APPEAL FOR UNITY

By
DANIEL SOMMER

"But He answered and said: Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." Matthew 15: 13.

Published by
Apostolic Review
904 Udell Street, Indianapolis, Indiana

Price 50 cents

APPEAL FOR UNITY

EXPLANATORY REMARKS

In the year 1869 I left a certain church not mentioned in the Bible. One of my reasons for leaving it was because I could not defend it and yet be honest with the Bible, also because that church was one of many churches which helped to divide the religious world contrary to the Savior's prayer for the oneness or unity of his people. I rejected my infant sprinkling and was immersed by the authority of Christ, and into the name of the God-head, because I became convinced that I should have more confidence in the word of God than in my own emotions or feelings or conscience. When I learned that Saul of Tarsus had a "good conscience" while he was a persecutor of the Church of the New Testament, and a blasphemer, I could no longer believe that conscience was intended for a guide. Besides all this I was pleased with the plea made by disciples for the oneness or unity of God's people on the Bible.

The name "disciple of Christ" I was led to regard as a synonym, or another name, for all that was true and pure and good in religion, and I rejoiced when I found that I had no name to defend except what I could find in the Bible. But I soon learned, to my sorrow, a difference had arisen, or commenced to exist, between disciples and disciples—that certain disciples were satisfied with what they found plainly set forth in the New Testament while others were not. In other words, I was annoyed, saddened, grieved, when I learned that certain disciples were disposed to become popular by organizing societies and adopting other devices that were not mentioned in the New Covenant scriptures; and that those disciples were called "fogies," "old fogies," "moss-backs" and "kickers," who would not adopt such devices. A controversy was thereby introduced which should never have been begun, and which has thus far engaged, perhaps, one-half of the time of the disciple brotherhood. Then came family divisions, strifes, contentions, alienations, congregational divisions, law-suits, criminations, re-criminations, disgrace—all these and other evils have been introduced. As a result, our plea for the oneness of all of God's people on the Bible was forgotten, discarded, disgraced, because of our own divisions. In the first half century of our existence as a separate people we pleaded for the oneness of God's people in many of our discourses and writings. In the second half we have neglected that subject through shame, or for some other reason.

But many of our devices have worked their own rebuke. This is certainly true of the church fair and festival, funny lectures and

oyster suppers, poverty socials and yule-tide parties, missionary jugs and eggs and potatoes, mite societies and box-suppers, with various other schemes for raising money. The same may be said of missionary societies, also church colleges, and local organizations. The results of all those devices have proved unsatisfactory, disappointing, humiliating! "Trees are known by their fruits." The first half of First Corinthians first chapter saved us from calling ourselves after the names of men, and we have wondered why it did not save all other religious bodies in Christendom from the same unscriptural practice, though the names they have chosen have generally been appropriate, for they have been descriptive titles. Then the second half of that same chapter should have saved us from thinking that we should have colleges to educate men for the ministry, especially when re-inforced by the second chapter of that letter. The apostle Paul did not write more clearly against Christians adopting the names of men as their descriptive titles than he wrote against Christians seeking after worldly wisdom in order to preach the Gospel.

"Man is what he eats." This is true of him physically, mentally, morally, socially, domestically, politically, spiritually. Streams of water partake of the kinds of soil through which they pass, and the soil will partake of the kinds of water by which it is moistened. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." Heathen mythology will never make a preacher of the Gospel. Man is more or less like a potter's vessel, which will hold a definite amount, but no more. Fill a man full of one commodity, and he will have neither room nor disposition for anything more. Cram much into a little vessel and you are liable to burst it. Man is limited in regard to brain power, nerve power, eye-sight, attention, expansion, concentration.

Who that knows the history of the "American Christian Missionary Society," the "Louisville Plan," and later organizations for doing missionary work by disciples, could endorse them on the principle that "A tree is known by its fruit"? And who that knows the history of "Transylvania University," "Eureka College" and "Hiram," with several other institutions which have cost millions of dollars, can regard them as good enterprises for disciples of Christ, who are exhorted to be followers, imitators, copyists of the apostle to the Gentiles? Does some one say that he was brought up at the feet of Doctor Gamaliel? The answer is that he wrote what shows that he regarded his earthward attainments as loss for Christ's sake, except that he had learned to make tents, and was thereby enabled to work with his hands for his temporal support. Does some one say that our religious neighbors have made a success of their educational and missionary enterprises? "Be not deceived," is the answer. They have had "troubles of their

own," of which an occasional report has been made. Besides, they were generally united in regard to such enterprises, whereas we divided the disciple brotherhood when we adopted our unauthorized enterprises, and the division was wrought because many disciples regarded them as unauthorized. Then and there we, who urged those enterprises, forgot the Savior's prayer for the oneness of his followers, and ignored the apostolic exhortations for "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Yes, and we forgot that our purpose was to unite all of God's people on the Bible. Then and there we copied after our religious neighbors in regard to enterprises, divided ourselves, ruined our plea for unity, and lost the grandest opportunity for good that any religious body has ever had since the primitive Church was betrayed. In our zeal for success many of us favored enterprises that have made us a compromised, betrayed, disgraced people. We should have tried to be ALWAYS FAITHFUL regardless of success, because the Savior likened the Kingdom of Heaven to a man who said, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," but said not a word about success. BUT OUR ZEAL FOR SUCCESS HAS RUINED US! Certainly it has ruined our plea for the oneness of God's people.

In view of the facts mentioned in the preceding statement, what should we do? Rather, what must we do when we consider the sin of the Samaritan sorcerer who sinned after his baptism by supposing that the gift of God might be purchased with money? We have supposed that success for the Lord's cause might be secured by monied enterprises which we have copied from our religious neighbors, and our sin has certainly been more inexcusable than was that Samaritan's sin. He had lately been converted from the sin of sorcery, and we had long been converted from sectarianism. He was commanded to repent and pray, if perhaps the thought of his heart might be forgiven him; and we should obey that command. One of the chief men of our number, after promoting one of those enterprises for many years, said to me, "I repent that I ever had anything to do with it." And should not all others of his class do the same?

Thus ends the first of a series of articles concerning the oneness or unity of God's people. In this series several repetitions will be found, but none too many in view of the importance of the various phases of the subjects discussed. And in view of the fact that we have been copyists after religious sectarians rather than after Christ our Exemplar and the apostle Paul as our "pattern," we should blush with shame!

DIAGNOSIS MADE AND REMEDY SUGGESTED

In the year 1883 I began to publish a semi-monthly magazine. My purpose was to name it "A Call to Unity," but I was prevented from so doing by Leonard F. Bittle, whom I wished to have asso-

ciated with me in editing that publication, and he preferred another name. I mention my purpose at that time in order that the reader may be informed of the fact that nearly fifty years ago I was seriously considering the divided condition of the disciple brotherhood. In 1886 the paper then known as "American Christian Review" was transferred to me, and soon I began to print articles, and even series of articles, in its columns, on the subject of Unity. In the meantime the subject of the unity or oneness of God's people became one of my chief subjects in protracted meetings and on other occasions. I once proposed a yearly meeting at Pennsville, in Morgan county, Ohio, for purpose of discussing the question: "How May the Churches of Christ Become United and Remain United?" The proposed meeting was held, but nearly all the divisive preachers remained away! Instead of having from twenty to twenty-five present, as in preceding annual meetings, only five or six were there! That was full of meaning to me.

But since then many of the disciple brotherhood have commenced to grow weary of our divisions, and I have decided to offer that brotherhood a volume on that subject, hoping thereby to hasten the discarding from its midst of all divisive doctrines, practices and institutions. And I am not without hope that the disciple brotherhood by discarding its divisive devices may show other religious bodies how to discard theirs and become united. We showed them how to go through four years of war in this country without dividing, though certain others then divided. And now we shall do well if we can show them HOW TO SETTLE RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES.

We have, as a brotherhood, read with some advantage what the apostle Paul wrote to the church at Corinth against divisions over humanly adopted names as religious titles or designations. But we have failed to consider aright what he wrote to that same church concerning the danger of depending on human knowledge, or "the wisdom of this world," in order to uphold and advance the Gospel of Christ. As a result of this failure on our part we have adopted religio-secular colleges to the utmost, and have become divided by reason of them. And this is a good place to state that if disciples had all obeyed the command to give as the Lord prospered them, not one of them ever could have accumulated money enough even to consider the building of a college. They had to withhold from the Lord's treasury what the Lord required that his people should all put into it, before they could think of building a college. And, according to Malachi 3: 8-10, all such were guilty of robbing God!

Besides this we have, as a brotherhood, failed to consider seriously what the apostle Paul wrote to the Galatian brethren of the danger of adopting any part of Judaism as an adjunct to the Gos-

pel. As a result we, or many of us, have resorted to Judaism for musical instruments, and have thereby wrought division—because we have thereby offended those who could not in good conscience make such a resort. But those who made such resort went back to the childhood age and servant period of God's people. (See Galatians fourth chapter.) And they overlooked the fact that Christians are sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. (See 2 Cor. 6: 17, 18.)

Then by a failure to consider aright what the apostle Paul wrote to the Ephesians about the Church being "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all," and about giving glory unto God "in the Church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end"—I say, that by a failure to consider all this and what is recorded in Col. 2: 10 about being "complete in Him who is the head of all principality and power"—I say, by a failure to consider all this aright a great part of the brotherhood of disciples imitated certain other religionists, and, as a result, we became a divided people.

To this I may add that by reason of not considering aright, and in its fulness of meaning, what is recorded in 1 Peter 4: 11 about speaking "as the oracles of God," and by reason of overlooking what the apostle John wrote in Revelation twenty-second chapter about the danger of adding to God's word or taking from it,—by reason of this a large part of the disciple brotherhood tried to make improvements on the worship and work and government of the Church, and by reason of this a further division in this brotherhood resulted.

Besides all this, mention should be made of the fact that after exposing the false reasoning of our religious neighbors, which they adopted in behalf of their humanisms in church names, church government, doctrine of conversion, worship and work,—I say, after all this many leading disciples adopted such reasoning in behalf of their own preferred devices! Yes, after exposing the doctrine in regard to baptism—that "a drop is as good as an ocean"—certain leading men adopted the doctrine that "a tuning fork is on the same principle as an organ in the song-service of the church." As a result a dreadful division was made!

Many leaders in our brotherhood told their religious neighbors that they should study the book of Acts and learn that a wholehearted faith, repentance, confession and baptism are always necessary to save alien sinners from their sins and make them Christians. Yet they failed to urge their own brethren in the Church to consider the importance of obeying wholeheartedly all the commands addressed to all baptized believers in regard to the private life of every Christian. And, as a result, very many connected with the brotherhood are ungodly! They will neither discipline themselves nor allow any one else to discipline them. And, as a further

result, another phase of division has been made in the disciple brotherhood.

Nor is this all, for leaders in this brotherhood have contended with their religious neighbors, in many instances, that they should "take the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," in regard to names and church government, doctrine and practice, even as in regard to the first principles of the Gospel, and be satisfied therewith. But many of those who have thus contended have varied from such contention when they have adopted societies, institutions, organizations not mentioned in any part of the Bible. They have said that the Gospel is perfect to make Christians, but have implied that it is imperfect in regard to the worship and work of Christians.

And the saying—"We speak where the Bible speaks, and are silent where the Bible is silent"—that saying soon began to be disregarded by many, and even to be ridiculed, and finally reversed. As a result we became divided and even sub-divided in many places, and jocularity was introduced where sobriety should have prevailed; also the clapping of hands, according to secular out-bursts of approval, instead of the Bible expression, "Amen," as found in both the Old Testament and the New. To this should be added that a certain class of divisionists went from city to city introducing and promoting what they called "The Men and Millions Movement." And in so doing they had what they called "A feast of reason and a flow of soul." By so doing they further divided themselves from the humble and prayerful part of the brotherhood.

Soliciting money from worldlings—by ungodly entertainments, dinners and suppers; also begging the rich of the world in many instances—in order to support and advance human devices;—by such means the disciple brotherhood became further divided, contrary to the Savior's prayer for unity, the apostolic exhortations for unity, and our original plea for unity.

But besides all this a large part of the disciple brotherhood seemed to forget that the Savior likened the Kingdom of Heaven to a man who rewarded his servants according to their faithfulness, but said not a word about their success. (See Matt. 25: 14-23.) As a result, many preachers and other individuals, also many congregations as such, bent their energies in the direction of making a SHOW OF SUCCESS, REGARDLESS OF FAITHFULNESS. In so doing they resorted to means and measures, plans and arrangements, doctrines and devices, advertising and antics, whereby they separated themselves from many others. And they enlarged the brotherhood by numbers rather than by converts to Christ, which resulted in an ungodly and reproachful membership. All this has tended to separate disciples from each other, and thus has caused division and derision.

Last and worst of all, mention should be made of the slander on the Savior, in the loose talking and writing that many have done in representing Him as a compromiser, by declaring that compromised talk and conduct are of "the spirit of Christ", and that all uncompromising talk and writing are "not the spirit of Christ." Whoever will read the records of the Savior's controversies with perverse Jews, especially as found in Matthew twenty-third chapter, will find that He was the severest of critics and denouncers of wrong-doers and talkers. Besides this we find in John 5: 19, 30, also in John 8: 28, 29, and in John 12: 48-50,—I say, we there find that Christ regarded himself as bound up and down, and in and under, TO THE DIVINE FATHER'S WILL AS EXPRESSED IN THE DIVINE FATHER'S WORDS. This is evident because He said, "The Son can do nothing of himself . . . I can of mine own self do nothing . . . When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I DO NOTHING OF MYSELF; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things . . . For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father who sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, EVEN AS THE FATHER SAID UNTO ME, SO I SPEAK." But many leading men in the disciple brotherhood have ignored all such declarations of the Savior, for they have tried to do many things which neither the Father nor the Son ever mentioned! On the contrary, they have followed the example and speech of Moses when he said in anger, "Hear now, ye rebels,—must WE fetch you water out of this rock?" (See Num. 20: 10.) We learn (by reading Psa. 106: 32, 33) that the sin of Moses on that occasion was that he spoke "unadvisedly with his lips." But, he made a wonderful success!? Yet he and his brother Aaron were both charged with unbelief and rebellion. They left the name of God out of their speech; and so did the leaders in the disciple brotherhood when they said, WE should build a college, and WE should organize a missionary society, and WE should imitate the Jews in having musical instruments, and WE should imitate our religious neighbors in adopting "the pastorate" in addition to the Eldership, instead of having the pastor as the Elder who labors "in word and doctrine", and therefore should be supported by the church. They added also,—and WE should imitate our neighbors in textuary preaching, and try to be orators; and WE should imitate other religious people in raising money by worldly entertainments. By thus imitating Moses when he was angry many of us have turned from our Savior who said, "THE SON CAN DO NOTHING OF HIMSELF . . . I CAN DO NOTHING OF MYSELF." By turning from Christ many leaders among disciples have mistreated Him.

And this suggests the story of a petty officer in the English army who had under him a private who was a noble specimen of a man. The officer seemed to envy that noble man, and annoyed him by all the technical criticisms that military regulations permitted. But the time came when that officer was required to take his men into battle, and soon he was wounded and fell. His men soon retreated, and in their retreat that noble man came to the place where that officer was lying, and he heard this piteous appeal: "John, for heaven's sake, don't leave me here to fall into the hands of the enemy!" The story stated that the noble private soldier gathered up his officer and started to take him out of danger, but while so doing he himself was pierced by a bullet and killed. But that officer was taken to a hospital and died in the horrors of remorse, crying and repeating, "O I mistreated my best friend! I mistreated my best friend!" And thus those should cry who have turned from God and Christ and the Holy Spirit, and the Divine Word, also from those disciples who have said, "O DON'T DISTURB AND DIVIDE THE DISCIPLE BROTHERHOOD BY COPYING AFTER CHURCHES NOT MENTIONED IN THE BIBLE!"

HISTORIC STATEMENTS

One of the first departures in the nineteenth century, from the Gospel in its simplicity, purity, strictness, authority—was made when one of the chief writers of the brotherhood proposed to substitute a pious life for obedience in baptism. That was done, as memory serves me concerning the record, in the year 1837. It was proposed in an article concerning Christians in the denominations, or churches not mentioned in the Bible. The writer said he could not substitute obedience to any ordinance for a pious life, and would give his preference to an unimmersed person of pious life above an immersed person who was not living a pious life. That writer failed to see that by such preference he was substituting a pious life for immersion.

That doctrine from that time onward began to be considered among disciples as a people, and within a quarter of a century from that date another prominent writer began to advocate "communing with the pious unimmersed." Then in course of another quarter of a century advocacy of "open membership" began to be discussed, and later began to be adopted. As a result a division on this subject has been made in the disciple brotherhood which was, for a time, liable to become general. Those favoring membership with the unimmersed have returned to the position held by the "Christian Connection," which began in the nineteenth century before the disciple brotherhood became a separated people. That was a doctrinal division of a prominent order, for it was a proposal to

ignore the importance of one of the ordinances—the only ordinance in obedience to which the name of the God-head is authorized to be pronounced over us. And it is the only one which is such a demarcation between the true Church and the world that it is rejected and denounced as a "non-essential" by the Romish church and the Protestant clergy that imitates Rome. The reader knows I refer to immersion.

The next departure from the simplicity and purity required by the Gospel was lack of discipline. This was introduced by emotional preachers who tried to make a name for themselves by baptizing many, whether or not they were properly taught. Then it was encouraged by "pastors" who wished large audiences, and therefore would not denounce all manner of sins. And it was further encouraged by Elders who did not wish to engage in the unpleasant work of exercising discipline on the unruly members of the Church, especially when such unruly ones were members of their own families or were in the families of their relatives. As a result, in course of a few years, congregational discipline was neglected till the professed disciples and worldlings were together on the dance floor, at the horse-race, in the theaters, at the card-table and various other places of ungodly entertainment. Thus another general division was made in the disciple brotherhood because other classes of disciples have never endorsed such practices, but contend that those who engage in such practices are not keeping themselves "unspotted from the world," and are in danger of being eternally lost. Those who thus contend are accustomed to say that the final Judge will not say "well done" to those who have not done well, nor will He say "good and faithful servant" to any who have not been "good and faithful."

Then the beginning of another division was made when a certain prominent writer showed that he did not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible. He showed this by declaring that the inspired men were as free to use their own words in their writings as he was free to select his own words in expressing himself concerning their writings. Thus he wrote in his "Rules of Interpretation," which he offered to his readers for their guidance in studying the Scriptures. But in thus expressing himself he overlooked the fact that in the writings of Moses we find this declaration—"And the Lord spake unto Moses"—more than seventy times. Then in the books of prophecy we find, many times, the statement—"The word of the Lord came unto me, saying . . . ";—then the exact words of the message of that "word" are offered. In harmony with this we find the apostle Paul declaring of the revelations made to him, " . . . which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual." (See 1 Cor. 2: 13.)

These and many other declarations of inspired pen-men show beyond question to any one, who will consider them aright, that the inspired writers wrote by verbal inspiration, even as they spoke by verbal inspiration, especially when they spoke in languages that they had never learned. And those parts of the Bible which were otherwise written were endorsed by inspiration.

But the fact that verbal inspiration is declared of much of the Bible, and then endorsement of all of it by those who were verbally inspired—these facts should have prevented every disciple of Christ from casting reflections on the doctrine of verbal inspiration of the Bible. But such reflections, in the first half of the nineteenth century, resulted in speculations concerning the integrity of the text of the Bible, in the latter half of that century. Then, as a further result, the introduction of so-called "Higher Criticism" was not uncommon with a certain class, and those who made up that class became another defection from the main body of the disciple brotherhood. And later, specially through the colleges, the foolery of Evolution has been introduced.

Thus one doctrinal division after another was introduced, and all as a result of a failure on the part of leading men in the disciple brotherhood to study the Bible with care and to the utmost. They were so busy exposing the errors of others that they failed to keep clear of errors among themselves. And now many of them are so well established in error that a marvel of humility will be needed for them to renounce their errors and come back to the simplicity, purity, authority, that is in Christ.

Very few disciples have ever considered aright the seventh chapter of the apostle Paul's first letter to the church at Corinth. If we could not find anything else besides that chapter in the entire Bible concerning verbal inspiration, yet we should find sufficient there to convince us on that subject. Therein we learn that Paul's inspiration was so clear that he knew the very word with which it began and the very word with which it ended. What we there find marked off as the tenth and eleventh verses Paul declared that the Lord commanded, but all other parts of that chapter he declared that he wrote "by permission" and "not of commandment", or wrote according to his "judgment", and in the twenty-sixth verse he used the word "suppose." And here is a two-fold lesson for us. First, the apostle Paul knew with what word inspiration began and with what word it ended. Second, that apostle did not try to stretch any Divine revelation so as to cover what was not revealed to him in plain words.

