENCE OF FALSE CHURCHES

False Confidence of False Churches That They Are Christ's Bride Makes Them Arrogant.

The false confidence of the false church found in Episcopacy and Papacy is thus expressed:

"For she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall in no wise see mourning" (Rev. 18:7).

Though recognizing that the relationship between her and the Lord, her spouse (as she claims), is not all that it should be, yet there is with her the confidence that she is not cast off of him as a widow, nor, indeed, can be, lest the Lord be scandalized. The Lord, with meekness, has endured so long that she presumes he is afraid, for his name's sake, to interfere with her; therefore she expects to continue as a queen and see no mourning. But this infernal arrogance is one of her chief offenses, and constitutes one of the measures by which punishment is meted out to her.—Philip Y. Pendleton.

WHY CALL SPRINKLING BAPTISM?

How do we know that sprinkling is not baptism? We know it from the meaning of the word used. What is the word? **Baptisma**. What does this word mean? **Immersion, submersion**. (Thayer, p. 94.)

Hence the LEXIOGRAPHER of the New Standard Dictionary, published by Funk & Wagnall, New York, N. Y., says: "The word baptize came into the English from the Old French baptiser, from the late Latin baptizo, and ultimately from the Greek baptizo, from baptō, dip. Therefore, the idea of sprinkling is not to be associated with it." (See The Literary Digest for March 7, 1925.)

Why say, "He took the cup (meaning the liquid)," Matt. 26:27, (J. N. Cowan)? How do we know that Matthew did not mean a liquid when he said "cup"? We know it from the word he used. What is the word? **Poterion**. What does this word mean? "A cup, a drinking vessel." (Thayer, pp. 533, 510.) And the LEXICOGRAPHER of the New Standard Dictionary, by Funk & Wagnall, says the same. (See the Phillips booklet on the cup, p. 6). H. C. H.

THANKS

I wish to thank all who have written me or the children so many nice letters of condolence in our sad hour. We have appreciated every one of them, but I just cannot find time to write you a personal letter in reply. They have been worth much to us, and I wish that I had space to give them in the paper, as they contain so much good advice to the children, but I doubt if this whole issue would contain them. We are doing much better than we thought possible. —H. L. K.

Won't you remember to speak a good word for the O. P. A. to your friends—urge them to support the paper by sending in their subscription today.

Ye num'rous sects
which all declare
"Lo: Christ is here,
Lo Christ is there."
Your stronger proofs
divinely give
And show me where
the Christians live.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

"Where is Thy Church,
O, Savior, where?"
and then I heard:
I heard the cry,
"Here is My Church
where men still dare
To take Me at My word."

"Thus saith the Lord, 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.' (Jer. 6:16) 'And they that be of Thee shall build the old waste places: thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations; and thou shalt be called, The Repairer of the Breach, The Restorer of Paths to Dwell in' (Isa. 58:12).

Vol. 7

LEBANON, MISSOURI, DECEMBER 1, 1933.

No. 1

"WHAT IS MAN?"—Heb. 2:6.

Here is a pamphlet purporting to prove that man is all soul. So publishes to the world Elder J. C. Cook of the William Miller school of materialists. But God's inspired apostle gives us to understand that the living man consists of "spirit, and soul, and body." (I Thes. 5:23.) Hence, I am bound to take the ground that this Adventist is wrong. He asks, "What, in the language of the Bible, constitutes the 'living soul'?" He answers, "The man." Again he asks, "Is not the soul distinct from the man as the jewel from the casket? And does it not reside in the body as a bird in a cage?" He answers, "No; for the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." "This," he says, "is God's definition." I must then say that God has never given us a definition of the soul, much less such a one as defines man to be the soul, and the soul to be the man. God says, "Man became a living soul." If one says, "Mary became my wife," does this not mean that Mary existed before she became a wife? And this intimates that Mary and wife are not convertible terms, as a definition must be. One is not the meaning of the other, as a term must be to be a definition. Man and living soul are not convertible terms. But such is the license which this class of biblical expositors assumes to itself, a license which makes havoc of any literary work. We are then bound from every just consideration to conclude that man existed before he became possessed of a living soul, or before God breathed into his nostrils the "breath of lives." And as much capital is sought to be made out of the phrase "breath of lives," I shall examine it briefly.

- This phrase occurs but four times in the Bible. They are Gen. 2:7; 6:17; 7:15 and 22. In the Hebrew of the Bible we find it uniformly *ruach chaiyim*. It has the plural form — "breath of lives," but is translated "breath of life." In Gen. 6:17; 7:15 and 22 we find this phrase applied to brutes that died in the deluge. And in Gen. 1:20 and 30 we find the Hebrew *nepash*, a word generally and correctly translated "soul," descriptive of fish, birds, and reptiles. And in this respect it exactly resembles its Greek representative *psuchee*, and its Latin converse *anima*. It often denotes any creature that lives by breathing. It is easily shown that such "living soul" is mortal. We can give many instances in which *nepesh* is

translated "soul," "blood," or the animal body, dead or alive.

