

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—Jesus.

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JANUARY 1, 1931

No. 1

NEWS FROM CHURCHES

Indiana:

Brazil.—Brother Joseph Miller writes that the Church, Harrison and Blaine Streets is still "continuing steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of the loaf, and in the prayers."

Cloverdale.—Brother Wayne Branneman writes that "Brother O. A. Timmons recently closed a meeting at East Unity Church of Christ with six baptisms. Several of us younger brethren are taking active part in the worship."

Spencer.—Bro. Raymond Miller writes from Brazil, saying: "Bro. Fiscus and about 30 other brethren and sisters at Spencer are worshipping as the Book directs."

Illinois.—Sister H. M. Edwards writes that the Church at Antioch, near Greenup, is doing nicely since the digressive element has pulled off and quit giving trouble and disturbing the peace of Zion.

Arkansas:

Gamaliel.—Sister J. L. Summers writes that "Bro. W. C. Rice, of Mountain Home recently closed here with considerable interest."

Henderson.—Bro. W. R. Maynard writes concerning the work at Maynard Bend: "We are doing very well here, but have had no meeting this year. We want Bro. Phillips to visit us again next year. He used to visit us often and give us some 'strong meat.'"

West Virginia:

Spring Hill.—Bro. Frank Cobbs writes: "I will tell you how the work is getting along at Mallory Chapel. We are getting along all right. One wayward brother and two sisters came back to the Church and were restored to the fellowship recently. Bro. I. G. Williams came out and preached for us two weeks in Sept. He baptized a man and his wife, who came to us from the Baptists. They seem to be very faithful."

South Charleston.—This is the place Bro. Phillips and Bro. Moore debated the S. S. question in 1928. Bro. Cobbs says: "I had a talk with Bro. Hazlett of the South Charleston Church, and he said they were getting along fine, and were determined to stay with the word of God. Bro. I. G. Williams is situated now so he can be with them every Lord's day. He told me he was going to look after the Church at So. Charleston. I have no fears of their going digressive as long as he is with them, for he is tried and true."

Texas:

Littlefield.—It is a well-known fact, after Bro. Duckworth moved the Apostolic Way to Littlefield, the Church there went digressive and put in the cups. But Bro. J. V. Speights, who worshipped with the faithful Church in Montebello,

Calif., for over a year, moved to Littlefield, and, finding the Church digressive, he and others, including our beloved Brother H. C. Welch, started a church near there, at a place called Enoch. He writes that the Church at Enoch is doing well.

California:

Montebello.—The Church meeting at 138 So. 4th Street is still faithfully and actively engaged in the work of restoring primitive Christianity. Two have been baptized recently. Bro. E. V. Holifield, who deserves much credit for the existence and zeal of the Montebello Church, is back with us, and is of untold value in the work.

South Gate.—This is the latest congregation we have established in the state. It meets in an auditorium at 3314 Post St. The work is progressing nicely, there being about 30 present each Lord's day. Several of the brethren take part in the teaching, etc. Bro. Phillips preaches for us on Sunday evenings when he is not away in meetings.

Los Angeles.—The Church meets each Lord's day at 3535 Siskiyou street. The membership is small, but faithful.

El Centro.—Bro. Musgrave has just closed a good meeting at this place. The Church is co-operating with the brethren in Los Angeles, Montebello and South Gate in mission work.

Temple City.—The brethren are still meeting in the lodge hall on Main Street, and are faithful. Bro. Kellems is doing some good teaching.

Taft.—Bro. Phillips has recently done some work here, and the work is going along nicely.

Texas:

Lometa.—I have put in a busy year, 1930, for the Lord, and have been rejoiced to see so many good reports of the brethren this year. Let us thank God, and take courage. There are a few who are willing to suffer and sacrifice for the way the Book reads, and our battle will soon be over. I want to do a greater work this year if I can, and am willing to go anywhere. Just get me word. And I want to so live and work that my labor will not be in vain. If you want a meeting, just write me at Lometa, Texas. And I want to do all I can to help keep the Truth going and the enemy on the run. Anyone that wants the Word of God taught without mixture and defended as "it is written," write me.

Jas. T. White.

Missouri:

Lebanon.—I closed a good meeting with the faithful brethren, near Atlanta, Tex., July 31, at the water. The meeting embraced two Lord's days and resulted in ten being baptized and one restored. This was my third consecutive meeting with these good people, and we had the best crowds and attention of any of the meetings held by me there. The house would not accommodate

all the people who came. I believe we have one of the best bands of loyal brethren at this place that it has ever been my privilege to assist in the work of the Lord. They seemed to be satisfied with the Bible way of carrying on the worship. May God bless them and ever keep them close to Him, is my prayer. I hope to be with them again in 1932.

My wife and three children were with me in the above meeting, and they, too, learned to love the folks there very much. We shall not soon forget the many kind deeds and hospitality manifested.

I am now at Suphur, Okla., in a series of meetings, which began the 9th. inst. Will report later.

Brethren, don't forget to speak a word for "The Truth" wherever you go. The brethren need the funds to keep the paper going regularly. I'm sending in four subs. with this.

Homer L. King.

COWAN AND KELLY REPORT

In the Apostolic Way of September 15, I find the following from Cowan and his moderator, Kelly, which again shows the truthfulness of the saying that "All digression is alike," that is, "If you can't meet the truth, just put out what will make a false impression about it. Kelly says:

Cowan-Harper Debate

While I had the pleasure of attending this debate held at Graham, Texas, which began August 21, and moderated for Bro. Cowan, and I am in perfect agreement with him that the "cup of the Lord" is not the drinking vessel used, but is the fruit of the vine, the communion of the Lord's blood, I shall not give a report of the debate, but conditions that have developed in the Church of Christ over this contention. I have been preaching 38 years and I never heard of any preacher of the church publicly contending for only one vessel to be used in waiting on an assembly, regardless of the number present, until less than 15 years ago. For several years I contended for one cup, but always said it was permissible to use two or more cups in waiting on an audience. Less than three years ago I was made to see that such a position was inconsistent and to contend for one cup only, in dividing the Lord's cup, the fruit of the vine, the ordinance of the Lord's blood among the members, I would have to make a law where the Lord had made none. Brother Cowan challenged Brother Harper to give the Scripture where the Lord told how to divide the wine among the members. He never attempted to do it. Why? It is not there. Yet H. C. Harper says he won't fellowship a congregation that uses more than one cup. I only know of a few others that have publicly taken this stand. Some of these brethren I have labored with personally and learned to love. Less than ten years ago one of these preachers said another division was needed in the church and that over the cup, and they were going to see that it come. My dear brethren everywhere, read Romans 16:17-20 and act on it and God will bruise Satan under your feet.

J. W. Kelly.

Cowan says:

Debate with H. C. Harper at Graham, Texas, two preachers settled on the cup question, and quite a few brethren gave up their contention for one container only. The debate was entirely satisfactory on our part in every way, and I believe it will go a long ways in bringing quiet and peace among brethren on that question.

The fact that Cowan's brethren refused to accept the challenge we made them to put Brother Harper up and furnished half the places to have the debate repeated at other places shows in itself the kind of victory of which Cowan boasts here; and when the public gets the debate he is now engaged in with Bro. Harper on the same propositions, they can get the truth of the matter "in black and white." And we want Cowan and his brethren to know that our challenge made at Graham, Texas, to have the debate repeated and furnished half the places, is still open to them and him. From the way things look, "quiet" has already possessed them, and just like all digressives—they "don't need it." Afraid of investigation. Afraid to open their eyes (Matt. 13:15), like the Jews were, for fear they might see the truth! Many preachers say, "I can't afford to dis fellowship these big churches." And many brethren change for other consideration than to get the truth—yes, whole churches sometimes. But the judgment is coming; then how will they stand?

Bro. Kelly says he is in perfect agreement with Bro. Cowan, that the "cup of the Lord" is not the drinking vessel used, but is the fruit of the vine."

So Bro. Kelly is in the same fix that Cowan is, for we are to "drink the cup of the Lord" (I Cor. 10:21 and 11:27). And as Bro. Harper pointed out, and let Thayer, the Standard Lexicon for N. T. Greek, and Bro. N. L. Clark answer. Thayer says—"drink the cup, that is, what is in the cup." Clark says, "How can one drink the cup? By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." Now if "the fruit of the vine" is the cup, let Kelly drink what it contains, or drink what is in "the fruit of the vine." Now get busy and tell us how you do this.

The truth is that "cup" here is the vessel out of which they drink; and they "drink the cup of the Lord" by drinking what it contains, and in no other way. You say, "Brother Cowan challenged Brother Harper to give the Scripture where the Lord told how to divide the wine among the members. He never attempted to do it. Why? It is not there."

Solomon says, "Buy the truth and sell it not." You have sold out, brother. It was fully shown that Jesus "took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it," and "they all drank out of it." (Matt. 26:27 and Mark 14:23.) And for the translation "out of" or "from" here, Bro. Harper gave a number of Bible translations and the scholarship of Harvard University, Chicago Un., Cornell University, Yale, and others. And he here called attention to the Living Oracles and other translations that render the Greek word "share" in English, instead of "divide," "Share it among you," "it", just one, the contents of one

(a) cup; and they did this by drinking the cup. How did they drink the cup? By drinking what it contains (Clark); by drinking what is in the cup (Thayer). And Cowan let this answer severely alone. And so will Kelly. It is the truth, and they know it.

You say, "For several years I contended for one cup, but always said it was permissible to use two or more cups in waiting on the audience."

Question: Since you "always said it was permissible to use two or more cups in waiting on the audience," when did you "contend for one cup," as you say you did? You may be "as slick as an eel," but you are not slick enough to get by with this. You may have played the part of a deceiver to get some preaching—rather get some money, but if you "always said it was permissible to use two or more cups in waiting on an audience," you never "contended for one cup." And we shall hereafter be able to apply Rom. 16:17-20, as you suggest. For you go beyond the doctrine of Christ" (2 John v. 9), beyond "what is written" (1 Cor. 4:6), and cause division thereby in the body of Christ and against the Savior's prayer and the Apostle's command for unity. (John 17; Eph. 4.) And as a matter of truth, when innovations come in "There must be parties among you, if genuine Christians are to be recognized." (1 Cor. 11:19—Moffat) But those who go beyond "the things which are written," are the ones guilty of the disgrace of this state of affairs, and not those that cling to the things Christ commands. The one who follows the Word of God, follows "the things which make for peace."

You say, "Less than three years ago I was made to see that such a position was inconsistent, and to contend for one cup only, I would have to make a law where the Lord had made none."

According to your stand now, then, the Lord has no word or law on the number, so you are now committed to **individual cups**, unless you are going to make a law for us where God has made none. And you now meet Cowan, who has signed to affirm, "Resolved, that the individual cups are deceptive and divisive"? I think I could "moderate" for Cowan on this. By the way, why did the Ralls church put out the individual cups just before the Cowan-Musgrave debate? I think, my good brother, that you have "jumped out of the frying pan into the fire." And if you do not think so, get ready to defend your stand on the cups, "two or more cups," yes, "individual cups," for they are coming your way, in fact have already come. If you had a hard question for us why didn't you ask it at the Graham debate, when the opportunity was offered?

By the way, what became of Cowan's speeches on "UNITY" at the Graham debate? Did they spoil? Did he forget them? They were conspicuous by their absence.

H. C. Welch.

SCRIPTURAL COMMUNION

I yet have some tracts on this important subject. This tract has been highly praised by those who have read it—the name, form, and design,

all treated and the tract is offered at 25 cents, or \$2.00 a dozen; and all that have not the price may receive it free if they write me for it.

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.

SALVATION ESSENTIALS OUTLINE

1. CHRIST. Saved by Him. By His life. Rom. 5:9, 10.
2. NAME. Saved by it. Jno. 20:31. Acts 4:12.
3. GOSPEL. Saved by it. Rom. 1:16. 1 Cor. 15:1, 2.
4. FAITH. Saved by it. Act. 16:31-34. Ch. 15:9. Heb. 11:6.
5. GRACE. Saved by it. Eph. 2:8. Tit. 2:11, 12.
6. TRUTH. Saved by it. 1 Pet. 1:22, 23.
7. WORD. Saved by it. Jas. 1:21.
8. HOPE. Saved by it. Rom. 8:24.
9. DOING. Saved by it. Mt. 7:21. Jas. 1:22-26.
10. WORKS. Saved by it. Jn. 6:29. Jas. 2:17-26.
11. BAPTISM. Saved by it. Tit. 3:5. 1 Pet. 3:21.
12. OURSELVES. Saved by it. Act. 2:40. 1 Tim. 4:16.

WHAT BAPTISM DOES

1. Puts into Remission of sins. Acts 2:38.
2. Puts into Christ. Rom. 6:3.
3. Puts into His Name. Act. 10:48. 19:5.
4. Puts into His Death. Rom. 6:4.
5. Washes sins away. Acts 22:16.
6. Saves us. 1 Pet. 3:21. Tit. 3:5.
7. Gives us Good Conscience. 1 Pet. 3:21.
8. Proves our faith. Col. 2:12.
9. Qualifies us for seeking things above. Col. 3:1, 2.
10. Concludes our Conversion. Rom. 6:17, 18.
11. Then we are saved by His blood. IF we walk in the light. 1 Jn. 1:7.

B. M. Massengale,
1515 E. Belnap St., Fort Worth, Texas.

NOTICE TO BRETHREN

Springdale, Arkansas, is in the heart of the Ozark Fruit Belt, in Washington county, surrounded by good farms, orchards, vineyards, and strawberry fields. We have here packing plants, canning factories, vinegar plants, Welch grape juice plant. And the peach industry is considerable.

There are a few brethren here who want to follow the Bible in their faith and practice and want to practice nothing that they cannot defend with an open Bible. We should be happy to have such brethren to locate here and help us build up the cause. You will please write A. R. Russell, Route 5, Springdale, Arkansas, and we shall take pleasure in giving you any information. Brother Harper, Brother King, and Brother Phillips have all helped the struggling band of believers here, and we appreciate them all very highly. Maybe you can do us good while we help you. Please write us. May the Lord bless the faithful.

A. R. Russell, Springdale, Ark., Rt. 5.

For anything in the Printing Line, Write to,
Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips

WHAT ARE WE DOING?

Last night (Oct. 9), I went to Santa Paula, Calif., where Bro. T. C. Hawley, author of "Building According to the Pattern," lives, and heard Bro. J. M. McCaleb, who for thirty-eight years has been doing missionary work in Japan, give a very interesting and profitable lesson on the conditions of that country and their need of the Gospel.

He did not fail to tell the need of such work here in the homeland which is, indeed, the most highly favored nation under the canopy of the Heavens; but he showed that the Great Commission is to "all the world"—"go disciple all nations." He also showed how the brethren had supported him by free-will offerings from "our own native land."

I was thrilled with his lesson. He showed that "while we were yet sinners" our beloved Lord "died for all"—Jews and Gentiles—and that His gospel—"the everlasting Gospel"—is "for every nation, and tribe, and language, and people."—Rev. 14:6. He showed that it is the duty of the disciples of Christ—His body, the Church, which is "the pillar and support of the truth"—to send preachers to "all the world" with "the everlasting Gospel."

While he was telling of the great work he and others were doing, this thought came to my mind: **This work is being done by the Sunday School** brethren. What are WE doing for foreign missions? Yes, What? The sad answer is: Nothing—absolutely nothing! What are we doing in the homeland? Almost nothing! It is hard for a loyal gospel preacher to even live—many of them go without the actual necessities of life to give their time to preaching the primitive gospel to disinterested and unappreciative brethren. The churches do not seem to care whether they have any support. And they do not seem to care whether any one but "Me and my wife, my son John and his wife,—us four and no more," ever hears the gospel. This condition is sad and appalling!

There are hundreds of congregations in the United States that use one communion cup and oppose the Sunday School, and they could—but they will not—keep dozens of preachers in the

field doing mission work at home and abroad. All they need to do is to get together and plan the work and put the men in the field and each member "lay by in store as the Lord has prospered him"—and this does not mean to give dimes to the work of the Lord and dollars to the places of amusement—and "the wheels of Zion would roll."

It is well and good to oppose all innovations. But opposing innovations will not take us to Heaven. It takes work—"work out your own salvation." "Must I be carried to the skies, on flowery beds of ease, While others fought to win the prize, And sail thru bloody seas?" Kindly and seriously ask yourself this question. Here is the answer: "Sure, I must fight if I would reign; Increase my courage, Lord: I'll bear the cross, endure the pain, Supported by Thy word."

"Hark, the voice of Jesus calling: 'Who will go and work today?'" Will you answer: "Here am I O Lord, send me"? But you say: "I cannot preach." Maybe not. But you can help support those who can. And it is your duty to do it. Remember, brethren, we are not doing enough!

I expect to make a trip to the East next spring and summer. If there are brethren in Ariz., N. Mex., Texas, Okla., Mo., Ill., Ind., Ohio, Ky., or W. Va., who would like to have me to assist them in meetings, they can arrange with me, if they will write early.—J. D. P.

We are glad to have the following report from Brother Eckstein, our Jewish brother who has sacrificed so much to preach "the unsearchable riches of Christ" to the fallen sons of Israel. We devoutly hope and pray that many among them will soon "look upon Him whom they have pierced," by faithful obedience to the gospel of the Sun of Righteousness, and that they will aid in "turning many to righteousness."

May we Gentiles realize that, under Messiah's peaceful reign—"the Reign of the Heavens"—"there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, for we are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:28). And may we encourage any worthy effort that is put forth to save the Jews.—J. D. P.

PROCLAIMING THE MESSIAH

By Stephen D. Eckstein.

I was permitted to spend nearly a week in the magnificent City of Houston, Texas, during which time I was spreading the Gospel of The Perfect Sufferer, Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world, among the tens of thousands of Jews.

I was granted a permit to speak in Yiddish on the streets of Houston, for which I was very grateful. Many of the "Children of Abraham" availed themselves of the opportunity by listening to me, and discussing with me in their own tongue concerning their only hope, in the Messiah—The Ja-Shoo-A.

I visited a few times with a scholarly Jewish young man, who is at present engaged in commercial activities. He possesses the capacity of enlisting others. He accepted a Hebrew New Testament gift. I hope to hear some day, that he

received wisdom and peace, and that out of his severe testing he came forth purified, and equipped with the armour of God, fighting the good fight of faith, and leading Jews unto saving knowledge of Jesus Christ.

I was laboring almost constantly under a heavy strain. Frequently it was nerve racking to listen to the rough, rude jokes, sneers and jeers which were hurled at me by the Jews. But am I, Stephen D. Eckstein, better than Christ, or Paul? Gladly do I bear these abuses that the Jewish people might hear the truth, and repent, and obey the commandment of righteousness, and become reconciled to God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Eternity alone will reveal the full results from testimonies for our Redeemer.

Of course you will appreciate the almost unsurmountable obstacles that lie before me as a missionary among the Jews, that of having to overcome in my arguments by not only removing their own rubbish of human philosophy, but also that coat laid over it by clever men, have done extreme violence to the principles and teachings of our Savior. How we need a deep humbling to walk in the shadow of the Cross, especially in these days when in all departments of human thinking we see that which characterizes a woeful ignorance of the word of God! Christianity is being preached without Christ, forgiveness without repentance, and salvation without the blood. How my heart aches because of this lamentable condition that has almost eclipsed our planet. Then, too, the poor Jew who is groping in darkness is being fed on that arsenic. How Satan is trying to pollute men's minds. Some linger, falter, an even fail against the powerful temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

Let us remember this world darkness is far spent, and the day draweth near when the sword, the emblem of divine justice, will be thrust forth. But when the Zero hour comes, how refreshing and comforting to know that the Blessed One will never fail, but will give energy to those who have devoted themselves to Him "by obeying perfectly the will of God."

We covet the prayers of the faithful friends of Israel that our needs may be supplied, for we are handicapped financially as never before since the establishing of our Hebrew Mission, in Dallas, Texas, nearly ten years ago. We are facing the tremendous task with cheerfulness, courage and hope. That spirit under God will not fail.

P. O. Box 1011
Dallas, Texas.

Bro. S. A. Bryant, of Route 5, Box 662, Phoenix, Ariz., is now in a meeting with the Brethren meeting in the Salvation Army Building, Obispo Avenue, Long Beach, Calif. He is doing some good preaching to small but interested audiences, and we devoutly hope the seed sown will bring forth fruit to the glory of our Lord and King. Bro. Bryant is a clean and good man, and should be kept busy in the Master's Kingdom.—J. D. P.

SUBSCRIBE FOR THE TRUTH!

PASTOR DISCARDS ALL FOR CHURCH Public Affairs Disillusion Dallas Pastor, So He Resigns From All Clubs

Abilene, Tex., Oct. 25.—Because "it is so difficult to tell the true from the false in public affairs today," Dr. E. D. Salkeld, pastor of the First Christian Church of Abilene, is withdrawing from all worldly activities in an effort "to develop a purely spiritual life." He has dropped his Masonic, American Legion and Kiwanis connections and has ordered his telephone removed from his home.

Thus, at the age of 52, this successful clergyman seeks to blaze a new trail for modern ministers.

"I was a war preacher," he told an interviewer who asked him why he had taken this step.

"I delivered many sermons on various phases of the war. I made speeches, took part in all drives and was a publicity chairman. In this capacity the government and other sources flooded me with literature, including barbarous tales of German torture.

Scores "War Lies"

"I found later that these were untruths—all lies. I remember how I preached about the Germans cutting off the hands of little children. I horrified people with that story and stirred them to intense enthusiasm and patriotism.

"Then came the truth and it shook my confidence in my ability to separate the truth from the falsehood in public matters, and caused me to lose interest in public affairs. That and the failure of the Inter-Church World Movement are the prime causes for my change."

"The world will never be changed by laws and edicts, but by individuals. We have depended on the law, courts and political powers to bring in the millennium. It must be brought in by cleansing the cup from within.

"Jesus was constantly mingling with the crowd. He loved men, and to be Christ-like you've got to be where men are and love them. I'm not withdrawing myself from the association of people, but from outside organizations."

The foregoing was clipped from the October 26th, issue of "The Springfield Daily News," and I thought it worth passing on to the readers of "The Truth."

The point I wish to stress is this, shall we allow the preachers of the Digressive (Transgressive) Congregations to take the lead in withdrawing from the institutions of men—giving up all for the Church, and thus bring us to shame? Shall we trail behind in stressing the Church above all secret orders, societies—all institutions of men? It grieves me to see brethren of means and influence sacrificing the blood bought institution for those of men. I have never yet seen a man who was faithful to the church and to one or more of these institutions at the same time. All the good that can be done in any of these institutions of men can be done in and through the Church of Jesus Christ, hence to the glory of God. I have no time for these institutions. I owe it all to my Master. Unto Him be glory in the Church,

by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages; worlds without end. Amen." "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him."—Paul.

Submitted in love,

Homer L. King.

EDITORIAL

"I told him (Bob Shuler) that he had too much sense to remain a Methodist."—Ben M. Bogard in "Baptist and Commoner," Oct. 1, 1930.

It has been said that "Sauce that is good for the goose is good for the gander." This being true, Bob Shuler should return the compliment by telling Bogard that he has too much sense to remain a Baptist. Both Bogard and Shuler should be Christians. "The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch."—Acts 11:26. They both admit the fact that you can be a Christian without being either a Baptist or a Methodist. But no one would be so foolish as to say that you can be a Christian without being a Christian. There is no such thing as a "Methodist" mentioned in the Bible. Neither is there such a thing as a "Baptist" church in the Bible. John "the (not a) baptist" was so called because he baptized—he was a BAPTIZER. Thayer says of the Greek word translated "baptist"; "BAPTISTES, a baptizer; one who administers the right of baptism." Since a baptist is "one who administers baptism," and since baptism is "BAPTISMA, immersion" (Thayer), "John the Baptist," literally translated, is "John the immerser," and the Baptists in their Bible Union translation so translate it.

"Baptists" and "Methodists" should both learn the truth and "obey the gospel" (Rom. 6:17, 18). Then they would be "Christians." (Acts 11:26.)

MUSINGS, METAPHORICAL

By C. D. Moore.

When we read, at Mat. 26:27, 28, that "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"; we learn that there is a drinking cup, and something in it called "blood," which we are to drink. How shocking that is! Drink His blood? It cannot mean that, so we read the 29th verse and learn that it is "fruit of the vine" in the drinking cup.

We now see that there are some figurative utterances to be dealt with. What shall we do now so as to understand what Jesus meant? Let us drop one figure (cup) and read it as follows: "He took the fruit of the vine and gave thanks, and gave (it) to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood."

This is what we all do, in our minds, when we read these verses, and the use of a dozen glasses from which to drink the one fruit of the vine does not make it more than one. The one drink element in a hundred drinking cups is still the same one cup, or drink element.

In view of the fact that the word "cup" is used in place of the word "wine," it clearly follows that the drinking cup has no important office or place to fill relative to the spiritual place and purpose of

the wine, hence may be dropped out of our minds entirely, and not detract one thing from the purpose for which we are to drink the wine. (I use the word "wine" for convenience).

"Drink this cup" is the figurative expression, while "Drink this wine" is the literal expression, or the expression of fact.

Remarks

The language in Mt. 26:27 is not metaphorical, but literal. "And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it." Christ says drink out of "it." Paul says "drink out of the cup." (I Cor. II:28) Mark says, "And they all drank out of it." (Mk. 14:23) And Thayer says of the "cup" here, "the vessel out of which one drinks." And on page 533 he gives "cup" in this place under the proper or literal use of the word.

He defines the Greek word to mean "a cup, a drinking vessel." (p. 533) "And he took 'a cup, a drinking vessel,' and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it." Nothing mysterious nor hard about this language.

Yes, in verse 29 we learn that "fruit of the vine" was in the cup, and is what they drank, and is what Jesus likened to his blood in the metaphor, "This is my blood." (v. 28) Such form of speech is very common in the Bible.

Now let us take the metonymy, "the figurative expression," Drink this cup," found in I Cor. 10:21 and I Cor. II:27. (See Thayer, p. 510) This is far from being "Drink this 'wine'." in meaning. One can obey the command "Drink this wine" without having a cup. But "How can one 'drink this cup'?" Answer: "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (N. L. Clark) By drinking "what is in the cup." (Thayer, p. 510) And not until the brother finds some "other way" can he dispense with the cup and obey this command. Nor can he use cups and do it.

Notice. What is in the cup, says Thayer, not cups. What it contains, says Clark, not what they contain. Furthermore, what "is" in the cup, says Thayer, not what was in the cup. What it "contains," says Clark, not what it contained.

This is "the expression of fact." And facts are stubborn things when it comes to dealing with God. This is all thrashed out in the Harper-Cowan Debate soon to go to press, 10 cents each, \$1.00 per dozen, post paid. Order now.—Editor.

REPORT

I have been very busy this year, 1930, in meetings, and have had the best hearings that I have had since the World War. I mean I have preached to larger crowds of interested people who seemed to appreciate the message of the Savior's love and God's boundless mercy. I made my first trip to Mo., meeting with that congregation of noble brethren at the home of our Brother Homer L. King. I found them walking in the truth, and delighting in the way of the Lord. You can read in the Bible what they practice in the assembly. And you know by this there was no organ there, no Missionary society, no Sunday School, no Christian Endeavor society, no "the Pastor," no cups in the Communion.

I learned some things while I was at Wichita Falls, Texas. Bro. Kelly had just been down there. The brethren there do not use the cups in the Communion. They use one to drink from, just as they can read from the Book. Bro. Kelly is very loyal and a great lover of peace in the churches, but he tells some of these brethren who believe just what the Bible says on any matter is right, and that whatever differs from right is wrong, that they are "drunk—unlearned." And this was his only argument for the use of two or more cups to drink from. They saw he was well informed on the cups, and so suggested to him that they get a man to defend their practice with him, but he is such a lover of peace that he would not accept their offer. The organ and S. S. people love "peace" just the same way.

I have met a few brothers this summer who said they believed in having just as many cups to drink from as they wanted, and of course that would mean as many as one for each communicant if they wanted it. And then I tell them of some preachers and debaters that believe just as they do, and ask them why not get together and discuss the matter, but it seems that these same brethren do not believe in debating unless they can get an organ man, a baby sprinkler, a S. S. preacher, and the like to meet. But when the debate comes their way, to defend what they "believe" and practice, they sweetly smile with a wave of the hand and are gone—yes, indeed—gone. They jibe the other fellow for showing retreat, and when it comes their turn to "defend," they—well they just won't do it. I have tried them. I teach one cup to drink from in the Communion, and this is the way my Bible reads on the Communion. This I am willing and ready to affirm is scriptural at any time in any place with any man.

I have just closed a good meeting at Somerton, Arizona. Am now at El Centro, Calif. Will next go to Bard, Calif.

Brethren, I find the paper, "The Truth" is doing lots of good in opening the blind eyes to the innovations that threaten the very life of the churches.

A brother has just recently told me that when he read the report of the Harper-Cowan debate, it forever settled the matter from him. He is now preaching the Bible way on the matter. Let us all help a little on the paper since we need it so much to get the truth of the Bible separated from the chaff with which some are trying to hide it with. God says, "What is the wheat to the chaff?" It is knowing and doing the truth that will make you free. Some good brethren are crying to quit the arguing, quit the contention, but the fight the Sunday School, yes, anything they have the Bible against, but they won't fight when it comes to the cups because they know they have no Bible ground any more on which to stand, and they soon sing in the sand. "Preach the word," says Paul: and that's why I preach one cup to drink from in the Communion. And Jude bids to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints. And

that is why I am always ready to stand on "the firing line." May the Lord bless us in the "fight of faith." Bob Musgrave.

TWO NEW VERSIONS OF EPH. 4:2, 3.

In the Leader of Oct. 7, 1930, Bro. Hall, who writes under the heading, "Soulful Hopeful, Helpful Thoughts," gives his readers a new version of Eph. 4:2, 3, with an exegesis of the same, as follows:

"With all unity and conceit, with intolerance, suspecting one another in enmity, endeavoring to keep the disruption of the Spirit in factions of hate. —"

"This is the only version that is compatible with the prevailing spirit of many disciples who call themselves loyal. Some say you cannot be loyal if you do not take your stand against teaching the Bible in classes on Sunday, and against a sister's teaching a class of women or children on that day. And you mustn't be allowed to preach for them, and they ain't a-goin' to fellowship you — . We also, are asking Bro. Hall some questions: "When Jesus comes will he place a sister on his left hand and say, 'You refused to teach the Bible to classes of women and children in your church house (place of meeting) thereby taking your stand against it, and this renders you ineligible to a place in my Father's everlasting Kingdom?' " Bro. Hall are you ready to say that these sisters (there are a lot of them) who are obedient to what is enjoined upon them in the "Holy Spirit inspired version," will be ineligible to a place in the Father's everlasting Kingdom? There are thousands of God-fearing women who are obedient to what the Holy Spirit teaches respecting their "silence in the churches;" and since they cannot possibly obey God, without "taking their stand" against a practice that requires them to disobey; In the fear of God, and in the hope of contributing something to the promotion of "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," I ask: When Jesus comes will he place a sister on his left hand and say, "You taught the Bible to classes of women and children in your church house and this renders you ineligible to a place in my Father's Everlasting Kingdom?" "

Remarks

Bro. Hall can revise as many passages as he pleases, but the Holy Spirit inspired version will still read the same. We have no doubt but what many of the "class" advocates would like to revise certain passages to suit their practice, but since they cannot do this, they will stoop to most anything to abuse and misrepresent those who have taken their stand against every innovation.

You owe them an apology for explaining your "version" in a way that reflects against those sisters who are opposed to teaching in "classes." Here is another "version of Eph. 4:2, 3." "With all "intolerance," and "proscription" with "lying," misrepresenting one another in malice, endeavoring to destroy the unity of the Spirit with "divisive" practices. Even as some are presumptuously doing—This "version" needs no explaining, beyond the following statement, made by Bro. I. B. Grubbs. — "The spirit that rules those who in-

troduce into the work and worship of God the inventions of men, is, (1) intolerant; (2) proscriptive; (3) divisive; (4) presumptuous; (5) lying." This indictment will no doubt "shock" the feelings of those who would rather sacrifice the truth than to oppose unscriptural practices, but our experience with innovators proves that Bro. Grubbs was right.—I. B. Kile.

I LIKE "THE TRUTH"

I certainly enjoy reading "THE TRUTH," for it "hews to the line" in its contention for "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints" and "shuns not to declare the whole counsel of God."

Some one has said: "You can fool all the people part of the time, and part of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time." I confess that I was "fooled" for a time concerning "THE TRUTH."

Bro. Bob Musgrave secured my subscription to "THE TRUTH" when it first started, and I liked it fine. But when that sissy preacher, Sidney W. Smith, held a meeting here, he stayed with me; and when he saw a copy of it he rebuked me for having it in my home, saying, "I will not read it, and it is not good for a young brother like you to read." He continually "harped" on its editors—Harper and Phillips—and said they were out to make trouble on the cup question.

I can now see why he dislikes "THE TRUTH." His and Cowan's and Johnson's darling idol—the CUPS—are fought to a finish in it, and wherever "THE TRUTH" circulates, their destructive work among the churches is at an end. Bro. Smith says there is too much "contention" in it. This is what I call a pussyfoot preacher.

When Bro. Smith was here and some of us tried to sound him out on the cup question, he was silent at first. But when it came to where he had to take a stand on the question, he finally preached a sermon on it, (but was careful to preach it one Sunday afternoon when there were just a few there to hear it), and in that sermon he said, "I stand strictly for one cup and no more." But he worships at Abilene, Texas, where they use the CUPS—two of them—and seems to think it is alright. In fact, he ridiculed Bro. Bob Musgrave for preaching a sermon, at his home congregation in Abilene, Texas, against the use of CUPS. He said, "We were at peace, and we didn't want him to come there and try to cause us trouble." May God deliver us from such "one cup" preachers.

Now, brethren, Bro. Harper has always been on "the firing line" with the truth and has never advocated an innovation. Bro. Phillips stands strictly for "that which is written," for he preached it at our congregation, when there was a great deal of opposition to it. We need hundreds of men like them. As long as they put out "THE TRUTH" it will be true to its good name. I, for one, intend to support it. Bro. Phillips says Bro. Harper is making a great sacrifice to put it out, and we should come to his support, and help him with our subscriptions and donations, so that he can continue to give us a paper that will contend for

"the faith" and expose the sophistry of empty-headed pussyfoot preachers.—Thos. S. Stark, El Centro, Calif.

Note:—We are glad Bro. Stark learned the truth on this matter, and we are sorry that a man of Bro. Smith's ability will fight the truth and those who stand for it.

A brother at Fresno, Calif., informs us that word came to him that Bro. Harper and I quit the Apostolic Way because we wanted the individual cups, and that "THE TRUTH" was started to advocate them. This only shows what the Devil, "transformed into an angel of light," and his "ministers, transformed into ministers of righteousness," will do to "deceive, if possible, the very elect." We are glad the brethren are learning the truth about the matter.—J. D. P.

PREACH THE WORD

Paul told Timothy to "preach the word." 2 Tim. 4:2. Then why not preach the word? When Jesus took bread, and gave thanks, he said, "This is my body." Mt. 26:26; Mk. 14:22; Lk. 22:19. Then why say represents, is an emblem of, or something else. Are you not satisfied with the "word"? "And he took a cup." Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23. The "word" records "a cup," then why do you preach cups? You leave the "word" when you do. And Paul says, "Beware lest any man spoil you." Col. 2:8, also verses 21, 22. Such preaching and practice is after "the traditions of men" and "the rudiments of the world." And we learn the same warning from Rom. 16:17, 18 and Gal. 1:6, 7, 8. Let us beware lest we "perish." Let us take the "word," and not the philosophy of men and vain deceit. Roy A. Fiscus, Spencer, Ind.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Nov. 13, 1930.—I closed a good meeting at a place called Freedom, near Montreal, Mo., the 2nd inst., embracing three Lord's days. This was my second effort with these good people, and I enjoyed the meeting very much. The crowds and interest were very good, considering the unfavorable weather the first week. Five were baptized into Christ, and some of the members seemed to take on new life and a greater desire to follow the Book more closely in work and worship. Unto Jehovah be all the praise, glory and honor.

I enjoyed being with my home congregation last Lord's day very much. The writer preached Saturday night to a very attentive audience. Lord's day morning, we had the regular Lord's day worship, Brethren C. H. Lee and H. E. Robertson taking charge of the lesson. A basket dinner was enjoyed at the noon hour; another service in the afternoon and singing Lord's day night. Seven carloads of brethren, from Freedom and Sunnyside, were in attendance Lord's day, and we enjoyed the worship and association very much. The day will long be remembered.

Don't forget to order your copies of the Harper-Cowan Debate, which will soon go to press—10c each, \$1.00 per dozen, post paid. Order now!

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."--Jesus.

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, FEBRUARY 1, 1931

No. 2

"YOUR REASONABLE SERVICE," Rom. 12:1.

I wrote under the above heading in "The Truth." Bro. Harper replied to it; then wanted me to commence again, under a proposition. I wrote him I would rather go on as I had begun, and he accepted; and that is all there is to his claim that I "refused to debate a proposition."

I think we have stayed as close to the issue—"the one cup"—as we would under his proposed proposition. So if Bro. Harper is really "spoiling for a fight," why not continue till one or both are ready to quit?

1. I will say this much in regard to what he proposed to affirm: No church can be "silent where the Bible is silent," and say that when more than one drinking-cup is used by a church of Christ, "it has fallen."

2. He "stultifies himself" boomerang, thrown at me, left me unharmed, and rebounded in full force against him, and knocked him cold.

In Paul's statements about "the cup of the Lord" and "the cup of devils" (1 Cor. 10:21); I made no attempt to prove how many drinking-cups should be used in the Communion, as he tried, to make it appear. I brought this up to show what constituted "the cup of the Lord" and "the cup of devils." I referred to Dan. 5:4 and Jer. 52:19 to prove that "the cup of devils" was drunk out of cups, "even the golden vessels, taken out of the house of the Lord, which was at Jerusalem." So his boomerang shows his own absurdity. See the meaning of "stultify." The above shows that Paul meant the wine, and it alone, by "cup" in 1 Cor. 10:21.

Why did he misrepresent me? Was it to attract the attention of the readers from the point at issue? Or was it an oversight on his part?

3. In his answer to No. 3, Bro. Harper says: "No, 'cup' cannot be used literally and figuratively, and then claims that both the wine and the drinking-cup are referred to. You see he has a kind of metonymy that carries the literal and figurative meaning in the same place: a thing he says cannot be! "Why not talk sense" and say wine, the object, is spoken of by the term "cup" as if it were a cup,—a metaphor, if you please.

He has added the plate to the Lord's supper. There is no authority for the plate. On what grounds, then, does he use it?

Will God condemn some churches for using more than one cup in the Communion, not believing it wrong; and let other Churches go free when they are using a plate without authority, as you claim?

The plate is "not in Bro. Bond's way." I can find sufficient scripture to justify the use of a plate; just as I do for the use of more than one

drinking-cup in "the Lord's supper." For proof, see Rom. 12:1 and 1 Cor. 14:40.

5. Bro. Harper says, "This is not a case of what is necessary in preparing the Lord's supper, but what is necessary in eating the Lord's supper." This is exactly what I claimed at the beginning of this discussion (See my 2nd art.), but he would not admit it. But he admits it now.

The necessity is in the eating and drinking at the Lord's table, "discerning the Lord's body" and blood, and not discerning the number of drinking-cups, as you seem to.

6. He failed to answer No. 7. Every church from Jerusalem down to the present time, have drunk "the cup of the Lord"—the wine—though they used many drinking-cups. Did they drink the cups of the Lord?

The one cup advocates can never get away from the fact that Christians drink "the cup of the Lord," but they drink it out of many cups; but they dare not say what their false theory teaches—drink the cups of the Lord.

7. His charge of "dictatorship" brings to our minds his unwillingness to discuss the point, with an assembly too large to function with his one cup service; while all the other acts of the worship could easily be done. His flying off to unreasonable numbers—"50,000 or 100,000"—was to escape the force of the argument.

8. Bro. Harper and I agree that Paul uses "cup" in a figurative sense in 1 Cor. 10:21, when speaking of "the cup of the Lord" and "cup of devils." And we are further agreed that a word cannot be used both literally and figuratively at the same place; and we agree that the "fruit of the vine" is meant by "cup" in this place, "cup" being used figuratively here.

So it follows as sure as one and one are two that there is no place for a literal use of the word "cup." So the wine alone is the "cup of the Lord." This shows his theory to be false.

9. We are further assured that this is true by Daniel's statement: that the drink-offering of idol-worshippers was wine, drank from cups. Paul calls it "the cup of devils."

So, then, cup, or cups, used in drinking the wine, is no part of "the cup" Paul was speaking of in 1 Cor. 10:21. If "cup" is used in a literal sense, meaning a drinking vessel, in 1 Cor. 10:21; then it has no figurative use and "the fruit of the vine" is not included in "the cup of the Lord" and "cup of devils." He can take either horn of the dilemma. But this scripture cannot refer to both, as he claims. That would make it figurative and literal; and this cannot be, as he says.

Brotherly, A. J. Bond.

Reply

I gave Bro. Bond the space he agreed to be the limit. He then came back wanting just one more article, and I gave it to him; and now I give him space for another, and he wants to go on. Why not? Because his straw has been thrashed and rethrashed.

1. I offered to affirm that a church of Christ can "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent" and use one drinking cup in the communion." He wrote me that he admitted this, so I told him to substitute cups for "cup" and I would deny it, but he refused.

Any church can "Speak where the Bible speaks," and say that when any church of Christ uses instrumental music in its worship or cups, it "has fallen," and should repent; for the Bible is silent on instrumental music and cups in the worship, and it says "cup" in the worship just as plainly as it says "sing." And if "sing" excludes the instrument, "cup" excludes the cups, for it says "not to go beyond the things which are written." (1 Cor. 4:6) And "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ hath not God." (2 Jno. 9).

2. If Bro. Bond did not contend for a plural number of cups by what he said here, I failed to see what he was trying to prove. And he concluded that "the wine alone is the cup."

But I showed that in this metonymy (It is not a metaphor as he contends) they "drink the cup" by drinking "what is in the cup," as Thayer says,—"In the 'cup,' not in cups. 'How can one 'drink the cup'? By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (N. L. Clark) Hence the "wine" is not the cup, but is drunk out of the cup in drinking the cup. I fail to see any misrepresentation.

3. This is not using "cup" both literally and figuratively. In metonymy we have both the "container and contained." "Cup" here is the container, and they "drink the cup" by drinking what it contains. This is common English, and any man should know the rudiments of language before he attempts to instruct us.

4. The "plate" in no way changes the institution, but cups do, for we can "drink the cup" "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." And God is as "likely to overlook" the organ in the worship as he is the cups. And I can find just as much justification for the organ in Rom. 12:1 and 1 Cor. 14:40 as you can find for the cups, none whatever.

5. This is not "exactly what" you claimed. You claimed that the cup to drink from had nothing to do with communion. But I showed that in the communion we must "drink the cup" and could do this only by drinking what it (yes, it, not they), contains. And you can observe this institution as well with beefsteak for bread as you could with cups for cup. Yes, "The necessity is in eating and drinking." Let us see them "drink the cup" without drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer), not cups—"what it contains" (Clark), not they contain. It will take more than Rom. 12:2 and 1 Cor. 14:40 to tide you through.

6. I did not fail to answer this, for I said that

every church that drink from the cup as the Lord directed, "drink the cup of the Lord." And there will be as many cups of the Lord as there are such congregations. And no church can obey the command to "drink the cup" by drinking out of cups.

7. Bro. Bond's "dictatorship" was exercised when he wanted to "reduce" the size of the congregation so that he could worship in some items as the Bible directs and not allowing us to do so, that we might worship in every item as the Bible directs, and this too in the face of the fact that he admits that we can "Speak where the Bible speaks" for our practice. He is the one that "flew off" and deserted his so-called argument here.

8. Already answered. (See 2, 3, and 4). The fruit of the vine is not meant by "cup" anywhere. "Cup" is a translation of *poterion*, which means "a cup, a drinking vessel." (Thayer).

9. 1 Cor. 10:21 is a metonymy, and is obeyed by drinking "what is in the cup," (Thayer), not what is in cups—"what it contains" (Clark), not what they contain. And this is a dilemma that Bro. Bond will never get around with his cups. He wants to assume the thing that he can not prove, namely, that they can "drink the cup" in some other way than by "drinking what it contains" (Clark) by drinking "what is in the cup." (Thayer)—Ed.

PARAGRAPHS

By C. D. Moore, Kendrick, Fla.

By miraculous means God revealed and confirmed or proved to those who beheld the miracles, the truth of the claims of Jesus and his apostles. "Many other signs did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book, but these are written that you might believe." (Jno. 20:30, 31).

The record of signs and wonders was made to be the perpetual proof to the end of the age, that Jesus is the Son of God. To us the New Testament is "The Law of the Lord," and "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." (Psa. 19:7)

Thus God furnished the super testimony completely perfected, so that Jesus said, "Whoever adds to it will have the plagues added to him."

The doctrine of Christ does not need another miracle wrought by anyone to prove or confirm it. This doctrine is found in the New Testament.

The Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to them that believe. (Rom. 1:16) Those who believe that text will not wish nor pray for any additional power with which to save people. Neither will they be heard praying to God to send down saving power or converting power.

The Lord says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mk. 16:16) "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." (Acts 2:38) "Arise and be

baptized and wash away thy sins." (Acts 22:16)
 "Baptism doth also now save us." (I Pet. 3:21)
 "Sanctified andd cleansed with the washing of
 water by the word." (Eph. 5:26).

WISE VS. OTHERWISE

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." (Prov. 9:10).

"Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes, but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." (Eccl. 11:9)

"Put away evil from thy flesh: for childhood and youth are vanity." (Prov. 11:10).

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." (Eccl. 12:13, 14)

"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, whether it be good or bad." (1 Cor. 5:10).

"But I keep my body under, and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway."—Paul, 1 Cor. 9:27.

R. H. Peel, Mickey, Texas.—Since they put in the cups here and divided the church we are meeting in the School House at 11 A. M., and we invite any preaching brother or other Christian that comes this way to meet with us. We don't put the muzzle on any preacher and we feel fully able to defend by the Bible our faith and practice, and when brethren get so shakey and afraid of an open Bible that they have to close the mouths of their preachers and teachers, it is time to take down their claim "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent."

We asked to meet in the church house in the afternoon, but were refused. They are more afraid of being disturbed in their man-ordained practice than Methodists or Baptists, and dare not put up a man to defend them in their unscriptural practice.

A. A. Patterson, Frederick, Okla.—I came here from Littlefield, Texas, where they put in the cups after Duckworth came there from Dallas. I wish to locate where there is a loyal church, and farm. Would like to make a crop with some one or would work for part of crop or by the day or month. I am not a preacher, but am interested in the church and take a public part in the worship, and want to locate where I can farm and help in the church or help to establish one after the New Testament pattern. Please write me at Frederick, Okla. I have no family. I am your brother in the fight

we are now in to hold the Bible as our rule of faith and practice.

L. L. McGill, Waterhole, Alberta, Canada.—Enclosed \$1.00. Please send me The Truth for one year. We live on the bank of the famous Peace river, and should like to be put in touch with any members of the one Body, who might think of coming to this country. Besides our daily family worship we worship the Lord each First Day of the week, and should be pleased to have others join us. We preach, and teach the Scriptures as directed in the Scriptures, as we have opportunity. Our latest battle has been with the Seventh Day Adventists, who have finally retreated behind the old excuse: "We don't believe discussion or disputing does any good." Of course it doesn't do their cause any good, but it does advance the cause of the Lord. Wishing you and all the Lord's people His choicest blessing, we are Your brother and sister.

Miss Ethel Honey, Salado, Ark.—Sister Nannie Morgan (aged widow of Bro. W. M. Morgan) is somewhat improved in health. She is greatful for some financial assistance received last month, and we hope the brethren will continue to assist her in her great need now, and the Lord will bless them. Address her Mrs. Nannie Morgan, Salado, Ark. I think the paper, "The Truth" gets better with each issue.

C. A. Sutton, Bardley, Mo.—I got to see a copy of "The Truth," and thought it contained more truth to the square inch than any other paper I ever read. The old writers have quit the * * * and there's a vast difference in the tone of that paper against digressions, a "digressive sweetness." Some here want the Sunday School.

A. J. Thompson, Sabinal, Texas.—"The Truth" is the best paper published by the brethren. You have the best writers. I am old and it grieves me to see the brethren going like the other digressives did. We love you for your courage in trying to hold the church to the Bible. The way is narrow, and "few there be that find it" or try to walk in it when found.

Mrs. R. C. Humphrey, Central Point, Oreg.—I think "The Truth" is the soundest paper I have ever read. When I was a girl, I used to read the old _____, and it seemed like meeting an old friend to get "The Truth," and I wonder why they leave "the old paths." I don't want to miss an issue.

Otis F. Young, Bloomington, Ind.—I believe "The Truth" is getting better all the time. Thanks for the samples to hand out. Cowan shied around us when here, and we are stronger in the Lord's way, and rumor says he gave the cups brethren no Bible for their practice. Enclosed find \$2.00 for Harper-Cowan debate. Take more later.

Support The Truth and help us grow!

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, J. D. Phillips,
Sneads, Florida Montebello, California
Homier L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips.

"BLASTING AT THE ROCK OF AGES."

The famous "Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes" has been doing what The Literary Digest calls "blasting at the Rock of Ages." But it seems that his powder is not very powerful, for his "blasts" have no effect upon any but the ignorant. The Literary Digest quotes the "Dr." as saying: "The Biblical God, Yahweh of the Hebrews, has been thoroughly undermined and discredited by the process of natural science, Biblical scholarship and cultured history."

Solomon says: "The fool has said in his heart, There is no God." But this wise (?) "Dr." is worse than Solomon's "fool" for he has said it right out loud, so all can hear.

Moses says: "Yahweh is our God, Yahweh alone" (Deut. 3:4, Rotherham Version). And Moses knew more than the "Dr." and all his host of "suckers" who are biting at his infidel and atheist bait, put together.

Let the "Dr." point out one man well educated along the line of "science" that will deny the Mosaic account of creation! Let him point out the man that is well acquainted with the facts of "cultured history" that will not say, "There is a God!" Let him point out the man that is well acquainted with the Bible, possessing the "Bible scholarship" that he says has led to the "undermining" of the Biblical God, Yahweh of the Hebrews, that will not say, "God is!"

The ancients taught: "Ex nihilo, nihil fit" — "from nothing, nothing comes." Something is, and hence something eternally was. And hence David says: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork." And hence, "Yahweh is our God, Yahweh alone." — Deut. 6:4.

PRINCE MESSIAH BEN DAVID

This "Dr." who has been "blasting at the Rock of Ages," says, "The conventional orthodox view of Jesus as the literal 'only begotten Son of God' and a peerless unique religious teacher is undermined as certainly and completely by the state of contemporary knowledge as is the Hebrew God, Yahweh."

But "the Hebrew God, Yahweh," has not yet been "undermined"—not by a long way, "Dr."; and hence, your "blasting at the Rock of Ages,"

Prince Messiah ben David, is the ravings of a morbid-minded man who is "not drunk" on the wine Babylon.

It is not "the process of natural science, Biblical scholarship and cultured history" that effects the "Dr."—he has a bad case of Egomania. Atheism, Agnosticism, Mohammedanism, Roman Catholicism, Aimee McPhersonism, etc., are common forms of this Egomania. The "Dr." has such a bad case of Paranoia Scribendi and Loguendi, that he has to talk and write this out of his system, or he would break out all over with Neurosis and Psychosis, and would not look pretty! Poor fellow! he is in a bad fix!

SHOULD WOMEN PREACH?

In reply to the question as to whether women should be allowed to teach and preach in the assemblies of the churches of Christ, I quote the following from Paul:

"Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but to be subject, as also sayeth the law. . . It is a shame for a woman to speak in the church."—1 Cor. 14:34, 35.

Again, Paul says: "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence."—1 Tim. 2:11, 12.

Tertullian (3rd Century) reproaches the heretics of his time for allowing women to teach in violation of Paul's teaching. "The very women of these heretics," he says, "how wanton they are: for they are bold enough to teach, to dispute, to enact exercisms, to undertake cures, it may be even to baptize."—De Praesc. xli.

SEND US YOUR REPORTS

We desire to publish a goodly number of field reports in each issue of The Truth; and we can do it, if you will send them in. So do not neglect this, please. We urge the preachers, especially, to send in reports of all their work. But this should not be left up to the preachers altogether. Let the leaders of the churches send in reports, too. The brethren like to know what is going on in the church; so send in your reports.

RENEW YOUR SUBSCRIPTION

There are many subscriptions now due, it being the first of the year. If you have not already done so, send in your renewal now, please. It takes money to make the presses go 'round, and to keep Uncle Sam paid. So renew now! Several religious papers have already sounded the distress signal, and some are threatened with being discontinued, for lack of funds. The Truth has done exceedingly well so far. Let us keep it free from debt by our prompt renewals and donations!

HAVE YOU WRITTEN ME?

Brethren in Ariz., N. Mex., Texas, Okla., Mo., Ill., Ind., Ohio, Ky., and W. Va., who want me to visit them while on my evangelistic tour during the spring, summer and fall, should write me at once, so I can hold the time for them.—J. D. P.

COWAN-HARPER DEBATE

This is a written debate between J. N. Cowan, of cups fame, and H. C. Harper, who loves the truth. I have read all the Ms., that has been written, and it is fine. Those who are honest and want

the truth will enjoy reading it. The price is only ten cents per copy. A dozen copies can be had for one dollar. It will soon go to press, and therefore, it will soon be ready for delivery. Order a dozen or more copies now, and put them out where they will do good. "Truth is the keenest weapon ever drawn." This will be fully realized by those who read the debate. "He who is right shall dare and die unconquered." This, too, will be made manifest to those who read the debate.

ACTS 20:7

(Quoted from the Christian-Evangelist):

Brother J. D. Phillips of Montebello, California, writes us concerning a new translation of the Scriptures, known as the Concordant Version to the following effect:

I want to call your attention to a new translation of the New Testament, called The Sacred Scriptures—Concordant Version. The translation was made by Mr. A. E. Knoch of 2823 E. 6th St., Los Angeles, Calif. The price is \$12.00 per copy. He has brought out what he calls "The Companion Volume"—a concordance and lexicon, price \$4.00. Besides the Version, he has what he calls "A Restored Greek Text." It was made from photographic likenesses of three ancient MSS namely, Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, and Vaticanus. It is all in capitals, with no space between words, and no punctuation marks, etc. It is the most literal translation I have seen, and is very valuable. But he renders *tee mia toon sabbatoon* (Acts 20: 7, etc.) "one of the sabbaths," thus leaving *tee* untranslated! He says "the first day of the week" is not in the phrase at all. I am making editorial mention of this, and will publish a review of him in an early issue of *The Truth*.

So far as we know, Mr. Knoch is alone in his peculiar rendition of Acts 20:7. The Greek text at that point is the same as the language found in Mark 16:2, Luke 24:1, John 20:1, and other places in the Scriptures, and it is uniformly rendered in English, "on the first day of the week." In this connection, it may be worth while to recapitulate a few of the translations of Acts 20:7.

KING JAMES: And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread. * *

DOUAY (Roman Catholic): And on the first day of the week, when we were assembled to break bread. * *

ROTHERHAM: And on the first of the week, when we were gathered to break bread. * *

ANDERSON: (Tischendorf text): But on the first day of the week, when we came together to break bread. * *

KENT: On the first day of the week, when we had met to break bread. * *

WEYMOUTH: On the first day of the week, when we had met to break bread. * *

TWENTIETH CENTURY: On the first day of the week, when we had met for the Breaking of Bread. * *

AMERICAN REVISION: And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread. * *

MOFFATT: On the first day of the week, we met for the breaking of bread. * *

GOODSPEED: On the first day of the week, when we had met for the breaking of bread. * *

The Concordant Version of the Scriptures to which our correspondent refers contains some interesting features, but is by no means superior, from the point of view of scholarship, to any one of the translations quoted above.

—Frederick D. Kershner, Dean School of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.

CONTRIBUTION

I know quite well what Bro. Jas. T. White said relative to Bro. Chas. F. Reese being able to take care of himself upon the subject which we are discussing; but to my mind Bro. White wanted to get his "feet wet," so to speak, or else he would not have entered into the controversy. In the light of God's word, I do not believe either of them are able to take care of themselves on the position they take on the proposition even though they try to defend each other. Bro. White said in his last effort that he asked to put the "material things" together. Very well. I shall accept your proposition that way. Now you have it this way: the "bread, cup and money" have to be put upon the Lord's table (the material things) or there is no fellowship. Now turn to 1 Jn. 1:7; "But if we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." Now, we are "material beings" or are we an entity of some kind? I take it that we are material beings, and according to your contention, onto the Lord's table you go with other material things. Ridiculous. I should say so, but please don't "poke fun" at the apostle, for he was speaking by inspiration, and remember when you go on the table, the songs, prayers, and sermons go on too, for these are performed through the instrumentality of men. 2 Cor. 4:5-7. Now in regard to Matt. 6: 1-6 shall say the Son of God said to enter into your closet to pray, and also said to give alms in secret, and you,—yes, you are "poking fun" at what he said.

Bro. White, I prefer to honor what the Lord said in his memorable sermon on the mount, instead of "poking fun" at him. Let me beg of you to enter your closet and pray God to forgive you for that act of yours. He didn't mean to teach that was the only place to pray (as you argue about the contribution) as there are instances of public prayer recorded, but in the closet is a good place to pray, for we all know we are not praying to be seen and heard of men when we are alone. It is not a matter of not being seen ourselves when we contribute, but a matter of not "flashing our money" to be seen and praised of men, as the brother I spoke of in my other article. Yes, when that brother "flashed his dollar" each Lord's day until he had attracted the attention of the audience. He sounded his trumpet, and sounded even unto me, from one of the elders of the congregation. No, Christ was not describing hypocrits; he was only telling his disciples not to do as the hypocrits, to be seen of men.

Who said Christ was not telling his disciples how to conduct themselves in the assembly?—

Jas. T. White, not inspiration. To say the least of it, he was talking to them only. (Read 5th ch. of Matt.) You said no one could tell what I wanted done in the assembly. It is not a matter of what I want done, but what does God want. I am not going beyond what is written as you have. You and Chas. F. Reese want to put the money (which is to perish with thee, Acts 8:20) on the table with Christ's body and blood, Matt. 26-28, but I can't find in the Book a command of that. In Acts 11:30 is the only place in the N. T. where we can find the location of the collection—in the hand of Barnabas and Saul. In Acts 4:37 we find Barnabas sold a possession and brought the money and laid it at the apostles' feet. Reese brought the latter quotation and you may join him again if you wish, but according to your contention that was unscriptural, unless they were upon the table. Ridiculous? I should say. Ananias and Sapphira put their money at the same place, Acts 5. Reese said we find money on the table in Matt. 21:12 and Mark 11:15. Yes, and you may join him again with the "thief bunch" if you wish, but if that is too wicked a place for you, all I know is to refer you to Heb. 8:5 and Acts 7:44, where inspiration said "look back," and in as much as I find no place under the new law to prohibit me from looking in 2 Kings 8:13 to locate a definite place to put the contribution, I have a perfect right to place my contribution in a "box" at the door, if I wish. I call your attention to 2 Tim. 3:16, 17; "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." The "all" Scripture would include the books of the O. T. Again, in 2 Pet. 1:20; "Knowing this first that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation, for the prophecy cannot in olden time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

Now, if you wish to "poke fun" at these holy men of God who told of boring a hole in a box and put it by the door to put their contribution in, that is your business; but I prefer to reverence God and his word. You thought you had a right to walk up to the Lord's table to put his things on his table, eh? Well, Solomon said, "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the ends thereof are the ways of death." Prov. 14:12. Paul "The foolishness of God is wiser than men." 1 Cor. 1:25. Again: The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." 1 Cor. 3:19. Read 1 Cor. 2:4-13 and 2 Cor. 1:12. But now if you still think you have to walk up to the Lord's table and put your contribution upon it to be a fellowship, we want you to cite us to the book, ch., and verse, which teaches it, and please don't linger about it, for remember I said all the Greek you could put up would not get you out of the predicament into which you placed yourself according to your position. And if you don't point out this Scripture to support your contention, you have made yourself "extremely ridiculous." But don't blame anyone but yourself, as you were the one who said all the "material things" must go on the table to

constitute the "joint fellowship," and as we are material beings we go on the table. That's your theory. W. T. Jones, Lafa, Ark.

Reply

My dear Brother: I do not care to carry on a prolonged wrangle with you in the paper. I do not believe your article is worth its space in any paper nor do I believe that an answer to it would be good reading matter for such a paper as "The Truth." You have too many personal thrusts in all your articles that I have read to be worth while to any one that is spiritually minded to be of interest to them.

Your slanderous remarks about me and the Lord's Table called for my article that appeared in the July 1st issue of "The Truth." I was sorry that I had to answer you as I did. I would much prefer a correspondence with you privately. The public is not interested in such style of teaching (If you could call such stuff teaching).

Bro. Jones, when you write remember that the readers and supporters of "The Truth" are not interested in "getting my feet wet," "You, yes, you, Jas. T. White," "Poking fun," "ridiculous," "Stalking up to the Lord's Table," "mourner's bench," "Getting on the Lord's Table," "Flashing a dollar," and "offending you."

I have no personal quarrel with you. If you want to debate the question, I will gladly meet you under honorable rules of discussion. I will meet you orally at your home or anywhere the brethren think your contention worth debating. All that I will ask of them is my fare to and from the place.

Remember, we are to discuss the contribution on Lord's Day or in the assembly. My affirmative proposition is enclosed and signed by me. Write yours below and if it differs from mine I will negative it. You will please sign "proposition No. 1" in the negative.

Bro. Jones, I trust that you will understand me and furthermore that we may get down to the exact difference between us scripturally so that some good can be accomplished. Personal thrusts like your article carries and calls for will get us nowhere.

In conclusion, please sign my proposition. Write yours, definitely stating your position as I have mine and I will deny.

With the kindest regards for you as a brother in Christ,

Jas. T. White.

Propositions

No. 1. It is Scriptural for each member to place or have placed the contribution of the Fellowship (money) on the Lord's Table in the assembly worship.

(Signed). Jas. T. White, Affirms,
Denies.

No. 2. It is Scriptural for each member to place or have placed the contribution of the fellowship (money)—(state where) _____ in the assembly worship.

_____ Affirms.
_____ Denies.

Subscribe for The Truth—do it now!

FIRST GOOD NEWS OR GOSPEL TO THE JEWS

Gospel means good news, glad tidings.

When Peter proved to the Jews at Jerusalem nineteen hundred years ago that Jesus whom they had recently crucified, was the Son of their own God. Was that good news or gospel to them? No, for good news makes people glad. That was not good news to them.

When Peter told them that their own God raised Jesus from the dead, Was that good news or gospel to them? No.

When he told them that Jesus is now at the right hand of God, and that God had made Him both Lord and Christ, and that "He" had shed forth this which you now see and hear," Was that glad tidings or gospel to them? No. For, when they heard these things, "they were pricked in their hearts," which indicates that they were in deep sorrow because of what Peter had just told them. Nothing that Peter had told them up to that time was good news or gospel to them, for it broke their hearts and made them mourn.