Now, suppose that all others who wrote concerning the Bible had followed Paul's example in that respect, what would have been the result? We certainly would have received from them two lines or domains of information. The first would have been under the

heading of "What Saith the Scripture?" and the other would have been under the heading of "Our Judgment,"—what we "suppose", and what we think is our "permission." Then the writings of the so-called "Apostolic Fathers" would not have been intermingling, confusing, misleading. The same might then be said of all Romish and Protestant writers, if they had followed the apostle Paul's example in that one chapter. Finally, the literature of the disciple brotherhood of the nineteenth century, and thus far in the twentieth, would not have been a medley of Divine teaching and human inference. But it would have been a series of volumes offering, first, what the word of God DECLARES, and, then, what uninspired men SUPPOSED CONCERNING IT.

STATEMENTS OF DAMAGING FACTS

As disciples of Christ we have rejected and exposed the doctrine that, in regard to water baptism, "one drop is as good as an ocean", and that "sprinkling is as good as immersion because water is used." But many of us soon adopted the doctrine—"A tuning-fork is on the same PRINCIPLE as an organ"; also, if two or more individuals or congregations unite to support an evangelist, without framing a separate organization, such union of their money in supporting a preacher is the same IN PRINCIPLE as the most extended missionary society organizations. Besides, many of us adopted the doctrine that the New Testament furnishes us THE PRINCIPLE of going to preach the Gospel, but not THE PLAN of going; and therefore we need to form THE PLAN by organizing a missionary society. But, those who wished to do the Lord's work in His own way had already gone—and gone—and gone—in any and every way that they could go, and established about a thousand congregations, regardless of all discussions about PRINCIPLE and PLAN.

In the meantime a considerable number of educated men were converted. Lawyers, doctors, schoolteachers and others of college education came into the Church, and several of them began preaching the Gospel. This should have taught us that no humanly arranged plan for converting sinners or perfecting believers was necessary. Besides, when we failed to find any provision for an organized plan we should have regarded everything of that kind as we had regarded the "mourner's bench" and "anxious seat" of the denominations around us. But the worst, most lamentable, most outrageous result was that, in adopting those plans for educating men by building a college, and sending out men to preach by a missionary society, WE DIVIDED THE PEOPLE who started out, or began their existence in the nineteenth century, with the professed purpose of UNITING ALL OF GOD'S PEOPLE ON THE

BIBLE! What is still worse is the fact that the Lord's treasury had to be robbed before any disciples could have accumulated money enough to have thought of building a college or formulating a missionary society! Even the Old Testament teaches that much: "Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, 'Wherein have we robbed thee?' In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation!" (See Mal. 3: 8, 9.)

Whoever will read the entire book of Malachi may learn that the Jews in the days of that prophet were charged with ROBBING GOD because they withheld from the Lord's "store-house" what He required of them. And whoever will read what the New Testament declares on the subject of Christian giving on the first day of the week and at other times, as indicated in 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2, 17,—I say whoever will read all that teaching may learn that the Savior never intended that riches of an earthly kind should accumulate in the hands of any disciple of Christ. And whoever will read with care the sixth and seventh chapters of the book of Joshua may learn that what the Lord anciently claimed as His own, and for His treasury, became a curse, or "an accursed thing," when withheld and applied to a man's own treasury or belongings. Finally, whoever will consider with fairness the history of the disciple brotherhood may learn that near or about all the devices, enterprises, arrangements which have resulted from disciples of financial wealth, and ability to gain wealth, are robbing God by withholding from the Lord's treasury what was due, by reason of their prosperity. The college buildings were thereby built, the missionary societies were thereby promoted, the costly meeting houses were thereby erected, the musical instruments were thereby purchased, the big salaries were thereby promised and paid. What we have withheld from the Lord's treasury (and thereby robbed God) has therefore served as the financial possibility of our divisive enterprises.

Does some one say that the Church in many places would then have had much money in its treasury? The answer is that it could then have ministered to the poor saints who, in many instances, were in distress. I know of one congregation that is giving and sending to poor saints, and specially the preachers and their families, also needy outsiders, according to Gal. 6: 10, though it is made up of poor people, such as need to work daily for their living. That church could have a regular preacher by straining itself financially. But its Elders are its chief teachers, and any preacher is only an incident. He comes and he goes as a visitor, except when called to assist in a protracted effort. And this is what should be true in all other churches that are made up of disciples of Christ. Such a church has no time nor money nor disposition to build a big meeting house, nor make any other display that will attract the

attention of a gazing and admiring world. It is afraid of seeking after that which specially pleases mankind generally, for that church is not forgetful of the Savior's saying, "For that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." (See Luke 16: 15.)

Now read the cablegram sent by a rich English gentleman who came to the United States in the autumn of 1930 to attend what might be designated the Mogul Convention in Washington, D. C., as it appeared in an English paper:

> Birmingham, Tuesday.—The following cable has been received from Mr. J. W. Black, chairman of the General Evangelist Committee, from Washington, where he is one of the British delegates to the World Convention of Disciples of Christ:
>
> Magnificent Convention, 10,000 attendance, 35 nations associated, perfect harmony; received by President Hoover. Flags of all nations presented. British delegates honoured. Wonderful fellowship. National Church dedicated; cost £300,000. Next World Convention, Leicester, 1935. Fifteen hundred delegates expected. Am appointed president.

The reader is requested to remember that the sum of three hundred thousand pounds in English money means near or about a million and a half dollars in the money of the United States. And think of such an expenditure of money being made to build one meeting house while millions in the United States are suffering for the common comforts of life, and many of them are disciples of Christ, even preachers of Christ! Then the length, breadth, height and depth of the departures which a majority of disciples have made from the Savior's teachings and example may be understood. And we may understand also the changes that will need to be made, in mind and heart and life, by such disciples if they would certainly be acceptable to God. Read again the Savior's declaration, "For that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." Read also the following: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs of the Kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him?" (See James 2: 5.) And notice this also concerning the church at Laodicea in Asia: "So then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth! Because thou sayest, 'I am rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing'; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor and blind, and naked!" And notice this also in regard to the church at Ephesus, as mentioned in Revelation second chapter: "Nevertheless, I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candle-stick out of his place, except thou repent."

The church at Ephesus had but one charge against it, and that was that it had left its "first love"; while the church at Laodicea was charged only with lukewarmness. Yet each of those churches was in danger of being rejected by the Savior, and was certain to be rejected if it did not repent.

Finally, for this chapter, I mention that in one little article concerning the late conventions in Washington, D. C., at the dedication of the so-called "National Church," there I find the words "proud" and "pride" as innocently used as if nothing was offered in the Bible against them. But even Solomon knew better than to use those words in any favorable sense. In Proverbs sixth chapter he declared, "These six things doth the Lord hate; yea, seven are an abomination unto Him,"—and, "A proud look" is the first that he mentions. Then in Prov. 16: 18 he declared, "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall."

OF THE DESIRE FOR SUCCESS

The divided condition of the disciple brotherhood has thus far, in this series of articles, been charged chiefly to certain false doctrines and humanly arranged enterprises that were adopted at different periods. But the declaration is now offered that a DESIRE FOR PROMINENCE AND POPULARITY, as indicated by success in gaining numbers and prestige, has really been one of the secrets of nearly all the innovations introduced and departures made from the beginning onward to the present time. The evangelist who could baptize the greatest number in course of a protracted meeting generally received the greatest number of calls for meetings. Then, after "the pastorate" was introduced and adopted, "the pastor" who could induce the greatest number to join the church in course of a year was the one chiefly sought after, called, retained. Such was the condition of the disciple brotherhood when I entered it in 1869, and even that early a tract had been written and published titled "The Pastorate"—I was informed.

SUCCESS was the greatest desire of the brotherhood. Many of us—most of us—soon became MORE ANXIOUS TO BE SUCCESSFUL THAN TO BE FAITHFUL. As a brotherhood we forgot the parable of "the talents," and thus forgot that the master in that parable said, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," but did not use the word "successful." The Savior said that the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto that master, as we may learn by reading a record thereof in Matt. 25: 14-30. Many of our preachers showed that they thought more of success, or a show of success, than they did about the importance of being faithful in studying the Bible—faithful in prayer, praise, thanksgiving—faithful in attending worship on Lord's Day—faithful in visiting and min-

istering to the sick or those otherwise distressed—faithful in contributing as the Lord has prospered us—faithful in supporting the poor saints, including the family of the poor and faithful preacher. Very much, if not all, of this doctrine of faithfulness was and still is forgotten by many disciples IN THEIR DESIRE FOR SUCCESS. That desire has caused young men and others, who intended to preach, to have much more desire to study eloquence than to study the Bible, and try to become good rhetoricians rather than to become good Scripturists. They studied to show themselves approved of men rather than to be approved of God. As a result of our desire to be SUCCESSFUL RATHER THAN FAITHFUL we have copied after our religious neighbors in regard to colleges, missionary societies, preacher-pastors, musical instruments, raising money, Sunday-schools, Endeavor societies, Ladies' Aid societies. And all these humanisms have contributed to our success, or show of success,—BUT NOT TO OUR FAITHFULNESS. Yet the success has been disappointing, for we have thereby become a compromised and betrayed people! And why should outsiders come to our meetings to hear the same things that they may hear in any prominent Protestant church-house, and perhaps better told, or better performed? In other words, as our preachers have sought to become pulpit orators rather than Bible expounders, why should any one wish to hear one of them rather than some sectarian orator?

In Deuteronomy twenty-eighth chapter we are informed that God told his ancient people that if they would obey him in all his commandments, then they should lend unto many nations, but should not borrow; that they should be "the head and not the tail" among the nations; and that they should be "above only," and "not beneath" the nations round about them. And such they were while they remained obedient to God. But when they became disobedient, then reverses came, and they were overcome. As a result they became the tail among the nations, rather than the head. The same was intended to be true of the Churches of the New Testament. They were to be the lenders, not the borrowers, the head and not the tail. But, by becoming unfaithful to God, the disciples of Christ in modern times have become the reverse of what we were intended to be. What is worse is that we have LOST OUR PLEA FOR THE UNITY OF GOD'S PEOPLE.

I am accustomed to say that "borrowed things should be taken home, or where they belong." And this saying, I suppose, is universally admitted to be true. As disciples we have been accustomed to say that the Romish doctrine of sprinkling for immersion should be taken back whence it was borrowed and left there. And we should say the same concerning all else that Protestants have borrowed from the Catholics and from the Jews, in-

cluding the musical instruments. We have no more right to Jewish musical instruments than we have to Jewish robes for preachers or Jewish incense for the audience. But this comparison is not good, for the robes for the priests and incense for the audience—these were both ORDAINED BY THE LAW AS GIVEN THROUGH MOSES. But that was not true of the musical instruments. They were not in the original law, and were not used in Jewish worship till after the Jewish nation HAD REJECTED GOD AS ITS RULER. (See 1 Samuel 8th chapter.) Nor can we find in the history of the Church of the New Testament any mention of their use till that Church had rejected Christ as the only Head of the Church, and had adopted a mere man as its head, and thus had ignored Christ as King and Lawgiver for His Church. These facts should have forever prevented all disciples of Christ from supposing that musical instruments in worship should be adopted by them. But many of them seemed to be so frantic TO BE SUCCESSFUL INSTEAD OF FAITHFUL, that they seemed determined to have the musical instrument in their worship "regardless of God, man or the devil"—as some one has said.

And this is the place to state that if those who desired the instrument in worship had gone to themselves and established new congregations in whose worship the instrument could be used, without local disturbance and division, they would have shown some honor. BUT THIS THEY DID NOT DO. On the contrary, by the aid of their preachers, they adopted the promiscuous vote—the vote of men, women, children that had been baptized, also the vote of delinquent members, reprobates and even heretics whose names were still on the church record,—and by these they voted the organ in and voted those out who opposed it, REGARDLESS OF WHO BUILT THE HOUSE. Sometimes an organ was brought into the meeting house between two days, and flippant specimens of humanity stood ready to keep it there by means of their fists, if any one tried to take it out. As a result one congregation after another was divided, all over the brotherhood of disciples, and many meeting houses were soon emptied of worshipers. The praying and teaching part of the congregation was driven out, and, perhaps, went to a private house, a schoolhouse, or court-house or some hall, in which to meet for worship till they could build another house. In the meantime one or more of the old people died, others moved away or became discouraged, and the congregation, in certain instances, ceased to exist. Those who held the house decided to raise money by festivals, oyster suppers, bazaars, and such-like devices,—got into trouble over such devices, and ceased to meet. As a result hundreds of congregations were ruined, meeting houses became empty, the name "disciples of Christ" was disgraced, and the plea for the unity of God's people on the Bible BECAME AS A

HISS AND A BY-WORD. A volume of a thousand pages would not be sufficient to write the infamous history of that period during which the true disciples were reproached as "antis," "fogies," "old fogies," "moss-backs."

THE MOST INCONSISTENT PEOPLE

I am accustomed to say, "It is bad for any other religionist to do wrong, but far worse for a professed disciple. We make a higher and better profession than any others, and we should therefore live a higher and a better life than others live. It was bad for other religionists to divide over slavery and over politics, over church government and other doctrinal differences; but it has been far worse for us to divide over colleges, missionary societies, musical instruments and other human devices. The reason is evident. We began our existence as a people, in the nineteenth century, by pleading for the oneness of God's people on the Bible, and therefore our divisions are that much more condemnable and deplorable than divisions among others.

Much of the writings of the disciple brotherhood in the first half of the nineteenth century indicated that, as a people, we were lamenting over the divisions in so-called Christendom. We could tell our religious neighbors wherein they were wrong in name, doctrine, practice, worship, work. And we could inform them how to get right, and thereby be saved from the sin of divisionism. But at the same time we were beginning to adopt means, measures, plans, arrangements, devices, if not deviltry, which would, in course of the latter part of the same century, make us really appear ridiculous in the estimation of the religionists and even the world round about us. For what was it but deviltry when we introduced the vote and then electioneered among the least responsible members in order to gain a majority against the older members of the congregation, in order to rob them of their church houses? At two places that I could name the disposition, planning, scheming, plotting to bring in the instrument, were deferred till the last note on the debt of the meeting house was paid, and then the organ was voted in by the majority of the least informed and least pious members. I could name another church in which the plea was made for the organ to be introduced into the Sunday-school—with the solemn promise that it would not be urged on the church in its worship. But not long after the organ had been introduced into the Sunday-school a banker's wife, who was a member of the church, said to the Elders, "You need not expect my presence nor my money if you do not use the organ in the worship." The Elders yielded, but were then charged with "truce-breaking," and about seventy members left the congregation. What

was that but deviltry, when considered in the light of the Savior's prayer for unity and the apostolic exhortations for unity, and the doctrine that "all liars shall have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone"? The loss of confidence, the alienation, strife, contention, bitterness, resulting from such conduct, especially among those who began their existence as a separated people, in the nineteenth century, with the professed PURPOSE TO UNITE ALL OF GOD'S PEOPLE ON THE BIBLE,—all this, when properly considered, calls for repentance, we might say, "in sack-cloth and ashes." Then the law-suits, charges, counter-charges, evading of truth, if not making use of positive lying on the witness-stand—all this when considered in the light of the Bible suggests the odor of brimstone, especially when coming from a people who denounced the divisions already existing, and proposed to unite all of God's people on the Bible. "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things!" Thus the apostle Paul wrote, in Romans second chapter, with reference to those Jews who knew enough to judge the heathen were wrong in idolatry and immorality, yet were bad enough in certain particulars for Paul to say to them they were doing "the same things." And what Paul said to those Jews may be safely said of those disciples who, in the first part of the nineteenth century, spoke against the divisions among Protestants, yet became divisive characters themselves!

Many who will, perhaps, read the record now offered will not be prepared to believe that unsubdued human nature was in many instances manifested in behalf of innovations among disciples. They may not therefore believe that an Elder would say as he walked away from a meeting house where much serious agitation had been introduced by reason of the organ in the worship,—I say they may not believe that an Elder would say, "I want peace; yes, I want peace"; and then, turning around, he said with clenched fist and violent gesture, "But they can't take that organ out of that house UNLESS THEY TAKE IT OVER MY DEAD BODY!" Yet the writer of this record heard that, and saw that, not fifty miles from Indianapolis, Indiana.

I don't know any doctrine more plainly taught, in either the Old Testament or the New, than that mankind are ACCOUNTABLE BEFORE GOD ACCORDING TO THE LIGHT THEY ARE PERMITTED TO ENJOY, and are under condemnation in proportion as they SIN AGAINST LIGHT AND KNOWLEDGE. This is very evident from what the Savior declared in Matt. 11: 20-24; also by John 15: 22-24 and many other scriptures. And, according to those scriptures,—the disciples of Christ who became divisive characters in the nineteenth century were under the deepest con-

damnation of any religious people of their generation. They had declaimed against the divisions among other religious peoples, yet became division workers themselves, and, thereby lost the best opportunity any people have had in modern times to honor and glorify God and Christ by consistently pleading for the unity of God's people.

But this is not all. Many disciples are now living who are going onward in the divisive work which was begun in the nineteenth century. What is worse is that they are adding to the work of division which their predecessors began! The havoc of the former divisions do not alarm them. A Brotherhood Journal, A United Missionary Society, A National Church—as separate institutions, and evidences of pride and power and strivings for popularity—these are of recent origin; and by these strivings for popularity the divisive work has been extended, deepened, intensified. This is more of the inexcusable work, and which endangers not only the leaders but all the followers in such work.

But even this is not all. While such evidences of pride and popularity are being made manifest, one college of the disciples brotherhood after another is going after infidelity of one form or another, and perhaps several forms together. This has already become so general that a certain disciple preacher said, not long ago, that "our colleges are so honey-combed with infidelity that I don't know of any to which I could safely send my son who is nearly ready for college." This means that disciples have spent many millions of dollars in establishing and maintaining colleges that are cursing the churches with betrayal of confidence, or breach of trust, and then are further cursing them by imposing infidelity on their children that are educated in them!

When we consider all of the preceding statements of conditions in the disciple brotherhood the conclusion is unavoidable that the wrong-doers of our brotherhood, who have become divisive characters, are under the **DEEPEST CONDEMNATION OF ANY RELIGIOUS SINNERS NOW ON THE FACE OF THE EARTH.** They have certainly sinned against light and knowledge more than have any Catholics from the Pope of Rome downward to the youngest and obscurest member of the Catholic church. Yes, and they have sinned more deeply and intensely against light and knowledge than has any one in any Protestant fraternities from the highest arch-bishop down to the least and weakest member that has been led to join even the obscurest sect in the Protestant part of Christendom.

WRONG METHOD OF PREACHING

The chief promoter and writer of the disciple brotherhood, in first half of the nineteenth century, warned his brethren specially against those guilty of textual preaching. He referred to them as "textuaries," and ridiculed their performances. But that same writer did much topical or subject preaching himself, and from that the descent was easy to the plan of the "textuary," of whose performances he gave a few samples and offered a few ridiculing remarks. But expository preaching, or such as would explain a whole chapter in a single discourse, was not properly emphasized, exemplified, commended, urged. Besides, when the College was introduced, then the science of sermonizing soon became a department of study. And, as a result, "the pastors," especially, felt the need of books of sermons, outlines of sermons, compendiums of sermons. As a further result the popular part of our preachers became ingenious sermonizers, instead of humble Bible-students and expounders. Many of them tried to become orators. They read books on oratory, and committed oratorical paragraphs from many oratorical sermons and essays. These they offered to their audiences as their own compositions, and thus acted the part of plagiarists, or literary thieves. And their admiring audiences became more and more drawn from the Bible and devoted to the man who entertained them.

"Bro. Shoe-cobbler, of what did the church die at this place?" I once inquired of a brother who wished me to preach where he lived. "Oratory! It died of oratory!" was his answer. To that he added something like this: "Bro. Blank came over from Blankville, once a month, and delivered two orations each time—one in the forenoon, the other at night; and thus continued for several years; and the church gradually died. That's the reason I say it died of oratory." This is all true except in names.

A pioneer preacher of extra ability was inquired of by a young preacher thus: "Bro. Smith, what did you think of my sermon yesterday morning?" The answer was freely given in about these words: "I had two objections to it, young man,—it lacked ideas and words to express them."

And this is what occurred about fifty years ago:—An old preacher was spending his last days in the home of one of his children in a town where the disciples had gone astray. They had a young preacher who was trying to imitate orators. As a result he made but little use of the Bible. But one day he read as his text the record of Lydia's conversion. The old preacher said he thought, "Now we shall have some Gospel!" But, to his surprise and disgust, the young man spent his time talking about the river-side where Lydia and other women went to hold a prayer meeting, and

the mossy banks of that river, and the trees that were there, also the birds that were flitting around among those trees, and the fish that were darting around in the waters of that river,—and closed his speech without a word about the Gospel which Lydia obeyed! When that old preacher inquired of him afterward why he didn't tell about Lydia's conversion, the young preacher asked, "Where then would the oratory have come in?"

At a later date I learned of another preacher that the people liked very well because he "never bothered his hearers with either politics or religion." Yes, and no wonder, when prominent preachers and writers declared that our "belligerent days" (meaning our warfare periods) were about over, and what we needed to do was to "preach the gospel of love."