But all this counts nothing for those who contend that man is but an animal with a superior organization, but in no way constituted different from the brute. The language thus far considered is not a definition of man, nor is it a definition of soul or body or spirit.

Man has a spirit. The word soul is, by many, supposed to be synonymous with the word spirit.

In fact, this is assumed by all materialists of every school, ancient or modern. And without this they can do nothing. They build upon a false assumption. And to have all the premises before us, we must have a short dissertation upon the word spirit. It is also stated in the living oracles that God made man in his own image and likeness. God is spirit, and as man was made in the image of God, he must have a spirit. And that man has a spirit is distinctly and frequently averred in the living oracles. The spirit in man is wholly intellectual; "Who knoweth the things of a man but the spirit of man that is in him." And who knoweth the things of God but the spirit of God? (I Cor. 2:11). Here the spirit of man and the spirit of God are introduced as intellectual spirits, each knowing, and alone knowing, the things of each person to whom he belongs. This is the reason why mortality or death or destruction is never once alleged of a spirit—any spirit, good or bad. Spirits belong not to the precincts of mortality. No expression could be any more incongruous than that a spirit died or can die. Indeed, it is said that "They cannot die," in saying that angels can not die. The reason that angels can not die, is not because they are angels, or messengers, for this is an official name; but because they are spirits.

In the N. T. we find *pneuma*, spirit, almost four hundred times. *Psuchee*, as already noted, we find one hundred and five times. *Pneuma* is never translated soul, nor is *psuchee* translated spirit, in any version of the N. T. known to me. This fact should speak volumes to those who confound the animal soul with the human spirit, and who thence infer the mortality of the whole man.

Pneuma, found three hundred and ninety-three times in the apostolic writings, is applied to the spirit of God two hundred and eighty-eight times; to evil spirits about thirty times; to human spirit forty times; and figuratively to indicate temper or disposition about seventeen times.

Here is another important fact—When anyone in dying gives up, or commends himself to the Lord, or to the Father, it is: "He gave up the ghost," or "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," or "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit." *Psuchee*, or soul, is never used, but always *pneuma*, spirit. This shows the marked difference between soul, as generally applied, and spirit. The spirit lives at the dissolution of man. The body returns to the dust with its animal life, or soul; "the spirit returns to God, who gave it." And we should—as Paul says the Word of God does, "divide asunder" or separate between the "soul and spirit," as well as "between the joints and marrow" of the spine. On this point, as on every vital one, the word of God is truly "sharper than any two-edged sword" when thus separating matters so much alike in so many particulars. And this discriminating word of God it was that taught Paul to pray that God would preserve your "whole spirit, soul, and body blameless to the coming of the Lord." What God hath separated, let not man confound. Inspiration has it, "spirit, soul, and body," not spirit, or soul, and body. There is a clear and well defined difference among these three, in the strict interpretation of them.

But inasmuch as soul and body are equally expressive of one ideal, so far as mere life is concerned, it has come to pass that soul is sometimes used to comprehend all that is set forth under the term spirit, though they are never in the original used as convertible terms. And when the Savior spoke in the Jewish idiom, saying, "Fear not them that can kill the body, but who cannot kill the soul," it is evident that in this use soul cannot mean the "animal life," for man can kill that. And soul is used to set forth that which is strictly indicated by spirit, that which man cannot kill.

(Selected from A. Campbell's writings.)

UNSCRIPTURAL EXPRESSIONS.

Brethren, Sisters, and Dear Friends, Greeting:

I am a young man, both in years and in the faith. A novice, so to speak. Coming as I did from the ranks of sectarianism, having obeyed the Gospel, was made a member of the church of Jesus Christ, and naturally, as is the case with so many others, I brought quite a load of sectarianism with me in the form of unscriptural expressions.

Lately I have been preaching some, and in order to speak as the oracles of God, (I Peter 4:11) I have found it necessary to clean up my speech and rid it of several obnoxious expressions. And after reading quite extensively the writings of several of the preaching brethren, I personally feel that if they will take this in the spirit of Christianity, and in the spirit in which I offer it, some at least may profit by the result of my findings.

"Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby. (Heb. 11:6)."

In (Col. 4:6) we read: "Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man."

Again (Titus 2:8) "Sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you."

There is no doubt in my mind, that when the brethren hear such expressions as the following, they feel that our Savior and his doctrine is being antagonized;

1. Get religion, 2. Get saved, 3. Get the Holy Ghost, 4. Have a Christian experience, 5. Get baptized with the Holy Ghost and fire, 6 Pray through, etc and so on.

Now brethren let us not catechise and rebuke the other party too severely. Remember, they have not placed themselves on the platform we stand on, e. g. (speaking where the Bible speaks and being silent where it is silent.) Let us bring the argument home.

I shall endeavor to state a few of the unscriptural expressions I have heard and read, together with what might be a reasonable correction.

