

The
College Question
Discussed

By

J. C. McQuiddy

(Managing Editor of "Gospel Advocate," and Owner
of McQuiddy Printing Co.)

D. Austen Sommer

(Contributor to "Apostolic Review," Indianapolis,
Indiana)

J. N. Armstrong

(President of Harper College and Publisher of
"Gospel Herald")

APOSTOLIC REVIEW
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

The
College Question
Discussed

By

J. C. McQuiddy

(Managing Editor of "Gospel Advocate," and Owner
of McQuiddy Printing Co.)

D. Austen Sommer

(Contributor to "Apostolic Review," Indianapolis,
Indiana)

J. N. Armstrong

(President of Harper College and Publisher of
"Gospel Herald")

REASONS WHY YOU SHOULD READ THIS DISCUSSION

The importance of this discussion cannot be over-estimated. It contains things vital to the Church of Christ. Bro. McQuiddy says: "Neither the missionary society nor any other association of Christians is wrong BECAUSE IT IS A HUMAN ORGANIZATION. Whether a human organization is right or wrong depends altogether upon what it does. If nothing were done by individual Christians through a missionary society but preach or teach the gospel, neither Bro. Sommer nor anybody else could show that it is wrong." Bro. Kurfees admits the same in the columns of the Advocate. If this be true, then most of the arguments used against the missionary societies of the Christian Church by the Advocate, Christian Leader, Firm Foundation, Pacific Tidings, etc., are false, for their chief argument against these societies has been that they 'were other bodies while the Book says there is "one Body," that they are human plants, and "every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up," and that we are to glorify God "in the Church" and not in a human organization.

If we can scripturally form a human organization of a Bible college to teach the Bible—work of the Church—then we can also scripturally, as McQuiddy says, form a human organization of a missionary society to teach and preach the Bible. Nor is there anything to keep us from forming a human organization of an aid society, or Dorcas society, etc., etc., to do charity work. Thus admitting the scripturalness of human organizations, as Bro. McQuiddy does, to do work which Paul commands to be done "in the church," (Eph. 3:10, 21), where will the stopping place be? But, brethren, McQuiddy must take this unscriptural position in order to defend your Bible college. Should you not investigate these things?

Another reason "that you should read this tract is that the greatest curse in the Christian world is "the kingdom of the clergy," (imported preachers who are continually doing what God ordained should be done by the bishops), and the theological seminary and Bible school and college is the hot-bed of this clergy. In a Prospectus of the Gospel Advocate for 1915, A. B. Lipscomb, now managing editor of that journal and president of David Lipscomb School, says of the Bible colleges, "If properly encouraged, these schools will become more and more useful for the dissemination of truth through the education of young men for the ministry and the preparation of boys and girls for the serious duties of life." Abilene Christian College has been still more outspoken for their theological seminary and has written that they would have a "special course" for preachers, and that those; studying for the ministry can receive as good an education as in the divinity schools of the sects and that the course will lead to certain theological degrees, etc. It is generally admitted that "the pastor" is being rapidly installed in the churches influenced by the Bible colleges. Was it not Bible-college preachers chiefly that introduced instrumental music. and societies over the heads of an undeveloped and weak eldership? Is it not the preachers, (not the bishops), who are leading our digressive brethren into greater apostasy, and, were not these. preachers trained in the Bible colleges! Is it not about time that we develop a God-given eldership? Harvard, Yale, Chicago University, Transyl-

vania, etc., were all started to teach the Bible along with other branches, and they are now tearing it to pieces. What is to hinder David Lipscomb School, Abilene Christian College, etc., from going the same way? It is hard enough to hold the church in line with truth when we have the Bible to govern it; how much harder human organizations founded and perpetuated in the uncertain wisdom of sinful man! So read this tract and see if Christians have a scriptural right to form such a dangerous organization.

D. AUSTEN SOMMER.

904 Udell Street, Indianapolis, Indiana.

McQUIDDY'S FIRST ARTICLE

TEACHING THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS

The Bible should be taught in the home, in the church, and in the school. I may say that I do not know any place where I should not be anxious and ready to teach the Bible. I would teach it in a saloon, if granted the privilege. I have known for some time that Roman Catholics had practically shut the Bible out of our public schools, but it is something new to me that even Christian people would drive it from schools taught by Christians. I have never had anything to do with deeding any kind of schools to churches and do not know of any school that is owned by churches. I am firm in the conviction that Christians are bound by Jehovah to teach, the word of God on all occasions, and to teach it anywhere and everywhere opportunity presents itself.

Concerning teaching the commands of God it was said to the Jews: "And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down; and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them, upon the doorposts of thy house, and upon thy gates." By good authority we are told that "to live in a community where there was no Bible school was forbidden to the godly Jews." A Talmudic authority said: "A village without a school for children ought to be destroyed." And it was even said after the destruction of Jerusalem that the disaster came because the schools there which were said to be something near five hundred) were neglected.

The evidence is so overwhelming that the Jews had Bible schools that it is wholly unnecessary to multiply authorities. Obviously it is in the light of well-known Jewish customs that we are to interpret the terms "teach" and "teaching" in the narrative of our Savior's life work. It is in the same light, also, that we must read the great commission as it stands on this one undisputed, authentic form in Matt. 28:19, 20: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy

Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." It should be noted that the Savior does not specify any method of going; neither does he prescribe any method of teaching. He does, however, limit them in what they are to teach. He authorizes them to teach what he has commanded them. In making disciples, no evangelist has the right to alter or change the conditions given by Christ. As no manner of going is mentioned and as no method of teaching is named, of necessity the eleven disciples or apostles were left to exercise their own judgment as to the best manner of going and as to the best or most efficient method of teaching. However, when God leaves it to the common sense of man as to method, he demands that the man shall use that method that is the most efficient and which will best serve the purposes of Jehovah. As the apostles were Jews and were trained in the synagogue schools, it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ in the commission gave them authority to organize Bible schools everywhere as the very basis or foundation of the church. Whatever else is added, the feature of teaching the word of God to children and the childlike in classes under skilled teachers must not be lacking.

Frequently, however, people who are not accustomed to reasoning imagine that there is no authority for teaching the word of God in classes in a Bible school unless the Savior had specifically said "teach in classes." But, if such people would only reflect a little, they would see at once that, if Christ had said this, no man would be allowed to teach the word of God except in classes. This would reduce such a position to an absurdity. When the Savior commands us to teach and leaves the method of teaching open to our judgment, he leaves us free to use any method that does not contravene his law. This commission is certainly authority for teaching the Bible in classes, in schools, or anywhere else. But while it gives this authority, it does not tie the man to any specific method of teaching to the exclusion of other methods. This of itself should show the critics of teaching the Bible in school and in classes that they have no right to bind Christians where God has not bound them. This is to be condemned just the same as it adding to or taking from the word of God. As an individual Christian, I reserve the right to teach the Bible on all occasions and in the most efficient way, and shall vigorously protest against any man binding my conscience where the Holy Spirit has not spoken.

[The article above was not published in the Apostolic Review but was commented on in the Review as follows]:

SOMMER'S FIRST ARTICLE**THE PRINCIPLES AND SPIRIT OF THE "NEW DIGRESSIVES"**

Several weeks ago J. C. McQuiddy, one of the managing editors of the Gospel Advocate, made a trip to Denver, Colo., and made a report of it in the Advocate. He had much to say in his article against those at Denver who opposed "Bible colleges," and gave arguments for such institutions. His remarks have been reprinted in the Christian Leader by its publisher, thus showing that that journal endorses the "Bible colleges"—human organizations established to do work of the Church. The chief argument which Bro. McQuiddy offers in favor of the schools is that the Jews at the time of Christ had schools and that these schools probably passed on from the Jews to the Christians. He says,

"As the apostles were Jews and were trained in the synagogue schools, it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ in the commission gave them authority to organize Bible schools everywhere as the very basis or foundation of the Church . . . When the Savior commands us to teach, and leaves the method of teaching open to our judgment, he leaves us free to use any method that does not contravene his law."

Let us see how this reasoning applies to some things which Bro. McQuiddy condemns. Infant church membership was more prevalent among the Jews than were their schools, and it was ordained of God. "As the apostles were Jews and were trained to infant church membership, it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ in the commission gave them authority to have infant church membership as the very basis or foundation of the Church." (Infant Sprinkler: "Shake hands, Bro. McQuiddy, we are in the same boat, we are one!")

They had instrumental music among the Jews: therefore with Bro. McQuiddy we can say: "As the apostles were Jews and were trained to instrumental music in their worship, it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ and the apostles, having worshiped where it was used, thus gave authority to use it." This was one of the strongest arguments used by J. B. Briney in the Louisville debate. (Briney and other digressives: "Shake hands, Bro. McQuiddy, we stand together in our reasoning, we are one!")

But, when our brother applies to the college question his statement above that we are free to use any method that does not contravene God's law, he takes for granted the very thing in dispute—that "Bible colleges" do not contravene God's law. In almost every issue of the Advocate some writer condemns the missionary societies, saying the Church is the only divine organization through which to do God's work. As a sample here is a sentence from the pen of C. M. Stubblefield in a recent number of that journal, "The church of Jesus Christ

is all sufficient, as an organization, for the carrying forward of the Lord's work, and, therefore, human organizations are, to say the least, superfluous." Most of the writers use stronger language even than this. Now these things are true: 1. The "Bible" colleges" are organizations. 2. They are teaching the Bible. (Bro. Elam acknowledged that, when we discussed the matter several years ago. The teacher of the Bible is appointed and supported by the organization, the individual is lost in the organisation, and it is the organisation that is doing the teaching.) 3. Teaching the Bible is "the Lord's work." 4. Therefore, the human organization of the "Bible college" to do "the Lord's work" is "to say the least superfluous;" and inasmuch as it is a tradition of man, we may add in the words of Christ, "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

The "Bible. college" is a human organization established to do "work of tie Church." But Paul says, "Unto him [God] be glory in the Church," Therefore when we do this in our own human organization, we are disobeying the inspired Paul. How can Bro. McQuiddy and the Gospel Advocate and Firm Foundation and Christian Leader, and all the other college journals, extricate themselves from these inconsistencies!