Having heard such awful news from Peter—the news that it was the Son of their own God whom they had hated without a cause, and had hatefully killed, they wanted to know if there was any remedy, or if there was any chance to be forgiven, so they cried out to Peter and the rest of the apostles, saying, "What shall we do?" They were seeking for good news or gospel, if there was any for them. They were anxious to know if the apostle had any good news or gospel for them, and Peter gave it to them, and here it is: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus for the remission of sins."

That is the first good news, gospel, to them that they had heard so far, so they began to be glad, and gladly received the commands "repent and be baptized," that God might forgive their awful sins, so they were baptized. "Be baptized for the remission of sins," was their first good news or gospel. And, "For the remission of sins," must have been the most gladdening part of that good news or glad tidings.

So it is yet, unto those who are as deeply convicted of their sins as they ought to be. For the deeper their conviction, the deeper their sorrow, hence the more anxious they are for God to forgive their sins, hence the better to them is the news, "be baptized for the remission of sins," about which they are mourning so deeply.

That God will forgive your sins if you repent and be baptized, was, and is, the good news or gospel to them that are craving God's forgiveness.

Let us be sure to preach the gospel—the good news, the glad tidings of salvation.

—C. D. Moore.

He says: "To do benevolent work through a human religio—secular order, or doing it through the church, is the same thing so far as the act and the result here are concerned. But one is a Christian act because done as Christian, in the name of Christ, and through the church, while the other is strictly human, done in human order, and not in the name of Christ." (Leader, June 4, 1929)

Now when he gets to operating his "class system," a "religio-secular order," the results are the same as if carried on through the church, just as are the results from missionary work carried on through the Society. But one is a Christian act because done as Christians, in the name of Christ, while the other is strictly human, not found in the word of God. And Bro. Hutson knocks his human "class system" when he knocks the others. And he must stand condemned with those who make void the commandments of God through their traditions, causing "divisions and offenses contrary to the teaching of Christ."

I. B. Kile.

GREAT SONGS OF THE CHURCH

Brethren who are looking for a collection of songs and hymns—450, in one book, well indexed according to topic, title, and first line, a collection of the best songs of all books, will find in these a superb collection for strength, clearness, and scripturalness, with appropriate church music. Cloth, 65 cents each, with round or shaped notes; manila, 50 cents each, shaped notes. Address The Word and Work, Louisville, Ky.

QUERIES

1. What is the scriptural meaning of the word baptize?—B.

Answer: The Scriptural meaning of a New Testament word is the meaning the word had when the N. T. was written. To find the meaning of N. T. words we go to the Lexicon of New Testament Greek, and Thayer's is the Standard. He says the word baptizo, which is rendered baptize in most English Bibles, means "immerse." We can not go to Webster for the meaning of N. T. words for the simple reason that he gives the modern current meanings of English words. Hence the LEXICOGRAPHER in the Literary Digest says, "The word baptize came into the English language from the Old French baptizer, from the late Latin baptizo, and ultimately from the Greek baptizo, from bapto, dip. Therefore, the idea of sprinkle is not to be associated with it." (The Literary Digest, March 7, 1925).

Sprinkling came in through the Catholic Bishop, who was considered to have authority to change the "form" for clinics, the sick, and this was called "clinic baptism." Protestants have, to some extent, kept this practice and argue for it on various grounds. Like our "cups brethren," they know that is not what the word means in its N. T. use, but they have various excuses for the practice—big crowds, convenience, what was the Savior's and N. T. practice, does not bind us now, clinics (especially consumptives), cleanliness, etc.,

Rob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—I enclose one dollar for the Harper-Cowan discussion. The January 1 issue of "The Truth" was the best ever. The reply to the Kelly and Cowan reports and to the "Musings" was worth a whole year's subscription. When we have one loaf, and one cup and all drink from it, we know we follow the only precept and example for our practice in the Bible, and we can do this by faith because it comes from the word of God, and this is enough to satisfy me.

"PREACH THE WORD"

Bro. Roy A. Fiscus, writing in the January issue of *The Truth* under the above heading, to my mind hits the exact spot where all the trouble lies. Bro. Fiscus is not the author of this heading. He gets this from the plain charge of the Apostle Paul, 2 Tim. 4:2. This same apostle says "Follow me as I follow Christ," 1 Cor. 11:1. Now, if all the preachers that support *The Truth* paper will begin now to teach exactly what the Lord said on the communion "cup" and "bread" and exactly what Paul said in delivering it to the Corinthians; teach others to do so; then, and not until then, can the Church be freed from the interpretations and notions of men.

Yes, Bro. Fiscus, the Word as it is written satisfies me. I will join you and preach the Word on this question and let the words of Inspiration do their own explaining. All who think the words of Inspiration need their explanation think they know how to make the point at issue clearer than the Teacher that spoke as no other man, Jno. 7:45. This Teacher spoke with authority. In no other way can we speak with authority. We must speak His word or no unity of spirit can be brought about through our teaching.

There is not one phrase used by the Lord in the institution of the fellowship He forced with His Apostle that is not being disputed by some preacher of the so-called Church of Christ that claim to speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent. Yes, Bro. Fiscus, I will join you in this. Now how many other preachers that read this will join us, and all speak that which is written and leave our "thinksos" out of the teaching? We can never get our "thinksos" to be ONE, but all can speak the WORD and no one CAN BE WRONG. Then all will be taught the same thing. All will get the Word of God in their minds. Will this not lead to the same judgment? If not, why not?

If any brother has a better solution of this question let him send it in; I want it. The time is far spent. Let us get busy and do something that all honest, consecrated lovers of that which is written can agree on. Preach the Word.

JAS. T. WHITE.

OUR HELPERS

R. H. Peel	\$1.00
T. E. Smith	1.00
Bob Musgrave	1.00
C. D. Moore	1.00
Luther M. Morgan	5.00

A PARABLE

A man and his family came to a certain well, in a desert. In it was an old oaken bucket. The man drew water from the well with the old oaken bucket, and brought water in a cup to his thirsty family.

Being alike thirsty, and loving, and unselfish, and unafraid, they divided it among themselves, by all drinking from the same cup. It is said that they all drank from the same well, and from the same bucket, and from the same cup. It is clear that they did not put the well to their mouth.

And they did not put the bucket to their mouth, for they had a drinking cup, and that is what drinking cups are for.

If any man hath ears to hear, let him understand the parable of the loving, and "joint participation" of the "common cup," in the desert of our mutual suffering.

There is precisely the same logic for dividing a congregation into classes, that there is for dividing "the cup" into "cups". When divided, they do not constitute unity, nor symbolize unity.

Paul shows, in First Corinthians 10, that the communion is not only a memorial of Christ's (single) sacrifice, but also symbolic of the "one body," the church. He calls it "the cup," and the closest communion is in the one cup.

The early Christians so understood it. Ignatius, in the First Century, said: "For there is one flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ, and his blood which is shed for us in one. One loaf is broken for all, and one cup is distributed among them all."—*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 1, page 81.

Again, Ignatius, in his epistle to the Philadelphians, says: "For there is but one flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ; and one cup in the unity of his blood."—*Apochryphal N. T.*, page 183.

Paul Hays, Fresno, Calif.

HARPER-COWAN DEBATE

Two propositions: I. "The cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same."—J. N. Cowan affirms. II. "The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid."—H. C. Harper affirms.

Order now. Ten cents each or \$1.00 the dozen. There will be a limited issue of these, so get your order in now to make sure of getting them.

AN APOLOGY

We are not in debt, never have been, in running the paper since it started, but we were obliged to publish only monthly to keep within our means. It would seem but a small thing to raise a dollar during a year for a paper, but we realize there is many a dollar demanded for other things, too, and we sympathize with those in need. If those who want the paper will let us know that they will raise the dollar during the year, we shall be glad to send them the paper.

We offered to publish the wine discussion, putting it out in one issue of the paper like the Clark-Harper discussion, but one of the brethren was insistent that we publish it by installments, promising to help. But they almost doubled the number of words agreed upon and no help came. We are anxious to have open investigation, and to do our part to that end. But we cannot give space to an unreasonable amount. There are yet two articles by each unpublished, and they are now writing on the proposition which affirms the unfermented article, limiting the articles to 1000 words. This, we may later run in one issue.—Ed.

When in need of any kind of religious or commercial printing, communicate with: Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn. They will do their best to give you complete satisfaction.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, MARCH 1, 1931

No. 4

HARPER-COWAN DISCUSSION

HARPER DISCUSSION

J. N. Cowan's first affirmative.

Proposition:—The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. Cowan affirms.

The reader will note that my proposition calls for the use of the word "cup." Cup is the name of a literal vessel, but may be used to denote what is in the vessel, as "He drank the poison cup and died." Meaning he drank the liquid which was in the cup. I contend that Christ used the word in that sense in the verse cited. "He took the cup, (meaning the liquid) and gave thanks, and gave it unto them saying, drink ye all of it, (the liquid.) For this (cup-liquid) is my blood of the New Testament." We desire to ascertain the meaning of "This is my blood." In verse 26 we read, "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body." The pronoun "this" certainly refers to the bread he took, and may read "This (bread) is my body." Then, the expression "This is my blood" just as certainly refers to the cup he took. We both agree that the fruit of the vine is what Jesus called the Blood of the New Testament. Therefore, He took the fruit of the vine and gave thanks, and gave it to them saying, drink ye all of it, for this is my blood. Hence, my proposition is proven. Let the reader try Putting a literal drinking vessel for cup and read; He took the literal drinking vessel and gave thanks, and gave the literal vessel to them, saying drink ye all of the literal vessel, for this literal vessel is my blood of the New Testament. The antecedent of the pronoun, "this" in verse 28 is "cup" in verse 27. (Harper) Pronouns stand for nouns. "This" stands for "cup," the same cup as mentioned in verse 27. If "cup" in verse 27 is a literal vessel, the pronoun "this" which stands for it must refer to a literal vessel, and that would make the literal vessel the blood of the N. T. But if the "cup" in verse 27 is the fruit of the vine, "this" in verse 28 refers to the fruit of the vine and is the blood of the N. T. Hence, the "cup" and the "fruit of the vine" are the same.

"FOR this is my blood" v: 28. "For" is translated from GAR in the greek. Gar is a conjunction and certainly joins verse 28 to verse 27. Thayer defines: "Truly therefore, verily as the case stands; for, the fact is, namely." And he took the cup-----for the fact is this cup is my blood. He took the cup-----namely the blood of the N. T. Thayer goes on to say, under "Gar," "Now since by a new affirmation not infrequently the reason and nature of something previously mentioned are set forth, it comes to pass that, by the use of this particle, either the reason and cause of a foregoing statement is added, whence arises the casual or argumentative force of the particle, for; or some previous declaration is explained, whence GAR takes on an explicative force." This authority fully agrees with my contention that verse 28 is an explanation of what the word cup meant as used by Christ in Verse 27.

If "the cup" refers to the fruit of the vine, I can see how a sufficient quantity can be provided to serve an audience of any size; but if it refers to the container I cannot see how only one could be used to serve the congregation in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. This day was the first day of the week, and before they had time to establish other congregations in the city. In fact there is no proof that there was ever more than one congregation in Jerusalem, and there were many thousand members there in a very short time. Neither is there any proof that they divided the congregation into groups in order to serve the communion; if they did do such a thing, they had as many cups in that congregation as they had groups. That would be too many for the one container advocates. It may be said that we are not discussing the number of cups, and that this argument is not on the subject; but it will be readily seen that if the "fruit of the vine" is what Jesus called the cup, that one volume of it

could have been provided to serve the congregation; but if a literal vessel is what Jesus called the cup, and only one literal vessel is permitted in the distribution of the wine, it would have been an utter impossibility to serve the Jerusalem church composed of over three thousand members with only one drinking vessel. Therefore, I conclude that the fruit of the vine and the cup are one and the same.

Sept. 9, 1930

J. N. COWAN.

FIRST REPLY

Please word the proposition as we signed it and define its terms, as the rules of honorable discussion demand.

The "cup" is used literally in Mt. 26:27, and Thayer so cites it, as does Ropes, the present Professor of N. T. Greek, Harvard University; and Goodspeed, present Professor of N. T. Greek, Chicago, University. And these scholars know fully of the use of "this" and gar; and "this authority" in no way agrees with your contention that "The cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. And while the antecedent of "this" in verse 28 is "cup" in verse 27, which is there used literally, yet the pronoun "this" is used metonymically. And if cup is supplied, it is so used. And your trying to read it through all literal or all figurative only gives the lie to Thayer, et al.

"Can a pronoun be used figuratively and have for its antecedent a word used literally?" Answer: "Yes."—Jas. M. Farr, Head Department of English, University of Florida. "Is 'this' (Mt. 26:28) or the noun 'cup' if supplied, used literally? or figuratively? Answer: "The latter."—Edgar J. Goodspeed.

"Are 'the cup' as used in Mt. 26:27, and 'the fruit of the vine' one and the same?" Answer: "No. The contents of the cup and 'the fruit of the vine' are the same."—James H. Ropes. "Is the word 'cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 the name of a solid?"—Answer: "Yes."—Ropes.

You say, "He took the fruit of the vine," etc. But the Bible says, "And he took a cup," etc. (Mt. 26:27) "Cup" is here the vessel which he took. And he said, "Drink ye all out of it; for this (figuratively, suggesting the contents (or this cup, if you please) is my blood," etc. It was not "the fruit of the vine" in an ordinary sense or way, as in the cluster, in barrels, in bottles, etc., but as Thayer says of I Cor. 11:25 and Luke 22:20 ("This cup is the new covenant in my blood") "in both which the meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant'."—p. 15. The "cup" is not the "wine," neither is the "new covenant" the "blood." And the "cup" is no more "the fruit of the vine" than is the "new covenant" the same as the "blood."

You say, "If 'the cup' refers to the 'fruit of the vine,' etc. Well, if it 'refers' to 'the fruit of the vine,' it is not 'the fruit of the vine,' for the thing that 'refers' to a thing is not the thing referred to. And even if 'the cup' in Mt. 26:27 were used metonymically as you contend in 'He drank the poison cup and died,' that does not make the 'cup' and what he drank the same. Here the 'cup,' one thing, is named, and its contents, another thing, are suggested. The 'cup' is not its contents. 'Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it.'—Williams' Rhetoric.

After you prove that "the cup" and "the fruit of the vine" as used by Christ are one and the same, it will be time enough for you to undertake, if you wish to do so, to prove that all the disciples in Jerusalem took the Lord's supper in one assembly. But as a matter of truth, "The oldest meeting-places of Christian worship were rooms in ordinary dwellings."—Schaff-Herzog. And Pentecost was the "oldest." So "In a society consisting of many thousand members there should be many places of meeting. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as 'the church' in this or that man's house, Rom. 16:5, 15; I Cor. 16:19; Col.

4:15; Phil. verse 2. Jamieson, Fausset and Brown. And "The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses. In large towns, where such a place of assembly could not accommodate all, it became necessary that smaller portions of the community dwelling at a distance should choose other places for their meetings."—Neander, Vol. I, p. 402. And when you prove your "cups and loaves" for a congregation, we will be ready to take individual cups and individual loaves. Why not? If you wish to call a "church," Rom. 16:5, 15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phil. v. 2, a "group," as some of the S. S. folks called a church a "class," you can; but the Lord provided for churches of Christ, and one "loaf" and "a" (one) cup for each. (Mt. 26:27; 1 Cor. 10:17). How do you have "one volume of it" without one cup to contain it? And why do you want "one volume"?

—H. C. HARPER.

J. N. COWAN'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

I worded the proposition from memory, and as I have not the original at hand, cannot make correction. Let my opponent correct if he sees a discrepancy. The proposition itself is a definition. What part of this definition do you want defined?

I feel complimented on my first affirmative because the first reply utterly failed to answer my arguments. Thayer does not cite Mat. 26:27 under the head "literally," but "properly," and that does not signify literally. If it does, Thayer also cites Rev. 17:4 under the same head, and every one knows that neither the woman nor the golden cup in her hand were used literally. No attempt was made to reply to my argument on "GAR." I gave quotation from Thayer showing according to his definition, verse 28 was an explanation of what was meant by "cup" in verse 27. Yes "Thayer understood" the use of the word, but you failed to answer the argument. As to Ropes, I have not seen anything but a mutilated answer from him, and as you did not quote what he said, it deserves no reply. Goodspeed is entirely too loose in his translation to deserve recognition as an authority on this question. Will you endorse Goodspeed throughout this discussion?

The pronoun "This" is not the word which denotes the figure of speech, but the word "cup." Cup is named to suggest the fruit of vine. "Metonymy is from a Greek word which means a change of name—that is, a thing is called or described by some other than its own name." (The World Book, vol. 6 P. 3757) In the passage in dispute, the fruit of the vine is called by some other than its own name, viz: the cup. I showed that in "this (bread) is my body," that "this" referred to the bread he took. That, "this (cup) is my blood," referred to the cup he took. This was not noticed. No man can get away from the fact that pronouns stand for their antecedents (nouns), and "this" stands for its antecedent "cup" in verse 27. If cup was used literally in verse 27, "this" in verse 28 refers to the same literal cup. You are tied fast here. My opponent has the Lord mention the bread, one element of the supper, and then abruptly change to a literal vessel which is not an element of the supper. The cup and bread are both elements of the same supper and one is as figurative as the other. Is the literal drinking vessel an element of the Lord's supper? "That which refers to a thing is not the thing referred to." Wonderful information! But in metonymy one thing is named when another is meant, as, the kettle boils. "Cup" is named when "fruit of the vine" is meant.

Concerning literal cup being an emblem of the New Covenant, I will submit the following from scripture. "For this (cup) is my blood of the New Testament." "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Do both passages refer to the same cup? When you answer this, I will take care of Thayer P. 15.

When Jesus took the cup, my opponent says it was not the fruit of the vine; when did he take the fruit of the vine? If he took the fruit of the vine at the same time he took the vessel, how do you know he did not refer to it instead of the vessel? My proposition is proven my plain and obvious meaning of the passage itself. "And he took the cup _____ for this (cup) is my blood." The Lord is my Star witness. No amount of quibbling can hide the force of such testimony.

My opponent tries to make the reader think my argument about the great number of disciples in Jerusalem is not relevant. "The oldest meeting place was in Jerusalem." Then

the disciples were not in the Temple as the scripture relates but in a room in a private dwelling-house on the day of Pentecost: "They would all meet together in Solomon's Colonnade." Will you take that? On the day of Pentecost, the first day of the week, before they had time to establish congregations over the city, thousands observed the Lord's supper. If the cup was a drinking vessel, what was its size? I frankly admit that in other cities, they met in private houses, but not for the purpose of using the one container, but because they had no public houses for worship. If they had such houses, they no doubt would have all met together as they did at Jerusalem where they had house accommodation. If my proposition is true, one volume of wine, called "the cup" could have been provided. Let my opponent tell how he would provide for 1000 brethren who may come together at one place on Lord's day with his position that "cup" means container. The volume would not be altered though in more than one container. Congregations established in different house are not on par with S. S. classes, but dividing the assembly on the day of Pentecost, when they had only one congregation, in order to commune, is on a par with S. S. class division. Oct. 1st, 1930.

J. N. COWAN.

SECOND REPLY

"The cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. J. N. Cowan affirms." (See your letter of Oct. 10, 1925).

This is your proposition, and the rules of honorable discussion demand that you define its terms, and make clear the issue. Are you afraid to do it?

You compliment yourself, that your so-called arguments were not met, and yet you spent your whole time in trying to patch them up after I utterly refuted them. Glad that you now see that Thayer cites "cup" here as used "properly." And if you do not know that this means "literally," you better "brush up" a little, to say the least of it. Don't make yourself laughin' stock.

Here is where Thayer cites "cup" of Rev. 17:4, too, your ignorant splurge to the contrary notwithstanding. Listen: "Is 'cup' in Rev. 17:4 used figuratively?" "No."—Edgar J. Goodspeed, Chicago University, letter Sept. 30, 1930.

I see you quote Goodspeed approvingly: "They would all meet together in Solomon's Colonnade," Acts 5:12. "Will you endorse Goodspeed throughout this discussion," eh? He says "cup" is used literally in Mt. 26:27.

I did quote what Ropes, of Harvard University said. Listen: "Is the word translated 'cup' in Mt. 26:27 there used literally?" "Yes." Again: "Are 'the cup' as used in Mt. 26:27, and 'the fruit of the vine' one and the same?" No. The contents of the cup and 'the fruit of the vine' are the same." Again: "Is the word 'cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 the name of a solid?" "Yes." And what he marked out was in regard to a supplied "it" in the Authorized version, and he says, "What I had written was crossed out by me." (Letter, Sept. 6, 1930) And this refutes you.

"And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it." (Mt. 26:27) "And they all drank out of it." (Mk. 14:23) And the plain, obvious passage imports that "cup" here is the vessel out of which they drank. And I have as my witnesses, not only the Lord, but also the scholars of the world, that your proposition is not true.

Do you know more about pronouns than does Jas. M. Farr, Head Department of English, University of Florida? These scholars know the force of "this" and "gar" here, and they know there is nothing in either to prevent "cup" here from being used literally, as they say it is. You have found only a mare's-nest.

But, as I said, even if "cup" were used here by metonymy, this would not make "cup" and "the fruit of the vine" the same, for if "Cup" is named to suggest the fruit of the vine," as you now say, or if "the cup refers to the fruit of the vine," as you said before, then the "cup" and "the fruit of the vine" are two different things, "wonderful" as it may seem to you, and your proposition is not true. "Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it."—Williams' Rhetoric, p. 220. It takes both "Container and thing contained" to constitute this kind of metonymy.—ib. p. 220. The "container," cup in this case, is no more the same as the "contained," the fruit of the vine in this case, than black is the same as white. However, "cup"

is not used metonymy here; but even if it were so used, your proposition is not true.

The "cup" is an "element," an essential constituent part, of the Supper, as much so as is "the fruit of the vine,"—each must drink the cup. "How can one 'drink this cup'? By drinking what it contains, and in no other way."—N. L. Clark. Drink the cup, "that is, what is in the cup."—Thayer. Then each drinks the cup by drinking what is in the cup. No one can do this without a cup.

We know by the context that the "cup" in Mt. 26:27 had "fruit of the vine" in it when he took it. Do you agree with Goodspeed, that if "cup" is supplied after "this," it is used figuratively? You talk about "the same cup." I find but one, "a cup," and "a" is from the Anglo-Saxon, meaning one. Do you find cups?

Yes, "this (bread)" is "my body; and "this (cup)—by metonymy if supplied, naming, or calling, the "cup" to suggest "what is in the cup," as "my blood." There is nothing unusual about this. "Cup" is first used literally in Lk. 22:20, and then metonymically in its second use, as Thayer indicates. And no amount of "quibbling" can set aside the Standard Authority of New Testament Greek.

Your assumption for big assemblies for "worship" was knocked in the head by the fact that "worship" was conducted in "ordinary dwellings," "private houses," "the church" in this or that man's house," Rom. 16:5, 15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phil. verse 2. You quote Goodspeed, Acts 5:12. Does he say they conducted the "worship" in the temple? Not by a long way. You can't fool us with another mare's-nest. It would take no longer to establish a "church in this or that man's house" than it would take for the disciples to go to "this or that man's house." And this is what they did, as the testimony abundantly shows.

"One volume of wine." Why? again I ask. It it "one loaf," too, or are you going to have "loaves" with your cups to drink from? And if God has no word on the number of cups, are you going to make a "creed" to limit the number and cut out the "individual cups," except one be "tubercular," and just have "two or more as you think needed"? It is your "provide," now, so take up the laboring oar. Can 25,000, as a congregation, worship in one assembly according to the N. T. pattern? Since "dividing the assembly" is "on a par with the S. S. class division," are you going into the S. S. ranks? or will you show us how to conduct N. T. worship with an assembly of 25, or 50 thousand?—or will you fudge?

If "the cup" was not "a drinking vessel," no man on earth knows what it was, for potation, "a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer) was the name of the vessel Jesus "took" when he instituted the Lord's Supper. And this is a "solid," and not a liquid. And "The volume" of a liquid is "altered" when converted into volumes, as much so a watch crystal is altered when broken into fragments.

Oct. 6, 1930.

H. C. HARPER.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

No material change in wording of Proposition. If the reader cannot see that the proposition says the cup and the fruit of the vine are the same, and that my respondent says they are not, which is the issue, then I despair of reaching them. What needs defining? I have consulted the best dictionaries, and fail to find one that defines "properly" to mean "literally," so laugh. Thayer cites Mat. 26:27 and Rev. 17:4 under the same head. My opponent seeks to prove the latter passage literal to save his position on the former. John saw a woman with a golden cup in her hand full of her fornication. The last verse in the chapter says, "the woman is that great city." So all know "woman" was used symbolically. Did the city have a literal drinking vessel in her hand? Did it contain literal fornication? My opponent and Goodspeed to the contrary, notwithstanding. In a written debate, it is not fair to the debaters, nor the readers to quote authorities without furnishing copy for examination. Then, the readers cannot examine. I shall only notice standard works as authority, which may be procured by every reader, in preference to extracts from private letters. "They all drank out of it," does not prove they put their lips to the same vessel; eg. Jacob and cattle drank out of the well; Israel drank out of the rock; they who keep a flock drink out of the flock. You cannot 'eek out on "ek." "Pronoun"—Gram. Lit. a word used instead of a noun or name; Used either substantively or adjectively to stand in the place of, or refer to persons or things named." (Webster) "This" is used adjectively and

stands for cup and refers to cup, the thing named in Verse 27. "This" is a demonstrative word. (Webster) "Demonstrative"—"Of the nature of demonstrating; or tending to demonstrate: making evident; exhibiting clearly." (Webster) In Mat. 26:28, "this" demonstrates, makes evident, and exhibits clearly what the cup is, mentioned in verse 27. This proves my proposition. Selah. All the extracts from college professors can never clear this away satisfactory. I asked you first to say if you will endorse Goodspeed. Come on. I accept William's definition of metonymy. No one denies the Lord had a container in hand when he instituted the supper, but I deny the word cup refers to it. He mentioned the fruit of the vine, not by naming it, but by naming the container which suggested it. Thanks! HEAR YE EXEGETES! "The container is an element of the supper." To eat the supper is to eat the elements which compose it. Shame! I have never understood that the dishes were any part of a supper. "HERE'S THE MARE'S-NEST" My opponent has discovered in some way that the church on the day of Pentecost organized many local congregations the same day. By actual demonstration, it has been proven that not more than one hundred can be served with one container once filled. Divide 3132 by 100 and you have more than 31 congregations established on that day. A few days later 5000 more were added which required 50 more congregations; 81 in Jerusalem, and strange to say, no mention is ever made in the Bible or history of but one. Why is my opponent driven to this? Answer, because he knows his position on what the cup is will not allow him to serve the entire number of disciples. I know how to provide for any number of disciples with one cup, for I know the cup to be the fruit of the vine; but my respondent just can't fix it. That's all. Where in Bible or history is it said they met in any private house in order to use one container? Where? "If the cup was not a drinking vessel no man on earth knows what it was." Jesus knew what it was for he said it was his blood of the N. T. "The volume of a liquid is altered when converted into volumes, as much so as a watch crystal is altered when broken into fragments." Not so. The "volumes" are but parts of the whole which was called the cup, and still just as drinkable as before; but the breaking of the crystal renders it unusable. I failed to find your answer to my question, "For this (cup) is my blood of the N. T." "This cup is the N. T. in my blood." Do both passages refer to the same cup? Don't fail to answer in your next. My quotation from Thayer on "Gar" stands unnoticed. Webster defines "cup" under 5. "The wine of the communion." My respondent quotes from N. L. Clark on how to drink the cup. I will quote from the ablest defender of the one container I have ever met, "The cup" as mentioned by Christ in Mat. 26:27 names a certain volume of wine set apart by the church of Christ to be used in the communion service." (Frank Stark, Anson, Texas.) May I hold you to this definition? The following scriptures prove there was only one congregation in Jerusalem. Reader, read them. Act. 2:46; 5:11-14; 6:1-7; 11:26; 14:27; 15:3-5; 15:22; 15:30-31; 16:5; "Drink ye all of it for this (cup) is my blood." (Jesus.)

Oct. 9, 1930.

J. N. COWAN.

THIRD REPLY

Since you need "dodging room," and are afraid of spoiling it by defining the terms of your proposition, as an honest debater should (See Hedge's Elements of Logic), it will not be expected of you; but you should at least word the proposition as we signed it.

I see a material difference between the cup and the word cup; the former is "a drinking vessel" Christ "took," as you now admit; the latter is a word. However, "the fruit of the vine" is neither; much less is it the use of either.

"Laugh"? No; I pity your ignorance; and for "good measure" will cite other standard works. See The Form of Baptism. And lest it be not "procured by every reader" and you could not find the place in the "work," I'll give a passage or two. Page 73: "Is the point of agreement between the 'proper or literal' meaning of baptizo and this metaphor found in the pouring?" Page 77: "There is enveloping in baptism as indicated by the 'proper or literal' meaning of the word." See also Bullinger on Figures of the Bible.

Here is the crux. If cup here is used literally, your proposition is false, and you know it. And you shall not "eek out" or sneak out on cups.

I have given the Head of the Department of N. T. Greek of Harvard University and Chicago University, and can now

add Harry M. Hubbell, of Yale (letter Oct. 8, 1930), that "cup" in Matt. 26:27 is used literally and that Thayer so notes it by "prop."

These "scholars" are more accessible to you and "the reader" by far than are the lexicons and other "standard works." A two-cent stamp in a letter of inquiry is sufficient. But you, like the baby sprinkler, want to ignore the "scholarship" and have dupes take your ipse dixit and subterfuges. Why so? Because your position drives you to this. And he can go to Webster for "sprinkle" as fast as you can for "The wine of the communion." And this sectarian route is that by which you try to escape. But when you go outside of poterion, "a cup, a drinking vessel" (Thayer), for an idea not inherent in this word, I'll force you to go outside of baptisma, "immersion" (Thayer), for an idea not inherent in this word, and make you take "sprinkling, pouring or immersion" by Webster. Now take this slimy trail if you dare.

✓ Rev. 17:4. Cannot a word be used literally in a symbolic Scripture? What "standard work" or recognized "scholar" gives "cup" as used by metonymy in Mt. 26:27? If "cup" in Rev. 17:4 is used figuratively, what is the figure of speech? What does Thayer mean by "prop." if not "literally"? "Furnish the goods" now. You better make at least a stagger at answering my questions if you are going to debate.

One thing "Thay all drank out of it" (Mk. 14:23) does prove, and that is that "cup" in this verse, as in Mt. 26:27, is "the vessel out of which one drinks." (Thayer p. 510. And "the vessel out of which one drinks" is not "the fruit of the vine." "Selah." And to "drink the cup" they must drink "what is in the cup." (Thayer, p. 510) or "what it contains." (N. L. Clark.) And no living man can refute it.

Was the "well" "the vessel out of which one drinks"? Did they drink the "well"? The "well" is conspicuous by its absence under "the vessel out of which one drinks." And "rock" (I Cor. 9:7) comes under "supply," and not "the vessel out of which one drinks." (Thayer, p. 191.) And if you will consult Winer, sec. 40, b3, as Thayer cites it, you may see where the "rock" comes.

✓ "This" (Mt. 26:28) is used "adjectively." (Cowan) Shades of more—gall, or is it pure ignorance? "This" is used substantively, subject of "is." And gar, in none of its uses, as you quote from Thayer, hinders "cup" in the preceding verse from being used literally, as Thayer shows, and every other Greek scholar knows.

✓ Your "the container which suggests it," shows that the container, cup, in this case, even if named by metonymy, is not "it" in the cup, suggested by naming the cup. It takes "Container and the contained" both to make this kind of metonymy. And one is not the other any more than black is white. More "Thanks."

"To eat the supper is to eat the elements that compose it." (Cowan) Then "eat" the fruit of the vine, brother. And not until you can "drink the cup" in some other way than "By drinking what it contains" (Clark), or "what is in the cup" (Thayer), can you dispense with the "cup" in the Supper. And this no living man can do. "Selah."

"Just as drinkable" in cups, eh? Then let us see them "drink the cup" in some other way than by drinking "what is in the cup," or "what it contains." Your "cups" are as "un-useful" for this as is the broken crystal for your watch. The fact that they met for "worship" in "ordinary dwellings," in "private houses," in "the church in this or that man's house, Rom. 16:5, 15; I Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phil. verse 2," is proof from the Bible and from "standard works" that there were no big congregations for "worship," no matter for what reason or reasons they so congregated.

At the "play" upon "congregation," I can beat you. There was but one in all the world, for "on this rock I will build my congregation," and "congregation of the first-born," and "he is the head of the body, the congregation." (L. O.)

I do not "endorse" any Revision or Translation in toto. Now I'm "on." Get me off if you can.

"Name" is used in a wide range of meanings now-a-days. In the sense that "the cup" could have but "one volume" of liquid in it; it points, designates, shows, or "names" "one volume, the statement is true. But the statement is not a "definition" of anything. Neither is your proposition a "definition" of anything.

If you use cup twice (It is used but once in any text.) in Matt., it is used literally in the first case and by metonymy in the second, just as Thayer gives it in Lk. 22:20 and I Cor. 11:25, and says, "The meaning is 'this cup containing wine,

an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant." (p. 15) I answered your "same cup," saying I find but one which contained "the fruit of the vine."

Oct. 15, 1930.

H. C. HARPER.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

I have accepted the correction in the reading of the proposition, and offered to define anything not made clear. The word "cup" was used to designate the fruit of the vine, calling the contents by the name of the container. That is what my proposition means. It is an outrage to every candid mind to argue "cup" in Rev. 17:4 means a literal cup. A symbolic woman with a literal cup in her hand! Preposterous! A travesty on the word of God!!! Why say it was literal? Because Mat. 26:27 is cited under the same head, and in order to make the latter literal, the former must also be literal. Thayer is not responsible for my opponent's ridiculous conclusion. On "pino ck," Thayer p. 510, "of the vessel out of which one drinks," three passages are cited, Mat. 26:27; Mar. 14:23 and 1 Cor. 10:4. The last passage makes the rock the vessel out of which Israel drank. If man and beast drank out of this rock vessel without lipping the rock, then we may drink out of the vessel which contains the wine without lipping it. Thayer is my witness, not your's. Again, I say, excerpts from private correspondence is not considered proof in this kind of debate, and specially not, when your opponent has no privilege of examining the witness. Do the standard authorities fail you? You wont endorse Goodspeed's translation, yet you call on him to help you in a private letter. My last argument on the pronoun "this" stands unassailed. Does Webster know what pronouns are? "It takes both container and contents to make this kind of metonymy." It does not take both to make what Jesus referred to when he said, "cup." Your question, "Do you eat the wine" seems like child's play. I will state it this way, we eat and drink the Lord's supper. If the vessel is a part of the supper, as you say, do you eat or drink it? You are the only man I ever met who contends that the dishes a supper is served in are a part of the supper. What next? The citation given to prove congregations worshipped in private homes do not refer to the large congregation in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Come on with the proof that thirty-one were organised on that day, and fifty more a few days later. If you do not, you will have to take the position they divided the congregation in order to commune. Neither did you prove they met in private homes in other places in order to use only one drinking vessel. You claim to have proven there were no big congregations for worship on Pentecost. "All that believed were together and had all things common." "And they, continuing daily with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." This breaking bread was, one in which they ate meat, and was done in their homes, but their worship was conducted in the Temple, where all were together. "And great fear came upon all the church—and they were all with one accord in Solomon's porch." Many other references could be given, and were given in my last but these are enough to disprove your contention that there were numerous congregations in Jerusalem, and if there were not, you lose on the cup question. "One congregation in all the world," and one cup for this congregation, namely, the fruit of the vine when set apart for the communion. Beat me again will you? "The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 names a certain volume of wine set apart for use on the Lord's table." Harper says this statement is true. Again, he says "the word cup as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 is the name of a solid." Both statements cannot be true. One time he says the word as used by Christ names a solid, the next time he says it was used to name a volume of wine, a liquid. Plain contradiction. The truth is, the Lord took bread, called it his body, one element of the Supper; and then he took the fruit of the vine, called the cup, the other element of the supper. The vessel containing the wine is no more an element of the Supper than is the plate which contains the bread.

I had a right to expect my opponent to answer my question, viz: Does "this is my blood of the N. T." of Mat. 26:28 and "This cup is the N. T. in my blood" of Luk. 22:20 mean the same? If he says yes, he loses, if he says no he has two cups. I have no desire to go outside of Thayer's definition of Cup. (Peterion) It does mean "a cup, a drinking vessel." But Christ used this name to designate what was in it,

and what was in it was the cup, as proven by "this (cup) is my blood of the N. T. Reading with this understanding, "He took the wine, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, drink ye all of it. For this is my blood, etc." Now gentle reader, try the literal view. He took the vessel, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying drink ye all of it. For this is my blood, etc." Do you think it requires the aid of a College Professor to determine which position is right? From my point of view, my opponent has solicited all the help possible to prove that Christ told a falsehood when he defined the cup in Mat. 26:28. Lord what is the cup? Answer, "This cup is my blood." Harper, and his garbled correspondence with Professors, to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Oct. 21, 1930.

J. N. COWAN.

FOURTH REPLY

"Garbled," eh? "Garble, to mutilate; to say in the wrong way." Bring the proof, brother, or retract this. Such aspersion well befits the man who has not yet worded his proposition as signed, nor defined its terms. Define "cup."

These letters were in your hands at Graham, Texas; and these scholars are accessible to you for verification. You want us, like sectarian dupes, to take "Cowan says it," do you?

You say such evidence is not proof. It is. (See "The Form of Baptism" and "The Handbook on Baptism.")

I have shown by the Standard Lexicon and by the living scholarship that "cup" in Mt. 26:27 is used literally. This refutes you.

You are affirmant: answer my questions. 1. Cannot a word be used literally in symbolic Scriptures? (Your ignorance here is a "travesty" on God and man.) 2. What "standard work" or "recognized scholar" says that "cup" is used by metonymy in Mt. 26:27, as you do? (Cowan says it) doesn't go now.) 3. If "cup" in Rev. 17:4 is used figuratively, as you have tried to make it appear, what is the "figure of speech" used? 4. What does Thayer mean by "prop," if not literally? There are others you have not answered.

Thayer, under "the vessel out of which one drinks" (p. 610) cites three passages on the Lord's supper: Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; 1 Cor. 11:28, the very ones he cites under the literal use of "cup," p. 333. And this clinches it, refuting you. And he cites "W. sec. 40, 3b." for the use of "rock".

"Without liping it," "Cowan says." Listen!

Elk City, Okla., Oct. 24, 1929.

Lexicographer The New Standard Dictionary
354-360 Fourth Ave., New York City.

Dear Sir:

Kindly submit answers to the following: 1. What would one have to do in order to drink from or out of a cup? 2. Must one put one's lips to a cup and drink in order to drink from or out of a cup?

New York, November 14, 1929.

Mr. H. C. Harper,
Elk City, Okla.

Dear Sir:—Replying to your inquiry, one drinks out of or from a cup when one places a cup to one's lips and drinks.

Certainly one must place a cup to one's lips in order to drink out of or from it.

Very truly yours,

THE LEXICOGRAPHER, B.

No, the "standard authorities" do not fail me, brother.

"This"—your "argument." You did not even know that "this" was not used "adjectively" here. I have shown that there is nothing in the use of "this" or "gar" in verse 28 to prevent the literal use of "cup" in verse 27, as Thayer cites it.

"Goodspeed"—you do not endorse his tr., yet you called on him for your "Colonade." "Selah."

Yes, Webster knows "what pronouns are," and you should know enough English to know that his definition does not cover all of them.

"Does not take both" container and contents as Jesus used "cup," eh? Then Jesus never used it by metonymy, which takes "Container and the thing contained." Williams, p. 220. But even if he did, it would not make them "one and the same."

"We eat and drink the Lord's supper," eh? Then we eat the bread and wine and drink the bread and wine, just as "John reads and writes English and Latin."

I can eat the bread without the plate. Can you "drink the

cup" without the cup? Let us see you "drink the cup" without drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer) or "what it contains" (Clark).

"One congregation in all the world," and your "one cup, the fruit of the vine." Now conduct the N. T. worship without "dividing" this congregation. You "fudged" with "25 or 50 thousand, even. And when you limit, we will, too."

It reads, "And he took a cup." Now see Cowan's English: He took a wine. And "This cup is my blood," is a Cowan tr. It is not in the Bible.

The Bible reads, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," "Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25, "in both which," Thayer says, "the meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'"

I answered your question on "the same cup," saying I find but one.

You've changed the language attributed to Bro. Frank Stark. Which time did you get what he said? I made it clear that "names," only in the sense I explained, makes it true, and that is, "In the sense that 'the cup' could have but 'one volume' of liquid it it." Now meet what I said.

"In the temple: They gathered there for the purpose of teaching the multitudes." Johnson, P's N. T.

"Breaking bread from house to house may refer to observing the Lord's Supper in private residences." Ib.

"Acts 2:44: All were together; not all those thousands in one place (this was impossible); but as Dr. Lightfoot explains it, they kept together in several companies or congregations, according as their language, nations or their associations, brought them and kept them together."—Matthew Henry, Vol. VI. "Acts 2:46: They did not think fit to celebrate the eucharist in the temple, for that was peculiar to the Christian institutions, and therefore they administered that ordinance in private houses of the converted Christians."—Ib.

"And he took a cup (poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel—Thayer), and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it. For this (suggesting the "wine" in the cup) is my blood," etc. Mt. 26:27, 28. In this view I am sustained by the Standard Lexicon and living scholars, what "Cowan says" to the contrary notwithstanding.

Oct. 25, 1930.

H. C. HARPER.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

"Garble" also means, "to select such parts as are wanted or may serve some particular purpose." (Webster), and I have nothing to "retract." At last, after much complaint, my opponent has found one word in the proposition he wants defined. The word "cup" as used by Christ referred to the fruit of the vine. I have given this definition several times. One of the letters displayed at Graham was considerably mutilated. The readers of this debate do not care to write personal letters to these Professors to see if you are right. You have not shown by the STANDARD LEXICON that you were right. But you have tried to force him to say Rev. 17:4 was a literal use of the word cup. You have not explained how a sym-bolical woman could hold a literal cup in her hand.

Questions.

1. It is not so used in Rev. 17:4. 2. Mat. 26:28. 3. Don't matter just so it is not used literally. 4. He means cup is used properly in Rev. 17:4, but he knew and you know it was not used literally. "Of the vessel out of which one drinks" is cited 1 Cor. 10:4. The rock was the vessel out of which both man and beast drank. We may drink the cup precisely as they drank the rock. To drink the water which came from the rock was to drink out of it, and to drink the wine which comes from the cup is to drink out of it. "This refutes you," I freely admit that we must put our lips to what Jesus called the cup to drink from it, but we may do that without putting our lips to the vessel the cup was in. Your scholars do not contradict this. You have not shown one thing about "this" and "gar," nor even replied to my arguments on them. You are defeated on pronouns until you bring a definition from standard authority which says they sometimes do not stand for their antecedents. "This" stands for "cup" the very cup Jesus took, and he says it is his blood. You are tied here to stay. I only quoted Goodspeed on "Colonade" and asked if you endorsed him. You turned him down, and then wrote him to help you out later. I was determined to stop so much "Goodspeed" from your pen, and I have succeeded. While

it takes both container and contained to make this kind of metonymy, Jesus could and did refer to the contents when he said "cup," "for this (cup) is my blood." All your quibbling about eating and drinking bread and wine is to cover up your sad plight, in which you said the vessel was an element of the supper. You are required to tell us whether you eat or drink the vessel. If it is one of the elements you must do one or the other. "Come on." The "one congregation in all the world," was too much for you. Of course we all have one bread and one blood, "the bread" and "the cup." The word "congregation" from L. O. was not used in the sense of Local congregation, however. But, you are still in a muddle about the Jerusalem church. Your authorities do not help you; Johnson said they gathered in the temple to teach the multitudes, and Lightfoot says they could not do 'er, for it was impossible. "Breaking bread from house may refer to observing the Lord's supper." Not certain. Yet it is certain they had meat in these meals. Acts 2:46. Now, I ask my opponent if he is going to take the "sectarian route" through the commentators? Will you take them on Baptism? When I quote Webster on "cup"—"the wine of the communion," you cry "slimy trail," and now you have selected one more slimy. You should "go out and weep bitterly." "This cup is my blood" a Cowan tr. Harper says the word "cup" may be supplied, so it is as much his tr. as mine. In Luk. 22:20 Harper says the cup is a literal vessel an emblem of the N. T. That is one cup. In Mat. 26:28, "For this (cup) is my blood, Harper says that is the wine. That is another cup. He contends that the literal cup or vessel is one emblem of the supper, and the wine, a figurative cup is another emblem of the supper. He says you drink from one, and drink the other. Two cups as clear as day. To be sure I am not mistaken, the reader will remember Harper has emphasized the Container-cup as being an emblem of the N. T., and the contents-cup as an emblem of the blood of Christ. These two cups cannot be the same cup, and at the same time be emblematical of two entirely different things. Now to forever explode his theory that "This cup is the N. T. in my blood," is a literal vessel, I have but to finish the quotation, "which is shed for you." The subject of the verb "is shed" is either "cup" or "blood," and in either case it everlastingly ruins Harper's position. I contend that "cup" is the subject.

For my opponents benefit, and that it may help him out of some of his difficulties, and for the sake of argument, I will say that the fruit of the vine referred to by Christ when he said cup in Mat. 26:27, was the literal fruit of the vine, a literal cup in that sense, and the same cup, fruit of the vine, was used in a figurative sense in V. 28 in the expression, "This is my blood." I will close this with the following contradiction: "The word cup as used by Christ in Mat. 27:27 names a certain volume of wine used by the church of Christ in the communion service." (Stark & Harper.) "The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 is the name of a solid." (Harper.) A case of Harper meeting himself coming back. Oct. 31, 1930. J. N. COWAN.

FIFTH REPLY

Rule 1, Hedge's "rules of honorable controversy," says, "The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the precise point at issue, should be so clearly defined, that there could be no misunderstanding respecting them." This you have not done.

"The word 'cup' as used by Christ referred to the fruit of the vine," is not a definition of cup. Thayer defines thus: "poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel." Hence, "a cup, a drinking vessel" is poterion. And if "cup" (Mt. 26:27 referred to "the fruit of the vine," it and the fruit of the vine are not "one and the same," for the thing that refers to the other is not the other.

I did not "select" any "parts" of these letters, but turned them over to you, and you know it. "Garble"—your foot! And if it "mutilated" Dr. Rope's for him to mark out, you have "mutilated" every paper you have turned in on this debate. Your "opponent" has "the goods," that's all.

Thayer means "properly" by "properly," another of your "definitions." Cute, if you are in the baby class. Does properly mean figuratively? "Come on now." "Cup" (Mt. 26:27; Rev. 17:4) is cited by Thayer under properly, and I have shown by "standard works" that we may say "proper or literal." And when you learn the difference between "literal cup" and the word "cup" used literally, the "symbolical woman" will not trouble you. No wonder you can't tell the "fig-

ure of speech" in the use of "cup" here—you can't make something out of nothing, and you know it. The Bible nowhere "says" anything about "metonymy." And if you are in the fool class, your citing "Mat. 26:28" as answer to my question, "What 'standard work' or 'recognized scholar' says that 'cup' is used by metonymy in Mt. 26:27, as you do? does very well; and the Bible says, "Answer a fool according to his folly." Such a man does not want the truth! Thayer gives all about gar and "this," and yet cites "cup" here under the "proper or literal" use of the word; and this refutes all you may say to the contrary. The Bible does not say, "This cup is my blood," neither do I endorse it. Jesus could and did suggest the contents of the "cup" (Mt. 26:27) by "this" (v. 28), making the "wine" "an emblem of blood," as Thayer says when considering, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood," (Luke 22:20 and I Cor. 11:25), saying, "in both which the meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'" (p. 15) "It takes both container and contained to make this kind of metonymy." (Cowan) Yes, and the cup is the New Testament, and the "contained" is the blood. And the man who cannot see it ought to be "bored for the simples." "Two cups"—your foot! And you "must" put the cup to your lips, with its contents, and drink, thus drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer) or "what it contains" (Clark), and not what was in the cup or what it contained, or dispute the "LEXICOGRAPHER" and the "STANDARD LEXICON." "Emblem of the supper"—your foot! Meet what I say.

"To eat the supper is to eat the elements that compose it," (Cowan) in "hook" at "cup an element of the Supper." Has he eaten the "wine" yet? The cup is "a drinking vessel." And a drinking vessel is the cup. I drink the cup by drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer) or "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (Clark, in Clark-Harper Debate) Now, "Come on," and eat the "wine." All scholars "contradict" what you say here.

"That rock was Christ," and it was "spiritual drink" (I Cor. 10:4) Why not read what Thayer cites, and get the truth ("W. sec. 40, 3b.)?

"The vessel the cup was in." (Cowan) What word in the Greek do you render "cup" here? And what word do you render "vessel"? "Come on now."

"Pronouns." "A pronoun cannot be defined merely as 'a word used instead of a noun.'" (Swinton, p. 28). "Can a pronoun be used figuratively and have for its antecedent a word used literally?" Answer: "Yes." (Jas. M. Farr, Head Department of English, University of Florida.)

"Stark & Harper"—your foot! I said, and I repeated it, that "names" in the statement, if used in the sense that "the cup" could have but "one volume" of liquid in it, is true. Now meet what I said! And what you say about my writing Goodspeed is an absolute untruth. The man who makes a statement about another not knowing that it is true, is as bad as the man who makes a statement, knowing that it is not true."

You have shown yourself an ignoramus in trying to criticize Goodspeed's translation, and you have not "stopped" anything from my pen. You don't know even the parts of speech in English sentences.

Webster gives the current use of English words. "The lexicons define the N. T. Greek, and they say poterion means, "a drinking cup," "a cup, a drinking vessel." But if you take current English, you must take sprinkle and pour for baptism, as I have shown. And when you bring the evidence (as I have done in your case) to prove that what the witnesses I have given, say, is not true, it will then be time enough for you to shout "more slimy." To take the sectarian dodge (See Campbell-Rice Debate; The Form of Baptism," et al.) "I impeach the witness," only shows "the white feather."

Johnson says they were in the temple to teach; Lightfoot says they were in separate "congregations," and so does McGarvey. You are added. If "congregation" in L. O. "is not used in the sense of Local congregation," "congregation" in Acts 2 was not a local congregation.

What ails you? You "fudged" even at 25,000. Wouldn't touch it. Why? Because you cannot worship as the N. T. directs with it, and you dare not "divide the congregation" without letting us out, per your own logic, "so you play 'dog in the manger.'" You can't "do 'er" either way. But we can worship as the N. T. directs, for the Lord in his word provides for "churches of Christ," and we have all that are necessary to worship him as "it is written."

There may be some who are afraid of spoiling "what Cowan says" by writing to these "scholars;" but there are others

who want the truth.

As a matter of truth "blood" is subject of "is shed," and I have "everlastingly ruined" your "contents-cup" theory here. And your "figure of a figure" ("Mat. 26:27) caps the climax of your absurd lingo.

Nov. 5, 1930.

H. C. HARPER.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE

My opponents fifth bunch of quibbles are before me as I write my last affirmative. He is the only one, I'm sure, who does not know the point at issue, and his reference to the rule is to hide defeat. I'm contending the cup is the fruit of the vine in the passage given, and he says it is the vessel. I have defined every word I have been asked to. "Poterion" is the name of a vessel, cup; But Christ referred to the contents when he used it, and that makes the fruit of the vine and the cup the same. Note, I did not say "cup" referred to the contents, but Christ did refer to the contents when he used the word.

I again say, if it will help my respondent any with his scholars, that the fruit of the vine is just as literal as the bread, and I'm sure the same scholars will say "bread" in verse 26 is used literally. Christ took two elements, bread and wine, literally, and he used them both figuratively as follows: "This is my body," "This is my blood." We eat the bread and drink the wine, and if the vessel, as you say, is one element, I would be glad you tell us which you do with it. Christ, my Standard authority and Star witness says "This is my blood," and the pronoun "this" stands for its antecedent, "cup" There you stay.

The "symbolical woman has not bothered me, but she has ruined your contention, for the merest tyro in Bible knowledge knows a symbolical woman did not have a literal cup in her symbolical hand.

You are now committed to the position that the contents is not the cup, and if the wine was a cup, it would make two cups, one a solid, and the other a liquid. "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this (cup) and divide it (cup) among yourselves." The wine not being called cup, they divided the vessel. Shame! Yes, we drink the cup and the rock, by drinking what they contain. (Thayer) But we have now learned (?) the Israelites never drink any literal water, it was "spiritual drink" that both men and cattle drank. Can you beat it? Was it more spiritual than drinking the Lord's cup? "The word 'cup' as used by Christ names a certain volume of wine used by the church of Christ in the communion service." Harper. "The word 'cup' as used by Christ is the name of a solid." Harper. Contradiction. "A pronoun cannot be defined merely as 'a word used instead of a noun,' but they always stand for their antecedents, and the antecedent of 'this' in Mat. 26:28 is 'cup' of the 27 verse. You said so at Graham. I remind you that the Greek word rendered cup in Mat. 26:27 is the same word rendered cup in 1 Cor. 10:21, and you say it means contents in the last passage. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of Devils." So we have a cup in a cup. What you say about not writing Goodspeed is summed up in the following from your second negative. "Is 'cup' in Rev. 17:4 used figuratively? "No"—Edgar J. Goodspeed,—Sept. 30, 1930." If you did not ask Goodspeed the above question, who did? The answer was obtained from him since our debate at Graham as the date shows. Either give the author of the question or take it back. Lord forgive him. You want take Goodspeed on, "They would all meet together in Solomon's Colonnade," because you try to prove by commentators that it was an impossibility. You impeached your own witness. Next, you quote Johnson, "they were in the temple to teach," and Lightfoot, "They were in separate congregations." So we have the separate congregations all in the temple, or one of your witnesses lied. Imagine thirty-one congregations with thirty one cups all in the temple. (Some Sunday school.) 25 thousand can be served with one cup, the wine, but cannot with one cup, a solid. You did what I predicted, made blood the subject of "is shed" and I say so too, but this cup" is that, and that is why I said cup was the subject, the equivalent of blood. If this debate has two-thousand readers, imagine Ropes, or Pharr receiving two thousand letters inquiring if Harper told the truth. Quote standard works in a written debate please. Thayer said too much for you in every place you quoted. No doubt some of your friends will say you skinned me alive, per the following gleaned from your last. "Your foot" five times. "Baby class"; "Fool class"; "Such a man does not want the truth"; "Bored for

the simples"; "Ignoramus"; "Fudged"; "Dog in the manger"; "Absurd lingo."

I have shown if "This is my body" refers to the bread he took, "This is my blood" refers to the cup he took. This has not been met. Not one word has been said about the scripture proof I gave that there was only one congregation in Jerusalem. I gave Thayer on "Gar" tr. "for" showing it meant a father explanation of cup as used in V. 27. Also Webster on "this," referring to the last thing mentioned and demonstrating what was last said about the cup, but have no reply. I have called for the Bible or history that says the disciples ever met in private homes in order to use one container. It has not been given. I have shown that the cup and the wine were the same because both are elements of the supper. The container is not. Space forbids I sum up more. "And he took the cup (wine), gave thanks, and gave it (the wine) to them saying, Drink ye all of it (wine), for this (wine) is my blood of the N. T." This proves our Lord was talking about the wine when he said cup. That is my proposition. Thanks!

Nov. 11, 1930.

J. N. COWAN.

FINAL REPLY

"The cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 and "the fruit of the vine" are one and the same. J. N. Cowan affirms."

He has not once given us his proposition as signed, nor defined its terms, preferring, it seems, to go down as a dishonorable debater rather than expose himself.

I have shown that Thayer cites Mt. 26:27 under the "prop." use of "cup," and not under "by meton." And this alone defeats him. And when he jumps to "metonymy" to escape this, he only "Jumps out of the frying pan into the fire."

He admits "It takes both container and contained to make this kind of metonymy." (5th aff.) And he now admits "cup" here is the "container," for he says, "The Lord had a container in his hand when he instituted the supper." (3d aff.) And he says, "I have no desire to go outside of Thayer's definition of Cup, Poterion." (4th aff.)

Thayer defines: "poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel." Then wherever we find "cup," it means "a drinking vessel" in its N. T. sense, or Thayer did not define poterion correctly. Hence, where we find "cup" we know that "a drinking vessel" is meant, and we can use the specific term "cup" instead of the generic word container. Hence, it takes both "cup" and "the fruit of the vine" to make this kind of metonymy. And this refutes his contention that "the cup" is "the fruit of the vine," unless he can show that the "container" is the "contained." And worse, it makes the "container," which is "the cup" in this place, the "blood," for he says, "The Lord had a container in his hand when he instituted the supper." (3d aff.) And "This stands for 'cup' the very cup Jesus took." (5th aff.) Again he says, "The antecedent of 'this' in Mat. 26:28 is 'cup' of 27 verse." (6th aff.) Then the container, and not the contained, is the blood. He is tied here to stay. And now he has gar to add an "explanation," showing the container is the blood. Now do you wonder why Thayer and these "scholars" do not put "cup" in Mt. 26:27 under "by meton."? Surely not.

"And he took a cup ('a drinking vessel'—Thayer), and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it ('out of the cup'—1 Cor. 11:28)—"And they all drank out of it" (Mk. 14:23)—for this (pronoun suggesting the contents of the "cup" (See Dr. Farr, 2d Reply) is my blood of the New Testament." (Mt. 26:27-8) Hence Thayer says, "This cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant." (p. 15) And this gives gar the correct force, as Thayer has pointed out. And in "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you" (Lk. 22:20) it is blood that "is shed," and not cup "is shed," and the "cup is the N. T.," just as Thayer points out in saying, "The meaning is, 'this cup-containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'" (P. 15) And this gives the "cup" and "the fruit of the vine" each its proper use in the Communion. And since they must "drink the cup" and can do this only by drinking "what is in the cup (Thayer, p. 510), they thus 'divide' or 'share' it, making the 'cup,' as well as 'its contents' an element of the institution. And it is a 'shame' that a preacher does not know this much, even when he can't 'eat' the 'wine.' And I have not only Christ as my Standard Authority and Star Witness, but also the whole galaxy "scholars."

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, J. D. Phillips,
Sneads, Florida Montebello, California
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00

LATCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

Order the HARPER-COWAN DISCUSSION
from "THE TRUTH," Sneads, Florida.
10c each; \$1.00 a dozen.

Yes, it is literal "bread" and literal "fruit of the vine" in the metaphors, "this is my body" and "this is my blood," just as it is a literal cup in metonymy. And we "drink the cup" by drinking what it contains, and in no other way. (Clark) I never said "cup" anywhere "means contents," and this "cup in a cup" is bred of ignorance. Neither did I say what he has my name to, as the reader can verify. And I never intimated that "a symbolical woman has a literal cup in her hand." The word cup has its "proper or literal" use here, as Thayer cites it. Now let literary critics judge "Who's who" here. Neither does Thayer cite the "rock" with "by drinking what it contains." Who said they did not drink literal water? He doesn't know what Paul is talking about, and can't "beat it" unless he has "cattle" drink "spiritual drink" for "that rock was Christ." Thayer cites "W. sec. 40, 3b" for explanation. Look it up.

I have never "turned Goodspeed down," nor written him as you say I did. And what you gave from him is in Acts 5, about the "apostles," and we were considering Acts 2 with Johnson and McHenry. And if they met in the Temple in congregations, they met in the temple as Johnson says "to teach the people."

The Bible and history teach that they met for worship in their houses, not in the temple, whatever the reason or reasons for doing so matters not, it shows they did not take the Communion in the temple, nor did they have big congregations. And he must conduct the worship" as the Bible directs" with 25,000, "one speaking at a time" for if he "divides the church," we shall turn him over to the S. S. folks. And he can't "do'er." I suggest that he write the "scholars" and incorporate it with this debate to save so much writing. The Judgment is coming; let us stand by the Bible.
Nov. 17, 1930. H. C. HARPER, Sneads, Fla.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Proposition: The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. H. C. Harper affirms; J. N. Cowan denies.

"A solid is a substance having a fixed form." "A name is a distinguishing title put upon a person or thing." "As used by Christ in Mt. 26:27," that is, in its New Testament meaning exemplified in Mt. 26:27. "The word 'cup,' 'that is, the word which is the translation of the Greek word *poterion*, 'a cup, a drinking vessel.'"

We are here brought face to face with the meaning of a New Testament word, as has been the case in the question as to "the form of baptism." And that the reader may get the issue clearly fixed in mind, the following statements are given: "We have to admit that one cup is mentioned." (W) "Sure: but the container is not mentioned at all." (J. N. Cowan, Mch. 21, 1929) Again: "I am fully convinced that when a brother takes the position that Christ or Paul referred to the container when they said cup is a heretic." (Ib.). Again: "I have never communed where there was more than one cup in

the scriptural meaning of that cup." (J. N. Cowan, June 18, 1925)

This question has been mistified by importing circumstances and consequences into the meaning of the word just as the baptism question has been on "the form of baptism; and to this end figurative language has been brought to bear upon the subject.

Poterion, which is here translated "cup," is a New Testament word, and it is defined by the Standard Lexicon for New Testament Greek: "a cup, a drinking vessel." (Thayer, p. 533) And this is its "scriptural meaning." And since "a cup, a drinking vessel" is the name of a solid, and Christ here "took" a cup, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

1. The word *poterion* as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a cup, a drinking vessel.

2. The name of a cup, a drinking vessel, is the name of a solid.

3. Therefore, the word *poterion* as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

But the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the translation of *poterion* as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27; therefore the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of the drinking vessel which he "took."

2. The name of the drinking vessel which he "took" is the name of a solid.

3. Therefore, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of the vessel they drank out of.

2. The name of the vessel they drank out of is the name of a solid.

3. Therefore, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

Nov. 23, 1930.

H. C. HARPER, Sneads, Fla.

J. N. COWAN'S FIRST REPLY

My opponents last negative and first affirmative is now before me. "Final reply." I submitted to the correction in wording of proposition and defined every term I was asked to. Nothing "dishonorable." When I admitted that Jesus had a container in his hand, I did not admit he referred to it when he said cup, but to what it contained. I showed "This is my body" referred to the bread he took, and "this is my blood" referred to the cup he took. This ought to settle the whole matter. "Then wherever we find 'cup,' it means, 'a drinking vessel' in its N. T. sense, or Thayer did not define 'poterion' correctly." Reader, please note "wherever we find cup" it means a drinking vessel. Then we may read "Father let this drinking vessel pass from me." "As oft as ye drink this drinking vessel." "Ye cannot drink the drinking vessel of the Lord and the drinking vessel of the devil." The woman of Rev. 17:4, while a symbolical woman, had a drinking vessel (literal) in her hand full of fornication. "I will take the drinking vessel (cup) of salvation." The above is the absurd predicament that a false theory leads a man into.

It would be somewhat amusing to hear my opponent explain how "the shedding of my blood" would render the literal container an emblem of the N. T. Thayer does not imply that the container was shed, but the shed blood of the grape was an emblem because it symbolized the shed blood of Christ. As long as the vessel is considered an element of the supper, you must tell whether you eat or drink it. "And I never intimated that 'a symbolical woman has a literal cup in her hand'" This admission gives the whole argument up. Thayer used the word "cup" "properly" in Rev. 17:4 to describe a symbolical cup, and so did Christ use the word in Mt. 26:27. He used the "proper word," to describe that which represented his blood. GOOD-BYE HARPER!!