1. The Christian's Creed. — Not "Creed," but "Rule," 2 Cor. 10:13—Gal. 6:16—Phil. 3:16.

2. Christian Baptism. — We do not baptize Christians, but sinners, Acts 2:38 — Rom. 6:3, 4-17.

3. Going to Church. — This is not possible. Christians, upon obedience to the Gospel were added to the Church, Acts 2:47. Being in the Church, we could hardly go to the church. We attend the meeting by assembling with the saints. Heb. 10:25, also Acts 20:7.

4. John the Baptist. — John the son of "Zacharias" was a "baptizer" or "immerser," and while this is what is meant by the word "baptist," I am afraid the translators who rendered the word thus, did not have this strictly in view. At least you will all agree that much has been made of this word. "John the Baptist" we hear so much about today was not the son of "Zacharias," but was the son of "Calvin" who lived about 1500 years later. It might go a long way toward teaching the opposition the true mission of this Bible character if we would more properly say "John the baptizer," or "immerser."

5. Sunday. — "The First day of the week," Acts 20:7 is "Lord's Day." Rev. 1:10.

Let us remember that our conversation is in Heaven, Phil. 3:20. These and many others. With love for the brethren.

Roy Koonrod, Terre Haute, Ind.

MASS AND CHRISTMAS

By Ben F. Battenfield

"Christmas is coming!" Everybody (commonly speaking) knows what Christmas means; and we may add that each after his own fancy prepares to celebrate it. Various are the impulses which move to various sorts of Christmas keeping. Perhaps the majority of Americans look on Christmas and the "Yule-tide" as a time for the presentation and reception of gifts of questionable

intrinsic value, and a time of feasting and pleasure. A decreasing minority of men and flappers (increasing) look forward to this occasion as the proper annual opportunity for a drunken spree, and make preparation for it as they would for a journey. Certain religionists exercise themselves into special feelings of sanctimony, or count it a grave sin not to do so.

Our concern in this holiday is motivated and guided by the relation it sustains to the maturing message of prophecy. And from this view-point, it appears to us well that we should set down here a discussion of the subject for the consideration of all who believe the sacred prophets and their Master, Christ.

Heathen and Pagan Festival

Even a superficial examination into the origin of the Christmas festival reveals the fact that it is undoubtedly Pagan and Heathen. We do well to start our examination with the lexical meaning of the word "mass." Webster gives the derivation from the Latin "Mittere," meaning "to send," "to dismiss." We quote further, "In the ancient churches, the public services at which the catechumens were permitted to be present were called *missi catechumenorum*, because at the close of them proclamation was made thus: *Ite, missi est, sc. ecclesia*. Then followed the communion service, which was called *missi fidelium*, and which, under the name of *missi*, or the *mass*, still constitutes the principal part of public worship in the Roman Catholic churches. Murdock. The communion service, or the consecration and oblation of the host, in the Roman Catholic churches."

From this definition of mass, it is an easy step to the understanding of the compound term, "Christ-mass," or Christmas. It is the mass celebrated in memory of the supposed birthday of Christ, instituted and perpetuated by the Roman Catholic church, and borrowed from them by careless Protestants.

Origin of Christmas

A quotation here from Newman's Church History is in order. Under the topic, **Multiplication of Ecclesiastical Festivals**, after discussing the observance of Easter and Pentecost, he gives a pointed paragraph concerning the origin of Christmas. He says:

"The feast of Epiphany probably originated in the second century, and was designed as a commemoration of the baptism of Christ, when he was manifested to the world as the Son of God. It was celebrated on January 6. At a very early date the idea of the nativity was added to that of baptism, both being commemorated on this day. It was not until about the middle of the fourth century that the birthday and the baptismal day were separated, the former being on December 25, the date of the Roman *Brumalia* at the close of the *Saturnalia* (Dec. 17-24), and of the Scandinavian Yule. This date follows immediately the winter solstice, and there was brought to be a peculiar appropriateness in identifying the birthday of the Son of Righteousness with that of the

physical sun" (Newman, *A Manual of Church History*, Vol. 1, p. 299).

Thus it is evident that no attempt is made to find a Biblical basis for the Christmas festival. It is a Roman Catholic invention, without Scriptural warrant and without reason. Therefore, in breaking away from the institutions of Babylon, Christians and Christian communities should stop observing Christmas. It is time to break Jezebel's pottery (Rev. 2:18-23). And this is a piece that deserves a sledge-hammer blow. Suffer no longer "that woman Jezebel" to call "herself a prophetess and to teach and seduce" the children to "commit fornication and to eat things sacrificed to idols!" Give no Christmas presents! Make no Christmas visits! Have no Christmas school holidays! Smash the idol! Forget Santa Claus. Kris Krinkle, St. Nick, and the whole business!

WHAT WE NEED

We need guidance. (Acts 20:28-35). Would that all churches had pastors of which these verses are descriptive.—Adventist Exchange.