But another word or two about their college. Worldliness is rapidly being introduced among the college people through these institutions. They now have their base-ball teams, etc., carried on under the name "Christian." Recently when Geo. Klingman, one of the chief men in Abilene Christian College in Texas, was chided for having their base-ball teams, etc., he wrote:

In saying; that "it is perfectly proper and right for young men to play baseball and to have what are called baseball teams, I had reference only to the playing of that game as Christian young men play. No sensible man will deny young men the right to participate in innocent games for the sake of recreation and innocent amusement. Last year the boys who played baseball in Abilene Christian College were all Christians; the fine young men who are lining up for athletics this year are being coached by two men who are loyal gospel preachers and their influence for good is felt throughout the student body. Personal purity and freedom from vicious habits are made requisites for membership on any of the teams.

If young men on their own hook wish to engage in innocent exercises for their own recreation, I have nothing to say; but when men use the sacred name "Christian" to beg money from the disciples everywhere to carry on athletics such as base-ball with preachers as coaches, etc., they may give a moral tone to athletics but they give a poor grade of Christianity to the world. They mix the Church and the world. That is really what the Christian and "Bible colleges" are—half-way houses between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of Satan.

A few years ago a quartette from the Nashville Bible School went among the Churches singing and reciting sacred and ridiculous songs and pieces, and taking collections at the close of the entertainment—and this in the meeting-houses built for the worship of God!

All of these colleges have their class plays which are nothing less than theatricals carried on by so-called "Christian," and "Bible" people!! Thus they prepare their students for the theatre.

They have orphan homes, old people's homes, etc., which are as much human organizations as the ladies' aid society which the college people oppose, and are as unscriptural! Many of the leaders connected with the Gospel Advocate, Firm Foundation and Christian Leader try to make their readers and "hearers think that the Review is waging simply & paper fight against them; but when the people see and know that we are fighting their "Bible colleges" because they are human organizations established to do work which Paul commands to be done through the Church, because they have theatricals connected with them, because they have Christians and even preachers playing and coaching base-ball games under the name of Christ, because they endorse voting on religious matters, and because these college advocates endorse old bachelors for bishops—when the people see that these are some of the things wo are fighting, they can see that we are fighting. A New Digressionism, and that personally we are fighting the New Digressives.

[This article was not published in the Gospel Advocate but was commented on in that journal as follows:]

McQUIDDY'S SECOND ARTICLE

SHOULD HAVE PUBLISHED THE ARTICLE

Below I give a garbled extract from an article of mine which appeared in this journal on November 20, 1919. Out of an article of about two columns and a half, D. Austen Sommer clips the following and publishes it in the Review: "As the apostles were Jews and were trained in the synagogue schools, it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ in the commission gave them authority to organize Bible schools everywhere as the very basis or foundation of the church When the Savior commands us to teach, and leaves the method of teaching open to our judgment, he leaves us free to use any method that does not contravene his. law. Had he published all that article, I would have been satisfied to leave it with his readers without another word. His sense of justice and fairness is dead, if he thought when he published what he did that he was fairly" representing the position of the article. Omitting all the reasoning that led to the conclusion and leaving out a part of the conclusion, he skips almost to the middle of the next paragraph, clips a sen-

tence and ties it on as though it were the conclusion of the preceding paragraph. I quote where he began the part he left out, and close with the sentence he did:

As the apostles were Jews and were trained in the synagogue schools, it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ in the commission gave them authority to organize Bible schools everywhere as the very basis or foundation of the church. Whatever else is added, the feature of teaching the word of God to children and the child-like in classes under skilled teachers must not be lacking.

"Frequently, however, people who are not accustomed to reasoning imagine that there is no authority for teaching the word of God in classes in a Bible school unless the Savior had specifically said 'teach in classes.' But, if such people would only reflect a little, they would see at once that, if Christ had said this, no man would be allowed to teach the word of God except in classes. This would reduce such a position to an absurdity. When the Savior commands us to teach, and leaves the method of teaching open to our judgment, he leaves us free to use any method that does not contravene his law."

I congratulate myself that he cannot answer the reasoning therein presented, so he elects to answer a perversion as follows:

"Let us see how this reasoning applies to some things which Bro. McQuiddy condemns. Infant church membership was more prevalent among the Jews than were their schools, and it was ordained of God. 'As the apostles were Jews and were trained to infant church membership, it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ in the commission gave them authority to have infant church membership as the very basis or foundation of the church.' (Infant Sprinkler: 'Shake hands, Bro. McQuiddy; we are in the same boat, we are one!')

"They had instrumental music among the Jews; therefore with Bro. McQuiddy we can say: 'As the apostles were Jews and were trained to instrumental music in their worship, it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ and the apostles, having worshiped where it was used, thus gave authority to use it.' This was one of the strongest argument used by J. B. Briney. in the Louisville debate. (Briney and the other digressives: 'Shake hands, Brother McQuiddy; we stand together in our reasoning, we are one!')

Infant church membership is not ordained of Christ; and as there was no church in the days of the Jews before Pentecost, but only the commonwealth of Israel, so there was no church membership until after Pentecost, and then no infant membership. I am surprised that Bro. Sommer did not know this. The commission forbids infant membership in the church of Christ, Christ commanded the apostles: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28:19, 20.) They were to teach the disciples, or taught, to observe all things commanded by him.

Under Christ, teaching is ordained, but not "infant church membership." Teaching is in both Jewish and Christian dispensations. It is strange that a fair-minded Christian gentle-

man would select two things as a parallel when he knows that neither is in the Christian dispensation. Before making such an attempt at reasoning, he should give us chapter and verse showing where Christ ordained infant membership or instrumental music in his worship.

We may apply the same reasoning to instrumental music that I have applied to the manner of teaching. As they had instruments of music in the old dispensation, they naturally enough would have brought them into the new dispensation had they been told to play as well as to sing. So, as the Jews had Bible schools, had taught in classes in the synagogue, when the Savior commanded them to teach, they naturally understood him to command them to organize Bible schools everywhere as the very basis, the initial form, of the Christian church. Grouping scholars—the child and the childlike—in classes, under skilled teachers, for the study of the word of God by means of an interlocutory cowork between teachers and scholars—that is the starting point of Christ's church as he founded it. In commanding them to teach, and binding on them no exclusive method of teaching, he gave them the power, "derived from opinion, respect, or esteem," to organize Bible schools—that is, congregations in which the Bible is taught in classes. Having esteem and respect for the methods of their fathers and of their childhood, they would naturally cling to them unless Christ forbade them to do so. Schaff sums up the whole case at this point when he says concisely: "As the Christian church rests historically on the Jewish church, so Christian worship and the congregational organization rest on that of the synagogue; and cannot be well understood without it." Fisher also says with explicitness: "The synagogue served as a model in the organization of churches." It would be remarkably strange if the Christian church, while retaining the other main features of the synagogue, had ignored its very chiefest feature, the Bible-school service, especially as the great commission laid pre-eminent stress on the work therein included. It is evident that this feature was not neglected, as is seen from Acts of Apostles and the epistles. From these we see that teaching after the pattern of the synagogue Bible schools was a recognized agency for the extension of the church of Christ. Just here I quote from Trumbull an appropriate extract:

"It is said of 'Peter and the apostles' in Jerusalem, that, every day, in the temple and at home, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ. These apostles were Jews before they were Christians, and it was as Jews that they had learned how to teach. That they realized the distinction between 'teaching' and 'preaching' is evidenced in their frequent antithetical use of the one term over against the other. Paul and Barnabas, again 'tarried in Antioch, teaching and preaching the word of the Lord, with many others also.' The truth taught by these Christian teachers was

very different from that which had been there taught as truth before, but the method of the teaching was in all probability the same. A careful reading of the Epistles will reveal the same truth."

Matt. 29:19, 20 is authority for teaching the word of God in any place and everywhere. In that it does not specify a method of teaching to the exclusion of others, it gives one the right to teach in classes or in any efficient way that does not contravene God's law. This commission was given to the apostles before the church was established. They taught before the church was founded, and then they went into new fields and taught and founded congregations in which the word of God was taught in classes by means of questions and answers. Does my critic deny the scriptural authority to teach the Bible in a school, in a saloon, in a Bible school, in classes, or anywhere else? If so, he should cite the scripture that denies the right. When God has not bound a method on individual Christians, he should bind none. He should furnish the proof or cease to bind Christians where the Holy Spirit has not bound them.

SOMMER'S SECOND ARTICLE

McQUIDDY'S DUST AND ARGUMENT

From the heading of Bro. McQuiddy's article, it seems that he thinks that we did him a great injustice in not printing his whole article, and yet he criticizes my article and prints no more of it in proportion than I did of his! He should have set us a beautiful example of how one critic should publish the article of another critic, but alas! we are disappointed. I have an old book here which says something about a man pulling the beam out of his own eye before he tries to pull a mote from his brother's eye.

He says, "Had he published all that article, I would have been satisfied to leave it with his readers without another word," and, "He elects to answer a perversion" of his article. Bro. McQuiddy talks also about how we "garbled" his writings, and heads his criticism, "Should Have Published the Article." From these remarks, one would suppose that he considered that we put a wrong construction altogether on his words, and would think he would have spent his time in showing how we had garbled his language and perverted his words; but, behold, he spends nearly all his time in answering my arguments!! It seems, thus, that all his talk about "garbled" extract, "perversion," etc., is merely dust thrown into the air to prejudice his readers against my fairness.

The word "garble" means "to pick out such parts of as may serve a (usually unfair) purpose; mutilate misleadingly; pervert." Now I deny that any such meaning can be applied to my use of Bro. McQuiddy's words. Let the reader peruse

closely what I copied from his article and the language which he tried to show "I perverted" and "garbled," and see if we have done injustice to his language. We gave in one concise statement of his article his whole argument. This is often done. The Literary Digest every week gives the opinions of different papers on current political news in a few sentences, or one sentence, and often in merely a few words of a sentence, and I have never heard any criticism of that practice. Bro. McQuiddy's whole argument in favor of the "Bible colleges," which we gave in the article we criticised, is contained in his statement which we quoted, "As the apostles were Jews and were trained in the synagogues, it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ in the commission gave them authority to organize Bible schools everywhere as the very basis or foundation of the church." This is not a garbling nor perversion of his language, but a digest of it in his own words."

Bro. McQuiddy says, "I am surprised that Bro. Sommer did not know"—that "infant church membership is not ordained of Christ." If Bro. McQuiddy will rub his glasses and read my words again, he will find that I did not say that infant church membership was "ordained of Christ." I said that "it was ordained of God" "among the Jews", the connection showing that I was talking of the Jews with their schools, etc. Thus he spends two paragraphs trying to disprove something I never said! Stephen speaks of the "church in the wilderness" (Acts 7:38), and this church was composed of Jews, therefore it was the Jewish church in the wilderness, the word "church" being used in the sense of "congregation." In Bro. McQuiddy's reference above from Schaff, that historian speaks of "the Jewish Church," and it is in that sense that I used it. If Bro. McQuiddy had used more care and less passion in his criticism, he would not have made this blunder.