Some one may say that the instances I mentioned were of the extreme order; and they may have been. But no one may safely deny that the encouragement began to be given, about fifty years ago, to "preach less on first principles and more on love." And let no one deny that then we began to be more like our religious neighbors than we had been, and that then "the pastors," especially, began to seek prominence by oratory and gush, or gushy oratory, with pathetic stories. Let no one say that they did not then begin to frequent the reading-rooms in libraries and examine the literature of their generation to find what they could that would entertain their gazing and admiring audiences. And let no one say that the first principles of the Gospel can be exhausted in a few discourses, nor that water baptism pertains simply to remission of sins. The new life to which baptized believers are introduced when raised from the waters of baptism—that new life is inseparably connected with the entire New Testament, especially the letters to Christians. Yes, and it is connected with the Old Testament, likewise, for in Rom. 15: 4 the apostle to the Gentiles informs us that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning."

And over fifty years ago I heard this statement from one of our most prominent compromising preachers: "Our pioneers made a mistake in trying to break down the denominations, for we should simply have tried to persuade them to adopt baptism for remission of sins, and then attend to the Communion every first day of the week, and leave them as they are in other respects." Their wrong names, wrong church government, wrong notions about the operation of the Spirit, musical instruments in the worship, pompous titles, humanly arranged schemes for raising money, man-made creeds, confessions of faith, books of discipline, books of covenant of human origin, and other humanly arranged divisive arrangements—all these that preacher and writer proposed to pass over.

In view of this the question arises,—How much of a disciple of Christ was he?

That same preacher and writer was urgent, for many years, in behalf of the doctrine—"communing with the pious unimmersed", and he thereby suggested the doctrine of "open membership", or receiving the unimmersed into the disciple brotherhood as members. And to several congregations and many individuals the "open membership" doctrine and joining the congregations of the unimmersed are the same. As a result many individual disciples and several entire congregations have gone to those who practice sprinkling for baptism. Then don't be surprised, reader, if near or about all of the advocates of "open membership" will soon join some one or other of the churches which practice sprinkling for baptism, unless we do something for them. And who can show the difference in principle between ACCEPTING AN UNIMMERSED PERSON INTO OUR MEMBERSHIP AND TAKING MEMBERSHIP WITH AN UNIMMERSED CHURCH? When a certain reformer of the sixteenth century was confronted with what he regarded as an unholy alliance, he used the word "hermaphrodite"; and when we are confronted with such an alliance as is now under discussion we should think of Moslemism (or Mahometanism), for Mahomet's religion resulted from an effort to join Jews, Heathen and backslidden disciples into one body. And one of the advanced advocates of "open membership" has been trying to unite Jews, Catholics and disciples into one society! And why not? Those who have in them the disposition to unite with somebody feel that they should gratify it. And as they will not humble themselves and repent of their divisive doctrines and practices, they feel that they should go onward and unite with somebody and something that will make a show of union! That is exactly what was done by many backslidden disciples in Mahomet's day. History informs us that many backslidden believers in Christ accepted Mahomet's overtures and became his followers.

Reader, the Lamentations of Jeremiah are here suggested to the mind of the old disciple who is now addressing you. Jeremiah the prophet lamented over the overthrow of the Jewish nation, and the destruction of Jerusalem which was inflicted because of the disobedience of that nation; and I feel like writing a book of lamentations over the disciple brotherhood.

THE GREAT DANGERS

I knew a brother who was connected with the pioneer work of the disciple brotherhood in the nineteenth century, and who accumulated about fifty thousand dollars while rearing his family of six children. Besides being a good business man he was a good stu-

dent of the Bible and became considerable of a preacher. He said to me one day, "I baptized all my children with my own hands and gave them the best education the country could afford." Then he paused,—and he had need to pause, for every one of his children married some sectarian and joined some sectarian church. That brother's experience has been somewhat repeated in the experience of many others of the disciple brotherhood.

And while wealth and education may have tended to cause the children of the brother, mentioned in the preceding paragraph, to depart from the simplicity that is in Christ, yet the divisions that were introduced in the city where that brother reared his family may have had much to do with the course they afterward adopted. Wealth, secular education, divisions in the Church—these three evils have wrought havoc among disciples of Christ! "Charge them that are rich, that they be not highminded." (See 1 Tim. 6: 17.) "Knowledge puffeth up." (See 1 Cor. 8: 1.) Then in Rom. 16: 17, 18 we are informed that those who "cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine" of Christ are they who "by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

Now we have before our minds three great dangers:—wealth, secular knowledge, and those who use good words and fair speeches. And all three of those dangers have wrought havoc in the disciple brotherhood. The rich among us have, with few exceptions, become "highminded", and have either left us and gone to some one of the religious parties around us, or the rich have gone back to the irreligious part of the world, or they have remained somewhat connected with us—to do us all the harm they could do. A considerable number of this last mentioned class are still with us, and are trying to betray us to the utmost.

And the colleges have tended to cause those connected with them to become "puffed up" with the idea that they are of a higher order of beings than common mortals. As a result they have done us all the damage that they could by their begging of money to maintain those colleges, and betraying of those students who have been entrusted to their care. Finally, the flattering talk that has been made use of in order to induce disciples to adopt divisive measures, plans, arrangements, devices,—such talk has been positively devilish! The devil was a flatterer when he approached our Mother Eve in the Garden of Eden, and his children have not hesitated to become flatterers in any age of the world's history. And flattery has been used specially in regard to the use of musical instruments in worship. The talking of those that have electioneered in order to get enough votes to secure a majority in favor of the instrument—such talking has been as devilish as human beings could adopt without being possessed of a devil with supernatural powers. And this becomes more evident when we consider the re-

proachful talking done against the older members of the Church.

Near or about forty years ago a certain preacher whom I could name was called to a place to preach at the opening of a new house of worship. He spoke on Lord's Day in the fore-noon, and then in the afternoon in the social circle he made a speech of this order to a considerable number of young people: "Now, you young folks have good voices, and you can sing well; but your singing would be much improved if you had an organ to assist you. Of course some of the 'old fogies' might object to it at first, but they would soon get used to it and everything would work out all right." In response to that speech one of the young men answered by saying, "When you come to talk about putting an organ into that house, I am here to tell you that we have some YOUNG FOGIES in this congregation, and we don't propose to put any organ into that house!" But notice the flattery of the young—about "good voices"; and the reproachful expression "old fogies," concerning the older members of the Church.

Here is another instance that was reported in one of the papers of the disciple brotherhood. A certain preacher (who favored the use of musical instruments in worship) was called to lead in holding a protracted meeting, but he was warned not to advocate the use of the instrument either publicly or privately. He came with that understanding, or agreement, and remained true to his agreement. Yet some time after that meeting was ended certain young people of the church began to talk in favor of an organ in the worship, and as time advanced others joined them. The Elders of that church made an investigation and learned that the preacher they had charged against advocating musical instruments in worship—they learned that he had secured the names and post-office addresses of several of the young members and had been writing to them. In his letters he urged that they should "never rest satisfied" till they could have an organ to help them in their singing. Was not such conduct on the part of that preacher downright deviltry? Could Satan himself have suggested anything more undermining and divisive? No wonder, then, that, in course of time, the lines of demarcation were drawn between those who favored musical instruments in worship and those who opposed such use of instruments.

But who were responsible for the divisions wrought after the manner indicated in the preceding paragraph? Many have been perverse enough to respond that those were responsible for it who OPPOSED THE USE OF THE INSTRUMENT! That sort of response, to say the least, is a marvel of perverseness, and those who have made it should have been quickly inquired of what they would do if incense and priestly robes would be introduced, and what they would do if the "mourners' bench" and the Romish confessional

would be urged on them. And they should have been inquired of whether they would admit them without opposition; and if they would oppose them, then who would be responsible for the division that would result? While this question is before us I feel like saying that if a "mourners' bench" would be lawful at any time it should be introduced for those disciples to kneel at who have been divisive characters. Yes, and though we have no right to introduce a "mourners' bench" at any time in a formal manner, yet those who have divided the disciple brotherhood by their devices, or endorsed the divisions made, should be mourners during the remainder of their lives!

In Prov. 6: 16-19 we find that Israel's wisest monarch declared, "These six things doth the Lord hate, yea, seven are an abomination unto Him." Then the first that he mentions is "a proud look," and the last is, "he that soweth discord among brethren." In view of this certainly the innovating members of the disciple brotherhood became, and still are, "an abomination" to God. Many of them have not only shown proud looks, but they have sown discord among brethren. What is worse, they have gloried in so doing, have gone near or about to their limit in so doing, and have ridiculed those whom they have offended and robbed and discouraged.

Having written the preceding paragraphs, and seven preceding articles, on this subject, I pause, though the discussion of it is not yet half completed. Yet I pause by reason of the fact that I have received a letter from a certain prominent preacher of the disciple brotherhood proposing a conference between certain leading brethren, in order to ascertain how much confidence we have in our profession. Such a proposal is in the right direction, and may be scripturally adopted in harmony with Acts fifteenth chapter, where certain apostles and other brethren, with "the whole church" at Jerusalem, met to consider the first divisive doctrine that had been introduced into the disciple brotherhood. That doctrine was the question of Judaizing Gentile Christians.

ANOTHER SURVEY OF DIVISIONS

Since writing the preceding essays I have read a volume of 211 pages on this subject: "The Equality of All Christians Before God," and am thereby induced to go onward with my writing. That volume was intended to inform its readers concerning the "New York Conference of the 'Christian Unity League' at St. George's Episcopal Church, Nov. 13-15, 1929." And the declaration is made, in its "Introduction", that "Eleven States and Canada were represented," and, "in all, twenty-five different communions" were represented. This means that twenty-five religious denominations, of the Protestant part of the religious domain known

as "Christendom", were represented by one or more preachers or others who were interested in that League.

The speeches reported in the mentioned volume were all dignified, serious, enlightening, when considered as intellectual documents, or products of intellectual men. But when considered in the light of the Bible they might be classed with what the apostle Paul designated "the wisdom of this world." In each of these documents a friendly gesture was made toward the Bible, but nothing more. Certainly not one of the speakers on the mentioned occasion even suggested that the Bible, or any part of it, should be used as the standard by which to determine who were and who were not Christians. But all of the speakers seemed to concur in these opinions or conclusions:—1, that religious divisions had worked their own rebuke; 2, that the time had not yet come for formal union of all denominations; 3, that, in the meantime, individual believers and individual churches might treat each other as Christians both publicly and privately. This meant that all doctrinal differences should be ignored, passed over, left unmentioned; but all "Christians" should be regarded on an equality before God and man. By so doing those participating in that "Unity League" hoped that, at some future date, the various denominations from which they came, and to which they belonged, would become good enough to form several unions, and, finally, one great union.

I stated that a few friendly gestures were made to or toward the Bible. And I now state that those gestures were made by references to the Savior's prayer for unity, and to the spirit of Christ as necessary to accomplish the unity which they were hoping would result from their efforts. And I may safely say that had any one of them repeated fully the Savior's prayer for the oneness of His people, and then shown what the spirit of Christ really was and is, then CONSTERNATION WOULD HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED into that Unity League. And had any one of those present emphasized what the Savior said with reference to His oneness with the Father, then that League might have learned that it was wasting time by offering "glittering generalities" instead of using Divine teaching as its standard.

I now kindly request the reader to consider these words of our Savior's prayer, as recorded in John 17: 20, 21,—"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word: that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee,—that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me." The first and last of the preceding sentences were mentioned by several speakers, but the closeness and completeness of the Savior's union with the Father was strangely omitted by them all. And there was a reason! If they had mentioned and emphasized that closeness and completeness of

relationship it would have caused many, if not all, who were present to understand that the League then in session in New York City was so widely separated from the Savior's prayer for unity that they should not be mentioned in the same speech, and especially should not be mentioned in the same sentence.

And the same may be said of the references to "the spirit of Christ." Whether we consider those references in the light of Rom. 8: 15,—where "the spirit of adoption" is mentioned as a special gift; or whether we think of Gal. 4: 6—where we read of "the Spirit of his Son" being sent into the heart; or whether we think of the word "spirit" referring to the disposition which Christ showed; yet we certainly have something before our minds more definite than is expressed by the word "ethics" or "ethical"—so frequently used in the volume to which I have made reference. This becomes most evident when we consider the Savior's declarations in John 5: 19, 30, also John 8: 28, 29. There we read this: "The Son can do nothing of himself . . . I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me." And He further said, "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things. And He that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please Him."

Notice the contrast between such declarations of unison, submission, conformity, subjection, harmony, oneness—which the Savior used to express his relationship to the Father—I say, notice the contrast between such declarations and the expressions of those who made up that Unity League now under consideration. I copy several of them. On page 81 I find this: "We were out to see whether we could build a platform of essential truth broad enough, or narrow enough, if you like, so that all persons coming together to negotiate could stand upon that platform in perfect good faith."

Now, that sort of sentiment as thus expressed causes me to think first of those who proposed to build a tower that would reach to Heaven. (See Genesis eleventh chapter.) And my next thought is with reference to Moses and Aaron, who said, "Must WE fetch you water out of this rock?" (See Num. 20: 10.) And though the building of the mentioned "platform" was in 1904, yet it is not unjust to all such efforts to compare them to the building of the Tower of Babel in the plain of Shinar, and the rebellious speech of Moses and Aaron when they said, "Must WE fetch you water out of this rock?" The words—"whether WE could build a platform"—show the connection between such building and the Tower of Babel.

Then, on the 106th and 107th pages of the volume before me, I find this reference to the demand of Baptists and Disciples, that all shall be immersed who come into their communions: "Now, that is something worse than an ecclesiastical impropriety; it is a violation of Christian morality; it is an infringement on the prerogative of Christ . . . Therefore the guilt that is on our hands in this sectarian procedure, this exclusive membership procedure, is not an ecclesiastical impropriety; it is a moral guilt; it is a violation of the mind of Christ."

These several declarations reveal that the Unity League members feel at liberty to build, interpret, interpolate as they see fit, and call their procedure the "spirit of Christ" or the "mind of Christ"; and whoever differs from them is guilty of "a violation of Christian morality" and "an infringement on the prerogative of Christ," and a "violation of the mind of Christ."

This means that the so-called "Christian Unity League" may ignore the New Testament in all that it declares about "the mind of Christ" and "the spirit of Christ," as set forth in Christ's own declarations and example; also that the members of that League may "build a platform" of their own and pass severe sentences on all who differ from that platform! Why not say of those who differ from them—that they are of the stricter part of Christendom now, but we will accept them as Christians, and hope that they may see their way clear to accept our "platform" at a later date? But, instead of showing such tolerance and hopefulness, they have shown intolerance and reproachfulness. Yet in Acts nineteenth chapter we find an instance of re-baptism under the apostle Paul's teaching, and much else in the New Testament concerning the necessity of water baptism. For instance, John's baptism was certainly water baptism, as Matt. 3:11 declares, and yet when the Pharisees and lawyers refused to submit to it they "rejected the counsel of God against themselves." (See Luke 7:30.) Those Pharisees and lawyers were the worst men then on earth, and they were the first that declared water baptism a non-essential to salvation! And when they thus declared, then the Sacred Text informs us that they "rejected the counsel of God against themselves." But the Unity League under consideration would rule out water baptism as advocated by certain communions, by using reproachful words against them! Why be tolerant toward one class of believers, but intolerant toward another class?

OF THE MIND OR SPIRIT OF CHRIST

Before concluding my references to the volume titled "The Equality of All Christians Before God," I wish to bring before the reader's mind certain scriptures which reveal the spirit of Christ more fully than what has been thus far offered. When we shall have learned, by the Savior's own declarations, what His spirit or disposition was while he was here on earth, then we may judge who may now justly profess to have His spirit.

In the preceding essay reference was made to John 5:19, where Christ said, "The Son can do nothing of himself"; also to John 5:30, where He further said, "I can of mine own self do nothing"; also to John 8:28, 29, where He said, "I do nothing of myself, but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things . . . for I do always those things that please Him." To this we should add what is recorded in John 12:49, 50, "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father who sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." Such declarations of our Savior show to us, in the plainest possible manner, the closeness of his relations to the Father. He did not say he would not like to do anything contrary to his Father's will. Neither did He say that he would not do much beyond what his Father had said to him. But He boldly declared, over and over, "The Son can do nothing of himself"; "I can of mine own self do nothing"; "I do nothing of myself." Then He added, "For I do always those things that please Him." Such was His close relation to his Father, and the perfect harmony of their relationship. We thereby learn that He did not in course of his personal ministry deviate from the Father's will in any particular, but submitted to His Father—even unto death.

Does some one say that after resurrection of His body, then he did according to his own will? If so, the answer is that after the resurrection of His body all power (or authority) was committed unto him. So He declared and gave to his apostles the world-wide commission. In that commission He told his disciples to teach, or make disciples of, all nations, "baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." And soon after those apostles began to preach under that commission they had occasion to say, by the Holy Spirit's directions, to a certain class, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Yet that baptism thus commanded to be attended to in the name (or by the authority) of Christ and into the name of the God-head—that baptism is ridiculed when it appears as an obstacle in the way of a certain so-called "Christian Unity League."

I copy two paragraphs as found in the volume before me, beginning on page 106:

Take this matter of re-baptism. Baptists are guilty of it. Disciples are guilty of it. When a Methodist comes forward in a Baptist church or a Disciple church, what do we ask him? He brings a letter from a Methodist church in another city, and we ask him how he was baptized. "Were you immersed?" we say. And if he was not immersed when he joined the church and became a Christian, then we say, "My friend, it is necessary for us to lead you outside of the Church of Christ in order that we may have the sectarian privilege of bringing you in again." My friends, that is the precise logic of our practice, as Baptists and Disciples, in respect to the re-baptism of other Christians.

Now that is something worse than an ecclesiastical impropriety; it is a violation of Christian morality; it is an infringement on the prerogative of Christ. The only basis on which I can justify that procedure is by telling this Methodist brother when he comes with his letter, "You are not a Christian, and the church that gives you this letter is not a Christian Church." If I say that, I have a logical right to induct him into the Christian Church by Christian baptism. But I don't say that! Baptists don't say that! Disciples don't say that! We know this Methodist brother is a Christian, and that the church whose letter he brings is a Christian church. Therefore the guilt that is on our hands in this sectarian procedure, this exclusive membership procedure, is not an ecclesiastical impropriety; it is a moral guilt; it is a violation of the mind of Christ.

Here, in the former of these two paragraphs, copied for the reader's consideration, we find an effort to ridicule the decision of Baptists and Disciples to have only an immersed membership. Then, in the latter part of the second of those paragraphs, we find two charges against Baptists and Disciples—one is called a "moral guilt," and the other is called "a violation of the mind of Christ." Each of those charges may be somewhat appropriate against the Baptists—who contend that alien sinners may become Christians by faith, repentance and prayer (even as Methodists, Presbyterians and many others teach), and then should be baptized in order to join a church not mentioned in the Bible, and thus not authorized of Christ. Yes, that is their view of water baptism. It is the only appointment in the Bible in obedience to which the name of the God-head is authorized to be called over us. Yet that appointment or command, which is to be obeyed by the authority of Christ and into the name of the God-head, all Baptists and Protestant denominations generally declare is A NON-ESSENTIAL TO AN ALIEN SINNER'S SALVATION, yet must be attended to in some form BEFORE UNITING WITH A CHURCH NOT MENTIONED IN THE BIBLE!? I regard that estimate and use of immersion as sacrilegious. But I cannot say the same of sprinkling and pouring for baptism, for I do not regard them as sacred. But as sure as that sacrilege may be committed by making light of a sacred something, and especially a Divine command, so certain is it that those who pronounce immersion in water by authority of

Christ, and into the name of the God-head, as a non-essential to salvation, are guilty of the crime of sacrilege, especially when they ridicule those who contend for immersion in water as divinely ordained. Therefore, instead of regarding such churches as deny that immersion in water by the authority of Christ, and into the name of the God-head, is necessary to an alien sinner's salvation—instead of regarding them as "churches of Christ," I think they should be regarded as sacrilegious churches. They are not mentioned in the Bible! And they show, by their names which they have adopted, that they DO NOT REGARD THEMSELVES AS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ORDER. Surely those who are truly Christians will be satisfied with the name "Christian," and those churches that are really obedient to Christ in doctrine and practice, worship and work—organization and discipline—surely such churches would be satisfied with the name "churches of Christ." Not more certainly would a true and legal wife be satisfied with the name of her husband than would a true church of the New Testament order be willing to be called by the name of Christ. But when a wife prefers the name of some other man than her real husband, she shows disloyalty. This needs only to be stated in order to be understood and admitted. And the same is true of all churches not mentioned in the Bible.

Does this seem intolerant? Reader, remember that contention for the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is here offered. But what of the intolerance of what has been declared against disciples, especially? We are charged with "a moral guilt," and a "violation of the mind of Christ." But as Nathan said to David, so we may say to the writer of such charges—"Thou art the man!"