Reply: Yes, this would be one grand step toward the New Testament order of things. But the Second Adventist Christian Church, and the Christian Church, and lately many "churches of Christ" have put in the "one-man Pastor," who is no more like the "pastors" of vs. 28-35 here, than the Pope of Rome is like Peter. They are not even trying to get such pastors as the churches had under apostolic guidance. On the contrary, they are fulfilling the apostolic prediction of apostasy, that "the time will come when they will not endure the healthful teaching; but having itching ears, they will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts; and they will turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables." (2 Tim. 4:3.) And as Peter says, "they will make merchandise of you." (2 Pet. 2:3.) And when they get a job as "the Pastor," they will stay, and give the people what they want—as long as the pay comes in. We surely live in the "perilous times" predicted by the apostle, perilous, indeed, to the souls of men. It is a "Money-mad religion," of "the Pastor" type that has led the flock into "lascivious doings," the "way of Balaam," and "their damnation slumbereth not." The "elders" in a church, if they pretend to have them at all, are but dummies to be looked at. "The Pastor," with a few women sometimes, "take charge," and my! how things do move—"to the world, the flesh and the devil." The so-called churches of Christ have in most cases tired of serving the Lord, and, with "the Pastor" perched in power, have gone into sectism, apeing the "sister denominations,"—going into Babylon. The people clamor for what they want, and the preacher, "our Pastor," clamors for their money. He gets the money, generally; and they get what they want, generally: The Lord is left out of the bargain. Awake, awake!

H. C. Harper.

Let Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn., take care of your printing needs.

OLD PATHS ADVOCATE

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT LEBANON, MO.

Entered as second-class matter March 24, 1932, at the post-office at Lebanon, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editors

H. C. Harper.....Sneads, Fla.
J. D. Phillips.....Montebello, Calif.
Homer L. King.....Lebanon, Mo.
Homer A. Gay.....Eola, Texas

Publisher

Homer L. King,.....Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.
H. E. Robertson, Assistant.....Phillipsburg, Mo.

Subscription Rates

Single Subscription one year.....\$1.00
Single Subscription six years.....\$5.00

Printed by Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

"OH, CONSISTENCY! THOU ART A JEWEL!"

"The word baptize, properly translated, is 'immerse.' A strict unbiased translation of this passage (Matt. 28:19) would read, 'immersing them into the name of the Father, etc.' Indeed, the American Bible Union, in their version, actually translate the Greek word baptizo into its English equivalent immerse (Roy Mason, Th.D., Baptist, in "After Conversion—What?" p. 34.

Yes, indeed, they did render baptizo "immerse," and baptisma "immersion." And to be consistent, they rendered baptistees "immerser." Hence, Matt. 3:1 was rendered: "In those days came John the immerser." This is right. For a translation of this passage to be correct it must read thus.

Hence, if this Baptist endorses this translation, he must either re-name his church and call it the **Immerser Church**, or just be honest and tell the actual truth and admit that his little human society, which split off from the Old School Baptists, another (vanishing) human society, in 1832, has a **human name** as well as a human origin.

In fact, everything that is peculiar to Baptists is human, pure and simple.

To show that the intelligent Baptists know that their society does not have a Scriptural name, I appeal to the fact that when their Bible Union version began to circulate among the rank and file and they looked in it for the word "Baptist" and failed to find it, but found "immerser" instead; they raised such a pitiful cry about it that the Bible Union managers got busy and put out a new edition in which "immerser" was changed to "Baptist." By catering to the Hottentots, they went back on their scholarship and consistency. And it does not become Mr. Mason to appeal to this version's correct rendition of baptizo while at the same time rejecting "immerser" as the rendition of baptisee. —J. D. Phillips.

We appreciate the support we are receiving for the O. P. A. It is encouraging to us. Any thing that is done for the good of the cause is always appreciated.

EXODUS FROM CHRISTIAN CHURCH

I give below a letter I received from a preacher I met while living in Deming, New Mexico. I wish to say that I know him personally and have heard him preach. He is a very able man in the Scriptures, and I hope that brethren will encourage him in his coming out from that body that has drifted so far from the Bible way of worshipping God, in calling him for your meetings and otherwise as you can use him.

Here is our hand Bro. Swindle, and may God help you to really come all the way back to "Jerusalem," and plant your feet solidly upon the rock of Truth. Here is hoping that you will become a power among us in staying the tide of departures from the Bible alone.

—Homer L. King.

Hollywood, Calif., Nov. 1, 1933.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Dear Brother:—Your good letter received, and first of all, as one who understands by experience just what it means, I desire to express and extend my deepest heart-felt sympathy to you in the departure of your good wife.

I take it for granted that Bro. Ruebush forwarded my letter to you, and if so, you know the ends to which some of my brethren are going. We had sectarian preachers in our pulpit two Lord's days in succession at the eleven o'clock services. A month later they had one of their own men, who receives people on their sprinkling or pouring, two Sunday evenings in succession.