But let us notice the argument for the "Bible colleges." McQuiddy said, as I quoted, "As the apostles were Jews and were trained in the synagogue schools, it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ in the commission gave them authority to organise Bible schools everywhere as the very basis or foundation, of the church." My argument was that the same reasoning could be used in favor of infant baptism and instrumental music, practices which our brother opposes. But he thinks it strange that we mention infant church membership and instrumental music as parallels with teaching when teaching has been brought over from the Old Testament. But, reader, if you note closely the argument which I made, I did not compare infant church membership and instrumental music with mere teaching but with teaching in organized "Bible schools." Suppose teaching has been brought over from the Old Testament,—that has nothing to do with the discussion. We are talking about the "schools" connected with the syna-

gogue being authority for colleges, such as the David Lipscomb School, connected with the Church. McQuiddy says, "As the apostles were Jews and were trained in the synagogue schools [not mere teaching] it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ in the commission gave them authority to organize Bible schools [not merely to teach the Bible] everywhere as the very basis or foundation of the church." Bro. McQuiddy must not simply show that teaching has been brought over from the Old Testament, but that teaching in schools—organized "Bible schools"—has been brought over. The only way he does that it by saying, "it would be naturally strange" if they didn't bring it over; the apostles "naturally understood him [Christ] to command them to organize Bible schools;" and, "it is but natural and reasonable to suppose that Christ in the commission gave them authority to organize Bible schools, "—all of which reminds me of Cardinal Gibbons' argument for infant baptism in his book, "The Faith of our "Fathers, "—"Although it is not expressly stated that there were infants in the household of Lydia, the presumption is strongly in favor of the supposition that there were."!! Although Bro. McQuiddy calls to his aid Trumbull, Schaff and Fisher, relying on them more than on the word of God, the strongest point which he can make in favor of his human organization of a "Bible college" to do work of the Church, is that of a supposition that Christ endorsed such schools. [Cardinal Gibbons: "I give you the right hand of fellowship, Bro. McQuiddy, for we are both standing on traditions, presumptions and suppositions!!"]

So I believe that my argument has held the test, that if we can have organized "Bible schools" under the New Covenant for the reason that they had such schools connected with the Jewish synagogue, "we can also have infant church membership and instrumental music in worship under the New Covenant for the reason that they had such under the Old Law. It is just as "natural and reasonable to suppose" that God permits one to be brought over as the other. The remark of our brother, that "the commission forbids infant membership in the church of Christ," is nullified by the command of Paul to glorify God "in the church" (Eph. 3:21), which forbids our doing it in organized "Bible schools" or any other human organizations. But of this we shall speak fully in the next paragraph.

Our erroneous brother says finally, "Does my critic deny the scriptural authority to teach the Bible in a school, in a "saloon, in a Bible school, in classes, or anywhere else! If so, he should cite the scripture that denies the right." I now accept our brother's challenge and proceed to give the scripture. The inspired Paul says, "by the church" the manifold wisdom of God is to be made known, and that we should give glory unto God "in the Church" (Eph. 3:10, 21.) Now what is the

Church? Let the New Testament decide. It consists of the local congregation, working as a congregation, and the individual Christian working as a mere Christian. It includes also the Christian family, for a man and his wife are said to be "one, "—they have a common treasury, and what one gives out of the common treasury for the Lord the other gives, when they do this by common consent. The individual Christian, the Christian family, and the local church can do aid work, missionary work, etc., and it is the church that is doing it. Paul commanded the brethren to give glory to God "in the Church," and they did it in this way; and we have no evidence they did it in any other way. Any human organization with its president, secretary, treasurer, laws, established by Christians to teach the Bible, help the poor or sick or do any other work of the Church, is unscriptural, unnecessary and dangerous! The David Lipscomb School and the other "Bible" and "Christian" colleges are human organizations, established to do work of the Church for which Christ died, and thus they are unscriptural!

The fallacy in the reasoning of the "Bible college" advocates lies in the statement that it is scriptural "to teach the Bible in a school, in a saloon, in a Bible school, in classes, or anywhere else." When a man teaches in a saloon, etc., it is he alone that is doing the teaching, if indeed he is working merely as a Christian; but when he teaches in the David Lipscomb School, or any other of these "Bible schools," he does so as a part of a human organization. When a man works for a railroad company he loses his identity so far as work is concerned and becomes part of the organization. If he runs his train over a man, the friends sue not the man but the company. When soldiers under the jurisdiction of the government commit depredations, the government, not the soldier, pays for it, though the government will probably punish the soldier. An ambassador to a foreign country signs his name to papers, but it is not his name simply, but the name of the nation back of him. And when a man is chosen to teach the Bible in a "Bible college," is paid for it out of the funds of the college, and the study of it is made part of the curriculum, and the institution is called a "Bible" College or "Christian" college because it teaches the Bible, it is evident that it is not the individual Christian as an individual that is teaching the Bible, but the college that is teaching the Bible. All those brethren who talk about it speak of the teaching of the Bible done by the college. Even Bro. Elam does that, the fellow-editor of Bro. McQuiddy on the Advocate. So when you are thus teaching the Bible, you are not doing it "in the Church" as Paul commands, but in the human organization of a "Bible college."

But enough. Bro. McQuiddy asked me to cite the scripture which denies him the right to teach the Bible "in a Bible

school," and I have given it; now will he give it to his readers!

McQUIDDY'S THIRD ARTICLE

THE BIBLE SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN SCHOOLS

On page 374 is an article from Bro. Sommer, entitled "Bro. McQuiddy's Dust and Argument," for which I request a thoughtful reading. Teaching the word of God is of such momentous importance that Christians should not sit idly by while the Roman Catholics, assisted by Bro. Sommer, drive it from our public and private schools. Christ did not regard teaching the truth lightly; for when all authority had been given him in heaven and in earth, he said to the eleven disciples: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into, the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28:19, 20.) This is good authority to every one who accepts the divinity of Christ for teaching the word of God to all nations, in a school, in a Bible school, in a saloon, in a church, in a family—in fact, everywhere.

My critic says: "Bro. McQuiddy must not simply show that teaching has been brought over from the Old Testament, but that teaching in schools—organized 'Bible schools'—has been brought over." He assumes that it has not, while all the facts that bear upon the subject are against him. Christ, in bringing over "teaching" without prescribing any special method of teaching, left the disciples free to use the same method of instruction which they had used as Jews. As they were Jews before Christians and as Jews they had learned how to teach, they understood Jesus, in the absence of limitations of the how, to authorise them to teach in schools—organised "Bible schools"—which my critic admits they had done as Jews. Obviously it is in the light of well-known Jewish customs, rather than only in the light of classic Greek or of modern English, that we are to interpret the terms "teach" and "teaching" in the narrative of Christ's life work. In the same way must we interpret "teaching" in Matt. 28:19, 20. As teaching comes over without limitation, it brings over with it "teaching in schools—organized 'Bible schools'"—unless teaching the Bible in schools contravenes the law of Christ. That to teach the Bible in schools is warranted by Scripture is evident from the following: From the days of Abraham systematic instruction had its place among the people of God. From the days of Moses the Jewish commonwealth had a measure of responsibility for the training of the young. From the days of Ezra the Bible school was a recognized agency, among the Jewish people, for the study and teaching of the word of God! In the days

of Christ there was a system of Bible schools corresponding quite closely in their general features with what is now generally termed the "Sunday school." The elementary or primary schools in this system emphasized the study of the Bible text. The advanced or senior schools in this system were a department of the synagogue and studied commentaries in addition to the Bible text. The elementary schools were for children only. The senior schools had a place for children as well as for adults. In all the schools the arrangement was that of scholars grouped under a special teacher; the method of teaching was by form of question and answers. The Bible school was the starting point of the Christian church, and it was by means of Bible-school methods that the Christian church was first extended and developed. At Ephesus, Paul spoke, reasoned, and persuaded the Jews in the synagogue school for a space of three months. He then departed from them, taking with him the Christian scholars; and he gathered the nucleus of a Christian Bible school in connection with a daily exercise "in the school of Tyrannus, which continued for the space of two years." (Acts 19:1-10.) As Paul taught the word of God "in the school of Tyrannus," so it is the duty of every Christian to teach the Bible in school and anywhere else he can. Again, for two whole years Paul was similarly engaged in his own hired dwelling in Rome, "preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things [the "all things" commanded by Christ] concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness, none forbidding him." (Acts 28:30, 31.) For lack of space, I refrain from quoting other passages of the same import, in which the New Testament abounds. It is worthy of consideration that within a century after the apostolic age Celsus, an able opponent, of Christianity, charged Christians with extending their numbers and propagating their views by getting hold of children privately in homes and schools and influencing them by conversation with them without the knowledge of their parents or teachers, and thus leading them away from the religion of their parents. Origen, in replying to this, did not deny the main facts as charged; but he contended and insisted that the children thus reached by Christians were benefited by the lesson imparted to them, and that if their parents were well disposed they would recognize this as the truth. With the authority of Jesus back of the word "teaching," it is easily brought over from the Old Testament into the New Testament schools in which the word of God is taught. This same Jesus could have spoken the word that would have brought over "instrumental music" and "infant-church membership" into the New Testament church; but, unfortunately for the fallacious reasoning of our brother, Christ did not speak the word, Christ authorised in the case of teaching, and it was done; in the case of "instrumental music." and "infant church member-

ship" he did not authorize, and it was not done.

My language was garbled, the meaning was garbled, because while I was writing of "Bible schools" in the churches, which are commonly called "Sunday schools," it was applied to colleges. I did not misinterpret the position of our brother, so published only the part to which I replied. I did not attempt a "digest" of his meaning. One should not give a "digest" of the meaning of an opponent, but should concede to him the right to do that for himself. If he considers such treatment fair, then we differ. I prefer to define my own position on colleges and schools where the Bible is taught, I teach that Christians have a right under God to associate themselves together, to organize a bank, a grocery store, a printing business, or a school in which the Bible is taught. They are obligated to teach the Bible as Christians in every way they can while working in such organizations. They should not teach in a school, work in a bank, a store, or any business where they are not permitted to teach the Bible.