Your battery has been silenced on "the spiritual drink" and the Jerusalem church." You most assuredly quoted from Goodspeed bearing date of Sept. 30, 1930. (See second reply). Why do you deny it? The Bible nor history says they met in their houses in Jerusalem to worship. Try again. The scriptures cited in my third affirmative clearly prove there was but one congregation in Jerusalem, and not a one of these has my opponent noticed.

First affirmative. My opponents capital error is in allowing "cup" to have only one meaning in the N. T. I agree that in some places it means a solid, but, not in all places. My opponent says "everywhere" The fallacy of such may be

seen by referring to quotations already given in this article. Another error is, in contending that Christ could not have spoken of the contents while he had a container in his hand. It is limiting the ability of Christ to speak of that which represented his blood, because he had it in a container.

I have nothing to retract from quotations cited from my pen. Use more of them when you see fit. The issue is not whether the word "cup" is the name of a solid, but whether it was used to designate a solid in Mat. 26:27. Christ used the word "cup" which is the name of a solid to describe that which was not a solid in, "Father, let this cup pass." The definition of a word may be substituted for the word without destroying the sense. If my opponent is right, we read again, "He also took the solid, and gave thanks, and gave it unto them, saying drink ye all of it." Every one knows this does not make good sense, hence my opponents position is wrong.

To show the fallacy of the syllogisms, we herewith submit one to compare with his first. 1. The word pterion as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a cup, a drinking vessel. 2. The name of a cup, a drinking vessel, is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore, the word pterion as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a solid. And Christ was praying that this drinking vessel, a solid, may pass from him. But the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the translation of pterion. Therefore, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a solid. Next, 1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 is the name of the drinking vessel which he "took." 2. The name of the drinking vessel which he "took" is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:27 is the name of a solid." This is stated exactly as My opponent has it. Now notice a parallel. 1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a drinking vessel which he was to drink. 2. The name of the drinking vessel which he was to drink is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a solid which he was to drink. The same answer may be given to his last syllogism. They are all wrong, because they are based upon a limited and restricted definition of the word "cup."

Question: Does it change the meaning of Mat. 26:28 to supply the word "cup" after "this"? If not, is this supplied word used to name a solid?

Nov. 28, 1930.

J. N. COWAN.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

He tries hard to patch up his defeat by another affirmative, and this entitles me to another "reply" and space also for my second affirmative.

He was asked time and again to define the terms of his proposition, but did not do it. "Admitted Jesus had a container in his hand." Yes, and he admitted it was a cup. "He said cup." Where? Not in Mt. 26:27. The only way he used "the cup" there was, "He took a cup." And you admit this was a "container," and the container was not "the fruit of the vine," as you affirm. And to clinch the matter I showed that Thayer gives "cup" here under "the vessel out of which one drinks." (p. 510) And to this Christ referred, "saying, Drink ye all out of it." (Mt. 26:27) And this is the "proper or literal" use of the word "cup," as Thayer cites it." (p. 533) And this alone settles it against you.

You say, "This is my blood" referred to the cup he took." Then the "container in his hand," which was "the cup," and not "the fruit of the vine," is the "blood."

But to try to escape, you dispute the world's ripest scholarship, and say "cup" is here used by metonymy, "container and contained." Then the cup is not the fruit of the vine unless the container is the contained. And since "this is my blood" referred to the cup he took, "a container in his hand," is the "blood." And gar adds an explanation why so.

Thayer says of—"This cup is the New Testament in my blood"—"The meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'" (p. 15) He does not "imply" that "the container was shed," but he says the blood was shed.

"Eat or drink it." I drink the cup, brother; and I do this by drinking "what is in the cup." (Thayer, p. 510) Now tell us how you dispense with the cup and yet "drink the cup." And you say the "wine" is an element of the supper, and that you eat the elements. Tell us how you "eat" the "wine." This is no "child's play." It is a man's job, and up to you.

Yes, the "proper word," cup, was used in Mt. 26:27 and

Rev. 17:4; but that is not what Thayer's notation "prop." under which he puts these passages, means; but he means the "proper or literal" use of the word "cup" here. Just let literary critics decide "Who's who" here, and tell who has "the argument." I stand with Thayer here.

My "battery" will play on you as long as you have "cattle" to drink "spiritual drink," for "that rock was Christ." And when you get that assembly of 25 or 50 thousand to "worship according to the N. T. pattern" without the "classes" or "churches of Christ," let us know. The disciples in Jerusalem, "breaking bread from house to house," just as the Bible and history say, and I have shown, is enough to satisfy us. And no need to say, "GOOD-BYE HARPER," for I expect to run you out of every hiding place before leaving. I did not say I did not quote Goodspeed. More of your "bunk" that I never said. You are good at making a man "meet himself" when you have to falsify to do it! Debaters that "know straight up" do not "reply" to citations of Scripture. What do you take me for?

Talk of "capital error"! "pterior, a cup, a drinking vessel." (Thayer) If this is "a limited" definition, just give the unlimited with the authority for it. And just cite the passage where pterior does not mean "a cup, a drinking vessel." We know what Jesus meant by attaching to his words the meaning they had when the N. T. was written, and to this end we take the Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, and Thayer's is the Standard. Whisper your "limit the ability of Christ" to the sprinkler. "It is limiting the ability of Christ to" say he could not have referred to sprinkle when he said baptizo. Is it? No, for N. T. words have fixed meaning. You now admit, "in some places it (cup) means a solid." It is a solid, but it "means" "a drinking vessel." The definition may be substituted for its word, but a solid is not the definition of "cup." "And he took a cup, a drinking vessel, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it." (Mt. 26:27) And Thayer gives "cup" here under "the vessel out of which one drinks." (p. 510) This is the literal use of the word. Cup is the name of a solid here.

"Christ used the word 'cup' which is the name of a solid to describe that which was not a solid in, 'Father, let this cup pass.'" (Cowan) This is a metaphor, hence not "cup to describe something else," but something else (affliction in this case) "likened to a cup" to drink out of. (Thayer, p. 533) If there is no "cup, a drinking vessel" meant by "cup" here, there is no metaphor.

One more, a metonymy: "As oft. . . drink this cup" — "drink cup of Lord"—"drink cup of devils." "How can one 'drink this cup'? By drinking what it contains, and in no other way" (Clark); by drinking "what is in the cup." (Thayer, p. 510) So here is "cup, a drinking vessel," or there is no metonymy. Hence "everywhere" in the N. T., pterior means "a cup, a drinking vessel," the name of a solid, these three uses—literal, metaphor, and metonymy—covering all.

We don't expect you to "retract" anything, not even the "heretic" but even if we are heretics in your sight, we are glad of the opportunity to expose your false teaching on this subject.

My arguments remain unrefuted, proving that—"The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. And you have conceded this in admitting Jesus used a container in his hand when he instituted the supper, and that this was a 'cup.'"

You can find the fallacy in your mimic stuff on page 189, in Elements of Logic by Davis. The fallacy of Figura dictionis occurs when a metaphor or other figure of speech is construed literally. This seems very trifling, but is a very subtle and ruinous form of fallacy he says.

"Cup" in Mt. 26:39 is in a metaphor. You can hold these figures up as literal language and make the unlearned jeer and laugh, but to those who see your sophistry, you appear as a simpleton or a knave. "Drink a cup." Cup here is a drinking vessel, a solid. (Harper) To "drink" means to swallow a liquid. You can't "do 'er." And all you lack now is the "laughing committee" to jeer and ha! ha! ha!!! But to one who knows the truth, that this is metonymy and involves "a cup, a drinking vessel" and its contents, and that one drinks a cup by drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer, p. 510), it is seen that cup here is "a cup, a drinking vessel," a solid. And in "Let this cup pass," your "was praying that this drinking vessel, a solid, may pass from him," to make it appear that "cup" here is not "a cup, a drinking vessel, a solid," is pure sophistry or ignorance. Of course, if the language were literal, that is it; but it is a metaphor in which he "likened" (Thayer, p. 533) his affliction to a cup from which

one drinks a bitter or poison potion. And "cup" here is "a cup, a drinking vessel, a solid, or there is no metaphor.
Dec. 3, 1930.

H. C. HARPER, Sneads, Fla.

J. N. COWAN' SECOND REPLY

My opponent "takes more space" after having his attention called twice to the fact that he was going beyond the agreed limit by 200 words. If the reader wants this verified, count the words. A contract holds only as long as both parties keep its conditions, therefore I have the right to an unlimited space. He certainly needs more space to get out of the ridiculous entanglements he is in.

Honestly, I do not see anything in his last that deserves a reply. The poor fellow cannot understand how the Lord could have had a container in his hand with the fruit of the vine in it, and have talked about the contents without talking about the container. In view of the fact that "it takes both literal container and it's contents to make this kind of metonymy" as my opponent says, it would be amusing to see him point out the literal container in Mat. 26:39. What literal container or drinking vessel did the Lord have his sufferings in?

Yes, "This is my blood" refers to the cup he took as much so as "This is my body" refers to the bread he took. My opponents inability to understand that he took the fruit of the vine called a cup at the same time he took the container which held it, is responsible for his confusion. And "Gar" translated "for" shows that "This is my blood of the N. T." is an explanation of the "cup" he took. "And he took a cup ----for this is my blood," etc.

Just how the literal drinking vessel was rendered "by the shedding of my blood" an emblem of the N. T. is still unexplained. What did the shedding of blood have to do with the vessel?

I have explained several times that I eat the bread and drink the wine, both elements of the supper, but the opposition has never said which he did with the vessel, cup. Paul said eat the Lord's supper, and all know that the wine was included. So when I am criticized for that expression, it is not I, but Paul who is criticized. I no more have cattle drinking spiritual drink than my adversary would have them baptised in the sea. Were it possible to assemble such a large assembly, that other congregations would have to be established in order to teach them, still it would not be necessary to establish other congregations in order to serve the Lord's cup. 25 or 50 thousand could easily be served with the wine without dividing them. Let the reader remember that I have cited passages of scripture to abundantly prove there was not but one congregation in Jerusalem, to which reference has not been made. Wild and reckless assertions have been made, as, they established enough other local congregations, so that each one could use one container, and history says they took the Lord's supper in private houses in Jerusalem. Act. 2:46 is the only proof offered from the Bible that they communed in private homes, and no living man can prove that this verse refers to the Lord's supper. If it was, they had meat in it.

Some ugly statements have been made about me falsifying in regard to Goodspeed. I deny the charge. My opponent now tries to make us believe he was quoting from Goodspeed's translation; but I again call attention to the fact that he was quoting from a private letter received since our debate at Graham, Texas. "Is 'cup' in Rev. 17:4 used figuratively?" "No"—Edgar J. Goodspeed, Chicago University, letter, Sept. 30, 1930." When my opponent says he did not write to Goodspeed, since our debate at Graham, and receive the above answer, he . . . Well, reader name it. The debate was in August, and the letter received in September of the same year. See Harper's second negative for the above quotation.

In every quotation from Thayer, if enough had been read, my opponent would refute his own position. For example, "under the vessel out of which one drinks," and Mat. 26:27 is cited. But 1 Cor. 10:4 is cited by Thayer under the same head. "They drank of that rock." This has punctured my opponents theory every time he has blown it up.

In the last negative on the first proposition we find, "Then wherever we find 'cup' it means a drinking vessel in its N. T. sense." I found cup in Mat. 26:29, 1 Cor. 10:16 and 1 Cor. 11:25-27. In these passages my opponent says cup means what was in the cup. "To drink the cup is to drink what it contains." It is then, as clear as a demonstration, that, what was in the cup was called the cup. If the container is this cup, and the contents is the cup, then we have two cups of

the Lord. When Christ was talking about drinking "this cup" (Mat. 26:39) he was not talking about what some literal drinking vessel, such as goblet, glass, or chalice contained. This explodes the whole of my opponents first affirmation, and he sees this, and knows he has been made a laughing-stock, hence his remarks about "jeers" etc. So, my first reply has completely upset his affirmation.

The common reader can understand the common english of Mat. 26:27-28. "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 N. T." The Lord here tells in plain language what the cup is. I wonder if the average reader will have to delve into all the scholars, on Greek and Latin, before he can intelligently observe the Lord's supper?
Dec. 16, 1930.

J. N. COWAN.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

The brother broke the limit in his first affirmative, and has done so in every other article, totaling about 800 words. And he figures for the "last speech" on both propositions, making a reply to my "final."

Proposition: "The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid." Questions: "Is the word 'cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 the name of solid." "Yes."—James H. Ropes, Harvard. "Are 'the cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 and 'the fruit of the vine' one and the same?" "No. The contents of the cup and 'the fruit of the vine' are the same."—James H. Ropes, Harvard.

The brother has not touched a single syllogism I gave in proof of the proposition, and I fully exposed his attempt, showing the fallacy in his mimic stuff. Thayer defines *poterion* to mean "a cup, a drinking vessel. "Now see.

1. The word *poterion* as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a cup, a drinking vessel. 2. The name of a cup, a drinking vessel, is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore, the word *poterion* as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. But the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the translation of *poterion* as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27. Therefore, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. Again:

1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of the drinking vessel which he "took." 2. The name of the drinking vessel which he took is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid. Again:

1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of the vessel they drank out of. 2. The name of the vessel they drank out of is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore, the word "cup" as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid.

We know what the Lord "talked about" by the meaning of the words used. "And he took a cup ("the vessel out of which one drinks, Mt. 26:27—Thayer, p. 510), and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it."—Mt. 26:27. And we know by the context that the "cup" had "the fruit of the vine" in it. But if "this is my blood" (v. 28) "refers to the cup," then "the vessel out of which one drinks," is the "blood." Escape you can not.

Mt. 26:39 is a metaphor, not a metonymy of "container and its contents," and it would be amusing to see you dispose of this metaphor without involving a "cup" from which to "drink a bitter or poison potion," to which Jesus "likened" (Thayer, p. 533) his sufferings. And the metonymy, "drink the cup," does not give "a demonstration, that what was in the cup was called the cup." The "contents" are not named in metonymy, but the "container" is. And in "drink the cup," "cup" is the name of the container. And we "drink the cup" by drinking "What is in the cup." (Thayer, p. 510) And what is in the cup is not the cup, neither is it called the cup by any law of language. And there must be "a cup, a drinking vessel" indicated by "cup" in this metonymy and in this metaphor, or there is no metonymy or metaphor.

The Lord gave the "cup" a place in the communion, as well as "the fruit of the vine;" hence we have "the cup of blessing," "the consecrated cup" (1 Cor. 10:16), "this cup containing wine." (Thayer, pp. 16, 260, 533)

Your "opponent" does not say "cup means what was in the cup," and never said it of any passage.

You never "explained" even once how you "eat" the "wine,"—you simply "bit off more than you could swallow" in trying to get rid of the "cup" to drink from in the communion, and to do it made Paul out a simpleton in "eat the supper."

Cattle did not drink "spiritual drink." Good. Why bring them up here then? And if "cup" (Mt. 26:27) was not "the

vessel out of which one drinks," just give "enough" from Thayer to refute Thayer, if you can. It is up to you.

It would be more than "amusing" to see the brother take "a cup" (Mt. 26:27) as Jesus did, and "one volume" of "wine" (See his 1st aff.), and "one loaf" as Paul says (1 Cor. 10:16) and have the communion with his 50-thousand congregation. But we will let him off, for when he comes to "teach them," he steers clear of "the S. S. and classes," just as we do in the communion, with his "other congregation."

"Breaking bread." Listen: "In a society consisting of many thousand members there should be many places of meeting. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as 'the church' in this or that man's house, Rom. 16: 5, 15; 1 Cor 16:19; Col 4:15; Phile. v. 2."—Jamieson, Fausset and Brown.

"The oldest meeting-places of Christian worship were rooms in ordinary dwellings."—Schaff-Herzog.

"The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses."—Neander. "The disciples came together to break bread."—Acts 20:7. "Breaking bread from house to house."—Acts 2:46. And while they at first had a "common meal" when they met for communion, yet Acts 2:46 does not indicate that they did any more than that they ate in the temple. Three distinct things are set forth: "And daily attending with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they partook of food with gladness," etc.

Thayer defines *poterion* "a cup, a drinking vessel." If this is not the correct definition, just cite the lexicon that refuted it.

You can "deny" as much as you please. When you say, "My opponent now tries to make us believe he was quoting from Goodspeed's translation," you say what is not true. Neither have I at any time ever "turned him down," nor "and then wrote him to help you out later." Neither have you "succeeded" when you "determined to stop so much 'Goodspeed' from your pen." And you will not get far with "Cowan said it" either.

Dec. 28, 1930.

H. C. HARPER.

J. N. COWAN'S THIRD NEGATIVE

My opponent said, "Wherever *Poterion* was used in the N. T. it meant a drinking vessel." Then in Mat. 26:39 it must also mean a drinking vessel, and Christ was praying for this drinking vessel to pass. His last article is nothing more than a rebash, and has been fully answered in previous replies. I have not disputed any standard authority on the definition of "cup." It does mean a solid. But the name of a solid is sometimes used to designate a liquid, as in "He drank the poison cup and died." Or, "The cup of blessing— is it (the cup) not the communion of the blood of Christ?" In metonymy, there is a changing of names; the name of one thing is put for another. The name "cup" is used in Mat. 26:27; 26:39, and 1 Cor. 16, but the contents are designated by this name.

I have exploded his syllogisms in my first reply, and will give only one sample here. Take his first one and substitute Mat. 26:39 for Mat. 26:27, and you will see the falsity of his conclusion. 1. The word "cup" as used by Christ in Mat. 26: 39 is the name of the vessel he was to drink out of. 2. The name of the vessel is the name of a solid. 3. Therefore, the word cup as used by Christ in Mat. 26:39 is the name of a solid. But every one knows this conclusion is false, because it was his sufferings he called a cup, and not a solid. This completely capsizes his syllogistic efforts.

In his further efforts, he says we cannot have the metaphor without the cup or vessel. Then tell us what vessel it was that could be described by "*poterion*?" He also denies that "This is my blood" refers to the cup Jesus took. Then, it is possible that "This is my body" does not refer to the bread he took, but to the container. Shame! Please point out the "*poterion*" literal drinking vessel in, "Let this cup pass from me."

"The Lord gave the 'cup' a place in the communion, as well as 'the fruit of the vine;' hence we have 'the cup of blessing.'" Here, "The cup of Blessing" is used by my opponent in contradistinction to the "fruit of the vine." Paul says of this cup of blessing, "Is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" Now he has the Lords' cup a literal vessel and the communion of the blood of Christ. I believe the fruit of the vine is the communion of the Lord's blood. "Your 'opponent' does not say 'cup means what was in the cup,' and never said it of any passage." Then, "cup" in 1 Cor.

10:16 does not mean what was in the cup, but the vessel itself, and Paul said it was the communion of the blood of Christ. The vessel the communion of the blood of Christ! This absurd position is further verified by, "Wherever '*poterion*' is used in the N. T. it means the drinking vessel." It is found in 1 Cor. 10:16, therefore, it, the vessel is the communion of the blood.

"Element" means a part, an ingredient. My adversary says the drinking vessel is an element of the supper. Paul says, "Eat the Lord's supper." Paul is not the "simpleton," but it seems to me the one who takes a position that the vessel is an element of what Paul said to eat, an ingredient of the supper, would be the singleton. I leave it to the reader.

I have no desire to refute Thayer, and he does not refute me. We drink the cup by "drinking what is in it"; just like Israel drank the rock by "drinking what is in it." "Both passages are cited under the same head. I brought up the cattle to show that both men and cattle drank from the rock although they used different drinking vessels. And to show that we may drink from the same cup, even though it be divided into different vessels. Luk. 22:17.

So far, not one proof from the Bible or history has been offered to prove there were a large number of congregations organized in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. The scripture proof I offered in my second affirmative has never been noticed, which showed there never was but the one congregation in Jerusalem. I showed that it was possible to prepare enough of the one bread (unleavened) and the fruit of the vine to serve the 3120 on Pentecost, or 50,000 for that matter. No testimony offered said they had church in ordinary houses for the purpose of using one vessel in the communion in any other locality. One authority cited is Jamieson-Fausset & Brown to prove Act. 2:46 had reference to the communion, and the same Authority says they sprinkled for baptism on the day of Pentecost. See Comments on Act. 2:21-46. The commentator route is "slimy." Brother. When I cite Webster on "cup" Def. 5 "The wine of the communion," you cry "Slimy trail," and then turn round and take one more slimy.

Goodspeed:—My opponent could settle this matter by telling the reader how come Goodspeed to write the letter from which he quotes in his second negative. The letter was in answer to questions someone had asked him, and that, too, since our debate at Graham. The debate was held the latter part of August, 1930, and the letter from Goodspeed is dated Sept. 30 of the same year. I cannot see why my opponent would deny writing to Goodspeed. Every one knows he is caught and should confess. I asked a question at the close of my first negative which has not been answered. And don't forget that I accept Thayer's definition of *Poterion*, but in metonymy one thing is called by the name of another. And don't fail to tell us about how the symbolic woman held a literal cup in her hand. Rev. 17:4.

Dec. 27, 1930.

J. N. COWAN.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Proposition: "The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid."

He has not touched by syllogisms. He repeats his fallacy as if he had not been made aware of it. This is a metaphor, and Christ "likened" his sufferings or death to a cup from which one drinks a bitter or poison potion. (Thayer, p. 533) And it takes both to make this "comparison." "The metaphor implies a comparison between what is said and what is meant."—Williams, p. 221. What is said? *Poterion*, "a cup, a drinking vessel." (Thayer) What is meant? Deep suffering or death, which he prayed might pass from him as a cup containing a bitter or poison potion might pass a person and not be drunk. And Davis in his Elements of Logic exposes this fallacy of "Christ was praying for this drinking vessel to pass," saying, "The fallacy *Figura dictionis* occurs when a metaphor or other figure of speech is construed literally. This seems very trifling, but is a very subtle and ruinous form of fallacy." (p. 189) This sophistry "capsizes" him with any man of sense. And his "opponent's capital error" in allowing 'cup' to have only one meaning in the N. T. has vanished. When put to it, he accepts Thayer's definition, "*poterion*, a cup, a drinking vessel." And since we can substitute the definition for the word, wherever we find *poterion* in the N. T., we can read it—"a cup, a drinking vessel," and that is "everywhere" we find "cup."

"And he took a cup, a drinking vessel." (Mt. 26:27) And Thayer says of "cup" here, "The vessel out of which one

drinks, Mt. 26:27." And Cowan says, "This stands for 'cup' the very cup Jesus took." (5th aff.) Then the "vessel" is the "blood." Here he is tied. This is another "sample."

He calls Mt. 26:27 "metonymy." He does not know a figure of speech from a hog track. Thayer gives this under "prop.", and not under "by meton." But take it by metonymy, "Container and contents." What is the container? "Cup is the name of a literal vessel." (C's 1st aff.) "No one denies the Lord had a container in his hand when he instituted the supper." (C's 3d aff.) (Poterion) It does mean 'a cup, a drinking vessel.' (C's 4th aff.) So it is cup. The "contents" are not named in metonymy, but the "container is," so "cup" (even if this were metonymy) is here the name of a solid, as I affirm. To your question,—Yes.

When Jesus took "a cup" and said "drink ye all out of it," we know by the language that "this" refers to "the contents of the cup," and when he took "a loaf" and said "eat," we know likewise that "this" refers to the bread; and we find ourselves in accord here with those who have made a life study of language, and it is a "shame" that any preacher does not know this much.

Thayer cites "cup" in I Cor. 10:16 under "prop.", not under "by meton." And it is the "common cup," which all drink "By drinking what it contains" (N. L. Clark), by drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer, p. 510), that makes it the communion; just as it is "one loaf" of which all partake that makes it the communion. (Thayer, pp. 260, 259) And it is not "cup" in "contradistinction" from the "fruit of the vine," but "cup" containing "the fruit of the vine." And the "cup" has a place as well as "the fruit of the vine."

I say the word "cup" is used literally in Rev. 17:4, and I say Thayer so cites it, as he does in Mt. 26:27 (p. 533), and I say the fact that you cannot tell by what figure of speech it is used, if figurative, is positive proof that you do not know what you are talking about.

Paul was not the "simpleton," but it seems to be the one who asked me to "eat" the "cup" because Paul said "eat the supper," and then fall down when I called on him to "eat" the "wine," an "element" of "the supper," and I leave it to the reader. I "drink the cup," "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (Clark) And you cannot "drink the cup" without the "cup" in the communion. "Both men and cattle drank from the rock," 1 Cor. 10:16. Then the "cattle" drank "spiritual drink," for "that rock was Christ," 1 Cor. 10:4. Better look up Thayer's reference. But where are the "different vessels" here? Maybe I can find "individual cups" here. How many do you find? We have passed the "big congregation" in this debate: we just have "other congregations" to commune as you do to "teach them." Does this "Authority" say baptize means sprinkle? From what you say, they are like "cups advocates," who know poterion does not mean cups, but when they get "big crowds," they need "cups for convenience," just as the other fellow needs sprinkling, or "more sanitary," or for "clinics," regardlessly. And I take the "slimy trail" of neither party. However, they were not quoted on Acts 2:46. They cited the Scriptures for what they said, and you've not noticed a single one of them.

Dec. 31, 1930.

H. C. HARPER.

J. N. COWAN'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Mat. 26:39, a Metaphor. "The metaphor implies a comparison between what is said and what is meant." (Williams) "What is said? Poterion. what is meant? Deep suffering or death." FINE. In Mat. 26:27, what is said? Poterion. What is meant? "This is my blood." Verse 28 begins with "for" (Greek Gar) which means a further explanation is being given of what was just said in verse 27, and "this" is a demonstrative, demonstrating what was meant by "cup" in verse 27. I have tried to get my opponent to notice that metonymy is from a word which means a changing of names, and that one thing is said when another is meant, the same as in a metaphor. Jesus said cup when he meant contents as explained by the demonstrative.

"It takes both container and contents to make this kind of metonymy." "It takes both (container and contents) to make this comparison." (metaphor) In the first, my opponent says to drink the cup is to drink what it contains while it is in the literal poterion. So, in the latter, Christ must drink the suffering's while in the literal cup, or drinking vessel. I am still asking for the literal vessel of Mat. 26:39. "Wherever

poterion is used it means a cup, a drinking vessel." POINT IT OUT! I am not the man who construed Mat. 26:39 literally. You are the one who contends that the figurative poterion is a literal drinking vessel in Mat. 26:39. You say wherever poterion is used it means a drinking vessel, and it is used in the above passage. Now swallow your "Figura dictionis."

No, Cowan don't make the vessel the blood because he admitted Jesus had a vessel in his hand when he took the cup. I deny that the vessel was what the word cup signified in the passage, and that, too, because Jesus said it was his blood, and "a preacher should have enough sense to know" it was the wine and not the vessel that represented his blood. "The contents are not named in metonymy but the container is so cup (even if this were metonymy) is here the name of a solid."

To be sure, "cup" here is the name of a solid, but the name was used to name a liquid, the wine. "This is my blood" proves that. Don't forget that your proposition says "as used." "He drank the poison cup and died." Cup here is the name of a solid, but it means a liquid. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils." Cup here is the name of a solid, but it is used to designate a liquid. Christ took the cup the name of a solid, but designated the fruit of the vine which he called his blood. USED THE NAME CUP TO DESCRIBE SOMETHING ELSE. Question:—"Does it change the meaning of Mat. 26:28 to supply the word 'cup' after 'this'?" "If not, is this supplied word used to name a solid?" Answer, "Yes." Who could get any sense from such an answer? Tell us if the supplied word changes the meaning of the passage cited, and if not, does the supplied word name a solid. What were you saying "yes" to? In our debate at Graham, and in some of the questions you ask the Professors, you said the word may be supplied, even supplied it yourself. "We know by the language that 'this' refers to 'the contents of the cup.'" With the word cup supplied we read, "for this cup is my blood." The antecedent of "this" is "cup" of verse 27. The word supplied is the antecedent of the pronoun. Therefore, the "cup" of verse 28 is the same cup of verse 27. This settles the question forever. Amen! Question:—"Is 'the fruit of the vine' any part of the Lord's cup? If not, do you not use it in contradistinction to the cup?"

Rev. 17:4, "Cup" is used literally" (Harper) "The woman which thou sawest is that great city." Rev. 17:18. This woman had a golden cup in her hand. v. 4. A city with a literal drinking vessel in her hand! In this cup was the filthiness of her fornication. v. 4. Of course every one knows symbolical fornication could not be had in a drinking vessel that was literal. Shame on such a man, who will thus handle the word of God, to save a pet theory on Mat. 26:28. I possibly should have said Lord, pity the man who is so blinded with materialism that he cannot see his own absurdities. Paul said "eat the Lord's supper." Harper says, the vessel is an element of that supper. Element means an ingredient, or part. Selah!

The people were baptised in the cloud and sea, while the cattle were not, even though they passed through the same water. The people did drink spiritual drink, and the cattle did not though they drank the same water. Cattle had no faith, people did. Yet they all drank from (ek, out of) the same rock, just as we all drink from, out of, the same cup. I'm sure some people who actually drink out of the cup, do so with as little spirituality as cattle. For instance, the man who has his faith in the container instead of the contents. The point you are seeking to cover up is, they all drank out of the rock, even though several containers were used. The same is true of the well, and is true of the cup.

The reader can now take his pencil and mark out all my opponent has said about or quoted from the commentators and dictionaries. He has admitted its all a slimy trail. He used Jam. Fau. & Brown until I showed they taught sprinkling on the day of Pentecost, now he vomits them up.

I will close this article with the scriptures which prove there was never but one congregation in Jerusalem, on Pentecost, or any other time. And remember, this proved, my opponent's proposition is overthrown Act. 2:46; 5:11-14; 6:1-7; 15:22; Reader, don't forget that 31 congregations had to be organised on the day of Pentecost, for my opponents position to work with one container to the congregation.

Jan. 2, 1931.

J. N. COWAN.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

Mt. 26:27 is neither metaphor nor metonymy. And "this" (v. 28) refers to the "contents of the cup" as Thayer and these scholars say, and not to the cup. You deny "that the vessel was what the word cup signified," but you are just "too short" on the meaning and use of language for us to take "Cowan said it," against the scholarship of the world. Where are your scholars that say Mt. 26:27 contains a metonymy? You can't produce them. Your ipse dixit does not fill the bill now. Thayer cites "cup" in Mt. 26:27 under "prop." and not under "by meton." (p. 533) And on page 510 he says the word "cup" in Mt. 26:27 as used here signifies "the vessel out of which one drinks." And this settles the question forever against you, for he is backed by the other scholars who have made a life study of language. Listen: "Is the word 'cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 the name of a solid." "Yes."—James H. Ropes, Harvard; Harry M. Hubbell, Yale; Edgar J. Goodspeed, University of Chicago. Again "Are 'the cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 and 'the fruit of the vine' one and the same?" "No. The contents of the cup and the fruit of the vine are the same."—James H. Ropes, Harvard. And this is just as Thayer cites it—"wine, an emblem of blood," the contents of the cup. (p. 15) And gar sustains this as these scholars know.

Thayer's definition is "a cup, a drinking vessel," and this definition can be substituted for the word anywhere.

"Drink the cup of the Lord." It takes the fruit of the vine in the cup to make this metonymy. And we "Drink the cup of the Lord" "by drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (Clark, Thayer)

Mt. 26:39. Christ in this metaphor was praying that his sufferings might pass as a cup from which one drinks a bitter or poison potion might, through entreaty, pass. And the cup from which one drinks a bitter or poison potion is the "cup, a drinking vessel" here, and without it there is no metaphor, for there could be no comparison between his sufferings and such a cup. And you again commit the fallacy figura dictionis in saying, "Christ must drink the sufferings while in a literal cup, a drinking vessel." You simply can't touch the proof of my proposition in my syllogisms.

"Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it."—Williams. "I accept Williams' definition of metonymy." (Cowan, 3d aff.)

"Drink the cup." Here we have "Container and the thing contained."—Williams. "Cup" is the container, and we drink the cup "by drinking what it contains, and in no other way." And if "this" refers to "cup," the container is the "blood" in "this is my blood." "Cup" is here the "drinking vessel," and so is it in "drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils."

"Yes" disposed of both questions. There is not a manuscript or Greek text or Bible tr. that contains your supplied word. "In some of the questions you ask the Professors, you said the word may be supplied." I did not, brother.

"With the word cup supplied we read, 'for this cup is my blood.' The antecedent of 'this' is 'cup' of verse 27." And this is more "Cowan said it." But "this" is an adjective here, and adjectives do not have antecedents. "The word supplied is the antecedent of the pronoun." But there is now no pronoun, brother. And this shows your caliber on language. You do not know the parts of speech in sentences, much less the "figures of speech," yet you want us to take "Cowan said it," and turn down scholars who know language.

I have no "pet theory" to save, brother. I have consulted the ripest scholars on Rev. 17:4, who say the word "cup" here is used in its "proper or literal" sense, and Thayer cites it under his "prop." Your spludge amounts to nothing.

"To eat the supper is to eat the elements that compose it." (C's 3d aff.) Then "eat" the "wine," an element of the supper. I drink the cup in the supper, and I do that "by drinking what it contains" (Clark), by drinking "what is in the cup." (Thayer) Let us see you drink the cup without "the cup," or by drinking what cups contain.

Since the "vessel" (Thayer, p. 510) was the "rock" (I Cor. 10:4) and "that rock was Christ," if they drank out of vessels, how many Christs did they have? And if the "cattle" drank out of this "rock" Paul is talking about, and "this rock was Christ," how did "cattle" do this without drinking "spiritual drink"?

The "well" is conspicuous by its absence here (Thayer, p. 510), not being "the vessel out of which one drinks." And

it seems that the point you are trying to cover up here is the point that Thayer says that the use of cup in Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; and I Cor. 11:28 is "the vessel out of which one drinks." And this kills all your effort to refute my proposition.

I am certain that brethren who use cups do not take the communion as directed in the Bible. And as to our motive and faith, we stand or fall before God, not J. N. Cowan. And while sectarians twit us as having our faith in the water when we follow the Bible in baptizo, immerse, some cups advocates jeer us as having our "faith in the container" when we follow the Bible in poterion, "a cup," not cups. And it seems that "Birds of a feather" do "flock together." And "All digression is alike."

One authority cited is Jamison, Faucet & Brown to prove Acts 2:46 had reference to the communion." (Cowan) Falsehood, No. 1. "The same Authority says they sprinkled for baptism on the day of Pentecost." Falsehood No. 2. "You turned him (Goodspeed) down, and then wrote him to help you out later." (Cowan) Falsehood, No. 3. And when you say I did so "write to Goodspeed, since our debate at Graham, and receive the above answer," you—, well, do not tell the truth, brother.

"In a society consisting of many thousand members there should be many places of meeting. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as 'the church' in this or that man's house, Rom. 16:5, 16; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phil. v. 2."—Jamison, Fausset, and Brown. "The oldest meeting-places of Christian worship were rooms in ordinary dwellings.—Schaff-Herzog. (Under Altar) The day of Pentecost was the 'oldest.' 'The places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses.'—Neander. Pentecost was 'at first,' 'Acts 2:46: They did not think fit to celebrate the eucharist in the temple, for that was peculiar to the Christian institutions, and therefore they administered that ordinance in private houses of the converted Christians.'—Matthew Henry.

Jan. 8, 1931.

H. C. HARPER.

J. N. COWAN'S FIFTH NEGATIVE

According to my opponent, I have played the part of the ignoramus in this debate. I leave that to the reader. It is a well known fact that our oral debate at Graham was the latter part of August, 1930. Now read: "Is 'cup' in Rev. 17:4 used figuratively? "No" Edgar J. Goodspeed, Chicago University, letter Sept. 30, 1930." This is quoted from Harper's second negative. Just why he will continue to deny getting this letter, after quoting from it is a puzzle. If such a letter was not received, then a bogus one was quoted from. Something wrong in Denmark!

Jamison-Faucett & Brown, another one of my opponents' witnesses says, "It is difficult to say how 3000 could be baptised in one day, according to the old practice of a complete submersion. . . the difficulty can only be removed by supposing they already employed sprinkling, or baptised in houses in large vessels. . . Formal submersion in rivers, or larger bodies of water probably took place only where the locality conveniently allowed it." The above is Harper's witness.

It is also well known by all who heard the Graham debate that Harper said "this" in Mat. 26:28 was a pronoun and "cup" in verse 27 was its antecedent. In the first negative of this debate he cites Professor Pharr of Florida on the use of pronouns. He also admits in the second and fifth negatives that it is so used, and in the Sixth negative he says, "For this (pronoun suggesting the contents of the 'cup' (See Dr. Pharr, 2d reply) is my blood of the N. T." This constitutes positive proof that he took the position "this" was a pronoun. Now note this from his fifth Aff. "But 'this' is an adjective here, and adjectives do not have antecedents. . . But there is now no pronoun." "And this shows your caliber on language." Since when is there no pronoun? Since you changed your mind? This is a complete somersault I have turned you. There can be but one reason why you have changed on what part of speech "this" is in Mat. 26:28, and that is you are completely whipped, if it is a pronoun, therefore you have decided to say it is an adjective. An adjective is a word used to qualify, limit or define a noun. (Winston). Now, when you tell what noun "this" modifies you will be in as bad a fix as when you said "this" was a pronoun. It qualifies, limits and defines the noun "cup" of verse 27, and hence "this cup is my blood of the N. T." refers to the cup of verse 27. "And while the antecedent of 'this' in verse 28 is 'cup' in verse 27, which is there used literally, yet the

pronoun 'this' is used metonymically." "But NOW there is no pronoun," EH? (For above quotation see Harper's first neg.) How does all this sound from H. C. Harper, the "Master-Grammarian," who accuses his opponent of being an ignoramus on language?

In his second negative, he uses "cup" as a supplied word freely on Mat. 26:28, and calls it the second use of the word "cup." Now he says it is a matter of "Cowan said it." He seems to have "striven about words to no profit," until the poor fellow is so mixed, he cannot remember from one speech to the next what he said.

He quotes from me, "the antecedent of 'this' is 'cup' of verse 27." And replies, "And this is more of 'Cowan said it.' Harper said the same in his first Neg.

To say that "cup" in Rev. 17:4 is used literally, a literal drinking vessel in the hand of a symbolical woman, is a travesty on the word of God; and to accuse Thayer of teaching such is an insult to his intelligence; and to try to prove it by Goodspeed is futile. Goodspeed said Enoch, the seventh from Adam wrote a book, and that it has been found within the last 150 years. But why contend that "cup" is used literally in Rev. 17:4? Because it is cited in connection with Mat. 26:27, and under the head "properly." There is not a dictionary on earth that defines "literally" and "properly" to mean the same, neither are they synonyms.

I am still relying on the word of God as to the number of congregations in Jerusalem, while my opponent is rambling through history and commentaries to try to disprove it. The scriptures cited have never been noticed.

The cattle did not drink spiritual drink any more than they were baptised in the sea, but they drank from the same rock, and went through the same water in the sea. The point is, they all drank from the rock even though they drank the water from different vessels, just as we all drink from the same cup, though it is from different vessels.

"Thayer's definition is 'a cup, a drinking vessel' and this definition can be substituted for the word anywhere." Of all the absurdities, this is the climax. We will now substitute the meaning in the following: "Father, let this cup a drinking vessel pass from me." "I will take the cup a drinking vessel of salvation." "For this cup a drinking vessel is the N. T. in my blood." "Take this (cup) a drinking vessel and divide it among yourselves." My cup a drinking vessel runneth over." The cup a drinking vessel which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" "Ye cannot drink the cup a drinking vessel of the devil and the cup a drinking vessel of the Lord." "As oft as you drink this cup a drinking vessel... ye show his death till he come." I have substituted the definition in every passage above quoted which makes complete non-sense. It fairly represents my opponents position.

"I drink the cup by drinking what it contains." But you must remember "the cup is an element of the supper," and this is one element you neither eat nor drink. You might as well say the dishes a supper is served in, are elements of the supper.

Christ took bread, one element of the supper, and he took the fruit of the vine the other element of the supper, and no living man can prove there ever was, or ever will be more than these two elements of the supper. We look for one more juggling of authors.

Jan. 12, 1931.

J. N. COWAN.

FINAL AFFIRMATIVE

"The word 'cup' as used by Christ in Mt. 26:27 is the name of a solid." "And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it." (Mt. 26:27) The word "cup" is here used as the name of the vessel out of which they drank, hence the name of a solid, just as I have shown in my syllogisms, which he cannot refute. And he has admitted it in saying:

"Christ took the cup the name of a solid." (His 1st neg.) Again: "It does mean a cup, a drinking vessel." (His 4th aff.) Again: "Cup is the name of the literal vessel." (His 1st aff.) "The cup and bread are both elements of the same supper and one is as figurative as the other." (2nd aff.) "I'm sure the same scholars will say bread in verse 26 is used literally." (6th aff.) Yes, they do and cup, too. "Is the word 'cup' used literally in Mt. 26:27?" "Yes."—James H. Ropes, Harvard; Harry M. Hubbell, Yale; Edgar J. Goodspeed, University of Chicago. Again: "Is the word 'cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 the name of a solid?" "Yes." (Same scholars) Again: "Are 'the cup' as used in Mt. 26:27 and 'the fruit of the vine' one

and the same?" "No." (Same scholars) And Thayer cites the word "cup" hereunder "the vessel out of which one drinks, ek tou poteriou, Mt. 26:27," out of the cup. (p. 510) And on page 533 he cites "cup" in Mt. 26:27 under "prop.," and not under "by meton." And I have shown that we may say "proper or literal." (See "The Form of Baptism, pp. 35, 72-77) And the Rhetoric use "ordinary, usual, proper, natural, literal" to distinguish that which is not figurative. And the same scholars cited above say that "this" in verse 28 "refers to the contents of the cup," as gar logically shows, and not to the cup, as you have it, making the container the blood. You say, "He drank the poison cup and died," and say, "I contend that Christ used the word in that sense in the verse cited." (Mt. 26:27) But your sentence is no more like that of Mt. 26:27 than black is like white. That sentence is ek tou poteriou, drink out of the cup, as Thayer points out. (p. 510) But yours is drink the cup, like that in I Cor. 10:21; 11:27. But even in this metonymy "drink the cup," "cup" is the name of the drinking vessel, the name of a solid. "How can one 'drink this cup'?" By drinking what it (the cup) contains, and in no other way." (Clark). Just as Thayer says—by drinking "what is in the cup." (p. 510).

Here "cup" is the name of the "container." "Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it."—Williams, p. 220. "Object, it, it" here is "contents" in "drink the cup," and the "something else" named is "cup," the drinking vessel, the name of a solid. And if "this" in v. 28 refers to "cup" in v. 27, the "container" is the blood.

"The definition of a word may be substituted for the word without destroying the sense."—Cowan. (1st neg.) And I said, "Yes," for this is one of the most cardinal laws of language, and he has upset himself by running into himself. It has kept him dodging. When the language is literal, he dodges to figurative to make a showing; and when it is figurative, he dodges behind literal. This fallacy has been exposed, and now he has trapped himself. Shall we break this law of language to let him out. Never. He must come across and construe the language figuratively. "The fallacy Figura dictionis occurs when a metaphor or other figure of speech is construed literally. This seems very trifling, but is a very subtle and ruinous form of fallacy."—Davis. (Elements of Logic)

One of each will suffice. Metonymy: "Oft . . . drink cup." How? "By drinking what it contains" (Clark), "what is in the cup." (Thayer) And one drinks "a cup, a drinking vessel," by metonymy, "By drinking what it contains." And "cup" here is the drinking vessel, too. Metaphor: "Cup runneth over." Metaphor is an implied comparison, a contracted simile. The Psalmist likens his joy to a cup from which one drinks an overflowing, delightful potion. And without this "cup and contents" with which to compare his joy, there is no metaphor. It is not so strange as I once thought: I do not think he knows any better, from all we have seen on this line of fallacy. Again:

"This." It is your "somersault," brother. I change not but the "part of speech" changes, and I keep my solid footing. I called "this" in Mt. 26:28 a "pronoun," and so it is; but in your sentence where you supply a word not in the inspired Scriptures, "this" is an "adjective," just as I said: but when you say, "It modifies, limits and defines the noun 'cup' in verse 27, you say what is not so. I used your word just enough to expose your error.

If the "cup," a drinking vessel, is not an element, "an essential part," of the communion, let us see you obey the command, "Drink the cup," without the cup to drink from. I drink the cup by drinking "what is in the cup." (Thayer) But you never did "eat" the "wine," an "element of the supper."

You say the word "cup" (Rev. 17:4) is used figuratively, but when called on, you could not name the figure nor produce the man that can. Thayer cites its use under "prop." with Mt. 26:27, and not under any figurative use, and so the other scholars say it is used "literally." And you have not refuted this by juggling with the symbolic presentation.

If you quote what I said, and someone should say Cowan said it, wouldn't that be "juggling authors"? Well, you quote what Olshausen said, and you said Jamieson, Fausset and Brown said it. But Olshausen's language is far from saying, "They sprinkled for baptism on the day of Pentecost." He modifies his statement by "supposing," which expresses uncertainty; besides he gives an alternative, "employed sprink-

ling, or baptized in houses in large vessels."

Jamieson, Fausset and Brown say: "In a society consisting of many thousand members there should be many places of meeting. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as 'the church' in this or that man's house, Rom. 16:5, 15; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Phile. v. 2."

And no "scripture" you cited shows a big congregation for communion, nor cups used. You fudged on conducting N. T. worship with 25,000 and had "other congregations" to "teach them." Jerusalem, with 500,000, had 40,000 Christians and your "never had more than one congregation," is but idle talk.

You falsified in saying of me, "You turned him (Goodspeed) down, and then wrote him to help you out later." (5th aff.) And the fact that I quoted his letter, written since the Graham debate, in no way shows that your falsehood is the truth. And I hoped that you, for your own good, would retract it.

"That rock," 1 Cor. 10:4, "was Christ." And the fact that Thayer cites the use of the word "cup" in Mt. 26:27 here under "the vessel out of which one drinks," utterly refutes you in trying to make it "the fruit of the vine." And your dodge to "vessels" will not cover this fact up. But as a matter of truth "that rock was Christ," and they had but one. Neither did the "cattle" drink the "spiritual drink."

The sprinkler can make just as good a showing for his practice from the Bible as the cups man can for his. The Bible says potterion, a cup, a drinking vessel, not cups, just as plainly as it says baptizo, dip, immerse, not sprinkle. And it says "a (one) cup" just as plainly as it says "one loaf," or "one immersion," not loaves or trine-immersion. Hence one cup, one loaf, one immersion, as "The Bible speaks," is the common ground for keeping "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, the unity our Savior prayed for, 'that the world may believe,' the unity Paul commanded (1 Cor. 1), and which we must 'endeavor' to keep if we walk worthy of our vocation (Eph. 4). Here I take my stand, and for this I plead. And I shall meet you all at the judgment-bar of God for the final decision on the matter. And now praying the blessing of God upon all lovers of the truth—"thy word is truth," I plead with you to study the matter candidly and prayerfully, and may we "be one."

Jan. 23, 1931.

H. C. HARPER.

J. N. COWAN'S FINAL NEGATIVE

"This (cup) is my blood of the New Testament" or its parallel in Luke, "This cup is the new Testament in my blood," is enough to satisfy any unbiased mind as to what the cup is. The fact that I admit that the word "cup" does sometimes mean a literal vessel, does not imply that I said Christ used the word to convey such an idea. He used the word "cup" to convey to the mind the second element of the supper which was the fruit of the vine. He took the bread and said this is my body; He took the cup and said this is my blood. Literal bread and literal fruit of the vine to symbolize his body and blood. Every one knows that the vessel does not symbolize either, and the communion was not given to commemorate anything but the body and blood of the Lord.

"Metonymy is a figure of speech in which an object is presented to the mind, not by naming it, but by naming something else that readily suggests it." I heartily endorse this definition. Christ presented an object to the mind (the fruit of the vine) not by naming it, but by naming something else (cup) which readily suggested it. Mat. 26:27.

"I called 'this' in Mat. 26:28 a 'pronoun' and so it is." (last negative,) "But there is now no pronoun brother." This is a complete contradiction, and you turned the somersault.

My opponent drinks the cup by drinking what it contains, while I drink the cup by drinking what Jesus called the cup. "This (cup) is my blood of the N. T." I have repeatedly shown that Jacob and all his cattle drank from the well, or out of it, and Israel and cattle drank out of the rock, even though they drank from different vessels filled with water from the well and rock. The argument of the One container brethren is, to drink out of a cup all must drink from the same vessel. So I argue, if that be so, that the people and cattle all drank out of the same vessel, which is preposterous. But if they all drank out of the rock by drinking water that came from the rock in different vessels by drinking of the supply which came from the rock, then we all drink out of the

cup by drinking of the supply which to cup affords. This has never been met fairly. My opponent tried to cover it up by asking if cattle drank spiritual drink. I say no, because they had not the power of spiritual discernment, but they did drink water out of the same rock the people did. Cattle went through the same water of the Red Sea, but were not baptised. Some people today drink out of the same cup that others drink out of, but they do not discern the Lord's body, any more than the cattle understood the rock was a type of Christ.

If all the scholars in the world should tell me that a sym-bolical woman had a literal cup in her hand I would not believe it. That is an utter impossibility. Away with such stuff!

You have at last admitted getting the letter, and the letter was an answer to a query asked Goodspeed since the Graham debate, and you used the letter to try to refute my position. You certainly thought it would help you, and that is what I said about it. So I have not "falsified," but you have kept something under cover about it through this debate, when you could have cleared the matter up with an explanation.

I stand for the one bread (unleavened bread), One cup, (fruit of the vine) one baptism (immersion) and for this I plead.

It is an admitted fact, that if there was only one congregation in Jerusalem, that more than one container was used to distribute the cup of the Lord. My opponent has plead for at least eighty congregations organized in Jerusalem within a few days. Reader, please note the following scriptures which have been cited ever since my second negative, and which have never been noticed by my respondent. "And all that believed were together ---- And they continued daily with one accord in the Temple." Act. 2:44-46. How many churches was this? "And they were all with one accord in Solomon's Temple." Just one congregation here. In Act. 6:1-7, we find the apostles calling the multitude of the disciples together, and seven deacons appointed. These deacons were over the entire multitude of disciples, which proves they had but the one congregation. "And when they come to Jerusalem they were received by the church." Act. 15:4. "Then it pleased the apostles and elders with the whole church." Only one congregation in these passages. Act. 15:22. I readily concede the fact, that in many cities where they had no place of meeting, their private homes were used, and it became known as the church is this man's home. But not so at Jerusalem. They had only one congregation at Jerusalem, and they met in Solomon's Temple as the record shows. History nor the Bible knows but one congregation in Jerusalem at any time. This fact clearly proven, it became an absolute necessity to have more than one container to distribute the wine of the communion. I submitted in a former article that One Hundred disciples were all that could be served with one vessel, and it has not been disputed. My opponent was forced, against the teaching of the scriptures, to plead for thirty-one congregations on the day of Pentecost, and fifty more a few days later. From this absurdity he has not extricated himself. Adding to this the absurd position that the vessel was an element of the supper, and that the vessel was an emblem of the New Testament, we see H. C. Harper involved in such absurd predicaments, as to render him obnoxious to all rational minds. Talking about the Judgment, after the seclusion of the truth about the Goodspeed letter, and after being caught in a positive misrepresentation about it, is certainly an appropriate subject for my opponent. Especially so, when he will divide congregations over a matter so trivial as to how the cup be distributed among the members. He has raked and scraped among worldly scholars, both Baptist and Pseudo-Baptist to escape the force of the language of Christ, When he said, "This is my blood of the New Testament." "This" is a pronoun and has for its antecedent "cup" of Mat. 26:27. If "cup" is used to mean a literal drinking vessel, and "this" stands for its antecedent, as all pronouns do, then "This is by blood" means that the vessel was his blood. But if the "fruit of the vine" is what Jesus had reference to when he said "cup," then "This is my blood" means that the fruit of the vine was what he called his blood. This argument has caused my adversary much trouble, even to change his mind about what part of speech "this" is. As my space is consumed, I here bid the reader farewell, with a prayer that the "One container Advocates" will see the folly of their contention and cease to trouble the church with such foolishness.

Yours for harmony among the disciples of Christ,

Feb. 4, 1931.

J. N. COWAN.

THE CUP

A Critical Examination of Scriptural Testimony, Prayerfully Submitted by Dr. G. A.

Trotti, Munday, Texas.

Every word and act employed in the actual institution of the Lord's Supper is of the most vital importance to us and the more nearly we can duplicate them in partaking of the communion, the greater will be our assurance of safety. This style of dodging recorded FACTS has been used, ad nauseam by dishonest polemics, until all careful investigators should be familiar with it and not be deceived. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked," Gal. 6:7).

This Passover table had been previously prepared and duly set by the Lord's command and no other container except a cup is ever hinted at in the divine record. For this reason I deny that any scriptural authority exists for giving thanks for the "fruit of the vine" in some other container—bottle, jug, flagon or what not—calling it "this cup," before it gets into a cup and then pouring it into a number of cups, still calling it "this cup," and violating every conception we have formed of the correct use of words. The wine was already in the "cup of blessing," used by the Saviour and referred to as "the cup" and "this cup."

But we are told that we do not drink the literal cup but only the contents, which we frankly admit, but want more than some man's assertion that this proves we have the right to disregard the drinking vessel from which Christ and His apostles all drank as of no significance. How come? Who said it? How does he prove it? We common people are asking for your Scripture and we are willing to accept it and nothing else. Anything that cannot be understood without the exegesis of an educational wizard is too deep for us: we believe God knows how to express Himself without the assistance of the highly educated. We all know that a cup of any liquid is the amount contained in the cup. To give thanks for coffee in a pot and designating it is "this cup" would be palpably false and to perpetrate such a blunder at the Lord's table would be ridiculous if it were not blasphemous.

But if we are privileged to use two cups the individual cups may be justified by the same rule; there is no way to escape from this conclusion. Many good and sufficient reasons could be given for the use of one cup in the communion but this will suffice for those who do not believe that the spiritual vision of Jesus was so myopic that He could not see and provide for the emergencies that would arise in future generations to be given us in due season by the wise (educated, if you please) men of the East who should arise to teach us better modes of worship than His example affords in this enlightened age. They have succeeded in convincing many and may yet convince many more, but there will arise other difficulties of the Lord's preeminence, as our guide and director, long after death has cast the mantle of oblivion over the author of this tract. The actual recorded facts, setting forth what was really done when the Lord's Supper was instituted are few in number and faithfully delivered to us for our edification and comfort. When this sacred meal was inaugurated the table was fully set; the wine was already in the cup from which all drank. It was not poured out of this cup into another cup much less a number of them. Jesus took the cup in His hand and gave thanks for it; gave it to His disciples and commanded them. Can we not follow His example, even though we bring upon us such odious epithets as infidels, trouble-makers and scismatics? Why should we worry as long as we know we are walking in His steps?

METONYMY

When a partisan debater sees no other way of escape he resorts to the big-word smoke-screen; that is, he injects into his argument some big word, with which a majority of his readers are supposedly unfamiliar, and by skillful manipulation makes what appears to the superficial reader a plausible defense of his position. The trouble is that the smoke screen is usually too thin to hide his antics. Take that word, "metonymy," for instance. Quite an awe-inspiring word to look at, isn't it? But after all, there is no mystery as to its meaning. Metonymy simply means that two things are suggested by the mention of one of them when so intimately connected that the mention of the one naturally brings to mind the other. It doesn't prove one single thing as to the relative significance of the two, but the persistent repetition of "the cup" and "this cup," by the Lord while holding a literal drinking cup in His hand filled with the "fruit of the vine," is not a vain repetition of jangling nonsense, but is the language of

Jesus Christ, Himself, and I hope to be aligned with any faction that dares tamper with the Lord's example of His words, in instituting the most sacred rite ever given to man. They may call me an infidel, a divider of churches, or anything else in the way of an epithet that betrays a malicious spirit and a determination to please themselves. Epithets never yet proved a thing to be scriptural, which the scriptures do not mention or even hint at, but they are the common resort of those who can find no other refuge. Such methods were worn so threadbare and proved so futile in the armament of digressive Nos. One and Two, that it is surprising to see them trotted out by No. three. However, they are unique in one respect and that it, the denunciation of those whose practice they voluntarily admit to be scriptural and an exact replica of what the Saviour said and did. Can you beat that? And to denounce them as infidels, and advising withdrawal from them if they do not recant. Whoopie! All of which we are asked to accept as scriptural, not because the scriptures say it, but because men who are well educated and have always been regarded as scriptural, assert it. We dare not gamble our souls on it.

CONSCIENCE

A little information from those who refuse to show any lenience to a conscientious objector—even when his conscience is claiming no basis except a scriptural one, by their own admission—is evidently due. Will they please tell us in what sort of a case Rom. 14 applies, or whether it is to be ignored entirely? Let them give us a little affirmative logic right here, so we may know just when and where it should be applied. If we are to be called infidels, trouble-makers and schismatics, we are certainly entitled to know the grounds upon which it is done. As to binding any laws upon the church, we have no such desire and deny the charge. Surely, no one is going to be silly enough to indict us of so heinous a sin simply because our conscience prompts us to act and speak as nearly like the Lord as possible. Jesus said of something less important than the institution in which we commemorate His death, "For I have given you an example; that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than His Lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." (Jno. 13:15-17). Some servants have arisen who seem to esteem themselves wiser than the Lord and are determined to please themselves, but Paul says, "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let everyone of us please his neighbor for his good to edification. For even Christ pleased not Himself; but, as it is written, the reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on Me. For whatsoever things were written aforetime, 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." (Rom. 15:1-6). There is but one way in which this delectable unity can be accomplished and that is, perfect agreement in all matters of doctrine and practice. This can be brought about by walking as closely as possible by the word of God.

JACOB'S WELL

When every other refuge fails, these infatuated fanatics hike out for Jacob's well, hoping in it to drown the troubles they have gotten into by their illogical conclusions and violation of common and well understood usage of words susceptible of several different shades of interpretation, according to the circumstances involved in the context. For instance, no child would any more think that we pick up a well and apply it to our lips in order to drink out of ("ed") it than they would surmise that to drink out of ("ek") a cup we must draw out the contents into some other container. The laws of language are too well understood for that and yet the Jacob's well argument is used as if we would necessarily have to translate "ek" in both cases alike, but it doesn't take an educated man to discern that the same shade of interpretation is not to be used for both. Anyway, we are glad they do not try to make us believe that two or more Jacob's wells might be involved; but unless this is the conclusion they intend their argument to convey, it is pointless and untrue, and we thank God that one doesn't have to be highly educated, or even know the meaning of "metonymy," to understand: "The wayfaring man though a fool shall not err therein. God spoke in plain language that may be understood by plain people—people who understand that 'the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.'" (1 Cor. 1:25).

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, APRIL 1, 1931

No. 5

COWAN'S FINAL

He does not hesitate to cut one of my sentences in two and put a part of it by the side of another to make it appear "a complete contradiction." Here is his patchwork:

"I called 'this' in Mt. 26:28 a 'pronoun' and so it is." "But there is now no pronoun brother." He then adds: "This is a complete contradiction, and you turned the somersault." The former is a part of a sentence from my final Aff.; the latter sentence is from my 5th aff., where I was speaking of his sentence, "This cup is my blood," and not of "This is my blood," in Mt. 26:28. And if he had completed my sentence, all would have been plain. Here it is: "I called 'this' in Mt. 26:28 a 'pronoun,' and so it is; but in your sentence where you supply a word not in the inspired Scriptures, 'this' is an 'adjective,' just as I said: but when you say, 'It modifies, limits and defines the noun 'cup' in verse 27,' you say what is not so."

And he misrepresents the Word of God in the same way, taking a part of a sentence in one verse and joining it with one in another verse, thus: "He took a cup and said this is my blood." But the Bible reads: "He took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them saying, Drink ye all out of it," showing that "cup" here is "the vessel out of which one drinks," as Thayer points out. (p. 510), and this destroys the brother's smoke-screen of "metonymy" here. And when Thayer cites "cup" here under "prop.," and not under "by meton.," it lifts his smoke-screen again. And when Thayer gives Mt. 23:25 and Mk. 4:8, where "cup" is used literally, under "prop.," it removes his smoke-screen again, showing that properly and literally refer to the same use as applied to words. And his smoke-screen put up on Rv. 17:4 to hide his defeat on "cup" in Mt. 26:27 went down before the scholarship of the world. The "woman" John saw, had a "cup" in her hand, and although the woman was a symbol of something, yet the words "woman" and "cup" are both used properly or literally, and Cowan's not believing it, does not change the truth of it in the least.

And when he now says, "Christ presented an object to the mind (the fruit of the vine) not by naming it, but by naming something else (cup) which readily suggested it," it is evident that the "cup" he named was not the "object" presented to the mind (the fruit of the vine), therefore the cup as used by Christ and "the fruit of the vine" are NOT "one and the same," as he affirmed. The "cup" is the "container" and if "cup" is the "blood," "container" is the "blood." He is tied to stay.

He says, "My opponent drinks the cup by drinking what it contains, while I drink the cup by drinking what Jesus called the cup."

But this still leaves him in his predicament. How does he drink the cup Jesus called the cup? is still before him. Can he drink the cup Jesus called the cup in any other way than by drinking what it contains? Here is the rub, the chasm he will never cross with his cups or his "the fruit of the vine" alone, for as N. L. Clark says: "How can one 'drink this cup'?" And he answers, "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." And this is backed by Thayer, p. 510, who says by drinking "what is in the cup." Now let him meet it. A smoke-screen does not hide his predicament.

"Rock" (I Cor. 10:4) was not "supply." It was "the vessel," as was "cup" in Mt. 26:27. (Thayer, p. 510) And they drank "spiritual drink" from "a spiritual Rock following: and that Rock was Christ," but one "vessel," Christ.

And the fact that Cowan says it would be "preposterous" to contend that "the people and cattle all drank out of the same vessel," shows that he knows better than to contend, as he does, that "we all drink from the same cup, though it is from different vessels." If his theory (There is no law of language for it) were true that all drink "out of the same vessel" when they drink out of "different vessels," why is it "preposterous" for "people and cattle" to "drink out of the same vessel?" And again he has shown his own fallacy that drinking out of different vessels, they do not drink out of the same vessel.

If he means by "parallel passage" that Mt. 22:28 and Lk. 22:20 are the same, he is mistaken. In "This is my blood of the New Testament" (Mt. 26:28), "blood" is the "attribute complement," while in "This cup is the New Testament in my blood" "New Testament" is the "attribute complement." And the "blood" and "the New Testament" are two different things. And Thayer gives the contents of the cup as the former when he speaks of the latter, saying, "The meaning is 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'" (p. 15) And he never did "take care of Thayer p. 15." (His 2nd aff.) All he can now do is to hoot, Harper obnoxious to all rational minds. What about Thayer? Are we to take "Cowan said it," and turn down scholars?