C. H. Morrison, editor of the Christian Century, said in an address at the national convention in St. Louis, a few years ago, that to refuse to accept people on their sprinkling and pouring is contrary to the spirit and genius of "our plea" for the union of all of God's people upon the Bible and the Bible alone. And yet, when he came here sometime ago practically all the christain (?) preachers in Southern California not only announced his forth-coming appointment, but urged all who possibly could to hear him. And when he did come they patted him on the back, banqueted him and lauded him to the skies.

What has become of our old-time John Sweeney and Benjamin Franklin's fiery pleading for the Bible and the Bible alone and their great sermons upon the great scheme of human redemption? Now we never get sermons of this kind. By their preaching one cannot tell a christian (so-called) preacher from a sectarian preacher to save his soul from eternal destruction.

While I had noticed and said as much myself, it hurt me to learn that you are compelled to say that many of the churches of Christ are of late adopting practically everything but instrumental music. I was so in hopes they would all stay on the track and be ready for the tremendous exodus of many tens of thousands who are now, and in the near future will be, compelled to forsake the side-stepping brotherhood.

The Bible is the only broad book in the world, and it is as broad as the human race and as deep

as the human need. They accuse me of knowing the Bible by heart, while I cannot repeat all the New Testament, I can quote much of it. And right there I propose to stay and not go beyond that which is written for anything.

I told the Workmen Street church, this city, thirty years ago to not add another thing, for if they did, half the membership would bolt; that half of the membership were already tolerating things that were forbidden and repulsive to them because unscriptural. I told them that if they did not dispense with many things they already had and cease to introduce other unscriptural things, it would be only a question of time till they would force the birth of a "non-progressive" (as they called it) church right along by the side of every church in Southern California. It has proven true almost to the letter. You need not be afraid of my introducing a single unscriptural thing, for I am surfeited with such things.

La Fayette Swindle,
5800 Carlton Way,
Hollywood, California.

P. S. I like the Old Paths Advocate. —L. S.

Honor Roll.

The following persons have our thanks and appreciation for their hearty co-operation in securing subscribers for the O. P. A.:

Homer A. Gay—21; Homer L. King—8; J. D. Phillips—3; O. C. Mathews—3; J. V. Speights—2; Omas Campbell—2; L. G. Park—1; Mary Stirman—1; T. W. Hogan—1; Tom E. Smith—1; Tennie Williams—1; T. F. Thomasson—1; Otis F. Young—1; E. H. Cavin—1; Donie Trott—1; C. W. Beavers—1; I. G. Hayes—1; Lowell Smith—1; E. F. Morgan—1.

We certainly appreciate the encouraging way brethren are sending in subscriptions. This shows what can be done when we put forth an effort. Friends of the paper will be delighted to learn that we are now out of debt and a balance of several dollars on hand. If all will just continue to work we shall soon be able to make some improvements in the paper. Let the good work continue!

—H. L. K.

SISTER GRIFFITH

Theo E., wife of R. B. Griffith and daughter of Archie and wife, Amelia Anderson, after an illness of many days, died in their home, in Santa Anna, Texas, June 21, 1933, being past seventy-five years of age.

She was married to R. B. Griffith in 1874, and to this union were born four sons and two daughters. One of the sons having preceded her in death, being a victim of the cyclone of 1927 in that section.

Sister Griffith obeyed the gospel in 1847, and continued faithful unto death, being very energetic and of unrelenting determination.

She leaves to mourn her passing, her husband, two daughters, three sons, and a host of other relatives and friends, who continue to speak words of praise.

The writer was called to speak words of comfort to the heart-broken on this sad occasion. The services were conducted in the Griffith home, after which the body was taken to the Glen Cove Cemetery to await the resurrection morn. We miss her, but we do not mourn as those who have no hope. "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth. Yea, saith the spirit that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them."

—J. Howard Stewart.

FROM THE FIELD

L. G. Park, Council Hill, Okla., Nov. 10, 1933.—The congregation here is in good condition. We recently baptized a man and his wife.

Roy Koonrod, 2127 Sycamore St., Terre Haute, Ind., Sept. 25, 1933.—Lately I have been working to get some of the "digressives" to give up their unscriptural practices, and succeeded in getting two to come out from among them. I am for the O. P. A. force in any way that I can assist in the work.

J. C. Tate, 501-A. N. Travis St., Wichita Falls, Texas, Nov. 5, 1933.—The church here is doing well now. We have several new members and two young preachers to assist in the work. They are Brethren Reed Chappell, of Henrietta, and Clovis Cook, of this city. Both are doing much good for the cause, and we have also a strong teacher who came over from the S. S. folks recently.