I deny that when a brother works for a railroad company he loses his identity or becomes a part of the organisation. Is the negro cook who cooks for a family a part of the family, and does she lose her identity as a cook? Nay, verily. If the railroad employee is a part of the organization, when he strikes, he strikes against himself. If Bro. Sommer be correct, the conflict between capital and labor is a myth, for the laborer is a part of the capitalistic organization. If our brother had not been blinded by his theory, he would not have said: "All these brethren who talk about it speak of the teaching of the Bible done by the college." When he made that statement, he could not know what all the brethren had said. If, as he says, the college does the teaching, then why employ teachers? Such a statement refutes itself. If a man loses his identity because associated with others, then the "black sheep" of a family, the hypocrite in a church, the defaulter in a bank or in a railroad company, can never be identified. Such characters never lose their identity with the Lord, for they shall be rewarded according to their works. A man by no means loses his identity because he is a member of the church and associates himself with Christian people.

When, in response to my challenge for scripture which denies me the right to teach the Bible in schools and colleges or anywhere else, he cites the passages which say that "through the church the manifold wisdom of God" is to "be made known" and that Christians are to glorify God "in the church" (Eph. 3:10, 21), our brother completely misses the point at issue. I believe both of these things as strongly as I can believe anything, but I distinctly deny that either of them is necessarily violated by a mere method of teaching the Bible. The command to God's children to "teach" is a general command

without a solitary hint as to the specific method by which it shall be obeyed. Jesus himself is the primary author of this command to the apostles, and it was afterwards issued by Paul to others in these words: "And the things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2:2.) Here again there is the general admonition to "teach," but not even a hint as to any specific method of teaching. Hence, Bro. Sommer and I have the right to form a business association or organization of persons called a "publishing company" and "teach the Bible through the Apostolic

Review and the Gospel Advocate, or to form another association of persons called a "school" or a "college" and to teach it in classes through oral and blackboard instruction, and still further to form such temporary associations or organizations of persons as a protracted meeting or a Bible reading for the same purpose; and in precisely the same way we have the right to establish any other conceivable method of teaching God's word which does not anywhere contravene a command of God. All these are organizations of individual Christians for doing effective work in teaching the Bible—the thing which God in general commands us to do—and it would be wide of the mark for some critic to tell Bro. Sommer that he should abandon teaching the Bible through a publishing company or through any other of these methods because the Bible says it must be done "through" or "in the church." Bro. Sommer seems to think a human organization is necessarily sinful in itself. In this, he is much mistaken. Neither the missionary society nor any other association of Christians is wrong because it is a human organization. Whether a human organization is right or wrong depends altogether upon what it does. If nothing were done by individual Christians through a missionary society but preach or teach the gospel, neither Bro. Sommer nor anybody else could show that it is wrong. But the missionary society is more than a method of teaching and preaching. It usurps and takes upon itself the authority and control over the churches which God has specifically placed elsewhere; and if a publishing company or a school should undertake thus to contravene a specific order of God, it would be wrong for the same reason.

Hence, I now renew my challenge to Bro. Sommer and ask him to name the passage in the word of God that gives some specific method of teaching the Bible, thus telling us how it shall be done. Let there be no evasion. Never mind about passages that say it must be done "through the church." The methods which I have named and which I am defending do it through the church. Please name the passage which gives a specific method of doing it "through" or "in the church." This is the issue, and to this issue we must hold.

SOMMER'S THIRD ARTICLE**BRO. McQUIDDY'S REPLY ON THE COLLEGE QUESTION**

Above will be seen an article from Bro. J. C. McQuiddy, managing editor of the Gospel Advocate, in which he reviews my article of several weeks ago on "McQuiddy's Dust and Argument," published in the Review. I am glad that Bro. McQuiddy is disposed to reason concerning the college question before his readers.

Bro. McQuiddy's chief argument for "Bible schools" is that they had such schools among the Jews throughout their history before Christ came, and that they had such at His advent, and that, therefore "it is but natural and reasonable to suppose" that they were introduced into the affairs of Christians. Our brother makes what seems to be a long quotation from some man to show that "Bible schools" had been brought over from the Jewish to the Christian dispensation, but seems ashamed of quoting men so much instead of God, as he did in his other article, to substantiate his reasoning, and so he leaves out the name of his author, quotation marks, etc. Either Bro. McQuiddy or his authority says this: "At Ephesus, Paul spoke, reasoned, and persuaded the Jews in the synagogue school for the space of three months. He then departed from them, taking with him the Christian scholars; and he gathered the nucleus of a Christian Bible school in connection with a daily exercise in the school of Tyrannus, which continued for the space of two years. " Now where does it say, Bro. McQuiddy, that Paul spoke, reasoned and persuaded "in synagogue school?" The inspired text says, "And he entered into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, reasoning and persuading as to the things concerning the kingdom of God." (Acts 19:8.) Bro. McQuiddy, in his own words or endorsement, has added the word "school" to the text in order to carry his point on the school question. John says concerning his words (and the same applies to all the rest of God's word), "If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book." Our brother would better be careful!

It is up to Bro. McQuiddy to try again to show that organizations of schools for teaching. God's word have been brought over from the Jewish to the Christian system. His connecting link is a "supposition," as he himself expressed it. His reasoning runs thus: They had teaching back in the. Old Testament, and Christ commands teaching in the New Testament; therefore "it is but natural and reasonable to suppose" that as they taught in schools in Old Testament times, "Christ gave them [his apostles] authority to organise Bible schools." This reasoning is much like the evolution theory of the origin of man: Monkey has eyes, man has eyes; monkey has ears, man has ears; monkey has head shaped like some men, and some

men have heads shaped like monkeys; monkey can act like some men, and some men can act like monkeys; monkey has a tail, and man has an appendix—therefore, "it is but natural and reasonable to suppose" that man and monkey are kin!? But there is a link out of the reasoning. [Darwin: "Shake hands, Bro. McQuiddy, we both are sitting in the 'missing link' row!"]

Now who was this Tyrannus who had this "school?" Echo answer: Who? Men had schools of rhetoric and philosophy in those days, and this might have been one of them. There is not the slightest evidence that it was established by Christians to teach the Bible, and I know of no "Bible college" advocate who affirms it; yet such should be the case to give authority to the example. This man seemed to take a liking to Paul or his teaching and permitted him to reason with his scholars concerning God's word. There is no evidence that Tyrannus hired Paul to teach, and made the Bible a study in the curriculum, and thus had it as a part of the organisation, as is the case in these "Bible colleges" under discussion. It seems that there was a continuous reasoning—investigation, debate—going on, Paul was doing this simply as an individual Christian, while the teacher of the Bible in these "Bible schools" and colleges today is hired by the organisation of the college, and his identity "so far as work is concerned" is lost—it is the school which does the teaching, not the individual as the individual.

Our brother challenges me again to show that God commands us "how" to teach, but warns me not to refer again to the command to glorify God "in the Church," for he says that the college people glorify God "in the Church" when they teach the Bible in their schools. Now we have come to the real point at issue. I deny that these college brethren are teaching the Bible "in the church" when they are doing it in their "Bible schools" and colleges as they are now doing. The Church in which Paul tells us to glorify God is an organization, as can be seen from the following definition of the word "organization" as found in the Standard dictionary: "A systematic union of individuals in a body where officers, agents and members work together for a common end." Christ is the head of this organization, the apostles are subordinate leaders, bishops of the flocks are heads of the local churches, deacons are specially appointed servants of the local churches, and as local churches, as Christian families, and as individual Christians the followers of Jesus worked in the Apostolic period in helping the poor and sick, teaching God's word, etc. The Church as found in the New Testament is God's definition of what He means by the word "church;" the way they worked in New Testament times is God's definition of what is meant by the expression "in the Church."

But there are other organisations; one is a "Bible college." It has a "union of individuals in a body," has "system" in such, has officers called president, secretary, treasurer, faculty, trustees, etc., and has agents to go out and drum up scholars; has pupils; and these all "work together for a common end"—the glorifying of God. The officers, laws, treasury, etc., of the Church are different from the officers, laws, treasury, etc., of the college. They are different organisations, and the college-crazed brethren give glory to God in the college while Paul commands us to glorify Him "in the Church." Don't say that those who teach the Bible in the colleges are Christians, for that has nothing to do with the subject. Men belong to both lodges of Odd Fellows and Masons, but what they do as members of Odd Fellows glorifies the Odd Fellows lodge, and what they do as Masons glorifies the Masonic lodge. So what you do "in the Church" merely as Christians, as Christian families or local churches, glorifies God "in the Church;" but what you do in a "Bible college" glorifies God in the "Bible college." But Paul says to glorify Him "in the Church." Bro. McQuiddy does not believe my statement that "when a man works for a railroad company, he loses his identity so far as work is concerned and becomes part of the organisation." He brings up several illustrations to show that people doing a work do not "lose their identity." But I did not say merely "loses his identity," but I said, "loses his identity so far as work is concerned." Thus, much that he says on this point is wasted. But I notice his illustration nevertheless.

Here is one of his examples to show that a worker in an organization does not "lose his identity so far as work is concerned;" "Is the negro cook who works for a family a part of the family, and does she lose her identity as a cook? Nay, verily." It is evident from Bro. McQuiddy's "Nay, verily" that he does not propose to have a negro cook as part of his family; but, say what he pleases, the negro cook is part of his household, if he has such a cook; and though the woman has not lost her identity as a cook she has lost her identity as an individual cook, which is the point at issue. Her cooking is no longer her own as such, but is McQuiddy's. She uses McQuiddy's flour-barrel, not her own. And when our brother's friends leave, after having enjoyed a good meal, they may say to him or his wife, "I have enjoyed your dinner so much," though perhaps neither he nor his wife did anything actually to prepare it. It was McQuiddy's dinner regardless of the fact that the "negro cook" prepared it. Why? Because the cook became a part of the organization and her work became part of affairs of the McQuiddy household. So the teacher in the "Bible college" "loses his identity so far as work is concerned," and he becomes part of the "Bible college" organization.

"If the railroad employee is a part of the organization, when he strikes, he strikes against himself." Well, I see nothing strange about that. I have seen many people work against themselves. The employee may be a member of another organization—the "union"—and his love for the labor organization may impel him to obey its orders and leave the capitalist organization. This only shows that a man may be a member of two organisations and that one may work against the other, just as a Christian may belong to the Church and the "Bible college," and his work in the "Bible college" may be against the Church. Nothing strange about that, for the college brethren are doing it continuously!