But the title of the book now under review should be considered. "The Equality of All Christians Before God,"—is this a doctrine that should be accepted as true? Were those Christians at Corinth—who called themselves after Paul and Apollos and Cephas—were they on an equality before God with those who were satisfied with the name of Christ? If so, then why did Paul rebuke them, call them "carnal," and reason with them in the plainest manner concerning what they had done by adopting the names of certain men? And were those Christians at Corinth who had gone to law with one another, equal to those who had not? If so, why did Paul rebuke them for their conduct in going to law? And were those in the church at Corinth who thought that meats were affected by idols—were they equal to those that knew better than to think thus? Were those whom Paul threatened with a rod equal to those whom he did not thus threaten? These questions need only to be seriously considered in order for the correct answers to them to be suggested. Besides, in Rom. 15: 1 the apostle Paul declared, "We then that are

strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." Were the strong and weak, there mentioned by Paul, on an "equality" before God? If so, then why were the strong ones exhorted to bear the infirmities of the weak?

The speakers in that so-called "Christian Unity League," which met in New York City in November of 1929,—those speakers gave evidence of being educated gentlemen, but not one of them showed himself to be a good Scripturist or a good logician, or even a reverent student of the Bible. A good Scripturist would have made more use of Scripture than any one of them made. A good logician would not have used the word Christian as a modifier or an adjective instead of using it in its original application—as the name of a character. A reverent student of the Bible, especially of the New Testament, would have made a humble appeal for all to study God's word in order to learn the will of God. In other words, they were educated gentlemen of the clerical order who have consented to be called "Reverend," after the Catholics, regardless of the use of that word in Psa. 111: 9.

CONCERNING DISCIPLES AND BAPTISM

All learners of Christ may be justly regarded as disciples of Christ, for the word "disciple" means a learner, regardless of the teacher. According to this meaning of the word "disciple" we read in the New Testament of the disciples of John the Baptist, the disciples of the Pharisees, and the disciples of Jesus. On the outside of the New Testament we read of the disciples of Socrates the philosopher, also of the disciples of Plato the philosopher. And this side of the philosophers of ancient times we pass to the domain of medicine, and we come to the disciples of Hippocrates, Galen, Hanneman, Thompson and other leaders or founders of systems of medicine.

In view of such use of the word "disciple" we may safely regard all Catholics as disciples of Christ, for they have all learned something of Christ, and would learn more if their priests would tell them more about Him. The same may be safely said of all the Protestant parties or communions. They have all learned something of Christ, and would learn more if their preachers would tell them, or show them how to read about Christ, especially as He is revealed in the New Testament.

But much difference is found between disciples of Christ now, even as was found between them when the Savior was on the earth. In the sixth chapter of John's account of the Gospel we read of certain disciples of Jesus who went back and walked no more with Him when he told them about eating his flesh and drinking his blood. Certain Jews said, "How can this man give us his

flesh to eat?'' And, later, many of His disciples, when they heard more of his speech about eating his flesh and drinking his blood, said, ''This is a hard saying, who can hear it?'' Next we read, ''From that time many of His disciples went back and walked no more with him.'' ''Then said Jesus unto the twelve, 'Will ye also go away?' Then Simon Peter answered him, 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God'.'' (See John sixth chapter, latter part.)

And thus the disciples of Jesus differed and separated themselves into at least two classes (according to John sixth chapter) while He was here on earth, and the division was made because certain of them, even a large majority of them, could not see or understand about eating His flesh and drinking His blood. They measured the value of His speech about eating and drinking by their own judgments or understanding, and did not ask nor wait for an explanation. After the twelve had heard the parable of ''the wheat and tares'' they asked for an explanation and received it. (See Matt. 13: 36-43.) And this indicates the difference between at least two classes of disciples in modern times. Then the division was made in regard to EATING AND DRINKING, but in modern times it is chiefly made in regard to WASHING. Then it was a question of FLESH AND BLOOD; now it is chiefly a question of WATER. But in both instances the division is made on the basis of the HUMAN UNDERSTANDING. ''WE CAN'T SEE HOW THIS MAN WILL GIVE US HIS FLESH AND BLOOD TO EAT'' —was the former complaint. ''WE CAN'T SEE HOW WATER BAPTISM IS GOING TO DO THE SOUL ANY GOOD''—is the latter complaint. ''WE DON'T INTEND TO HEAR ANY MORE OF THAT DOCTRINE ABOUT EATING A MAN'S FLESH AND DRINKING HIS BLOOD''—was the former decision. ''WE DON'T WISH TO HEAR ABOUT WATER BAPTISM AS AN ESSENTIAL TO AN ALIEN SINNER'S SALVATION''—is the modern decision.

The preceding comparison, between ancient and modern objections to the Savior's teaching by his disciples, is here set forth because of what has been made manifest in modern times. A large majority of professed learners of Christ, who sometimes seem to think they are Christians, will listen to a preacher of Christ until he begins to urge the necessity of water baptism. Then, with few exceptions, they will decide ''never to hear that preacher again.'' Nearly every religious denomination (including Catholics and onward to the true disciples of Christ) POSITIVELY DESPISE the doctrine that water baptism is necessary to the salvation of alien sinners. Mormons, German Baptists (now known as Church of the Brethren) with one or two other smaller bodies and disciples do not object to the doctrine of the Savior on this question. Bap-

tists of all sorts, Methodists of all sorts, Presbyterians of all sorts, for instance, have taxed their ingenuity to the limit of possibility against the doctrine that water baptism is necessary to save alien sinners. Yet they all contend that it must be attended to by every one who wishes to join their communions! They thus contend that water baptism is not necessary in order to salvation, BUT IS NECESSARY TO JOIN A CHURCH NOT MENTIONED IN THE BIBLE!? This is the climax of irreverence and absurdity, especially when we consider that water baptism was submitted to by the Savior as an act of righteousness, and is the only command in the Bible that is required to be submitted to in the name of the God-head! In other words, it is the only requirement in submission to which the name of the God-head is commanded to be called over us, yet it is "a non-essential to salvation"—in the estimation of nearly all the chief denominations and many of those who are of the minor order!

But why should this be so often repeated? The answer is that for the last three or four centuries the doctrine of water baptism for the salvation of sinners has been ignored, denounced, contemned, ridiculed; and in the volume titled, "The Equality of All Christians before God"—in that volume it is referred to as "theological and historical straw"! This means that all reference to the baptism of Jesus is "theological and historical straw," and all reference to the Savior's command to baptize all disciples "into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" is "theological and historical straw"! This means, also, that when some one contends for Mark 16: 16, and thus that baptism is necessary to the alien sinner's salvation, then that one is calling attention to "historical and theological straw"!? And whoever insists that Acts 2: 38 should be preached by all who profess to be proclaimers of the Gospel—all such should be charged with "threshing over old theological and historical straw!" And the same should be charged against all who insist upon any or all the other references to water baptism—if this modern doctrine against such baptism is to prevail. To this I may add that all demands that true disciples shall consider water baptism for alien sinners and the weekly communion for true disciples, and upon the first day of the week—I say, all who demand or even propose that these ordinances shall be ignored or regarded as "theological and historical straw"—all such preachers and writers by those proposals suggest the proposal of the devil to Jesus, when he said on a certain mountain, after showing Him the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, —"All these will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me."

What, then, is the condition of those who talk of the ordinances which Christ has commanded as "old theological and historical

straw"? Their condition suggests the speech of a certain Methodist lady in eastern Pennsylvania many years ago. She heard a preacher of Christ set forth the Gospel as recorded in the book of Acts, and became fully convinced that she should be immersed, leave the Methodist church and become a member of the Church of the New Testament. And she shed tears, but did not yield when the invitation was given. Later in a personal interview she said, "I am astonished at myself; for I have often said in 'experience meetings' that I was willing to follow my Savior wherever he would lead me. But now, when I see that He would lead me down into the water and have me immersed, and then leave the Methodist church and join another church, I find rebellion in my heart!"

Now, what was true of that lady? SHE HAD BEEN DECEIVED! She thought she was wholly surrendered to Christ when she was not, and rebelled against His requirements rather than leave the Methodist church. In other words, she was a METHODIST—NOT A CHRISTIAN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ORDER. She was only CHRISTIANISH—not fully surrendered to Christ, though a professed believer in Him. And what of those gathered at the mentioned "Christian Unity League," who could speak of a Divine ordinance to which the Savior submitted (and later commanded by all authority) as a "non-essential," and as "old theological and historical straw"? Their condition is expressed by the word SELF-DECEPTION. But many of them may never be convinced of it till eternally too late to repent.

And here is another instance which will explain conditions:—A certain preacher, after talking until two o'clock one night with a disciple of Christ, said, "I see you have the advantage; but we Methodists have built up a great system, and for us to apply certain scriptures as you do would tear our system all to pieces."

Reader, a few Catholics, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists and a few others have yielded to the Gospel of Christ as revealed in the book of Acts, and have become members of the Church of the New Testament; but the "great systems" of those denominations remain. And, perhaps, nothing less than a literal fulfillment of what is indicated in the last of Revelation sixth chapter will cause the leaders in those systems to turn from them. "We will storm Heaven with our prayers!"—was the speech of one of those leaders, many years ago, while in the midst of a protracted meeting. And that was an index to the condition of many minds in those different humanly arranged theological systems. Their idea seems to be—"We will build up something so big and great; and we will do so much good, that we will compel the Lord to accept it and accept us!" But they should remember that Paul wrote of Christ, "He cannot deny himself." (2 Tim. 2: 13.) This means He could not give one plan of salvation, and then save peo-

ple by another. Besides, we should remember that in Rom. 3: 3, 4 the apostle Paul wrote this: "For what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar." This means that we must maintain that God is true even if His word condemns us all!

What, then, is our hope, especially for the learned ones among the churches not mentioned in the Bible? I see none except in these words of our Savior: "He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." (Matt. 10: 39.) This includes the Protestant martyrs of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and may include certain others. But we are not required to offer salvation, in our preaching, on the basis of martyrdom, but on the basis of whole-hearted obedience to the Gospel in all its requirements.

OF TRUE DISCIPLES—CHRISTIANS

All the religious communions or communities have in their membership a few true disciples—those whom the Savior designated "disciples indeed." What this means is evident from John 8: 31, 32, "Then said Jesus to those Jews who believed on him, 'If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free'." CONTINUANCE IN THE TRUTH—this, then, is the sign or evidence of being true disciples, or "disciples indeed", or in fact, in reality. This means that we do not stop short of what the Savior requires nor go beyond it. We find a warning against going beyond it, in the ninth verse of the apostle John's second letter. That apostle there declares, "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." This means that whoever goes beyond the doctrine of Christ thereby becomes a transgressor, for he does what is not required, and thereby implies that Christ did not give enough doctrine or teaching,—and to that extent he "hath not" or holds not to God. And this is true of all the denominations, or communities of so-called "Christendom," beginning with Roman Catholicism and ending with the Salvation Army or some other more recent community. They all begin with belief in Christ, but do not continue in His word, for they adopt much that is beyond His word.

And what is the explanation of such procedure on the part of the different denominations? It is explained by their failure to accept Christ as King, and thus as the Supreme Lawgiver for His people. They believe in Christ's personal character without reserve. But they do not accept fully His official character. They believe in Him as their atoning Sacrifice, as chief Teacher or Prophet, High Priest, Mediator; but do not accept Him as King,

and thus as Lawgiver for His people. On the contrary, all the denominations that are not mentioned in the Bible seem to think that they can believe in Christ and love him sufficiently to be saved by him, yet legislate and make laws for themselves! Here is found the fundamental heresy in all churches not mentioned in the Bible:—THEY DO NOT FULLY ACCEPT CHRIST AS THEIR LAW-GIVER!

But while this is true of those churches as such, yet individuals among them are so devoted to Christ that when they hear more of His doctrine than their teachers have told them, they will consider it, and many of that class will accept it. They will turn from humanly arranged churches and become members of the Church of the New Testament, regardless of cost to them. A few of that class have been found among the Catholics, also among Lutherans, Anglicans (or Episcopalians). Many have been found among the Baptists and Methodists, also Presbyterians, United Brethren and others.

These facts justify the saying that several classes of church-members may be found among the different denominations. Certain of them seem to have joined the meeting-house, as may be inferred by the fact of what they say about their meeting-house being "the finest in town" when they commenced to go there. Others seem to have joined the preacher who was the most popular man in town when they joined there. Still others seem to have joined the creed, for they "liked the doctrine and the service." Then, another class of members "liked the society" of the church that they joined. But another class in all the churches is made up of those who joined themselves to Christ in mind and heart and life, regardless of the humanisms connected with the ceremonies of the church they joined. Christ is the one whom they regarded as their Savior, and they loved Him because of what they had learned He had done for them; and they would leave Catholicism, Lutheranism, Baptistism, Methodism, Presbyterianism or any other kind of ism, in order to follow Christ and be his true disciples, his "disciples indeed", and thus be Christians according to Acts 11:26 and 26:28. And these are they who have largely made up the disciple brotherhood, from its beginning as a separated people about a hundred years ago. In many of the protracted meetings of our brotherhood a considerable number have come from one or several of the denominations around them. And many of those that have come from those denominations have become preachers of the Gospel. And those that have thus come have, in several instances, made the most effective preachers. But in the meantime serious divisions have arisen in this brotherhood.

And now a very serious question arises, which is this:—Have we, by our divisions, built up a great system from which we will

not turn in order to be true disciples, "disciples indeed," or disciples of the New Testament order, or such as the New Testament approves? If so, then we are, as a brotherhood, like the sects around us, and therefore we cannot be united, but must remain as we are with our systems, till we shall be filled with consternation by the Divine judgments in reserve for this wicked world. In other words,—**ARE WE SO DEVOTED TO OUR HUMANISMS** that we have, as a brotherhood, become so afflicted with our devices that we will cling to them regardless of the Savior's prayer for our unity, and the apostolic exhortations for our unity? Or, to be more explicit, concrete, definite, plain, the question is—whether any of us have become so devoted to an educational system (which so many of us have adopted by imitating our religious neighbors) that we will not give it up, nor even modify it, in order to conform to the Savior's prayer and the apostolic exhortations for unity? And, have we become so devoted to our great humanly arranged system for missionary work that we are not willing to turn from that system, nor even modify it, in order to conform to the Savior's prayer? And have we become so devoted to our musical system that we will not turn from it, nor even modify it, in order to conform to the Savior's prayer and the apostolic exhortations for our unity? And are we so devoted to our humanly arranged system of church government that we are not willing to change to apostolic simplicity for the sake of conforming to the Savior's prayer and the apostolic exhortations for our unity?

But this is not all. Have we become so devoted to seeking popularity in our preaching that we will follow the example of our neighbors in being textuaries, and sermonizers, instead of reading the Bible to the people and giving the sense, as did Ezra and others when the people had returned from captivity, and as the Savior illustrated in his Sermon on the Mount and in his other preaching? And are we so devoted to humanly arranged methods of raising money that we are unwilling to turn from them and confine ourselves to the divinely ordained methods and motives with reference to giving for the Lord's cause, and thereby help to bring about the unity for which the Savior prayed?

But even this is not all. Are any of us so devoted to the dance, the card-table, theatres, the movies, the ball games and races of various kinds, that we are not willing to turn from them in order to be united with our brethren who oppose such entertainments? And are we not willing to turn from all ungodliness and try to be plain, humble disciples of our Savior, and keep ourselves "unspotted from the world," and thereby "abstain from all appearance of evil?"

Finally, have we become so devoted to humanly adopted methods of trying to serve the Lord in a lukewarm and half-hearted

manner, that we are unwilling to repent of our lukewarmness, and henceforth strive to be wholehearted in our devotion to God and Christ? Or, are we willing to risk the salvation of our souls by trifling in regard to our public duties, and disregarding the importance of living in close communion with God and Christ by daily reading and studying of the Bible, and by daily prayer, praise, thanksgiving and adoration? The only original idea I have been able to discover in the Protestant parties around us is that **PEOPLE MAY GET TO HEAVEN IN MANY DIFFERENT WAYS!** And the only original idea I have discovered in the disciple brotherhood is that **WE MAY GET TO HEAVEN BY LIVING A LITTLE BETTER THAN OUR RELIGIOUS NEIGHBORS!**

OF TRUE DISCIPLES AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITY

Bad conduct, we may safely say, is bad for all other religionists, but far worse for those who profess to be disciples of Christ. We make a higher and better profession than any other people, and we should live a higher and better life than any others live. For any other religionists to tell a lie would be a disgrace; but for a disciple of Christ to tell a lie would be not only a disgrace but it would be a crime against the highest and best profession now made on the face of the earth. We profess to be closer to Christ than are any other religious people—in name, also in devotion to the ordinances. We talk more about the right divisions of the Bible, also the plainness of the Divine record, than do all others combined. We, as disciples of Christ, profess to be capable of teaching our religious neighbors how to study the Bible, and we have preached much on the importance of being able to give a reason for the hope that is in us with meekness and fear.

But this is only the beginning of what should be stated on this subject. We should never forget that we became a separated people by reason of our rejection of religious humanisms whereby Christians might be divided. And for the first half-century of our existence, as a separated people, we preached and wrote much in behalf of the oneness of God's people. And by making a plea for oneness we accomplished much and caused many to leave their religious parties and take a position with us. We said to the people, that they could not be united on any human creed, but they could unite on the Bible. But, in course of time, certain humanisms began to be advocated among us which many disciples could not in good conscience accept. Then divisions began because those humanisms were not only not authorized by the Bible, but many thought they were contrary to it in certain particulars. And the history of the introduction of those humanisms is a history of a perverse disposition on the part of many disciples. But those human-

isms were urged and introduced for the purpose of making the disciple brotherhood popular. LEADERS IN THE MOVEMENT WISHED TO IMITATE OTHERS. This cannot be successfully denied. And the history of innovationism among disciples in the nineteenth century is a history of dissension, debate, strife, division, disgrace!

But certain innovations or humanisms adopted by disciples have worked their own rebuke in the estimation of many. As a result, a calmer spirit prevails in many places. An illustration is here offered. In a certain town the church had become bankrupt. "The pastor's" salary was not promptly paid, coal bills were left unpaid, the janitor's wages were not paid, and "the pastor" called a council of the older brethren to "consider conditions." In that council several explanations of conditions were made, but not one of them seemed satisfactory. Finally one brother arose who said he had made some inquiries, and had found that the Ladies' Aid Society of that congregation had over a thousand dollars on interest in the Building and Loan Association, also that the Senior Endeavor had a hundred and seventy-five dollars on interest, and the Junior Endeavor had about seventy dollars on interest. And thus this brother had counted up from twelve to fifteen hundred dollars that should have gone into the church treasury but was put into other funds! When that brother had finished his speech that "pastor" arose and said, "You are right, Bro. Clifford; and after all we may say about 'our conservative brethren', they are certainly right in opposing these extra organizations." This report indicates what was meant by the statement previously offered—, that certain of the innovations among disciples "had worked their own rebuke."

Several of our religious neighbors seem to feel as if their divisions have done them sufficient harm for them to meet and consider the question of unity. And, strange to say, they place unity before union. But in explanation of this they indicate individual unity is more easily accomplished than general union. Be this as it may, our business as disciples of Christ is to lay aside our differences and become united. THEN WE MAY SHOW OTHERS HOW TO UNITE.

Here is a part of the apostle Paul's exhortation in regard to this subject: "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 ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." (See 1 Cor. 1: 10.) If this exhortation had been adopted and always closely practiced by the disciple brotherhood, it could not have divided. By "speaking the same" they would have remained together. The Divine Word tells us what to say; and by speaking as that Word declares

we would have been held together. And here is part of the apostle Peter's exhortation on that same subject: "If any man speak, let him speak as the Oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it of the ability which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion forever and ever. Amen." (See 1 Pet. 4: 11.) Now we have found that Paul exhorted Christians to "speak the same thing," and the apostle Peter told them how to do it—by speaking "as the Oracles of God," which means according to the word of God.

The question of names is offered first in Paul's specifications in regard to divisions. And we, as disciples, have learned that we should not call ourselves after the names of men nor by any other humanly-given names. And we have learned that "disciples" and "Christians" are the most scriptural or appropriate names, especially as these names are not much used by other religionists. But we are not so united in regard to the name for the church or congregations. Of course we are all satisfied that the name "churches of Christ" is scriptural, for in Rom. 16: 16 it is definitely given. Yet many of those who have adopted innovations prefer the name "Christian Church," and certain ones have tried to translate the name "churches of Christ" into "Christian Churches of Christ." But that is a strained effort, to say the least, and is not justified by the Greek text. But certain ones have adopted the name "Church of Christ," regardless of their innovations; yet the innovating part of the brotherhood has officially declared in favor of the name—"The Disciples of Christ." But this is too comprehensive, and thus too exclusive, for, as a form of speech, it embraces all learners of Christ, even the denominations around us, or it implies, by its exclusiveness, that they are not learners of Christ. Besides, that name excludes "the conservative brethren" who refuse to adopt innovations. What, then, shall we do in regard to names? The writer of these remarks suggests this: **ADOPT THE RIGHT NAMES AND THEN TRY TO SHOW OURSELVES WORTHY OF THEM!** These names are "disciple," "Christian," "the church," "church of Christ," "churches of Christ." The name "church of God" has been adopted by two or three denominations that are widely separated from the Church of the New Testament, and therefore we cannot safely use it. In Hosea 2: 16, 17 we find that the name Baal (which means "lord") was ruled out by Divine command, because it had been misapplied. And this suggests to us that when a name in the New Testament has been misapplied we should not use it, at least not use it without explanation.