M. F. Pruett, Wheatfield, Ind., Nov. 10, 1933.—Bro. Homer A. Gay closed a short meeting here October 22, with good results. We were much strengthened by the wonderful sermons delivered. We were much pleased by his good Christian family. We seldom have an opportunity to hear a loyal preacher, and the loyal churches are scarce in this section. Bro. J. D. Phillips once visited us, he, too, is a power in the gospel. Such men are always welcome here. Best wishes to Bro. Gay in his work, and to the O. P. A. we did not know of its existence until Bro. Gay came our way. It should be in every home. I would like to be counted as a faithful gospel preacher, but I am unable to go from place to place, due to my poor health. I have been preaching for over twenty years.

J. D. Phillips, Van Court, Texas, Oct. 30.—I preached yesterday at San Angelo, Texas. The church there is at peace, and enjoying a steady growth. They have recently purchased a good lot in a good section of the city, and are now on a deal with the "Church of God" for a building, which they intend to move to their lot. I anticipate for them a continual growth. "Blessed is that man who knows the will of God, and does it" (Bishop Newton).

B. F. Black, 905 Clinton Ave., Ottumwa, Iowa, Nov. 5, 1933.—Bro. Homer A. Gay closed a series of meetings here October 15, embracing three Lord's days. The church has been transformed as a result, thirty-one having confessed their faults, while two were withdrawn from. The church has taken on new life as a result of complying with God's word. A number of the young men who had been out of duty have again been participating in the teaching service. One has been baptized since the meeting and others are expected. Bro. Gay is kind and forceful in his manner of presentation, and is satisfied with that which is written. Brethren, let us encourage such men by using only those, who are loyal both in and out of the pulpit, in our meetings, and thus avoid a common cause of division. Why not call these and no others for our meetings?

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla., Nov. 10, 1933.—Bro. G. B. Harrell and Bro. Goldman, of Garland City, Ark., visited us the third Lord's day in October, continuing a few nights. We are well acquainted with Bro. Harrell, but it was our first to meet Bro. Goldman. We were favorably impressed with him as a Christian and as a preacher. One was baptized during their meetings, and three more the following Lord's day by Bro. W. E. Ray. Two of those baptized were from the Baptists.

W. F. Cates, Munday, Texas, Nov. 13, 1933.—I believe we have a loyal congregation here, as we have only that in our work and worship, which is as old as the New Testament. I am glad to report that the church here is growing both in numbers and knowledge. Since Bro. Phillips was with us in a meeting, we have gained one family of five from the S. S. brethren, and one young man has been baptized, who learned the truth under the preaching of Bro. Phillips. I must say that I enjoy reading the O. P. A. I am glad we still have men who have put on the whole armor of God, and who are willing to suffer with Christ.

John T. Chambers, Harrodsburg, Ind., Nov. 14, 1933.—The Church of Christ, at Harrodsburg, Ind., closed a series of meetings November 5, with Bro. Homer A. Gay doing the preaching. The results were nine baptized and four placing their membership with us, making thirteen additions. Bro. Gay is a sound reasoner, and he endeavors to magnify the Lord in all his sermons. Thus we feel that his work will stand and his sacrifice will not be in vain. Our hearts were made sad by the sickness and death of Bro. Jesse Inman at the close of the meeting.

Clyde Penner, Vanzant, Mo., Oct. 12, 1933.—Brethren Homer A. Gay and H. E. Robertson closed a fine meeting here the ninth of September. Much good was accomplished in addition to the five baptized. A few days later I baptized another, and it seems that the church has taken on new life—brethren who had been neglecting their duty have been aroused to work in the Vineyard. May God help us to lead them in the way that will be

pleasing to the Lord. Since the meeting we have as many as twenty-three who meet to "break bread." May the Lord bless Brethren Gay and Robertson for their faithfulness in the work here. On with the good work.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Nov. 15, 1933.—I closed a series of meetings at Palestine, Ark., October 30, with two baptized, and it seemed that the brethren were aroused to do more for the Master. I went from here to Memphis, where I spent three days visiting the faithful few who meet for worship in Bro. A. H. Pinegar's home, having lost their house to the S. S. brethren. Although few in number, I enjoyed my stay with them very much, and learned to love them more. They have asked me to return next year for a series of meetings. I returned from here to Palestine to preach over Lord's day, and baptized four more and restored one. We left them rejoicing and much encouraged. Bro. Ryan Bennett drove me to his home in Jonesboro, Ark., where I preached three nights. I enjoyed the stay in his home very much. I reached home November 9, and found the children all well and attending school. Do you suppose that I came home to rest? No, I found the work on the paper waiting for me, and I had to launch right into preparing the copy for the December issue. And, too, I found an urgent call for me to return to the community where I conducted the mission meeting at McBride. I was with them last Lord's day, and expect to begin there for a week the 17th inst. We are expecting to baptize a number next Lord's day. The harvest is plentiful but the laborers are few. Who will go and work in the harvest? We were delighted to have that valiant soldier of the cross, "Red" Gay, and his good family with us two nights this week, as they returned to their home from the North. He gave us two splendid sermons, which were enjoyed by all.