"If Bro. Sommer be correct, the conflict between capital and labor is a myth, for the laborer is part of the capitalistic organization." Where have I said that when a man worked for an organization he lost his entire identity! I said that "he lost his identity so far as work is concerned and becomes part of the organization." While he is working for that organization he is part of it. When a laborer works for an organization, he is part of that organization "so far as work is concerned." Nothing "mythical" about that! And, on the same ground, when a Christian is hired by a "Bible college" to teach the Bible (that study being part of the curriculum), that individual loses his identity "so far as work is concerned" and becomes part of the organization, and is thus giving glory to God through the human organization of a "Bible college" instead of through the divine organization of the Church, as Paul commands.

"If, as he says, the college does the teaching, then why employ teachers? Such a statement refutes itself." On the same principle we might ask why he applies the name "McQuiddy Printing Company" to his business concern when he knows that neither McQuiddy nor his company does the printing, but the presses! Does this title on your stationery "refute itself"! Tut, tut, my brother; no more child's reasoning! The college does the teaching of the Bible by employing Bible teachers, just as the "McQuiddy Printing Company" does the printing by employing printers and presses. The Bible teacher in the human organizations of "Bible colleges" "loses his identity so far as work is concerned and becomes part of the organization," just as the printer in McQuiddy's Printing Company loses his identity so far as work is concerned, thus permitting this printer's work to go out under the name "McQuiddy Printing Company." As the "McQuiddy Printing Company," not the individual printer, gets the glory for the good work which he does for the company, so the "Bible college," not the Church, gets the glory for the good which the Bible teacher does through that organization. But Paul says, "Unto God be glory in the Church."

"If a man loses his identity because associated with others," "a man by no means loses his identity because he * * * associates himself with Christian people." Who said he did? Why does Bro. McQuiddy use the word "associate?" It is "organization" not mere "association" that we are talking about. Nowhere have I said simply, "he loses his identity," referring to personal identity, though our brother takes that idea and intimates that I teach that he will not be judged as an individual in the Last Day. I said in my former article, as mentioned several times, that "when a man works for a railroad company, he loses his identity so far as work is concerned." Much that Bro, McQuiddy has said is irrelevant, for he has misrepresented continuously my statement.

This reasoning applies to all organizations established to do work of the Church, whether they be "Bible colleges," religious journals which are "companies," orphan homes, aid societies, missionary societies, etc. The Christian who does his good works through them, loses his identity, "so far as work is concerned," and is thus giving glory to God through the human organizations instead of "through, the Church," as Paul commands.

Bro. McQuiddy's effort to break down the line between organization and un-organization, by speaking of the "temporary associations or organizations, of persons as a protracted meeting or a Bible reading," shows how a drowning man will grasp at a straw. Such temporary co-operation has no real right to the name "organization;" and, besides, such co-operation is endorsed by Apostolic teaching; but we have no Apostolic teaching for such organisation as we have been condemning. The Church of the New Testament did all kinds of missionary work, aid work, and Bible teaching work, and they had no such human organizations; can't we work the same way, and thus be sure we are right!

Even if these "Bible colleges" are scriptural, they are doing an unscriptural work—they are developing a clergy to take the place of the bishops. In most places where they can support a man, the churches under the influence of these colleges have a preacher to preach practically every Lord's day morning and night. Is he not "the pastor?" Where are the bishops which God ordained should feed and guide the flock of God? At Fort Worth, Tex., in last December, about a hundred preachers, "representative men" from different parts of that State, met (says the Firm Foundation) and formed the colleges and orphan homes into "a corporate body," as they called it, with three men to control it, to raise a million dollars for these human organizations. And this "unification" of these organizations went through this body of "representative men" without dissension. The Christian-Evangelist has been trying to get such a unification of their societies for

twenty years, and only recently overcame the opposition; but here these "representative brethren" put this "corporate body" through, with its triple pope, the first time it is proposed. My brethren of the college craze, are you not going into popery faster than are the old digressives? "Purge out the old leaven" of humanisms that you may be a new lump.

McQUIDDY'S FOURTH ARTICLE

BRO. SOMMER SEEKS TO CHANGE THE ISSUE

On page 538 of this issue the reader will find an article from Bro. Sommer under the caption, "Bro. McQuiddy" Reply to the College Question." There is no new argument in his long-drawn, pointless article.

I have shown in this discussion that the word of God should be taught everywhere. "They therefore that were scattered abroad went about preaching the word." (Acts 8:4.) "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. 28:19, 20.) "And the things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. 2:2.) Thus we see that God makes it our imperative duty to teach the truth in the family, in a Bible school, in the office, in the store, on the farm—in fact, everywhere. Jesus is the author of this command. Bro. Sommer only renders himself ludicrous by dragging in irrelevant matters which did not appear in the article to which he was replying in order to make fun with monkeys and evolution, which is beneath the dignity of a religious discussion. Men who are seeking the truth and to teach it should not condescend to such vulgar methods. He had better watch out, or he will lead our readers to conclude that he has supplied "the missing link."

Instead of meeting the issue that has been presented to him from the very beginning of this discussion, he seeks to make a new issue, and says: "Now we have come to the real point at issue. I deny that these college brethren are teaching the Bible 'in the church' when they are doing it in their Bible schools and collages as they are now doing." This is not the issue. I would not be foolish enough to affirm what the Bible schools are doing, for I don't know; neither would I affirm that all the churches of Christ are teaching the word of God, for I do not know this to be a fact. But he seeks in vain to shift the issue, for I shall hold him to the task which he started out to perform when I challenged him to come the passage which gives the specific method of teaching the truth "through" or

"in the church." Instead of coming up to the issue and making the effort, he simply answers the challenge with a flat denial which is not satisfactory or convincing to any one. His one attempt at argument is to assert that the individual who works in an organisation loses his identity so far as his work is concerned and becomes a part of the organization. Whether an organization is right or wrong depends entirely upon what it does. A missionary society is wrong, not because it is an organization, but because it is more than a method of teaching and preaching and usurps the functions of the church by taking upon itself the control of the churches. Organization appears to disturb his waking thoughts and makes him perform a number of logical somersaults. He is exceedingly mad at Bible schools—so mad that he charges that I added the word "school" to the text in order to carry my point! I added nothing to the text, and was only giving the meaning of the word "synagogue." Thayer defines the Greek word for "synagogue" as follows: "An assembly of Jews formally gathered together to offer prayers and listen to the reading and exposition of the holy scriptures." Thus it is seen the word means a school in the synagogue, or a synagogue school, as I indicated. The charge that I added the word "school" to the Bible text is a vicious statement conceived in ignorance or sin, on which lies the acorn of intelligence and reason and which the righteous soul spews out as a vile conception. I shall now proceed to show by his admission he concedes that Paul taught the word of God in an organized school. He cannot deny that Paul taught in the school of Tyrannus, if he would. But he denies "that Tyrannus hired Paul to teach, and made the Bible a study in the curriculum, and thus had it as part of the organization." Thus, according to his own admission, Paul taught two years in an organized school. It is clear that Paul was not teaching rhetoric or philosophy, for he tells us that "all they who dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks." Also, we learn that while he was teaching the Bible in this organized school the Ephesians heard and believed the word of truth. (Eph. 1:13.) It is clear that Paul at Ephesus, as at Corinth, "knew nothing among" them, "save Jesus, Christ, and him crucified." If Paul could teach the Bible in a humanly organised school while others were teaching rhetoric and philosophy, why cannot individual Christians do the same thing now that Paul did? Paul, who wrote that we should glorify God "in the church," certainly glorified him "in the church" while he was teaching the truth in this organized school. Again, Bro. Sommer, by his admission, though not intending to do so, comes to the support of the truth when he says: "The way they worked in New Testament times is God's definition of what is meant by the expression 'in the church. '" Bro. Sommer's position fails, for

Paul did not become a part of the organization of Tyrannus, neither did he lose his individual identity. No matter whether Paul was in prison, in Caesar's household, or guarded on a ship, he did not lose his identity. It matters not whether Tyrannus put the Bible in or out of the curriculum, for Paul always put it in the curriculum everywhere he went, and because he did, so Bro. Sommer classes him as a "new digressive." He calls me a "new digressive" because I am with Paul. But he tells us Tyrannus did not hire Paul. Whether he did or did not has nothing to do with teaching the word of God in a Bible school. David Lipscomb taught the Bible everywhere the opportunity presented itself, taught it in "the Nashville Bible School," and yet no man ever hired him or paid him for his teaching. Does Bro. Sommer hold that it is right to teach rhetoric and philosophy in an organized school and wrong to teach the Bible in the same school? If it had been wrong to organize a school, Paul certainly would not have taught in that school; neither would he have taught in it if it were wrong for Christians to organize and uphold such schools.

But my critic is in desperate straits, trying to establish that when one works in an organization he loses his identity so far as his work is concerned and becomes a part of the organization. He certainly knows that "household" and "family" are not interchangeable words. One may be in a household and not in the family. "Household" is from "oikos," and family is from "patria." In order to be a member of the family, one must be a lineal descendant. Thus, it is readily seen that no negro cook can become a part of the organization, or, in other words become a part of a white family, where she works. Why did he use "household" and not "family," as I did not mention the word "household!" This of itself shows that because one works in an organization, he does not become a part of that organization. But his reasoning is like that of a sectarian when he is trying to prove the doctrine of justification by faith alone. I have not held that the family loses its identity because it employs a negro cook. The family must furnish the provisions, must furnish the cooking stove and utensils, and must furnish the fuel, before the negro cook can prepare the meal. The cook and the family co-operate together just as the members of the body of Jesus Christ co-operate together in the work of saving souls. Neither the cook nor the family loses identity or becomes a part one of the other.