But we have learned by considering 1 Cor. 1: 11-15, also 1 Cor. 3: 1-7, that we should not adopt humanly given names as religious titles; and that is more than our religious neighbors have learned. And we wonder why they don't see at least that

much. Yet the statement should be made that the letter to the Galatians is as clear against DISCIPLES ADOPTING JUDAISM as the first letter to the Corinthians is against disciples ADOPTING HUMANLY GIVEN NAMES. As a result, this scripture is applicable to us, "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things! . . . And thinkest thou this, O man that judgest them who do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" (See Rom. 2:1, 3.)

OF PAUL AGAINST JUDAIZING

The apostle Paul's letter to the Galatians was specially directed against Judaizing. In his first chapter he wrote thus: "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from Him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel. Which is not another, but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed! As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed!" (Gal. 1:6-9.)

Such declarations show the sublimity of Divine confidence and of Divine intolerance. Paul invoked a curse on himself, or an angel from Heaven, or any other man than himself (which included the other apostles), if he would preach any other gospel than that which he had preached in Galatia, and which they in Galatia had received. Here is expressed the limit of sublime confidence and intolerance.

And why did Paul write thus? We learn (in the first of the fifth chapter and the last of the sixth chapter of that same letter) that the Gentile disciples in Galatia were in danger of being perverted so as to adopt Jewish circumcision! Could any declarations be more expressive of the fact that the Gospel which the apostle Paul preached was God's finished arrangement for the salvation of mankind, and should not be tampered with in any measure or degree, at any time or under any conditions, by any being on earth, or even a heavenly being?

And yet Roman Catholics and all Protestant parties, including a large part of the disciple brotherhood, have felt at liberty to add to the Gospel, or take from it, or change or modify it according to their ideas of propriety! God gave to the ancient Israelites the privilege of building an altar of stone on which to burn offerings unto Him. But He told them that they should not build it of hewn stones, nor lift upon one of those stones built into

that altar any iron tool, as we may suppose, to knock off even a rough corner. If they did so, God said that the stone would thereby be "polluted." (See Exo. 20: 24, 25;—also Deut. 27: 5.) That altar fore-shadowed the Gospel as the substance by which we, under the Gospel age, offer ourselves to God. And as God did not intend any human improvements to be made in the substance, he was careful to forbid it in regard to the shadow. And the exactness of every part of the Divine law concerning all offerings made under the law should teach us that we should not try to improve on the Gospel in any form, manner, degree, item, particular.

But the apostle Paul not only invoked a curse on either man or angel who would pervert the Gospel he had preached to the Galatians, and which the disciples there had received, but he reasoned with them in the third chapter after this manner: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" (See Gal. 3: 1-3.)

Such reasoning, if properly considered, would have kept the primitive Church from going astray, prevented the apostasy from being developed, prevented the universal bishop or pope from arising. Yes, and after all those evils arose and flourished for a thousand years, such reasoning of Paul should have kept all Protestants from borrowing from Rome, or from Judaism. The force of that reasoning for us is to this effect:—Are ye so foolish? Having begun with the DIVINE, are you made perfect by the HUMAN? Yet that is what Rome and all her off-spring have been doing. They all commence with belief in Christ and repentance, yet have tried to go on with their religious life by adopting human devices and arrangements in regard to conversion, sanctification, church government, education, worship, work. Such has been the procedure of Rome and her daughters, and a considerable part of the disciple brotherhood has gone in the same direction in some measure or degree. As a result, the Romish church has fulfilled the prophecy concerning the apostasy or falling away,—foretold by the apostle Paul in his second chapter of his second letter to the Thessalonians. Then, as a further result, the Protestants generally have thereby separated themselves widely from the Church of the New Testament. And, as a final result, a large part of the disciple brotherhood has gone in the same direction by disregarding Paul's question about beginning with the Spirit and trying to go on to perfection by human devices. Then, as a certain part of the disciple brotherhood would not deviate, but insisted on observing Paul's

reasoning on this subject, we have become a divided and disgraced people!

Then, in the fourth chapter of that same letter, Paul likened the Jewish law and Jewish people to the bond-woman in Abraham's family, who brought forth unto bondage. Having done this he likened the Gospel and its obedient believers to Abraham's wife and her son Isaac. Then he summed up by endorsing the speech of Abraham's wife (Sarah) when she said, "Cast out the bond-woman and her son!" And Paul wrote thus in order to show that Judaism should be rejected by the Gospel Church. But what is Judaism but a religio-secularism, for it is a religious law and a secular law combined. And what is a religio-secular college but a religio-secularism? And the same may be said of a religio-secular journal. And the same is true of the worship with a Judaistic instrument of music. "Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bond-woman and her son!" This means,—Cast out all Judaism!

But before leaving the fourth chapter to the Galatians we should consider that Paul there wrote of the Jewish law as covering the period of childhood and servants of God's revelation to man, while the Gospel covers the period of sons. See what the first part of that chapter declares: "Now this I say, that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world." This shows that those who have adopted musical instruments in worship (because David used them) have gone back to the childhood age of God's people. And the last part of the same chapter shows that they have gone back to the bond-servant period of God's people.

Then in his fifth chapter to the Galatians the apostle Paul declared that those who went back to Judaism, or those Gentile Christians who would adopt even one item of Judaism, would thereby become "debtors to do the whole law," and would become "fallen from grace," and Christ would become of "no effect" unto them. What else could he have meant when he wrote thus: "Stand fast therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I—Paul—say unto you, that if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace!" (See Gal. 5: 1-4.) Think of what is here stated, and consider it. Those Gentile Christians that would consent to adopt Jewish circumcision would thereby leave the liberty into which they had been called, and would become entangled with a yoke of bondage, would make Christ of no effect unto themselves, would be debt-

ors to do the whole law, and would be fallen from grace. And all this would be accomplished by MISPLACING ONE DIVINE COMMAND!

Here we learn that a misplaced truth, or a misapplied truth, is a dangerous error. Circumcision was a Divine appointment given to Abraham for himself and his male descendants, also for his male household servants. (See Gen. 17: 9-14.) And that appointment was re-inforced by the Jewish law. But it was not required of the Gentiles as such, except when they wished to become members of the Jewish nation. And specially was it not required of Gentiles who had become Christians. Therefore the apostle Paul preached and wrote against it, and in his writing called for a curse on any man or even an angel from Heaven who would advocate it as necessary among the Gentiles who had become Christians. It pertained to the order of appointments that were represented by the bond-woman and her son, and she was commanded to be "cast out"!

In view of all this what of us if we go to Judaism by adopting David's musical instruments? If Abraham's circumcision, when adopted by Gentile Christians, made Christ of "no effect" unto them, and caused them to be a people who had "fallen from grace," and had become "debtors to do the whole law,"—what then will be the result to Gentile Christians when they adopt one or more of David's musical instruments? And did not Paul invoke a curse on all who would pervert the Gospel by adding to it a requirement pertaining to the Jewish arrangement? And does not that invocation of a curse still remain? And are not those disciples in danger who turn to Judaism in any form?

But consider Paul's final arraignment of those Judaizing teachers against whom he wrote: "As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law; but desire to have you circumcised that they may glory in your flesh." (See Gal. 6: 12, 13.) Here the apostle to the Gentiles, we may say, STRIPPED THE MASK FROM THE JUDAIZING TEACHERS OF HIS GENERATION, for he declared that they desired to "MAKE A FAIR SHOW IN THE FLESH." In other words, they could thereby enlarge the two brotherhoods by a fleshly bond of union and communion. And this is what all advocates of musical instruments in worship have had in view. They have wished to enlarge the audiences and finally enlarge the brotherhood by a musical instrument! And all such are Judaizers. They may not know it, yet they are Judaizers, and are in danger!

OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS AND EPHESIANS

We must admit that the first four chapters of Paul's first letter to the church at Corinth is certainly against professed followers of Christ calling themselves by humanly given names. The people known as disciples of Christ, who separated themselves from all others early in the nineteenth century, learned that much in regard to names. But in each of those chapters clear declarations are recorded in favor of **THE SUFFICIENCY OF GOD'S WORD FOR THE PREACHER OF CHRIST WITHOUT RANKING WITH THE LEARNED MEN.** But the people known as disciples of Christ in the nineteenth century did not learn that much, and therefore they soon began building colleges, and thereby divided the Church.

Does some one say that learned men were necessary in order to uphold the Gospel before the educated part of the world? This may be successfully denied by referring to the record made by Elder John Smith of Kentucky, and Elder Benjamin Franklin of Indiana, who overshadowed all the learned men of their generation in the disciple brotherhood. Elder Smith might be called "a genius" by reason of his extraordinary wit, but Elder Franklin was not thus gifted. Yet these men, and a host of others, made the best records for effective work of any men of their generation. Elder Franklin debated with and confuted several of the strongest men that could be brought against him from the religious parties around the disciples. Such are the facts, and as facts they remain.

What could have been more evident concerning the ability which the word of God would give to preachers, than such Divine declarations as are now offered? "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty: and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen; yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in His presence. But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption: that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." (See 1 Cor. 1: 26-31.)

Does some one say that the apostle Paul was a learned man, and therefore we should have colleges as church institutions? If so, then read a few of Paul's declarations concerning himself on that subject:—"And I, brethren, when I came to you came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified. And I was with you in weakness,

and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." (See 1 Cor. 2: 1-5.) Here Paul informs us that he did not use his worldly wisdom, and he tells us why.

And now we are better prepared than previously to consider that in every chapter of the letter to the Galatians we find something against Gentile Christians adopting any part of Judaism. In that letter we find much to the effect that adopting of any part of Judaism would ruin any Gentile Christian. This should have been seriously considered by all professed Christians in all periods of the Gospel age. And then the Church of the New Testament would have been saved from going after Jewish circumcision, Jewish instruments of music, Jewish priestly robes, Jewish pictures and images, and all else pertaining to Judaism both before and after the people (later known as Jews) had rejected God and had chosen a man as ruler.

Nor is this all, for we are now prepared to consider what the apostle Paul offers in his letter to the Ephesian brethren on the subject of unity or oneness. In chapter 1: 10 we find this. "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him." What is here meant by the word "one" we may learn by considering the last two verses of this same chapter from which we have already copied. "And hath put all things under His feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." Then in Eph. 2: 13-16 we find these declarations concerning God's purpose to make one body or church of both Jews and Gentiles: "But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For He is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us. Having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Human language with Divine precision chosen, we may safely say, could not have set forth more clearly than has been done in the declarations here copied, that Christ in his body's death ended the Jewish offerings whereby Jews and Gentiles had been kept separated. That is what is meant by the expression "having slain the enmity thereby." In other words, Christ became the end of the law which pointed forward to his body, when his body died on the cross.

Then in Ephesians third chapter Paul made mention to the

church at Ephesus concerning his knowledge in the mystery of Christ, and then added, "Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the Gospel." Here we find oneness again indicated, especially by mention of "fellow-heirs" and the "same body."

And now we come to the fourth chapter of this letter to the Ephesians, and we find it is almost entirely made up of instructions concerning unity or oneness. Notice these declarations: "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love. Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling,—one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

Here is an exhortation and an explanation offered in the humblest, plainest, simplest form and manner, which should have been sufficient to have kept the churches of Christ united in all periods of the Gospel age. But this is only one exhortation and explanation of many of the same kind and bearing. The plain truth is that sufficient was offered to the disciples of the first century of the Gospel age to save the Church, in all the centuries that have since passed, from division, and thus kept them united in name, doctrine and practice. Personal differences were unavoidable because of different temperaments and degrees of experience, as we find mentioned in the last of Acts fifteenth chapter, also in the latter part of the second chapter of Galatians. Yet all such could be adjusted or settled, without congregational division, even as those were which have just been mentioned.

Whoever will read the Old Testament with care, from beginning to end, may learn that God went to the limit of possibility in the use of plain, severe and yet merciful speech and judgments, in order to cause His ancient people to do right always. And the same may be said of the New Testament, at least in regard to speech, and with reference to God's people in the Gospel age. The Jews were inexcusable for their divisions and disobedience, and the same has been true with reference to Christians.

OF CHURCHES, NAMES, AND OTHER SUBJECTS

The "one body" referred to by the apostle Paul, in Eph. 4: 4, meant the church of Christ which is called "his body" in Eph. 1: 22, 23. And it is there declared to be "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." With this before our minds we cannot find a place

for many bodies, churches, denominations, sects, parties, communions. Jesus the Christ DIED TO ESTABLISH ONE CHURCH, and that Church is declared to be "his body." Not only so, but as it's declared to be "the fulness of Him who filleth all in all," and thus "the fulness" of God's arrangement for the salvation of mankind, what need could any one imagine to exist for more than one church or communion in order to save our fallen race?

In order to understand the perverse ignorance or ignorant perverseness, the presumptuous irreverence or the irreverent presumption found in a desire for even two churches different from each other in name, doctrine, practice, worship, work, organization, discipline, we should ask concerning two Spirits, two hopes, two Lords, two faiths, two baptisms, two Gods and Fathers. We certainly have as much Bible and as much reason for two or more Gods, Lords, Spirits, faiths or gospels, as we have for two or more churches, or religious bodies, in order to save mankind! With this much understood we must conclude that all humanly arranged religious partyism is wrong. No pleading, apologizing, explaining, arguing, urging of reasons nor anything else can be justly offered in behalf of the existence of any church except the Church of the New Testament.

And when we consider aright that the apostle Paul, in 1 Cor. 1: 13, urged these questions: "Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul?"—when we consider aright that Paul urged such questions, then the presumption of having different churches, with different names and organizations, becomes shockingly evident. All know that Christ is not divided, also that not John the Baptist, John Calvin, Martin Luther, John Knox, John Wesley nor any other man than the man Christ Jesus was crucified for our race. All know that no one has been baptized in the name of any one of those men. Therefore neither Divine revelation nor human reason even suggests the adoption of any one of those names nor any other name than the name of Christ, as the right name for Christ's followers.

Yet from another viewpoint we might say that the names adopted by the different religious parties are all appropriate. THOSE NAMES INDICATE WHAT THOSE WHO HAVE ADOPTED THEM REALLY ARE. Certainly the Catholics are not Christians of the New Testament order. Certainly the Lutherans are not Christians of the New Testament order. Certainly the Anglicans (or Episcopalians) are not Christians of the New Testament order. And certainly the same is true of the Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists and all others that are not mentioned in the Bible. But they all are what their names somewhat indicate; and in the light of the Bible we may safely say that not one of them is of the order mentioned in the New Testament. Therefore not one of them has any right to the New Testament name or names.

Right names and right objects belong together. The right

name to a wrong object or institution is altogether inappropriate. The same is true if a wrong name is applied to a right object or institution. But right names belong to what is right, and wrong names belong to what is wrong. This means that if the Church of the New Testament be called "Campbellite church"—that would be wrong—as wrong as to call it "a Paulite church." And, on the same principle, if a Baptist or Methodist or Presbyterian church should be called Church of Christ—that would be wrong. Therefore the statement may be safely made, repeated, emphasized, that all the churches in the entire domain of so-called Christendom have all chosen the right names for themselves. The fact that individually and collectively they have chosen names not mentioned in the Bible, SHOWS WHAT THEY ARE, or, at least, that they are NOT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ORDER. But if they had all chosen the right names while they are in doctrine and practice, worship and work, organization and discipline more or less wrong, that would have been on the order of sacrilege, for they would have made light of a sacred name by misapplying it.

Did Christ refer to any one of the denominational churches when he said, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell (hades) shall not prevail against it"? (Matt. 16: 18.) Or did Paul refer to any one of them when he wrote of "the church of the first-born which are written in heaven"? (Heb. 12: 23.)

But read more after the apostle to the Gentiles: "And He gave some (to be) apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive; from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." (See Eph. 4: 11-16.)

Who can read and consider seriously such declarations from the apostle Paul and see any resemblance between such teaching and the divided, distracted, distorted, dismembered condition of so-called Christendom? And who can suppose that such a religious condition is in any measure or degree acceptable to God? Such a condition suggests the word conglomeration rather than unity. It could scarcely have been worse if the Savior had prayed that his disciples might be DIVIDED TO THE LIMIT OF POSSIBILITY. And the same may be said if the apostle to the Gentiles had exhorted those whom he addressed in his letters to DIVIDE THEMSELVES

INTO AS MANY PARTIES AS POSSIBLE. Woe, then, to those who suppose that Christ will accept them in their divided, confused, conglomerated condition! They are wrong in name, organization, creeds, confessions of faith, books of discipline—wrong in regard to water baptism, the baptism of the Spirit, the evidence of pardon, the Communion, the life of the Christian, the simplicity of the public worship, the conversion of sinners, the sanctification of believers; and, above all else, they are wrong concerning Christ as King and thus as Lawgiver for His kingdom!

Can all this be justly said against churches not mentioned in the Bible, after confessing that they preach the Gospel in its prophecies and its facts? Yes. Because they do not accept Christ as King (and thus as Lawgiver for His kingdom) such churches have supposed that they can believe on Christ and love him sufficiently to be saved without obeying all of his commands, and thus without confining themselves to his teachings in regard to name, doctrine, practice, worship, work, church organization or church government.

In view of all this, certainly those churches that are not mentioned in the Bible have much bending to do—bending that will require much humility—humility enough to cause them to turn from everything that is not authorized by the Savior. The writer of these essays had to do that in his early life; but he has rejoiced that he humbled himself then, for he was then delivered from the bondage of religious errors which had been imposed on him by uninspired teachers, and he was exalted to the high and holy position of true disciples of our Lord and Savior. Reader, by humility you may be likewise exalted.

According to Genesis thirty-fifth chapter, when ancient Jacob was told to go up to Bethel and build an altar there, he commanded the members of his household to put away their gods (or images) and change their garments and be clean. They did as he commanded, and gave up their ear-rings as well as their images. Then, according to the ninth and tenth chapters of the book of Ezra, when the Jews had returned from captivity they were required to put away the wives that they had married of other nations; and they did so. Then, according to the last chapter of Nehemiah, we learn that the Jews (in order to be acceptable before God) were required to put away from among themselves certain others whom God had ruled out from among His people. Finally, in Acts nineteenth chapter we are informed that the heathen who used "curious arts" brought their books together and burned them, though the price was fifty-thousand pieces of silver. How much are WE willing to give up in order to be certainly acceptable to God?

ONLY ONE WAY TO SERVE GOD ACCEPTABLY

Churches not mentioned in the Bible seem to hate these words of our Savior: "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way which leads to destruction, and many there be who go in thereat: because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leads to life, and few there be that find it." (See Matt. 7: 13, 14.) And those same churches seem to hate this also: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in and shall not be able." (See Luke 13: 24.)

Intelligent readers know that the word "strait," as found in the sayings of our Savior concerning the Way of Salvation, means **NARROW** or **DIFFICULT**. And they are aware also that the expression "the gate" means one gate. Therefore they can see that the Savior taught **ONLY ONE WAY TO HEAVEN**. And this is the doctrine, above all others this side of rank infidelity, which those hate who preach that many ways lead to Heaven.

No doubt many, if not all, of the preachers and others of the churches not mentioned in the Bible, would deny that they hate the Savior's sayings about the one way to Heaven; yet with one accord they will turn from and speak evil of any one who will advocate **ONLY ONE WAY TO BE SAVED, AND WARN PEOPLE AGAINST ALL OTHER WAYS**. And they will tell (as certain ones of them have told) about "the twelve gates to the New Jerusalem representing entrances by twelve leading denominations." They must preach thus or condemn themselves! They must bend the Bible or bend themselves! And as they are not willing to bend themselves, therefore the Bible must be bent or explained or construed, or twisted to suit their doctrinal positions.

A certain preacher of Christ, at the opening of a new meeting house, preached (as he thought) suitable to the occasion. The next morning a man of the world said to him, "We have plenty of preachers in this country that will suit us better than you do." The preacher asked, "What's the matter now?" The man of the world said to him, "The doctrine you preached yesterday and last night won't BEND; but all the other preachers around here can bend their doctrine to suit the people."

And such is the condition. Preachers of Christ are divided into two classes,—Gospel preachers of the apostolic order, and Gospel preachers of the bending order. They all preach the Gospel in its prophecies and its facts, for they repeat the prophecies concerning Christ (as found in the Old Testament) and the facts of the Gospel as found in the records of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. But when a large majority of them come to the book of Acts they differ from the Divine record, and begin to bend the Gospel, or try to bend it, in order to suit their various theories. Yes, Rome and

all the Protestant parties really preach the Gospel in its prophecies and in its facts; but when they come to the commands and promises of the Gospel, then they divide and compromise and construe and interpret and avoid and evade so as not to condemn themselves.