He says I admitted "getting the letter." I did not. I said, "The fact that I quoted his letter, written since the Graham debate, in no way shows that your falsehood is the truth." He now says I was "caught in a positive misrepresentation about it," which is another falsehood. Neither have I "kept something under cover about it through this debate," as he says. Here is his statement: "You turned him down, and then wrote him to help you out later." (His 5th aff.) And I know this is not true: and God knows it; and if he prefers to meet the Judge on it, I am perfectly willing for it to go that way.

"Cup" an element.—An element is "an essential part," as I said. And if the "cup" is not "an essential part," let us see him "drink the cup of the Lord" (I Cor. 10:21:11:27) without the "cup." He can "drink the cup" "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way," and this makes the "cup" an essential part of the institution.

The "big congregation," we passed long ago, for when he reduces to have "other congregations to teach them," we do the same thing to have communion. And when he finds in the Bible where they used "two or more cups" in the communion, I will find where they used "individual cups," which he says are "deceptive and divisive." "Resolved, that the individual cups are deceptive and divisive. J. N. Cowan affirms." And since the 5th Street Church in Roswell put in the "individual cups" and the congregation divided, and Alva Johnson has held them two meetings, and Charley Watkins is to hold another there in 1932, I suggest that Cowan hold the next one and teach them the evil of their practice. If they will not stand with a "Thus saith the Lord," maybe he can get them to take his creed he offered when he was there, if he works for "harmony among the disciples of Christ, as he has in the past. And when they have tried a little Pope for awhile, they may be ready for the big one, who says for one man to drink all the "wine." Why not? Is one man's way in the sight of the Lord any better than another man's way? How come? The Bible way is "foolishness" with these digressives, but we know "the foolishness of God is wiser than men," I Cor. 1:25. And "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God," I Cor. 3:19. Next. "First comes, first served." Come on now.—H. C. Harper.

PERMISSIBLE

Permissible is allowable. But who permits it? Who allows it? Is the permit from the Head of the church, Christ, or from man? Man has permitted a great many things—a sacrifice not commanded, to begin with; but what was the result? "Woe unto them that have gone in the way of Cain?"

Brother J. W. Kelly says he has contended for one cup for many years, but always said it was permissible to use two or more in waiting on the audience. And could he not also say it is permissible to use "individual cups" in waiting on the audience. Is Kelly the head of the church? Do permits originate from him for the church, which is NOT his body?

Paul says he received from the Lord what he delivered for the church to go by, and says "cup," as the Lord's example is. And should we turn this down and take what Brother Kelly permits? Paul tells the Corinthians that he preached the gospel unto them, and it was "the cup" all the way through. And he said if any man (and this means Kelly as well as me) preach any other gospel, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1:9) When a man or any set of men get big enough to give the church permission to do something that God does not, they are too big in the wrong way to be followed by the church. Just furnish the "word"

which all are to preach for this permit, and we can take it safely. The S. S. brethren admit it is Scriptural for one man to teach at a time. They also say it is permissible for two or more to teach in classes and for a woman to teach a class. The Organ folks say it is Scriptural to sing without the instrument, but permissible to sing with it in the worship. And Brother Kelly now stands with the "permissible" brethren. And it seems that many in the church of Christ are itching for what MAN says is "permissible." But as for me it is, "Speak, Lord, and thy servant heareth."

"Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Then how careful we should be to ask of the Lord, not man, for our way.—Bob Musgrave.

"So far as 'cup' and 'cups' are used to denote the vessels containing the fruit of the vine in the Communion, this scribe will 'defend the use' of one as soon as he would defend the use of many. It is time for those of men's size to be men in demeanor."—Editor Ira C. Moore (Christian Leader, Jan. 27, 1931).

Yes, you said at the Phillips-Moore S. S. debate at South Charleston, W. Va., that you would defend the use of one cup in the communion and you said you would defend the use of more than one, even the "individual cups." But at the conclusion of that debate when confronted with a proposition with a man's name signed to it to deny the use of the CUPS, you backed squarely OUT, and you know it and the congregation know it, for it "was done in a corner." And this shows that you lack much of being of a man's size in demeanor. But the way is yet open for you when you feel you can be a man in demeanor.

* * *

"A certain little paper whose editors and correspondents seem to be able to see only the hole in the doughnut and think the doughnut is composed of nothing but hole, and who cannot distinguish, apparently, between drinking the contents of the Communion vessel and swallowing the vessel, and who, in their gant-straining efforts to find something over which to create trouble and set up a cause of needless and senseless contention and division, have fallen onto the all-important and all-absorbing idea that there should be but one vessel in the Communion service for the wine."

Well, these editors and correspondents of that "little paper" who can see "the hole," can see "a leetle" then, and are not in the sad plight of our erring critics," who, having eyes, see not," being completely blinded by their traditions, as were the Jews in the time of the Savior.

And they have better sense than to think, with our esteemed critic, that to "drink the cup" one must swallow the vessel, or that the "cup" is a liquid." They have sense enough to know that a church "drink the cup" "By drinking what it contains, and in no other way," and that the "cup" is the vessel.

And since the congregation can "drink the cup" (I Cor. 10:21; 11:27) only by drinking "what is

in the cup" (Thayer, p. 510)—"By drinking what it contains, and in no other way" (N. L. Clark in Clark-Harper debate), and since this sets aside the use of Cups in the Communion, will the astute editor of the Christian Leader please tell us on what ground he accuses us of "gnat-straining efforts to find something over which to create trouble and set up a cause of needless and senseless contention and division"? It is not right to obey the Lord? Has this divine ordinance turned out to be "a non-essential" with our critics, as baptism is with sectarians? The Leader can now see where we stand, and if it thinks we are wrong, why not try to set us right, as they do the organ Digressives and sectarians? Is it not because they have not "the wherewith to do with?" They have left the word of God, and like all Digressives and sectarians, all they can do is to malign and make fun.

* *

"He said, 'The churches which he (J. D. Phillips) swung over to his 'woman-silence,' no-class, one cup (vessel) in the Communion, have, so far as I can learn (Please notice that), ceased to meet—don't have even one class nor vessel.' And such is the information given to me by one who had been in the territory or near it and seemed to know."—Ib.

"Seemed to know" is the mother of falsehood, and the editor of the C. L. picked it up as "a sweet morsel" with which to besmirch "J. D. Phillips" and "a certain little paper." But it fell wide of the mark. And any one can see how shallow it is as the best argument (?) the Leader can put up against the stand of "The Truth," even if what this informant had said were true. God pity the men of men's size that cannot be men in demeanor.—H. C. Harper.

OUR HELPERS

R. H. Stringer	-----	\$5.00
Sister Russell	-----	\$1.00
A. Sister	-----	.98
Irvin R. Boss	-----	1.00
L. L. McGill	-----	1.80

TRACTS

"The Cup" by Dr. Trott	-----	Free
Harper-Cowan Debate	-----	10 cents each
The "Review" and Baptism	-----	10 cents each
Advent Christian Church exposed	-----	10 cents each
The Communion (Jas. T. White)	-----	25 cents each

Walter W. Leamon, Salado, Ark.—At this writing I am engaged in a meeting at Red Rock, Ark. This mountain country is undergoing famine, because of the drought. Many Christians need medicine and other things not provided by the Red Cross. Funds to help in this work may be sent to E. M. Honey, Ark., and all will be judiciously distributed, and a complete and careful report sent to the donors.

For any kind of printing, communicate with the Laycock Printing Co., of Jackson, Tenn. They will save you money and appreciate your business.

E. E. Gibson, Rattan, Okla. — I have been preaching four years. Have worshipped with the church at Greenfield, N. Mex., and at L. F. D. church near Roswell, and refer any one interested in me to Brother L. Walters, Dexter, N. Mex., and Bro. C. F. Fletcher, of Hagerman, N. Mex. I am 29 years old and single. I am interested in preaching the Gospel of Christ and doing all I can to help fight of Digression from the church. I have taken a stand against the use of the cups in the communion. I would rather be right than popular. I shall be glad to assist brethren in meetings at any place. You can address me at Rattan, which is in southeastern Okla.

Dr. E. W. Gossett, Hot Springs, Ark.—I want you to enroll my name as a subscriber to your loyal little paper. I am very much pleased with it and now fully realize our hopes for a loyal paper in the brotherhood is not lost forever. Our papers are becoming so subsized to innovations and other agencies of the devil that it is a hard matter to get the truth to the people.

P. A. McCracken, Colony, Okla.—Bro. Sam L. Shultz will hold our meeting here this year, beginning August 1. I have been busy, but will be open for meetings after July 15. Brethren will please write me here. I am satisfied with the way the Bible directs us and want no innovations. Let us sound out the Word.

Walter W. Leamon, Salado, Ark.—I have been busy preaching the Gospel of the Son of God. The people seem hungry for the truth. Those wanting meetings can write me here. "Work, for the night is coming," Will our work be done when called? "Soon the evening shadows falling close the day of mortal life." "Prepare to meet thy God."

PERILOUS TIMES

Please find enclosed one year's subscription to "The Truth," the only paper being published free from innovations and isms of man. It seems that man pursues his own way not realizing that he must soon stand face to face with God. "What shall I do when he riseth up, when he visiteth me? How shall we answer him when he calls us?" This should be the chief inquiry of every one. The important thing is not how to become rich, prominent, or powerful, but how to live that I may "inherit eternal life." God has given man a perfect plan, and if man will faithfully follow it, the vilest sinner can be made clean and pure. "Ye were the servants of sin, but God be thanked that ye obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you, being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6:17:18) This requires a belief in Jesus as the Christ the Son of the Living God, John 3:16, Acts 16:31, Rom. 10:10, Acts 8:38; followed by repentance, Luke 24:47, Acts 2:38; and a confession with the mouth, Matt. 10:32, Rom. 10:10, Acts 8:37; followed by baptism, Acts 8:38, Acts 2:38. Into his death (Rom. 6:4) where we reach the blood.—Herschei Massie.

THE TRUTH

Published Semi-Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, J. D. Phillips,
Sneads, Florida Montebello, California
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips
IS MR. KNOCH RIGHT?

A Review of Mr. A. E. Knoch's Translation of Tee mia toon sabbatoon (Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2) in the "Concordant Version" of the Sacred Scriptures.

Mr. Knoch, of 2823 E. 6th Street, Los Angeles, has gotten out what he calls "The Concordant Version of the Sacred Scriptures." The book is a diatylot, containing, as its compiler says, "A Restored Greek Text, with various readings, conforming, as far as possible, to the inspired autographs," and "A Consistent Sublinear, based upon a Standard English Equivalent for each Greek Element, and An Idiomatic, Emphasised English Version."

His Greek Text is evidently one of the very best, for he spared neither time nor money in making it as nearly perfect as possible. He made it photographic likeness of the three best MSS. of the Greek New Testament, namely: Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus.

The early Greek was all in capitals, and had no spaces between words and no punctuation points. For example, Acts 20:7, transliterated, reads: TEEMIATOONSABBATOON. This phrase, transliterated from Modern Greek, is tee mia toon sabbatoon. Literally, this phrase is "the (day) one, of the sabbaths." It is a Greek idiom, meaning "the first day of the week."

Finding no printer in the U. S. prepared to set the type in Greek of the first centuries of Christianity, he began the Herculean task of making the type from small pieces of tool steel, using as tools, a hammer, a punch and a file. It took several years to complete the job. It took him more than a quarter of a century to make the type and the translation.

The work is a very valuable one, for some advantages can be gained from it that are not found in any other work with which I am familiar. I do not think his literal, word for word, English Sublinear can be beaten, for it gives a standard English equivalent for each Greek Element.

But we need not look for perfection in men or

translations, for Jesus is the only perfect one that has ever lived. "It is human to err." No translation is perfect. The King James Version, made by forty-seven scholars, learned in the languages, contains some serious mistakes and inconsistencies. For example, the Greek word pascha occurs twenty-nine times in the N. T. and the King's translators correctly translated it "passover" twenty-eight times and mistranslated it "Easter" once, in Acts 12:4.

While the Concordant Version is one of the best, it contains one serious error that no other version, so far as I know, contains. Here it is tee mia toon sabbatoon is translated "one of the sabbaths." Tea, a definite article meaning the, is left untranslated! Mia, being feminine, refers to heemera, "day," and hence mia (heemera) is "the (day) one", or "the first day." Toon, is "of the." Sabbatoon (genitive plural) is "sabbaths," and refers to the interval 'from sabbath to sabbath,' meaning "week." And hence the phrase tee mia toon sabbatoon, properly translated, is "the first day of the week."

The phrase tee mia toon sabbatoon is used in the New Testament as follows: (1) Referring to the day of Christ's resurrection, Matt. 28:1, Mark 16:2, Luke 24:1, and John 20:1, (2) Referring to the day upon which He met with His disciples between His resurrection and ascension, John 20:19, and (3) Referring to the day upon which the disciples met for worship, Acts 20:7 and 1 Cor. 16:2.

If Mr. Knoch were correct in his peculiar rendition of this phrase, we would, of course, in the interest of truth, have to change our position on the proper day of Christian worship: a change from the "Lord's day" of the Christian Age to the Sabbath of the Jewish Age.

If "one of the sabbaths" were the proper translation of this passage, every scholar among the Adventists and other sabbatarians, would long since have discovered it, and hailed with gladness the solution of their great problem of proving that the Jewish Sabbath is "the Lord's day," saying, Eureka, "we have found it."

Now, let us see why Mr. Knoch translates this phrase as he does. Mia, translated "one" in his version, and "first" in all others, is a cardinal number, meaning one, and hence he so renders it. Toon means "of the." Sabbaton (nominative singular) means sabbath, and usually refers to the weekly sabbath of the Jews; while sabbatoon (genitive plural) means sabbaths, and in this case refers to "the interval from sabbath," and is put for a whole week. Mr. Knoch denies that sabbatoon (sabbaths) is used in the sense of week.

Turn to Matt. 28:1: "In the end of the sabbath (sabbatoon, week) as it began to dawn toward one of the sabbaths (tee mia toon sabbatoon)" is intolerable. "The end of (either) the sabbath (or the week)" cannot "dawn toward" another sabbath. It cannot "dawn toward" anything but "the first day of the week." And hence that is what is meant by the phrase tee mia toon sabbatoon used here. "Horse sense" used in the study of the Greek Text of Matt. 28:1 shows that "the

first day of the week," is meant, and not "one of the (Jewish) sabbaths."

Moreover, the very frequent use of the definite article *tee*, meaning "the," with the phrase *mia toon sabbatoon*, makes it definite; whereas the rendering "one of the sabbaths" makes it indefinite!

Mia is a cardinal number, it is true, and so is (Hebrew) *ekhad*, but they are used as ordinals in many instances, meaning "first." Hence, Professor Goodspeed, of Chicago University, says: "There can be no doubt of the ordinal sense of *mia* in Greek of the New Testament period."

The Hebrew *ekhad*, corresponding to the Greek *mia*, is put for "the first" in Gen. 8:13; Exod. 40:2, 17, etc. In Gen. 1:5, the Septuagint version reads (Greek): *heemera mia*, meaning in English, day one. To make good English, it is necessary to render it "the first day."

Prootos, or *prootea*, is Greek for first, and Pickering says of *mia* as an ordinal, "the first, the same as *prootos*."—Lexicon.

Concerning *mia* as an ordinal, Dr. Robinson says in his Lexicon of New Testament Greek: "From the Hebrew (*ekhad*) as an ordinal, the first, mostly spoken of the first day of the week, Matt. 28:1 *heis mian* (*heemera*) *sabbatoon*, Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2."

E. E. Stinrgfellow, of Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, says:

"The use of *mia* as an ordinal, in place of *protee*, goes back to the Greek translation of the Old Testament, several centuries before Christ, and is a Hebraism, that is, an imitation of the Hebrew usage. See Numbers 1:1, where the same phrase is found (*hen mia tou eenos*, "on the first day of the month"). This usage is found in the later Greek in inscriptions and is the usual usage in Modern Greek. So the N. T. usage is just a step on the way of the cardinals becoming ordinals, and not the first step, for that was the LXX. There are several such usages in the N. T. as follows: Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2."

In Moulton's "Grammar of New Testament Greek" is found a striking illustration of cardinals being put for ordinals: "page forty" means "the fortieth page." Such expressions are common to us all, and hence this needs no comment.

Sabbaton and Sabbatoon. As already explained, *sabbaton* is nominative singular, and means sabbath, and usually refers to the weekly sabbath of the Jews. *Sabbatoon* is genitive plural, and is put for a week. And hence Bullinger says: "Sabbaths is sometimes put for a whole week."—Figures of Speech. And hence Wilson, in the Emphatic Diaglott, translates the phrase *tee mia toon sabbatoon*, "the first of the sabbaths" in his interlinear work; and "the first day of the week" in his emphasised idiomatical English Version. Both are correct, for "sabbaths" is used in the sense of "week."

In a well known figure of speech, "a part is put for the whole." And as an illustration of "sabbaths" being put for a whole "week," we need only to refer you to the expression "a lassie of seven winters." The other seasons of the year—spring,

summer, and fall—are, of course, included in the expression.

Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, gives as the second definition of *Sabbaton*: "A period of seven days, a week."

Robinson says: "*Sabbaton*. . . Meton. a sabbath, put for the interval 'from sabbath to sabbath'; hence a *se'en-night, week*."—Lexicon.

Young says: "A week (from sabbath to sabbath), *sabbata*."—Analytical Concordance. "From sabbath to sabbath" includes all the days of the week.

Hence the Greeks, who know their own language, simply use the term *sabbatoon*, preceded by the proper numeral to show any day's place in the week, thus:

Tee mia toon sabbatoon, "the first day of the week,"

Tee duo toon sabbatoon, "the second day of the week," and

Tee trite toon sabbatoon, "the third day of the week," etc.

It is interesting, as well as edifying, to know that Friday, the day before the sabbath, is designated by the expression, *pro-sabbaton*, meaning before-sabbath, in Mark 15:42.

The term *sabbaton*, preceded by the proper numeral to show any day's place in the week, did not originate with the Greeks, for the Hebrews expressed the days of the week, by numbers, precisely the same way, for Robinson says in his Lexicon, in dealing with *sabbatoon* in the sense of "week":

"In the Talmudists the days of the week are written: the first, second, and third day in the sabbath (week); see Lightfoot *Hor. Heb.* in Matt. 28:1). (This quotation is from the revised edition of Robinson's Lexicon. J. D. P.).

Professor G. O. Hedley, acting head of the New Testament department, in The Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif., says:

"The expression *tee mia toon sabbatoon*, while meaning literally 'the one of the week' ('one' being feminine, referring to *heemera*, 'day') was a common idiomatic usage for the first day of the week."

Philip Doddridge, one of the translators of the "Living Oracles" N. T., says, in his excellent work, entitled, "The Family Expositor:—

"On the first day of the week (1 Cor. 16:2.) So *kata mian sabbatoon* signifies."

James MacKnight, one of Doddridge's associates in making the "Living Oracles" translation, says:

"*Kata mian sabbatoon* signifies the first day of every week." See The Emphatic Diaglott, p. 598.

Carl H. Kraeling, of the Department of the New Testament, of The Divinity School of Yale University, New Haven, Conn., says:

"Literally the phrase (*tee mia toon sabbatoon*) means "on day one of the (well known) seven day week." cf. C. Gardner Smith, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1926, pp. 179-181. The seven day week is called *sabbatoon* by reason of the fact that it ends with the sabbath—"the seventh day," of rest. Either singular (*sabbaton*) or plural (*sabbatoon*, genitive) can be used to designate the

seven day week—as N. T. and contemporary writers (Philo Judeas) show.”—Letter to J. D. Phillips.

John Calvin translates Matt. 28:1 as follows: “Now in the evening of the Sabbaths, which began to dawn toward the first of the Sabbaths.” He then remarks:

“Ou, au bout du Sabbaths cowme le jour apporaisait pour le premier de la semaine;”—“or at the end of the Sabbath, as the day began to dawn toward the first of the week.”—Calvin’s Commentary, Vol. 3, p. 337.

Again, Calvin says (on Mark 16:2): “Le premier des Sabbaths; the first of the Sabbaths, or day of the week.”—Ibid.

Again, Calvin says: “The two Evangelists (Matthew and Mark) give the name of the first day of the Sabbaths, to that which comes first in order between the two Sabbaths.”—Ibid., p. 340.

H. D. M. Spence, M. A., D. D., Dean of Gloucester, and Joseph S. Exell, in commenting on John 20:1, say:

“Now on the first day of the week (toon sabbatoon); sabbata, in the plural, is used for the whole week, sabbaton including in itself the various days that intervened between sabbath and sabbath, the first, second, third, etc. Mia (one) here and in Luke 24:1 and Matt. 28:1 corresponds with the prootee (first) of Mark 16:9.”—The Pulpit Commentary, p. 462.

W. B. Godby, A. M., for forty years a constant reader of the Greek N. T., and who, for twenty-five years before making his “Translation of the New Testament from the Original Greek,” read “nothing but the Greek Text,” translates tee mia toon sabbatoon “the first of the sabbaths,” and explains what he means by saying, “The first day of the week.” See his Translation of the N. T.

The Compiler and Translator of The Numeric New Testament renders tee mia toon sabbatoon “the first day of the week,” and says, in the marginal notes, “Greek: the day one, of the week.”

Thayer, who stands at the very top of the long list of Greek scholars, his Greek-English Lexicon being the standard, says:

“Mia sabbatoon, the first day of the week, Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7.”

Again, Thayer says, in his Lexicon:

“Kata mian sabbatoon, the first day of every week, I Cor. 16:2.”

In such expressions as tee mia toon sabbatoon, “the first (day) of the week,” we have the feminine form of the article and numeral because he-mera (day) is understood.

If the phrase tee mia toon sabbatoon, in Acts 20:7, etc., meant “one of the sabbaths,” we should have heni instead of mia, because it would have to agree with sabbatoon, which is neuter gender. Since Luke used mia, we know that heemera (day) is understood.

“The first day of the week” was typified under the Jewish Economy by “the morrow after the sabbath,” when the priest waved the first ripe sheaf, or “first fruit” of the harvest. See Lev. 23. Christ, “the first fruits of them that slept,”

arose from among the dead on “the first day of the week, or “morrow after the Sabbath,” agreeing perfectly with the type.

The early Christians understood “the first day of the week” to be the day of Christian worship as the following quotations show:

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, says (A. D. 250):

“The eighth day, that is the first day after the sabbath, and the Lord’s day.”

Justin Martyr says (A. D. 140):

“But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because Jesus Christ, our Saviour, on the same day, rose from the dead.”—Apology, Chapter 67.

These writers were acquainted with the practice of the Church in its early history and were (evidently) acquainted with N. T. Greek, and, therefore, knew what tee mia toon sabbatoon meant in their day. And since they understood this language to apply to the first day of the week, their testimony goes a long way toward settling the question of translation. Hence,

“There is no room to question our ordinary translation of this passage,” as Professor Hedley of the N. T. Department of The Pacific School of Religion, says. Hence,

“Mr. Knoch is certainly wrong,” as C. H. Kraeling of the N. T. Department, of Yale University, says.

There are some old versions of the N. T. that are older than any Greek Ms. now in existence—Coptic, Egyptian, Syriac, etc.—which, if translated into English, would read “the first day of the week.” And I have never been able to see why Mr. Knoch fails to consider this strong evidence.

I think Mr. Knoch’s mistake is wholly unintentional. He is a very lovable and sincere man. He is a warm friend of mine, and has been a great help to me in many ways. I love him.

I feel perfectly safe in what I have written in review of Mr. Knoch, for I am backed by all Lexicographers of New Testament Greek. Let us accept the truth, regardless of the cost.

Endorsement

Dear Mr. Phillips: Your Greek seems to be right, and your position is sound.—Edgar J. Goodspeed, of The University of Chicago.

Dear Brother Phillips: I think you are dead right in the positions you have taken in your article, and I am unable to detect any flaws whatever in your argument. It appears to me that Mr. Knoch has been misled by the common fallacy of rendering an idiom literally instead of idiomatically. Of course, this is always a mistake from the standpoint of accurate translation. Your article covers the ground completely, and I do not see that anything more needs to be said upon the subject. You are at liberty to publish this statement or any part of it which may serve your purpose.

Very sincerely yours,

(s) Fredrick D. Kershner, Dean

School of Religion,

Butler University,

Indianapolis, Indiana.

Dear Brother Phillips:

I had long wanted to see a translation that gave us a single English equivalent for each original Greek word. The passages under consideration, concerning "the first day of the week," show some of the difficulties in the way of such a translation.

I used to wonder, when I first began the study of the Greek New Testament, why the translators so unanimously agreed in giving "the first day of the week" as a fair equivalent of the original. Your comprehensive study of this subject, and the able presentation of the accumulated evidence, should satisfy every thoughtful student.

We owe you a debt of gratitude. I trust that you will be able to get this before the public in some permanent form.

Brotherly,

(s) Paul Hays,
Fresno, Calif.

WALKING IN THE LIGHT

Psalms 119:105, "Thy WORD is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path." Proverbs 6:23, "For the commandment is a lamp and the law is light." I John 1:7, "If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Now, with these Scriptures before us we learn that as many as walk in the WORD of God, walk in the light of God, and their path is in the light and they need not stumble—it is the safe way. That is the way I want to take. And all that walk that way have fellowship one with another, and the blood cleanses us from all sin. To walk otherwise is to walk in darkness, to stumble and fall. Let us, as the old prophet admonished wayward Israel, seek out "the old paths, where is the good way." Look for the commandment, the light of God: the law of Christ, the lamp to us. Those who walk in the light have fellowship one with another, but do not have fellowship with those who walk in darkness, but rather reprove them. I Cor. 6:14.

Some people think it awful not to fellowship those who walk in darkness, but how can we walk in the light and walk with those in darkness? A walk without the word of God is in darkness. Let us all get into the light, then we can have that fellowship and please God. This is the only safe way to get together, for only then will the blood of Jesus Christ cleanse us from sin. We might compromise but this would only deceive ourselves, not God. (Amos 3:3) "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" And to walk in the light, We must all take the Lord's way. The church is but "one body" with one head, Christ; hence the church is subject unto Christ. (Eph. 1:20, 21) Then the only way for us to agree is to agree to take "the law of faith" (Rom. 3:27) and follow the Lord's way. Hence Paul says, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly" (Col. 3:16) This is our light, and where the light falls, there is our safe way. Hence we need to study the word of Christ diligently to learn the right way, and to see that preachers "Preach the word."

And when we hear preaching, like the Bereans, who "searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." (Acts 17:11)—Bob Musgrave.

SELF-CONDEMNED

A brother who worships where they use two cups in the worship and refuse to use the "common cup," said to me, "If you contend for one cup, you make a law where God has made none, for God has no law on the number we use." I replied, "Then you make a law where God has made none in using two, and making all come to your law or get out." And more, "You must worship with them if they put in 'individual cups' and make a law where God has made none." And more, "If they put in 'individual cups' and force me to them or to get out, they make a law where God has made none." "And if God has not made a law in the Bible where he give one cup, you tell me how the brethren can worship unless they take some human law, in other words, a man-made creed." He has not answered yet. Did not Cowan make a creed for the brethren to follow at Roswell, N. M., when he made an article to govern the worship, cutting out the one cup and the individual cups (except when one be Tubercular), and stipulating two or more as needed? Certainly. And here is a matter that Brother Harper has put up to Johnson and Cowan in debate that they have not met and cannot meet with the truth.—H. C. Welch.

NOTICE TO BRETHREN

My wife and I are rural school teachers and members of the church of Christ, and qualified by education and experience, ages 33 and 31, to do good work in the line of teaching and church work, both good singers; and would appreciate having a school next term where we can help build up the community by earnest, consecrated work in church while we teach. References furnished on request. Address me at Bogue Chitto, Miss.—T. A. Pool.

"Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord." (Gen. 4:3) "Abel also brought of the firstlings of his flock."

"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. 10:17)

"By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous." (Heb. 11:4)

"Woe unto them: for they have gone in the way of Cain." (Jude v. II)

"And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them; and they died before the Lord." (Lev. 10:1-3)

Sidney W. Smith, Abilene, Texas.—Please make correction. I never heard Brother Musgrave preach, neither did I ever ridicule him or anybody else for preaching on the cup question.

NEW MEXICO NOTES

The work in this field is progressing nicely, the interest and attendance at L. F. D. and Greenfield holding up fine, and one restored at Greenfield. New faces greet us at almost every service, and most of the male members are taking an active part in the public work of the church. And here at Lake Arthur we have secured the use of the Presbyterian house and are going forward with the work with a good prospect of establishing a loyal congregation. I have been preaching here to increasing congregations, and if any brethren are passing or are locating in this section they will find a royal welcome at L. F. D. church out from Roswell or at Greenfield or at Lake Arthur. These congregations are avoiding all innovations on the New Testament teaching.—T. F. Thomasson.

SOME THOUGHTS

But once, my friend, you'll pass this way:
Do all the good you can today.

* * *

'Tis said, "The straighter the path the shorter the distance." "Make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way; but let it rather be healed." (Heb. 12:13)

* * *

"All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes; but the Lord weigheth the spirits." (Eccl. 10:2) "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye doubleminded." (Jas. 4:6).

* * *

Christ said of the Father, "I do always those things that please Him." (Jno. 8:29) Have we the spirit of Christ? "Even Christ pleased not himself." (Rom. 15:3) "If I yet please men, I should not be the servant of Christ." (Gal. 1:10) We know what will please God by his will, the New Testament.—Otis F. Young.

* * *

Geo. Masser, Abilene, Texas.—I take this means to say that I am ready to go anywhere to preach the gospel. Who wants some preaching? I shall be glad to tell the sweet story of the cross with a full salvation for those that are lost and without hope. "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor that we through his poverty might be rich." Those that want nothing but "the word" preached, write me here at Abilene, Texas, and we can arrange the time.

* * *

W. H. Frasier, Hot Springs, Ark.—Please send me the paper. Have just learned that there is such a paper published in the brotherhood. (We shall be glad to send samples to hand out or to send samples to those whose names brethren send in. Let us get the paper before the brethren.—Editor).

* * *

"Where is thy Church, O Saviour, where?"
I heard the cry, and then I heard,
'Here is my church, where men still dare
To take me at my word'."

EVIDENCE OF PARDON

There are many who take feeling as an evidence of salvation from past sins. There is no Scripture for such teaching. In fact the feelings are very deceptive. Feelings are produced by evidence, true or false. When Joseph's brethren left the evidence with their father that Joseph was dead, Jacob felt that Joseph was dead, and mourned him very bitterly, saying he would go down into the grave in sorrow. But his feeling that Joseph was dead was far from making it so. Joseph was not dead. And later when Jacob was given evidence that Joseph was alive, he believed it not. He felt as if it were a falsehood, but it was the truth.

Now if the preacher tells one to do a certain thing, and God will save. If one does what the preacher says, believing it is the truth, the person will feel that God has saved him. But if the preacher's evidence is false, in other words, if God did not say such a thing, there is no salvation at all.

Anyone can now see that to have salvation from past sins, we must have the evidence from God's word, truthful evidence, and do what God says to do, then when we feel that we are saved, the evidence being true, we are saved, and not because we feel that we are, but because we have believed the truth and obeyed the truth. "Ye were the servants of sin, but God be thanked that ye obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered unto you, being then made free from sins, ye became the servants of righteousness." (Rom. 6:17,18)

John says we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. But he also states that we know we love the children of God when we love God and keep his commandments.

The Spirit bears witness with our spirit, that we are the sons of God, says Paul; hence he says, "God is my witness." Why take any other witness, kind reader.

"With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." (Rom. 10:10) "Repent" (Acts 2:38) "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." (Acts 11:18) "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. 10:10) "Confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus." (Rom. 10:9) "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father who is in heaven." (Matt. 10:32)

"What doth hinder me to be baptized?"

"If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Commanding the chariot to stand still, they went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him . . . and he went on his way rejoicing." (Acts 8:36-38) "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mk. 16:15, 16)—H. C. Welch, Morton, Texas.

* * *

Subscribe for The Truth and help keep the work growing.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, MAY 1, 1931

No. 6

SOLVING THE PROBLEM

By W. D. Hamett

"If My people, which are called by My name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wickedness; then will I hear from Heaven, and will I forgive their sin, and will heal their land."—2 Chron. 7:14.

We are living in "perilous times." The unemployment situation, the drought in the East, the low prices of farm products, etc., is causing a great financial depression. People throughout the U. S. are suffering from hunger and cold.

The "crime wave" is terrible. Murder, rum, and ruin are seen on every hand. Hearts are broken, family ties are torn asunder. The jails and penitentiaries are full to overflowing, and yet, more crimes are being committed. All this leads to poverty and ruin. The people are looking for a remedy, and find it not, because they do not look to "The Great Physician," who can heal every ill. They trust in politics, and in "their man" to free us from the terrible situation.

If our rulers, and those who control the wealth of the land, would turn from their selfish ways, and trust in God rather than in their wealth, I am sure that God would bless us and times would be different; for they would follow "The Golden Rule" of Matt. 7:12, which requires us to "Do unto others as we would have them do unto us."

There is plenty of food, clothing, and shelter for all, and it should be divided among the poor in these days of poverty.

Jesus said: "I was hungry, and you fed me." Are we feeding the poor? "Naked, and you clothed me." Are we clothing the naked? Are the rich men doing their duty along this line?

Men need to humble themselves before God. If all would do this, the world would be a brighter place in which to live. Men would cease being "lovers of themselves, more than lovers of God." Humble men will pray and seek God, and turn from their wickedness; and love their fellowmen more than they do the dollar. They will not stand and make long and loud prayers, and at the same time see poor little children cold and hungry, without doing something to help them.

Where is Christianity today? Is it exemplified in fine cars, fine meeting houses, selfishness, and the love of money? Is it exemplified in seeing people beg for bread, and clothes, and shelter? Jesus came to Earth "to seek and to save that which is lost." His interest was in the poor. "The poor have the gospel preached unto them." Feeding the hungry, and clothing the naked, are two things we must do, as Christians.

"Awake, O Christians! God is reigning." Don't forget that His Son, Jesus Christ, is "the King of kings, and Lord of lords." If all men would

humbly confess Him before men, repent of all transgressions, be baptized into His name and into His death; and then look to Him as their King, and obey His laws in all that they require, the world would be a fine place in which to live. Republicanism, Democracy, and Socialism, would disappear. Holy Rollerism, the Murder craze, etc., would soon vanish. The rich would cease their robbery of the poor, slaves would be freed, and the prohibition laws would not be necessary.

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in His law doth he meditate day and night. And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."—Psa. 1:1-3.

This promise is to the individual that does right—"he shall prosper." A congregation of disciples, all doing right, always prospers. Israel prospered while walking in God's ways; but in their own way, they failed. A nation would prosper if it walked in the ways of Jehovah, for the Lord says, in addressing His beloved Zion:

"The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted."—Isa. 60:12.

"Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness," says the Lord Messiah, "and all these (temporal) things shall be added unto you." I am glad that some good preachers and writers have been teaching more along this line.

Brother J. D. Phillips, whom we have learned to love and consider a righteous and Godly young man, was with me last Lord's day. He will hold us a meeting in the late summer or early fall. He is able and willing to "declare unto us the whole counsel of God," in its purity and simplicity. I am glad he teaches that we should trust in the Lord to "give us this day our daily bread," while we "work with our hands" to "provide things honestly in the sight of God and man."

It does not look good to a devout Christian to see the sisters bobbing their hair. See 1 Cor. 11. Do they do it to please God? To be more Christ-like? To be more modest? To be more humble? To be more like God made them? No, no. "God hath made man upright; money, the love of pride, the love of popularity, and the love of ease, is condemning thousands of otherwise good people."

What is the solution of the problem? Autocracy has failed to solve it. Democracy has failed. Republicanism has failed. Socialism is failing. Catholicism has failed. Mohammedanism has failed. Protestantism has failed. United or Federated Protestantism has failed. Philosophy and Education have failed. And, finally, Our Whole

Composite Civilization has failed. The plans have failed because they are **human**; every human system will, sooner or later, fail; for "every plant which My Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."—Matt. 15: 13. Voting will not make conditions any better.

The Solution is Christ He has the power, the will, the character, and the wisdom, to solve it. The chief laws of his kingdom require **love** for all. "Love God . . . love your neighbor as yourself." "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

"Oh, that My people had harkened unto Me, and Israel had walked in My ways! Then should I have subdued their enemies."—Psa. 81:13. "Oh that thou hadst harkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river."—Isa. 48:18. Let us, then harken unto the commandments of God, and instruct others in the way of the Lord.—R. R. 1, Box 569, Fresno, Calif.

"The New Testament furnishes a word for everything which is in the New Testament; and if a church has anything today for which there is no New Testament word, it has something which is not in the New Testament."—Gospel Advocate. The Apostolic Way quoted this in their issue for March 1, 1929, with approval.

The New Testament speaks thus: "And he took a cup (one cup, if you please) . . . saying, 'Drink ye all of it.'"—Matt. 26:27. **The cup** of blessing which we bless."—1 Cor. 10:16. And thus it is seen that "cup" in connection with the Communion is "a New Testament word," and is, therefore, right, and as F. L. Rowe used to say, "If it is right, it cannot be wrong."

Now, can The Apostolic Way find the word **cups** used in connection with the Lord's supper? If they cannot, it is evident that they have "something which is not in the New Testament," but is an addition to the New Testament—an innovation upon the New Testament order of things.

And if The Apostolic Way thinks we should "have a New Testament word" for everything we have in the churches, they should locate the word **cups** in connection with the Communion—yes, locate it in the New Testament—before forcing their **cups** law upon the brethren. And truly; "To make a law where God has made none is sinful as it is to break a law God has made," as Bro. Creacy says.

McGarvey "hit the nail on the head" when he said the strongest argument that could be made for the organ in the church is, "We want it and we are going to have it." And from the present attitude of those who advocate the **cups** we may safely conclude that they "want" the **cups** and they "are going to have" them regardless of what God says about the matter. The use of **cups** in the Communion is "something for which there is no New Testament word," hence it is "something which is not in the New Testament," you see.

And since the use of **cups** in the Communion is "something which is not in the New Testament," there being "no New Testament word" for it, the ones using them do not "continue steadfastly in

the Apostles' teaching" (Acts 2:42), but have "gone beyond the things which are written" (1 Cor. 4:6), hence they "have not God" because they "abide not in the teachings of Christ."—2 John 9.

GOD'S WAYS VERSUS MAN'S

Man is an ever changing creature in all his ways. Left to himself, he is a vacillating creature. Many of his changes are good, and many are harmful. He is prone to forget God, his maker and lawgiver. Made in the image of God, his first concern should always be for his spirit or soul, "for what doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" "Fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man."—Eccl. 12:14. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."—Rev. 22:14.

Every reader should seriously consider this. Is your heart right with God? Read Jer. 10:23: "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps."

This should be a warning to all—to our brethren who claim things right in the worship of God where God has not spoken, to sectarians, who likewise presume to dictate ways and things not in the Bible, to the world of the ones who make no profession. All that expect to be saved must come to that attitude as did the true prophet of God in saying, "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself." Why the Flood? Why the Fire and Brimstone from heaven? Why the Wilderness after the Red Sea? O Lord, make us to know our littleness in thy sight. Make us to be thankful that thou hast pointed out the safe way whereby we may escape the snares of the devil. May we estew the ways of man, be they never so inviting, and may we heed thy admonition: "Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the OLD PATHS, where is the GOOD WAY and walk therein."—Jer. 6:16.

Why this confusion of ways? God's ways are perfect. (Ps. 18:30). If we add to or take from the perfect, what can we expect but confusion and eternal ruin. Who is guilty? "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the FAITH; prove your own selves."—2 Cor. 13:5. We hear members, especially preachers, pray to God that we may be one. This is to admit that we are not what God expects of us, for we read: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you; but that you be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."—1 Cor. 1:10.

Ask the organ advocate whether those that reject its use in the assembly can worship and please God without it, and they will say they certainly can. Ask the class-division man or the woman-teacher man whether those who reject such practices can worship and please God without these things in the church, and they will say we can. Ask those who are using the "individual

cups" or the "two or more cups" in the Communion whether those who reject these practices can worship and please God, and they will say we can. And so we can go through the whole category of innovations and get the same reply. This makes it evident that these things are not in "the will" of God, for it is only those that do his "will" that shall enter the kingdom of heaven.—Matt. 7:21.

God's people are "a peculiar people." This has always been so, and is so in the very nature of things, for God's ways are not man's ways. "The steps of a righteous man are ordered of the Lord," and none are righteous unless theirs are so ordered. And "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man; but the end thereof are the ways of death."—Prov. 16:25. Man may be deceived, and he may deceive himself, too. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."—Gal. 6:7, 8. All man's ways are after the flesh, for they are after man; but all the ways of God are after the Spirit, for the Spirit guided according to the WILL of God.—E. E. Gibson, Rattan, Okla. (I have some time yet for meetings not engaged. Write me.)

"There is nothing in the Bible about the Baptist church, and anything that is not in the Bible ought not to be anywhere else."—Jas. A. Allen, in the Gospel Advocate.

Now, if there is anything wrong with this statement of Bro. Allen, let some brother point it out to us. It is God's truth and is, therefore, good. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," says the Saviour. And this is "the truth" about the Baptist church—"there is nothing in the Bible about" it, you see.

Truly, anything that is not in the Bible ought not to be anywhere else," as the Editor says. The Sunday School, with its classes, women teachers, uninspired literature, separate collections, etc., "is not in the Bible," therefore, it "ought not to be anywhere else," as all can see. And since Editor Allen and the Gospel Advocate advocate the Sunday School, we would like for them to show it to us in the Bible. And if they cannot do it, they should begin to teach their readers that the Sunday School "is not in the Bible" and, therefore, it "should not be anywhere else."

"Sauce that is good for the goose is also good for the gander," they say. And if the Editor's "sauce" is good for the Baptists it ought also to be good for the Editor and all other advocates of the Sunday School—a human institution on equal footing with the Baptist church. John Smyth had as much authority to found the Baptist church as Robert Raikes had to found the Sunday School. And the "Baptist and Reflector" has as much right to uphold the Baptist church as the Gospel Advocate has to uphold the Sunday School—neither of these institutions is "in the Bible." Hence you will find them both in the same nutshell, viz: in the imaginations of men

who have gone "beyond the things which are written."—1. Cor. 4:6. "Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up," says Jesus.—Matt. 15:13. And when "Mystery Babylon" shall fall (Rev. 18), the Sunday School and the Baptist church will both fall together. And their friends shall stand off and lament over them, crying, "Alas, alas!"—Rev. 18:19. But the saints shall rejoice over her fall.—Rev. 18:20.

And since "Anything that is not in the Bible ought not to be anywhere else," will their advocates remove the cups from the churches of Christ and thus heal the division, alienation, and disobedience to God caused by their introduction by man? Better do this than to have your "name blotted out of the book of life."—Rev. 3:5. There is nothing in the Bible about cups with the Communion. And "anything that is not in the Bible ought not to be anywhere else."

HOW ABOUT IT?

Well, brother, you use tobacco, don't you? Yes, I decided it was wrong and tried to quit, but I just all bloated up and got where I couldn't even tie my shoes, so I went to the doctor and he advised me to go back to using tobacco. But, brother, instead of having what the Great Physician said in the interest of your soul, you went to a medical doctor about your body. Now read Matt. 10:28 and see about this. If a sinner should ask how to obtain forgiveness of sins, would you send him to a medical doctor? And, brother, remember that nine out of ten M. D.'s will tell you that tobacco is injurious to bodily health. But suppose it is good for the health, so is wine, and Paul advised Timothy to use it for his stomach trouble; but it is written again, "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is made weak. (Rom. 14:21) So you can see that wine was recommended by one inspired for health, while tobacco never was, and yet there is a time when it is wrong to drink wine. And if under the above-named conditions it is sinful to drink wine, which was recommended for health, how can it be right under the same conditions to use tobacco, a thing that inspiration never did prescribe for any one's health? Think it over, brother? How many are you by your example leading into a dangerous habit? Jesus said, "If a man love me, he will keep my words." (John 14:23) What are some of his words? Listen: "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof. (Rom. 13:14)—H. C. Welch, Morton, Texas.

"Bro. _____, you know the last time I saw you at _____, Texas, I had undertaken to quit tobacco, and failed. Well, I started in last summer to make good and have succeeded. I do not use the weed any more and am proud I can say that Bro. _____, Bro. _____, and Bro. _____ have also quit the habit.

—Tom E. Smith."

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, J. D. Phillips,
Sneads, Florida Montebello, California
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

HERE AND THERE

Frédéric D. Kershner, Dean of The School of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana, March 31.—Dear Brother Phillips: Thank you very much for the interesting copy of *The Truth*, containing your excellent article (*Is Mr. Knoch Right?*). It seems that your argument is water tight, and I shall be interested to learn whether anybody will be able to impeach it. I do not think that any one can well mistake your argument.

With much appreciation of your kindness in sending the journal containing your contribution, I remain, Very sincerely yours, (s) Fred. D. Kershner.

L. I. Gibbs, 7735 Whitsett, Los Angeles, Calif., Apr. 4.—That article of yours, "*Is Mr. Knoch Right?*" is fine. I hope he gives it serious consideration. The S. S. folks at Eugene, Ore., have agreed to drop their innovations in order to get the two congregations back together. The Brethren meeting on Siskiyou St., Los Angeles, and at Montebello, and at So. Gate, are getting along nicely, as usual.

W. T. Taylor, De Leon, Texas, Apr. 1.—I was glad to read Bro. Phillips' article, reviewing Mr. Knoch's "Concordant (rather discordant) version" of the Scriptures. Mr. Knoch should thank Bro. Phillips, and insert a leaflet in each copy he sells, containing the article. If Cowan is right in his contention that "the fruit of the vine" is "the cup of the Lord," we had as well have the individual cups. But he is not right. "The cup of the Lord" is a metonymy. And it takes a "Container (cup) and the thing contained" ("the fruit of the vine") to constitute this kind of metonymy.—Williams' Rhetoric, p. 220, and Thayer's Lexicon, p. 553. Therefore, it takes "Poteerion, a cup, a drinking vessel," and "the fruit of the vine" to constitute "the cup of the Lord."

The publication of The Harper-Cowan debate has stirred up a great deal of interest on the cup question. The Apostolic Way would be doing good work if they would open their columns for a discussion of the question. This would get the truth before their readers, and also show that they mean

what they say about getting "both sides of every question before our readers."

My article in review of A. E. Knoch's translation of *mia sabbatoon*, which he renders "one of the sabbaths" instead of "the first (day) of the week," as this Greek idiom should be translated, has stirred up considerable interest in the matter. Mr. Knoch claims to be honest, and to want the truth. He carries some discussions in his magazine, "Unsearchable Riches." If he will open his paper for the discussion, we shall be glad to open the columns of *The Truth*, and thresh it out. And I will agree to furnish the scholarship of the world in support of what I put up as argument, and not set myself up against the combined Greek scholarship, as Mr. Knoch does.

Bro. W. T. Taylor says: "I hope those with money will come to the support of *The Truth*. We, in this part of Texas, have had three years of very short crops, and thousands are being fed by the Red Cross. I wish we were able to do something for the support of the paper."

Times are hard. The great depression has hit us all hard. By extreme sacrifice, we have been able to keep *The Truth* growing. But those of means should come to our aid by sending in donations. Preachers and others should work for its circulation. It is the only paper now standing for a "Thus saith Jehovah," and, therefore it should be better supported.—J. D. Phillips.

Mrs. J. W. Brock, Unionville, Ind., Apr. 5: We had a good crowd out for worship today. Since the division, we meet in the High School Building. Cowan has been here since the division, but he gave no authority for his cups. I told him I could make better arguments for the classes and women teachers than he could for his cups. Bro. Phillips, we are awfully glad you are going to visit us once more. I am going to tell you how we worship, and if we are wrong, you can set us right when you come. We want the right way. Here is the way we proceed: We sing, first. Then, some of the brethren arise, one at a time, and reads some portion of the Sacred Scriptures. Then, the brethren teach, one at a time. Then, we "lay by in store." The collection basket is passed from one to another, and the contribution is put in it. Then we partake of the loaf and the cup. Thanks are offered for the loaf, and it is passed round. Then, "in like manner" thanks are offered for the cup, and it is passed round. Then, we have two prayers, by two of the brethren. A hymn is then sung, and that ends the worship.

Note: I have spent a many a day in the home of Bro. and Sister Brock, and have preached many times for the Unionville Church, before the division came. At that time, I stood for as many cups as the brethren wanted to use. They used two. Finally, Bro. King and I saw the unscripturalness of the cups, and we both took our stand against them. We both preached against them at Unionville. Bros. Young and Chitwood stood

by us, as did others. After making an effort to set the church right on this and other matters, and seeing that it could not be done, these brethren, with the help of Bro. Joseph Miller and other men of God, quietly withdrew and started the worship as it should be. I see nothing wrong with their worship as now conducted, and, therefore, will have no criticism to make when I get there. "How sweet and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." — David. Let us, then, "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the uniting bond of peace," as Paul exhorts us to do.—J. D. P.

Fred Hogland, Melrose, N. Mex., Apr. 7.—The church at this place is divided, and has been for over two years. Our family and Bro. Lyons' family have been worshipping in our homes, while the S. S. people have retained the building, and are conducting services in it. Since the division, a few families have moved in here who oppose the S. S. but not strongly enough to obey the heavenly call to "Come out of Babylon." They are not settled on the Cup question, but I think they will take their stand against the cups, when they are shown the fallacy of them. We are asking Bro. Phillips to give us some time, if he can, while on his trip, East.

Note: I shall be glad to conduct a meeting for these good brethren. I held a meeting for the S. S. brethren in Melrose, in 1924 (I think), before I got entirely straight on the S. S., and before I had given the cup question any consideration. I think I can help to lead some of the brethren out of Babylon, and get them planted on "The Rock of Ages."—J. D. P.

Mrs. Zella Mullen, Ottumwa, Ia.—The Church here has made some improvement, and I think there is more interest shown in the meetings.

Bro. T. F. Thomasson, of Lake Arthur, N. M., is doing some fine work in the Pecos Valley and other sections of N. Mex. The L. F. D. Church, near Roswell, the Greenfield Church, and the Lake Arthur Church, owe their existence and prosperity to Bro. Thomasson. He will conduct a meeting for Bro. King's home congregation, near Lebanon, Mo., beginning the first Lord's day in Aug. He is a man of great ability, fine personality, and, above all, a Christian who not only preaches just what the Book says, but actually lives, in his every day life, what he preaches to others.

Bro. Paul Hays, R. 4, Bx. 15, Fresno, Calif., recently conducted a meeting among the Portuguese people of Fresno, which resulted in several Portuguese Catholics, and others, confessing Jesus as Messiah, and being immersed into His death for the remission of sins. There is a lot of such work that needs doing. "The harvest is great, but the laborers are few."

Young Bro. Chan Hill, of Spring Hill, W. Va., has been doing a great deal of gospel work, at a

heavy sacrifice. He preached some for the Malory Chapel congregation south of Spring Hill and for the So. Charleston congregation, where the Moore-Phillips debate was held, and where Bro. Moore flatly refused to debate the cup question with Bro. Harper.

ALL HAVE SINNED

The proud religious Pharisees had sinned. All have sinned. Weighed in the balance of God's infinite justice, the perfection of his laws, the magnitude of his gifts, and the plentitude of his power, we are humble suppliants of his mercy. There is none deserving no not one.

The world despises a beggar, but we are beggars. Ingratitude is the greatest crime, but we are often ungrateful, and forget the giver of all our good. Selfishness is a mortal sin, but we fail to "freely give" to others, that which has been given to us.

Many of those who pride themselves in their goodness, gloat over the record of Crime, as depicted in the daily papers,—and the picture shows and the modern theatre.

Those who pride themselves in their integrity will cheat in a trade, dodge the paying of their debts, and foreclose the mortgage of a poor widow.

Parents who claim to love their children, allow them to run riot in the streets, with less restraint and protection than they would provide for their livestock.

People who claim to be modest and pure, dress themselves and their children in a style that characterized the harlots of a generation ago,—a dress borrowed from the harlotry of Paris.

And instead of crying aloud in very anguish of soul, and the very "fanaticism" if pity, and horror of rebuke,—we have winked at evil and said nothing. And "he that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is Sin."

But the Greatest Sin of all is the neglect of the Saviour. We refuse him for ourselves, and selfishly refuse to warn and woo and win those who are in like condemnation. We would not care, or dare to "snatch a brand from the burning," and perhaps blame God for cruelty.

O, if we were in His place, we would let sin run riot, and allow murderers and adulterers to violate our homes, without threat or fear of punishment. Are we better than they? How dare we refuse to join the Lord Jesus, in an effort to suppress crime, and save the lost?

But if none of these things may be laid at our door, perhaps we deserve no credit, if we have been better taught. At the last estimate, we owe everything to God, and are debtors, deserving no credit.

Even supposing that there might be a soul, somewhere, who had never sinned, has not God a right to ask us to submit to his Son? Has he not a right to Demand it, as an example to others? To refuse is to disobey God, and transgression of his law is Sin.

It is indeed Gracious in God, who is more than just, and very merciful,—that he offers salvation

to all alike, and on the Same Terms. This cannot shame the best in us, nor shame the worst of us, while we join hands to help, and be helped, in the Divine plan of salvation. This is Love.

But the sweetest revelation of Love is, that "God so loved the world that WHOSOEVER believeth in Him might not perish, but have Everlasting Life."

We must believe in him as a Leader, as well as a sacrifice for our sins. The Scriptures assure us that we are not justified by faith only, inasmuch as "devils fear and tremble," and yet are not saved.

"Trust and obey, for there is no other way,
To be happy in Jesus, but to Trust and Obey."

"The time is come that Judgment must begin at the house of God." "And if the righteous shall scarce be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" —Paul Hays.

MARK 14:23-25

And He took a cup (a drinking vessel—Thayer) and when He had given thanks, He gave (it) to them; and they all drank of it (the drinking vessel).

Verse 24. And He said unto them, This is (telling them what the vessel contained) My blood of the (New) Covenant, which is poured out for many.

Verse 25. Verily I say unto you, I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine (which is "My blood of the Covenant"—that which "you all drank out of the cup—a drinking vessel—Thayer) until I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

After the kingdom of God had come Paul writes thus: 1 Cor. 10:16. The cup (the drinking vessel—Thayer) of the blessing which WE bless, is it not "the cup?" a communion of the blood of Christ? (Or "Is it not the cup of participation of the blood of the Covenant"—Mark 14:23; "The fruit of the vine I drank with you from the cup—drinking vessel"—Mark 14:25.)

1 Cor. This 'cup (drinking vessel) is the New Covenant in my blood (or in it is the fruit of the vine, My blood of the New Covenant. Mark. 14:23-25.) (Or the cup you all drank out of is the manner in which I formed the New Testament in My blood. 1 Cor. 11:25.)

By having communion of My blood in it, 1 Cor. 10:16. They all drank out of it, Mark 14:24—Diaglott Tr.

Without the IT, the cup, the drinking vessel, no New Covenant in His blood, 1 Cor. 11:25; no joint fellowship (or communion) in His blood, 1 Cor. 10:16; no memory of Him, 1 Cor. 11:25; because they cannot do what He did when He took a cup and they all drank out of it, Diaglott tr. No one can drink the cup (1 Cor. 11:26) without drinking what it, the cup, contains—so say Clark and Thayer. Yet Clark separates the fruit of the vine from the cup the New Testament in His blood, which the Lord put in the cup which He dedicated as His blood of the New Testament and told them all to drink it, Matt. 26:27, and they all drank out of it, Mark 14:24; all had joint participation

in it, 1 Cor. 10:16. Had a New Institution, the cup, the New Testament, Agreement, 1 Cor. 11:25; the communion in His blood, 1 Cor. 10:16; something new that had not been before.

In my debate with Cowan I affirmed that the cup mentioned in connection with the loaf in the communion, is the blood of the New Covenant. The first thing he undertook to do was to get me to admit that the wine was all that was meant by "cup" and is only a symbol of His blood. So we see he and other cuppers see nothing real in it at all. No one can defend the cup, a drinking vessel, and make a metonymy of the language "This is my blood." The metonymy is on the cup. No one can offer thanks for the fruit of the vine and follow the Lord. The Lord offered thanks for the cup every time. Paul gave the reason. Thus the Lord formed it, the cup, the New Covenant in His blood, 1 Cor. 11:25.

Let us keep the form by speaking that which is written.

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.

INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION CUPS VS. THE BIBLE.

In view of the fact that this question is and has been much-talked about and is a great disquieting factor in the ranks of the brotherhood, and that so many have fallen victims of its aggression in the church among those who claim loyalty to the Word of God, I shall offer a few things for the reader to think over.

The first thing I want you to fix in your mind is the relationship the product bears to the thing that produced it. This is mathematically true. It is also true in the mineral, animal and vegetable kingdoms. The product of an example bears a close relationship to the rules employed to produce that product. The apple, peach and pear bear a close relationship to the respective trees that produce them; the grape, the cluster, bears a close relationship to the vine that produced it; and "the fruit of the vine" bears a close relationship to the cup that produces and makes possible its use. The polished diamond, with all its beauty and attractiveness, owes a close relationship to the crude elements which produced it. Our Savior, the product of the Father, bears such a relationship to Him that it is said they "are one."

The loyal churches of Christ knew nothing of these late innovations for nearly two thousand years. They were satisfied with what "is written." And the loyal church today is in the same condition—satisfied with what "is written."

A few years ago the devil set up his "mourners' bench" in a little different way from what he has always had, and ninety-eight per cent of the preachers, to say nothing of "the lay members," have gone the "saw-dust trail" to his mourners' bench and have learned his way perfectly well; and the world has been filled with his dastardly, distorted and pernicious doctrine; and I'm afraid we will never recover from it. And while these preachers were down at the bench, he gave them some good lessons in "It is more sanitary; and the

'cup' just means the contents anyway, and not the container; and we will never get anywhere if we don't do as all the rest of the churches do."

The devil is the father of all these things. Just a short time ago I listened to one of these self-styled loyal preachers preach a good gospel sermon; and at the time he made it a point to say something about the "individual communion cups," and his experience in reconciling his conscience with this innovation. Among other things he said, "It took me a long time to get this matter settled in my mind. I went at it very cautiously and slowly; it took me a long time to make up my mind about it."

No doubt other preachers have had a similar experience, and this is just what the devil is working for. If he can get you to keep "returning to see what the Lord will say more," he always counts you his servant. There is not one of these fellows who does not know "what the Lord said" the first time. The Lord lets them have what they want.

I have been asked, "Doctor, do we drink the cup?" Well, let us see. In Gen. 2:16 God says, "Of the trees. . . thou mayest freely eat." Did they eat the trees? No. Did they eat of the trees? Yes. Well, how did they eat of the trees and not eat the trees? Just the same way we **drink of the cup in drinking the cup**. They ate of the trees by eating the products of the trees; we drink of the cup by drinking the product of the cup—what the cup produces and makes possible for us to drink.

Now, listen: Moses says, "The tree is man's life." Deut. 20:19. Study the meaning of this and make your own answer. Again: A few mornings ago two of our preachers and one of the members ate one-half dozen eggs each for breakfast. Did they eat the shells? I think not. Well, how did they eat the eggs without eating the shells? Just the same as we "drink the cup" without drinking the vessel. The reader will kindly indulge me while I show them their folly. I want to show them what a big joke they are. Solomon says, "Answer a fool according to his folly." Prov. 26:5. It is the most deplorable experience of my life to listen to a self-styled "loyal" preacher stand up before a congregation and preach really a good sermon, and at the conclusion desecrate the Lord's table and sacred service instituted to "keep in memory His sufferings and death," by employing **individual cups**. Such a thing was unthinkable even twelve or fifteen years ago. But it is never too late to serve the devil if you want to. And this is where they have gone "beyond that which is written."

One of the most flagrant perversions of truth, decency and respectability was **planned and pulled off** in our little congregation at Hot Springs, Ark., not long ago. Its equal for treachery, meanness, unrighteousness and ungodliness could not be found this side of the Inquisition of Roman Catholicism. The leadership of this diabolical and contemptible plot connived with evil and made a covenant with sin and unrighteousness and

brought shame and reproach upon themselves, and dissipation for the time at least—upon the cause of our blessed Savior here at Hot Springs. Their conduct was so vicious and determined—all of which originated at a private council a few weeks before. A private council has always been the hot-bed of heresy in the church. And they are now living out the object of their dream, and may continue to do so until they are converted to the precepts and examples of New Testament teaching and Christianity as opposed to sectarianism. I shall have nothing to do with them till they return to "the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls." Yours for truth and righteousness.—E. W. Gossett, M. D., 245 Hazel St., Hot Springs, Ark.

QUERIES

1. What is the difference between the meaning of "Drink of the cup" and "Drink out of the cup?"
2. What is difference between the meaning of "Drink of the cup" and "Drink the cup"? A. Y.

1. **Of, from, and out of** all mean the same. They formerly used "in" also; but as the lexicographer of the New Standard Dictionary says, "in is archaic," that is, it is an old use, found now only in poetry. And he says of **of**, which is not so much used now, that "Tennyson in 'Becket' gave a new lease of life to **of** in 'drink of the cup.'" Again he says, "**From** means **out of**, therefore, either one is good form."

2. "Drink of the cup" and "Drink the cup" mean the same thing. In saying **Drink of** (from or out of) the cup, we use literal language; while in saying **Drink the cup**, we use figurative language, a figure of rhetoric called metonymy. The same act is done in obeying either command. In drinking the cup, they drink out of the cup, that is, they drink what it contains; and in drinking **out of** the cup, they drink the cup, that is, they drink what it contains. They do the same thing, as we see, in obeying either command.

And the lexicographer says, "Certainly one must place a cup to one's lips in order to drink out of or from it." Again he says, "We eat soup when we use a spoon and convey the soup out of the plate to the mouth; but we **drink** soup when it is served to us in a cup, and we take the cup to our lips." (Lexicographer, 354-360 Fourth Avenue, New York).

Walter W. Leamons, Salado, Ark.—We are receiving funds to distribution to the destitute in the Oark counties of Arkansas. A careful record of all expenditures is being kept. Send all funds to E. M. Honey, Salado, Ark.

J. B. Daniel, Hatch, N. Mex.—A few still meet at this place keep house for the Lord. We have a fine country, so if interested, write me. And brethren, passing this way, stop and meet with us. There is a good opening here for a brother who is a first-class barber.

If it's **PRINTING** you need, communicate with Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

WHATSOEVER IS NOT OF FAITH IS SIN

"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."—Matt. 26: 27-28.

All are agreed on the following facts: 1. That Jesus took a drinking vessel in His hand, called a cup. 2. That this cup had "the fruit of the vine in it." 3. That all drink the cup by drinking what it contains. 4. That when the disciples became numerous, the Holy Spirit provided for "churches of Christ," and nowhere provided for cups. When we act by faith, we have "churches of Christ." When we act without faith, we have cups; and "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." "So then faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Rom. 10:17. Where the Word of God stops, faith stops. And whatsoever, yes, whatsoever is not of faith is sin. We know what will please God by his will.—Matt. 7:21. His will is expressed in his word. Wherefore be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is." Eph. 5:17. We talk of following Christ in "the action of baptism," but this is not the only place where we must follow Christ. He said of the Father: "I do always those things that please him."—Jno. 8:17. And Paul says, "Ye have received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God."—1 Thes. 4:1. Doing what is not directed by the pen of inspiration will never please God: it is not of faith, and hence is sin. As for myself, I had rather follow the example laid down by the Savior.—W. H. Reynolds, Kinston, Ala.