In his desperation, I did not expect him to make men in an organization no more than machines. He now says the presses do the work! This is so absolutely ridiculous that it is hardly necessary to take space to answer it. The truth is that in the McQuiddy Printing Company it requires the managers, the printers, the pressmen, the bookbinders, the machines, the bookkeepers and stenographers all to do the work on which we

put the label, "McQuiddy Printing Company." All work together in order to make the completed job. The label represents the individual work of each one in the organization. If the presses do the work, the company should turn off the managers, the bookkeepers, and all the help, and thus make a fortune. But any man knows that these all work together and that each part of the organisation is required to do individual work before we can have a completed job. If the individual workman in an organisation loses his identity so far as his work is concerned, then he should not be particular about merit or about doing first-class work. No one will ever know him from the incompetent, according to Bro. Sommer's reasoning. The hypocrite in the church will lose his identity, so far as his work is concerned, if the position I am opposing be correct. But 2 Cor. 6:10 assures us this will not be so: "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

I close this discussion by again calling upon our brother to present the passage of scripture that reveals a specific method of teaching the Bible "in the church." As he has presented no new argument, I see no necessity for continuing this discussion further. He must discuss the issue with me or not at all. We are commanded to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. The disciples, in obedience to this command, "preached the gospel unto every creature under heaven" and "their sound went out into all the earth." Bro. Sommer closes his article by saying, "If these Bible colleges are scriptural, they are doing an unscriptural work," and also refers to some preachers meeting at Ft. Worth, Tex. I know nothing of this, have never taken any part in preachers' meetings, and, therefore, this is entirely irrelevant to our discussion. I may say to him, however, because men wrest the Scriptures unto their own destruction (2 Pet. 3:16) is no reason why we should chain the Bible" as a felon to a post and burn it as a bad book. In the language of another, I would say: "Christianity is a rational religion and grows best in the light of truth. It has always been the friend of education and the mother of schools and colleges, and of science, literature, and art. Christ himself was and is 'the truth' and 'the light of the world.' All things belong to the kingdom of God, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world." (1 Cor. 3:21-23.)"

SOMMER'S FOURTH ARTICLE

MORE ABOUT THE NEGRO COOK, ETC.

Bro. McQuiddy is still determined that a negro cook shall not be considered part of his family. I said she was part of his household, but could have said with more point that she was

part of his "family" in the original meaning of that word He says that "family" comes from "patria," but where does he get that? Family is from the Latin "familia," the meaning of which both Cicero and Caesar give as "the slaves in a household, a household, slaves." So, after all, I think Bro. McQuiddy will have to make his negro cook part of his "familia," according to the first meaning of that word. He would better "brush up" a little on his Latin. Yes, the "individual work" of Bro. McQuiddy's cook becomes the work of the "familia" of which he is the head, and his friends praise the good meals of his organization, just as the "individual work" of the "Bible school" teacher becomes the work of the organization of the "Bible college," and the human organisation receives the praise for the work done, and not the Church.

Did McQuiddy add the word "school" to the Bible! Let us see. His statement is, "The Bible school was the starting point of the Christian Church, and it was by means of the Bible school methods that the Christian Church was first extended and developed. At Ephesus, Paul spoke, reasoned and persuaded the Jews in the synagogue school for the space of three months." The inspired text says, "And he went into the synagogue and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God." (Acts 19:8.) McQuiddy's words are almost identical with those of Luke, with the exception that McQuiddy added the word "school." Our brother was evidently angry when he said, "The charge that I added the word 'school' to the Bible text is a vicious statement conceived in ignorance or sin, on which lies the scorn of intelligence and reason and which the righteous soul spews out as a vile conception."

Bro. McQuiddy started his first article by trying to show that it is proper to teach the Bible in "Bible schools" and everywhere else, and to show that "in school" is the same as "in the church." This I have denied. And now he charges me in the heading of his article with seeking "to change the issue." He says in a former article, "The methods which I have named and am defending [Bible schools and colleges] do it through the church." Here is McQuiddy's reasoning: (1) "The method's which I have named and am defending do it through the church." (2) But the methods I am defending are those of teaching the Bible in "Bible schools" and colleges. (3) Therefore, the method of teaching the Bible in these schools which I have named and defended, "do it through the church."

Now this is the very thing that I am denying, and the thing which he says he is "defending;" and yet when I ask him to "defend" it, he says I seek to change the issue!! He is not quite so willing to "defend" his proposition as he thought he was:

In my argument I have shown that when a man becomes a part of an organization and works for that, he loses his identity so far as work is concerned, and his work is that of the organization. I have shown that thus a Christian who is hired by a school to teach the Bible where the Bible is made a study in the curriculum and money is begged because the school is teaching the Bible, etc.—that such a man is not glorifying God "in the church," as Paul commands, but "in the school." But my opponent still positively affirms that his work in the school is individual, for otherwise he is not responsible to God. Now no one has said that a man and his work in an organization become part of that organization as potatoes become part of the blood and body of the physical man for "Bible colleges" and such institutions are artificial organizations. A teacher of the Bible for the "Bible colleges" is responsible to God for permitting his work to become the work of a human organization so that the name "Bible" or "Christian" college swallows it and gets the glory, when Paul commands us to glorify God in the Church.

But I now show by the process of *reductio ad absurdum* (reducing to an absurdity) that his reasoning is false and that the "individual work" does become the work of the organization. If the teaching of the Bible is entirely an individual work (as he tries to make it appear), then the teaching of Latin is also merely an individual work. And if the teaching of Latin is merely an individual work, so is the teaching of rhetoric, mathematics, and all the other subjects. And if their work is merely individual, then the work of the president, trustees, and all others connected with the institution is entirely individual. And there is no organization at all!! But these schools take out charters as organizations, and the advocates of them frankly admit they are organizations. Therefore, their own words and actions give the lie to their reasoning (when they try to defend them) that the teaching of the Bible in those organizations is merely individual work though the teacher is hired and authorized to teach the Bible by the college, and the study is part of the curriculum.

Bro. McQuiddy tries to confuse the minds of the readers by mixing together what is done as part of an organization and what is done incidentally. He does this by harping on Paul's teaching "in the school" of Tyrannus." Was Paul's teaching part of the work of that organization (if they had an organization), or was it simply incidentally connected with it? Without a doubt it was the latter. During the Great War, camp pastors were permitted to teach religion in the camps among the boys, but these camp pastors were not part of the military organization. Their work was entirely individual so far as the United States Army was concerned. But the teaching that was done by the chaplains was not that of the individuals them-

selves but that of the U. S. Government which chose them, paid them, and regulated them.

Paul was working in the school of Tyrannus much as the camp pastors worked in the camps—Incidentally. The "Bible school" teachers who are appointed, hired, and regulated by the trustees, president, etc., of these "Bible colleges," are like the chaplains who are appointed, hired and regulated by the military authorities—permanently. The work of the camp pastor was not part of the military organization and the work of Paul in the school of Tyrannus was not part of that organization (if there was an organization); the work of the chaplain becomes part of the military organization, and the work of the "Bible school" teacher in Abilene Christian College, and all the others, loses its individual capacity and becomes part of the work of the organization of those colleges. But Paul commands us to glorify God "in the Church." Bro. McQuiddy refuses to see the difference between what is done incidentally and by mere permission of an organization, and what is done permanently and by the authority of an organization. But I believe that many of his readers see.

My opponent tries to stir prejudice against me and my position by saying that I and the Roman Catholics are driving the Bible from the school. I have no objections to a Christian teaching the Bible as a mere Christian, but I have shown that it is unscriptural to give glory in human organizations. If the State permits a teacher to read the Bible to the pupils, as has been done in our public schools, that teacher does that religious work merely as an individual Christian; but when the State appoints, hires and regulates a Bible teacher, and makes that study part of the curriculum, then the teacher is no longer doing it as a mere individual. I am in favor of Christians giving glory to God in the Church, but am much against their forming human organizations in which to do this, and in their begging hundreds of thousands of dollars from the brethren to help their human organization rob the Church of its glory, as these "Bible colleges" are doing.

But our brother has really admitted what I have been showing. When speaking of our illustration of the McQuiddy Printing Company, and how the individual printer's work is lost as such and becomes part of that company, he says "it requires the managers, the printers, the pressmen, the bookbinders, the machines, the bookkeepers and stenographers all to do the work on which we put the label, 'McQuiddy Printing Company' . . . But any man knows that all those work together and that each part of the organization, is required to do individual work before we can have a completed job." Here our brother admits that the "individual work" must be lost in the whole—that the men in his employ must do their "individual work" as "part of the organization" of the McQuiddy Printing Company—in

order to a "completed job." Just so, my brother, just so! And so the "individual work" of the Bible teacher in the "Bible college" must be done as the work of "part of the organization" of the school in order to the "completed job"—the graduate. But Paul commands us to do our work, not as "part of an organization" of man, but as part of the organization of the Church. "Unto him [God] be glory in the Church."

Our brother says, "Neither the missionary society nor any ether association of Christians [why did he not say organization, for that is the point at issue?] is wrong because it is a human organization. Whether a human organisation is right or wrong depends altogether upon what it does." Here is a most significant principle advanced, and one which Bro. Kurfees is now and then giving to the Advocate readers; but it is a principle altogether different from what has been advanced by writers of the Advocate through many years. Its readers know that one of the chief arguments they have offered against the societies has been that they are human organizations. The same is true of the Firm Foundation, Christian Leader, and other "Bible college" journals. But now they say that societies and other organizations are all right, if they do not hinder the "autonomy of the churches," as Bro. Kurfees calls it. Aid societies, endeavor societies, missionary societies, and other such human organizations are all right if they do the "right" kind of work—if they do not "usurp and take upon themselves the authority and control over the churches which God has specifically placed elsewhere." Thus the difference between these "Bible college" journals and the Christian Standard on the society question is not in kind, but in degree, of power which they exercise. These "Bible college" advocates are digressing from principles which they once advanced as well as from the word of God, and they need not wonder if some call them "the New Digressives."

In conclusion I quote passages I have often seen in the Advocate and other "Bible college" journals: "Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

McQUIDDY QUITTS

Our renders remember that we were having a discussion with J. C. McQuiddy on the college question in the columns of the Advocate and Review, and that just when we were fairly launched into the subject, McQuiddy said, "I close this discussion by" etc., though he had no right to close it without publishing my reply for he had the first article and I should have had the last one. But he has refused to publish my last article, though I have been waiting ten weeks to see if he

would do it. When discussing the Denver affair, I gave him the privilege of presenting the last arguments, and yet he has the audacity to come on with another long article on the Denver affair in which he still argues for old bachelors for elders and quotes sectarian authorities to prove it, and for voting for ciders (one of the greatest heresies among religious people), and asks us to publish it! In other words he wishes us to give him two articles in conclusion on the local Denver affair, and yet he will not print my last article on the college question. It seems that the Denver affair is troubling him much. He needs much space to try to straighten himself with his brethren; but I surmise that many of them will not tolerate his heretical doctrines of voting for elders and putting in old bachelors at that. And on the college question he seems to have decided that the best thing to do is to throw that out immediately. He gives page after page to his contributors to fight what they maliciously call "Sommerism," (refusing to permit a correction of their false statements in his columns), but puts the ban on a further discussion of the college question which is at the bottom of the trouble. What he and his contributors call "Sommerism" is simply an effort to keep these Bible collage men from forcing upon us their human organisations of Bible colleges, etc., to rob the Church of glory which Paul says should be given in it. "Unto God be glory in the Church." We do not propose to sit by cowardly and permit the Bible college people to attach their barnacles to the Church of God.