We should not charge, in so many words, or without modification, that our religious neighbors do not preach the Gospel. Such a charge would be incorrect. They all preach the Gospel, and seem glad to do so, from the Pope of Reme down to the latest and lowest proclaimer among the children of men. But, they do not preach that Gospel of Christ in its fullness. What they find of the Gospel (or good news concerning Christ) in the Old Testament they offer without reserve. And they offer near or about all they find in the first four books of the New Testament. They like to talk and write about the personal character of our Savior, and even concerning him as the supreme Prophet and atoning Sacrifice and perfect Exemplar. But when they come to the last commission of our Savior to his apostles, they begin to draw back and divide. They do not consider seriously that the apostle Paul wrote, "Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." (See Heb. 10: 38, 39.) Not knowing or not considering that Paul thus wrote on the subject of faith, our religious neighbors "draw back" from the Savior's commission in which he said, "Teach all nations, baptizing them,"—which means, baptizing those they had taught, or had made learners or disciples of; and that the baptizing should be done in or into "the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit", and "teaching them to observe all things" that He had commanded them. (See Matt. 28: 19, 20.) Then they "draw back" from Mark 16: 16, which informs us that our Savior said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned!" The Romish church and nearly all of the Protestant parties "draw back" from baptism as there commanded.

Mention should here be made that all parties that now profess to be "faith-curists" insist that the promise of miracles, in Mark 16: 17, 18, should now be advocated as applicable to all Christians. But faith-curists overlook the difference between "them that believe" and THEM THAT SHALL HEREAFTER BELIEVE. As a result, they overlook Mark 16: 19, 20, and make a wrong application of what precedes.

Nearly all of our religious neighbors, as found in churches not mentioned in the Bible, "draw back" from the Savior's teaching concerning water baptism. Even those, in certain parties, who contend for immersion will insist that salvation from sin is necessary before baptism is due. Their doctrine is,—"He that believes until

he is saved from sin must be baptized in order to join our church." Others offer this to those whom they would instruct: "He that believes and repents and prays till he feels his sins forgiven, should be baptized in some form, in order to join a church not mentioned in the Bible."

"Let the truth be known!"—is an old and beautiful saying, and should be specially applicable in regard to religion. Therefore the plain and unwelcome truth should be made known to the people generally—that all churches not mentioned in the Bible are wrong DANGEROUSLY WRONG!

And yet whoever attacks the divided condition of so-called "Christendom" is in danger of being charged with "throwing clubs", "running down other people", "thinking that all are going to Hell but himself", and be reproached by other unhandsome and maligning speeches. Yet suppose a man would now appear before the public, named Martin Brinker. Suppose that he would say, "I am of German parentage; I have studied as many languages as Martin Luther ever studied, and I am as much in earnest to save souls as he was, and I intend to start a church." Suppose he would do so and his followers would call themselves "Brinkerans." Could any one now be saved in that church? NO! This is the common sentiment. Yet the followers of Martin Brinker would have as much right to call themselves "Brinkerans" as the followers of Martin Luther had to call themselves "Lutherans." This is evident as soon as stated. But whoever will undertake to persuade followers of Martin Luther to turn from his catechism and the Augsburg Confession of Faith will have a task equally serious to that which Luther had when he tried to turn people against the Pope of Rome. Whoever would undertake such a task should consider it as the German poet (Schiller) represented a certain revolutionist as considering his task in a soliloquy. Here are a few lines of it:

> What is thy purpose? Hast thou fairly weighed it?
> Thou seekest e'en from its broad base to shake
> The calm enthroned majesty of power—
> By ages of possession consecrate—
> And with the people's first and fondest faith,—
> As with a thousand stubborn tendrils twined.
>
> * * * *
>
> Out of the common is man's nature formed,
> And custom is the nurse to whom he cleaves.

Luther protested against his followers calling themselves after his name, and urged them to call themselves "Christians". But he had offered to them so much that was peculiar to Luther that they would not heed his protest.

Ask a confirmed Calvinist to study his Bible till he finds his predestination notions are wrong; and watch for results. Ask a

Baptist preacher to read his Bible till he learns that he should not regard immersion into the name of the God-head as a non-essential to an alien sinner's salvation; and watch for results. Ask an Episcopalian (or Anglican) to study his Bible till he learns that the New Testament does not authorize his clerical orders; and watch for results. And ask a Methodist to study his Bible till he learns that his feelings are not a Divine evidence of pardon without obedience to the Gospel as revealed in the book of Acts; and watch for results. And thus we might proceed with representatives of all the other churches not mentioned in the Bible; and with what results? Very likely each one, especially if a preacher, would feel insulted. Yet each of them, in periods of religious fervor, has felt as if he was willing to follow the Savior wherever He would lead.

What, then, is the trouble with those people? They are all learners of Christ, and in that sense are disciples of Christ. But they are not "disciples indeed," or true disciples, or wholehearted disciples. They have but little use for the book of Acts, where we learn that men and women "believed and were baptized," and that the disciples were called "Christians," and were satisfied with that name. Nor have they much use for Rom. 16: 16, where "churches of Christ" are mentioned. But, above all else, they have no use for the first four chapters of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, where he rebuked certain members of the church in Corinth for adopting humanly given names as religious titles.

CONCERNING ONE WAY TO HEAVEN

Churches not mentioned in the Bible seem to have adopted the idea that mankind may get to Heaven in any old way, or by any new way, that they may see fit to adopt. While not one of them will recommend all the ways of the other churches, yet they all seem to think that the Lord should tolerate them all! They would not have much confidence in any man who would preach for any one of them that might wish him to serve it, yet they seem to think that the Lord should be pleased with them all!

Many people seem to have the idea that there are several ways to do everything—"a wrong way, and a right way, and a way that will do." And the churches not mentioned in the Bible seem to have adopted that idea, in some measure or degree, in regard to religion. They know very well that the wrong way would be to regard the Bible with utter indifference, then the right way would be to become and remain wholehearted Christians, as did the apostle Paul. But the wrong way they seem to think would be **TOO DANGEROUS**; while the right way will be too costly, as it would require of them more than they are willing to give. Therefore they have decided that they should urge every one to "join some church," or they may

say "some orthodox church," or say "that all should join the church of their choice." But while they are cherishing and urging such an idea, the Savior is informing those who will read His records that he intended to build His church, and that the powers of the unseen world should "not prevail against it." And those who will read with care the record that He has offered to them in the New Testament may learn, in Heb. 12: 23, of "the church of the first-born which are written in Heaven."

But this is only the beginning of what is offered to readers of the New Testament. For on the day of Pentecost, mentioned in the second chapter of Acts, we are informed of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles, also of the preaching of the Gospel by the apostle Peter, and of the conversion of three thousand. Next the Bible reader may learn that the converted ones met for worship, and in that worship they "attended to the apostles' doctrine, the fellowship (or contribution), the breaking of bread and prayers." Next the Bible reader may learn that "the Lord added daily to the church such as should be saved," or such as were being saved. From that chapter onward the Bible reader may learn of "the church," "the church of God," and finally he will find, in Rom. 16: 16, mention of "the churches of Christ."

In view of all this, what confidence can we have in the doctrine that the Lord will accept the supposition that "many ways lead to Heaven," especially when the Church is spoken of as the bride, "the Lamb's wife"? (Rev. 19: 7.) Is Christ to be regarded as a polygamist, and that He has many wives? Besides, the Church is spoken of as Christ's body. (See Eph. 1: 22, 23.) And is Christ to be regarded as a monstrosity, that he as one head has many bodies? Let those answer who flatter themselves that different religious denominations are different bodies of Christ, or even branches of His body.

The Bible reveals one God, one Lord Jesus Christ, one Holy Spirit, and one Gospel, one Church, one rule of faith and practice for that Church,—and that is the New Testament. Why then should any one suppose that all these ones or units should be maintained except in regard to the Church, or body of Christ; and that in regard to the Church many different and conflicting bodies should or may be maintained? Asking this question is to answer it. And why should any one regard all these different and conflicting churches even as "Christian churches"? How can any one show that Christ has ever recognized even one of them for a single day or hour? Could our Savior give one plan of salvation and then save people by other plans? Paul declared, in the second chapter of his second letter to Timothy, that Christ "CANNOT DENY HIMSELF." But would He not deny himself if he would save people by some other plan than that which He had given? Does some one say that

in Rom. 16: 16 we read of "churches of Christ"? Yes, but they were all of the same order; and reference was there made to the different congregations of that order, and not to different and conflicting religious parties such as are now in existence.

This brings us to the question of non-essentials. Millions of men and women became Christians, lived the life of Christians and died the death of Christians before the Romish church came into existence. Therefore the Romish church is a **NON-ESSENTIAL** to the salvation of mankind. The same is true of the Eastern part of the ancient Church, commonly called the Greek Catholic church. Millions of men and women became Christians, lived the life of Christians and died the death of Christians before that part of the ancient Church came into existence. Therefore it is a **NON-ESSENTIAL** to the salvation of mankind. And the same may be said of every Protestant church that is not mentioned in the Bible. They are all *NON-ESSENTIALS to the salvation of mankind, because millions* of men and women became Christians, lived and died as Christians before any of those churches now in existence, that are not mentioned in the Bible, were formulated or thought of by mankind as churches.

But some one may now be ready to ask, "Have not the Protestant churches done much good, even if they are not mentioned in the Bible?" I answer,—Certainly they have done much good—morally, socially, domestically, politically. They have made millions of men and women better in life's relations generally, but they have done so at a dreadful cost! And does some one ask what is that dreadful cost? The answer is that they have taught the people generally that the Bible DOES NOT MEAN WHAT IT SAYS in certain particulars, and have prepared them to think that it does not mean what it says in any particular. In other words, Protestant preachers generally have said so much about "non-essentials in the Bible" that they have encouraged millions to think it is all non-essential. They have taught the people that the divinely given names are **NON-ESSENTIALS**, and that the divinely named officers in the Church are **NON-ESSENTIALS**, and that the ordinances as divinely given are **NON-ESSENTIAL**, and the divinely ordained worship is **NON-ESSENTIAL**; and they have taught the people, indirectly at least, that the divinely ordained humility is a **NON-ESSENTIAL**. Think of it, reader,—churches that are themselves **NON-ESSENTIAL** to salvation have decided thus of many Divine appointments! No wonder that, when the Jews acted thus concerning certain parts of the law, God authorized Isaiah to write, "Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker! Let the pot-sherd strive with the pot-sherds of the earth. Shall the clay say to him that fashioned it, What makest thou? or thy work, He hath no hands?" **(See Isa. 45: 9.)** But is there no basis of hope for any of them? None is revealed ex-

cept as indicated in the latter part of Matt. 10: 39. Christ knows who would die for him, and on that basis we may hope for the final salvation of the martyrs for Christ's sake in all ages. But our business is to make known and contend for salvation by the Gospel, and not by martyrdom.

But what of the people known as "the disciple brotherhood" in regard to non-essentials? The answer is that they have been divided, sub-divided, disgraced over non-essentials to salvation. Not one man or woman who has reputation to lose will arise and say that religio-secular colleges are essential to the salvation of mankind. Nor will any one affirm that a man-made missionary society is essential to the salvation of mankind. Neither will any one of reputation affirm that a man-made musical instrument is an essential to the salvation of any human being. And who will affirm that the man-made preacher-pastorate is essential to any one's salvation from sin? And who will affirm that the funny-lecture, the donkey-social, the poverty-social, Tom-Thumb wedding, or any other foolery, was ever essential to any one's salvation? Yet by the adoption of those non-essentials we became a divided people! And after all the talking that we, as a people, have done against others for their talk ABOUT IMAGINARY NON-ESSENTIALS in the Divine arrangement—after all that talking, YET WE HAVE DIVIDED OURSELVES BY ADOPTING REAL NON-ESSENTIALS! O my soul! How inexcusably condemnable, or — condemnably inexcusable—our course of conduct in becoming a divided people, and disgracing our plea for the oneness of God's people!

And what was the purpose of those who were chief in making us a divided people? The answer is that they wished to make the disciple brotherhood SUCCESSFUL AND POPULAR—they wished us to be like the denominations around us. And they succeeded, for we became and still are a compromised and betrayed and divided people! As a result we have become a laughing-stock for all sectarians and infidels who know enough of our history to understand our real condition. Therefore repentance—WHOLEHEARTED REPENTANCE—is necessary on our part. And if we don't intend to repent, then all so-called "Union Meetings" or "Get-together Meetings" are a waste of time, a sham, a mockery, and a shame, especially for the disciple brotherhood that started to unite God's people.

CONCERNING "NON-ESSENTIALS" AGAIN

Mention should be again made that, as disciples of Christ, we contend that the Romish church with all others that are not authorized by the Bible are non-essential, or unnecessary to the salvation of alien sinners from the sins committed before baptism, and

unnecessary to the eternal salvation of all Christians. We prove that this contention is true by referring to the fact that millions of men and women became Christians, also lived and died as Christians before either the Romish church or any other unauthorized churches came into existence. Therefore the entire Romish church and all of the Protestant parties are non-essential, or unnecessary to the salvation of mankind. And then we prove that "the disciple brotherhood" is divided over non-essentials, by referring to all the divisive doctrines and practices introduced into this brotherhood, and showing that millions were saved in and by the Church of the New Testament before any of these divisive doctrines and practices of the disciple brotherhood were mentioned.

But when all this has been done, then the question arises—"What shall be done with the Colleges, the Missionary society, the musical instrument, and the one-man preacher-pastorate? All of those divisive arrangements or devices are here, and what can be done with them?" The answer is simple, and is suggested by the story of a military officer in full uniform who went into an asylum for the insane to transact some business. One of the inmates asked him what he had hanging to his belt. "That's my sword," he answered. "What's it for?" was the next question. "That's to kill my enemies," said the officer. "Oh, don't do that! Let 'em alone, and they'll die of themselves"—answered the asylum man. And so we may say in regard to the divisive devices among disciples—LET THEM ALONE AND THEY WILL DIE OF THEMSELVES.

But this needs some explanation. Surely the disciple brotherhood is not now troubled in regard to what it shall do with Hiram College, nor Transylvania University, nor Eureka College. Those institutions have gone to the ridiculous, and thus have settled all questions concerning them, if I have been correctly informed in regard to them. And all the other colleges of the disciple brotherhood will likely go in the same direction, especially if they are endowed heavily. Infidels don't build institutions of learning, but let others build them, especially religious people; and when they are heavily endowed then infidels often manage to get control of them. Thus it has been, thus it is, and thus it will hereafter be. In other words, unless some better method can be found to control religio-secular institutions than has yet been adopted, then, if they be heavily endowed, they are all destined to go over to some shade or grade or degree of infidelity. And this is a natural result of the text-books used in the institutions now under consideration. Many of them were written by infidels and accepted by the State institutions, and they are offered to the religio-secular institutions. If in these institutions diplomas are given, or degrees bestowed, the pupils must study the books written by those infidel authors; and very few teachers are competent to expose all of the fallacies in those books,

even if they could command the time to do so. And here is a governmental crime exposed. Citizens of the United States are heavily taxed to support institutions in which no opportunity, perhaps, is lost to make doubters concerning the Bible of all who attend them. And the religio-secular colleges and universities are over-ruled to accomplish the same end.

But the letter to the Galatians informs us that we must avoid Judaism! And what was and is Judaism? Briefly described, IT IS A RELIGIO-SECULARISM—a union of religious law and State law. And one of the fundamental principles of the United States is THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH FROM THE STATE. In view of this the religio-secular college is a violation of the word of God, also of a foundation principle of the United States government. And no wonder if evil results have been abundant to the disciple brotherhood from their religio-secular institutions!

Does some one say that the denominations have quite generally made a success of their colleges and universities? My answer is—Don't deceive yourself! Their colleges and universities have been a burden and a grief to them. But they do not make any such profession as disciples make, and those denominations are largely made up of Judaism.

But that is not true of us. If we are true disciples, then the apostle Peter wrote of us after this manner: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people,—that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvelous light." (See 1 Peter 2: 9.) And we should again consider that in Deuteronomy twenty-eighth chapter God said to His ancient people that if they would obey Him he would set them "on high above all nations of the earth"; that they should "lend unto many nations", but should "not borrow"; and God would make them "the head, and not the tail." Then He told them that He would reverse all this if they would turn aside from His commands. And thus He did to them, when they obeyed Him and when they disobeyed Him.

And, according to the New Testament, the Savior intended to do the same for his people. He intended to make them the head, and not the tail; also that we should lend truth, but should not borrow, for by obeying the Gospel fully we would not need to borrow. But by reason of our borrowing from the denominations around us we have followed after them as their tail instead of being at their head and showing them how to walk in the ways of the Lord by conforming to the Gospel of His grace.

In view of all this, what shall we do? I know of nothing except the doctrine of repentance on the part of all wrong-doers. After the Samaritan sorcerer had obeyed the Gospel he sinned by thinking that the gift of God could be purchased with money. And he was

told to **REPENT AND PRAY.** (Acts eighth chapter.) And after a great part of the disciple brotherhood has sinned by supposing that success for the Lord's cause might be secured by the Church adopting human devices established by money, I know of nothing else except the common doctrine for all sinners:—**THEY ARE REQUIRED TO REPENT.**

We need to repent for ourselves and our fore-fathers in this work of borrowing from the denominations. In so doing we should consider again the old doctrine that "*all borrowed things should be* taken home and left there." Thus with our borrowed doctrine of religio-secular colleges and universities. We have become Judaizers, and have adopted the doctrine that Church and State should be united—at least in educational institutions. And in proportion as we have thus done we have robbed the Lord's treasury of what we should have placed therein, and we have become Judaizers! We cannot undo the damage that our fore-fathers, in the brotherhood to which we belong, have inflicted on us. But we can declare before God and men, before earth and heaven, **THAT WE WILL GO NO FARTHER IN JUDAISTIC PROCEDURE.**

HOW TO AVOID USING OUR DEVICES

But some one may be ready to ask, "If you reject all the supposed 'helps' which have been adopted by disciples, then what have you left?" The answer is simple, and easy to give. **WE HAVE EVERYTHING LEFT THAT GOD GAVE TO US—THE BIBLE AND THE CHURCH!**

God said to his ancient people when they were disposed to ask help of the Egyptians, "Woe to the rebellious children, saith the Lord, that take counsel, but *not of me*; and that *cover with a covering*, but not of my Spirit, that they may add sin to sin; that walk to go down into Egypt, and have not asked at my mouth; to strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh, and to trust in the shadow of Egypt: therefore shall the strength of Pharaoh be your shame, and the trust in the shadow of Egypt your confusion." (See Isa. 30: 1-3.) Then in Isaiah thirty-first chapter we find this: "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are very strong; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord. . . Now, the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses flesh, and not spirit. When the Lord shall stretch out His hand, both he that helpeth shall fall, and he that is holpen shall fall down, and they all shall fall together."

But all this, and much more of the same order, a great part of the disciple brotherhood has ignored. Perhaps I should say—has never read or never understood. The follies of Israel according to

the flesh should have been a warning to the disciple brotherhood of the nineteenth century, even as the apostle Paul mentioned those follies for a warning to the disciples of the first century of the Gospel age. But when men and women scorn to read and consider the history of the past they are liable to repeat the follies of those who in the past were ruined by them. And this is what disciples in the nineteenth century did. They went to Egypt as well as to Judaism for help to advance the Gospel. Their humanly arranged schemes for getting money from the world were evident appeals to Egypt for help. Their colleges and musical instruments were an evident appeal to Judaism. And they did not ask counsel of the Lord, but scorned that counsel when offered to them. "What does the Bible say about it?" was the question of one disciple of a former generation. "The Bible! The Bible! I'm tired hearing of 'the Bible'!" was the scornful answer.

And as a people we have been reaping the results of our wrongheadedness and strongheadedness. We have become a compromised and betrayed people and reproached people! We began with the plea for the oneness of God's people, and we have so divided ourselves by our worldly and Judaistic inclinations that we have lost our original plea. But if we would all humble ourselves so as to turn from our divisive devices, and unite on the Bible as we once were united, then we would still be able to show to other religious bodies that our discipleship has not been entirely lost. We could show to them what we have left of our discipleship is more than they have yet shown in all their "Get-together" meetings. Our discipleship was sufficient to hold us together during the so-called "Civil War." Though certain others divided over politics, yet we have not had a political division and I trust we never may have. Yet I confess that the people of the Southland are, in a certain sense, treading on dangerous ground when they are doing their utmost to magnify and remember what they wish us to forget, politically; and many disciples of their order come Northward with their divisive doctrines, and divide one congregation after another. But, serious as this is, yet it is a minor matter compared with the general division wrought by the adoption of the religio-secular college in the Southland after it had been made manifest in the Northland as a divisive device. They are the most inexcusable part of the brotherhood, if they be measured by the opportunities they have had for learning by the history of the past. And they are destined to reap the reward of their perverseness!

Does some one ask, "What shall we do in regard to the musical instrument?" **USE IT AS MUCH AS YOU PLEASE IN PRACTICE, BUT DON'T USE IT IN THE WORSHIP!** This is the simple solution of the problem, or answer to the question. The musical instrument pertains to the rudiments of a musical education even as

the note system pertains to that department, and as the letters of the alphabet pertain to the rudiments of an education in artificial speech. Think for a moment, and be convinced. The letters a-b-c, also the sounds do-re-mi and toot-toot-toot are all elementary. And when we get the benefit of what is elementary in our language then we pass on without repeating the elements. Likewise when we get the benefit of our note system we read the tune without repeating the notes. And we should do the same with reference to the tones of an instrument. We say of those who need to spell their words in reading—that they have not yet learned to read. And we say of those who spell out their tunes by repeating the notes that indicate them,—that they have not yet learned that tune. On the same principle we may say of those who need the sound of the instrument while singing—that they have not yet learned the tones of that song. Here I introduce two letters from Germany, which country is generally regarded as having the most thorough schools in music as well as in other domains of education.