PASSED ON

My dear wife, Lucy L. Bennett, fell asleep in Jesus, March 17, 1931. She was born March 26, 1865. We were married October 25, 1885. She was baptized into Christ about 30 years ago, and lived a consistent Christian life until death. It was hard for me to give her up. I want to ask the prayers of all the faithful everywhere, that I may hold out faithful till death, that I may meet her in the happy home above. I am left alone in this sinful world, and I need your prayers and encouragement. She was sick about a year and a half before she passed away.—Your brother in Christ, Ryan Bennett, Palestine, Ark.

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.—You say the cups brethren are not reading your debate with Cowan. There is a reason for this, as Brother Trott used to say. What you did for his effort was a great plenty. I knew one effort from your pen would lay him in the shade. All can see his perversions and dodges and unproven assertions. I am to engage Baptist by the name of W. A. Kile, Seymour, Texas, beginning April 21, for six days and six nights. Next I go to Waco, Texas, to begin a three weeks' meeting, beginning May 10. Here is where they recently put in the cups and divided the church. Then I go to Oklahoma City, for a meeting; then to Lorenzo, Texas, for the remainder of June. Then to Floresville, Texas,

first half of July. Then to Centerpoint, near Floresville for the rest of July. Then to Pike City, Okla., for first half of August. All who live near there please take notice and be there if you can.

AT EASE IN ZION

The brave, heroic prophet, Amos, fearlessly proclaimed God's solemn words of condemnation against Israel and Judah. He shows how God pled with them to turn from evil, and promised to forgive if they would repent; otherwise they would go into captivity. With their great wealth there was great sin. There was no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge left in the land, as we learn in Hos. 4:1-4. The shameful worship of Baal and the abominable worship of Ashtoreth, principal female deity of the Phoenicians, had supplanted the pure worship of the true God, leaving the people spiritually impoverished. From a worldly point of view they flourished both nationally and socially. And the times seemed propitious. But unbridled lust held sway and intemperance was seen on every hand, especially among the rulers. And it seemed that Amos must have been looked upon as "a calamity howler," or "a fusser," using a modern phrase.

What is the matter? Are we not wealthy as a nation? Are not the people contented and at ease? Why raise a religious fuss? Do not other nations worship Baal and Ashtoreth? Some people are just so straight they lean backward! But oh, the impending woe! They forgot God. They would not repent. How hard it is for a church today to repent when it has left God's way! But like ships at sea: "They that will not be ruled by the rudder must be ruled by the rock." These ways led to the downfall of Judah, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the captivity. O, what sorrow!

"As I live, saith the Lord, Sodom thy sister hath not done—she nor her daughter—as thou hast done. Behold this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom—pride, fullness of bread, and prosperous ease." The sins of Israel and Judah are frequently compared to the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah, Isa. 1:2.

God warns the church today—his spiritual Israel—against departing from his ways, 2 Pet., and Jude, and all through Paul's letters. The church at Laodicea said, "I am rich and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing." It was prosperous from a worldly standpoint; it congratulated itself on being in this condition. But oh, how near to destruction! In God's sight it was poor, and naked, blind and wretched; and without repentance it was ready to be spewed out of the mouth of the Lord—yes, rejected and lost eternally. "Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me."

"Workman of God, lose not heart; but learn what God is like, And in the darkest battlefield thou shalt know when to strike.

Thrice just is he to whom is given the wisdom that can tell That God is on the field when he is most invisible."—A. R.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JUNE 1, 1931

No. 7

MUSINGS, METAPHORICAL

By C. D. Moore.

Am giving some instances gathered from the Bible, in which one thing is named as standing for another thing.

Gen. 41:26—"The seven good kine (cows) are seven years," "and the seven good ears (of corn) are seven years." Verse 27: "And the seven thin and ill favored kine that came up after them are seven years: and the seven empty ears blasted with the east wind, shall be seven years of famine."

Gen. 40:12 and 18—"The three branches are three days." "The three baskets are three days."

Rev. 17:9—"The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth." Verse 18—"And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth."

Rev. 1:20—"The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches."

Rev. 5:6—"Seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God". 5:8—"Golden vials full of incense, which are the prayers of saints."

Eph. 6:17—"The sword of the spirit, which is the word of God."

Lk. 8:12—"The seed is the word of God."

Mat. 13:38—"The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of wicked one."

Jn. 6:63—"The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

Mat. 26:27-29—"This (bread) is my body." "This cup (fruit of the vine) is my blood of the new testament." Mark 14:22-16, the same.

Lk. 22:18-20—"This (bread) is my body which is given for you." "This cup (fruit of the vine) is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you."

1 Cor. 10:17—"For we, many, are one bread, and one body." Ch. 11:24, 25—"This (bread) is my body, which is broken for you." "This cup (fruit of the vine) is the new testament in my blood."

These are not all the same kind of metaphors or figures of speech, but I believe the ordinary reader understands the meaning of each of the figurative expressions given, though he may not know the specific names of the figures presented in the texts.

A figure of speech in which a word is used in place of another which it suggests by association, is called "Metonymy."

Examples might be helpful to some, so I will give a few: A man comes staggering toward us and we smell his breath as he passes, and one of us will say: "He has been sampling the jug too freely." Another says, "He has been turning up the bottle too often." Another says, "He has

been putting the bottle to his lips." Another says, "He has been partaking too freely of the cup." Dropping the figure, one says: "He is drunk from drinking too much intoxicating liquor."

The words jug, bottle and cup are used in such connection instead of the intoxicant, because of the close association of intoxicating liquor with the jug, bottle and cup. However, the cup the Lord gave us, does not make us drunk. His is a different cup from the cup that intoxicates.

(Now, let the brother find where the Bible says, This cup is the fruit of the vine. He finds many is's, but this is one "is" he does not find. Neither does he find "This cup is my blood of the new testament" in Mark nor in any other book of the Bible. It reads, "This is my blood of the New Testament," and Thayer, with the other leading scholars of the N. T. Greek, says "this" refers to the contents of the cup, and the contents of the "cup" and the cup are two different things. Try as they will, the bed of the cups advocates is too narrow, and leaves them so exposed that one can plainly see "the cloven foot." (See reply to Editor Moore, of the Christian Leader).

LEES SUMMIT

The above is the name applied to the new building recently erected for a meeting place of the Church of Christ in the community, about eleven miles west-of-Lebanon, Mo.

We have secured the services of Bro. T. F. Thomasson, of Lake Arthur, New Mex., for the month of August. We plan to have two series of meetings; the first at the place of meeting, beginning August 1st, the other one will be a mission meeting at some nearby point. We are expecting Bro. Homer A. Gay, of Eola, Texas, and also Bro. J. D. Phillips of Montebello, Calif., the first week of the meeting, and of course, the writer will make an effort to arrange to be here too for a few days to meet these good brethren again and to hear them preach. We all anticipate a great feast of spiritual food with Bro. Thomasson doing the major part of the preaching. I just wish that I could stand by Bro. Thomasson and assist him in these meetings, as he has me in meetings in New Mex.

Brethren who plan to take a vacation in August, would do well to consider a trip to this part of the Ozarks, and take in these meetings. All are cordially invited.

Inasmuch as two of my meetings have been postponed until fall, I do not plan to begin my evangelistic meetings until about the middle of June, which will be at Healdton, Okla., continuing until about the middle of July; then to Rucker, Texas, then to Troy, Texas; then to Fouke, Ark.; then to Sulphur, Okla.; then to Elk City, Okla., and on to Wichita Falls, Texas. I hope that

the brethren at all these places will be ready and that much good may be accomplished. I plan to hold a mission meeting between now and the middle of June. Pray for me and the work of the Lord.

—Homer L. King.

TRUTH

Christ, when asked by Pilate, "Art thou a king then?" said, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Pilate then said to him, "What is truth?" John 18:37, 38.

We, as Christians, should be especially interested in the answer to this question. Let the Savior answer the question for us. He says in his prayer to God the Father, "Sanctify them through the truth; thy word is truth." John 17:17. Hence, Christ says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." John 14:6.

We learn from these Scriptures that Christ and his word is truth, or as we might say: anything directed by the mind of God is truth.

Solomon says, "Buy the truth and sell it not." Prov. 23:23. Again he says: "Let not kindness and truth forsake you: bind them around thy neck." Prov. 3:3. The Apostle Peter says, We purify our souls in obeying the truth I Pt. 1:22. Hence we see the importance of believing and obeying the truth.

I am reminded as I study this subject of the narrative that Josephus gives of Zorobabal's discourse about truth. King Daeius had promised his three bodyguards a reward of victory to the one that would make the best oration on what is the strongest, wine, kings, woman, or truth. After two had given their orations on the first two, Zorobabal, after giving his oration on women, begins on truth, saying, I have already demonstrated how powerful women are; but both these women themselves and the king himself are weaker than truth; for although the earth be large and the heavens high, and the course of the sun swift, yet all these things move according to the will of God, who is true and righteous; for which cause we ought to esteem truth to be the strongest of all things; and that which is unrighteous is of no force against it. Moreover, all things else that have any strength are mortal and short-lived. But truth is a thing immortal. It affords not indeed such a beauty as will wither away by time, nor such riches as may be taken away by misfortune, but righteous rules and laws. It distinguishes justice from injustice, and puts what is unrighteous to rebuke. Book II, ch. 3.

Realizing as we do that some are making a great sacrifice of time and means to maintain the truth through this paper, which is set for upholding the truth that will make us free, as Jesus says, we should all feel its worth to the cause of New Testament Christianity, and use our influence in promoting its circulation. Let every lover of the Lord and his truth see how many new subscriptions he can send in this year. May we get busy at once. Many do not yet know there

is such a paper being published. There is a settled opposition to it because it is the only paper now calling for a "Thus saith the Lord" for our faith and practice." The big churches and papers have bid adieu to the motto: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent." Faith comes by the word of God; but they do not walk by faith any more. There is no use to run unless we are on the right road. "And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully."—Paul. The church is the pillar and ground of the truth, says Paul. Let each one help if it is but little. Yours for the truth. — Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.

SPRINKLING AND THE CUPS

"Immersion, when attained and carried into practice, what does it accomplish but to make one of the great Sacraments of Jesus Christ our Lord difficult in all cases and impossible in many others, thus causing many to fall under the condemnation of Him who said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God?"

(Does not suit "convenience," you see)

Again: "The practice of baptizing by affusion has prevailed since the twelfth century as this is attended with less inconvenience."

Indecent

"However immersion may seem to those accustomed to it, many people will not go themselves nor permit their children to go to witness it as a spectacle, because of the impulse to other emotions than reverence." (Form of Baptism).

Don't Have To Follow N. T. Practice

"By the general principle that the genius of Christianity in adaptation to varied conditions, and that similar changes have taken place in the mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper." (Schaff's statement of second ground for effusion—Ib.)

"Suppose Jesus meant to tell the Apostles all to drink out of the same vessel, it would not follow that every group of disciples should do so." (N. L. Clark, 5th aff., C. H. debate) Why not take sprinkling then?

Indecent

"Christ would not bind upon his people something absolutely not clean. . . . We are commanded to 'do all things decently,' I Cor. 14:40, also 'cleanse yourselves from all filthiness of the flesh,' 2 Cor. 7:1. This applies to us when assembled as well as individual Christians. . . . At a certain church where one cup for 'the fruit of the vine' was used, a member told me they were sitting next to an old brother too feeble to keep himself absolutely clean, took the cup and sipped, when he removed it from his lips, a string of saliva stuck to the cup. Brother ----- would try to make us believe our blessed Savior has compelled us to drink of or out of such filthy vessels. No! no! no! a thousand times no! You can now begin to see why I am close to a point of conviction where I will be conscientiously compelled to refuse the one drinking cup for all." (A. J. Bond):

Again: "Are individual cups permissible while communing? (Answer) Don't see anything wrong with personal cups, if all members agree. If we can place the wine in two cups, we can divide as often as we please (Luke 22:17). But the old way is right also; and if the change is offensive to any, this would make it wrong in practice (I Cor. 8:13). We must strive for things that make for peace (Rom. 14:19). — A. R. Moore, Apostolic Review, May 12, 1931.

The Russell "Bible students" have long talked of "To Hell and back." But this is to Hell with no "back." Cowan has signed a proposition "Resolved that the individual cups are deceptive and divisive." Johnson and others endorse their use. What is "deceptive and divisive" is sinful; and what is sinful cannot be Scriptural. But as the Review says, "If we can place the wine in two cups, we can divide as often as we please."

When the organ went in, at first there was some consideration given to those who were conscientiously oppose to it, and it was not allowed to break up a church; but it was not long till some said, "We have a conscience, too, and we cannot worship without it," just as Bro. Bond says he is headed for the individual cups. Of course if they use "two or more," more than one drink from the same cup, and that will not be "something absolutely clean." And since we are commanded to "cleanse" ourselves from "all" filthiness of the flesh, how can we use a cup that someone else has used, for he might be a brother of that old brother's, you know. We just can't "do'er," to use a Cowan phrase. So let us kick the Bible aside, as the sprinklers did, and "modify" "in adaptation to varied conditions" to suit us, and make a creed as they did. Cowan started the "ball rolling" at Roswell, N. Mex., when he in his creed cut out Bond's individual cups and the one cup, and made provision for "two or more."

Didn't the apostle say something about those who were "ever learning and never able to come to a knowledge of the truth?" Talk of iniquity (lawlessness). Did not Paul say it was already working in his day? Yes, and Peter says they would "wax worse and worse." But we seem to be getting to the worst that ever disgraced God's footstool. It is nothing but infidelity.

THINGS NOT FORBIDDEN

Where has God forbidden infant baptism? Where has He forbidden sprinkling for baptism? Where has He forbidden the offering of incense, the counting of beads, in worship? What harm is there in all this?

This is sophistry, deception, delusion, and that, too, of a very low and unworthy order.

Where is the Divine authority for doing this or that? If there is no Divine authority for doing this or that, in religion, or worship, that very circumstance is Divine authority against it!

"Who hath required this at your hand?" is the inquiry of the Word of God, to all such as introduce things into religion or worship, not authorized in Scripture. We may add nothing to the

religion of Christ, the faith or practice, the precept or example, the worship, the rewards or punishments.

Those who consider themselves free to do anything not forbidden in Scripture, are out at sea, pretty much cut loose from the Bible. They have in their horizon a broad range. They are not in search of Divine authority, not engaged in that for which there is Divine authority, but things for which there is no Divine authority—things not forbidden. They are not studying how to do the commandments, but whether men cannot be saved without doing the commandments; not how to obey the Gospel, but how men can be saved without obeying the Gospel; not how to build up the Church of God, set it in order and keep it in order, —how to worship according to the Scriptures; but, how to make the Church attractive, entertaining and popular. Their theme is not the Gospel, nor is their mission turning the world from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God; but so to model and fashion the Church as to please the world as it is, in its unconverted state, without the work of turning it to God. Let them have their way, and the Church, in a short time, will be so let down that men will need no conversion to come into it. There will be no cross nor self-denial in it.

Be careful and not fall "into the trap," as Luther did! If there is no Divine authority for a thing, that is enough. We need no Scripture forbidding it.

We can unite on the things required in Scripture—the things commanded; but we never can unite on the things not forbidden. There are too many of this latter class; they are too various, contradictory and inconsistent.

Let us stick to the things that are written; these are divinely authorized. The things not written are not divinely authorized.

Let us stand to the prescribed terms of pardon, the prescribed life of the saints, and the prescribed worship. Those who depart from this are going back!

—B. Franklin.

Remarks

So wrote Benjamin Franklin. Listen: "If there is no Divine authority for a thing, that is enough. We need no Scripture forbidding it." Yes, "Let us stick to the things that are written." "The things not written are not divinely authorized." This puts the "organ," the "Missionary Society," the "Sunday School," the "Individual Cups," the "Two or more Cups," all under human authority, and those who "stand" for such are "going back" into apostasy. They have fallen "into the same trap, as Luther did."

THE TRUTH FUND

D. E. Stone	-----	\$1.00
Homer L. King	-----	1.00

NOTICE

If any one can spare a copy of **The Truth** for May 1, 1931, please send to the office at Sneads, Fla.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, Sneads, Florida
J. D. Phillips, Montebello, California
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - \$1.00

LAYCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips

Is Christ Coming in 1935?

My attention has been called to an article in *The Present Truth Messenger* (Adventist), under the caption: "675 A. D. to 1935 A. D." It was written by W. R. Young, and appeared in their issue for Dec. 4, 1930. According to him, we have only four more years to wait for the return of Christ, "the Lion of the Tribe of Judah." He dates the "time, times and a half," or 1260 days (years) (Dan. 7:25; 12:7) from 675 A. D., when the Roman Catholic Hierarchy began the use of the "Latin Language in divine worship," and, therefore, concludes that the Papal power will fall in 1935. I stop not to examine this part of his article. I, too, expect the downfall of Catholicism, or "Mystery, Babylon the Great" (Rev. 17:1-7) within a few years. Her 1260 years of tyrannical usurpation and supremacy will soon come to an end, and hence her destruction draws near. See Dan. 7:25 and Rev. 13:5.

But the second advent of the Messiah will not take place at the judgment of the Roman Hierarchy. "Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots," will receive her doom long before the second advent. Hence, Mr. Young is mistaken. In fact, the 1260 days (years) of Dan. 12:7 do not refer to the Papal system, as does the time limit in Dan. 7:25: for the former refers to "the breaking in pieces the power of the mighty ones and the holy people" (the Jews) and "the time of the end" is not "the end of time." Besides this, there are in Dan. 12, two other time limits (1290 and 1335 years) which, if reckoned from the same chronological date, which is very likely, will terminate, the one thirty, and the other seventy-five years, later. So, then, if the 1260 years expire in 1935, the 1290 years will expire in 1965, and the 1335 years in 2010 A. D. And hence, Mr. Young is far from being right in his calculations. I am not setting these dates, expecting these things to happen in 1935, 1965, and 2010 A. D. I do not think the three time limits of Dan. 12 date from the year 675. I simply state these things to show that, if they do date from 675, A. D., as Mr. Young contends the 1260-year period does, he is wrong in expecting the return of the Lord in 1935;

for there are two other time limits which will expire after the expiration of the 1260 years. And since the second advent is the crowning event of prophecy, we know that it will take place after the other things, and not before. Let us be very careful about accepting any theory of unfulfilled prophecy.

Bottle or Cup? Which?

"The container for the fruit of the vine should be a suitable one—if you want to use a bottle . . . that is all right." —J. P. Baxter in *The Apostolic Way*, Feb. 15, 1931.

The Lord had sense enough to say what He meant, and to mean what He said. His word was written in Greek, and not in English. There is one word in Greek for **cup**, and another word for **bottle**; **Poterion**, the word used to name the vessel for the fruit of the vine used in the communion, is the word for **cup**, and hence Thayer says: "**Poterion**, a cup, a drinking vessel." **Askos** is the word in Greek for the English word **bottle**. And "**Poterion**, a cup, a drinking vessel" is not "**Askos**, a bottle."

In the institution of the Supper, the Lord "took a cup" (**poterion**). He did not take a bottle (**askos**). **Cup** (**poterion**) is the word used both in Scripture and in ecclesiastical writings to name the communion vessel. The word **bottle** is never so used. Hence,

Paul says: "Out of the cup (**poterion**) let him drink" (1 Cor. 11:28); not "out of the bottle (**askos**)."

Again, Paul says: "The cup (**poterion**) of blessing for which we bless God" (1 Cor. 10:16): not "the bottle (**askos**) of blessing."

Ignatius says: "There is one cup in the unity of his blood"; not "one bottle."

Again, Ignatius says: "One cup (not bottle) is distributed among them all."

INSTITUTIONALISM

By Paul Hays, Fresno, Calif.

This is an age of Institutionalism. Business tends to Trusts, Combines, and Monopolies. Politics, through Bolshivism and Fascism, to Dictatorship.

Education tends to Government control, where private schools are forbidden, the Home jeopardized, and conscience outlawed.

The Social world is being rapidly Universalized by Press and Movie, Phone and Radio. The Home and the Individual are "Taboo."

The true foundations of society are not in Organic Unity. God confused "tongues," and smashed Empire, that "men might seek after the Lord." (Gen. 11, and Acts 17).

The tendency of our times is all away from God. "These be thy gods, O Israel," — Human Wisdom, Big Business, Jazz, and The Brotherhood of (all) Men.

Religious has not fallen behind, in the race for Bigness. Church Federation, and a Congress of all Religions, "arrayed in purple and scarlet," is preparing to "ride" Big Business, when it shall "ascend out of the bottomless pit." Rev. 11 and 17.

But shall "The Church of Christ" assist in finding the "missing link," or seek to "ape" the "Sects," and the Evolutionists, in producing "Giants" for "that great day of God Almighty?" Rev. 6.

We have held that the Word of God thoroughly furnishes the Church unto all good works. This doctrine is both inclusive and exclusive: "We dare not give a penny or a prayer" to any institution which God has not planted, for religious work and worship. Eph. 4.

Whence, then, these other Auxiliaries, for Edification, Benevolence, Missions, Ministerial support and insurance, Temperance, Publication, Building, Education, and Social entertainment?

What about our "committees" "board meetings," conferences, camp meetings (annual), "Big Meetings," and "County co-operations"?

What about our church houses, and Trustees, and church debts? What about our one man "Minister" and his stipulated salary? Have we Institutionalized the "pulpit"? Matt. 28:19.

Where do we get our Orphans Homes, Widows Homes, Bible Colleges, Church Papers, Sunday Schools, etc.? Where does the singing evangelist come in?

In Bible times we read of no attempt at making Singing a drawing card for sinners. But, in the Church, "every one of you hath a psalm," a doctrine, etc. We have institutionalized our singing.

Whenever a certain work becomes institutionalized, it not only implies a separate organization, but it loses its vitality, as a volunteer heart-service.

What we call "looking after a certain work in a systematic way," becomes an Ecclesiastical, Formalistic Ritualism. We need MEN, and not "methods." We need men on fire for God, and for souls.

A Special call may grow out of true missionary zeal, or love for souls; but a set, permanent, appointed service, loses its fire, and quenches its "testimony."

We do not need an Institutional Alms-house, with its furnished "tables," but we need "a daily ministration," with men "set over this business," to see after the poor, and widows, in their homes, as they have need."

What right have we to form an institution to provide for widows which the church is forbidden to support? Tim. 5:9.

We need Christian homes, where "hospitality" is shown, to widows and orphans. The Home is God's institution. It would be a "good work" to help such a home, as it has need.

It would be Scriptural to "assist" any Phoebe, or Stephanas, or any individual, or "household" that addicts itself to the "ministry."

Any "co-operation," larger than the local church, suggests general "delegates" for organization and administration." Taxation without representation" is unfair.

A "brotherhood" institution calls for permanent endowment, chartered rights, and "the Creed in

the deed." It calls for Trustees, buildings, "by-laws," and organization in perpetuity.

Moneyed men may use their money to further their own ideals, in Printing, Education, Benevolence, etc. If others care to assist in such work, without corporate interest, that is their privilege.

But the Church and the Home are God's exclusive co-operative institutions, for religious work and worship. And they are limited by the Word, in their respective capacities, organization, and work.

That the Church is not capable to carry on Institutionalism is indicated by the fact that "our" institutions are "organized," chartered, endowed, and entailed in perpetuity,—in such fashion as would (or should) put a church to shame.

What right have we to take God's money out of the "church treasury" and put it into unscriptural work? Is there any Scriptural use for our "contribution," except for the poor, including poor preachers and widows? 1 Cor. 16:2.

A church in a man's house is Scriptural, but "Church Property" is not. We are divided over our opinions. Why not confine ourselves to the revealed New Testament methods?

We well know that most of these innovations began hundreds of years this side of the Apostles. Some of them are very Modern. Maybe we are a little proud of some of these "Church of Christ" Institutions.

A return to the Bible methods need not cripple any good work. The Evangelism of apostolic times was tremendously successful. Their Benevolence was phenomenal. Their mutual edification developed whole congregations of preachers.

It would be unique, if we had believers added to the church "daily," and if we had a daily ministration, and if we had "an effectual working in the measure of every part, unto the edifying of the Body, in Love."

Jerusalem and Antioch, with a membership of (perhaps) 100,000 disciples, each, had one set of bishops and deacons, over the whole city. Tremendous success resulted, without buildings, or Institutionalism.

Every member of the church was working for God and for souls, under the oversight of the "elders" of the city. Acts 15, 22; 20:17; Phil. 1:1; Tit. 1:5, etc., etc.

They could not, and did not, all meet in one meeting house, for history shows that they had no such buildings for 150 years after the apostles. Rom. 16 indicates a plurality of assemblies, and when "prayer was made of the whole church" at Jerusalem, they were not all gathered in one place. Acts 12.

If we can not "Restore New Testament Christianity," why not, at least, attempt to "imitate" it? An imitation is no Counterfeit, if authorized by the Government. Phil. 4:9. Why are we ashamed of the Lord's truth? Will He be ashamed of us?

Brethren, I have written these things in Love, and in Earnest. God fill our hearts with Loyalty to Him, and Love for the brethren.

Remarks

Consider seriously what Bro. Hays says about "Institutionalism." The "children of this age," in "the house of darkness," have had enough experience with Institutionalism to know that the whole thing is a failure. Hence, there is now a strong demand among many sectarians to rid the Churches of Sunday Schools, Bible Colleges, Missionary Societies, etc. But we, "the sons of light" and "of the day," who claim to be of "the house of light," have gone crazy over Institutions—at the very time many sectarians have seen the extreme foolishness of such things, and are giving them up!

"The Church of Christ" is, to a great extent, in Babylon, and must, therefore, heed the call, "Come out of Babylon, my people" (Rev. 18:4), and seek refuge in restored churches of Christ (Isa. 60), or meet her doom with "Mystic Babylon," "the Beast," and "the False Prophet" (Rev. 19). May God open our eyes to the light of His truth that we may act advisedly in these hours of crisis, and may we warn others of their on-coming avalanches of judgment and doom! —J. D. Phillips.

A REQUEST

My special request: I want all loyal members of the church of Christ to rally to the support of "The Truth." Send in your subscription, and those who can a donation. This is our only redemption now. The papers and preachers are subsidized. The names, "Firm Foundation," "Gospel Light," etc., are but "sounding brass." I don't want to be too personal, but all compromising and excuse-making should come to an end, and Jesus Christ should be enthroned in our lives. I shall never stand for anything else though I be called a "hobby-rider" or anything else that a vile tongue can invent. Yours for the truth and righteousness. Dr. E. W. Gossett, Hot Springs, Ark.

"PREACH THE WORD"

In February 1st issue of The Truth, I see an article from Bro. Jas. T. White that rejoices my heart, and makes me think that perhaps there are yet "seven thousand in Israel who have not bowed the knee to Baal."

Bros. White and Fiscus want to just take the word as it reads and preach it as it is without any thinkso's, or "I believe's" about it. "Preach the Word." Never mind these long drawn out controversies, which only gender strife, and cause ill feeling.

I am with them heart, soul, and body. We cannot begin too soon. What is the use of argument. If brethren will not have the plain statement of the Bible, they will reject your restatement altho you embellish it with all the rhetoric at your command, or prove it by all the lexicons extant. "They have tasted the apple, and are bound to eat it."

How many readers of The Truth and other religious papers in the Brotherhood will join us in truly "Speaking where the Bible speaks and being silent where it is silent?" I do not mean to place

it at our "mast head" and then falsify it. God's word thoroughly furnishes us to every good work, hence we must have just what it says in everything. Who will have it? Let every consecrated soul speak out. Is the word as given on Mount Zion good enough for you, or must it be mixed with the "leaven of the Pharisees" to make it more palatable?

"We have all gone astray, there is none that doeth good, no not one." Where shall we begin says one? Will you let your humble brother, who has been a member of the Church of Christ for Fifty-six years make the suggestion that we begin with the organization of the church at Jerusalem, go from there to Antioch, and study the organization of the church, then take up its practices, and strictly conform to them. Will we be ashamed to take up those old practices of our grandfathers, that gave them so much joy and happiness?

Now, please brethren, let no one enter this restoration who wants a controversy, but those with consecrated hearts, who want to be saved and save others from the apostasy into which the church has fallen.

Is The Truth willing to be a helper in this struggle? I am now satisfied it will. Will the Leader, Advocate, A. R., F. F., and all other papers in the Brotherhood "come over into Macedonia and help us?"

Why not throw away disputation, party-spirit, and prejudice, and save our souls by carrying out God's plan as He gave it, and as it was carried out until about seventy years ago.

We all know there is no Bible authority for the eldership of today. We all know that this "go as you please" preaching is very modern, and causes all kinds of trouble with "humbugs" in the church. Why? Because it is not scriptural. We all know that "scrapping the Bible" as we are doing in "following the path of least resistance" marked out by the "International Sunday School Committee," is helping our children grow up in ignorance of the real teaching of the Bible, and is a straight path into digression.

Many see these things but fear to speak of them because it brings reproach upon them from those who want to modernize the worship and teaching of the church that they may be more fashionable, hence they call those who want the Bible way, "fogies," "hobbits," and many other names that we rejoice to wear for Christ's sake.

Brethren, call me what you please, you cannot call me a worse name than this class of people called him whom I am trying to follow.

We all know further, that most congregations in the cities have left the plain teachings of Christ and Paul on the Supper, and have fallen into exactly the same pit the Corinthians fell, when they became so selfish that each wanted to take it apart from the others. Hence the "individual cups." O GERMS, Bah!

There is not a church member over twenty years old, who did not see this digression begin. Who must answer for it? May God have mercy on the souls of those who engage in it, for they are lost,

as certain as God's word is true. "Teach them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you, and Lo; I am with you to the end of the world." Did the Apostles teach any one to avoid the "Cup of blessing" because of MICROBES?

O brethren! How we have fallen by the holy highway! Let your old brother plead with you to repent and turn to God. Until you do, don't ask a sinner to repent; don't try to get a mote out of any one's eye until you are relieved of that awful beam.

May God our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord help us to return to the Living Way, that the holy angels may once more sing, "Peace on earth, good will to man."

Yours in hope,
E. A. Lowry.

Dayton, Tenn., 2-15-31.

COMMENDED

To Whom It May Concern:

Bagwell, Texas.

This is to certify that I have known Brother W. J. Harris twenty years and all the time I have had association with him, which has been much, I have found him to be a Christian in every sense of the word. My father was instrumental in his conversion, also in his becoming a minister of the Gospel. I believe him to be sound in the faith and that he will endeavor to keep same in the Unity of the Spirit. Yours respectfully, J. C. W. Denton, Elder and Minister.

Healdton, Oklahoma.

Bro. King, of Lebanon, Mo., will hold a series of meetings here, beginning the second Lord's Day in June (June 14) and run to July 12 if the interest demands. July 4th there will be services all day, and dinner for all on the ground. Several preaching brethren, and good singers from other congregations, are expected to assist in the services. Bro. King's meeting here last summer was with very much success, and with the co-operation we now have, we are expecting a large attendance and a soul-stirring meeting. Those from a distance are invited to remain during the entire meeting and will be comfortably cared for. Our church-house is located three blocks east of the railroad crossing and one block north. Hoping that you will accept this as a special invitation, we look forward with pleasure to the time we shall see you. —Church of Christ (O. C. Matthews).

WHY NOT?

We shall be glad to furnish copies of the Harper-Cowan Debate to those who will sell them at ten cents each, and trust them to send the money to the office after they sell the debate. Some are saying that Cowan proved his cups theory, but they are afraid to read the debate; so get some copies and put it up to them to read it. You can return those you do not sell. Let us know how many you will take, and we will keep you supplied. Cowan promised to keep a supply on hand and ordered a few, but he has quit.

D. E. Stone, Revere, Calif.—Everything is going along nicely at Montebello. Brother Phillips certainly has edified us in the faith. It is said there are exceptions to the "rule." But there are no exceptions to the rules of mathematics. Twelve inches is always one foot. So with the truth and a thus sayeth the Lord: it is, and always will be the truth as there are no exceptions to God's rule, and the Apostle Paul admonishes us to "walk by the same rule." Here is one dollar for my subscription and one dollar for The Truth fund. May the Lord bless you for your stand for the Lord's rule, The Truth.

W. T. Taylor, Route 3, De Leon, Texas.—I rejoice when I read of the many good meetings that are being held by our faithful men—men like R. B. Musgrave and others that could be mentioned. We do not have enough such preachers to push the work as it should be pushed; yet some of our preachers are not getting enough preaching to do to keep up an interest in the work. Why is this? There is much teaching to be done. Many people are not acquainted with the very fundamental teachings of Christ. These must be taught to know the truth and how to live it. The command of Paul to Timothy to "Preach the word" embraces more than faith, repentance, the confession and baptism. It means to "declare the whole counsel of God" to men. We must obey this command. I have some time for meetings.

R. H. Peel, Mickey, Texas.—I wish more of the preachers would announce their meetings in the paper so that those at a distance could arrange in time to attend.

QUERY

Did Enoch die? Heb. 11:5. No, for we also find this, "And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, because God took him." Gen. 5:24. That is, he was not found, as Elijah was not (2 Kings 2:1-11), because the Lord took him to heaven. Both were translated or transferred, not experiencing death. So Paul says of those who will be alive when Christ comes—"We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." Again: "The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." I Cor. 15:51, 52.

Brother Harper met Brother Dennis, of Union City, Ga., in Atlanta, Ga., May 4, 5, 6, and 7, in debate on the cup question. This is a one-cup church. Brother Dennis tried to get a place in Ala., where they use cups, to repeat the debate, but they turned him down, saying, we don't need any debate, just as the S. S. people do. Bro. Dennis has agreed to meet Bro. Harper again in October at Lowery, Ala., a one-cup church, and the debates will be continued if Bro. Dennis furnishes an equal number of cups churches.

WHY I AM NOT A BAPTIST

By Geo. Masser, Abilene, Texas.

1. It has an unscriptural name. Baptist is one who baptizes.
2. It has a human creed. In proof I present the Baptist Manual by J. M. Pendleton.

3. Baptists call on converts to confess their feelings.

4. They vote on reception of members.

5. They have one plan for salvation and a different one for church membership.

6. They say salvation is not in the church, so it is in the devil's kingdom.

7. They teach that repentance and faith are wrought in the soul by the regenerating Spirit of God. If this is true, the sinner can't believe or repent but must wait till God works these in the soul; hence this doctrine makes God responsible for all unbelief and infidelity.

They teach the duty of all to accept salvation; but how can they accept it by faith and repentance if God does not act to produce these in the soul? If this doesn't suit you, let me hear from you.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla. — Last Lord's day, April 12, I preached at Healdton, Okla. One lady confessed Jesus and was baptized. We went to Wheeler schoolhouse in the afternoon and heard a very edifying sermon by Bro. Walter Bray. Then we came back to Healdton for night services, a Lord's day well spent in the service of God. Let us work while it is day.

Walter W. Leamon, Salado, Ark.—A reader of *The Truth*, Bro. Noah Meads, has invited me to conduct a meeting at Advance, Ark. We plan to begin August 29. This is the seventh meeting I have booked for the Arkansas field, and I have one for Tennessee, and I still have some time open. If you need me, let me know. I do not want to be idle a day. The Lord cometh to reckon with us.

Solomon said: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." —Ecc. 12:13.

What is written? One Lord; one baptism; one loaf; one cup; one body. "He took the wine-cup." —Goodspeed tr. Then if Christians seek what is in the Book they won't fail—"none of these shall fail"—they will seek one cup. Jesus commanded one cup. —Lk. 22:17. In keeping the command, "They all drank out of it." —Mk. 14:23. The early Christians did all drink from one cup. Cowan admitted in debate with me at Lorenzo, Texas, that the Bible does not say two or more containers in observing the communion, neither was there any command for them; yet he affirmed that two or more containers to be used was Scriptural and apostolic.

Now listen: if they are not written in the Book of the Lord, nor did Christ command them, how could it be the duty of Christians to use them? Can they be safe? Can we unite on think-sos? Is there any "Unity of the Spirit" (Eph. 4:4) where the Spirit does not direct? Think it over, Brother, Sister, it will meet you when "the books are opened." Read the Book of the Lord then go by it, and you can answer the Lord by it. How glad you will be then to know you followed the Lord's day. Why will people take a chance on

sprinkling? We know immersion is not questioned. Why will people take a society? We know the church is not questioned? Why will people take an organ? We know to sing is safe? Why will people take cups? "We know one cup is safe,"—so the Bible reads. Why not take "Safety first" for a home in heaven? With much love, Bob Musgrave.

THE MIS-LEADER

In reviewing the article we published on "Cups Not Of Faith," Ira C. Moore, editor of the *Christian Leader*, Cincinnati, Ohio, says: "Let them use one, two, three, a dozen, fifty or a hundred vessels—the vessel is not what is called 'the cup'."

Reply: Thayer, the *Standard* on the meaning of the Greek words of the New Testament, page 510 says: "The vessel out of which one drinks, *ek* (out of) *tau* (the) *poterion* (cup), Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23; I Cor. 11:28." (Drink out of the cup, "the vessel")

"And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all out of it." (Mt. 26:27)

"And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them; and they all drank out of it." (Mk. 14:23)

"And drink out of the cup." (I Cor. 11:28)

So we see that Editor Moore's "not" in "the vessel is not what is called 'the cup'" perverts God's word as much as did Satan's "not" in "Thou shalt not surely die."

Again he says: "'Drink the cup' is not the 'metonymy'; but the word 'cup' is the metonymy—the container put for the matter contained and of which the disciples drank."

Reply: But the word cup is not the metonymy; the word cup in "drink the cup" is used by metonymy, and of the kind "Container and the thing contained." (Williams' *Rhetoric*, p. 220) Now, listen: "How can one 'drink this cup'?" By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (N. L. Clark in *Clark-Harper Debate*, 3rd aff.) "It." What is "it" here? "Cup." "Cup" is the name of the "container." Thayer cites this language under "by metonymy" on page 533; and under "drink" on page 510, he says "Pino to poterion i. e. what is in the cup, I Cor. 10:21; 11:27." If "the cup" here is not the vessel, what is it? They drink the cup by drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer), "what it contains" (Clark); "drink the cup," being the figurative language (metonymy), and "drink out of the cup," being the common or usual or literal mode of expression. And no man can obey either command and dispense with the cup. The cup is vital to this institution. Jesus says, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," Lk. 22:25; I Cor. 11:25. "In both which," says Thayer, "the meaning is, 'this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant.'" (p. 15).

And in I Cor. 10:16 Editor Moore admits "Paul did have reference to the vessel containing 'the fruit of the vine,'" just as Thayer under eulogia gives it, pp. 260, 259, 533.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, JULY 1, 1931

No. 8

INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION CUP VS. THE BIBLE.

Ha! I never saw so many long, lean and lank "mourners" crawling up off their knees in my life. Most of them have "fire in their eyes and fight on the brain." But if you think I'll not tell the world where you are and what you are doing, you have another guess coming. You may take this for a little timely warning. I am 58 years old; weigh over 200 pounds; out in the open with no fence around me; standing behind the "Old Gospel Gun" that automatically reloads itself with a "Thus sayeth the Lord," and I am certainly not afraid nor ashamed to take sight and pull the trigger; and if a lot of you long-tailed preachers get "shot in the fracas," don't blame me; blame the Book.

All manner of things are being said about me falsely; but my purpose in writing these articles is to sound a warning in the hope that people, in their mad rush for worldliness and works of the devil, might give a little heed to the "things spoken" and not let all slip. I fully realize that in all ages when this warning was given, "the thunders from the seven-hills city" of sin and opposition "uttered their voices" it is no less than the same today. My fight with "the bests" here at Hot Springs, and as might apply at other places, is "not after the manner of men." If it were, I'd be down there using their implements of warfare—yes, "the individual cups service." A great number of my best friends have suggested and insisted on my going on and fighting it out with them; but I am wondering just what kind of fight I could make for the Lord in the devil's workshop, employing (using) his tools on the job, "the individual cups service."

The reader will please turn to my article in "The Truth" of May 1, 1931, and after re-reading it, associate it with this. It is now well to ask, What is the cup—the Lord's cup or "the cup of the Lord"? It is a burning shame that it has become necessary to ask such a question. "The faith" was once delivered to the saints; but it has long since become necessary to ask, What is that faith? The "one baptism" was once believed, understood, and practiced; but it has long since become a question for discussion. Jesus said, "I will build my church" (which he did), but people have lost it, and it has become necessary to ask, Where and what is that church? There is a cause for all this. Let the Word of God tell you the cause. "There is a way which seemeth right unto man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." (Prov. 14:12).

Again: "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." I want to ask you one or two things: Is the empty cup "the cup of the Lord"? It certainly is not. Is the fruit of the vine outside of

the cup (or its equivalent) "the cup of the Lord"? It certainly is not. "The cup of the Lord" is the cup with the fruit of the vine in it, and the fruit of the vine is in the cup. I defy the world and every preacher in it to gainsay this explanation of "the cup of the Lord."

I am referred to and spoken of as a "hobby rider." These same dissenters would speak long and loud against a Methodist or Baptist who would call them hobbyists on the mode and purpose of baptism. They would soon point their finger at such and say, "Thou art the man." But these same men have gone out of the way, and have "made void the commandment of God" by their traditions. They have gone about "to establish their own righteousness, and have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God." Still they cry out "hobby rider." I am going to point my finger straight at you, and say **you are the man.** You and your bunch are the ones who have broken up the church at Hot Springs, Arkansas. I want to say to those who have visited this city and enjoyed my instructions so much and returned to your homes in different states, and have written me such nice letters of commendation, that our church is no more as it was. It has fallen into the hands of "evil and seducing spirits," and its ultimate ruin is in sight.

In a recent issue of one of our papers, space was given to two lengthy articles from the pen of a self-styled loyal preacher who was the man that drove the wedge of unmitigated presumption in appointing an unscriptural and ungodly eldership at the instance and pleasure of only one man in the congregation; and in the meantime stating, "It is the will of the brethren," when the church knew absolutely nothing about it. And when I enter my protest, I am dubbed a "hobby-rider." You don't have to guess who this man is. He, of course, wants to shift responsibility to the other fellow, which is the tune with the popular sentiment, and all they can say is "hobby riding." You know "birds of a feather flock together." The paper referred to above could not grant me space for even one short article. Can't you see how these things are going? And they don't want their dirt exposed.

Now I am going to give you more facts about the "individual communion cups," and I challenge any preacher to refute them: The practice of one dividing the fruit of the vine into a number of individual cups for all, is nothing short of blasphemy. In this they destroy the symbolism of the oneness of the blood of Christ and dissipate its purpose in the world. And all this is to serve their own tastes, purposes, and will and not the will of the Father. Eternity will reveal your mistake and it will as certainly be announced to you, "Depart from me and take the individual cups with you." I never knew you. Listen: "If

the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape?" One departure will always call for others, and just as certain as you make one, you will be perfectly justified in making others. Preachers are slow to learn this as well as others. And there is another practice that is growing popular, which must be watched and corrected, and this is the plan of offering thanks for the volume of the fruit of the vine in a large container, and then pouring it into individual cups to serve the congregation. This is another one of the devil's slick tricks, and thousands of the innocent (?) membership will take up with it. Be on your guard. Watch.

In the report in that paper the names of the so-called elders of the church at Hot Springs was given. I want to tell you the church at Hot Springs has no elders—not one possessing a single qualification. God does not know them as such, and the church does not recognize them as such. I was at the church this morning (Sunday) to hear a "converted Jew" preach, and they called themselves holding the Lord's day service with the Individual Communion Cups, and these Scriptures came to my mind: "All speak the same thing, and be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (I Cor. 1:10), and "Hold fast the traditions which you have been taught" (II Thes. 2:15). They have no Scriptural eldership or communion. That individual set reminds me of one big devil in the middle and a bunch of little devils around the edge; and when you take of either, you are serving the devil's slick agency of perverting the Lord's sacred service. I know some of the members are far from being satisfied, but are drifting with the popular current; but I'd rather be alone with the Lord than with ten thousand serving the devil. No communion in "individual." Apostolic Way will please copy. —Dr. Gossett.

EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT

This is an age of leniency. Whole "Conferences" of Protestants have "voted Hell out of existence," they say. The "civil courts" have undertaken to prohibit the punishment of children in schools, and in the home. The trial and execution of criminals is delayed, or defeated, Church Discipline is almost unknown.

Has this improved conditions? Are the people less criminal? Are the children better children? Are the churches more successful? Is Christ appreciated more? Is the Bible read more?

No government, of God or man, can be sustained without just punishment. Reformation cannot be obtained, except in connection with salutary fear. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

Perfect love may cast out all fear, but who has perfect love? Perfect love may be the end of Wisdom, and he punishes sin, because we are unloving, and unwise.

Every age, and every dispensation of God's providence, has ended in a terrific cataclysm of fierce judgment. Reformation succeeds judg-

ment, but men weary of righteous government, and drift into selfishness and sin, and must be judged again.

Time and again, and almost constantly, God has deluged the world with death, and the whole world "groans and travails together in pain until now." Christ's death, and ours, is preceded by years of sorrow, disappointment and fear. Much of life is a "Gethsemane."

God is seeking to demonstrate the exceeding sinfulness of sin. God hates sin, and "will in no wise clear the guilty," except through the atonement of Christ, and the acceptance of that atonement.

We tolerate sin, make light of it, and even deny it. We ascribe its punishment to "the laws of Nature," or undertake to prove by "Christian Science," that there is no such thing as sin or suffering.

The Old Testament shows the awfulness of sin, and the severity of its punishment. But, if "they who transgressed Moses' law, died without mercy," "of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the (New) covenant an unworthy thing, and hath done despite to the Spirit of Grace."

But what is worse than "death without mercy"? It is eternal punishment. A total and sudden extinction in the fires of Gehenna would not be worse than death without mercy.

It is the New Testament that reveals "our God as a consuming fire," and the extremes of Heaven and Hell. God has tried everything else and now he tries that. "What could he do for his vineyard, that he has not already done?"

It is because God loves the world, and would do anything right to save men. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son" to die the cruel death of the cross. We have redemption freely offered through Him. "There is no other name given among men, whereby we must be saved."

God does not will the death of any, and he does not willingly afflict the sons of men, but his government can not be sustained without Judgment. He would become Guilty Himself, if he tolerated evil.

God is not "experimenting," to see what will work, but we, ourselves, would not be satisfied, in the great judgment day, unless God had tried every means possible. We do not want to live in an eternity of "anarchy," and violence, and disobedience to law.

Take God off his throne, and the fear of God out of the world, and all Civil Government out of the Nation, and all restraint out of the Home, and we will have a "hell on earth," right now. God knows what is best, and we are short-sighted.

That God threatens a judgment of "torment," for "ages of ages," cannot be successfully denied. Some well-meaning preachers claim that this doctrine "makes infidels." But are they not making infidels, by denying the Bible?

We ought to be spending our time "justifying" God and the Bible, rather than trying to weaken

its words and their power. "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteousness." And yet, God told him to sacrifice his own son, who was "heir of their promises."

But, "could a just God punish men, eternally, for a brief life of sin"? Do not our own courts punish men for life, when their crime may have been committed in a moment? And do not the consequences and the influence of our sins go on, infinitely longer than it takes to commit them?

The Gentle Saviour says that "whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit, hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an Eternal sin." An eternal sin, eternal in its influence and consequences, receives eternal punishment. If any man, or preacher, reviles the word of God, he reviles the Spirit of God, which is its Author. Mk. 3:29.

Punishment serves three conceivable purposes: (1) Revenge, (2) Reformation, (3) Warning. Now God does not punish for revenge, in the sense of "spite." Does the "age-lasting punishment" work reformation?

Our penal institutions do not usually reform men, especially if the punishment lasts long. They seem rather to be hardened by punishment. Even temporary punishment is resented by most criminals. Punishment serves rather as a deterrent, than a means of reformation.

"And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues: and they repented not to give him glory."

The circumstances and influences of hell are not calculated to reform men. The Devil and his angels are there. All kinds of evil men and women are there. There are no preachers there, except the ones who were "hypocrites in the church" here.

If "evil men wax worse and worse (here), deceiving and being deceived," why will they not do the same, when "God's spirit has ceased to strive with men"? God sends terrible judgments on men, for their sins, here and now. "But for all this they repent not" of their idolatry, murder, fornication, and thefts.

If the "rich man, in torment" repented of his sins, he at least saw no place of repentance availing him anything, but desired rather, that his brethren should be "warned" not to come to that place of torment.

So, we come to the last purpose of punishment: It is a warning to others to follow the Lord, instead of the Devil. Hell was made "for the devil and his angels." God forbid that we should follow them there!

Jude assures us that "angels fell from their first estate, and were cast down in everlasting chains of darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." If angels could despise the personal experience of the Glory, Plenty and Peace of Heaven, why might not redeemed men, and other angels, fall?

We do not understand the mystery of it all, but

it is quite certain that God has dealt with us thus far as subjects of discipline. But even though we should become such as are "once in Grace, always in Grace," yet the angels need a constant warning, for they seem not to be so "predestined."

Now, Hell was made "for the devil and his angels." But some men, at least, will follow the devil, and "the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, * * * and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the Holy Angels and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever."

Paul shows in his Ephesian epistle, that "in the ages to come," God will be showing to "the Principalities and Powers of the Heavens" His Manifested Wisdom. We cannot presume to judge the Almighty, and if we do, "he shall come clear when he is judged." Rom. 3:4.

If you "could not be happy in heaven, knowing that some of your loved ones were in torment," remember that when "flesh-ties are broken," you ought to be as able to bear it, as the dear loving Saviour, who loves them far better, and more wisely.

And why not learn, here and now, that "except a man hate all that he hath, he cannot be Christ's disciple." "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me. Nevertheless: not my will, but thine, be done"! Rev. 22:15.

Paul Hays.

MEETING AND DEBATE AT WACO

I closed a good meeting for the loyal church at Waco, Texas, the latter part of May, with four baptized and two confessing faults, and I did enjoy the meeting so much. I have never met with a body of disciples that were more loyal to the Bible teaching. This is a congregation driven out of the old meeting house by the elder putting in what he called "containers." It had been "cup" up until about six months ago, for thirteen years or more. And those who wanted to still follow the Bible had either to submit to that which they believed an unscriptural practice or get out. They quietly left the house to those who wanted the "containers," believing it to be the spirit of Christ to suffer wrongfully.

Well, while I was there, these "containers" brethren came down twice and challenged for debate in a public way. The brethren accepted and I met R. G. Hatter for two nights. It was pitiful for them. The poor fellow could not give one passage of Scripture for their practice, but he did as much for "containers" in "communion" as any other man can do. They have left the Bible. No more can they "Speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where the Bible is silent" until they put away those "containers," and come back to "a cup," as the Bible reads. The Lord willing, I shall return for another meeting with the faithful brethren at Waco next year in June. Bob Musgrave.

Let Laycook Printing Co., of Jackson, Tenn., do your printing at reasonable prices.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - \$1.00

LATCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips.

HELL

"Hades," "Gehenna," "Tartarus"

The word "Hell," in the King James Version of the Bible, made in 1611, is translated from three Greek words, having as many meanings. Many have been misled into thinking the word "Hell," wherever used, denotes only one thing, namely, the abode of the damned, and hence many scriptures concerning some things are hard for them to understand. The following Greek words, defined according to the Lexicography of the world, may help some in a study of this question:

1. **Hades.** "Hades, the unseen" (Knoch) — "the invisible world, Hades" (Berry). "The state of the spirits while separated from their bodies. The separate state of human existence which intervenes between death and the resurrection, occurs, Mt. 11:23, 16:18, Lk. 10:15, 16:23, Ac. 2:27, 1 Cor. 15:55, Rev. 1:18, 6:8 ("Hades" here refers to the powers of darkness, especially Catholicism, as the abode of the spiritually dead.—J. D. P.), 20:13, 14—eleven times."—A. Campbell. When a man dies, his spirit must go somewhere, it being immortal. "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit."—Jesus. "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."—Stephen. It goes to Hades, where it stays until called forth in the resurrection. "His soul was not left in Hades" (Ac. 2:37). "Abraham's bosom" denoted, among the Jews, a place of rest. It is an apartment, or park, in Hades, and is the "paradise" to which Jesus told the penitent thief he should go "this day"—the day he died. Here is where the spirits of all righteous persons go at death. Hence, when Lazarus died, he "was carried away by angels into Abraham's bosom" (Lk. 16:22). Christ's soul "was not left in Hades" (Ac. 2:27). Those who teach that Hades means the grave are in error, for it is never so used, in the Scriptures.

2. **Tartarus.** "Tartarus, the name of a subterranean region, doleful and dark, regarded by the ancient Greeks as the abode of the wicked dead" (Thayer). "God spared not the angels that sinned, but having confined them in tartarus with chains of thick darkness" (2 Pet. 2:4). "As the Greeks and Romans had their gardens and fields of delight in Hades, and their tartarus in the same

region; so the Jews assimilated to them, and had their garden of Eden, or Paradise, and their Tartarus, all within the boundaries of Hades. So Abraham's Bosom, or Paradise, was the abode of the happy, separated spirits, and Tartarus was the abode of the wicked. Even Peter, a Jew, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, adopts their word tartarus, and says (2 Pet. 2:4) that God cast the angels that sinned down to tartarus."—A. Campbell.

Hence, the spirits of all men, whether righteous or wicked, live on and on, even between death and the resurrection—either in a state of happiness or misery—the righteous in Paradise and the wicked in Tartarus. At the Judgment, they shall be judged, and the righteous taken to the Celestial Realms and the wicked to Hell, or Gehenna.

3. **"Gehenna,** place of punishment in the future world" (Berry). The word at first referred to The Valley of Hinnom (near Jerusalem), where the refuse of the city was cast, and where fires were kept burning. But, "by an easy metaphor," says Robinson, "the Jews transferred the name to the place of punishment in the other world, the abode of demons and the souls of wicked men." "The gehenna of fire" refers to this place,—which John describes as a "Lake of (liquid) fire" (Rev. 20).

The punishment in Gehenna will be eternal, for it is described by aionios (Mt. 25:46), and Aristotle, the teacher of Alexander the Great (4th Century B. C.), derives aion, from which the adjective aionious is derived, from AIEI, always, and OON, the participial termination of EIMI, to be; hence, always being, or being or existing without end of duration. In this "Gehenna of fire" the "fire is not quenched, and the worm dieth not," says the Lord Messiah.

The American Standard Version comes out clear on the words translated "hell," in correction of the King James Version, made in 1611, and gives us "Hades" and "Tartarus," and where it uses "hell" in the N. T., the original is "gehenna," which, as Campbell long ago pointed out, is the place of final punishment for the disobedient.

FROM THE FIELD

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., 6-18-'31. — I closed a mission meeting at the Flat Woods School House, near Lebanon, on the 13th inst. So far as I know, this was the first time many people in that community ever heard the primitive gospel, in its simplicity. The attendance and interest were fine throughout, and we should have continued much longer, but it was all the time I could spare, as I had to leave for Healdton, Okla., where I am now engaged in a good meeting.

The mission meeting was conducted without one cent of support. I have urged upon the brethren the importance of mission work, but it seems that if we ever get any of it done, the preacher will have to do it, or at least lead out in the work.

I have made up my mind to hold, at least, one mission meeting each year, at my own sacrifice. How many preachers will join me in this much neglected work of the Lord? I know that the preacher should not be forced to make all the sacrifice; but I feel very keenly the need of such work, and I sincerely believe that some one will have to give account to God for their neglect of duty.

J. D. Phillips, Montebello, Calif., June 18. — Since leaving Calif., I have held meetings at Greenfield, Roswell, Melrose, and St. Vrain, N. Mex., and at Enochs, Texas. Besides holding these meetings, I have "edged in" visits with the brethren at Deming, Tucumcari, and Hudson, N. Mex., and at Lorenzo, Texas. I am now at Healdton, Okla., visiting Bro. Homer L. King in his meeting here. My next meeting will be at Sentinel, Oklahoma, beginning the first Sunday in July. I hope to be in Illinois by the second Sunday in August, and on to Indiana by the first of September. I have some meetings in Ky., W. Va., and Pa. I will make a full report of all work done, when I return to Calif.

Geo. A. Moore, Gothenburg, Nebr.—Glad to see the fine reports from the field in *The Truth*. I want to say that Gothenburg is a good place now for an Osteopathic doctor to locate. Is there not a loyal Christian that would not like to locate here? If so, come.

Clarence N. Young, Tucson, Ariz.—We like *The Truth*; we miss *The Truth*; we want *The Truth*. Here is a donation for *The Truth Fund*.

O. B. Perkins, Eadsville, Ky.—I recently held a good meeting in Detroit, Mich. It is the only loyal church in the city now. Had six additions. Please send me two dozen copies of the Harper-Cowan debate. I am sure I can sell several copies. Am twenty-one years of age and have been preaching three years.

H. C. Welch, Morton, Texas.—Bro. J. D. Phillips has just closed a good meeting at Enoch. Three were baptized and three restored. It was a busy time with the people, yet we had good crowds throughout the meeting. Eternity alone will reveal the good done. One man baptized was 55 years old, and had been a Baptist for years; another was a Methodist school teacher. We hope to have Bro. Phillips with us again when he returns from the East.

Dr. Gossett, Hot Springs, Ark.—A short time since Bro. Joseph Cohen, a converted Jew, came to Hot Springs and held a three weeks' meeting which was greatly enjoyed by all who heard him. His ability and loyalty to the Book is immediately seen and interest increased from the beginning. The last night of the meeting the house was filled to capacity, and the people sat in almost breathless silence as he reasoned from night to night

from the sacred scriptures. It is such an unusual thing for a Jew to accept New Testament Christianity and enter the evangelistic field against the strong opposition of his own people and their religion. I believe the loyal churches of our country should give him every support and encouragement that it is possible to give.

Bro. Cohen went from Hot Springs to Texarkana for a meeting and everything was starting off nicely for a successful meeting, when a short article appeared in *The Gospel Light* mentioning his being at Hot Springs in a rather reflective way—and this article was from the pen of Bro. R. H. Johnson of Morrilton, Ark., too — which caused his meeting to close very prematurely to the great embarrassment of Bro. Cohen, and to the chagrin and displeasure of almost the entire church at Hot Springs. His meeting at Hot Springs closed with three confessions and baptisms and four took membership; and following Sunday two confessions and baptisms as a further result of the meeting. Owing to a little misunderstanding, my second article on the Individual Communion Cup vs. The Bible failed to appear in June first issue.

QUESTIONS

1. When we eat the Lord's Supper, is it for the remission of sins we commit from one Lord's day to another?

2. Are the bread and the fruit of the vine the literal flesh and blood of the Son of God?

3. When do we get into or come in contact with the blood that Jesus shed for the remission of sins for the whole world. —R. M. D.

1. We know of no such teaching in the Bible. The law of pardon to the Christian is faith, repentance, and confession of sin. (Acts 8:22; I John 1:9, 19; also 2:1; Heb. 11:6; Heb. 4:16).

2. No. Bread is not flesh nor is the fruit of the vine blood in any literal meaning of those terms. Jesus' blood in literal meaning was yet in his body, and no one drank it at the institution of the communion. His body was before them and no one ate it then in any literal sense, nor can they do so since.

3. We may be said to come in contact with the blood shed for the remission of sins when we come to the point where we receive the benefits of Christ's death. (Rom. 4:1-18; Col. 2:11-13; Col. 1:13; Gal. 3:26, 27) And in doing so one receives the remission of sins (Acts 2:38), and is thus added to "the church," who are the children of God.

Please explain in *The Truth*, I Cor. 5:7, 8-11 and 12. — R.

Vs. 7, 8—"Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are unleavened, for our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ: wherefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

Vs. 11, 12—"But as it is, I wrote unto you not to keep company, if any man that is named a bro-

ther be a fornicator or covetous or an idoleter or a reveler or a drunkard or an extortioner; with such a one no not to eat. For what have I to do with judging them that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within?" Things pertaining to physical realm are taken to illustrate or express ideas in the spiritual realm. The cause is often used for the effect and the effect is often put for the cause. And these things in the physical realm being well known, are pregnant with ideas when applied to the spiritual realm:

"Leaven" (yeast) is a cause of corruption by producing fermentation, and the unleavened mass is wholly corrupted by its presence. When not present, the mass keeps fresh, that is, uncorrupted. During their "feast of unleavened bread," the Jews were required to "put away leaven out of your houses; for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel." (Ex. 12:15) During this time the paschal lamb was sacrificed. In the spiritual realm, Christ is the sacrifice, and sincerity and truth are the unleavened bread, as opposed to the leaven of malice and wickedness. In Christ the mass (Christians) was pure, uncorrupted; but leaven (wickedness) had entered, and would corrupt the whole mass. "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump," that is, "Put away the wicked men from among yourselves," v. 13.

When Paul wrote them not to have company with the wicked, he had reference to those in the church, and he now says not even to "eat" with such. Our sacrifice (Christ) and our "days of unleavened bread," when all "wickedness" is to be put away, is for all time now, and whosoever eateth the "leavened bread" (wickedness) shall be cut off from spiritual Israel. We should not encourage a brother when he becomes wicked, but should act in a way that he will see that our fellowship is thereby broken up. This will cause him to reflect seriously, especially if we can get him to realize that we are deeply concerned in his welfare; hence the admonition, "Note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother."

"NOT OF THE WORLD"—John 17:14

Christians have been called out of darkness into marvellous light, as we read in I Pet. 2:9, and they shame the cause of the blessed Savior and endanger their souls by not walking "as children of light." Yes, they keep the "world" away from Christ, for they are led to say, "I am as good as these church members just as I am." How sad this is to see them thus barter away their souls and lead others to eternal ruin. "Awake to righteousness, and sin not." I Cor. 15:34. They surely do not realize their danger in thus being led into the "snare of the devil." 2 Tim. 2:26.

One great hinderance to the cause of Christ is the life many professed Christians are living. We are living in a time of evil, and many that have been added to the church are partaking of the things of the world as those that think not

of God. Many of the young members attend parties that the world give and bring reproach upon the cause for which Christ died. Just think of a young sister at "a slumbering party" going from house to house clad in pajamas. And think of Christian parents permitting such to be. No words can express the damage such are doing to the cause of our blessed Redeemer. And no wonder the world says, we are just as good as the church members.

If we expect to be a "light," we must stay out of the darkness. If we practice the things the people of the world practice, we are no better than they are. Why do church members do such things? Because they love them. No one will partake unless they have a desire for these things of the world. Paul says for us to abstain from all appearance of evil—to shun revelings and such like. (Gal. 5:19-22) John tells us if we love the world, the love of the Father is not in us. Brethren, young and old, let us cut loose from the "world," and set our affections on "things above," and then when Jesus comes, he will find us faithfully doing his commandments. Let us live such lives of purity as we find His word teaches us. Submitted in the love of Christ. E. H. Cavin, Lorenzo, Texas.

FORGIVENESS

I think during these terrible times which are trying the heart and faith of men such subjects should not be neglected, but should have the earnest attention of all that love the truth and the right. I fear we are neglecting to teach the very fundamental characteristics of the Christian life. It is easy to preach first principles and to expose the errors of sectarianism; but when it comes to explaining how to apply the teachings of Christ to our every-day life and of living them out in actual practice, it is not so easy.