In a private letter to me, Bro. McQuiddy said on the college question, "I am anxious for our readers to see just what you have to say." But just as we get fairly launched into this discussion and he tells us of Tyrannus and his school where Paul taught, etc., he says, "I close this discussion," and refuses to permit his readers to see what I have said in my last article against his arguments, though I, not he, should legitimately close the discussion, as he wrote the first article. (Each of us wrote an article without publishing fully the other's article, which two neutralize each other so far as the summing up it concerned.) It seems that Bro. McQuiddy is not as "anxious for our readers to see just what you have, to say" as he thought he was. Did our arguments have something to do with changing his mind!!

E. C. Fuqua, one of the prominent college preachers in Colorado was like Bro. McQuiddy—anxious and glad at first that this discussion was appearing in the Advocate, and then anxious for it to stop. Here is what he said on page 445 of the Advocate after he had read one reply of Bro. McQuiddy,—

I have just received the Gospel Advocate of April 15 and read your reply to Bro. Sommer; and I cannot resist the impulse to write you a line to say that I believe your reply the best and most thorough refutation of the deflection of anti-Bible-college-ism I have ever seen. It settles the issue as emphat-

ically as it needs settlement * * * I am glad you do this through the Advocate, for the brethren throughout THE WORLD OUGHT TO KNOW that this whole trouble comes of the lust of these men to make laws for and rule over disciples of Christ in the absence of law from their Head. * * * Continue to press Bro. Sommer (1) for the scripture which specifies the method of teaching the Bible and (2) for the right of your articles to appear in the Review. This will settle the matter in the minds of all who love God and the truth.

Bro. Fuqua was very glad that this college question was being discussed in the Advocate and said that "the world ought to know it!!" But how sad to know that just when we came to the point in the whole question, Bro. McQuiddy says, "I close this discussion," and does not give my reply to his readers, though I was entitled to the last article. I suppose Bro. Fuqua was sad when he saw the "I CLOSE" of Bro. McQuiddy because of the good which would not be accomplished!!

Bro. Fuqua also says, "Continue to press Bro. Sommer." No doubt he was made sad again when Bro. McQuiddy who was himself so "anxious", for his readers to see "just what we had to say," changed his mind and would no longer "press Bro. Sommer." Now, Bro. Fuqua, I have been waiting for ten long weeks for Bro. McQuiddy to "press Bro. Sommer," and am so sorry he will not!

Bro. Fuqua was anxious, too, for Bro. McQuiddy to press me "for the right of your [McQuiddy's] articles to appear in the Review." Now, my dear brother, we have published everything he wrote on this subject in the Review, except the first article in full as he did with our first article. Now, Bro. Fuqua, you would better "press Bro." McQuiddy "for the right" of my article "to appear" in the Advocate, for he has shut it out!! You would think that Bro. Fuqua's anxiety that "the brethren throughout the world ought to know", the facts on this discussion, would stir him to write Bro. McQuiddy to "press Bro. Sommer" by printing Sommer's last article; but alas! he wrote the following to him:

"I am specially interested in your 'bout' with Bro. Sommer, but fear that he is not getting the satisfaction that I am. It confirms my long opinion that he and his colleagues have no argument or reason to present, have never had, and never can have, so long as they oppose things they do for the reason they oppose them. However, I think you did wisely in drawing the discussion to a close, seeing there is nothing to discuss. The point at issue they will not discuss; so why prolong the wrangle?"

Well, well, well! This is something strange—that Bro. Fuqua was enjoying so much this discussion on the college question and that it was doing so much good, and yet he thinks McQuiddy did "wisely" in bringing the discussion to a "close!!!" After he had read one of Bro. McQuiddy's articles he said, "Press Bro. Sommer;" but after he read a couple more, he said, "You did wisely in drawing the 'discussion' to a

close." What caused Bro. Fuqua to change his mind? The praise of this discussion by McQuiddy and Fuqua and their refusal to publish it further, reminds us of the little girl's essay on Pins, when she said, "Pins is useful things. They have saved a good many babies' lives by their not swallowing them." These men seem to think this college discussion will do good to their cause by their not publishing it further!!? Fuqua seemed to think that McQuiddy made a failure in his arguments for he suddenly changed his mind about whether the people "throughout the world ought to know" the arguments on this subject, and McQuiddy himself seemed to think he was making a failure for he too changed his mind about the advisability of letting his "readers know just what we had to say on the subject." And now comes J. N. Armstrong, president of Harper College, Kan. and publisher of "Gospel Herald," and answers my arguments in an impersonal way, evidently dissatisfied with McQuiddy's defense. So he takes up the discussion where McQuiddy laid it down, three months ago. We shall notice his arguments next week and see if he will print our article in his "Gospel Herald." So keep your eyes open for the arguments next week of another Bible college champion, to see whether Armstrong can do any better than McQuiddy.

Don't think, brethren, that because this college question is not bothering you now, that it never will. We are fighting to keep it from devastating your own spiritual fields and carry the war into the enemy's country. They cry "Evangelistic Assumption," but they are engaged in fostering the greatest of "evangelistic assumption." God gave the elders to lead and guide and feed the flocks of God, but wherever this college system predominates, they have practically the pastor system where one man, now called "the settled minister" (but who is really "the pastor") preaches every Sunday morning and evening for one church. Thus the evangelists among the college people are continually doing the work God ordained to be done by the elders, or bishops. This is evangelistic assumption in the highest degree. The greatest curse in the Christian world is the "kingdom of the clergy," is Alexander Campbell often called it; and the nursery of this kingdom, of the clergy is the theological school or Bible college. Abilene Christian College announced that they would have a "special course" for preachers which would be as good as anything they would get in any of the theological schools about them, granting degrees for that department; and in a prospectus for a college number of the Gospel Advocate several years ago the editors spoke of how the colleges were for the purpose of training young men for the ministry as well as training the students in general. So in our effort to destroy the nursery of the clergy and establish the God-ordained eldership, we are getting at the foundation of

most of the troubles in the Christian world.

Besides this, every Christian knows that it is hard enough to hold the church to the truth when we have the Bible to govern it, how much harder to hold to the right these human and unscriptural organizations which have no Bible to govern them! Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Chicago University, etc., were established in part to teach the Bible to theological students, and now they are tearing that Book to pieces. And you all know that the Bible College of the Christian Church at Lexington, Ky., where McGarvey taught so long, is now tearing to pieces that Book which McGarvey tried to implant in the minds of his students.

And the further fact that McQuiddy has the boldness to contend in the Advocate for voting for elders, (which voting he endorsed at Denver, Colo.,) and to labor long to prove that an old bachelor (whom he appointed to the bishopric at Denver) is scripturally qualified for the eldership, though the Bible says plainly that a bishop should be "the husband of one wife," shows that a "new digression" is rapidly arising among the people of God. Can we count on you, my brother, to help in this great fight for the Church which will be governed by the Word of God and not by the doctrines of men?

ARMSTRONG TAKES THE PLACE of McQUIDDY

THE RELATION OF CHRISTIAN COLLEGES TO THE CHURCH

The board of regents of Harper college is composed of faithful Christians, and the fact that they are the board of directors of a school could not mean that therefore they have lost their identity as individual Christians. For are they not still responsible to God as individual Christians? Can they not still worship God on Lord's days, at prayer meetings, and in their homes, just the same as Christians? Suppose some day when they are in session transacting business for Harper college, some poor beggar should approach the room wherein they were sitting, and should ask of these brethren alms,—would they be barred from helping just because they are the board of regents of Harper college? Is their identity so lost in the organization of Harper college that they cannot act any more just as simple servants of God? Suppose their hearts are moved by the appeal of that beggar, until they want to help him, may they do it? If so, how shall they do it: as members of the church of God, or as a school board? Are they forced to help him, if they help him at all, as Harper college? Suppose they were to volunteer the gift of one dollar each to this beggar, would the nine dollars thus given be a gift from Harper college or from these Christians, as Christians? To ask these questions is to answer them.

The contention, that because brethren constitute a school

board therefore they can never any more act around that school, in that school building, or do any work in that school simply as Christians is a "reductio ad absurdum." That men who are sane in other matters would be guilty of such reasoning to support a position is to be deeply regretted. Yet this is the kind of reasoning that keeps up the opposition against the only safe school environment known to me. If brethren who compose a school board may help a poor man, as Christians, may make a gift to him, thus co-operating together as Christians to support the poor, could they not just as scripturally co-operate together in selecting a faithful teacher, of the Word to hold a meeting in some school house ten miles in the country, doing the work just as Christians, co-operating together as they would to give to a beggar? If these Christians could us individual Christians co-operate in supporting the poor; if they could find a community starving for the Gospel and could supply that need by co-operating together in selecting a faithful preacher to do the teaching, could they not, just as Christians, select a teacher to teach the word of the Lord in their own place of business? It would be the very height of foolishness to contend that these Christian men could select and support a teacher of the Word in some destitute field, not as the board of regents of Harper college but as individual Christians, but could not in the same way select some faithful man to teach the word in their own school-house.

Could Christian men composing a corporation pray for the blessings of God to be upon the business conducted by that corporation? Because they have formed a corporation, or firm, to engage in that business, are they denied the privilege and blessedness of asking the Lord's favors on their business? Then, if these Christians may pray God for their business though they are a corporation directing that business, how shall they pray? As a corporation of God? Which? Certainly they could not pray to God as an incorporated body, for "there is one body." So, either they must pray, as Christians for their business or they cannot pray for it at all. Either the contention that Christian men, composing a school board to direct a school, lose their identity as Christians, is utterly false, or all Christians in the world who are members of business firms or corporations have ceased to be Christiana responsible to God or worship God in any capacity. If they may still pray, sing and worship toward God as Christians and as members of the one body, they may, as Christians and as members of that body, teach the word of God in their own place of business and select others to do so, without doing it through and in the name of the business institution.