J. Madison Wright, 2816 Osceola Ave., Columbus, Ohio, Nov. 7, 1933.—I offered to go to India, but I find now missionaries must get permission from England and authorities in India before going. To get this one must have some church or society that will agree to support him in India, so that he will not become a charge on the government. It will require about three months to settle this matter.

H. E. Robertson, Phillipsburg, Mo., Nov. 15.—I just closed a series of meetings at Vanzant, Mo., embracing two Lord's days, with seven baptized and others almost persuaded. Had good crowds and interest throughout. We now have a good congregation there of about thirty members, with excellent material for leaders who are satisfied to take God at His word in work and worship.

Lowell Smith, Lawton, W. Va., Nov. 13, 1933.—I preached over last Lord's day at the Lane school house, near the Lack Bridge, W. Va. Had fine crowds and fine singing. I expect to be at Elton

the 18th and 19th, inst. Bro. Hannah and I will investigate the Sunday School system of teaching at his home, and will also consider the testimonial meetings. He is in favor of these things; while I oppose them.

E. F. Morgan, New Castle, Texas, Nov. 13, 1933. —I have had to work hard this year at secular labor in order to live, and have been able to do but little in the service of the Master. I have been preaching once a month and have held one mission meeting, which resulted in four being baptized. Have also baptized five at my home congregation, California Creek, and four have been restored here. I expect to give more of my time next year to preaching. I rejoice to learn of the successful meeting Bro. King held in the Baptist stronghold. It is encouraging to see so many turn from the doctrines and commandments of men to divine authority.

Bro. Pursley, of Graham, Texas, dies: It will be sad news to many to learn of the passing of our beloved Brother Pursley, which occurred several months ago. I should have reported it sooner, but thought someone else would. He was a great and good man; we miss him so much. He was a brave and loyal soldier of the Cross to the end. The following expresses my estimate of him: "He fought a good fight, finished his course; kept the faith, henceforth there is laid up for him a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give him at that day."

CAKE RECIPE

(Selected by Mrs. Edith Phillips)

One cup of faith, one cup of zeal, two cups of charity, one-half gallon of human kindness, three good resolutions beaten into daily practice, one cup of forbearance; flavor with the essence of humility; and add the fruits of good works. Bake through a life-time in the oven of righteousness and cover with the frosting of purity.

BAPTISM.—The fact that it is "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28:19), "into Christ" (Gal. 3:27); "into Christ" (Gal. 3:27); "into His death" (Rom. 6:3); a burial in the likeness of His death (Rom. 6:4); a birth "of water and the Spirit" (John 3:5); "for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38); "the interrogation of a good conscience toward God" (1 Pet. 3:21); a thing that "saves" (1 Pet. 3:21); a thing that stands between a sinner and salvation (Mark 16:16)—these facts, and many others, show that baptism is essential to salvation from sin! — J. D. Phillips.

FAINT YET PURSUING.

We closed the meeting at Ottumwa, Iowa, Sunday, October 15, with a splendid crowd and good interest, and I think twenty-eight confessions.

Leaving there Monday, October 16, we headed north and east by way of Davenport and on to Chicago. While there we went down to the lake,

so the children could say they had washed their hands in Lake Michigan and in the Gulf of Mexico. We made it on to Wheatfield, Ind., and began there Wednesday night, October 18, and continued there until Lord's day night. We learned to love the good folks there, as well as at Ottumwa, and hated to leave so soon. We had a pleasant home there with Bro. and Sister M. F. Pruitt.

Leaving Wheatfield, Tuesday, October 24, we drove to Harrodsburg, Ind., and began the meeting there Wednesday night. It is a pleasure to work with the Harrodsburg church. While there I baptized three generations the same night; one an old man seventy-two years old. But with all the joy there is always sadness: Brother Jesse Inman, of Harrodsburg, was sick when we got there and died the next night after the meeting closed — Monday, November 6. Bro. Inman was a good man and a faithful and loyal christian. He was interested in the church and rejoiced in the success of the meeting. Our loss is Heaven's gain. Our deepest sympathies go out to the loved ones left behind.

Leaving Harrodsburg, Tuesday, November 7, we drove to Greenup, Ill., and began that night, continuing over Lord's day, the 12th, with growing interest, but no additions. Here we have a good loyal church.

Leaving there Monday morning, we drove to Lees Summit church, near Lebanon, Mo., where I preached last night and am to preach again tonight. (I am with Bro. King today).

We are to leave tomorrow for Tulsa, and Healdton, Okla., and Anson, Tex., and then on home. That will make us about seven thousand miles of driving this summer, over seven states. We have seen lots of new country and people.

Since the first of June I have preached 156 sermons and have had 141 baptisms and restorations.

We regret very much that we did not have the time to stay at all these places in the North longer, and that we did not get to visit the places in Kentucky, West Virginia and Pennsylvania, who wanted us. Maybe, we can some day.

Brethren, "the harvest is white, but the labourers are few."

Homer A. Gay.

SOUNDS LIKE ALEXANDER CAMPBELL!