In practice stubbornness and humility are exactly opposite. An humble Christian will be manifesting or exhibiting the fruits of the Spirit—love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness and temperance (Gal. 5) in every act of life, while the stubborn one will follow out his own way—right or wrong. Men of this type are too obdurate to be humble. They are so opinionated that they consider everyone wrong except themselves. They will violate the plainest passages of Christ's teaching in order to have their own way. Samuel, the prophet, tells us that "Stubbornness is as iniquity and idoletry."

An apology is accepted by gentlemen as an end of strife; yet we have Christians (?), leaders, too, of congregations, who refuse to accept private and public acknowledgements of wrong by brethren. These leaders have violated and are violating the very genius of Christianity. It is natural and inevitable that differences arise, yet we ought to be humble enough to adjust these differences to the good of the cause of Christ and to our eternal well-being.

The Holy Spirit, speaking through the apostles, gives us a true picture of men and conditions as they exist today. "For I know this," says Paul,

"that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." This is class one. "Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after themselves." This is class two (Acts 20) Class three are men that have attained the leadership of congregations through clandestine methods and who are exhibiting the characteristics of Diotrephes, as given in 3 John, and that the reader man have the picture before him, I quote it: "I wrote unto the church, but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words; and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the church." That is out of the congregation, as I understand it. This is an exact picture of some leaders of today. They cast out of the congregation men of far more ability and moral worth than themselves. Oh, what times these are! May God have mercy on us poor mortals, and may we strive to be faithful to His holy Word, is the earnest prayer of your humble servant. Prayerfully consider this. —W. T. Taylor, De Leon, Texas.

EXAMPLES, NUMBER TWO.

The Lord told Saul to destroy Amalek and all they have, but Saul spared Agag and the best, but everything vile and refused they destroyed. Saul obeyed in part. He saved the best to sacrifice to the Lord, a thing God had not commanded. Saul confesses to have transgressed, and Samuel says rejected the Lord's word, and the Lord rejected him as king. Oh, what a lesson is here for us. Let us as Christians do all God bids us, and do not even think to do what we are not bidden. Paul says, "And if a man also strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully." This shows that God is yet watching his people. No wonder the wise man says, "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." When we get to moving in the worship of God outside of his direction, there will be a sad failure in the reckoning time.

In 1st Chron. 13:9, we have another striking example. Uzza put forth his hand to stay the Ark of God, but he was not a priest, and this was not his work, although the oxen had stumbled and the Ark was about to fall. When men seek to justify what they do on the ground of "a good work," they should remember poor Uzza. What better are they? Let us learn to fear, reverence, God, and honor his word by moving in the sphere he has allotted us. Why should we die? Lord, fix this lesson on our hearts, that we may not forget thee in our zeal to do good.

And there was David (1b. ch. 15:2) with his cart to move the Ark, which God had committed to the priests to carry, but David did not hunt the matter up on God's chart, the Scriptures, to find the way to move the ark—common sense would do him in such a simple thing. But the plagues of God came for such neglect and they found God

left none of it to them to use "common sense" as a guide.

Brethren, Paul says, "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God." Those who set aside God's word either through ignorance or wilful rejection, cannot receive the reward for the righteous. Paul says to Timothy, "Study to show thyself approved unto God . . . handling aright the Word of God." We should seek God's approval and to this end should "handle aright" his word." It is our guide as to what will please God and gain his approval. What care I whether man approve my acts or not, God is my Judge. I love his Word; I seek his approval; let others do as they wish.

Miriam, sister of Moses, O, how wretched she became in her leprosy. And there is no cure but to take God's remedy prescribed in his law. And if we are in the disobedience to God as she was, may God help us to be satisfied with no other remedy for our cleansing from the awful filth of sin but that which God has provided, either as an alien sinner out of Christ, seeking a saving faith in him by the word of God (John 20; Rom. 10:11-18; Acts 16:31, 32); a repentance unto life (Acts 11:18; Lk. 24:46, 47; Acts 2:38); a confession unto salvation, of the Lord Jesus with the mouth (Rom. 10:9, 10; Mat. 10:32; Acts 8:37); a baptism for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16; Mat. 28:19; Mk. 16:16; or as an erring Christian in prayer and confession to God, with true repentance (Acts 8:33; Heb. 3:16; I John 1:9; 2:1, 2) And may we sweetly abide in God's love, realizing that this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.

Geo. A. Moore, Gothenburg, Nebr.

"THE LORD'S DAY" (Rev. 1:10)

By Philip Y. Pendleton

It is not the Sabbath day, and should not be so called. The Bible calls it the "first day of the week," and the Lord's day. This latter name was the one by which it was commonly called in the early days of Christianity, as we learn from the early writers. Ignatius (suffered martyrdom A. D. 107) advises Christians "not to sabbatize with the Jews, and to live according to the Lord's day." Clement of Alexandria (died about A. D. 220) also counsels "to observe the Lord's day," and Irenaeus (born about A. D. 130) says that "to pray standing on the Lord's Day, is a symbol of the resurrection." On this day Christians met to break bread (Acts 20:7) and to give their offerings (1 Cor. 16:1). The Standard S. S. Commentary.

THE TRUTH FUND

W. J. Harris	\$1.00
Bob Musgrave	1.00
B. M. Massengale	2.00
Clarence Young	1.00

COMMENDATION

We, the Corinth congregation, near Fouke, Ark., have been imposed upon by hirelings and perversers, who delt us misery. We are now at peace through the untiring efforts of Bro. W. J. Harris. He did his labor in love, declaring to us "the whole counsel of God." He is plain, simple, positive, free from pretense; and above all free from pride and vain glory, and works in a lovable manner.

L. F. Hodges; W. W. Nall, Elders.
G. W. Hoss, Deacon.

HARPER-GRIDER S. S. DEBATE

This debate was held at Lowery, Ala., June 11 and 12, between the Editor of "The Truth" and W. T. Grider, of Troy, Ala., and was the outgrowth of an article—"A Good Soldier," I wrote in "The Truth," in which I said, "We have preacher brethren over Alabama, Fred M. Little, I. L. Boles, W. T. Grider and others, who are advocates of an innovation, The Sunday School, who dare not defend their practice in either written or oral debate." I also said, "My experience with them proves to my mind that when they have the truth, they are ready to defend it with any man on earth, but when they are in error, they are cowards."

In reply to this I received a letter from Fred M. Little, of Montgomery, Ala., in which he said that I was—"that that comes out of an ash hopper." And that I was a "wilful -----" Grider said I had done him an injustice and should publish an apology in *The Truth*. I promised him if he would debate the Sunday School question in a proposition that stated his practice, that I would publish an apology. But he would not. He worded a negative proposition and then affirmed it only one day. Here it is: It is not anti Scriptural for the church to meet at any time and place other than the regular assembly and have more than one class, using uninspired literature and women teachers to teach the word of God. I signed this proposition with Grider after he refused to affirm a proposition that states his practice. Brother Harper affirmed the second day, leaving out the word "not." It is needless to say that the truth was well vindicated.

Three Sunday School preachers were present—Smith, of Nashville; Huffman, of Greenville, Ala., and Heaten, of Andalusia, Ala. Two Missionary Baptist preachers were present, and one of them, Mr. Wallace, said he would meet Grider on the Sunday School. And there was also a Free Will Baptist preacher in attendance, who had been educated for a priest in the Catholic Church, and spoke five different languages. He said Grider had not met the issue. Grider refused to repeat the debate, and refused to meet Brother Harper on the cup question. I had the pleasure of moderating for Bro. Harper. Grider slung mud all through the debate.

I said when these Sunday School preachers had the truth, they would meet any man on earth. Do they want me to apologize for saying this? I also said when they are in error, they are cowards. And since they take it that this epithet applies to

them, they admit they are in error. And when Grider gets backbone enough to affirm a proposition that sets forth his practice and meets us on it, it will then be time enough to talk about an apology.

W. H. Reynolds, Kinston, Ala.

SCRIPTURAL METONYMY

There has been much said, both written and spoken, on this question; and maybe as it is with most of the issues, too much authority of men is offered in proof, instead of giving that which the Lord has taught. Valuable time is used in telling and debating what theologians, lexicographers, and translations have said. If we always teach and practice what has been bound by the New Testament, there will be no room for the wisdom of men, or of "this world," which is "foolishness with God." I Cor. 3:19.

By following uninspired teaching or doctrine, the plain truth has been obscured. I wish to offer an argument made by the Christ, that there is no getting around or away from. Our Savior has proven, whether people accept it or not, that "the fruit of the vine" and "the cup" are both included in one. Turn to Matt. 26:23 and read. It says, "And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." Does our Lord teach here that "the dish" is empty and that he and Judas Iscariot were sitting there, dipping in an empty dish? The very idea of their dipping in "the dish" is evidence that there was something in it. However, Jesus only makes mention of "the dish," and does not say a word about anything being in it. Who is ready to say that there was nothing in the dish? And just as sure as there was something in the dish (and there was), then the inevitable conclusion is, "the dish" stood for the vessel and its contents.

Mark 14:20 has it thus: "And he said unto them, It is one of the twelve, he that dippeth with me in the dish." Were the Redeemer and Judas dipping in a "dish" that had nothing in it? I think no one will affirm they were.

Now let us follow inspiration a little further. In John's account, he says: "Jesus therefore answered, He it is, for whom I shall dip the sop, and give it him. So when he had dipped the sop, he taketh and giveth it to Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot. John 13:26. "The dish" is not mentioned in this Scripture; but who will deny that it is here? And in the next verse it says, "And after the sop, then entered Satan into him." Both of these verses speak of "the sop," but say nothing of "the dish." Matt. and Mk. mention "the dish," but say nothing about "the sop." John mentions "the sop," but is silent on "the dish." Thus the teaching of inspiration is that "the sop" was in "the dish" on the table. Hence to speak of "the dish" includes both the dish and the sop. And to allude to "the sop" includes both the sop and the dish. Therefore, we have the Scriptural "metonymy," if you wish to call it that. There are other Scriptural arguments that could be given, but this is sufficient.

—Joseph Miller, 1004 N. Lambert St., Brazil, Ind.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, AUGUST 1, 1931

No. 9

MARRIAGE OUT OF THE COVENANT

The marriage question is a very solemn affair and should be approached with seriousness by both sex. A mistake in marriage usually means ruination to both parties. Hence, precaution needs to be exercised in this God given contract. God's law should always be heeded in all things. God never made but one man and one woman. Gen. 2:7:22-23. Thus evidencing one woman is all he intended for a man to have at a time, and one man is all a woman should have at a time. Gen. 2:24; 1 Cor. 7:12.

The Will of Jehovah is that man and woman are to be perfectly united, Gen. 2:22:23. Mt. 19:5:6. Therefore, mortals should not meddle with God's doings or arrangements. Thus it is said, "So they are no more two, but one flesh, what therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder." Mk. 10:9. Mt. 19:6. This teaching shows that it is a very dangerous thing to tamper with the word of God or his way.

Adam and Eve were children of God. Gen. 2:7:22, Lk. 3:38. Therefore they were joined together in the covenant of God. Mk. 10:9. 1 Cor. 6:17. Gen. 2:21-24. God has bound the principle of his people marrying in his covenant through out every dispensation. Hence, the Lord's children were forbidden to marry out of covenant relationship in the patriarchal dispensation. Gen. 6:3-5. These scriptures inform us that it was then "wicked" (wrong) for Jehovah's people to marry out of his covenant. The Old Testament further instructs us that under the law (after the flood) our Creator forbid his sons and daughters marrying out of his covenant. Ex. 34:14-16. Deut. 7:2-4. Neh. 9:2; 10:30. 13:25-27. From the foregoing we have learned that under those two covenants our heavenly Father forbid his children marrying out of the covenant relationship, thus warning them, should they marry out of covenant relationship they would "turn away from following him" which meant destruction. See Deut. 7:3:4.

How careful the Lord's people should be in all things and not do evil thinking good may come. Ro. 3:8. The principle of marrying in the covenant taught and bound throughout the inspiration of God. Some remark "are there not just as nice, beautiful, virtuous, intelligent, industrious, women who are not saints as those who are?" Yes, so far as morality, etc. goes. But we should remember "God's thoughts are not our thoughts and his ways are not our ways." Isa. 55:8:9. Pro. 30:6. With this much before us we now come to The New Testament with the marriage proposition. Let us keep in mind that morality, etc., is not the issue but what saith the Lord or does he require? So, "to the law and to the testimony." Isa. 8:20. Thus it is written, "A wife is bound for so long a time as her husband liveth,

but if the husband be dead, she is free to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord." 1 Cor. 7:39. This is very plain in regard to the widow. That she is commanded "to marry in the Lord." But some contend that there is no marriage law for the virgin. Let us see. "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity? Or what communion hath light with darkness?" 2 Cor. 6:14. This is a plain command forbidding the children of God being "unequally yoked with unbelievers." Some say that the above does not apply to marriage. Well, when a child of God and child of the devil marry, if they are not "unequally yoked" let some one tell why. The above scripture applies to marrying out of the Lord, followers of Christ being unequally yoked up with secret-orders, etc. The command is, "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers." If the above imperative is adhered to then Christians will be "keeping themselves unspotted from the world." Jas. 1:27. Ro. 12:1:2. It does not look very good (is not natural) to see a horse and mule yoked together. But it looks a good deal worse to see a disciple of Christ "unequally yoked with an unbeliever." (alien). Thus we find that it is wrong for the Lord's people to marry out of the Lord, (body). Those who do it bring condemnation upon themselves and as long as they remain in the above condition God nor Christ will not save them. They have not promised to save people in their sins. The will of God must be done. Mt. 7:21, Heb. 5:9. Therefore, people are commanded to "repent, etc" See Lk. 13:2. 2 Pet. 3:9. Paul has given further proof that the followers of Jesus are to marry in the Lord. Let us hear Paul, "Have we no right to lead about a wife that is a believer, even as the rest of the apostles and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" 1 Cor. 9:5. Paul here indicates should he have married he would have married "a believer." (That is in the Lord) Moreover if Paul "had a right to marry a wife that was a believer" then, does it not follow he had no right (authority) to marry a wife that was not a believer? This is the unavoidable conclusion. Furthermore Paul commands, "Be ye imitators of me even as I also am of Christ." 1 Cor. 11:1. Verse 11 "nevertheless neither is the woman without the man nor the man without the woman in the Lord." With this teaching before us it is obvious to anyone who wants the truth that Christians are to marry in the Lord. We have to admit it is safe to marry in the Lord, then why not do what the Lord would have us do and be on the safe side? Those who do not obey God will find that "the way of the transgressor is hard." Pro. 13:15. When saints yoke or hook up with the devil he usually out-pulls because he has a down grade route. Mt. 7:13, Lk. 13:24. In view of the above warning we should beware, lest we "fall from our own steadfastness." 2 Pet. 3:17. 1 Tim. 4:1. "It is a

fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Heb. 10:31. Those brethren and sisters who are acquainted with me do not come to me for assistance when they want to marry out of the Lord, neither do those appeal to me to assist them who have a living wife or husband and want to marry another. I always try to give the scriptural teaching on the marriage question (and all others too) so those who hear may understand. I do not assist in "unequally yoking up people nor aiding any man or woman in having more than one wife or husband at a time. This marriage issue is being neglected by the most of the preachers and public teachers. Why not "Declare the whole counsel of God?" Acts 20:27. Then practice the same. If it is wrong for a Christian to marry an unbeliever and to have more than one wife or husband at once, why should it not be taught as it is written and practiced or lived up to accordingly? "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that were heard, lest haply we drift away from them." Heb. 2:1 Let all the faithful help to eliminate evil or wrong doing by abstaining from it. 1 Thes. 5:22, Ro. 12:9, Jas. 4:7.

"Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp and said, 'whoso is on Jehovah's side, let him come unto me' and all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him." Ex. 32:26. Jos. 24:15. 1 Ki. 18:21. —Joseph Miller, Brazil, Ind.

THE COMMUNION CUP

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" (I Cor. 10:16).

Literal Cup

"And he took a cup" (Mat. 26:27). It is admitted that a literal container is necessary, and it is also admitted that the container Jesus used was a literal cup. And Jesus says to his apostles, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven" (Mat. 18:18). And we find that the Apostle Paul in I Cor. 11:25 to 28 specifies the "cup" (always in the singular) as the container to be used, and thus binds it on the church.

Ceremonial Cup

The Passover was not a common meal where each one might have his own cup, lamb, etc., but the cup, the lamb, and the bread are ceremonial. And Jesus took the bread and cup from the Passover, and used them in what we call the Lord's Supper. Cruden's Concordance says: "And among the rites, 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 his turn, to which custom it is supposed that our blessed Lord alludes in the institution of the cup, which is also called the cup of blessing."

History

The one cup dates back in history to the days of the apostles. Ignatius wrote in the latter part of the first century, saying, "For there is one flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ, and his blood which

is shed for us is one. One loaf also is broken for all, and one cup is distributed among all." (Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, p. 81).

Purpose Served By The Cup

"And whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty" (Mat. 23:18). Here we have a literal altar with a literal gift upon it, the gift being a type or figure with the altar probably taking no part in the figure, so that the Jews said that "the altar is nothing," but Jesus said, "Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?"

We might paraphrase in this way: Whether is greater, the fruit of the vine, or the cup that sanctifieth the fruit of the vine. The altar sanctified the gift on it, because God had specified that it should be offered upon an altar, and the cup, which is specified in the communion, sanctifies or sets apart a certain portion of the fruit of the vine as the blood of Christ, for the same reason.

We might give thanks for a whole barrel of the fruit of the vine, but this would not be Scriptural. To use anything but "a cup" would be to use our own wisdom in setting aside something that God has ordained both by precept and example. As well might the Jew have substituted a table or something else of his own choosing for the God-ordained altar.

Communion

"And they all drank of it" ("cup," which he took and gave to them), Mat. 26:27; Mark 14:23. This is communion as taught in the Bible. Again: "For we are all partakers of the one bread (loaf). This is just as true of "a cup" (Mat. 26:27; Mark 14:23; I Cor. 10:16, 17) To use more than one cup interferes with the communion or joint-participation.

Figurative Language

"O my Father, if it be possible, yet this cup pass from me" (Mat. 26:39). Here we have a Metaphor in which Christ's sufferings and death on the cross are likened to a cup from which one might drink poison that produces suffering and death. And in every case of metonymy (I Cor. 10:21 and 11:27), where the communion is referred to, we have both the cup and its contents, and neither can be dispensed with if we obey the divine command to "drink the cup."

Revelation 17:4

John says, "I saw," which shows that what he saw was real to him. And the "cup" is plainly distinguished from its contents here, which are also named, thus making the use of "cup" literal. But listen: Unless "cup" here stands for or is the name of its contents, as some contend for Mat. 26:27, it has no bearing on this issue. But this is too much for them.

The Well, John 4:12

"Art thou greater than our father Jacob, who gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle?" A well is not a drinking vessel, but a cup is; and there is no doubt that the disciples put their lips to the cup and drank from it, as we have seen.

The Rock

"And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ" (I Cor. 10:4). They drank of the water that flowed from the Rock, and we drink of the fruit of the vine that comes from the cup. The Rock was spiritually Christ, and the flowing water, his blood. As the blood of Christ flowed from his body on the cross so the water flowed from a literal rock, and the fruit of the vine flows from a literal cup, making beautiful figures of a spiritual truth.

- The Blood

"For this is my blood" (Mat. 26:28). This is not a definition of the word "cup," but an explanation of its spiritual signification. The contents of the cup separate from the cup are not the cup. To put the contents of the cup into a jug, bottle, or cups, and still call it the cup is contrary to all the rules of language.

"Declaration and Address"

I call attention to article XII in the Declaration and Address by Thomas Campbell as worthy of our consideration. He says: "Lastly, That if any circumstantial indispensably necessary to the observance of Divine ordinances be not found upon the page of express revelation, such and such only, as are absolutely necessary for the purpose, should be adopted under the title of human expedients, without any pretense to a more sacred origin, so that any subsequent alteration or difference in the observance of these things might produce no contention or division in the Church."

Large Congregations

The question as to how large a congregation should be in order to acceptably worship God, is very important. If our idea of the worship of the church is of "the Pastor" type or that of "an evangelistic service" with the communion at the close, we would hardly think much of limiting the size of the congregation more than to such size that all could hear the speaker. But if it is after the New Testament pattern for the church to "edify itself" (Eph. 4:16), we find that a congregation too large to use one cup to hold the fruit of the vine, is too large to do a number of things required of it in the New Testament. And since we are to develop the talents of the church and do this by giving every one an opportunity as divinely stipulated to exercise his gifts (see Rom. XII ch.; I Cor. 14 ch.; Heb. 13:15, 16, and many other passages bearing on the worship), the congregation must be so limited (and here is the divine authority for limiting) that these requirements can be met.

The Temple

The apostles found the temple an opportune place to preach as well as the synagogues of the Jews, and the market places. The temple was not like a modern hall or meetinghouse. It was divided into the temple proper, where only the priests were allowed, and the outer courts were divided up into the women's court and the court

of the Gentiles, etc. The Jews were coming and going all day long to offer sacrifices; the apostles were frequently arrested for preaching in the courts. Under such conditions any one can see the impossibility of holding an orderly communion in such a place—a place about as opportune as some market street in a busy city of today.

Private Houses

"And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart" (Acts 2:46). Three propositions: 1st, Daily in the temple; 2nd, Breaking bread from house to house; 3rd, Did eat their food with gladness. If there is nothing but an ordinary meal in this "breaking bread," why should it deserve special mention? Is it not the usual thing to eat food at home? Here we find the same terms used—"breaking bread"—that we find in Acts 2:42; 20:7; I Cor. 10:16, referring to the communion. "And daily in the temple and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ" (Acts 5:42). This shows that they were using private houses. The Jews had the temple, but there were over 460 synagogues in Jerusalem where they assembled to hear the law read and expounded. These synagogues and temple courts as places were out of the question for conducting New Testament worship. In Acts 12:12 we find a private house in use. In Acts 20:7 we find a "room" in use, and mention is made of many more in Rom. 16:5 and 16; I Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15, and verse 2 in Philemon, which goes to show that the N. T. church conducted the worship in assemblies where one cup to contain the fruit of the vine could be used.

Authentic History

"We have already observed that the places of Christian assembly were at first rooms in private houses belonging to different members of the church. In large towns, where such a place of assembly could not accommodate all, it became necessary that smaller portions of the community dwelling at a distance should choose other places for their meetings on Sunday" (Neander, Vol. I, p. 402).

A Campbell

"The simplicity, humility and brotherly kindness which appear in these small assemblies, and the more rapid progress which the disciples make in Christian knowledge, faith and love, from more of them being called upon to take a part in the Christian worship, are greater auxiliaries to the spread of the gospel, more powerful arguments for the truth and recommendations of the excellency of the Christian institution, than an immense pile of stone, brick or wood with ornaments of architecture, called a church or meeting house, filled with an assembly of carnal worshipers in all the pomp and pagentry of the lusts of the eye and the pride of life, waiting upon a person; all of whom save one consecrated tongue, are dumb in the Christian worship" (Memoirs, p. 599).

(Continued on page 7)

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida
J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips

The Supreme Sacrifice For Sin.

The loving and merciful Savior of mankind 'paid the debt of sin' when he suffered untold agonies on the "Old Rugged Cross." The opposition of His enemies and the desertion of His friends were hard enough for Him to bear. But then came the dread darkness (Mt. 27:45) which was an indication of the withdrawal of the Divine Presence. Then, He cried in bitter anguish of His soul, "My God! My God! why have You forsaken Me?" This was far more awful than the opposition of His enemies and the desertion of His beloved disciples. Before this darkness enveloped Him, He had lived in the light of God's smile. Now, He was hanging on a tree, accursed of God (Gal. 3:13). Sinless, He became sin (2 Cor. 5:21). Figuratively, fire from above entered into His bones (Lam. 1:13). The 'Lord bruised Him' (Isa. 53:10), so that "By His stripes we are healed." Mr. A. E. Knoch says, "It was the travail of His soul in these dark hours that settled the question of sin. It is only as we see God against Him that we can appreciate what He is for us now. Crucified by man at the behest of Satan, and abandoned by God, He was the most forlorn and forsaken creature in the universe. . . . For His own sake God would never have abandoned Him. For my sake (and yours, beloved reader), He endured, not merely the physical pain, the mental torture, the moral degradation which men inflicted, but the deeper, direr despair of the awful enmity of God." "See from His head, His hands and feet, Love and sorrow flow mingled down. Did ever such love and sorrow meet? Or thorns compose so rich a crown?"

The Sprinkling of His Blood.

After the silent Sufferer had said, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit," and then said, "It is finished," and "yielded up His spirit," into the hands of Almighty God, His side was pierced, and from this wound, received "in the house of His friends" (Zech. 12), flowed "both blood and water" (John 19:34). This was for the

redemption of my sins (and yours, too, kind reader). For "apart from the shedding of blood, there is no remission" (Heb. 9:22). It was "impossible for the blood of bulls and goats (the kind they had under the Law) to take away sins" (Heb. 10:4). But "the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanses us from all sin" (1 Jno. 1:7). "And they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. 7:14). Their hearts were sprinkled from an evil conscience, and their bodies washed with pure water' (Heb. 10:22), when they were "baptized into Christ" and "into His death (Rom. 6:3). His blood is "the blood of sprinkling" (Heb. 12:24). On the Day of Pentecost (A. D. 33), the stream of grace which flowed from the side of our Redeemer, began to be proclaimed to the world. Then, there was "a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness" (Zech. 13:1). "Living waters flowed out of Jerusalem" (Zech. 14:8). These waters are for the healing of the sin-sick souls, "dead in their trespasses and sins" (Eph. 2:1-4).

The Gospel Must Be Obeyed.

But you must obey the gospel in order to receive and enjoy the remission of sins. For when the beloved Apostle Peter preached to the Jews on Pentecost, he proclaimed, for the first time, the supreme sacrifice for sins. He showed them the exceeding sinfulness of their sins. They were convicted and cried out, "What shall we do? To which Peter replied, "Reform, and let each of you be immersed, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the forgiveness of your sins" (Acts 2:38). "Are you washed in the blood of the Lamb?" If not, come to Jesus, and come now!

FALLEN ASLEEP

"Asleep in Jesus! blessed sleep,
From which none ever wakes to weep!"

Sarah Mountain Wheatley was born in Ottumwa, Iowa, May 19, 1863, and died April 28, 1931, having lived upon earth sixty-seven years, eleven months, and nine days.

She was married to William Wheatley, Oct. 28, 1885. To this union one son was born.

She was "baptized into Christ" (Rom. 6:3) in 1895, and lived a faithful Christian life. As long as her physical strength would permit, she was always at "the Lord's house" (1 Tim. 3:15) to partake of "the Lord's supper" (1 Cor. 11:23) on "the Lord's day" (Rev. 1:10). Her worthy example is well worth imitating, and by it, she, "being dead, yet speaketh" (Heb. 11:4).

Her funeral services were conducted by Bro. Burley F. Black, at the meeting house of the Church of Christ, Findley and Adella Streets, in Ottumwa. —Mrs. Zella Mullen.

Louisa D. Black was born January 20, 1860, and passed on a short time since, in Wauneta, Iowa.

She was married, February 7, 1875, to Henry R. Collins. To this union six children were born.

Sister Collins had been a faithful member of the church of Christ for many years, and was active in Church work.

Funeral services were conducted at the church of Christ, Bro. L. S. Terry being the officiating minister.

Sister Collins and Sister Wheatly had many relatives, friends, and brethren and sisters in the Lord Jesus, and we all mourn their departing, but not as others who have no hope. —Mrs. Zella Mullen.

SLANDER

By R. H. Boll, in *The Word and Work*.

From the word "slander" the devil derives his name, for that is the meaning of the Greek term "diabolos," translated—transferred, rather—into English as "Devil." Now a slander is a falsehood told to the hurt of another's good name, a defamation, a malicious misrepresentation. It is the Devil's special and peculiar line of activity, and he is past-master of it. He slanders God and slanders men. He slandered Christ and still does so; and there has never been a faithful and earnest Christian who has not come in for his mead of slander at the hands of Satan's servants. For all the Devil's children bear that family resemblance, as if it were branded on their foreheads. "Ye are of your father the devil," said the Lord Jesus to the Jews, "and the lust of your father it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and standeth not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar and the father thereof." (John 8:44).

God's people must give special heed to shun this grievous sin. Under the influence of evil passions—anger, wrath, enmity, envy, jealousy, hate, the soul is thrown out of its balance and the lips utter what the evil heart dictates. The blinding, overpowering influences of religious prejudices and strife must especially be guarded against. One of the hardest things is to avoid misrepresentation in religious controversy. Some appear to think that slander is all right if done in the interest of "the cause" or of "sound doctrine." But God will bring such things into judgment, and all liars shall be cast into the lake of fire.

"NOT THERE," SAYS JOHNSON

During the Phillips-Johnson Debate on the Cups, at Sentinel, Okla., in July, 1929, Phillips quoted Thayer, who says of the Greek word translated "cup," "Poterion, a cup, a drinking vessel" and Robinson, who says, "Poterion, a drinking vessel, a cup" and Liddell and Scott, who say, "Poterion, a drinking-cup, wine-cup."

He then made the argument from Thayer and Robinson to show that in such expressions as "drink the cup," "this cup is my blood," etc., "cup" is used by Metonymy, a figure of Rhetoric, to suggest to the mind the contents of the cup, which is "the product of the (grape) vine" (Mt. 26:29). For Thayer, after saying that poterion, "cup," is used literally in Mt. 26:27, Mk. 14:23, etc., says, "by meton. of the container for the contained, the contents of the cup, what is offered to be drunk,

Lk. 22:20 (b), 1 Cor. 11:25 sq."—Thayer, p. 533.

Robinson says, (b) meton. cup for the contents of a cup, cup-full, e. g. cup of wine, spoken of the wine drank at the eucharist, Lk. 22:20 et 1 Cor. 11:25. . . . So pinein to poterion to drink the cup." —Robinson, p. 693.

Johnson's only refuge was to try to cast a reflection on Bro. Phillips by saying: "Can you read Greek? I don't believe you can read Greek." To which Phillips replied: "Brother Johnson, if you will show us one Scripture that says any congregation of disciples in Apostolic times used 'two or more cups'—the thing you are contending for in this debate—I will not make another argument on the question, but will surrender my position, and will read Greek till you tell me to stop." To this Johnson made no reply.

At the noon hour, I said to Johnson: "Bro. Johnson, I would just like to hear that boy read Greek. Why don't you point out your church, in the Bible, that used 'two or more cups' so the debate will close and we can hear him read Greek?" To this Johnson replied: "It is not there!"

If this is not "acknowledging the corn," I do not know what it is. Bro. Phillips may hold five hundred more debates, but he will never hold another one that will give any better satisfaction than the one he held here with Johnson gave us. It seems to have put a "quietis" on Johnson, for he has not debated the Cups with Phillips or any one else since then.

And it has put a "quietis" on Bro. Savage, too. He is the one that pulled off a little faction from the Church here in Sentinel, and went to a school house out in the country and started up with two cups, and challenged us for a debate on the question. He ramrodded the Cups side of the debate, but he, like Johnson, is in his hole now, and says he will not "be out trying to get up another debate on the Cups."

Bro. Savage and Bro. Sullins used to worship with us every Lord's day. We used one cup then, as we do now, and have ever since Bro. R. H. Howard started the Church in Sentinel. I have heard both Savage and Sullins say, many times, that they believed that "the Son of God and the angels in Heaven rejoice over our worship, for it is just exactly like it ought to be." And Bro. Phillips, during the debate, didn't fail to tell them of it, either; and he "rubbed it in" on them because they would make such remarks as that, and then go off and start a little begrunted faction in opposition to that which they said "the Son of God and the angels rejoice over" and put in the cups for their divisive factor and then challenge us for debate on it! No wonder they are done with debating the question.—I. H. Bills, Sentinel, Okla.

MEETING NOTICE

The place: Stag Creek half-way between Sipe Springs and Sidney, Comanche county, Texas. Time: Saturday night, July 25 to August 2nd.

There is a loyal band of Christians at this place, who will welcome all that will visit the meeting. Comanche county is noted for its good singers. Preaching by Elder Jas. T. White, of Lometa, Texas. Come and be with us.

NOT A DREAM

From the Christian Leader of February 3, 1931, I quote the following: "Churches and church leaders are always telling what kind of preachers they would like to see. I for once, feel disposed to tell what kind of a church I should like to see in all our large cities. Its Bible school work would be conducted as carefully and as accurately as the best public school system in the state. There would be plenty of rooms and the right kind of equipment for those rooms; blackboards, tables, maps, etc. There would be a real series of graded lessons prepared in an attractive way. The Bible school would be larger in attendance than the membership of the church, for all members would attend plus their children and many friends and neighbors. If it is good to have a young peoples' training class in the evening, it is ten times better to have ten classes at night. If it is right and proper to have a Bible school in the morning, it is just as useful and necessary in the evening."

The Leader writer then asks: "Am I dreaming an idle dream?" Not a bit of it, my erring brother. You have "browsed" around in the fields of digression in the church of Christ until you have taken the "Christian Church" fever. And if you will look around, you can find plenty of just such churches as you describe branded "Christian Church," and many churches of Christ are going in the same way. Of course, it has the "Organ" and the Missionary Society and Young Peoples' societies and Woman's societies, individual cups, etc., etc. And the pity is that you with other Christians that have forsaken God do not go to them, and spoil two houses.

You ask, "Do I have the right conception of a New Testament church in the twentieth century?" If you have, the "Christian Church" is a New Testament church; and so is the Roman Catholic Church. Shades of the restoration of New Testament Christianity. Shades of the Campbells, Stone, Smith, et al, who tore loose from the "world, the flesh, and the devil" to set us free from the "commandments and doctrines of men" and establish New Testament Christianity, that "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent." Yes, "A 'thus saith the Lord' for our faith and practice." Yes, "a movement to unite all Christians on the Bible and the Bible alone."

If these sot drunkards on the wine of Babylon, the religious Mother of a litter like unto her, would go to the Christian Church—yes, "Go over to them, soul, body, boots, and breeches," as one has said, instead of trying to drag the snowy-white skirts of the sweet "bride, the Lamb's wife" into the corruption of transgression, it would be a God-send to the church of Christ of the twentieth century—it would. And may God hasten the day when it shall be fulfilled that "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." "Woe unto you hypocrites."—Ira B. Kile, Sistersville, W. Va.

THE TRUTH FUND

W. J. Harris \$1.00

SEEKING GOD'S APPROVAL

No. 1.

As a religious people we claim to be christians—no more; no less; the followers of Christ. (Acts 11:26; 26:28; 1 Pet. 4:16).

Our creed is the gospel of Christ (Rom. 1:16) as taught and practiced by the apostles of Christ and recorded in the New Testament.

As a body we are the church. Christ built his church (Mat. 16:18). He adds to it (Acts 2:47). He is Head of his church (Eph. 1:22; 5:23; Col. 1:18). And he is the Savior of the body, the church, which he purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20:28).

To be a Christian, that is, to be a member of the church of Christ, the following requirements are set forth in the New Testament, namely, **Faith, Repentance, Confession, and Baptism.**

The apostles were sent to preach the gospel (Mat. 28:19; Mark 16:15; Rom. 10:14-17). **Faith**—"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17). Again: "Howbeit many of them that heard the word believed; and the number of the men was about five thousand" (Acts 4:4). Again: "Peter arose, and said unto them, Men, brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe" (Acts 15:7). "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. 11:4). "And they said, Believe on the Lord, Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house" (Acts 16:31). Again: "Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness" (Rom. 10:10).

Repentance.—"And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (Luke 24:47). "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commands all men everywhere to repent" (Acts 17:30). "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:3). "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life" (Acts 11:18).

Confession.—"Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father who is in heaven" (Mat. 10:32). "The word of faith, which we preach. That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10:9, 10). "See, water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" (Acts 8:36, 37).

Baptism.—"And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized

him. And when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing" (Acts 8:38, 39). "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). "Baptism doth also now save us" (I Pet. 3:21). "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (Mat. 28:19). "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized" (Acts 2:38, 41). The apostles being thus taught by the Spirit (John 14:16, 17, 26; John 15:26, 27; John 16:7, 8, 13; Luke 24:49; Acts 1:5; Acts 2:1-4) it is "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" (I Cor. 12:13).

"Newness of Life"

"Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses" (Col. 2:12, 13). "Therefore we were buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4). "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, and not on things on the earth" (Col. 3:1, 2).

Christ said to teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you (Mat. 28:20). Christ is the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him (Heb. 5:8, 9). —Bob Musgrave.

THE COMMUNION CUP (Continued from page 3)

F. B. Srigley

"Preachers love to preach to large congregations, and elders feel that they are doing a great work overseeing and directing a large company; but to succeed, the smaller church is better. Four churches with fifty members each will do far more good in a city than one will with two hundred members. It is true that they will not make the same show, but they will establish the cause much faster." (G. A.)

David Lipscomb.

"Such a little band of earnest, working Christians is much more effective for converting the world than a rich church of a thousand wealthy, fashionable members supporting one of the most learned and eloquent preachers in the land to study, teach, pray, exhort, and admonish for them, while they live at ease and support him. — Every child of God, by virtue of his birthright into the family of God, a family of kings and priests to God, has the right to perform any and every service connected with the church of God.—

All should be encouraged to take part in the service, and in doing service each manifests his talent for work and trains himself for fitness in God's work. The congregation is for educating and preparing men for any and all the work God had commanded to his church" (G. A.)

We should go back to the New Testament plan then we would have no occasion to change the New Testament order. This applies to all digression. —T. C. Hawley.

FROM THE FIELD

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas.—I have my work so arranged that I can hold a mission meeting or two this summer. Just write me when you want to begin, and arrange for the place and get the people notice.

J. C. Moore, Waco, Texas.—We baptized one since Brother Musgrave closed his meeting here.

H. A. Cooper, Elk City, Okla.—J. N. Cowan was met here on the cup question by Brother Musgrave, beginning June 17. Cowan again admitted that there is no Bible passage for his practice. Evans, Cowan's supporter, said Cowan signed the wrong proposition, admitting his defeat, as it was also freely admitted by outsiders.

Bob Musgrave, Oklahoma City, Okla.—I have just met J. D. Dossey here on the cups. J. A. Dennis moderated for him, and I signed propositions with Dennis to meet him in Waco, Texas, in July on the cup question. It is pitiable to see these brothers who have been fighting the Sunday School, demanding "chapter and verse" for it—yes, a "Thus saith the Lord" for your practice, to now crawl out on the "silence" of the Bible. Poor souls.

FROM RATTON, OKLAHOMA

Dear Brethren:

I am now situated so that I can give my time to preaching, and surely there is need of a man who stands boldly for the gospel as written and practiced by the primitive church, and who lives as the gospel requires a preacher to live. I have no desire to get rich and am willing to share the burden of carrying the gospel to the lost with my brethren.

I am thirty years of age and single. The churches at Greenfield and Roswell, New Mexico, know me well, and I refer you to Bro. T. F. Thomasson, of Lake Arthur N. Mex.; to Bro. Liberty Walters, of Dexter, N. M.; and to Bro. N. O. White, of Mena, Ark., who has known me from childhood. I have been preaching four years. Let me hear from the brethren that want the whole Gospel preached and nothing but Gospel.—E. E. Gibson, Rattan, Okla.

For High Grade Printing at Low Prices, Write
Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

SCRIPTURAL COMMUNION

My book, "Scriptural Communion, Name, Form and Design," I can fill all orders on the following terms: single copy 25c, \$2.00 per dozen—free to all who have not the price; all postpaid.

The book is different from any others that I have seen on this subject. It is not a personal thrust at someone's teaching on this question but rather a Scriptural examination of all prevailing teaching that is in common use today. We do not get into details of each position taken, but try to give the reader enough for him to see the difference between human and divine Name, Form and Design.

Jas. T. White, Lometa, Texas, Box 324.

A BROTHER IN NEED

Bro. S. S. Sutton, for many years an Elder in the church, had the misfortune to fall and break a thigh-bone. This, coupled with his age of eighty-two years, renders him a complete invalid. His grand-daughter is caring for him and she needs assistance. Brethren, send an offering to help. Send to Miss Connie Sutton, Red Rock, Ark. There is not an established congregation there, but the postmaster will verify the above statements.

Your sister in Christ,
Mary Williamson.

NOT EXACTLY THE TRUTH

The senior editor of the Christian Leader, issue March 13, 1928, in trying to keep up the appearance of non-digression, gets off the following: "In conversation not long ago with one of the Baptist 'Pastors' in the city here, in answer to his question, I told him that those disciples with whom I stand identified in faith and practice are occupying the ground in faith and practice on which Alexander Campbell and his co-laborers stood."

But you told him something, my erring brother, that you know is "not exactly the truth" of the matter, and any one can see this by consulting the writings of the Campbells, father and son, and those associated with them in restoring New Testament Christianity. They discarded everything from the worship and work of the church that is not "expressly enjoined in the New Testament." And the practices you uphold and practice are not so enjoined, and they are dividing the church, and you dare not affirm in discussion that they are so enjoined. You have been tried.

When the individual cups were being put into the Christian Church, and an article appeared in the Christian Standard upholding the practice, and no reply was offered in that journal, the publisher of the Christian Leader offered a rebuttal article, in which he said, "The Standard has proven indifferent to its opportunity to rebuke something that is at variance with Scripture precedent." And he said, "The manner of participating in the Lord's Supper is stated in Holy Writ just as plainly as the 'mode' of baptism."

But now the Leader has jumped into the same boat with the Standard on this innovation, giving unqualified approval of the adoption of the same

practice, and being the main force behind their adoption into the churches of Christ in West Virginia and other states, and this, too, when it was evident that division would be the outcome. And open division has come to a once united and happy brotherhood.

Your "Sunday School class system" has been thrust into the churches to their disruption, when you know full well that you cannot find in the Scriptures where such a practice is "enjoined," and that churches are of the apostolic pattern without it. And neither this editor of the Leader nor its publisher, who sails under the Campbell motto: "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent," dares let the readers of that journal see both sides of these questions discussed. It has been their policy to keep the brotherhood in the dark as to their hellish designs on the churches of the New Testament pattern and work their innovations in wherever they can, no matter what the result. You just better quit berating the Standard and you better go and tell that Baptist "Pastor" the whole truth. And when you get up more courage than you have manifested in the past and feel able to defend these things on Bible ground, just speak out, and we shall accommodate you. Your taking a "fing" at us and then running off, of itself brands you with the Standard and all other religious cowards that have "forsaken the right way of the Lord."—Ira B. Kile.

ATTENTION, CUPS ADVOCATES

J. J. Moss, of the Christian Church, commenting on 1 Cor. 10:15-17, says:

"If, at the giving of thanks, the loaf, or bread, should be unbroken to represent the unity of the one body, and our joint participation of the loaf, why should it not be the one cup at the giving of thanks, to represent the unity in the blood as well as in the body, and our joint participation in the one cup, which is metonymically the blood? 'The cup of blessing which we bless,' not cups." — Criticism and Exegesis, p. 170.

This is in perfect harmony with what Ignatius, one of the Ante-Nicene writers, says; namely, "One loaf is broken by them all, and one cup is distributed among them all."—Ante-Nicene Fathers.

Again, Ignatius says: "There is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the unity of his blood."—Apochrapha.

Brother Moss is right. Are the "loyal" brethren, who are advocating the cups, going to let the "digressive" brethren arise and condemn them by handling the scriptures with sound logic, good sense, and the correct interpretation of language?

Judgment must begin "at the house of God." Brethren, it is time to repent!—J. D. P.

Let us not listen to, "Lo here!" or "Lo there!," but "Look up, for our redemption draweth nigh." "Even so, Come, Lord Jesus! Amen."

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, SEPTEMBER, 1931

No. 10

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE APOSTASY OF THE CHURCH

Paul saw the heaven at work in the church of Christ in his day, which was ultimately to dethrone Christ as its Head and erect a Pope in His stead. It was a gradual growth of wickedness. It was forming years, seemingly so meager or imperceptible to the common people that but few saw the danger brewing. Soon after the passing away of the apostles, a few of the leaders in the church became so impregnated with the idea of authority, leadership, etc., etc., that, to obtain their ideals along this line, they felt the need of organization as an auxiliary, not seeming to realize that the church of God was the only religious organization that God would be pleased with. They were slow to realize that God had already loaded it with all the organization it needed. They failed to see that by taking the authority out of the local eldership and placing it in a humanly organized council they would be changing God's spiritual house, the church, the danger of which is plainly declared in the book of Ezra (6th ch.) to merit death. If it meant death, literal death, to make a change in Solomon's house or Temple in its rebuilding, may it not mean spiritual death to alter the antitype, the church?

Now, when the original episcopacy or rule of the eldership over the local congregation was changed to authoritative or legislative bodies called Councils and Synods, was that not a radical change in God's spiritual body, the church? So you see plainly from church history that the local rule of the divinely ordained eldership was swallowed up by these ecclesiastical bodies called Councils and Synods, which continued right on in their apostasy till about A. D. 300, when talk of a Universal Bishop became common. No doubt Paul saw in this Universal Bishop "the man of sin," the Pope. So A. D. 325 found this apostate church ready to become creed-bound. Hence they made them a creed, which, to this day, is known as the "Nicene Creed."

It seems to be the Satanic nature of man to think he can't worship God aright without the help of human organizations. These institutions were called Synods by the Greek disciples, but by the Latins they were named Councils, both bodies being presided over by a president Bishop. Finally they selected one as President over the Council in Rome, who became the chief, in fact the only source to look to for the proper adjustment of all their troubles. The decisions of this tribunal settled all matters permanently. It practically became their supreme authority and legislative body for all requirements. In fact the supreme Council from which there was no appeal.

You should now see from the rapid degeneracy of the church that in A. D. 300 there was much talk of a universal Bishop, which Paul could see,

if we can't, mean "the man of sin," a full empowered Pope at Rome. They not only talked in A. D. 300 of a universal Bishop, but to get the way thereto in better shape, they in A. D. 325, made for themselves the Nicene Creed, which paved the broad way to the Papacy; and, like other creeds, the way to any innovation they wished.

I have shown in the foregoing that the change from God's rule of the church through its eldership presiding over the local congregation, to Councils and Synods, they made these Councils and Synods legislative bodies. Notice, please, a plain legislative enactment by the Lateran Council in changing the divine order of taking the Lord's Supper from the evening or night's service to a morning, or breakfast meal. We frequently make it a dinner or noon meal, and call it the Lord's Supper. Can we do this and tell the truth, if taken at breakfast or dinner time?

The church of Christ which started in the palmy days of Christ and his apostles, had nothing to guide them but inspiration till it ceased; then depending on human devices in the way of Councils and Synods presided over by president Bishops, in A. D. 300 there was much talk of a universal Bishop. In 325 they made a human creed. With a human creed coupled with their legislative bodies, will they not soon reach the fulfillment of Paul's prophecy in 2 Thes. 2:1-4? You can now see Paul's "man of sin," can you not? For convenience they changed baptism to sprinkling. For convenience they changed the Lord's Supper to a breakfast meal. For 400 years (less 3 years) they changed the Lord's Supper to breakfast celebration. Hear Geo. Klingman in Church History, page 87. He says, "In regard to the time of day when the Supper was celebrated, it is generally admitted that at first the evening was considered the most appropriate time. In A. D. 397 the Council of Latera decreed that the Lord's Supper must be received fasting, which led to its observance in the morning."

As to the time of taking "the Lord's Supper," the New Testament is clear. On the time which is the evening part of the first day of the week. The mention in the New Testament shows it was celebrated at night. Please hear what the lamented E. G. Sewell said in Gospel Advocate in 1914. He says, "In the evening of the day that Christ arose the disciples met together and Christ met with them. Then on the evening of the next first day the very same thing occurred again, thus giving a divine sanction to the importance of that day and its wonderful triumph."

Yes; Bro. Sewell, Jesus honored the very part of the day with his bodily presence—that body which suffered in the garden and on the tree. He instituted his Supper at night, and while taking it, told his apostles he would take it no more till he took it anew in his Father's kingdom—in the church, hence on the evening of the first Pente-

cost after his death, his disciples met together and Jesus met and took the Supper with them, and on the next first day in the evening, the same thing occurred again. I Pet. 2:21—"For hereunto were ye called; because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that ye should follow his steps." The church of Christ followed in his steps for nearly 400 years. What! Did they take the Supper in the evening for nearly 400 years? To give exact figures they took it in the evening for exactly 397 years. (See Klingman's history, page 87).

In conclusion let me ask some questions. To me a correct answer is very important. Will the editorial staff of "The Truth" please see that the proper person handles my questions? I am not seeking a wrangle: I am humbly asking and seeking for light.

1. Was the decree made by the Lateran Council inspired? 2. Will you remember that this same Council was walking at this same time of the decree by the Nicene Creed, the workmanship of their own hands? 3. Will God inspire men who ignore the New Testament as a creed and who walk by one of their own make? 4. If we are true restorationists, will we not put the Supper back where Christ and the apostles had it—namely, on Lord's day evening? 5. Can we be true restorationists and continue taking the Supper as a breakfast or dinner meal and call it Supper. 6. Klingman's Church Hist. says, page 87: "In regard to the time of day when the Supper was celebrated it is generally admitted that at first the evening was considered the most appropriate time for the Lord's Supper for 397 years." "Most appropriate," being the superlative degree, how can an uninspired Council make the morning more appropriate? The congregation I worship with today tried to take exactly fifteen minutes to twelve—noon.

Fraternally, M. H. Northcross.

(Too lengthy for reply here. See next issue for that. Please be brief, brethren.—Editor).

THE BIBLE VS. THE INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION CUPS:

In the two preceding articles it has been well established, to the minds of those who want to know the truth, that the wording of the subject matter should be changed and appear as above. It has been no little pleasure to me to engage the thoughts of the readers on this MOST important subject; for we all realize it has been neglected too long, and the lives and destinies of teeming millions have been influenced by its blighting and malicious teaching. Even some of my closest friends and nearer relatives are victims of its dastardly aggressions. I have a distant church relative at Little Rock, Ark., and one at Morrilton, Ark. These are little fellows, "nursed the back teat," and never developed into anything but "runts." They kept fooling round the "OLD FELLOW" till he set them up on the "Individual Cups" hobby and they have gone so far he shall never expect them back. In a private letter one says he will ride by after me; and if I'm not

ready, he will take up board with me 'till I am. He shall be my very welcome guest, and when he comes I'll change him to the "front teat" where he can get the "sincere milk of the word" and feel he will "grow thereby." He is a man, I guess thirty-eight or forty, but "has become such" as needs the milk diet.

In a recent issue of The Gospel Light, W. R. Frazier "went off half-cocked." We think Bro. _____ of Morrilton, Ark., monkeyed with his MAINSPRING though." Now, I'm going to give him something to make his hammer stand: Bro. Frazier is not; never has been "in good standing" with the church. His record is before the membership at a number of places, ALL of which COULD verify this statement. He was picked up and placed in as Elder at Hot Springs before he was converted, but was a mis-fit and he quit the job. The only thing I have to suggest to these fellows is, "The way of the transgressor is hard."

In conclusion, I want to say I hold no malice nor ill feeling toward these men. They are still invited into my home to share its hospitalities and social functions the same as ever; but their unscriptural teachings and practices are not invited, and the sooner I am able to stamp my uncompromising disapproval upon them, the better satisfied I will be. I want to say I stand 100% for the "Bible and the Bible alone" and am fully able to defend its precepts and examples. Again thanking the readers for their patience and for a goodly number of encouraging letters received, I am as ever, Dr. Gossett.

P. S. Bro. W. R. Frazier was raised a Baptist, leant toward the Holy Rulers, fell out with the Methodist and "joined" the church of the Individual Communion Cups on two weeks' probation. He always "does something" before the two weeks are out, and has to make another confession. He says, "A good confession is good for the soul." and a preacher (at Morrilton) says "AMEN" and he starts out on his next probation period.—G.

Brethren, let's rally to the cause of The Truth.

Statement From R. H. Johnson

In your July 1 issue you state that Bro. Cohen went from Hot Springs to Texarcana for a meeting, and everything was starting off nicely for a successful meeting, when a short article appeared in the Gospel Light, mentioning his being at Hot Springs in a rather reflective way and this article was from the pen of Bro. R. H. Johnson of Morrilton, Ark. too, which caused his meeting to close very prematurely to the great embarrassment of Bro. Cohen, and to the chagrin and displeasure of almost the entire church at Hot Springs.

I deny the above statement, and ask you to please publish just what I said in the Gospel Light relative to Bro. Cohen, to-wit; The Hot Springs meeting closed May 6th. Four precious souls were baptized and much good done otherwise, we think. A Jew by the name of Cohen, came and started a meeting as soon as we closed. No one seems to know him. He said he lived in South Car.

R. H. Johnson, Morrilton, Ark.

Hot Springs, Ark., July 1, 1931.
Editor of the Gospel Light,
Delight, Ark.

Dear Sir:—We the undersigned members of the Church of Christ of Hot Springs National Park, Arkansas, do hereby testify to the accuracy of the report of the recent meeting held by Brother John Joseph Cohen, a Converted Jew. This report was sent in by Dr. E. W. Gossett and was published in the issue, June 15th, and was correct in every detail.

Signed:

C. A. Talley
Mrs. Nina Miller
Mrs. D. Maddox
Mrs. Mollie Soward
Mrs. C. H. Gaw
Miss Mabel Franks
Mrs. E. J. Herdy
Bonnie Chandler

REPROVE—REBUKE—EXHORT

(2 Tim. 4:1-4)

The Apostle Paul has given a charge here—"reprove, rebuke, exhort." We see that it is the sacred duty of those who teach or preach to carry out this command. And truly the time is here when it is needed. The times are truly "perilous" to precious souls. How sad that some should fall away—that some should refuse to heed "sound doctrine" even that after "godliness." If they could only realize their danger who "run riot." While one is doing his part as the Spirit requires of him, some get the idea that it is because he has some personal feeling or dislike for others and is reproving and rebuking because he has some illfeeling in his heart or because it is his child that is being reproved and it is none of the preacher's or teacher's business. But here is a God-given command to look faithfully after the spiritual welfare of the children of God, a duty that cannot be neglected without endangering his own soul who has such a command to obey. In Acts 20:28 we learn that the church is to be fed spiritually, and the leaders in the church are held responsible for the welfare of the souls bought with the precious blood of the Lord. The church must be warned of the many sins that are bleeding the cause of the dear Savior to death. Brethren, it is our duty to carry out this command and protect the flock from the cunning devices of Satan, that none be taken captive by him to eternal ruin. And if we do not warn them, their blood will be on our heads. Why should one feel hurt or feel angry at one who points out to any one a pitfall, a chasm that will engulf him in eternal ruin if he goes that way? I always feel thankful to any one that has so much concern for me that he will seek to warn me of any danger, temporal or spiritual. And I believe that all who are really trying to live as the Bible directs will appreciate any effort put forth to keep him in the narrow way that leadeth unto life, and that he may shun the broad way to destruction. Gal. 6:7 and 8 says they that "sow to the Spirit" shall "reap life everlasting." While those that "sow

to the flesh" shall "reap corruption." And he tells us what the "works of the flesh" are. Brother and sister, let us "watch" our "step" lest we fall, for how "great" is the fall. (Matt. 7). Submitted in love of the truth and souls.

H. E. Cavin, Lorenzo, Texas.

EXPERIENCE

I have held eleven oral debates on The Cup Question, five of them with preachers who claim to be loyal to the Book, and who oppose the Sunday School. In all my debates I have never asked any man to affirm anything he does not teach and practice, and I have never refused to sign a proposition that states in words my teaching and practice. I teach that one cup should be used to drink out of in observing the Communion, and I am willing to affirm this any time with any man in oral debate.

Now, preachers and congregations that teach and practice the use of more than one cup to drink out of in observing the Communion, the way is open for your practice and teaching to be tried out by the Book. People can get what I teach and practice from the Bible; but the weak and evasive things put up for the cups show that this practice is not in the Bible. They all run from the proposition they sign. A big debater at the Waco debate said he was in the work to stay, so if the cups brethren really believe they teach and practice the truth on this question as it is revealed in the Bible, just turn him loose, and let us see that the people get the truth of God. We are ready. "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves." (2 Cor. 13:5)

Bob Musgrave, Elk City, Okla.

Musgrave-Dennis Debate

This debate was held at Waco, Texas, July 19, 20, 21, 22, on the Cup question, Bro. Musgrave affirming for one drinking cup in the Communion and Dennis, of Union City, Ga., affirming for more than one. The debate was well attended, and we are thoroughly satisfied with Bro. Musgrave's defense of our teaching and practice. Dennis evaded his proposition from first to last, and Bro. Musgrave did not fail to expose his pretense, and foolishness, and sophistry. Dennis could not possibly "Speak where the Bible speaks" for the teaching and practice of more than one drinking cup in the Communion, and it was in the face of the silence of the Bible that he made any effort at sustaining his proposition by bald assertion and what he called inference, such as would prove baby sprinkling. And all could see the contrast, for when Musgrave took up his proposition, he showed that every passage bearing on the teaching in regard to the Communion said "cup," and not cups, to drink out of.—J.

THE TRUTH FUND

A. J. Bond	1.00
Tom E. Smith	2.00
W. J. Harris	1.00

For all kinds of good printing at a reasonable price, write Laycook Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper, Sneads, Florida
J. D. Phillips, Montebello, California
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - \$1.00

LATCOOK, JACKSON, TCHN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips

THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK

Sometime ago, I called your attention to the curious "Concordant Version" of the N. T., in which the Greek phrase *mia ton sabbaton*, the usual phrase for "the first day of the week" in English, is rendered "one of the sabbaths." This absurd translation has partially "overthrown the faith of some" on the matter of the Lord's day; and some, thinking "one of the sabbaths" the correct rendition, are about ready to turn Adventist and keep the Jewish Sabbath.

To the novice in Greek, *mia sabbaton* is a puzzler. Its literal meaning is "one of the sabbaths." But *mia*, 'one,' is feminine gender, dative case; and *sabbaton* is neuter gender, genitive case. It cannot mean "one of the (Jewish) sabbaths" because of the differences in case and gender. Moreover, *mia*, "one," is feminine, and, according to Greek grammar, a feminine noun must be supplied to make the sense complete. *Sabbaton*, 'sabbath,' cannot be supplied here, for it does not agree with *mia*, 'one,' in either gender or case. "One (sabbath) of the sabbath" would be sound without sense. *Hemera*, 'day,' is feminine, and fits the case.

Sabbaton, 'sabbath,' means, not only sabbath but, also week. Mark 16:1-3 shows that the Jewish sabbath was past, and hence we are forced to the conclusion that the second use of *Sabbaton* here is for week. Hence, we have day one of the week as the meaning. It cannot be otherwise.

In Hebrew, the days of the week run from one to seven without name. And as for the usage, *mia sabbaton*, we have an almost perfect analogy in the Rabbinical mode of designating the days of the week. We shall transliterate the Hebrew, thus:

(1) First day of the week. Sunday: A-Ch-D B'Sh-B-Th (First (one) of the Sabbath). (2) Second day of the week, Monday: Sh-G-I B'Sh-B-Th (Second (two) of the Sabbath). (3) Third day of the week, Tuesday: Sh-L-I-Sh-I B'Sh-B-Th (Third (three) of the Sabbath). The prefix (B') indicates possession in each case beginning the word. (See Meyer's Commentary).

The Greek idioms are borrowed from the Hebrew. While the words are Greek, the thoughts are Hebrew. In Greek, *Sabbaton* means (first) the Seventh day of the week, Saturday; then Week, of seven days. The numerals *Mia*, 'one,' *deutera*, 'two,' *trite*, 'three,' *telarta*, 'four,' *pempte*, 'five,' *ekate*, 'six,' are placed before *Sabbaton* to indicate the day of the seven day week. The full expression would be *Hemera (day) mia (one) Sabbaton (of the seven day week)*.

Hence, in Mt. 28:1, Mk. 16:1-3, Mk. 16:9 (where *prote* (first) *sabbaton* (of the week) is used), Jno. 20:1, 19, Ac. 20:7, 1 Cor. 16:2, the correct rendition is "on the first day of the week." So the so-called "Concordant Version" is "weighed in the balance" of divine truth "and found wanting." We sincerely hope and pray that its editor will see his mistake and correct it and thus quit leading the saints away from the truth.

* * * *

Is "Sunday" of Heathen Origin?

Adventists, and other Sabbatarians, have much to say about the word "Sunday" having a heathen origin. They think this a sure indication that "Sunday keeping is a 'mark of the beast' (Rev. 13)." No one denies that the name "Sunday" is of heathen origin. But did it ever enter the minds of Adventists that "Saturday" is of heathen origin, too? It is, and so is the name of the other days of the week.

Sunday has always been repeated every seven days, and has always been ruled by (scientifically associated with) the Sun; Monday is Moonday; Tuesday is ruled by Mars (note the French *Mardi*); Wednesday by Mercury (French *Mercredi*); Thursday by Jupiter (French *Jeudi*); Friday by Venus (French *Vendredi*); and Saturday is Saturn-day.

Thus we see that all the days of the week are of heathen origin, and if the keeping of one makes it "a mark of the beast," so does the keeping of any other day, Saturday included. One of the Ante-Nicene Fathers said to a Sabbatizer: "Our Sunday is as good as your Saturn-day."

Do You Appreciate "The Truth"?

Do you realize that the editors donate all their work, as well as some money, to keep it going? And do you realize the fact that they do this for your benefit? And that it is your duty to help us over the hard times? The load is a heavy one. If our readers, who appreciate what has been done through the paper, could only realize the pressing need of subscriptions and donations to help us pull through the present depression, I am sure they would do more for the paper. It is our only hope for a paper that will stand firm for truth in a time of drift from the Apostolic pattern. So support it to the extent of your ability, brethren.

* * * *

The King James Version

Since we have used such translations as that of Goodspeed, Wilson, Knoch, et al, in our controversy with the advocates and apologists for the use of cups in the Communion, some seem to think this a sure indication that the King-James-Version is against us. But this is not the case. Any

one that knows the first principles of English grammar knows that the King James Version is on our side of this question. "The cup" and the pronoun "it" connoting "cup" just anteceding (See the King James Version on Mt. 26:27) cannot be made to mean anything but one cup. We use other translations, and the Greek texts, on this as on other matters, for "in the multitude of counsel there is wisdom."

BE SURE TO READ THIS

Brethren, our paper, "The Truth," needs your support now as never before. We now owe the printers about \$35.00, having fallen behind a little on the issues for June, July and August.

All religious papers are now in need of support. Some old papers are missing an issue now and then in order to keep going. A few have ceased publication.

"The Truth" is a young paper. Its mission is to aid in the work of restoring primitive Christianity. It is the only paper published that contends for a "Thus saith the Lord" for every item of doctrine and practice. If it should die, we would be near our row's end.

The enemies of truth and righteousness have done all they can against "The Truth" and its editors and correspondents. They have peddled all sorts of falsehoods against us, and especially against Bro. Harper. They have tried to starve us from the field, and while they have made it hard on us, they have signally failed in their fiendish undertaking. We have paid but little attention to their slanderous reports, knowing that God shall bring all things into judgment, and all liars shall be cast into the lake of fire. Now, the light is breaking. Many brethren who were once deceived by them have witnessed their gradual apostasy, and are now standing with us for truth and righteousness.