Dresden, Germany, Nov. 7, 1912.

King's Royal Conservatory of Music.
Mr. A. R. Kepple, Kirkman, Ia., U. S. A.

Most Honored Sir:—In answer to your inquiry of Oct. 4, we offer the following answer: The famous professor of Dresden Conservatory, Miss Origeni, in teaching voice culture uses nothing but the paper knife and cork, "which, being interpreted, is a tuning-fork." We cannot possibly advise the use of instruments in connection with voice culture, for they are always a detriment and create a state of dependency.

Very Truly,—The Board of Directors, (per M. Krantz).

Stern's Conservatory of Music, Berlin, Germany.

Dear Sir:—Your letter of inquiry received and answer returned. In the department of voice culture in this conservatory we never use instruments of any kind in connection with voice culture; but will state however that we demand a knowledge of instrumental music from our voice culture students. Our reason for not using an instrument, primarily, is because it creates a state of dependency upon it; secondarily, because there is no instrument as perfect as the human voice. We consider the human voice the standard of harmony.

Very Truly Yours,—The Stern's Conservatory of Music.

In view of these letters from Germany the conclusion is unavoidable that a musical accompaniment in a song-service **IS A CONFESSION OF WEAKNESS** which we as Americans—as Americans—as Americans, I say!—**SHOULD SCORN TO MAKE.** And it is a confession of weakness which we as disciples of Christ **SHOULD BE ASHAMED TO MAKE!** And this is specially true of the stronger congregations, though these are the very ones that confess the weakness, and that they need an instrument on which to lean. **THIS IS A DOUBLE SHAME!** I was told by a prominent English disciple that all the stronger churches of disciples in Great Britain use the instrument in their worship. I suppose he mentioned that fact as

an argument in its favor, but to my mind it was of the contrary order. It meant to me that the stronger a congregation is the more it needs to lean on a humanly arranged crutch, which is a paradox and a disgrace, or a paradoxical disgrace.

"What then should we do with our musical instruments?" The suggestion is here offered that we may use them for practice, even as we use the note system for practice, and as "our conservative brethren" use them in their homes; BUT KEEP THEM SILENT WHEN WE MEET FOR WORSHIP! By so doing we shall soon find that we don't need anything to lean on in our song-service. We don't wish any one to sing the notes while we sing the words of any song. And we should not wish any one to sound the notes of a song on an instrument while we sing that song. Several years ago a singing contest was held in St. Joseph, Mo., and the prize (I was informed) was taken by a choir (from one of the Northwestern States) which used neither instrument nor song-book. We might do the same.

If singers learn to depend on an instrument, or even on a tuning-fork, they are very much like preachers who learn to depend on written or printed notes for their sermons. IT IS A QUESTION OF HABIT, AND NOT OF NECESSITY. I knew a sister, many years ago, whose father (I was informed) had spent a thousand dollars on her musical education. But when I announced a song and requested her to lead it, she asked ME to give her "the pitch"! What would we think of a nurse that would persist in leading the little ones by the hands so that they would never learn to walk alone? Such a nurse serves to illustrate the teachers whose pupils never learn to do anything without a crutch of some kind on which to lean. The fewer we have of such nurses or teachers or instruments, the better for us.

OF VARIOUS DEPARTURES AND THE CORRECTION

The adoption of church colleges has worked its own rebuke in so many instances that devotion to such devices has been much relaxed in course of the last few years. The same is true in regard to the humanly-organized missionary societies. But the evils of the musical instrument in the worship of the Church, and the evils of "the pastorate" in the work of the Church are not yet evident to many. The reason is that the worst results of these last-mentioned evils are not apparent in this world. King Saul was made to feel better by hearing David play on a harp, but it did not make him really better. And he did not seem to need a musical instrument to soothe his feelings till he had become a miserable backslider. Neither were musical instruments introduced into the worship of ancient Israel till it had become a backslidden nation. Nor was such an

instrument introduced into the worship of the primitive Church till it had become backslidden, and even apostate or fallen. Nor was such instrument introduced among modern disciples till they had shown signs of backsliding. Such are the historic facts which can be easily verified. But as sufficient has been offered on that subject, our attention should be now turned to another subject.

The modern, one-man, preacher-pastorate should next be considered. Many churches rebel at the thought of giving up their "pastor." Nor is there any need to give him up if he will only make himself fit to become a scriptural Elder instead of a textuary-preacher and would-be orator. Timothy served with Paul a considerable period before Paul left him at Ephesus to regulate the church there as an evangelist, but not as an Elder. (See Philip. 2: 19-23, also Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus, though they were only evangelists.) Then in 2 Cor. 11: 28 we find that Paul had "the care of all the churches." And that which is here emphasized is that he did not leave Timothy at Ephesus nor Titus in Crete till after those men had been tested by working with Paul. In 2 Cor. 8: 23 we learn that Paul wrote of Titus,—"He is my partner and fellow-helper concerning you." When all this is considered we must conclude that INEXPERIENCED MEN ARE NOT THE ONES TO TAKE CHARGE OF CHURCHES AS PASTORS OR SHEPHERDS. Nor are they mature enough to be teachers of the kind that every congregation needs if it would live and advance in learning.

But as we do not read in the Bible of a one-man, preacher-pastor over any congregation, we need to resort to 1 Tim. 5: 17, 18, where we read of Elders "that labor in word and doctrine," and that such should be supported by the church. Therefore every preacher who is old enough and good enough to serve as an Elder, according to the qualifications mentioned in First Timothy third chapter and Titus first chapter, should be chosen as an Elder, and let such men serve as Elders. Then we can have SCRIPTURAL PASTORS OR SHEPHERDS, WHO WILL BE KNOWN AS ELDERS; and "our conservative brethren" will be satisfied. But the name "pastor" has become objectionable to them. In Hos. 2: 16, 17 we learn that God discarded a name that was proper for the Jews to use with reference to Him. But He discarded it because it had been misapplied to an idol. And this indicates that we may do the same in regard to a name. That is one reason why we should not make much use of the word "bishop" when referring to an Elder, but should call him Elder or Overseer. The word "bishop" has been much misapplied by Rome and Anglicans.

Every congregation needs a good teacher—yes, several of that class. And if preachers will study the Bible from beginning to end so as to understand it, they may become good teachers. In other words, if they will study the history of the Bible till they learn that

it explains its law, and will then study the history and the law so as to understand the prophecies, they may teach the people—chapter after chapter. A teacher can do this by reading and explaining a chapter by easy comments. This is sometimes called "expository preaching," and it is certainly the best kind, for listeners can then go home and read the chapter for themselves. As a result they will thereby refresh their minds concerning the sermon that they heard. Yes, and many can be induced to bring a copy of the Bible to the meeting house and read with the preacher as he proceeds with the chapter selected for the occasion.

But mere text-preaching offers so much that hearers cannot remember. Therefore they simply hear and forget, hear and forget, hear and forget,—year after year, decade after decade, and one score of years after another. Two religious ladies (who had been listening to such preaching for about fifteen years) asked a certain preacher if Adam and Eve were Jews, and, then, whether they were Catholics!

The dense ignorance of millions who have been listening to preachers who are mere textuaries, or text-preachers—or even topic or subject-preachers—is shocking! The only kind of preaching that enters the domain of thought where the masses of mankind live and have their being is READING AND COMMENTING. And the comments offered should not be concerning what the "learned and justly-celebrated" Dr. Adam Clarke, or Dr. Jameson, or Dr. Scott, or Doctor Some-one Else has said about this, that or the other part of the Bible. But the comments should be within easy reach, yet not childish nor flippant. Neither should an expository preacher try to press every chapter into the division of learned discourse.

The statement may be safely made that nine-tenths, if not ninety-nine hundredths, of every textual sermon addressed to a promiscuous audience, is lost, except as the impression has been made that it was good, or about something good. And this is specially true when the preacher tries to act the part of an orator. The hearers may be entertained, but they are not edified. We, as disciples, were warned against such preaching a hundred years ago, but we did not heed the warning. In colleges much is offered concerning the oratory of the Latin Cicero, and the Greek Demosthenes, and the impression is made on many candidates for the pulpit that ORATORY IS OF MUCH IMPORTANCE TO PREACHERS. The fact that the apostle Paul ruled out everything of that kind in his first and second chapters, as we find them, to the church at Corinth, is overlooked by the teachers in such institutions. Human learning is magnified, but Divine wisdom is overlooked. As a result, the preaching done by disciples of Christ has been largely a failure, if we CONSIDER THE IMPORTANCE OF EDIFICATION, or

building up an audience in the knowledge of the Bible.

The textual preacher magnifies himself before his hearers, by building a big house on a small foundation. "What can he say about that text?" This is a common question in the minds of many when a single sentence or part of a sentence is read as a foundation for a discourse. And then the sermon or discourse is generally so far above the audience that no one is much edified, while many may be confused.

Every old Bible-reader, especially every old preacher, well remembers the difference in his own experience between twenty and thirty years of age. And by reason of that experience he is able to state that young men under thirty years of age may serve well as helpers with older preachers, but they **SHOULD NOT BE ENTRUSTED WITH CARE OF ANY CONGREGATION.** In regard to the Eldership, the apostle Paul declared that a novice (or new convert) should not be chosen; and he gives as the reason—"lest he be lifted up with pride."

The Bible is all right. Everything on the Divine side is all right. The sun, and the moon, and the stars are all right. The rotations of the earth are all right, and so are the four seasons of the year. The entire animal kingdom is all right, and the same may be said of the vegetable and mineral kingdoms. Perfection is found in the entire domain of nature, though it is to perish. And would the God of the universe stamp perfection on that which is to perish, yet give an imperfect guide for mankind who are to have an eternal existence? Asking this question is to answer it in the negative. But God intended that man should improve himself by conforming to Divine law. And, to say the least, His law is perfectly adapted to man's needs, and will accomplish the divinely intended results in man in proportion as he will make proper use of it. But the Divine Word is as necessary for man's spiritual strength and growth as is daily food of a material kind for man's physical strength and growth. Therefore the Bible—the Bible, I say, **SHOULD BE STUDIED, AS NEARLY AS POSSIBLE, EVERY DAY BY EVERY RESPONSIBLE HUMAN BEING.**

CONCERNING LEGISLATION

About twenty years ago a celebrated case was before the Supreme Court of the United States for decision. Reference is here made to the case of the Standard Oil Company which had been heavily fined for violating what was on record as the "Anti-Trust Law." The Company's lawyer contended that the law on that subject was not intended to be against **ALL COMBINATIONS** for restrictions of trade, but only against **UNREASONABLE COMBINATIONS.** The Supreme Court—except one of its number (Jus-

tice Harlan)—adopted the contention of the Oil Company's lawyer! But Justice Harlan published his protest against such acceptance of the word "unreasonable", and he designated such acceptance of it as "JUDICIAL LEGISLATION," which means COURT LEGISLATION, or making law by a decision of a court of judges. He contended that the business of courts was to apply law which legislative bodies had made, and not to make nor even modify any law that such bodies had made, nor even decide whether such law is according to the will of the lawmakers except by what they have expressly declared. To this should be added the statement that a certain writer (commenting on the mentioned decision of the Supreme Court) DECLARED THAT JUSTICE HAD THEREBY BEEN ASSASSINATED IN ITS CHIEF TEMPLE IN THE UNITED STATES. That writer's reason for thus declaring was that if the mentioned decision of the Supreme Court of the United States would be followed by all other courts, then every law of every State in this country would be subject to modification in every case brought before a court. As a result, he stated that "Judicial Legislation," or making laws by court decisions, would be the order, and that books on law would be of little or no value. Then that writer declared that from Judicial Legislation the advance would be easy to Executive Legislation,—which would mean that every official in the United States might interpret every law according to his own notions or preferences, and anarchy would result! But, fortunately, other courts of this country did not follow the example of the Supreme Court, and, as a result, anarchy has not yet become general.

But the writer referred to in the preceding paragraph proceeded to consider the question of Executive Legislation as found in the religious domain known as "Christendom". In that domain he declared that every church not mentioned in the Bible had adopted for its convenience a Legislative body, also a Judicial body and an Executive body. The first of these makes laws for the church it represents, the second determines the application of those laws, and the third executes those laws. Such, at least, is the governmental arrangement of every church or denomination which has adopted a humanly arranged creed, confession of faith or book of discipline. And such an arrangement has been, and still is, appropriate for churches not mentioned in the Bible, and which therefore do not recognize Jesus the Christ as their King and their Lawgiver, nor the inspired apostles as the divinely ordained executives and recorders of His laws.

But the disciple brotherhood (which asserted itself early in the nineteenth century) was different from all other churches. That brotherhood professed to regard Jesus the Christ as King, and thus as its Lawgiver. It declared that His laws for establishing his Church and regulating it are supreme and perfect. Thus that

brotherhood began, and thus it continued for a period. And such is the contention of "the conservative part of that brotherhood" even to this date, and will continue to be its condition, I trust, till the end of time.

But near the middle of the nineteenth century a certain class of prominent men in the disciple brotherhood began to act as if they thought that the laws of our King were defective in regard to THE WORK OF THE CHURCH. Then, soon after the middle of that century, a certain class of prominent men began to act as if they thought that the laws of our King were defective in regard to the WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH. And about the same time a class of many disciples acted as if they thought that their King's laws were defective in regard to the SUPPORT OF THE CHURCH. The first of those classes of men introduced an educational society and a missionary society, also "the pastorate." Then the second of those classes acted as if they must have musical instruments and church choirs. The third of those classes introduced humanly arranged schemes to raise money, — such as church fairs, festivals, poverty-socials, funny lectures, negro minstrel shows, with various other devices to draw money from the pockets of sectarians and other worldlings. Those who contended for such societies and other devices called themselves "progressives," and called their conservative brethren "fogies," "old fogies," "moss-backs," "kickers," and by other unhandsome and reproachful names. Thereby the divisions which have disgraced the disciple brotherhood have been made and intensified. And those divisions all resulted from what may be safely designated EXECUTIVE LEGISLATION. In other words, in their efforts to execute the law of Christ so as to make a success of it among the people, certain disciples added to that law in regard to work, worship and support. Thus it was with the disciples of Christ in the second, third and fourth centuries, and, as a result, they went astray, became divided and became contentious. This may be learned by any one who will read with care the records offered concerning the so-called "Apostolic Fathers." They soon forgot that Jesus the Christ is King, and thus is the Lawgiver for His people. Having forgotten his Kingship, and therefore that he was their supreme Lawgiver, those "Fathers" seemed to think that they could make laws, rules and regulations to suit themselves. And certain prominent men, for the same reason, seemed to think they could do the same in the nineteenth century.

But the chief apology made by those men, who introduced what was not authorized of Christ, was summed up in their DESIRE FOR SUCCESS. Forgetting that the New Testament does not require a success, but that all disciples shall be faithful—I say, forgetting this, many disciples urged certain humanisms in order to

MAKE A SUCCESS. They "stooped to conquer," and stooped so low that their stooping made us a compromised, betrayed, divided, disgraced people! And whether we, as a people, will ever recover ourselves from our stooped condition remains yet to be seen. But in order to help in this direction let us now take a final survey of our situation.

FIRST.—We began our existence as a separated people early in the nineteenth century, and specially to unite all believers in Christ. This was specially indicated in the document called "Declaration and Address," published by Thomas Campbell in 1809.

SECOND.—A notable advance was made in the direction of the Bible as our guide, in 1823, when Alexander Campbell published his first essay in the journal known as "Christian Baptist," in which he declared that the primitive churches moved "in their congregational capacity alone."

THIRD.—Then, in course of the year 1830, the Mahoning Association was disbanded because it was regarded as an addition to the local congregations by reason of the fact that it was an "extra organization." That act left the congregations free from all extra organizations, and for a period only unorganized annual meetings were the general assemblies of the brotherhood.

FOURTH.—But a backward or stooping move was made in course of the year 1837, when Alexander Campbell (in answer to, what became known as the "Lunenburg Letter") ventured to argue in favor of giving preference to the pious unimmersed over an immersed person who was not pious, and by implication he proposed to "substitute" a pious life for obedience to Christ in baptism! That proposal a generation later was seen in the discussion introduced about "communing with the pious unimmersed." Then in a third generation it began to be seen in the proposal for "open membership," or receiving the unimmersed into the fellowship of the disciple brotherhood. And here I am reminded of a statement of Justice Bradley, of the Supreme Court of the United States, made before that court had become a legislative body. The statement I refer to is this:—"ILLEGITIMATE AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES GET THEIR FIRST FOOTING BY SILENT APPROACHES AND SLIGHT DEVIATIONS FROM LEGAL MODES OF LEGAL PROCEDURE."

FIFTH.—The next backward and downward move was made in 1840, when a charter was secured for a college in order to educate men for the ministry; though the apostle Paul (in writing to the church at Corinth) expressed himself against such an institution, especially in his first three chapters to that church.

SIXTH.—In 1849 another backward and downward move was made when a missionary society was organized, specially for foreign work. This was done because those engaged in formulating

that society overlooked the fact that all alien sinners are declared to be "strangers and foreigners." (See Eph. 2: 19.) But they overlooked the scriptural meaning of the word "foreigner," and acted on the political and geographical meanings of that word.

SEVENTH.—In the meantime, the scriptural Elder who labors in word and doctrine, and is supported by the church (1 Tim. 5:17), was overlooked, and the one-man, preacher-pastor (often a young man) was adopted, after the manner of the religious parties around us. That was another backward and downward move, and has resulted in untold evil! As a final result, the preachers who are old and good enough to be Elders who labor in word and doctrine—these preachers are now regarded as unworthy of service in the church when they are best prepared to serve the church, and many of them are trying to serve as evangelists.

NINTH.—Another backward and downward move was made when musical instruments were introduced to help in the song-service of the Church. And the chief argument in their favor was that the psalmist David used them, though David lived and died in the childhood age of God's people. (See Galatians fourth chapter, and then consider that the entire letter to the Galatians was directed against Gentile Christians adopting any part of Judaism.)

Still another backward and downward move was made when humanly arranged schemes for raising money were adopted. But these soon worked their own rebuke.

TENTH.—Another backward and downward move was made when "the conservative brethren" of the disciple brotherhood were reproached by the names "fogies," "old fogies," "moss-backs" and "kickers." But that has worked its own rebuke.

ELEVENTH.—Still another move, both backward and downward, was made when those capable of becoming rich in the things of this world decided that they would not give as the Lord had prospered them, but that they had the right to lay up for themselves treasures on earth, regardless of the Savior's warning on that subject.

TWELFTH.—BUT THE ONE GREAT AND MOST CONSTANT DOWNWARD AND BACKWARD MOVE OF THE DISCIPLE BROTHERHOOD RESULTED FROM THE DESIRE TO BE SUCCESSFUL MORE THAN THE DESIRE TO BE FAITHFUL.

CONCERNING OUR "CONSERVATIVE BRETHREN"

"And though the Lord give you the bread of adversity and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed into a corner any more; but thine eyes shall see thy teachers: and thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, 'This is the way, walk ye in it'—when ye turn to the right hand and when ye turn to the left."

(See Isa. 30: 20, 21.) Thus God required the prophet Isaiah to write in regard to the Jews when they would return from captivity in Babylon. And thus our "conservative brethren" in the disciple brotherhood have appealed to those disciples who have seemed more disposed to be successful than to be faithful. As a result of such disposition "the pastor" has been the chief man in as many congregations as possible, and the Elders have been overshadowed, and in that sense thrust "into a corner." But when the Church will have returned to the simplicity that is in Christ, then the pastor will be one of the Elders; and, as the Elder who labors in word and doctrine, he will not overshadow his brother Elders, but will wish their help and counsel in all his labors.

But the prophet Isaiah was required to write, "And thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, 'This is the way, walk ye in it'—when ye turn to the right hand and when ye turn to the left." And this is the kind of "voice" that our "conservative brethren" have been sounding in many of our ears. At least they have been calling to those who have been seekers of popularity, and who seem to have been trying to be SUCCESSFUL more earnestly than they have tried to be FAITHFUL. In their contentions our "conservative brethren" have urged the importance of the Church which the Savior died to establish as "the pillar and ground of the truth", and thus as the upholder of the Truth. Then they have contended that the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible should be contended for as our rule of faith and practice, especially as it is summed up in the gospel of God's grace. And when those brethren have been inquired of—what is left after Colleges, Missionary societies, Ladies' Aid societies, musical instruments and other arrangements have been discarded?—when this inquiry is offered, then the answer is plain, simple, direct, positive,—WE HAVE ALL LEFT THAT GOD GAVE TO US,—THE BIBLE AND THE CHURCH! This has been the contention of the "conservative brethren" from the first, and they have one journal in which that contention has been constantly offered, for over a half century.