(The following from Gilbert O. Nations, editor The Fellowship Forum, sounds so much like Alexander Campbell and those who stood with him in his advocacy of a complete restoration of the ancient gospel and church that I pass it on for the consideration of the brotherhood. I would to God that every disciple of Christ could catch the clear vision necessary to finish the restoration!)

J. D. P.)

Let others found and propagate churches with names to distinguish them as sects or divisions of the Church. We must occupy our time and strength and talents with the supreme task of restoring the Church as founded by authority of Jesus Christ and fashioned by the Apostles under

the guidance of the Holy Spirit. That is the greatest task now challenging mortal man. It is worthy of the truest faith, the bravest hearts, the clearest minds and the most sublime courage of our time. It is the one antidote for the ills in which our country and the whole world are now suffering. In the power of God it can be accomplished! Gilbert O. Nations, 882 L St., N. E., Washington, D. C.

WILL IT PAY TO ADVERTISE?

The business world says it will, and we notice all leading companies are well advertised, by so doing they keep their products before the people which increases their sales.

If the business world can prosper by advertising, why can't the Church of Christ prosper in number as well as gladden the hearts of many isolated brethren, by sending in a report and location of the place where we worship?

It was over a year after we moved to California before we knew there was a loyal church closer than two hundred and fifty miles of us.

By and by the O. P. A. came to our rescue; looking through the reports we were made to rejoice to learn of a loyal congregation at Hughson, only ninety miles away. Through said report we have been able to meet with true brethren who believe in worshipping God according to the pattern laid down in the Bible.

Later I sent in a report of our worshipping here in my house, and in a few days after said report was published, I heard from a Bro. in Richmond, only thirty minutes drive, stating he had failed to find a congregation there, and noticing my report in the O. P. A., he was wondering if we could all worship together, which we will, as we are just one big family here on earth, we are always glad to meet each other.

And I know of no better way to get acquainted with each other than to report through the O. P. A. As far as I know it is the only paper left in the brotherhood that opposes the Sunday School and other innovations, and it is living off the support of a faithful few. Should it fail we would have no way of locating each other.

In fear that it may fail through these trying times, let me suggest that each lover of the Truth renew his subscription and send in at least one new subscription. And if you haven't already sent in a report of your place of worship, do so. If you live where there is no church, let it be known; you may be living near brethren and don't know it.

Remember we are right in the hardest of the fight, and should we lay our arms down at this time and begin to retreat it will be hard to pick up courage enough to charge again.

Cotton picking is on, and the price of the paper is \$1.00 for twelve months, don't put it off any longer, send in today and be prepared for good reading this winter.

John L. Reynolds.

Let us have your subscription for the O. P. A.

WHAT THE DISCIPLES PREACH AND TEACH.

1. The sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith.

2. The New Testament contains the Will of God concerning our duty in this age of the world. "God has spoken to us by His Son."

3. That faith must have Jesus Christ for its object, and not opinions and speculations of men.

4. That there is a "thus saith the Lord" for every article of faith and item of practice.

5. That sinners now must be told to do just what they were told to do in the days of the Apostles to obtain pardon of sins.

6. They plead for a complete restoration of the ordinances as they were at the beginning.

7. They protest against sects and sectarianism.

8. They deplore the divisions in the body of Christ and plead for Christian unity.

9. They demand, as they give, the largest liberty of opinion, but ask for unity in matters of faith.

10. They plead for the complete restoration of the apostolic church, its doctrines, its simplicity, its practices, without change. —H. A. Tritt.

THEOLOGY AND MORALITY

Blot out the first eleven chapters of Romans. Begin with the twelfth. Begin with what some commentators would call the practical portion of the epistle. What then? The practical has become impracticable. You can not expunge the theology of Romans and maintain the morality. Neither can you make the end of the fifth chapter the starting point in the Epistle to the Galatians and ignore the previous chapters. Why? The first five chapters contain the root. The rest of the epistle is but the culture of the fruit.

The epistle to the Galatians is a passionate appeal and warning to people out of whose minds the primary truth was fading, and in whose lives moral enthusiasm was declining. They had begun their religious lives in the power of the gospel of grace and its great truths had energized them with healthy moral passion.

We are able to stand firm, strong, and irresistible only when our loins are "girt about with truth." If we forget the truth, the soul loses its vigor, sinks into moral laxity, becomes sluggish and limp.

It is true in the history of the visible church that, when the great doctrines of grace were dethroned, the passion for holiness was chilled.

The same thing is true today. When we exalt the fundamental truths of the gospel, moral enthusiasm will abound. When we stress the great doctrines of grace, under the power of the Holy Spirit, consciences will be quickened, the sense of sin will be revived, the chilled passions for holiness will be rekindled and rekindled. A theology revitalized under the Spirit's guidance will create a re-empowered and unimpaired morality. You may expect a great revival in your congregation when your minister preaches a series of expository sermons on the Book of Romans or the Epistle to the Galatians.—Evangelical Christian.