But times are so hard that no one has much money. We suggest, therefore, that each send a small donation, say \$1.00, or \$2.00, to help us over the gulf. The load is, indeed, a heavy one. If you could be made to realize what the donation of a dollar now and then means to the paper at this critical period of its work, we are sure that you would send one in your next mail. And in the meantime work for subscriptions. Send to H. C. Harper, Sneads, Florida.

Yours in His blessed service,

Homer L. King.

J. D. Phillips.

FROM THE FIELD

J. M. Foust, Mountain View, Okla.—Send me your paper. I thought the A. W. was enough, but have decided after reading yours and Cowan's debate to take your paper.

John Hallums, Lurton, Ark.—W. S. Tucker, Materialist, has challenged Bro. Walter W. Leamons for a discussion. It will take place at Deer, Ark., beginning night of August 29th. No brethren at Deer. If Bro. Leamons receives support in a fi-

nancial way, it will have to come from elsewhere. Send to him, care Postmaster, Deer, Ark.

WHO WILL HELP?

We have lacked a small amount of meeting the printer's bill on the last three issues, amounting in all to \$29.38, and if brethren will each send us a small donation to cover this amount, we shall be glad to acknowledge the amount sent in each case. Please don't neglect this, brethren.—H. C. Harper.

W. H. Reynolds, Kinston, Ala.—It is said that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country." Some preachers try to excuse themselves by this saying without even making a trial of themselves to see whether they be without honor or not. I believe that the Savior was honored by some, at least, in his own country, and if we would put forth the effort that we should, we can accomplish more than we think. After the brethren of my home church concluded that they were not able to send for "the big preacher" I told them that if they would co-operate with me and advertise the meeting and attend themselves that I would hold their meeting. To this they consented. We begin Saturday night before the fourth Lord's day in June, closing first Sunday in July. The results were five baptized and one confessed his faults. We had large attendance and received more commendations of my preaching than anywhere that I have ever held meetings. I do not speak of this boastfully but to show what can be done if we only put forth the proper effort. To the Lord be all the praise.

J. S. Power, Freeport, Fla.—I left my Kentucky home late last January and came to Freeport, Florida, and held my first meeting in this vicinity. Baptized a lady seventy-four years old, who came from the Methodists. Second meeting was at Pleasant Valley, near Ponce de Leon, Fla., with one from the Methodists. My third meeting of fourteen days was at Ferry Pass, seven miles out from Pensacola, with four baptized, one fifty years old coming from the Catholics. And in all I taught three classes in vocal music. I have visited several congregations of the church of Christ and formed the acquaintance of several preaching brethren. I have fallen in love with Florida, and while I am leaving now, August 6, I hope to return in October to make my home here. I am ready to do all the work that I have the ability to do. Brotherly.

E. H. Cavin, Lorenzo, Texas.—Bro. J. P. Drain of Oklahoma, helped us in a ten days' meeting here in June. He was true to the Bible, and we had a good meeting.

O. C. Mathews, Healdton, Okla.—We had a good meeting with fifteen additions to the one Body. Bro. Homer L. King did a lot of good, clear gospel preaching. We got him for our meeting next year. The Healdton church is still doing mission work, this time at Reck, about nine miles south of us, Brothers Bray, Landon, and Smith doing the preaching to good crowds. Two baptized to date

and one restored. Bro. J. D. Phillips is here now waiting with Bro. King for Bro. T. F. Thomasson to go on, Bro. Phillips to Greenup, Ill., where he will hold a meeting and Bro. Thomasson to Mo., to hold a meeting at Phillipsburg.

J. E. Whigham, Kinston, Ala.—We had a good meeting at Lowery church, beginning July 19th with Brother Harper doing the preaching. Two were baptized and one restored to the fellowship. This is where Bro. Harper met Grider, of Troy, Ala., on the Sunday School last June. This church stands strictly for the Bible teaching in all things. We take neither the Sunday School nor the cups innovation on the New Testament order, and we stand ready to defend our faith and practice. Bro. Harper has also closed a good meeting at Esto, Fla., not far from here.

D. F. Watson, Broken Bow, Okla.—Closed at Cabaniss, July 13, at the water's edge with five baptisms and three restored to their first love. Preached at home Thursday and Friday nights and one lady made the good confession and was baptized. Began on the 18th of July at Spring's Chapel, near Hugo, Okla., embracing two Lord's days, resulting in eight baptisms; but had to close too soon on account of sickness of our baby, so have arranged to return there the latter part of Sept. Began at Loco, Okla., the first Sat. in August. Best wishes for The Truth and love to all the faithful.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.—Bros. Walter Bray and E. L. Landon and I began a mission meeting at Reck, Okla., July 18th and closed Aug. 2nd with seven baptisms and two reclaimed. The Healdton, Okla., church helped in this meeting, and we appreciated their liberal assistance. We had good attendance all the time. We had with us during the meeting, Bros. J. D. Phillips, T. F. Thomasson, and Bob Musgrave. We expected Bro. Homer L. King to be with us, but on account of sickness he was not able. These able brethren preached while with us, and this was much enjoyed by all. Our next meeting will be at Zanie's consolidated schoolhouse four miles south and one mile and a half west of Healdton. We expect to establish a congregation at Reck. We three are doing all the mission work we can and the Healdton church is assisting us. Our work will be reported in "The Truth." Let us "Preach the word." The time is short, for "the night cometh."

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., July 14th, 1931.—I closed a series of meetings at Healdton, Okla., the 5th inst., embracing four Lord's days. Bro. Tom E. Smith, of Healdton, preached the first three days of the meeting, the writer being delayed that long. Considering the great number that heard the gospel in this meeting, I consider it one of the best it has ever been my privilege to conduct. The crowds and interest were fine throughout. Some estimated the crowds at five hundred or more at times, and although the S. S. folks began a meeting a few blocks away, running the last week of our meeting, the interest and

crowds at our meeting seemed not to be affected by it. Some of their members continued to attend our services in spite of their meeting. We look for some of the honest hearted ones to take their stand for the truth ere long. Nine were baptized and six restored. To God be all the praise, glory and honor.

It was a pleasure to be associated with the good brethren at Healdton again. Healdton is the home of the beloved preaching brethren, Tom Smith, Walter Bray and Landon—brethren who are satisfied with the Bible way of worshipping God. We were pleased to have Bro. J. D. Phillips, of Montebello, Calif., with us for more than a week, who assisted much in the meeting. Also Brethren W. J. Harris, Stewart, Paterson and Doss. They asked me to return next year, beginning the second Lord's day in June.

Here are five subs. for The Truth. Let us push the work.

Elders W. J. West and W. A. Watkins, McAlester, Okla.—Brother D. F. (Dave) Watson of Broken Bow, Okla., began a meeting at Cabaniss, Okla., June 27 and continued two weeks. Five were baptized and three restored. We all feel as if a lot of unseen good had been accomplished. Bro. Watson is loyal to the truth, and any one needing a meeting will make no mistake by calling him.

T. F. Thomasson, Lake Arthur, N. Mex., Aug. 6.—I closed a very interesting meeting at my home (Lake Arthur, N. M.) the second Lord's day in July. While there were no visible results, the attendance and interest were fine. The brethren meet, at present, in the Presbyterian house.

I began a meeting at Mickey, Texas, with the few faithful there, the third Lord's day in July, and continued over the fourth Lord's day. We had one baptism and three restorations. The brethren considered it a very great success. The Church divided several months ago, and those who wanted to stay with "that which is written" (1 Cor. 4:6) were driven out, as is the usual case.

I went from Mickey to Healdton, Okla., to meet Bro. J. D. Phillips, who was ready to leave in his car for Greenup, Illinois, for a meeting with the faithful; and found Bro. Phillips assisting Brethren T. E. Smith, E. L. Landon and Walter Bray, of the Healdton Church, in a very interesting and successful mission meeting at a nearby place called "Reck." They had announced that I would preach on Tuesday night, and I gladly embraced the opportunity, and it was much appreciated by the brethren. I met all the leading brethren of the Healdton Church, and was made to rejoice over the great work they are doing.

Bro. Phillips and I left Healdton Wednesday morning, and spent the night in the good home of Bro. Russell, at Springdale, Ark. We arrived at Lees Summit, near Lebanon, Mo., the next day, and found Bro. King at home. Bro. Homer A. Gay, of Eola, Texas, was here in a meeting. He preached on until the first day of August, when I took charge of the work. Bro. Phillips preached on Sunday afternoon. Bro. Gay left us August

5th, for his meetings at Harrodsburg and Unionville, Indiana. Bro. King will leave tonight for some meetings in Texas, and Bro. Phillips will leave tomorrow for a meeting in Illinois. He will hold meetings in Indiana, Ky., W. Va., and a long debate with a "Church of God" man in Pa.

I shall continue the meeting at Lees Summit, hoping, working, and praying for much and lasting good to be done in the name of the Lord. I have certainly enjoyed my association with Brethren Gay, King, Phillips, Robertson and Lee—all loyal gospel preachers. My association with them has convinced me that a half dozen preachers who are satisfied with just what the Lord says can preach together and "be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10).

J. D. Phillips, 252 S. 5th St., Montebello, Calif., Aug. 7.—I am now with Bro. King and Bro. Thomason in Bro. Thomason's meeting at Lees Summit, between Lebanon and Phillipsburg, Mo. Bro. Homer A. Gay was with us a few days, but left yesterday for Indiana. I leave tomorrow for Greenup, Illinois, where I have labored a great deal in the past, for a meeting with the faithful ones left.

I enjoyed the associations with the preachers in Mo. One of the saddest things for a preacher is to say "Good-bye" to other faithful preachers. But, if we continue faithful here, we shall win the "crown of life" at the end of the race (2 Tim. 2:1-4), and there shall be no more partings! For, as the poet well says, "In the sweet by-and-by, We shall meet over there, Where the trials of time come no more, And forever shall dwell in the dear Savior's care, On that bright blissful evergreen shore."

We wished for Bro. Harper and other faithful brethren to be with us. My meeting at Sentinel, Okla., where the Phillips-Johnson debate was held two years ago, closed the third Sunday in July. Only one addition. Brethren, let us push the fight against sin of every description. The Lord will soon come to reckon with us, and all sinners shall be cast into the lake of fire. (Rev. 20).

Thomas Shaw, Commodore, Pa.—We are looking forward with much interest to Bro. J. D. Phillips' visit with us. We have been challenged to put up a man to meet Mr. Rupert, of the "church of God," in debate, and as Bro. H. C. Harper says Bro. Phillips "will do the job in good shape," he is the man we have selected. We hope to have an interesting and successful meeting, and an honest, dignified discussion, with a view to learning the truth on the subjects discussed.

Maye Mullen, Ottumwa, Iowa.—Bro. R. L. Ludlam is here, and he and Bro. Burley F. Black are making many calls, both in, and out of, the city, encouraging the brethren and sisters to remain faithful.

B. S. Matheny, Greenup, Illinois.—Bro. J. D. Phillips will begin a meeting for us at Antioch Church the second Sunday in June. We hope to

have a good meeting. He has been with us before, and we are anxious to have him with us again.

D. F. Nichols, 3207 Garnett, Los Angeles, Calif.—We are doing fine with the Church work at 3535 Siskiyou street. A Bro. Batey, of Okla., a very useful man, has located with us, and has put in a store near Graham. While he says he is no preacher, he talks for us each Sunday night, and is doing us good. We now have good crowds both Sunday morning and Sunday night.

A. L. Thomason, 10541 San Carlos, South Gate, Calif.—We are getting along fine at So. Gate. Our place of meeting is 3314 Post street, near the main business section of the city.

L. I. Gibbs, 7735 Whitsett, Los Angeles, Calif.—Bro. Sam L. Shultz, of Loco, Okla., recently held a meeting at Long Beach. The brethren at Montebello are doing nicely, though the attendance is sometimes small.

John Rankin, Maricopa, Calif.—The ladies' aid society that was started here several months ago has died out, and we are glad of it. The Church is now getting along nicely. We usually have good crowds.

B. M. Massengale, 1515 Belnap, Ft. Worth, Texas.—We now use one cup in the Communion, and many of us consider it one step toward Jerusalem. However, a few oppose the use of one cup, not because of any teaching of the Scriptures, but because they like the old custom better.

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo., Aug. 6.—Closed a series of meetings with the Ramsy Congregation, near DeLeon, Tex., July 26th, embracing two Lord's days. The meetings were well attended, and we had the very best attention, but no visible results. This was my third effort with these good brethren, and I enjoyed the work very much.

By the time this reaches the readers, I shall have assisted in two meetings, near Troy, Texas. I anticipate a very profitable visit to this field. This will be my first effort in that section of the country, but our beloved Bro. Homer A. Gay has labored much there, and it is a pleasure to follow such loyal and faithful men.

Brethren, let us have a few words from you for the paper, in the form of reports and announcements. It is always interesting and encouraging to learn of the work in other fields. If there is any one thing that is read by all the readers, it is reports. I think it would be fine to have a report from all preachers (loyal) and from the congregations, at least once a month. So, come on, brethren, let us know what you are doing.

Louie Gibbs, Los Angeles, Calif., July 31.—Just received "The Truth." I wish there were more field reports in it. The crowds and interest at the Church at 3535 Siskiyou Street are getting better all the time. I understand that there is to be a new preacher at Montebello next Lord's day.

Note:—Many have suggested that we carry more Field Reports. The brethren have been very negligent about sending them in. We would like for each preacher and each congregation to make a monthly report of their work. This will create more interest in the work.—Ed.

Paul Hays, R. 4, Box 15, Fresno, Calif.—Here is a dollar for my renewal to "The Truth." I liked Bro. Hawley's article in the August issue. Attendance at meetings here is good. I baptized one recently and expect to baptize another one soon. I have been very poorly of late. Love, and best wishes.

COMMUNION

The manner of dividing the contents of the cup is the real issue. Jesus said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me," and "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me." Mt. 25:40, 45. Again: Jesus said, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me," Acts 9:4, when Saul was persecuting the followers of Christ. Here we learn that whatever is done or not done to a follower of Christ is done or not done to Christ himself.

I am told that if I allow only one cup to be used, all the followers of Christ in Jerusalem could not be served. I do not know of any one cup advocate that so contends. It is my opinion a cup to about each hundred members was used. (Proof of this will appear later.) Each assembly divided the contents of their memorial cup with each other (communing), and according to Mt. 25:40 Christ looks upon such manner of dividing with him; and he pronounces a blessing; while with the use of cups they do not divide the contents of the memorial cup with each other, because some one divides it for them. And according to Mt. 25:45 Christ looks upon such manner of dividing it as not dividing it with him, and he pronounces a curse, Mt. 25:46, for they drink of cups and not of cup as in I Cor. 11:28.

From the foregoing it is clear that it is the manner of dividing the contents of the memorial cup that is the real issue; and not the cup—what it is.

But I am told that if I divide the disciples for communion, I am like the S. S. people dividing for teaching. Let us see. We read: "Howbeit many of them which heard the word believed; and the number of the men was about five thousand." Acts 4:4. Jesus fed five thousand men, Mk. 6:44, to demonstrate his power over material things and thus prove to the people he was the Messiah. But why did he command them to be seated in assemblies instead of forming a line and hand each one his portion, and thus saving his disciples so much walking. Brother, this is a divine lesson for us. "And they continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread (communing) from house to house, did eat their meat (food) with gladness and singleness of heart." Acts 2:46. Here the Holy Spirit, in keeping with the example of Jesus, was directing the apostles how to have the disciples, at least 8000 in Jerusalem, to commune. This is not my way: it is the Lord's.

I am told that where we are not divinely directed how to obey a command, we are at liberty to select a way. But the Lord has directed here. But the Lord has directed here. But I am asked, "Where are we told how to distribute the contents of the cup?" Notice: They are to do the dividing. Lk. 22:17. "And they all drank of (from or out of) it." Mk. 14:23. "It" — what? The "cup," I Cor. 11:28,—"drink of (from or out of) the cup." And this is just what they were commanded in "Drink ye all of (from or out of) it." Mt. 26:27. And when God has spoken, let puny man keep silence.

But I am told, "It makes no difference whether it is poured into two or more cups." And some tell me, "It makes no difference whether we sprinkle or dip."

The name of the vessel in Mt. 26:27; Mk. 14:23, and I Cor. 11:27 is "cup." And all drank of (from or out of) "it," which stands for "cup," and not from them, as cups would be. This is plain enough for those who want God's way, and nothing would do anybody else any good.

The cups challenge the divinity of Christ. There is no excuse for them on account of numbers, and those who take them on account of cleanliness or sanitation thereby degrade the Son of God.

Listen, all of you: The man who enlists in the army affirms he will obey all orders of his superior. And this he does for the few dollars he gets. How much more should we be willing to obey the Captain of our salvation? It did Israel no good to be "baptized into Moses" (I Cor. 10:2) when they failed to obey him thereafter and perished in the wilderness. To be "baptized into Christ" (Col. 2:12; Gal. 3:27) will avail us nothing unless we keep the faith, as Paul did. G. W. Pasley.

When the sixteenth century reformers threw off the heavy yoke imposed by the apostasy, they stopped short of restoring the form of the primitive Church. The result has been a large crop of communions more or less out of fellowship and accord. A divided Protestantism is the greatest handicap in the religious world. It is so recognized by a growing number of Christians.

The remedy for this tragic conditions appears obvious. The Church divinely-established in the beginning must be fully restored! No human institution can perfectly re-unite people of God and execute His program for salvation of the world. The perfect model shaped by the Holy Spirit in the first century should be prayerfully studied anew and completely restored in form, ordinances and doctrine. It appears to this magazine as the one solution of the religious problem the great apostasy now presents.

The political problem has received far more attention in these columns. For centuries the Papacy has played the role in international struggles. It boasts an intelligent freedom. It vindicates its authority by positive law supported by sanctions of physical force. It outlaws civil and religious liberty in which modern democratic government is rooted. It is alien to every land its hierarchy and subjects inhabit! Disfranchisement is the only remedy adequate to this intolerable wrong.
—The Protestant.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, OCTOBER 1, 1931

No. 11

DISCUSSION ON THE KINGDOM

Proposition: The Kingdom of Christ has been established, and this is the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44. H. C. Harper affirms; D. D. Lunsford denies.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

The proposition was worded: "The kingdom of Christ has been established." But the brother said he would affirm this himself; so the issue is whether this kingdom of Christ is the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44.

In Dan. 32 to 45 four universal kingdoms are mentioned to arise in succession. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." (v. 44) This kingdom, represented by a "stone" that smote the image of gold, silver, brass, iron and clay, representing four universal kingdoms, became a great mountain, while the image became as chaff that disappeared.

The Babylonian kingdom is identified as "this head of gold." Then follow the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman, as historically of the same type—universal kingdoms.

The "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" has long since been written. And the Caesars had no sooner mounted the throne of this kingdom than it was announced by the "harbinger," John, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt. 3:2) And "wise men" came from the East, saying, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" And "they saw the young child with Mary, his mother, and fell down and worshiped him." (Matt. 2:1-XI) And when Peter confessed him as "the Christ, the Son of the living God," Christ, to whom was given all authority "in heaven and on earth," said, "And 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 he commissioned them to "disciple all the nations." (Matt. 28:19) "And they went forth and preached everywhere." (Mk. 16:20) And so the kingdom increased from a "stone" to a "great mountain," as multitudes were "delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son." (Col. 1:13)

In the image, from the head to the breast was the Babylonian kingdom; from the breast to the belly, the Medo-Persian; from the belly to the legs, the Grecian; from the legs to the end, the Roman. And when the Roman kingdom came up, the stone smote the image, and the conflict began, for "these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another King, Jesus." (Acts 17:7)

"This" is the singular of "these," so "these kings" are headed by "this," king of Babylon, making Nebuchadnezzar head the list of "these kings." Each one of these four universal kingdoms absorbed the one preceding it, so that when

the Roman went down, all went down with it. The Roman has gone down, therefore the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44 has been established.

1. In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom. (Dan. 2:44) 2. The days of these kings has passed. 3. Therefore, the God of heaven has set up the kingdom of Dan. 2:44. H. C. Harper.

FIRST NEGATIVE

Prop.: The Kingdom of Christ has been established, and this is the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44.

I agree with Bro. Harper that the kingdom has been established; but deny that it is the one spoken of in Dan. 2:44. As you will notice that Bro. Harper (and I also agree) that at the time Christ came the Roman empire had just gained universal power thereby making the stone smite the image on the top of the legs instead of the feet.

We will see what this image is composed of as Daniel records it, 2:32, 33. This image's head was of fine gold (Babylonian kingdom), his breast and his arms of silver (Medo-Persian), his belly and his thighs of brass (Grecian), his legs of iron (Roman), his feet part of iron and part of clay (What kingdom?) You tell us, Bro. Harper. I assume that you have Gibbon's work of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Dan. 2:41 says the kingdom shall be divided—not the gold, silver, brass, or iron; but in the iron and clay mixed which is the feet and toes and that is where the stone was to smite the image, not up in the legs as it would of had to of done if the kingdom set up on the day of Pentecost was the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44.

After the "stone" smote the image on its feet, Dan. 2:35, then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them. The Roman empire was not completely divided until 1435 A. D. The Roman kingdom was divided into ten kingdoms, and they are still here and will be till the stone will smite them; and the ten kingdoms are the iron and clay of the image. The word smite in Dan. 2:34 means to destroy, to break in pieces, or in other words to kill them, Luke 9:56. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. Now, Bro. Harper, if you can destroy and break in pieces a nation and not kill them, you tell us just how you would do it. When the stone smote the image upon its feet, the image was destroyed and done away with. What kingdom was destroyed and done away with. What kingdom was destroyed when Christ was here? You be sure and tell us, Bro. Harper, in your next aff. We know it was not the Roman kingdom; that never went down till 1435 A. D. And that was not done by the church. As Bro. Harper said

in the beginning, I will affirm that the kingdom of Christ has been established, so the reference of Matt. 3:2 where John says, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand, has reference to the church or spiritual kingdom, also Matt. 16:13-19. Peter bound on earth the plan how to get into the kingdom or church on the day of Pentecost, Acts 2:38. Bro. Harper says that the kingdom increased from a stone to a great mountain. Read the 2d and 3d chapters of Rev. then you will know if Bro. Harper is right. We are delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son, Col. 1:13. We are delivered from a spiritual darkness into a spiritual kingdom. The kingdoms spoken of in Dan. 2d ch. were literal. Acts 17:5 tells us who said that Paul and Silas were teaching that there was another king, one Jesus. Christ never said that he was king of the Jews. Bro. Harper compare Dan. 2:44 with 7:13, 14 in your next aff.

D. D. Lunsford.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

The legs, feet and toes represented "the fourth kingdom." And the "stone" in striking any place in this compass, strikes the kingdom; and since the Roman kingdom had absorbed the preceding three, the "image" of four (and only four) universal kingdoms was smitten. A force (the truth) stronger than "arms" was launched against the image, before which it was disintegrated and finally it disappeared, becoming as chaff as the stone became a great mountain. And if it did not strike the Roman kingdom before it fell in 476 (See Gibbon), it did not strike the image at all.

In Dan. 7:19-24, when contemplating the rise of the Papal kingdom at a later period, ten kingdoms are mentioned among whom the Papal kingdom arises, but not in Dan. 2. Here since "the feet and toes" were "part of clay and part of iron, this signifies but two parts when "divided," and that of quality—"partly strong and partly broken," the "iron" representing the strength, and the "clay" representing the weakness. "So the kingdom (not kingdoms) shall be partly strong and partly broken." (V. 42) "But there shall be in it of the strength of the iron." (V. 41) This is the way kingdom is "divided." And the cause is given: "And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay." (V. 43) "It" ("the fourth kingdom) is not all iron; but "there shall be in it of the strength of the iron." The Book says so.

Smite means to strike; and there is no weapon more powerful than "the truth," the "gospel," which is the "power of God" (Rom. 1:16), which was preached to "every creature under heaven." (Mk. 16:16-20; Col. 1:23) Men ceased to worship the Emperors. Men ceased to honor the gods of the nation. Men beat their spears into pruning hooks; swords were moulded into plowshares. The truth of the Gospel invaded even the royal palace. "Might makes right" of the kingdom of the Caesars was supplanted by "the golden rule."

The kingdom of Christ is a literal kingdom, and

we are "fellowcitizens" (Eph. 2:19), "a holy nation." (I Pet. 2:9)

Jesus asserts before Pilate (Jno. 18:37) that he is a King. This is the import of his answer. And if "The kingdom of Christ has been established," as the negative admits, Christ has been crowned (Heb. 2:9; Heb. 1:8; Acts 2:30) and has "all authority in heaven and on earth." (Matt. 28:18)

No ten kingdoms now occupy the territory of the Roman Empire.

"This" (Dan. 2:38) is the singular of "these" (V. 44), making Nebuchednezzar head the list of "these" kings of Dan. 2:44, and since "these kings" have come and gone, the kingdom of Dan. 2:44 has been set up. And since the kingdom of Christ has been set up, as the negative admits, this kingdom of Christ is the kingdom of Dan. 2:44, as I affirm.

The stone struck the Roman Empire, which under the influence of Christianity gradually sank until 476 A. D., when it fell. (Gibbon) But before it went down, "the God of heaven" set up a kingdom, "the kingdom of His dear Son" (Col. 1:13), and this verifies my proposition.

It was when considering the rise of the kingdom of the Papacy at a later date that ten kingdoms are mentioned in Dan. 7:24, being represented by "ten horns" among which another (the Papacy) arose. And three kingdoms were plucked up by the roots. Are they still here? No.

SECOND NEGATIVE

The legs of the image were of iron and were a representation of the fourth kingdom. Bro. Harper says that the stone striking any place in the compass strikes the kingdom. V. 34: Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet (not his legs) that were of iron and clay and break them to pieces. If the kingdom that was set up on the day of Pentecost was the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44, the stone did not strike the image on the feet but up in the legs. The stone smote the image upon the feet, which were of iron and clay, or after the kingdom was divided, V. 41. And the first division was not till 364 A. D. I asked Bro. Harper to compare Dan. 2:44 with Dan. 7:13, 14 and he failed to do so through an oversight I hope.

Dan. 7:14: And there was given him (Christ) dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him. Where is this kingdom to be at that God gave to his Son? And don't forget this is to be after the Roman kingdom is divided into ten kingdoms. And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom. You will notice that Daniel said in the days of these kings, not this king. He knew where the stone was to smite the image at and he knew there would be kings, not king as there was just one king (not kings) when the present kingdom was set up. This image had ten toes. Compare that with the beast that had ten horns in Dan. 7:7 representing ten kingdoms, Dan. 7:24; 2:41. The kingdom shall be divided. He does not say how many times here, but he does in 7:24.

Dan. 2:42: The kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken. We know that Italy, Spain,

France and England are not of the same strength as a whole. They are partly strong and partly broken. They are four of the kingdoms that came out of the Roman Empire.

You are mistaken, Bro. Harper, in the horn that plucked up the three horns, Dan. 7:8, representing Popery. It represented Mahomet. The three kingdoms that he plucked up are Egypt, Asia Minor, and Thrace (or Turkey), and they are all here yet and are ruled from Constantinople.

When you mentioned that men beat their spears into pruning hooks and their swords into plowshares did you have reference to Mica 4:3? That was nations that would do that and not just a few men as it was when Christ was here. You said that the kingdom of the Caesars was supplanted by the golden rule. I thank God that we have not got that kind of a Golden rule here today. You said that the kingdom of Christ is a literal kingdom. We are translated out of spiritual darkness into a literal kingdom, I Pet. 2:9, that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light. We are called out of darkness (a spiritual darkness) into his marvellous light (a spiritual light), hence a spiritual kingdom. Your saying that the kingdom of Christ is a literal kingdom, you admit that the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44 is a literal kingdom. Rev. 3:21: To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne. When did Christ sit on his throne, Acts 2:30?

D. D. Lunsford.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

He says the "legs" represented the fourth kingdom. And he has the "toes" to represent ten kingdoms. The Book does not say it nor teach it. Since he wants to discard Daniel and do the interpreting, let him tell what the "feet" represent. And since the stone struck the "feet," not the "toes," it struck too far off to fit his interpretation of ten kingdoms.

The Book gives but one kingdom from the "thighs" to the end of the image, and has no divisions into kingdoms here at all. The division of "partly strong and partly broken" still leaves "it" a kingdom, "partly strong and partly broken" by reason of "mingling themselves with the seed of men," when they would not "cleave to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay." "King" is used for kingdom (Dan. 2:38, "Thou art this head of gold"—Babylonian kingdom; Dan. 7:17, "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings"—Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome), of which the Babylonian headed the list and the Roman closed it; and all have fallen. And since the days of "these kings" have passed, and we are now, and have been since the Pentecost after the ascension of Christ," translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son" (Col. 1:13), therefore the kingdom of Christ has been established and is the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44. Christ was king when he had this kingdom, being "raised up" from the dead to sit on his throne (Acts 2:30-32)—"for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor" (Heb. 2:9), "made an high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec"

(Heb. 6:20), "king of Salem, priest of the most high God" (Heb. 7:1), for "He shall be a priest upon his throne" (Zech. 6:13), "that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow" (Phil. 2:10), "that all people, nations, and languages should serve him" (Dan. 7:14), "all nations" (Mt. 28:19) "every creature" (Mk. 16:15). "Peace on earth," good will toward men" (Lk. 2:14); "a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom." Heb. 1:8.

Mahomet, in Arabia, came up in the sphere of the Grecian kingdom (Dan. 8:23), while the Pope, who took up three kingdoms "by the roots" (The Vandal, the Ostrogoth, and the Lombard), utterly destroying them, came up in the sphere of Rome (Dan. 7:24). I know of no kingdom of "Asia Minor," and if Mahomet plucked up "Thrace (or Turkey)," when was it? Nothing is now "ruled" from Constantinople. The Vandal kingdom was in Africa, that is, in Roman territory. Spain is not a kingdom. The ten kingdoms which sprung up in the wake of the Roman empire have no existence now.

Spiritual is the antonym of carnal: literal, of figurative. If we are in Christ we are "spiritual," "a spiritual house, to offer up spiritual sacrifices." The kingdom of Christ is literal and spiritual. Christ said, "Put up thy sword." And, "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Others have vainly tried to revive the old image of universal dominion. It is dead and has no resurrection. But the Gospel goes on, claiming universal dominion for Christ,—He is Lord of all. And I thank God for the Golden Rule of Jesus. Let love and truth endure. Let all bow the knee to Jesus as Lord. This is the reign of heaven, His kingdom that is "not of this world" any more than the "stone" was of the "image." He came "to," not from, the Ancient of days for his kingdom, and "one" with the Father, he now has "all authority in heaven and on earth." If he were "on earth" he would not be a priest, or priest upon his throne. Heb. 8:4.

H. C. Harper.

THIRD NEGATIVE

You would sure be glad if I was the only one that said the legs represent the fourth kingdom, but as Dan. 2:40 says the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron so the legs are of iron and represent the fourth kingdom. No, I don't want to disregard Daniel, but you do. You admit that the fourth beast Daniel saw was the fourth kingdom or Roman kingdom in 7th chapter, and the ten horns that came out of the beast are ten kingdoms, and the horn that came up and plucked up three horns was the Pope (I deny that), and you admit that the kingdom was given to the horn that plucked up the three horns for a time and made war with the saints. I know that is what you admit because the Book says so. (Dan. 7:25; Rev. 13:7) Tell us how you are having the kingdom of God established on the day of Pentecost when Daniel says this horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them until the Ancient of Days came and judgment was given to the saints of the most high. Read Dan. 7:27. Now, Bro. Harper, you have got things balled up until you don't know if you are going or coming.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California
Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - - - \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

You say the Pope took up three kingdoms by the roots. What countries occupy the territory now of these three kingdoms? When did the Vandal, the Ostrogoth and the Lombard kingdoms gain their independence from the Roman Empire? 3rd, and when did they lose it to the Pope? I deny the Pope being the horn so answer these questions? I asked you when Christ sat on his throne. You never answered that because you can't and the man does not live who can because Christ is not sitting on his throne, but on the right hand of his Father. (Eph. 1:20; Rev. 3:21; Acts 2:34; Matt. 22:44) So you can see why no man can say that Christ is sitting on a throne now and tell the truth. So away goes your literal kingdom now. It has no king, no throne, and is not here. But don't forget Christ is going to have a throne to sit on, Luke 1:32, 33. The Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Acts 2:30—that God would raise up Christ to sit on his (David's) throne. Some people want to make Christ sitting on David's throne now; but that cannot be as David's throne is not in heaven and never will be; and again Christ is not sitting on any throne now. Jas. 2:5: Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom? The kingdom is not yet, is it, Bro. Harper? Rev. 11:15: The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and every sane person knows it. Any one that picks up a paper sees what Hoover is doing or what King George is doing and knows that Rev. 11:15 has not come to pass yet.

You wanted to know when Mahomet plucked up Thrace (or Turkey). In the month of May 29, 1453 A. D. Bro. Harper, you say nothing now is ruled from Constantinople. Read p. 3, Vol. 7, written by Alexander Van. Millig, Prof. of History, Robt. College, Constantinople. Give the names of all ten kingdoms that came out of the Roman Empire, please ans. D. D. Lunsford.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Yes, Daniel says, "the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron" and he says of this fourth kingdom "there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay." And he says, "As the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the

kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken." And no inspired man says, "The legs represent the fourth kingdom," and those who do say it to bolster up an unscriptural theory contradict inspiration.

The Book plainly tells what is meant by "divided" here, namely, "the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken," due to mingling "themselves with the seed of men." And since "in the days of these kings" or kingdoms the God of heaven set up a kingdom; and since "these kings" of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome have come and gone; and since "the kingdom of God's dear Son" (Col. 1:13) has been established, it is the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44. And "no living man" or dead one either can refute it.

Christ is now Priest. He was to be "a priest upon his throne;" therefore he is now upon his throne. He became king when he was "crowned" (Heb. 2:9). He is now "crowned" (Heb. 2:9; Act. 2:30-32), therefore he is now king. God would raise up Christ to sit on David's throne. (Acts 2:30) Christ is now raised up. (Acts 2:32). Therefore he is now sitting on David's throne.

Christ's kingdom is either literal or figurative; it is not figurative, therefore it is literal. Christ's kingdom is either carnal or spiritual; it is not carnal, therefore it is spiritual.

"The Byzantine Empire fell (1453) to rise no more." (Gen. Hist., p. 407) Was Thrace the Byzantine Empire? Tell us what that Prof. says is now ruled from Constantinople. The ten kingdoms were the Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Vandals, Franks, Huns, Lombards, Burgundians, Heruli, Sueves, Saxons, each of which occupied Roman territory from 356 to 562. (Machiavel) Dan. 7 portrays the four kingdoms of Dan. 2, and gives later developments,—ten kingdoms, the Papacy, etc.

Genseric, leader of the Vandals, "founded an empire at Carthage." (Egypt); "The Ostrogothic kingdom was in Italy" (Moesia); "The whole nation marched down and, in 568, set up a kingdom in Italy,"—See "Lombards." (Gen. Hist.) They were independent.

To sit upon David's throne is to be King after the lineage of David, of Judah.

All carnal kingdoms shall fall. "For He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." (1 Cor. 15:25) And when "death" is destroyed and "immortality" is put on, it is called "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. 1:11; Jas. 2:5) And it is still the kingdom of Christ, God's dear Son, we see. And the negative is not only "balled up" but is estopped.

H. C. Harper.

FOURTH NEGATIVE

Dan. 2:40: The fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron. H. C. Harper says with iron and clay mixed, but Daniel does not until after the kingdom is divided, v. 41. Who is right, Daniel or Harper? Dan. 2:44: And the kingdom shall not be left to other people. The kingdom spoken of in Col. 1:13 was left to other people, Matt. 16:19. The establishment of this kingdom was done by the Apostles and began on the day of Pentecost,

so is not the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44; but it shall, break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms. The kingdom established on the day of Pentecost never broke or consumed one kingdom or was it intended to, Luke 9:56. The kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44 is to break and consume all these kingdoms and there was not but one kingdom here when Christ was here and it was impossible for the kingdom to break in pieces only one which it never did. H. C. Harper will tell us that there was ten kingdoms come out of the Roman Empire afterwards, so it was not destroyed.

It could not have destroyed the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, or Grecian kingdoms because they fell years before A. D. 33. How are you going to patch things up, Harper? H. C. Harper says Christ is sitting on David's throne. Christ says he is not sitting on any throne, Rev. 3:21. Whom do you want to believe? I don't see why the affirmative could or did not tell what Christ was crowned with in Heb. 2:9. He was crowned with glory and honor. That does not even intimate that he was given a throne. Lindenberg was crowned with glory and honor when he flew from N. Y. to Paris, but where is his kingdom? God shall give Christ the throne of his father David, Luke 1:32. The affirmative says to sit upon David's throne is to be king after the lineage of David. If my son would operate a mine in Alaska, he would be operating my mine would he? No, he would not. Neither can Christ be sitting on David's throne, for it was in Jerusalem, not in heaven. Matt. 19:28: When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Isa. 1:26: I will restore thy judges as at the first. Those two promises have not been received yet and won't be until the first resurrection, Rev. 20:4, 5, in order for the Apostles to sit on the thrones. Formerly Thrace was a part of the Byzantine (or Roman) empire, and it was the last part of the Roman empire to fall, which was May 29, 1453. All countries that have the Ottoman form of government are ruled from Constantinople. Bro. Harper, you know that the Franks and the French are the one and same people. Lombards and the Italians are the same, and so are the rest of the ten kingdoms, and they are still here today.

The affirmative admits that Christ is to have another kingdom which is in the future. Now, since the stone did not smite the image on the feet, but on the legs, before the iron became mixed with clay, and the kingdom was left to other people (the Apostles) and there was no kingdom destroyed when Christ was here, and Christ is not sitting on his father David's throne, Luke 1:32, the kingdoms of this world have not become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, Rev. 11:15, so the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44 has not been established since there has not been one single requirement done. When was Dan. 7:13, 14 fulfilled? Yes, the negative is stopped, but when? D. D. Lunsford.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

Harper did not say the fourth kingdom was as strong with the "iron and clay mixed" as the iron alone; but he says with Daniel that after "they mingle themselves with the seed of men," "the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken" And this is the only way it is "divided." And you cannot refute it. And since God set up the kingdom of Dan. 2:44 "in the days of these kings," the kingdom of Col. 1:13 is the kingdom of Dan. 2:44, for no other kingdom did God set up in this time. And my proposition is sustained, namely, "The Kingdom of Christ has been established (admitted), and this is the kingdom of Dan. 2:44 (provided)."

The "stone," representing the kingdom God set up, struck the fourth kingdom, which now embraced the three preceding, and all went down together, for "the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, were broken to pieces together."

Christ is now priest "after the order of Melchisedec," who was "king of righteousness" and "priest of the most high God." (Heb. 6:20; 7:1, 2), But "He shall be a priest upon his throne." (Zech. 6:13) Hence he has a "throne" now and is "crowned" (Heb. 2:9), and wields his scepter." (Heb. 1:8) Crowned-estephanoominon — in fact, which Lindenberg never was. And has his subjects, "fellow-citizens." (Eph. 2:19) This kingdom was not "left to other people." With "all authority in heaven and on earth" (Mt. 28:19), Christ sent forth his Apostles from Jerusalem (Lk. 24; Acts 2), and "they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them." (Mk. 16:20) And he said, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Mt. 28:20) They were Christ's "ambassadors." (2 Cor. 5:20) Christ came "to" not from God for his kingdom (Dan. 7:13 and Ps. 24). If you owned a mine in Alaska, your son might operate your mine there. God is "Lord of heaven and earth." (Acts 17:24)

Neither Mt. 19:23, Isa. 1:26, nor Rev. 20:4, 5 fits your theory of a temporal kingdom on earth, for "if he were on earth, he would not be a priest." (Heb. 8:4) But he is to be "a priest upon his throne." (Zech. 6:13) Therefore, he cannot be a king on earth.

No country is ruled from Constantinople, much less "countries." "Thus, in the year 774, the Lombard kingdom came to an end." (Gen. Hist.) France is not a kingdom. You might as well prevaricate that the Roman Empire is here today as to say of the ten kingdoms, "They are still here today."

The affirmative admitted no such thing. He said when 'death' is destroyed and 'immortality' is put on, it is "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. 1:11; Jas. 2:5) And it is still the kingdom of Christ, God's dear Son, we see. And the negative is not only 'balled up' but is estopped." And so I say again. Dan. 7:13 was fulfilled when Christ ascended. (Acts 1:vs. 24; Heb. 7; Zech. 6:13) And since the "stone" struck the "feet" and not the "toes," it knocked the theory of the negative out, for this is just a little too previous for ten toe-kingdoms of his, not Daniel's, interpretation.

Have you sent in your subscription for The Truth? If not, please let us have it now. H. C. Harper:

"This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay." (Dan. 2:32-34)

"Thou (Nebuchadnezzar) sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." (vs. 34, 35)

"Thou art this head of gold (Babylonian kingdom)" (v. 38) "And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee (Medo-Persian), and another third kingdom of brass (Grecian), which shall bear rule over all the earth." (v. 39) "And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all, shall it break in pieces and bruise. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay." vs. 40-43. (Roman kingdom)

"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." (v. 44)

Of the image we have these four and no more.

H. C. Harper.

FIFTH NEGATIVE

Harper says that I misrepresented him in his fifth affirmative. He has said time and again that the iron and iron and clay mixed represent the Roman kingdom. Turn back to the first two paragraphs of the fourth negative, and see what I said. Daniel does not say what Harper claims and it hurts. The affirmative says that "after they mingle themselves with the seed of men the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken." Daniel used those same words, but not in this form, hence you are changing the meaning and you know it. The stone struck the image on its feet. The first division was A. D. 364, and two parts east and west. Would that make the legs of the image? Yes, as the arms represent the Medians and Persians. The end of these two kingdoms would be the feet then the toes. The toes was there when the stone struck. There was no legs to the image division of the Roman empire when the kingdom of Col. 1:13 was set up. Harper has a legless image. Daniel had a complete one. Harper says Dan. 7:13 was fulfilled when Christ ascended. In his second affirmative he

says, "Dan. 7:19-24 at a later period when contemplating the power of the Papal kingdom the ten kingdoms are mentioned." The Son of man that came to the Ancient of days (Dan. 7:13) was not until after the three kingdoms were subdued by the horn which the affirmative says was Popery, and it was not thought of when Christ was here. You are wrong in your 2d or 5th affirmative as you have crossed yourself. Which is it?

Zech. 6:13 is for me, not you, as I have given abundance of evidence to prove that Christ is not sitting on a throne. Heb. 8:1, An high priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens. You use Heb. 8:4 to disprove this. Christ could not of been a priest on earth as he was not of the seed of Levi, and he had to go back to the Father to be glorified in order to complete the redemption of man, so Heb. 8:4 does you no good. You say Matt. 19:28; Jas. 1:26 and Rev. 20:4, 5 fits my theory (notice he says "theory") of a temporal kingdom. That is merely your assertion. You have not given one single passage of Scripture to prove my theory (as you call it) is false.

You have made plenty of assertions, as I thought you would, but there is not a man on earth who can give a single reference to disprove my position, because it is not in God's word. Harper says he never admitted that there will be another kingdom, but he did and did not know it. There is to be an everlasting kingdom after this, I Cor. 15:24. If that does not make two, I can't count. You admit the kingdom now and you admit the everlasting kingdom. Somebody balled up bad. Harper uses some pretty big words such as *estephanoominomn*. I have Webster's dictionary, and he did not know what that word meant, and I don't think he does, but what does Paul say in I Cor. 14:9. So Harper is speaking in the air. In Dan. 7:14 (that the affirmative says was fulfilled when Christ ascended) his kingdom dominion and glory was given to him. No price was paid for it, but the kingdom or church that is now was purchased by the blood of Christ. There was no greater price or sacrifice that man could make for a kingdom than Christ made for this kingdom called the church of Good, Acts 20:28. Feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood. Yet Harper says it was given to him, Christ. So the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44 has never been established.

D. D. Lunsford.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE

The Image (Dan. 2:32-44)

"32. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, 33. His legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay."

What Occurred

"34. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet of iron and clay, and break them to pieces. 35. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them; and the stone that

smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth."

Daniel's Interpretation

"38. Thou (Nebuchadnezzar) art this head of gold. 39. And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. 40. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise. 41. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes part of potters' clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. 42. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. 43. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. 44. And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Dan. 2:32-44.

We see that Daniel does say "what Harper claims." There are but four universal kingdoms represented in this image, and all from the "belly and thighs," which represent the Grecian kingdom, to the end of the image represents the Roman, which is described in verses 40, 41, 42, and 43, as "the fourth kingdom" and "the kingdom" and again "the kingdom" and "it." Yes, "there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay." Yes, "And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken." Why? Answer: "And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay."

The "image" had "feet," "head," and all other parts at the same time, and all went down together, for it says, "Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them." Each succeeding kingdom embraced what went before it, and each section of the image represented a universal kingdom—the "head" the Babylonian, the "breast and arms" the Medo-Persian, the "belly and thighs" the Grecian, the legs, feet and toes, the Roman.

You say, "The arms represent the Medians and Persians." Then what does the "breast" represent? You say the "legs" represent "two parts east and west," and the "toes" represent ten kingdoms. Then what do the "feet" represent? And you have the fourth always divided, as were the "legs." And what about the "belly and thighs" for the third? You need four thighs, don't you? In fact your interpretation is all "rot." The Grecian kingdom was divided into four kingdoms.

(Roach and Fowler, p. 275; Barnes, p. 153).

We have "The fall of the Roman empire (476)." —See The Volume Library, page 298. We have the "kingdom of God's dear Son" (Col. 1:13) established during the Roman kingdom. Therefore: "The kingdom of Christ has been established, and this is the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44," as I affirm.

The event of Dan. 7:13 was not "after the three kingdoms were subdued." It occurred when Christ came "to" God, v. 13, Acts 1:9; Acts 2:24-30; Heb. 1:8; Heb. 2:9; Ps. 24:7-10. In this chapter the scene of the four universal kingdoms, together with the setting up of Christ's kingdom, is again portrayed, and later events are represented by the eleven horns. Dan. 7:24.

The church (ekklesia) is not the kingdom (basileia); however, the church are the "citizens" (Eph. 2:19) of the kingdom, "a holy nation," called out from "all nations," I Pet. 2:9, Mt. 28:19. If the negative thinks a thing cannot be "given" to one who has "purchased" it, he should look up the meaning of a little word in his Webster; and if he will consult a good lexicon, he can find that "big" word, and learn that Christ was "crowned" and has a "kingdom" now. And since "this mortal shall have put on immortality" (I Cor. 15:54), the kingdom "shall stand forever" (Dan. 2:44), as "the kingdom of God's dear Son" (Col. 1:13), "the kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," 2 Pet. 1:11. However, he did not "purchase" the kingdom (unless he purchased himself), for he is part of the kingdom—the King. The prophet said, "He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne," Zech. 6:13. He is now a priest "after the order of Melchisedec" (Heb. 6:20), who was "king of Salem, priest of the most high God," Heb. 7:1. Therefore, Christ is now priest and king upon his throne.

I did not say those passages fit your theory. They do not, "for if he were on earth, he should not be a priest," Heb. 8:4. And your saying, "He had to go back to the Father, etc." does not extricate you from the dilemma. Yes, I said "time and again that the iron and the iron and clay represent the Roman kingdom, and I have proved it. But I did not say what you said "Harper says." And I certainly used the words "mingle themselves with the seed of men" in the same form and connection, too, as found in Dan. 2:43, where this is portrayed by "iron mixed with miry clay," and is known to be the very condition that prevailed in the Roman kingdom. You have not produced one scintilla of "evidence to prove that Christ is not sitting on a throne." H. C. Harper.

SIXTH NEGATIVE

You say that I have not produced one scintilla of evidence to prove that Christ is not sitting on a throne. To say that is to deny the word, Rev. 3:21. To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne. Acts 2:34, 35: The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool. We have Christ's own word that he is with his Father in his throne, Rev. 3:21; and again

Peter's word that he (Christ) is on the right hand of his Father, Acts 2:34. We have Christ's and Peter's word against Harper. Christ is not sitting on a throne now, and won't be until when the Son of man shall come (not go) in his glory and all the holy angels with him then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, Matt. 25:31. When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, Matt. 19:28. That shows that you are wrong again as usual and are misapplying Zach. 6:13 with Heb. Isa. 1:26: I will restore thy Judges as at the first. Christ tells us who the judges will be, Matt. 19:28; and Dan. 7:13, 14 tells us what the condition in the kingdom will be. All people would serve him. All people never and still do not serve him. There was and still is a very few compared with the population of the world that serve and obey him, but there is plenty that claim to. All nations should serve him. Has one nation ever served him? No; but some people out of every nation; but that is not what Daniel says, but all people and all nations, not people out of every nation. God only recognizes two nations—Jew and Gentile. But Israel which followed after the law of righteousness hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law, Rom. 9:31, 32. So I have the word of God to back up my theory (as Harper calls it) again. So we see that if all nations did not serve him all people could not serve him. Now if Daniel would of said that there would be people out of every nation serve God then Harper might of had some claim to the 7:13, 14 of Dan. But the 7:13, 14 of Dan. alone is proof that he is wrong as also Dan. 2:34. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay and brake them to pieces. The stone smote the image upon his feet and destroyed it.

Let us see what the stone is. Harper says in his fifth affirmative "the stone representing the kingdom of God set up" which I agree; but the church is not that kingdom. Did the church destroy or even help to destroy the Roman kingdom? No, it did not, because the church would not take up carnal weapons, and I challenge the world to prove that it had any part in the destroying of the Roman Empire. So the stone has not destroyed the image yet and as the fourth kingdom (not the people of the fourth kingdom as Harper wants to have it) was to be divided, Dan. 2:41. Dan. 7th Ch. divides it in ten parts. No; Dan. 2d Ch. does not say how many parts the kingdom shall be divided into, but it does say "the kingdom shall be divided," not the people of the kingdom. What destroyed the Roman power? Paganism, heathenism, barbarianism and Mohamadism; so we see the church had nothing to do with it. But the stone will smite the ten kingdoms as they are still here today. No; they have not all got kings, but the boundary lines are just about the same as when they had kings, so God will recognize them as kingdoms. The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, Rev. 11:15; so republics are as kingdoms with Christ, and because two or

three of the kingdoms that came out of the Roman Empire have become republics does not make any difference with God. Harper says that I need four thighs. The Grecian kingdom was never divided, but it did have four kings. If the kingdom had been divided into four parts then I would of needed four thighs. Harper wants to know what the feet represent. Medes and Persians combined. The eastern part of the Roman Empire never fell till May, 1453. Enc. Brit., Vol. 27, p. 446. And the stone never destroyed it, but Mahomet II. Constantine Palaeologus was the last occupant of the imperial throne. Ibid. p. 446. It is too late by far for the kingdom spoken of in Dan. 2:44 to be the kingdom set up on the day of Pentecost. Bro. Harper has done all any man could do, but the Bible teaches a future kingdom on earth and I will affirm it. D. D. Lunsford.

FROM THE FIELD

I. G. Hayes, Troy, Texas.—Bro. Homer L. King closed a meeting here the 23rd of August. We had good interest and large crowds. There were eight baptisms and seven reclaimed. The meeting extended over three Lord's days, which was none too long. I was impressed with Brother King's humble manner of presenting the truth. I called to mind Gal. 6:1—"Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye that are spiritual restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted."

Brother King seems to be as this in mind. But at the same time I believe he was one among the plainest preachers I ever heard. He certainly believes in calling "a spade a spade." When he talked about the M. E. Church or the Baptist Church, he called them by name; and the thing I appreciate most of all was when speaking of the "cups" division, he did not say you might have done wrong; but he said you cups advocates are Digressive. Brethren, let a spade be called a spade until it is changed to something else. Brethren, let us be more humble; more meek; but let us cry long and loud against the cups digression.

J. A. Malone, Waco, Texas. — We now have about fifty that worship regularly and attendance from outsiders is increasing. We are now located at 16th South, 4th St., under the tabernacle. Were driven out from 15th Park Ave. by their putting in innovations. Two have been added by baptism since our last meeting held by Bro. Bob Musgrave. And the church has just administered in a substantial way to a sick brother. This is our duty. We have all the items of worship laid down in the Bible. And there are five male members that are capable of handling the sword of the Spirit—W. R. Long, Dan Sexton, Ed. Bates, J. L. Kirk, and J. C. Moore, the last three being our elders. And brothers and sisters that pass this way are cordially invited to worship with us.

Tom E. Smith, Healdton, Okla.—Bro. Walter Bray and I closed our meeting at Wood's Park, near Zonie's school, August 27, with one baptism.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, NOVEMBER 1, 1931

No. 12

HOW SHALL WE DIVIDE "IT"?

"And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves." (Lk. 22:17)

I desire to show that the Bible is just as plain on how to "divide it" as it is on how to teach. In 2 Tim. 3:17 it tells us that the Scriptures given by inspiration thoroughly furnish the man of God unto all good works. Is the Communion a good work? Yes; so then we are thoroughly furnished as to how to do this. We read in Mat. 26:27 where the Savior told the disciples to drink of the cup. We find that the word of God says Christ took a cup (one in number). We find this cup had "the fruit of the vine in it," as given in verse 29. And in Luke 22:17 Christ "divide it among yourselves," not one divide it for all; but each one must take part in the dividing. This ought to suffice for any intelligent person that the "two or more cups" or the "individual cups" are unscriptural in use in the Communion. But says one, Why don't you prove how to divide "it"? All right. Paul says in I Cor. 11:33, "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat." Notice (1) the purpose of coming together should be to eat the Lord's supper, and (2) they were (and we are) commanded to tarry one for another, as expressed in I Cor. 14:31 "one by one." They cannot do this and two drink at the same time. In Mat. 26:27 Jesus tells them all to drink out of the cup, as Paul does in I Cor. 11:28; and Mark 14:23 says, "And they all drank out of it." He did not say they all drank out of them. Then why be confused about a thing as plain in the word of God as this is. The great trouble is, I think, they do not want to follow the word of God. As it is with the baptism question, "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," as Samuel Johnson, of the Episcopal Church has said. And they would as well take sprinkling for the ancient baptism as to fail to take the ancient ritual established by the Lord on the night in which he was betrayed.

Paul warns us that some shall depart from the faith. They will not endure sound doctrine after our Lord Jesus Christ. They will turn away their ears from the truth. And by this the way of truth will be evil spoken of. Read 2 Tim. 4:3; I Pet. 2:21. These times are upon us. It is lawlessness in the world and lawlessness in the church. Christ always pleased the Father. Some profess to follow him, but they do as they please about his Father's will. They are building on the sand. (Mat. 7 Ch.) Christ has left us an example. Are we following in his steps? Are we

"doers of the word," and not hearers only? "If the Lord be God, serve Him; if baal, then serve him."

Submitted in the love of Christ the Lord,
E. H. Cavin, Lorenzo, Texas.

CHANGING AN ORDINANCE OF GOD

"Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent," was the divine motto laid down by the great Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander. This is practically the rule given by the Apostle Peter in First Peter 4:11—"If any man speak, let him speak as the Oracles of God."

The Campbells taught and preached this great principle all over the country, and every loyal preacher who endorsed the great work of the Restoration endorsed and preached this principle. This wrought a wonderful influence in bringing about the great unity of Christians effected by Barton W. Stone and the Campbells or the "Christians" and "Disciples of Christ."

The proclamation of this principle was heard from the pulpit of every preacher who joined in the work of the Restoration. But now how many of our modern preachers do we find holding this up to their audiences? In fact, very few seem to know that there is such a principle or ever was. Even the Bible Colleges seem not to pay any attention to it. But the late innovation, "the individual cups" practice stands out foremost in all of them, it seems. They do not seem to realize that the one loaf represents the one body, and that the one cup stands for Christ's one cup of suffering.

The loaf and the cup are always in the singular number. But our modern preachers have "added to" and thereby changed God's ordinance.—Dr. W. W. Stone.

"BAPTIZED FOR THEM"

A writer in the Review of September 1, 1931, in giving his view of I Cor. 15:29 says, "Now we hear Paul asking, 'Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead?' What dead? Christ, of course; for that was the subject, if you please. So the 'dead' we are baptized for, is Christ."—W. G. Roberts.

But that the "dead" the brother is thinking about is not the "dead" that the sacred writer is talking about, is made clear by the American Standard version, which reads, "Else what shall they do that are baptized for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they baptized for them?" (v. 29)

That "them" is the pronoun for "the dead" is evident; and that "them" does not mean "Christ," is far more evident. And that the resurrection of "them," "the dead," is the subject under consideration, is evident to anyone even with a casual

reading of this fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians.

"The dead" signifies all the dead, as is made clear in Luke 20:37; Acts 23:6-8; Acts 24:15; Acts 4:2; John 5:28, 29; I Cor. 15:21, 22, 35, 54.

And every one who "obeys from the heart that form (tu^{pos}, Rom. 6:4, 17; "buried with him in baptism, in which also ye were raised with him through the faith of the working of God, who raised him from the dead"—Col. 2:12) of doctrine is baptized for (huper, in behalf of, for the benefit of) the dead, "them," all the dead, "both of the just and of the unjust," Acts 24:15, who will be raised, thus getting an unconditional benefit in Christ, as stated in I Cor. 15:22, 29, because they testify by such a tu^{pos} at baptism in this very action that all the dead will be raised, and the baptism is but the tu^{pos} (mark, brand, indicator) of resurrection of the body of each, as set forth in I Cor. 15:35-54. Hence, the apostle of God stresses, first, the fact of Christ's resurrection, second, their own baptism, and third, the intense sufferings they endured (v. 32), all three, in proof of the resurrection of "them," "the dead." (v. 29) Every baptism portrays a benefit for the dead, "them," "both the just and the unjust," namely, a resurrection.

COWAN'S GRAMMAR

In his debate here at Elk City Cowan accused Bro. Musgrave of being ignorant of grammar. He asked M. what "this" refers to in the sentence, "For this is my blood of the New Testament." M. replied, "This refers to the drink." Cowan then said, "Musgrave does not know a verb from a noun."

But Musgrave was right; "drink" is a noun in that sentence. It is Cowan's ignorance. If Cowan will look in a dictionary, he will find drink "any liquid swallowed." When Jesus told his disciples to drink out of the cup, then as used drink is a verb; but when Musgrave said, "This refers to the drink," drink here is a noun.

In his debate with Cowan, Bro. Harper said that in the sentence, "For this is my blood of the New Testament" "This" is a pronoun." And he was right. It was Cowan's ignorance in calling "this" an adjective here. In the sentence, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," Harper said, "This is an adjective," and he was right. "This" here modifies 'cup.' But Cowan said he turned Harper a "sommersault," but he exposed his own ignorance again.

Cowan ignored the rules of language and set himself up against the scholarship of the world on language. It is an accepted rule of language that "Words must be taken in their primary and commonly accepted meaning, unless we are compelled, by the context, to give them other meanings." There is nothing in Matt. 26:27 to prevent "cup" from having its commonly accepted meaning of "a cup, a drinking vessel." And Thayer cites its use here under "prop.," and not under "by metonymy" or any other figure of speech. (Page 533) And he gives cup in Matt. 26:27 as "the vessel out of which one drinks." (p. 510)

And Cruden's Concordance says under "cup," "This word is taken in Scripture in a proper, and a figurative sense. In a proper sense it signifies a material cup, which people drink out of at meals." And to say that cup here is the fruit of the vine, is to betray ignorance in a vain attempt to uphold error. I admire the defense Cowan has made for the truth against the Sunday School; but when he is driven to such perversion of the truth in defense of "containers," it is time for brethren to begin to think where he is leading them. He needs more education before he becomes a safe teacher in language, at least.

A. J. Jernigan.

QUERY

"I recently visited three congregations, each claiming to be a church of Christ; one used instrumental music, one had not such music but had the Sunday School and classrooms, the other had no Sunday School and no such music as the first; but all had individual cups and a loaf to each tray of cups. Is this a Scriptural procedure?"—B.

No; this is a modern—very modern, procedure, more modern than that of the priest taking all of the drink element. And I suppose they each would claim no higher authority for their practice than the Catholic does; namely, the wisdom (or ignorance, if you prefer to say it) of men. But why wonder about this? Look at Israel in the wilderness. Did they not have the word of God? Yes. Did they go according to it? No. Jesus says, "Wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many are they that enter thereby. For narrow is the gate, and straitened the way that leadeth unto life, and few they are that find it." (Matt. 7:13, 14) Hence he bids us "beware" of false leaders. (v. 15) For as Peter says, "There were false prophets among the people, even so there shall be false teachers among you." (2 Pet. 2:1) And he says, "Many shall follow their pernicious ways" or "doings," as the Revised has it. Yes, and he says, "By reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." And Paul warns us thus: "In later times some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies." (I Tim. 4:1, 2) Again he says, "But evil men shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." (2 Tim. 3:13) And he directs us to the word of God for protection. He again says, "The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers; having itching ears, they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." (2 Tim. 4:3, 4)

"We all partake of one bread" or one "loaf." (I Cor. 10:16) And it is "a cup," not cups, in the word of God. Those who will not take the word of God are in the "broad way"—just as broad as the various commandments and teachings of man. (Col. 2:21, 22; Matt. 7:26) For "narrow is the way that leadeth unto life"—just as narrow as the word of God is. (Matt. 7:25; I Cor. 4:6; 2 John v. 9)

OBITUARY

Mrs. Mary King, daughter of James and Sarah Davis, was born near Morgantown, Ind., May 12, 1867; departed this life September 8, 1931, at the Springfield Baptist Hospital, while undergoing an operation for gangrene in the foot, after an illness of some two months; being 64 years, 3 months and 27 days of age.

In 1884 she was married to Alvin King, who preceded her in death. To this union six children were born, one of whom died in infancy. The surviving are: Mrs. Ora Triplett, Claud, Homer L. Mrs. Dollie Robertson, and James, all, of this community. Besides rearing her children, in marriage she assumed the care of four motherless children; three of whom survive: Charley and Willie King, both of San Francisco, Calif., and Effie Beard of Agnes, Mo. In addition to the above, she leaves 17 grandchildren, two great grandchildren, two sisters, and a host of other relatives and friends, to mourn her departing.

She left Indiana with her husband soon after her marriage, coming to Missouri, where she resided, except for about two years, until her death.

She obeyed the gospel very early in life, thereby becoming a member of the Church of Christ; to which faith she remained true unto death. Among her last words were: "I'm trusting it all to the Lord," and, "Children, live right and bring your children up right." It is sweet to remember that she died in the triumphs of a living faith, hence we "sorrow not as others who have no hope."

She was a kind and loving mother, sharing both the sunshine and shadows of her children, and was a devoted wife and companion.

Funeral services were conducted by Bro. C. H. Lee, and internment was in the New Hope Cemetery.

OBITUARY

Sister Howton, wife of our beloved Brother Jackson Howton, who has long resided at Blanket, Texas, but lately has been residing at Littlefield, Texas, has gone to her reward, as Paul said "to depart, and be with Christ." She was a devoted mother, not only in her family but also a mother in the Israel of God where neither "circumcision nor uncircumcision" in the flesh count anything, but "that of the heart." Sister Howton was a firm believer in the Bible way of serving God, and she was ever ready to do anything she could to advance the cause she loved so well. May the blessed Lord bind up the hearts riven by the loss of this saintly mother, and keep us all true so that we may share eternity together.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN SEEYMORE HALL

Brother Hall departed this life August 19, 1931, after an illness of four week's duration. His death followed a serious operation in a hospital in his home town, Hamilton, Texas.