And now those "conservative brethren" have a brighter hope than ever before, that what they have so long contended for will be seriously considered. As they glance at the journals of those who have contended for Success more than for Faithfulness, they see symptoms of a disposition to turn from humanly arranged societies, and to magnify the Church as "the fulness of Him who filleth all in all." (See Eph. 1: 22, 23.) That disposition is according to the declaration in Col. 2: 10, "And ye are complete in Him who is the head of all principality and power." And in proportion as such scriptures are considered, emphasized, accepted, observed, "hope sees a star, and listening love hears the rustle of a wing"—as a certain infidel said at his brother's grave. And the hope, in this instance, is

that the disciple brotherhood may again be united! Not only so, but, in uniting according to the Gospel, they will be able to show their religious neighbors how to unite. Then our lost opportunity will, in some measure, be regained. We really did show our neighbors how to remain united during the so-called "Civil War," and thus how to avoid divisions over politics. But in the meantime we had, as a brotherhood, commenced to divide over instrumental music in the worship and societies in the work of the Church. And now, after fifty years of experience and experimenting with such humanisms, if we can turn from them and become united on all that God has given to us, then we shall have redeemed ourselves somewhat before our neighbors, and will certainly have shown the right regard for the Savior's prayer for Unity, and the apostolic exhortations for Unity. Then we shall be enabled to sing as never before—

Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love!
The fellowship of kindred minds,
Is like to that above.

But in the meantime we should sing for our encouragement the song that Bro. M. C. Kurfees wrote—

How blest and how joyous will be the glad day
When heart beats to heart in the work of the Lord,
When Christians united shall swell the grand lay,
Divisions all ended, triumphant His Word!

And why may not this grand, glorious, unspeakable end be accomplished at an early date? All extra organizations, both general and local, have worked their own rebuke by proving to be a disadvantage. Certainly this is true of the General Missionary Society, commonly called by the name "United Christian Missionary Society." It has been the cause or occasion of a second division in the brotherhood, and the local societies have proved to be a separation between the preacher, and the worship of many of the Church. If those local organizations would be rightly named they might be called "Pets," and pets which require much time, attention, work, anxiety. Many years ago a certain man said, to the writer of these lines, that his wife had "worked herself sick" on several occasions, in order to make a success of some one of their dinners or suppers. And a certain woman said to a sister in "a conservative church,"—"The entertainments of the Ladies' Aid society are a burden to me!" And a preacher in one of the denominational churches said to the writer of these lines, only a few days ago, "I don't think I shall ever organize another Ladies' Aid society." He said this after informing me of a quilt that the Ladies' Aid had made and for which they sold "chances." He had rebuked them for it.

As for the musical instrument, certainly the "conservative

brethren'' (both North and South) have shown that it is not necessary to success, even if success, or a show of success, should be regarded as the chief end in view. BUT FAITHFULNESS SHOULD BE CHIEFLY CONSIDERED, REGARDLESS OF SUCCESS. Therefore we should all consider that by being faithful we can be united, and thus be in harmony with the Savior's prayer for unity and the apostolic exhortations for unity.

But this is not all, for we must admit that the more instrumental music we make use of the less we can obey the command to teach in our song-service. ''Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs,'' is plainly set forth in Col. 3: 16. But how can we teach when the listener who is blind, or has no book, cannot hear what is said because of the instrument? In course of the year 1875 or 1876 the writer of these lines was permitted to hear an eight-thousand-dollar organ, and he could not tell whether the man next to him was singing—except by the motion of his lips; and could not tell (from what he heard) whether the congregation was singing a sacred or a secular song. I did not use a book, and I certainly was not taught nor admonished, though it was a time when I needed both teaching and admonition.

Besides, as indicated in a preceding chapter, the use of a musical instrument in our song-service is a confession of weakness which we should scorn to make. And to this should be added the statement that all references to David with his musical instruments are pitiable, because he lived in the childhood age and servant period of God's people, and children especially like playthings. See Gal. 4: 1-5. ''NOW THIS I SAY, THAT THE HEIR, AS LONG AS HE IS A CHILD, DIFFERETH NOTHING FROM A SERVANT, THOUGH HE IS LORD OF ALL; BUT IS UNDER TUTORS AND GOVERNORS UNTIL TIME APPOINTED OF THE FATHER. EVEN SO WE, WHEN WE WERE CHILDREN, WERE IN BONDAGE UNDER THE ELEMENTS OF THE WORLD: BUT WHEN THE FULNESS OF TIME WAS COME, GOD SENT FORTH HIS SON, MADE OF A WOMAN, MADE UNDER THE LAW, TO REDEEM THEM THAT WERE UNDER THE LAW, THAT WE MIGHT RECEIVE THE ADOPTION OF SONS.''

In view of such declarations offered by the apostle Paul this question is due:—Why should Christians, who are sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, wish to go back and adopt a plaything which was tolerated among God's ancient people while they were in their CHILDHOOD AND SERVANT PERIOD OF GOD'S REVELATION TO OUR FALLEN RACE? And while considering the preceding question we should not forget the following:—If we wish to be faithful to God, then why should we go back and adopt a plaything that was not used by the ancient children in public worship until after those children had rejected God as their ruler—as

we learn, in 1 Sam. 8: 7, 8, that the children of Israel had done? The entire fourth chapter of Paul to the Galatians is against those who have adopted musical instruments in worship unless they wish to be numbered with "children" and "bond-servants." I challenge every reader of this essay to read that chapter with care.

Reader, the ancient Israelites were a backslidden people when they added musical instruments to their worship, and they were reproved for it by an inspired prophet. (See Amos 6: 1-5.) Then the primitive Israelites, or Christians, did not adopt such instruments till they became a backslidden and even an apostate people. And, finally, the modern Israelites, or disciple brotherhood, did not adopt musical instruments in their worship till after they had commenced to backslide. The ancient Israelites showed their backslidings by wishing to copy after the nations around them, and many of the modern Israelites showed their disposition to backslide by wishing to copy after the denominations around them. But while these modern Israelites have been copying after those around them, a voice has been behind them saying:—"THIS IS THE WAY, WALK YE IN IT, WHEN YE TURN TO THE RIGHT HAND [AFTER SOCIETYISM] AND WHEN YE TURN TO THE LEFT [AFTER MUSICISM]."

That voice has been sounded by the "conservative brethren" of the disciple brotherhood. And it is still being sounded by them, as indicated in this "Appeal For Unity."

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The wisest monarch of ancient Israel, near the ending of his writings, offered this exhortation: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter,—Fear God and keep His commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." (See Eccl. 12: 13.)

I once inquired of an elderly brother why the Savior omitted to say, "He that is not baptized shall be condemned"—for the Savior certainly knew that many professed believers in Him would try to avoid being baptized by reason of that omission. That brother's answer was, "The Bible makes no provision against the dishonest mind." I think he was right. The Bible is so written that honest men and women may read it for themselves, learn for a certainty what it requires of them, then obey what it requires with full assurance of faith, and be saved. But if the mind is not honest, and thus is disposed to avoid full obedience, or go beyond full obedience, then that mind can find some pretext for gratifying its dishonesty. All of this is true in regard to the first principles of the Gospel, also the requirements of Christians, as found in Acts of Apostles and the Epistles to Christians. The Holy Spirit did not propose to hem men and women in so closely that they would obey Christ as a fire-escape.

But the Holy Spirit has made a revelation which will enable all honest and humble minds to learn the Truth, and, in full assurance of faith, obey it to their own rejoicing and to God's honor and glory in this world and the world to come. Whoever denies this thereby impeaches either the intelligence or the benevolence of God. For if God did not furnish mankind with a plain Book—one that they could understand by diligent study—His failure to do so implies He COULD NOT or HE WOULD NOT DO SO. If HE COULD NOT, then he did not know enough to do so; and that impeaches His intelligence, and proves him unfit to be our God. Then if He COULD have furnished such a book, but WOULD NOT, then surely His goodness or benevolence is impeached, and he is thus proved unfit to be our God.

In view of all this we must conclude that the Bible is plain enough for all those to understand it who are honest and earnest enough concerning their salvation to study it (as the Guide-book that God has given to us) with such diligence as is reasonable. As an illustration of this conclusion reference should be made to this material world and the diligence with which we need to work physically or mentally, or both physically and mentally, in order to exist in this world. This is always true if our existence is in any degree worthy. If a farmer, for instance, has a crop of grain or vegetables, he must work to raise or produce that crop. And the same is true of good results with the merchant, the schoolteacher, the politician, and even the housekeeper. And the same must be true in regard to the Bible. The farmer would reap a harvest of weeds and briers if he did not till his soil with more diligence than most farmers study their Bible. The merchant would soon go out of business if he would treat his business as he generally treats his Bible. The same would be true of the schoolteacher and the politician. As for the housekeeper—she would be a disgrace to the community in which she lives if she would treat her household duties as she generally treats her Bible. I heard of one of that class who lost her spectacles, and did not find them for about six months,—for she had left them in her Bible! I think I have known a few of both men and women, even churchmembers, who would not have found their spectacles for a year—if they had left them in their Bible.

In conclusion on this question I state that the ignorance of the Bible (which results from indifference in regard to studying it) is the secret of nearly all the mistakes which are made concerning it. And the danger is that if the Judge of all the earth would, in the Last Day, condescend to ask any questions of the disobedient, the first question would not be,—"Did you not know better than to disobey your God?" But, rather,—"HAD YOU NO OPPORTUNITY TO KNOW BETTER?" And by reason of such a question the disobedient would feel self-condemned, and acknowledge that the sen-

tence against them (even the sentence of eternal condemnation) would be just. To this should be added the statement that of all the inexcusable people now on the face of the earth, certainly those that began their existence "to unite all believers in the Bible," but soon became divided themselves—these are chief in the ranks of inexcusables!

Now mention should be made of the fact that a certain legal aphorism declares, — EVERY INTERPRETATION OF LAW WHICH IS SO LIBERAL THAT IT BEGETS NEW LAW OR NEW INSTITUTIONS, NOT MENTIONED IN THE AUTHORIZED LAW, IS EVIDENTLY VICIOUS, AND IS IN PRINCIPLE SUBVERSIVE OF ALL LAW.

That aphorism, or self-evident saying of civil law (called "the science of jurisprudence"), has been violated by every humanly arranged organization that has been adopted by any part of the disciple brotherhood. And we should remember that every organization separate from the local congregation has needed to adopt a code of new laws for its regulation. This shows that we, as disciples of Christ, have disregarded human law as well as Divine law, or human reason as well as Divine revelation, in our divisive course of thoughts and actions. By so doing a great part of our brotherhood has been brought under the sentence of those who "cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine" of Christ. (Rom. 16: 17,18.)

To this should be added another legal aphorism which is to this effect:—EVERY INTERPRETATION OF LAW WHICH IS SO RESTRICTED THAT IT PREVENTS THE FULL AND FREE EXECUTION OF ANY AUTHORIZED LAW, IS, IN ITSELF, EVIDENTLY VICIOUS, AND IS, IN PRINCIPLE, SUBVERSIVE OF ALL LAW.

This second aphorism, or self-evident saying of civil law, is against all that part of the disciple brotherhood which has caused divisions by trying to be more restricted and definite than the Holy Spirit has been in regard to worship and work and privilege, especially the worship and work and privilege of womankind in the Church. Those restricted ones have wrought division also in regard to the privileges of Christians with reference to civil governments, and in regard to the teachings and work of our religious neighbors. Yes, and mention should be made also of the restrictions in regard to Bible classes for both old and young in the house of worship. In denouncing all such, one of that restricted order declared in public print: "I hate the Sunday-school as I hate the devil!" And he "could not see" any difference between unorganized Bible classes and a fully organized Sunday-school as an extra organization!

Mention should be now made of the Divine law concerning "expediency". As advocated by a certain part of our brotherhood,

it has included more than is mentioned in the law of Christ, and thus more than is permitted by that law. In 1 Cor. 6: 12 and 10: 23 we find that things or practices may be lawful, but not expedient. Thus the word "expedient" is not as extended in meaning and application as the word "lawful". Washing the saints' feet by a woman, for instance, was lawful and expedient in primitive times when travelers wore sandals, but it is not expedient now in view of the changes in foot-wear. The same was true in regard to honoring the king and greeting with a kiss,—when and where the king was and is a political custom, and the kiss was and is a social custom. But such acts would not be expedient where the king and the kiss are not established as customs. Thus we see that the word "expedient" in Paul's writings MEANT LESS than the word "lawful", but many disciples have used it in behalf of certain devices as if it MEANT MORE than the word "lawful." As a result such disciples have become wrong reasoners, have extended the meaning of important words beyond the Divine intention, and have thereby become divisive characters—"contrary to the doctrine" of Christ!

The erroneous doctrine "Whatever is not expressly forbidden by the word of God is allowed"—that doctrine has been previously set forth and discussed in this series of chapters, in one form or another. And I may say—the same may be said of the erroneous doctrine—"Whatever is not expressly allowed by the word of God is forbidden." These two erroneous doctrines may be regarded as fundamental fallacies which many disciples have adopted, and have thereby become divisive characters. Those that adopted the former of them have been UNSCRIPTURAL INCLUSIONISTS, for they have included in their teaching and practice much that the Bible does not authorize. Such have been designated "innovators." Then, those that have adopted the latter fallacy have become UNSCRIPTURAL EXCLUSIONISTS, for they have excluded much that is divinely authorized, and have been designated "hobbyists." The advocates of each fallacy have become numbered with those who have caused divisions and offenses "contrary" to the doctrine of Christ!

In conclusion the statement should be made that both of the classes of disciples, to which reference has last been made, have been known to adopt what Sir William Hamilton (in his work on Logic) designates by the word "Sorites," and explains it by calling it, "The fallacy of continuous questioning." Then he illustrated it by the question—"How many grains of corn are needed to make a heap of corn?" And when a "heap" is admitted, then offer the question: —If one grain be taken from it, will the heap remain? Then question:—if two or three grains be taken from the heap, whether that which is left will still be a "heap"? That fallacy has been used to the limit among disciples of a certain order, in favor of their schools

and societies of various orders. The question has been asked, "If one man conducts a school, is that lawful?" Then another has been added, and still another, and so on to a dozen, or more than a dozen. The same method has been adopted in regard to a Missionary society, an Endeavor society and various other organizations. As I stated, Sir William Hamilton (in his work on the science of Logic) designates such reasoning by the word "Sorites"; and I now add that he calls it a "contemptible fallacy." Yet that "contemptible fallacy" has been resorted to, in many instances, in order to overthrow appeals to right reason and Divine revelation in favor of the oneness of God's people on the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. Yet differences will arise, because the Bible "makes no provision against the dishonest mind," and not all of mankind are honest in religion.

Yes, and differences may arise by reason of differences in temperaments, devotion, age, experience,—as the difference between Paul and Barnabas concerning John Mark as a traveling companion. (See the last of Acts fifteenth chapter.) But such differences may soon be corrected, or at least they will not become general, especially if both parties will act the part of Christians.

Finally, the statement should be made that differences may arise like that which is mentioned in Galatians second chapter. But even that difference never became general, nor was it continued, though it was a difference between the apostles Paul and Peter. And at a later date the apostle Peter wrote of "our beloved brother Paul," which clearly indicates that nothing evil was rankling in his bosom against the apostle Paul, though he had received from him a public rebuke. And we should imitate the apostle Peter in that particular, especially when we consider that the wisest monarch of Israel declared, "Rebuke a wise man and he will love thee; give instruction to a wise man and he will be yet wiser; teach a just man and he will increase in learning." (See Prov. 9: 8, 9.)

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

What may we scripturally salvage or save of our humanisms? Must they all be discarded or "junked"?

The disciple brotherhood, as such, is not opposed to a liberal education. On the contrary, such an education is generally regarded in our brotherhood as a valuable asset for all our sons and daughters who are capable of securing it. It is a valuable accomplishment for all, and is justified and even required by what the apostle Paul enjoined upon an evangelist named Titus, when he wrote thus, "Sound speech that cannot be condemned, that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you." (See Titus 2: 8.) Does not such speech require that it shall be correct in

manner as well as in matter, and in form as well as in sense?

Consider an instance that actually occurred. A preacher of Christ (who had not received a liberal education) was debating with an infidel who was objecting to the Bible because of the "contradictions" in it—as he called certain contrary statements. The preacher did not know what to say in response. But he had a moderator who was liberally educated, and he wrote on a slip of paper these words: "Deny that your opponent has found even one CONTRADICTION. He has found only CONTRARY STATEMENTS, and CONTRARIES always admit of explanation, while CONTRADICTIONS exclude each other." The preacher grasped the discrimination found in these words and proceeded to show the difference between contradictories and contraries, and soon the discussion on that subject was ended. "Sound speech that cannot be condemned" had ended the controversy.

And now another instance is offered. A certain preacher of Christ (who was liberally educated) was on the witness stand in a church case. The lawyer questioning him said, "That's only your opinion; and every man has a right to his opinion." The witness answered, "That depends on whether the opinion is right. God never gave a man a right to anything that is wrong—not even a wrong opinion. God suffers mankind to hold wrong opinions at their peril, but does not give them any RIGHT TO HOLD THEM." That lawyer proceeded to his next question. "Sound speech that cannot be condemned" had taught that lawyer something of which, perhaps, he never before had thought (we may suppose).

And yet another instance should be mentioned. That same preacher was again on the witness stand in a case wherein the "general teaching of the Church" was in question. The lawyer that questioned him on cross-examination asked, "Mr. Blank, all churches of Christ are not unanimous, are they?" Mr. Blank answered, "Mr. Knight, I would not like to place myself on record in answer to any such question as that." "Why, what's the matter with it?" asked the lawyer. The witness answered, "I think I know what you mean; but your question annuls itself, for it begins with a universal affirmative, and ends with a universal negative, and thus annuls itself. But UNANIMITY is not the question before the court —it is the GENERAL TEACHING of the Church. Unanimity does not admit of any exceptions, but the general teaching admits of exceptions." The witness then looked up at the judge, and he assented. The lawyer seemed non-plussed. "Sound speech that cannot be condemned" had confused him.

The "conservative brethren" of the disciple brotherhood are generally, if not universally, in favor of all the education that is necessary to enable its preachers (and as many others as may be possible) to use "sound speech that cannot be condemned" by the

Bible or by any other standard of truth. And I don't think that any of them are very particular whether such speech is learned in a high school, college, or university, or learned by the lone student —as Abraham Lincoln received his education. But the "conservative brethren" of our brotherhood are opposed to pompous titles for preachers, especially as such titles do not indicate certain efficiency, but chiefly serve as letters of commendation to school-boards, business men and corporations, that have not the time and, perhaps, not the ability to test the efficiency of those who apply to them for positions.

Finally on this subject the inquiry is,—Can the Church as such have connection with any other institution and yet be scriptural? We must not forget Acts 19: 19.

The next question for discussion might be this:—Can we not so magnify the local congregation as a monied institution and as a missionary society, that no need will be felt for any other organization to gather money and do missionary work? This question will involve the inquiry whether the requirement to give "as the Lord has prospered us" does not apply to the rich as well as to the poor and those in moderate circumstances. It involves the inquiry, also, whether 1 Cor. 16: 17 does not authorize several disciples to unite in missionary work in harmony with the local congregation and to God's honor and glory. That scripture shows that certain men supplied to Paul what was lacking on the part of the church. And the question is:—May not earnest disciples now do the same if the church as such proves to be delinquent in its duty?

The next question for discussion is:—May not all disciples of Christ have the same order of worship in regard to instrumental music, by omitting all use of the instrument at the entire service when the Communion is observed? This will permit all disciples of Christ to commune together without fear of endorsing any part of Judaism.

Then the next question should be:—Have not those disciples who do not use the instrument in connection with their singing in public made a satisfactory demonstration that its use is unnecessary?

Finally, on this subject the question is:—May not those churches that have the instrument use it in practice as pertaining to the rudiments or elements of music, even as they use the notations in their song-books? "Conservative disciples" generally make such use of instrumental music, and cannot all disciples agree to do the same, for the sake of "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace"—as the Gospel requires? Historic evidence declares that the disciple brotherhood has been denied mention of having contributed to the oneness of believers in Christ, because they (as a brotherhood) divided over the organ!

Another question worthy of discussion is:—May not all the

mature preachers of the disciple brotherhood, who do not wish to serve as evangelists, be used as "Elders who labor in word and doctrine," if they be good enough to serve as Elders; and they be supported by the church?

Does, or does not, the Bible—by its dignity, unity, impartiality and other characteristics—proclaim its origin, and that it should be accepted as man's Supreme Guide-book in religion, morality and behavior?

These questions are offered as a suggestion in regard to the chief subjects, or the subjects that should be regarded as most important, in the disciple brotherhood. If we can be united on a scriptural basis, or foundation authorized by the New Covenant Scriptures, then we may regain somewhat of our lost reputation, though our lost opportunities are gone forever. But by reforming ourselves and uniting on a scriptural foundation we may show others how to do the same, and then all the religious domain known as Protestantism, at least, may be united to the glory of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen and Amen.