Brother Hall was a true and tried soldier; fought under the blood-stained banner for forty-one years; died in action with the sword of the Spirit in hand and the battle-cry on his lips.

Brother Hall's voice is stilled in death, but I

fancy I can hear his voice as it echoes and re-echoes against the great walls of time in thundering times, portraying the love of God to the traveler of earth in the following:

"The Son of God in tears the wondering angels see;

Be thou astonished, O my soul, he shed those tears for me.

Were all the ocean filled with ink and every quill a pen,

And ev'ry man a scribe by trade, 'twould drain the ocean dry

To write the love of God above on parchments of the sky.

Nor could the scroll contain the whole though stretched from earth to sky."

In the loss of this great and good man, the church of Christ has lost one of its ablest defenders,—a man of strong conscientious convictions, willing at all times to teach and be taught; always ready to lend a helping hand to the needy and to speak words of encouragement to the broken-hearted.

Brother Hall was a real friend to the young preachers wherever he found them; always ready in an humble way with his fatherly advice. His life has been a great factor in my life. It is by the help of God and the influence of this great and good man; to which I attribute my usefulness in the cause of Christ.

To dear Sister Hall and the children let me say, this tie on earth is too weak to hold us all together long. It has been broken as far as earth is concerned, but has become an eternal tie that can never be broken. (Rev. 14:12, 13)

Brethren, don't forget Brother Hall's faithful companion, who has borne patiently the hardships of a preacher's life. Submitted in love, J. I. Grantham, Kempner, Texas.

PLEASE READ AND ACT.

Those who have given me their subscription, and have not paid, will please do our loyal paper the kindness of sending your dollar in as early as possible as the paper is in need of funds to continue its good work. This is a duty we can perform and don't neglect it. NOW is the time it is needed.

My readers can expect a hearing from me in a very interesting subject matter in a short time. Brethren, let us strive to get closer together on the Bible. Our religion is a religion of faith, and this comes only one way—let us respect that WAY more.

Faithfully yours,

Dr. Gossett, Hot Springs, Ark.

THE TRUTH FUND

L. M. Morgan	---\$1.00	J. T. Cambers	--- 2.00
C. A. McKinnon	-- 1.00	A Sister	----- 1.00
Homer A. Gay	--- 1.00	Tom E. Smith	--- 1.00
J. V. Speights	--- 1.00	Verdie Poteet	--- 2.00
W. J. Harris	--- 2.00	A Brother	----- 1.00
L. F. Upshaw	--- 1.00	Mrs. L. M. Pond	--- 1.00
Ryan Bennett	--- 2.00	O. C. Mathews	--- 1.00
Ch. Mizier, Ill.	--- 2.00	Wm. Milner	----- 1.00
A. A. Patterson	--- 1.00	L. I. Bibbs	----- 2.00
Homer L. King	-- 1.00		

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year

\$1.00

LATCOOK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips

MORE WOBBLING

Concerning a great and good man, Bro. Duckworth says, in the Apostolic Way, of May 1, 1930:

"He seemed to be familiar with all translations in general use. He had a comprehensive analytic as well as a practical knowledge of New Testament Greek, and he often stated to me that there were no divine teachings in the Greek MSS that were not to be found in the King James translation, that the same ideas, principles and demands that were found in the Greek were to be found in the King James translation."

What the brother referred to may have said about this matter, I know not. But I do know that the King James Version of the Holy Scriptures is far from being perfect; and that there are some ideas in the Greek that are not in the King James Version, and there are some ideas in the King James Version that are not in the Greek.

For example: Who is it that knows Greek that can get the idea of "Easter" out of the Greek word *pascha* (Acts 12:4)? In Eruder's "Concordance to the Greek New Testament," he gives twenty-nine references in the N. T. to this word. I have looked them all up, and found the word to be translated "passover" twenty-eight times, and "Easter" once! It should have been "passover" in this instance, as that is the only meaning the word has. "Easter" was substituted here for the evident purpose of bolstering up a Roman Catholic institution and making it appear to have Apostolic sanction. May God deliver us from such snares of the Devil!

In Rom. 7:24, 25, The King James Version represents Paul as saying, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." His important question is left unanswered, and we are left to wonder what the answer is. But the Editor of the Concordant Version, following the Editor of Codex Vaticanus, restores the answer, which is *charis*, 'grace.' Consequently it reads: "A wretched man am I! What will rescue me out of this body of death? Grace! Now I am

thanking God, through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

The word baptize came into the English language from the old French baptiser, from the Latin baptizo, and ultimately from the Greek baptizo, from the root bapto, 'to dip.' Here is the whole family of Greek words: Bapto, 'dip.' Baptisma, 'dipping.' Baptistes, 'dipist.' Baptizo, 'dipize, Baptismos, 'dipping.' Our idiom requires these words to be translated "immerse," "immersion," "immerser," "immersing." The King James Version does not translate this family of words at all, but simply transliterates them. Since the saints do not now have the gift of tongues nor the interpretation thereof, we should no longer speak in Greek to them, but we should translate these words. The King James Version is excessively lacking on this point. "The Living Oracles" is much better.

"The breaking of bread" is an idiomatic Hebrew expression, like the Englishman's "taking tea" or the Arab's "eating salt," and denotes an ordinary meal. This same idiom is used to denote the Lord's supper,—only when the Communion is intended it is "the breaking of the loaf," the Greek for "the loaf" being *ton arton* (Mt. 26:26; Mk. 14:22; Act. 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11; I Cor. 10:16; 11:23). The makers of the King James translation have made this matter rather misleading by their leaving *ton*, 'the,' untranslated and translating *arton* "bread" instead of "loaf" as the Greek text requires.

The genitive preposition *ek* in connection with the Communion-cup is always rendered "of" in the King James Version. This is not so bad as some other matters, but it could be improved. *Ek* is 'out of,' and Thayer says of it: "Pino *ek* (drink out of) with a genitive of the vessel out of which one drinks, *ek tou poterion* (out of the cup)."

JELLEY STUFF

Bro. E. S. Jelley is wobbling with his "bowl full of jelly" on this important matter. In 1930, he had a series of articles in *The Apostolic Way* on "Why We Prefer the Authorized Version." His line of reasoning (rather lack of reasoning) is pure "bunk," designed, evidently to put him on better terms with the management of the paper. Bro. Duckworth and Bro. Johnson, and several others I could name, regard the King James Version as being "The Holy Bible;" nothing else counts with them. The Greek MSS., containing the very words the inspired writers used, have no weight whatever with them. Bro. Johnson's sugar-stick in debate is: "Why don't you take the Bible instead of Greek?" —! Even though the King James Version has been convicted of containing over 20,000 errors, and some of them very serious ones, they seem to prefer it to one that corrects them, or even the inspired autographs.

Bro. Jelley is an unfortunate man. He is too unstable to be worth anything in the Army of the Lord. He obeyed the Gospel many years ago, and preached it for many years. But his membership, at the time *The Way* raised the money to send him to India, as a missionary, was with the Missionary Baptist Church, Hood River, Ore. He claims

there are "demons" in India, as there were in Palestine in the Savior's day, and that God inspired him to learn the Indian language in an unreasonably short time! When we take all this into consideration, it is easy to see why he is so warped in his writings. When a man writes to a paper for selfish reasons, rather than to disseminate a knowledge of the truth, we can expect most anything from him. A paper that will publish such nonsensical trash from such an unreliable source is hard-pressed for something to publish. It would not be so bad if it were not for the fact that many good brethren take such assertions to be the truth.

Jelley and his kind have such an over-weening confidence in their own findings as no words can describe. Their findings are as solemnly true to them as Holy Writ itself, when they think they have found something. The scholarship and findings of the scholars of all time seem to have no weight at all with these partisan fanatics. The evidence of the thousands of Greek MSS. we now have, (some of them dating as far back as the fourth century), as over and against the variant readings of the eight from which the King James Version was made (none of which was earlier than the tenth century), will cause any sensible and sincere student to investigate such grand works as the Revised Version, The New Emphatic Bible (by Rotherham), The Emphatic Diaglott, Goodspeed, etc. But the best of all is the evidence contained in the Original Greek MSS. It is high time for those who profess to love the Bible were learning what the Bible is, and how we got it.

The King James Version is as good as any that could be made at the time it was made. Most of the errors in it are due to the fact that some of the MSS. were modern and faulty. The translators before them had made many mistakes. It contains the Plan of Salvation, and so does the Douay Bible, in use in the Catholic Churches. But both have many errors in them that need to be corrected. The modern ones contain less error.

"The Truth" extends sympathy to Bro. Homer L. King and his brothers and sisters in the passing of their mother from earth to Paradise. She has gone home. Her form will greet us no more upon earth. The words of cheer she always had for every one will be sadly missed by all who knew her personally. But, while she is absent from the body, she is at home with the Lord. Thank God! Our loss is her gain. We hope to meet her "in the sweet bye and bye."—J. D. P.

BROTHER J. E. REAGAN, of Kansas City, Mo., has been called home. I have just received a letter from Sister Reagan in which she says:

"Dear Bro. Douglas: Received your papers addressed to Reagan, and by this I know that you have not heard of the death of my beloved companion, who passed away nine weeks ago today. God alone knows my grief, sorrow, and sufferings. Left without any income, and I have been at the point of death the last few weeks, and the Doc-

tors have given up all hopes. It is only just a question of time with me. Bro. Reagan passed away very suddenly, and I am sure in need of Christian sympathy, love, and help.

"O, Bro. Douglas! how I wish you were here so I would have your words of Christian sympathy, and your smile that greeted us so often when you were located here. You know, Bro. Phillips, that I have been sick several years, and that Bro. Reagan made low wages and it took all he could make to live on, and so we could not save any money. So I am now left sick and helpless, and without support."

Bro. and Sister Reagan always wanted just what the Book says on every matter. Sister Reagan is now left an aged widow, and she is in need, and is worthy in every sense of the term. I hope that those who read this will send her some financial aid. Send to Mrs. J. E. Reagan, 2615 Jackson Ave., Kansas City, Mo.—J. D. P.

AN INTERESTING QUESTION

"Is Lk. 22:20 in the Greek? and what is meant by 'This cup is the New Testament in my blood?'" —B. F. B.

Yes, Lk. 22:20 is in the Greek. Westcott and Hort reject it, however, as an interpolation. But the same is quoted by Paul in I Cor. 11:25, and no critic, so far as I know, denies its genuineness. So, if Lk. 22:20 is an interpolation, Paul's language cannot be denied. It came from God.

"This cup is the N. T. in my blood." The verb "is" is from *estin* in the Greek, and denotes a metaphor. If the cup were literally the New Covenant, it would read "This cup the New Testament, thus leaving is out. But the simple figure of speech used here needs to be understood by all. The Greek and Hebrew substantive, *to be*, is not expressed when dealing with matters of fact. But when a figure is intended, the verb must be used. It is a metaphor.

"The New Covenant" is with spiritual Israel, even as the Old one was with fleshly Israel. The first was ratified by the blood of calves and he-goats (Exod. 24:8), but the New with the precious blood of Christ (Heb. 9:15-17). The Old was ratified by the blood of animals when it was sprinkled with blood, by the priest. The New has been ratified by Christ's precious blood.

In the Communion the cup (*poterion*, a drinking-cup, wine-cup—Liddell and Scott) is (*estin*) the New Covenant (*diatheka*, covenant and 'last will and testament'). Thus we see in the cup of wine on the Communion table the Covenant (symbolized by the vessel) and the blood of the Covenant ("which ratifies the Covenant"—Goodspeed and Thayer). The blood is symbolized by the "new (unfermented) fruit of the vine."

Thayer says, "In both (Lk. 22:20 and I Cor. 11:25) which the meaning is, 'This cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the New Covenant.'"—Lexicon, p. 15. Robert H. Pfeiffer, Curator of the Semitic Museum, Harvard University, says, "Thayer is substantially right."

Bro. F. R. Gay, Professor of Greek in Bethany

College (founded by Alexander Campbell), says:

"Paraphrasing I Cor. 11:25 to make the meaning perfectly clear: 'This cup (that is, the cup and its contents) represents the new (covenant and testament. Both ideas are included) which is ratified by my sacrificial death.'

"The word **cup** is used literally (that is, it refers to an actual material cup), and it is used to symbolically represent the **he kaine diatheke** (the New Testament), where **diatheke** (as in Gen. 9:12 and elsewhere in the Septuagint) is used for the Hebrew **Berith**, a covenant or agreement between two parties, one of which sometimes is God. (For this sense see Gal. 3:5). Here it includes both the senses of covenant and 'last will and testament,' for it was a covenant that God entered into with man, and it was Christ's death that sealed it." (Letter to J. D. Phillips, Sept. 1, 1931).

I hope this explanation will be clear and satisfactory.—J. D. P.

FROM THE FIELD

Walter W. Leamons, Jerusalem, Ark.—The brethren were well pleased with my defense of the truth in the debate with the Russellite at Deer, Ark. As a result of the debate we baptized six at a nearby schoolhouse. Closed a meeting at Appleton the last Sunday in September with one baptism and one restored. Began a meeting at Jerusalem September 29th with good attendance and attention. The Free Methodists (a Holiness sect) challenged for a debate at Limestone, but when it came to delivering the goods, they backed down.

G. L. Park, Council Hill, Okla.—We almost have our church building done outside. The building is 30x40 with concrete floor, and we will be glad to have it finished.

Had a meeting of one week's duration, in August. Brother Miles Rehorn of Nashville, Tenn., did the preaching. 21 were baptized. We were well pleased with results. We were busy working on the Church house, and a Methodist meeting also in progress at the time.

Have attended Brother Keeble's meeting at Muskogee twice. He is doing a wonderful work, and preaches the Gospel so straight that he makes them see it. Thousands have heard him, and to date, in the two weeks he has led nearly two hundred to Christ. Also some sixty white people have answered the call. This colored brother should be encouraged. He is humble and powerful. The meeting is being supported by the white church of Christ in Muskogee.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Oct. 5, 1931.—I closed a series of meetings with the faithful congregation in Sulphur, Okla., the 1st., inst.; embracing two Lord's days. This was my second effort there, and I enjoyed the work very much. The results were very gratifying; eighteen baptized into the one body, and apparently the church

much encouraged and strengthened. The gospel is still the "power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," and let us not forget it, brethren. Hence, do all that we can to see that it is preached to all whom we can reach. Unto the Lord, be all the glory and honor.

From Sulphur, I went to Pike City, near Haldton, Okla., and preached two nights, and from all appearance, much good was accomplished in the way of restoring peace and unity in that section. Several confessed faults the last night. Large crowds greeted me at these services.

I am now at Wichita Falls, Texas in a series of meetings, which began the 3rd, inst. Although this is a city of several thousand population, the crowds are not very encouraging at present. By the time this reaches the readers of The Truth, I shall have closed a meeting at Fouke, Ark.

Homer L. King, Route 2, Lebanon, Mo.—Closed a good meeting with the faithful brethren at Bethel, near Temple, Texas, Aug. 30, embracing three Lord's days. We had the very best of attention and attendance throughout. The results were, if I remember correctly, eight baptized and seven confessed faults.

The above congregation is the home of our beloved and faithful Bro. I. G. Hayes, a loyal gospel preacher. It was a pleasure to be associated with him and other good, faithful brethren there. Bro. Homer A. Gay, of Eola, Texas, has labored much with these brethren, and is held in high esteem by all.

I came home from the above meeting to be with the family and others for a few days. Bro. Homer A. Gay and family stopped over with us one night, on his way home from his work in Indiana. We had announced preaching for that night, and all enjoyed the good sermon delivered by him. It was certainly a treat to me to be associated with Bro. Gay again, and to hear him preach again. I consider Bro. Gay one of the very best preachers and a man that lives what he preaches. It was very encouraging to find that he had not been carried away with this new innovation, the cups. An innovation that has captured so many of the ones that I love.

Owing to the sickness and death of my dear Mother, who was buried the 9th, inst., I am delayed about two weeks with my meetings. It is very trying to have to give up one to whom we owe so much. More than to any other one person, I owe to my mother, all that I am and all that I hope to be. When I became discouraged in my preparation for a school teacher, most of all it was Mother that said, "Homer, go on." And, oh, how often, has she encouraged me, and stayed my faltering hand in my weak efforts to preach the gospel! God bless her sweet memory!

Mrs. Verdie Poteet, Harmony, Okla. — I am pleased to see the good work carried on in all the meetings. Glad I had the chance to hear and learn the truth in the Haldton meeting. I was a Baptist. I wish I could go to church now. Plenty of denominations around here and Sunday School and cups church. I wish the brethren would es-

establish a church here of the Bible kind so I could attend.

Jackson Howton, Littlefield, Texas.—Brother Harper, I thank you for the warm-hearted love you manifested for me in the death of my dear wife.

Frank Cobbs, Spring Hill, W. Va.—Brother I. G. Williams began our meeting at Mallory Chapel, August 9, which resulted in eight baptisms, two of them being my daughters. To God be all the praise and glory and honor. Brother Williams is a true gospel preacher, and there are very few of that kind in southern West Virginia. The church here is contending for the faith against all innovations. Enclosed find our renewals for "The Truth." On with the good work.

D. F. Watson, Broken Bow, Okla. — Arrived home from three very successful meetings. Began at Loco, Okla., the first Saturday night in August, which embraced the first three Lord's days in August. Two were baptized and three returned to their first love, two of them from the Sunday School church. Next at Mud Creek, August 17 and continues till August 30, and closed at the water's edge with four baptisms. From there to Valley View, east of Duncan, where we began the last Lord's day night in August, and continues over the first two Lord's days in September, with two baptized and one restored and much good done in other ways. Will return to Valley View in October, for a discussion with a Missionary Baptist if he does not back out. I promised to return to all three places for a three weeks' meeting at each in 1932. Am to begin a meeting at Spring Chapel, near Hugo, tomorrow, September 19. Much success to you and "The Truth."

Otis F. Young, Route 6, Bloomington, Ind. — Bro. Homer A. Gay closed a good meeting here August 30. Three were baptized and the church was much edified. Brother Gay's manner is plain, pleasant, and convincing. This was his first trip among us, and we learned to love him much. Bro. J. D. Phillips was here twice while the meeting was in progress, and this we appreciate very much. The crowds and interest were fine throughout. We still meet in the schoolhouse and we have about given up any hope of the cups brethren laying down the cups. At the last of our meeting they started meeting Saturday night, Lord's day and Lord's day night; but our meeting went on with increased interest. We want to thank the visiting brethren for their encouragement to us. Brethren in passing will find a pleasant place to worship with us.

Ralph Knight, Central Point, Oregon.—Bro. W. D. Hamett, of Fresno, Calif., was with the church here in a short meeting. He preaches the whole counsel of God with power and love. The good seed sown both publicly and privately will yield fruit to the glory of God. Our intentions are to

have another meeting in the early spring. Apostolic Christianity is a rare thing in the Northwest. We desire to have the prayers and good-wishes of the brethren in our efforts to uphold the worthy name of our Lord in these parts of the country.

T. F. Thomasson, Lake Arthur, N. Mex.—We continued the meeting at Lee's Summit, Mo., over three Lord's days, and up until Thursday night before the fourth L. D., and closed with five baptisms. Began a mission meeting at Mt. Zion, Mo., Friday night and continued one week with increasing crowds and interest. After we closed at Lee's Summit, Bro. Dotson Lewis preached L. D. and L. D. night and baptized one more. Bro. King came in from his meeting at Troy, Texas, and was with us at Mt. Zion until Saturday night before the 5th L. D., when he preached Saturday night and L. D. at home. We closed at Mt. Zion Saturday night and returned to Lee's Summit L. D. to be with the brethren and hear Bro. King preach at eleven o'clock. I preached that night and we had two more confessions, making eight in all. They have a fine congregation of faithful, loyal Christians at Lee's Summit. This is Bro. Homer L. King's home congregation, and he is held in very high esteem there, both by the church and the world. Bro. H. E. Robertson and Bro. C. H. Lee, who are also highly esteemed by the church and the world, are active in the good work here. I am made to feel stronger and much encouraged being associated with these brethren, and having heard their good singing. After a brief rest at home I assisted the brethren at a schoolhouse near Tucumcari, N. Mex., in a week's meeting. Here I found a fine band of faithful brethren who oppose all innovations. The Lord willing I shall return there for a two weeks' meeting.

O. B. Perkins, Eadsville, Ky.—Bro. J. D. Phillips and I had an enjoyable trip together to West Virginia. I had the privilege of hearing him preach several times when he was in Kentucky, and I enjoyed the sermons very much.

Bro. Phillips left me in Fairmont, West Virginia, and went on to hold a meeting in Commodore, Penn. I preached three sermons for the loyal congregation at Fairmont. I enjoyed my visit with them, and I intend to visit them again in the future. I aimed to visit South Charleston and Mallory Chapel, but did not get to. I stopped in Huntington and preached one sermon. I also preached one sermon at Point Pleasant in Ohio.

I am now back in Kentucky. I begin a meeting October 10, at Watson's Chapel, Casey County, Kentucky. I intend to go back through West Virginia in the spring and visit all the loyal congregation.

J. D. Phillips, 252 So. 4th Street, Montebello, Calif., Oct. 14.—My meeting at So. Charleston, W. Va., closes tonight. Three confessions for baptism and one restoration are the visible results thus far. One or two more confessions are expected tonight. I begin at Mallory Chapel tomorrow

night. Several additions expected there. The brethren in this section are remembering Bro. Harper kindly. Our sainted and lamented Bro. C. H. Williams is missed since he went home to be with the Lord Jesus a year ago. God bless his memory. I start back to Calif., soon. Any brethren wishing my services for a few days as I pass through Oklahoma, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico, should write me at once.

I. G. Williams, Box 1025, Charleston, W. Va., October 10.—The work at So. Charleston is progressing nicely. It has been up hill work in the past, but the fight is getting easier. During the winter we distributed food and clothing for the poor, yet we are poor financially. We owe about \$800.00 on our meeting house. I have baptized several this year, which I did not report. I will report more regularly in the future. So. Charleston is truly a loyal church of Christ. Bro. Phillips stopped on his way home for a week, and is doing some fine preaching. We wish he could stay longer. He handles the "Old Sword" like a past master.

Robert R. Hull, who left us several years ago and took up with Roman Catholics, writes that he may have a debate in New York City with a representative of The American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, soon. We wish him success in defending the Bible to be a revelation from God, but his Catholic doctrine is poor backing. We hope, too, that he may return to the Lord and His Church before it is too late.—J.D. P.

Gilpin, Ky., Sept. 27, 1931.—Bro. Phillips: Your meeting with us was an inspiration to us all. We rejoice, not only over the five additions by Baptism, but over the edification of the Church as well. We had a business meeting of the Church on Saturday night, after you left, and my father made a talk and showed why we do not wash feet in connection with the Communion, as the Baptists, do and this cleared up the matter in the minds of some who were confused over the matter. He extended an invitation at the close, and two from the Christian Church in Liberty gave up their innovations and came in with us. We want you back with us some time. Love, and best wishes,—James F. Thomas.

Bro. Frank Cobbs, of Spring Hill, W. Va., baptized three a week ago, at Mallory Chapel; and the brethren expect others to obey the gospel when Bro. J. D. Phillips meeting starts there, Oct. 15th.

Bro. J. D. Phillips recently closed a good meeting at Commodore, Pa. He is now in a meeting at Charleston, W. Va., where he met Ira C. Moore, Editor of the Christian Leader, Cincinnati, Ohio, on the S. S. question, in 1928. His meeting started yesterday, and last night two came forward, one for baptism and the other one for restoration.

Bro. A. J. Salyards, of Nanty Glo, Pa., recently visited and preached for the Church at Bolivar,

Pa. He is true to the Book.

Bro. Chan Hill, of Spring Hill, W. Va., is doing some good preaching in the Mallory Chapel community. Bro. Ira C. Moore's report in the Leader that Bro. Phillips' sermons against innovations killed this and other churches in W. Va. is absolutely false.

CLAIMING THE PROMISE

Jesus said, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. 18:20).

Do the sects gather in the name of Christ? No; it is in the name of Baptist, Methodist, Catholic, Presbyterian, Lutheran, etc., etc. They surely do. They have chosen a name of their own. Then Christ is not in their midst, but it is the evil spirit that which was in King Ahab and King Saul, because they would not be convinced by the word of the Lord that they were wrong. (I Kings 22:21, 22).

None but those who obey the commands of Christ and that for which they were given, can lawfully be counted "Christians." Any person can assume that name, but such counts for nothing. None but actual Christians can come together "in the name of Christ." G. W. Paisley, Wawawai, Wash.

PROGRESSING

"As soon as our young people marry or get other jobs in a new environment they can worship in the Christian Church just about as satisfactorily. They fall into what is nearest and most convenient."—J. N. Armstrong, President of Harding College (See Word and Work, Sept. 1, 1931).

Well, what is the difference, and what makes them "fall" so easily? The pot should not say to the kettle, "You're black." Such a "fall" is slight, and will never damage any one with God, for he is as bad before the "fall" in transgressing "the commandments of God" by his traditions as he is after the infinite small "fall." The "young people" just take another step—"a leetle un." And as long as the seniors keep pushing the fence down, the "young people" will keep getting over. And the old people would, too, if they had not fought the organ so hard.

QUERY

Please answer for us in your next issue: Does the grape vine produce a fermented drink? N. H. "The vine," so noted was the grape vine in Palestine that its common appellation was "the vine." It produces grape juice, a product that nothing else will produce. The vine does not produce a fermented drink. That is produced by yeast. No yeast, no fermented drink. Grape juice, and nothing else, is the gennema of the vine. Gennema is defined as "that which has been begotten or born." Jesus calls what he used (Matt. 26:29) "the gennema of the vine." It is translated "fruit," "product," "produce," of the vine, "the juice of the grape," in the different translations of the Bible. This is unfermented wine.

THE TRUTH

"If ye abide in my word, then ye are truly my disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Vol. 4

SNEADS, FLORIDA, DECEMBER 1, 1931

No. 13

WHY THE CHANGE?

We are changing the location from which to mail out the paper to a more central place, and it will go out from Lebanon, Mo., with Bro. Homer L. King as the publisher. And since the task is one of calling spiritual Israel back to the "Old Paths" (Jer. 6:16) as the true prophets did for the old-covenant Israel, it has been deemed best to name the paper the "Old Paths" to better express its mission.

We have run the paper for four full years now and will be all paid up as soon as we pay for this last issue. It has been a pleasure to me to act in the capacity as publisher of the paper, but no light burden, and I desire to thank the brethren for their unstinted support both financially and in maintaining our Bible footing for the church of Christ. And I am asking the same earnest spirit for maintaining the paper.

It was not possible for me to change locations; neither did I deem it necessary for the success of the paper to do so, for it goes directly into the hands of competent brethren, and it is my desire to see it well cared for while I have an opportunity to advise and help establish it on enduring basis. Brethren will please donate to the extent of their ability and willingness and to work for subscriptions as heretofore. Many subscriptions expire at the end of the year. These should all renew promptly in order that there may be funds to meet the printing bills. Brotherly,

H. C. Harper.

MINGLED MUSINGS

By C. D. Moore.

First Cor. 10:17: "For we, many, are one bread, and one body." Paraphrasing, we have this: For cups, many, are one wine, and one blood. (To save space I use the word "wine.")

The phrase "the cup," as a figure, can mean but the one drink element under consideration. That drink element in a hundred drinking cups is still but "the cup." Each one drinking from either of the drinking cups, jointly participates in the blood of Christ, because he is joining all the other participants in partaking of the one wine in the one purpose—remembrance of Jesus.

The phrase "The Bible" may mean but one (copy), and it also may mean all the copies in existence. If I say, "Hand me the Bible," but one copy is meant. But if I say, "The Bible is the best of all books," all the copies in existence is meant.

A hundred people agree to a joint-participation in reading the Bible. They come together to read it. The Bible is passed to each of them. Each person has one and reads from it. Who would say that there is no joint-participation in that reading; because each one reads from a sep-

arate Book? Who will claim that all will have to read out of the one book in order to jointly participate (or commune) in reading the Bible? The hundred all "drink" "The sincere milk of the word" (I Pet. 2:2), though each one "drinks" it out of a separate cup (book).

And since Jesus says "This cup is the new testament," and the new testament contains the "sincere milk of the word," which we are to "drink" (read), does an assembly of worshippers all have to drink (read) it out of but one cup (book), in order that all may be drinking the same "milk of the word?"

While there is but one Bible—the sincere milk of the word—yet there are thousands of them from which to drink (read) it.

While there is but one cup—the wine—yet there are thousands of them from which to drink it.

Each copy of the New Testament is a "cup" from which to drink. Are we limited to but one copy (cup) to read from? Did Jesus so limit us, though He gave us but one New Testament? Did He limit us to but one drinking cup, though He gave us but the one wine to drink?

One drinks "the cup"—the wine—when one drinks the wine from any kind of a vessel, does he not? The worshippers must drink the wine, which, by a figure, is called "the cup." Is not the wine the "one cup" to which we are limited? The wine is called "the cup" at any time before it is placed in the vessel known as a cup. It is called "the cup" even if it never be put into a cup. (I know this to be true, or I would not write it).

Was His shed blood the drinking cup? Was the drinking cup He used, His blood? If so, no other drinking cup is His blood, is it? Was the fruit of the vine His blood? If so, no other element is His blood, is it?

If a drinking cup is not His blood, then the only importance of a drinking cup is to convey the wine to the lips. Therefore may not a number of drinking vessels be used for that purpose, without disobeying any command that Jesus gave relative to this matter?

Reply

But you did not paraphrase anything. You simply made an absurd statement about something else. When the "wine" is in a cup, we may say, using figurative language (metonymy) "drink the cup." But when it is in cups, we say drink the cups, by the same figure. Figurative language is language used in an unusual way to express thought. We usually say; Drink of, from, or out of the cup or cups; as; drink out of "it" (Mt. 26:27), drink out of "the cup," as in I Cor. 11:28.

But in the unusual (figurative) language we have it "drink the cup" in I Cor. 10:21 and 11:27, where the cup holding the thing to be drunk is

named in a way that suggest its contents also, that is, the word **cup** here involves both the cup and its contents. The contents are not the cup, neither is the cup its contents; but both are involved by the unusual language used; one, the cup, being named; the other, the contents, being merely suggested by the form of language used. Hence Thayer, the Standard authority for New Testament Greek, says, "drink the cup, that is, what is in the cup." (p. 510) And the man who talks of **drinking the cup** when he drinks from a bottle, or jug, or cups, talks nonsense in the light on New Testament language. And N. L. Clark, on this point well says, "How can one 'drink this cup'? By drinking what it contains, and in no other way." (See Clark-Harper Debate) Jesus said, "This cup is the New Testament," as we have it in Luke 22:20 and I Cor. 11:25. "In both which," says Thayer, "the meaning is this cup containing wine, an emblem of blood, is rendered by the shedding of my blood an emblem of the new covenant." (p. 15)

No congregation can dispense with the cup and its contents (the fruit of the vine) and observe the communion as directed in the New Testament; nor can they do so and drink the fruit of the vine from cups.

"Is called," etc. Yes, and sprinkling "is called" baptism, the sacrament in which immersion or sprinkling with water," etc. And you have now arrived at Ashdod on your way to Babylon. The sprinkling will come later. You may know "this to be true" also if you will. And if you are going to take "is called," I know that you, to be consistent, will take sprinkling, too, for "the pot cannot say to the kettle, 'You're black'."

You cannot find the scholar who dares to put in the Bible sprinkling as a meaning of baptizo; nor do you dare—nor can you find the scholar who dares to put in the Bible a "drink"—fruit of the vine, wine, or any other liquid—as a meaning of potior. Your lingo is pure "rot" here.

There are "individual cups," and there are "two or more cups" in use in so-called churches of Christ. And there are churches that use "a cup" (Mt. 26:27), which is "the cup" (I Cor. 11:28) from which they drink and thus "drink the cup of the Lord" (I Cor. 10:21) by drinking "what is in the cup" (Thayer), "what it contains." (Clark)

"The phrase 'the cup, as a figure.' What figure? What figure permits persons to drink from cups and then say in so doing they drank a cup or the cup? Name it, and give an example, and we'll submit it to the scholarship.

Yes, there are many copies of the Bible. And if "the Bible" is passed from one to another and each reads, it is a common Bible; but with each an individual Bible in the reading, there would be no common Bible; each could read the Bible at home as well, just as he could remain at home and drink his individual cup or one section of the church might go to one place with "two or more cups" and commune and disregard the other section or sections, but they could not thus act and call it "one another" as respects "the whole church."

Now if you want to get before the public, just induce some cups paper to divide space with us and state your proposition. They're not afraid of their ground—of course they're not. This will give the cups users a chance to get someone to defend their ungodly practice (if he can). You will wait a long time before you get any of the cups papers to come out before the public and indorse such stuff to be a correct use of language. It is no wonder that Dr. Trott in his tract on "The Cup" refers to such (He had corresponded with J. N. Cowan on this matter) as "the cheap inventions of shysters, employed for the purpose of befogging the intellects of those to whom they are addressed," and brands them as digressives "No. three," for all digression takes this route. And those who do not want the truth desire to have it so.—H. C. Harper.

HISTORICAL FACTS

In his debate with me on the setting up of the kingdom of Christ, Brother Lunsford took occasion in his last speech to say: "What destroyed the Roman power? Paganism, heathenism, barbarism and Mohammedanism; so we see the church had nothing to do with it."

I here submit some historical evidence to the contrary on the matter. Read it.

H. C. Harper.

"Rome entered on the persecutions because it saw in Christianity that which threatened its own existence. The Christians declined to support the state religion; they even condemned it unsparingly as sinful and idolatrous. They refused to worship the genius, or guardian spirit, of the emperor, and would not burn incense before his statue, which stood in every town. Such a refusal to take what was really an oath of allegiance was regarded as an act of rebellion. They refused to serve in the army. Every city had a congregation of Christian worshippers. They met, not in synagogues as did the Jews, but in private houses. The meeting of each was called *ecclesia* from the Greek for assembly. They sang hymns, listened to the readings from the Holy Scriptures, and partook of a meal in memory of the last supper of Jesus with his disciples. They would not join in the amusements of the circus or the amphitheater. They never appeared at public feasts and entertainments. Certain officers called presbyters, or elders, were chosen to conduct the services and instruct the converts." Early European History by Webster.

"The Christians would not attend the Roman temples or worship the Roman gods. They refused to mingle with the crowds and enjoy the cruel shedding of human blood at the gladiatorial combats. They would not enlist as soldiers; they refused to fight. They did not obey the Roman edicts concerning religion. 'What would become of an Empire whose laws were not obeyed,' said the rulers." —Epochs of World Progress by Barnard and Roorbach. (Also see Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire by Gibbon.)

Write Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn., when in need of any kind of printing.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Bro. Phillips: Bro. Pendleton, pastor of the Christian Church, Tucson, Ariz., came to see us and tried to convince us that we cannot worship God acceptably without instrumental music. He brought with him a Greek dictionary, and read the definition of psalmos (psalms) and argued that the word carried with it the idea of mechanical music. What does psalmos mean? —C. N. Y.

The Hebrew words *zemir* (a pruned psalm or song of praise), *zimrah* (a song of praise), and *mizmor* (a song of praise), are each translated "psalm" and they do not seem to carry with them the idea of instrumental music. These words are, of course, found in the Hebrew, or Jewish Scriptures.

The English word psalm (Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16) is from the Greek noun *psalmos*, from the very *psallo*, to touch, to feel, to play on a stringed instrument with the fingers, and finally to "make melody (music) in the heart—not on a mechanical instrument—as in Eph. 5:19. The meaning of the noun *psalmos* corresponds with that of the very *psallo*, and denotes a touching, a twanging, a playing on a stringed instrument, a song accompanying a stringed instrument, any song or ode. And hence, the word psalm may or may not refer to instrumental music. As Prof. Milligan says, "Its proper meaning in any and every case, must be determined by the context. And, according to this fundamental law of interpretation, it is pretty evident that in Ephesians and Colossians the term *psalmos* has no reference whatever to instrumental music; for, in both cases, it is the strings or chords of the heart, and not of an instrument, that are to be touched."

Thayer says (Greek-English Lexicon, p. 675). "Psallo . . . in the N. T. to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song, Jas. 5:13 (R. V. sing praise)." He also cites Eph. 5:19, Rom. 15:9, I Cor. 14:15.

Of *psalmos*, Thayer says (Ibid.), "hence, a pious song, a psalm, Eph. 5:19, Col. 3:16; the praise psalm is used of one who has it in his heart to sing or recite a song of the sort, I Cor. 14:26).

The fact that the Church from A. D. 33 to A. D. 567 had vocal music, or singing only, is positive evidence that Paul's use of *psallo* and *psalmos* does not authorize the use of mechanical music in Christian worship. Paul certainly would not have commanded its use, and then stubbornly disobeyed the command!

And the fact that the Greek Church, which speaks the very language in which the N. T. was written, rejects mechanical music as being authorized, is another strong indication that *psallo* and *psalmos* do not authorize its use.—J. D. P.

1. In Acts 20:11, "When Paul was come up again, and had broken bread," was this the Communion? Does it come from the same as Acts 2:46, "and breaking bread"? Y.

"The fact that the same phraseology is used in both places (Acts 20:7 and 11) shows that they refer to the same thing."—B. W. Johnson (Peo-

ples' N. T.) And so it is in Acts 2:42 and 46. "Any time after sunset on that evening would be the Lord's day as they counted it, and after midnight, which was the time of breaking the loaf on that occasion, was on the Lord's day as we count it." "We have no evidence that either Jews or Gentiles had yet adopted the custom of counting the hours of the day from midnight; consequently we must suppose that the night in question was that belonging to Sunday, as it was then reckoned, or Saturday night, as we now style it."

(J. W. McGarver—Acts)

2. If the Lord's day, "as they counted it," was from sunset to the next sunset, how could Paul depart on the morrow (ep-aurian, "on the next day"—Thayer), if he departed before the next sunset, as is stated in v. 11? (Will some of our readers tell us?)

A brother asks: "From what Greek words are 'body' and 'soul' and 'spirit' translated in I Thess. 5:23, and what are the meanings of these words?"

Answer: The word "body" is *soma* in Greek, and it means the organic substance which composes a human being. It does not necessarily include the soul or the spirit. See Mt. 10:28. "Soul" is *psuke* in Greek, and it refers to the seat of affections. The word translated "spirit" is *pneuma*, and it is the highest and distinctive part of man.

TO A BAPTIST FRIEND

I rejoice to know that you are striving to serve God and worship him in a way that would be pleasing and acceptable in his sight. And I am really glad you are willing to discuss things with me concerning salvation. I agree with you that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life," as we find in John 3:16. And in John 4:9, in connection with this, it says, "In this was manifested the love of God toward us because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." Now, how do we live through him. In I John 5:11, it says, "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." Now, if eternal life is in God's Son before we can have eternal life we must get into God's Son.

So it becomes an important question how to get into the Son. We must (1) believe (Mark 16:16; Acts 16:31; Acts 8:12 and 37), (2) repent (Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38; Acts 17:30; Acts 26:30; Acts 26:20), (3) confess Jesus is the Christ (Acts 8:37; Matt. 10:32; Rom. 10:9 and 10), be baptized (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38 and 41; Gal. 3:27; Col. 2:11 to 13).

You now see that we cannot take belief alone for salvation. James tells us "Seest thou how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only?" (James 2:17) Ans. in verse 26 he says, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

Yes, I agree with you that the law and the prophets were until John and since then the kingdom of God is preached.

THE TRUTH

Published Monthly at Sneads, Florida

EDITORS

H. C. Harper,
Sneads, Florida

J. D. Phillips,
Montebello, California

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo.

Entered as second class matter as a Semi-Monthly, Feb. 25, 1929, at the Post Office at Sneads, Florida, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

SUBSCRIPTION

One Year - \$1.00

LAYCOCK, JACKSON, TENN.

EDITORIAL

By J. D. Phillips

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Bro. Harper has decided to turn the paper over to Bro. King and me. He wants to get the plans well under way for a loyal paper before he is called away. Hence he has, for some time, been planning to turn it over to younger men for publication.

I am at this writing in the home of Bro. King. After giving the matter full consideration, we have decided that Bro. King is the one to whom the work of publishing it should be given.

New Name

We have decided to publish the paper under a new name, "Old Paths." "The Truth" is a good name and so far as we know, the brethren have been satisfied with this name. But we have decided to select one that will be more suggestive of the work we are engaged in—the restoration of Primitive Christianity.

Old Paths

When Israel departed from the right way, God, through His prophet, exhorted them to "Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the Old Paths, where is the good way, and walk therein" (Jer. 6:16). This Scripture will be our motto. It is suggestive of the work we wish to do through the paper.

Lebanon, Mo.

As this is the home of Bro. King, the paper will be published here. So, instead of sending your correspondence, subscription money, etc., to Sneads, Fla., send to "Old Paths," R. R. 2, Lebanon, Mo. Better put it care of Bro. King, too, as the paper in this community will be new to the Post Office Department and the R. R. carriers.

Subscription Rates

The subscription price will be \$1.00 the year. However, as a special inducement for new and renewal subscribers, we are making this offer for the first three months: For \$5.00 we will send the "Old Paths" six years to one address. Or, for \$5.00 we will send the "Old Paths" to six addresses

for one year. So you may secure six subscriptions for one dollar each, send in \$5.00 and keep one for your trouble. Children, especially, should take advantage of this opportunity.

Old Paths Fund

No commercial advertising will be carried in the "Old Paths." But, in order to maintain and enlarge the paper, a fund will be carried, to be known as the "Old Paths Fund." This will be open for donations at all times. As the new paper will be without any funds to start with, we insist, that you make a donation to this fund now.

Do all you can for the paper, brethren, for the future of our work depends, to a great extent, upon what you do for the paper. Send to Homer L. King, Publisher, "Old Paths," R. R. 2, Lebanon, Mo.—J. D. P.

ACTS 20:11

Must have reference to the Communion, for it is the same form of expression as that in Acts 2:42, *ton arton*, 'the loaf,' which would not have been the case if an ordinary meal had been intended.

"The breaking of bread" is a Hebrew idiom, like our "taking tea," or the Arab's "taking salt," and denotes an ordinary meal. But what is emphatically styled "the breaking of the loaf" (Acts 2:42, 20:7 and 11, 1 Cor. 10:16) refers, not to a common meal, but, to the Lord's Supper.

I have Wordsworth's "Greek New Testament with Notes" (one vol., Acts) and on p. 138, commenting on Acts 20:11, he says:

"11. *Ton arton*) Observe the article — 'the bread,' or loaf, i. e., of the Holy Eucharist.

"Elz. has not the article, but it is in A, B, C, D, and has been received by Lachm., Tisch., Bornemann, Alford.

"The disciples had met to break bread (v. 7). St. Paul preaches till midnight, Eutychus falls from a window of the third story. Paul descends from the upper room, and revives him, and returns to break the bread; and after the breaking of the bread he had a repast (*geuetai*, see 10:10)."

"There came evening and there came morning, day one" (Sept. Gen. 1:5). This shows that, in primitive times, the day began in the evening. The Jews began the Sabbath at sun-down Friday, and it ended at sun-down Saturday.

The disciples at Troas must have "come together to break bread," on Saturday night, which would be the beginning of "the First day of the week (*te mia ton sabbaton*). The "breaking of the loaf" (Acts 20:7, 11) took place before daylight on Sunday morning, for Paul "continued his speech till after midnight." The "breaking of bread" was after Paul's discourse had ended.

—J. D. P.

THE TRUTH FUND.

Grace Chisholm ----- \$3.00

Laycock Printing Co., Jackson, Tenn., do all kind of commercial and publication printing.

"SCRIPTURAL METONYMY"

Under this head Bro. Jos. Miller, of Brazil, Ind., has an article in *The Truth* of July the first. I think he speaks the truth when he says, "too much authority of men is offered," and "Valuable time is used in telling and debating what theologians, lexicographers, and translations have said." The common people heard the Savior gladly.

Brother Miller says, "Our Savior has proven, whether people accept it or not, that the fruit of the vine and the cup are both included in one." His proof is Matt. 26:23, Mark 14:20, and John 13:26. I don't just understand what he means by "both"—wine and cup—"included in one." If he means that we must have a container to hold "the fruit of the vine," I know of no one that has ever denied it. But if he means to prove by these Scriptures that Jesus meant by "this cup," that the whole assembly must drink the wine out of the same cup, or that only one vessel was used by Jesus and the twelve in taking the wine, these Scriptures completely fail him, and prove the reverse—that more cups than one were used at the Lord's Supper in taking the wine.

Let us see. Take John 13:26. "Jesus answered, he it is for whom I shall dip the sop and give it him." Surely no one will deny that "the dish" was here—even dishes, for we know that "dish" did not mean that only one was used in the giving of the "sop" to Judas; for then there would have been no dipping in giving the sop. The facts are "dish" was not used literally at all, nor was it applied to giving the "sop" to Judas; but was a figure of speech used by Jesus, referring to the twelve eating with him. "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." This was said as he and the twelve were eating. (See Matt. 26:21) They were all dipping with him in the "dish," that is, were all eating with the Savior, but not all eating out of one "dish." Again: "It is one of the twelve that dippeth with me in the dish." (Mk. 14:20) This shows conclusively that the twelve were dipping with Jesus in the "dish."

It is evident from the above that "dish" was a figure of speech used by our Lord, referring simply to the twelve eating with him, and has no reference at all to a certain "dish." No one would be so foolish I am sure to claim that Jesus and the twelve were all "dipping" and eating out of one dish.

"Dish" in the above Scriptures plays the same part that "cup" does when used by our Savior in the wine service—a figure of speech applied to something else, the fruit of the vine.

Bro. Miller speaks of "other Scriptural arguments that could be given." Well, if he proves his claim, he will have to give them, for the ones given have failed him. I do not know why he added the word "he" after "twelve" in Mk. 14:20. It is not in the text.

"Dippeth with me in the dish." Just as well claim that Jesus had the twelve to eat out of the same dish with him as to claim he has bound upon each assembly to drink the wine out of the same cup. You say he commanded the twelve to all

"drink out of it—the cup." Just as much sense and just as much Scripture for the claim that they all ate out of the same "dish." Too much hair splitting argument for me. I cannot accept such. Your theory is contrary to "your reasonable service" and "do all things decently," as the Savior has taught. (Rom. 12:1; I Cor. 14:40; II Cor. 7:1) We know this, and we know he has not taught something contrary, which would be, if your theory were true.—Brotherly,

A. J. Bond, West Grove, Ia.

Reply

It was shown by the New Testament that Jesus teaches that "the fruit of the vine" and "the cup" are both included in one. See my article in July issue. The argument our Lord made on "the dish" and "sop" in Mt. 26:23, Mk. 14:20, Jno. 13:26:27, was given for proof. This still remains unmoved.

Mt. and Mk. mention "the dish," but do not mention "the sop." John speaks of "the sop," but not "the dish." Hence, when "the dish" is spoken of in Mt. 26:23, Mk. 14:20, it includes "the sop," and when Christ spoke of "the sop" in Jno. 13:26, 27, this includes "the dish." Please open up the Word of God to the above scriptures, then get the July number of "The Truth" and read, or re-read, for yourselves.

If Brother Bond does not believe what our Lord taught it is his own fault. If he can prove by the New Testament that our Redeemer did not include "the sop" when he spoke of "the dish," nor included "the dish" when he spoke of "the sop," nor "the fruit of the vine" includes "the cup," nor "the cup" includes "the fruit of the vine," he will then have an argument against the teaching of Christ.

Brother Bond says he doesn't just understand what I mean "by both wine and cup included in one." I said nothing about 'wine.' See my article. I, of course, meant what I said.

He speaks of "container," "more cups than one were used at the Lord's supper in taking the wine," "Dish not used literally," "but is a figure of speech, or used figuratively," etc.

The Word of God says nothing about "container" and "cups in the Lord's supper." But "a cup," or "the cup." Mt. 26:27. Mk. 14:23. Lk. 22:20. I Cor. 10:16:21. 11:25. There is no divine evidence for using "cups in the Lord's supper." This is why Brother Bond has not given scripture for his position.

He avers, "dish" means "dishes," and "cup" means "cups." His teaching forces him to this conclusion. But the 'Author of our salvation' said, "dish" not "dishes," "sop" not "sops," "cup" not "cups." If "dish is a figure of speech" or figuratively" as he claims, then they had no "dish" so Judas did not "dip in the dish," but in the "figure." If "the dish is figuratively," so is "the sop." So according to his reasoning they had no "dish" nor "sop." The conclusion is, our Lord was mistaken.

He thinks that I "added 'he' in Mk. 14:20." I quoted from the "American Standard Version."

as I usually do. If you wish to examine the above version, you will find it just as I gave it. But enough (Yes, too much) of this irrelevant stuff.

Brother H. C. Harper has given a masterly discussion through "The Truth" on "The Cup." So far as I have learned, all who accept what the Word of God sets forth are satisfied with Brother Harper's defense. There is no Bible authority for the use of cups; they are wholly of man. I still say this one argument from the language of Christ is sufficient. It stands unshaken. Joseph Miller, 1004 N. Lambert, Brazil, Ind.

Remarks

The "sop," or morsel, after being dipped in the common dish on the table was given to Judas Iscariot. The language is literal. Of course there is connotation here, but not metonymy. "By the connotation of a word or phrase is meant what it implies or makes one think of, over and beyond what it literally says." (Working Principles of Rhetoric, p. 34) There is suggestion in connotation as well as in metonymy; but metonymy is figurative language, that is, language used in an unusual way to express thought; as, "drink the cup" in I Cor. 10:21 and 11:27, where the cup holding the thing to be drunk is named in a way to suggest the contents also, that is, the word cup here involves both the cup and its contents. The contents are not the cup, neither is the cup its contents; but both are involved in the language; one (the cup) being named, the other (the contents) being suggested.

Why a man will cry down scholarship, and then set himself up as the standard for right, expecting brethren to take his ipse dixit, is strange to me. If I cannot back up what I say by the best scholarship there is, I ask nobody to take it. And when people talk language and do not know the a, b, c of what they are talking about, it is time to halt. Those who want no higher authority than "Cowan said it" or "Bond said it" for the correct use of language are welcome to it so far as I am concerned. I know they are no nearer the truth here than was the devil in the garden of Eden. Bro. Bond says, as an example of his perversion, "The facts are 'dish' was not used literally at all, nor was it applied to giving the 'sop' to Judas; but was a figure of speech used by Jesus, referring to the twelve eating with him." I say again the devil never perverted inspired language to exceed this. Now get your authority on language and clear your skirts if you can: if not, swallow the lump. We have had enough of "Bond said it." The devil said it, too (Gen. 3:4); but it was far from the truth. —H. C. Harper.

Brethren, Take Notice!

I intend to spend the winter in Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma. I will be in Oklahoma not later than December 1st. I intend to make headquarters in Tulsa, Okla. I stand foursquare on the Word of God. All loyal congregations who would like to have my help, may write me at Eadsville, Kentucky, until December 1st.

Yours in the Christ,

O. B. Perkins.

FROM THE FIELD

T. E. Smith, R. F. D. 1, Foulke, Ark.—Bro. Homer L. King of Lebanon, Mo., closed a meeting here the last of October. The meeting commenced Saturday night, October 17, and the attendance increased until the house would not hold the people. Bro. King commands the best interest and attention of any preacher, I believe, that I have heard. He did not fail to declare the whole counsel of God. Three were baptized and seven were restored. I am sure there were others almost persuaded. Bro. Louis Musgrave of Wichita Falls, Texas, was with Bro. King and preached Sunday evening on the binding and loosing of Satan and the millennium. With a little practice I believe he will be one among the best preachers we have. Brethren will not make a mistake in calling him for a meeting. He and Bro. King stayed in my home during the meeting, and we enjoyed their company and conversations on the Scriptures. They left in Bro. Musgrave's car for Lebanon, Mo., where Bro. Musgrave will preach for awhile. Here is my subscription to "The Truth."

P. F. Furguson et al., Groesbeck, Texas.—Bro. W. J. Harris has been with us in a campaign against sin for ten days. He is able and does not shun to declare the whole truth as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord. He has edified the church much. We are made to rejoice over the results of the meeting. To God be all the glory.

E. A. Brown, Ft. Worth, Texas.—We are using one loaf and one cup, and our attendance has been on the increase. Hard times caused me to discontinue my subscription and not because I wanted to quit the paper, for I know it is the only loyal paper in the brotherhood today. I am sending you one dollar for renewal.

J. C. Jones, Shreveport, La.—Bro. Harper was with the church here from Aug. 11 to 16. We had good crowds, and good preaching as we always do when Brother Harper is with us. The church appreciated his services, and we hope to have him again with us whenever he comes this way.

Walter Lemons, Flippin, Ark.—I closed a meeting last Lord's day at Advance, Ark., with eight baptisms, and left many searching the Scriptures. One baptized was 88 years old and a Civil War veteran. I have just finished a four-days' debate with a Baptist at Thida, Ark. I shall begin the meeting at Flippin tomorrow.

E. E. Gibbs, Ratton, Okla.—We have been meeting in a private house, because there is no loyal congregation near us. We are to locate permanently at Ethel, Okla., and want to establish a loyal congregation there. We are about five miles from Antlus, the county site town and on a farm.

near Ethel. Who will come and hold us a meeting this fall or winter? We shall be glad to receive a little help for this meeting to buy song-books and get a place for the meeting. Brethren will please write me here. I refer you to Brethren T. F. Thomasson, Artesia, N. Mex.; L. Walters, Dexter, N. Mex.; N. O. White, Mena, Ark.; A. Williams, Rattan, Okla.; Dearwood Write, Route 2, Hugo, Okla.

W. T. Taylor, Rt. 3, De Leon, Texas.—I want to locate with some small congregation where I can assist in the teaching and preaching. I prefer a place on the Santa Fe R. R. west of Temple, Texas. I will rent or lease a small farm or filling station. I would like to put in my time preaching as much as possible. Brethren needing a preacher either for a meeting or to assist the congregation in teaching may write me at once here.

C. C. Cleary, Wichita Falls, Texas.—We have just (Oct 12) closed a very fine meeting with the largest attendance we have ever had. Two were baptized and two restorations. Bro. Homer L. King will be with us again next year the last part of September and first part of October. Our young Brother Lewis Musgrave, who is active in the work here, is now going with Bro. King for awhile. Bro. King goes from here to Faulke, Ark., for a meeting. Bro. Lewis Musgrave is a nephew of Bro. Bob Musgrave of Elk City, Okla., who is mighty in the Gospel ministry. Any congregation will make no mistake in getting him for a meeting. He is sound in the faith. Our congregation meets at N. 6 and Grand Sts., Scotland Addition, Wichita Falls, Texas. Shall be glad to have brethren to meet with us. You can address B. C. Dikes, R. C. Carr, D. O. Fancher, John Tate, or C. C. Clary, Box 201. Will send in subscriptions soon.

Homer L. King, Lebanon, Mo., Oct. 22, 1931.—Closed a series of meetings with the brethren meeting on N. 6th St., Wichita Falls, Texas, Oct. 12. The results were two baptized and one restored. Also a young preacher of much ability, converted from the Sunday School and a plurality of cups in the communion. You will read elsewhere in this issue of the paper of said conversion, hence nothing more here.

From Wichita Falls we went to Shreveport, La., and preached two nights; meeting with the brethren, with whom I have labored much. From here we went to Atlanta, Texas, where we preached two nights, meeting many good brethren in the Lord. We were gladly surprised the last night here to have Bro. Tidwell, of El Dorado, Ark., with us.

From Atlanta we came to Foulke, Ark., and began a series of meetings the 17th of October, and expect to continue until the 25th. We are having good crowds and fine attention. One has confessed faults to date. The young preacher, Bro. J. L. Musgrave, who was converted at Wichita, has been with me in the above work, and expects to continue with me for some time.

Arceneaux-Tidwell Debate

Was held at Tague, Texas, Oct. 5, Arceneaux affirming that "The Scriptures teach that the class work as practiced by my brethren and me is Scriptural, and James E. Tidwell denying.

To sustain his contention Arceneaux gave the case of Miriam's action in Ex. 15:20; Hulda, a prophetess (2 Kings 22:14); the "woman of Samaria" who went into that city and told of the Savior's talking with her (John 4:7); Phillip's four daughters, who prophesied (Acts 21:9); Priscilla and Aquila (Acts 18:26); and Anna in the Temple. All of this met a decisive defeat in the reply of Bro. Tidwell with every other subterfuge put up by Arceneaux.

Bro. Tidwell affirmed: "The Scriptures teach that the class work as practiced by Brother Arceneaux and his brethren violates the word of God and is therefore sinful. He exposed by many scriptures Arceneaux' contention for "the hour of worship." He piled up passage after passage showing the devious, sinful course of Arceneaux and his brethren in the strife, confusion, and un-Christian attitude of these "class" brethren in destroying the "unity" for which the Savior prayed (Jno. 17), and which the Holy Scriptures enjoins on all Christians and churches, warning us against the "commandments and doctrines of men," lest we fall away from "the faith of the Gospel."

The S. S. folks are not fully satisfied and talk of challenging for another debate. We are ready. Bro. Tidwell is fine in debate. Call him when you have to meet digression from the word of God. The church at Tague who follow the Bible is well satisfied with the results of the debate and they are "living stones" in the Temple of our God.

W. J. Harris.

C. A. McKinnon, Teague, Texas.—The church of Christ at the corner of Seventh and Mulberry streets has just closed (Aug. 29) a twelve days' meeting with Evangelist J. E. Tidwell, of Eldorado, Arkansas, conducting the services. Four young ladies added to the church by baptism were as priceless jewels for our feeble efforts. And our congregation has been greatly strengthened spiritually not only by the great truths in the written word of God analyzed by Bro. Tidwell, but also by the encouragement and fellowship of visiting brethren from Dallas, Waco, Port Arthur, Thornton, Mexia, Cotton Gin, and Campbell Branch, Texas.

We count ourselves very fortunate to have a man so full of the love of the Lord and the power of His might to do the teaching.

Great interest was manifested throughout the meeting; and brotherly love was manifested at the close of each service which portrayed the oneness in Christ both in faith and practice. And our denominational friends and neighbors seemed to give us a congratulating hand.

We want to commend Brother Tidwell for his house-to-house work as well as for his teaching in the assembly during the meeting. We also want to commend Bro. Claud Core of Mexia for

his hospitality toward the Campbell Branch congregation in furnishing transportation for them to attend the meeting. We are sure Brother Core, with the rest of us, rejoiced to see his big truck come up to the meeting-house, and from twenty to forty get out every night to attend the services.

Brother Stark of Dallas did the baptizing; also Brother Stark, wife and family and Grandma Stark from Corsicana were in almost regular attendance. Bro. Stark knows Bro. Tidwell's work in the cause of Christ throughout Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

Bro. Bass Cobb, wife, and daughter of Port Arthur were over to hear Bro. Tidwell. Each had heard of the other's talents, but they had never met.

Bro. J. P. Jones, wife, and family of Waco; Bro. and Sister Smith of Thornton; Bro. Broadfute and son of Thornton; Bro. Eveman of Thornton; Bro. and Sister Rasco of Thornton; Bro. and Sister West of Mexia and many other out-of-town visitors were in attendance to hear and be with Bro. Tidwell in the cause of the Master. Also Bro. Tidwell of Dallas was here over Saturday and Sunday to be with his brother and commend both the visiting and the Teague brethren for the great interest manifested and for the unity that prevailed.

We are very grateful to Bro. Rasco for his interest and co-operation in making our meeting a success. We have known and loved him for many years for the truth's sake. He has been a father to us, ever warning us through the Scriptures to stand aloof from the doctrines and traditions of men, ever keeping in unity of the Spirit.

We are glad to announce that Bro. Tidwell is to be back with us for another meeting to begin the first of August, 1932.

We now give thanks to God our Father for the many manifestations of the oneness in Christ our Lord, and we pray God's richest blessings on all the faithful in Christ Jesus. (Church of Christ at Teague, Texas.)

THE LORD'S DAY

We have precisely the same reason for a particular manner of observing the Lord's day that we have for observing it at all, viz., the example of the first Christians. Hence, we are just as firmly bound to observe it after their manner as we are to observe it at all. The authority for the manner is the same as the authority for observing the day at all. It is nowhere called a Sabbath, and it cannot be truthfully so-called, for it is not properly a day of rest.

And if we were to rest from our own work, stay in-doors, kindle no fires, etc., after the Jews' manner of observing the Sabbath, we would not be observing the Lord's day. We must "not neglect the assembling of ourselves together," etc. Then, by the same potent authority, we must attend to (1) the apostles' teaching; (2) the fellowship; (3) the breaking of bread; (4) the prayers; (5) teaching and admonishing one another in holy songs; (6) exhorting one another; (7) withdrawing from

the incorrigibly wicked; (8) receiving the worthy. In this manner did the ancient churches observe the first day of the week. Not a word is said about our modern pastor or his sermonizing. How we deceive ourselves if we imagine we are observing this holy day when we simply cease from our ordinary work, or when we listen to an eloquent sermon, and perhaps put a few dimes into the church treasury! "These ought ye to have done, and not to have left the others undone." And what of those who observe the day Scripturally once a month, once in three months, or once a year! Is this the measure of their obedience? Is this their Christianity? It is not apostolic Christianity! (Page 96. Live religious issues of the Day. By Carrol Kendrick.)

(And "we have precisely the same reason for a particular manner of observing" the "Lord's supper" "that we have for observing it at all." And "The authority for the manner is the same as the authority for observing" the "Lord's supper" at all. "In fact F. L. Rowe, before he bowed the knee to Baal, said, in exposing the Christian Standard, "The manner of participating in the Lord's Supper is stated in Holy Writ just as plainly as is the 'mode' of baptism.")

BRO. J. L. MUSGRAVE CONVERTED TO THE TRUTH

In the early spring of 1930, I obeyed the gospel at the age of 19. Within a few months, I began taking a part in the public work of the church, and about seven months ago I endeavored to preach my first sermon. Receiving some encouragement as a result of that effort, I have since continued to do what I could in that work, as I had opportunity.

About three months ago, through the influence of some of the leading S. S. brethren, I was led to believe that the Sunday School and a plurality of cups in the communion were all right. Therefore, I accepted a position as "minister" of one of said churches, and in which work, I continued until Bro. Homer L. King came to Wichita Falls, Tex. to conduct a series of meeting October 3rd to 12th. On October 8th, he spent the day in my home, talking over these questions with me. As a result I saw the error of my way, and have now taken my stand for the Bible alone, and against the S. S., cups and all other departures from the word of God. Like Moses, of old, in Heb. 11:25, 26. "Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt."

My greatest ambition and heart's desire is to enter the evangelistic field in the service of my Master; that I may build up His Kingdom among men. Brethren, here is my hand, and you may count on me as a co-laborer in the vineyard of the Lord. I shall put forth my very best efforts in whatever capacity it may be my lot to labor. Brethren, pray for me that I may ever uphold the bloodstained banner of Prince Emmanuel.

Yours for the whole truth.

—J. L. Musgrave.