SOMMER'S REPLY TO ARMSTRONG

Bro. Armstrong seems to be dissatisfied with Bro. McQuiddy's defense of the "Bible colleges," and seems to think he can do a better job, for he tries to answer my arguments in his "Gospel Herald" in an impersonal way. So we give him a chance and shall see whether he has the courage to publish our reply in his paper. The emphasis in his article is mine.

The position I have taken on this organization question is practically the same that the college brethren have held in the past. Paul commands Christians to glorify God "in the Church," and says that "by the Church the manifold wisdom of God" should be made known. (Eph. 3:30, 21.) When Christians work for God as mere individual Christians, as members of a Christian family (man and wife are to be one) and as members of a local church, they are glorifying God "in the Church." But any human organization established by Christians to teach the Bible, care for the poor and needy, etc., is unscriptural. This includes "Bible colleges," for they are human organizations established by Christians to teach the Bible—work of the Church.

The reasoning which has been made for these colleges, first by David Lipscomb and then by those who succeeded him, runs like this: A man has a scriptural right to run a farm and teach the Bible to his farm hands; and a man has scriptural right to run a factory and teach the Bible to his factory hands; therefore a man has a scriptural right to teach school and teach the Bible to his students, and hence Christians have the scriptural right to form human organisations of "Bible colleges" to teach the Bible.

Now the fallacy in this reasoning is that it passes from the work of the individual Christian to that of an organization. When a man teaches the Bible to his farm hands, he does so merely as a Christian; and when a business man teaches it to his factory hands, he does so merely as an individual Christian; but when Christians form an organization of a school, make the Bible one of the studies in the course; appoint, hire and regulate a man in the teaching of it, and then generally name it "Bible" or "Christian" college or school because the Bible is taught there, then the individual, or individuals, teaching the Bible "have lost their identity so far as work is concerned" (for they are doing it for the school), and the school—a human organization—is teaching the Bible. Hence, you have a human organization established by Christians to do work which Paul commands to be done "in the Church."

Let me illustrate. An ambassador of the U. S. to a foreign country loses his identity so far as work for the United States is concerned; and when he signs his name to an official document, it is not his name simply but the authority of the government for which he is doing it. What he is authorized by

THE COLLEGE QUESTION DISCUSSED

the U. S. to do, it is not he but the government back of him which really does it. He is a tool of the organization. Likewise, the binders, printers, stenographers, etc., in the "McQuiddy Printing Company," or any other such concern, lose their individual work as such and become part of the organization which hires them to do that work. The people praise the good work which this company does, and do not think of hunting up the individuals themselves, for the individual work is lost in the whole. So in the human organization of a "Bible college" such as Harper college. Its 1920-21 catalogue lies before me, evidently put out by Bro. Armstrong, the president. On page 54 under the heading "Course of Study," we have this: "Bible A. New Testament.. One unit.—Bible B. Old Testament . . . One unit.—Bible C. Paul's Epistle . . . One unit." This shows that the Bible is one of the studies in this organization and that the student receives credit for his work in it; and these credits we know help to get the diploma, and the diploma shows the work of "Harper college." Therefore the teaching done in Harper college is the work of a human organization and not the work of the Church, as Paul commands, for the individual work for the college is lost in the whole.

Even Bro. Armstrong, the president, admits this, for on page 14 of this catalogue he says, "The SCHOOL is unique in this particular: IT EXALTS the Book, or the Bible, to the first place in the education, of every child." So it is "the school" ("it") which "exalte the Book, or the Bible," not the Church!

Notice: 1. To "exalt" is to glorify. 2. To "exalt" the Bible is to glorify God, the author of the Bible. 3. Paul commands us to exalt God "in the Church." 4. Armstrong says, "The school . . . exalts . . . the Bible." 5. Therefore Armstrong and his followers are going directly contrary to the command of the inspired. Paul in trying to exalt the Bible, and thus God, the author of the Bible, in his "school" instead of "in the church."

In his reasoning on this "Bible college" question, Bro. Armstrong argues that it is the mere individual who teaches, the Bible in Harper college, but in his natural and unguarded moments, he blurts out the truth as it is in fact and says that it is "the school" which "exalts" "the Bible!" Like Peter on the night of the betrayal, he is seeking to save himself, and his cause, but "thy speech betrayeth thee."

What we have just said explains his illustration about the individuals on the school board giving a dollar to a beggar. When they help the beggar they are doing something which the school did not authorize them to do—they are doing that simply as Christians. But if the school had announced in its catalogue that they were a charitable organization to beggars, as they have announced that they are a moral and religious or-

ganization to train the young; and if they had begged tens of thousands of dollars from the brotherhood to distribute to beggars, as they have begged tens of thousands of dollars from the brotherhood to teach the Bible in their organization along with other studies; and if they had announced that the school board was to oversee the distribution of this money to beggars, as they have announced that the school board is to oversee the teaching of the Bible in their human organization—then Bro. Armstrong would have his illustration so that it justly illustrates the point at issue, and he would have to say that the giving of the money to the beggar by the board was not the work of the individuals as such but the work of the charitable organization of Harper college through its board, just as our brother now says that "the school" "exalts" (teaches) "the Bible" through the Bible teachers whom the board appoints, hires and regulates! Bro. Armstrong would better join his pupils in the Philosophy class and learn a few points on comparison and classification!

Bro. Armstrong refuses to see the difference between mere co-operation and organization. The word "co-operation" simply means "working together," while "organization" is working together to that degree, of cooperation where officers are appointed and laws made, and head and members work together to a common end. Mere co-operation, or working together, is abundantly sanctioned in the New Testament, but working together in human organizations is forbidden by the absence of any examples and by the express command of Paul to glorify God "in the church." The men on Harper school board are organized for their work of teaching the Bible in that college, but they are not organized for the work of helping beggars. If the men on this board, when the beggar came, had formed themselves into a charitable organization to help him, appointing one of their number president; another secretary; another treasurer; had made some laws to govern it, and appointed the treasurer to gather the money and give it to the beggar, so that they could say "it," their charitable organization, "exalts" charity—then our brother's illustration would amount to something; but, as the college advocates nearly all do, he tries to confuse the mind, whether honestly or dishonestly remains to be seen, by "mixing mere co-operation of individual Christians with organization of Christians. (The gong is ringing, Bro. Armstrong, and it is time for you to go and take another lesson in the Philosophy class on discrimination!)

Our brother it opposed to missionary societies, yet if teaching the Bible through Harper college is the work of mere individuals as such, as he desperately argues, and is scriptural, then the teaching of the Bible through the missionary society is the work of mere individuals as such and is scriptural, if the society does not include churches. Also, if the teaching of the

Bible through the human organisation of Harper college is the work of mere individuals as such and is scriptural, then the helping of the poor and sick—through the human organization of a ladies' aid society, Dorcas society, etc., is also the work of mere individual Christians as such. (Briney, Lord, Lappin, Garrison: "Come take your seat with us, Bro. Armstrong, in the Digressive row—our only difference is that our seat is old and yours is new! "We are the Old Digressives and you and your followers are the 'New Digressives'!")

But brethren McQuiddy and Kurfees see the inconsistency in opposing the human organisation of missionary societies because they are organizations, and at the same time endorsing the human organizations of "Bible colleges" and orphan homes, etc., and we now saying the missionary organizations are all right. McQuiddy said in his discussion with me which Armstrong is trying to finish for him, "Neither the missionary society nor any other association of Christians is wrong because it is a human organization. Whether a human organization is right or wrong depends altogether upon what it does." If this is not rank digression from God's word, I would like to know what it is!

These editors say this regardless of the fact that the Advocate has all along condemned the society for being a human organization, doing the work of the Church, as well as for its other unscriptural characteristics. F. W. Smith, one of the prominent writers of the Advocate for years, when writing against the society in its number of July 22, says this in italics on page 737, "There is not the slightest intimation in the New Testament of my organization for any purpose whatever other than the local congregations, which were independent of each other." Now this sentiment of Smith is what has been the sentiment of the Advocate from its beginning, in theory at least, and is exactly the belief of the supporters of the Review; but when we clearly show that it condemns their own human organization of "Bible colleges," they draw back and denounce our doctrine as "Sommerism." Smith said the Advocate have then been teaching "Sommerism" for years, but practicing Lipscombism, McQuiddyism, Hardingism and Armstrongism. The theory of the Advocate all these years has been "thumbs up," and Smith has taken it for granted that it would continue thus, and he is not yet used to the "thumbs down" of McQuiddy and Kurfees on the "question of the scripturalness of human organizations to do the work of the Church of God. They would better take him aside and post him a little, or he will spoil the game!

Brethren Kurfees and McQuiddy are going to be consistent even though they have to endorse human organizations to do work of the Church, as missionary societies; but Bro. Armstrong still prefers to be inconsistent and to reason as a child

by putting on a par the incidental and unorganized charitable work of the individual members of the school board of Harper college, with the authorized and organized educational work in the Bible of the organization of Harpers college of which they constitute the head.

Bro. Armstrong's illustration of whether Christian men in a corporation could pray as a corporation or as individuals, has no point, for it is founded on his misrepresentation that I teach that Christians "lose their identity as Christians," which I have nowhere taught. My expression was that when a man becomes a member of an organization and works for it, "he loses his identity so far as work is concerned" for that company, and his individual work is no longer his but that of the company which hires him to do it. McQuiddy made this same misrepresentation that Armstrong now makes. (Time for Armstrong to go to the Philosophy class again and learn Attention to Propositions!) If he had represented my position correctly, the thunder in his arguments would have been gone, and only harmless, far-away "sheet-lightning" would have been seen.

Our brother speaks the truth when he says of the men in the corporation praying to God for success, "They could not pray to God as an incorporated body, for 'there is one Body.' So, either they must pray as Christians for their business, or they cannot pray at all."

Paul and Armstrong: "There is one Body," the Church.

Paul and Armstrong: "Unto Him [God] be glory in the Church," one Body.

Armstrong alone: "The school . . . it . . . exalts [glorifies] . . . the Bible," hence glorifies God.

Therefore, Armstrong's "school" ("it") and the one Body, the Church, are the same!?

This must be Armstrong's logical conclusion. These advocates have denied that their colleges are church institutions but who would have ever thought that one of them would take the position, as Armstrong must here do by his own arguments, that their school is the church itself!!!

Don't you see, dear reader, that the "Bible college" business is a heresy? The men who argue for them are in utter confusion in their arguments. They contradict themselves, contradict one another, and contradict the word of God! They are mixed in religion as much as Russia is in her politics. And it is these human organizations founded on such flimsy and self-destroying arguments that these people are trying to foist upon us. They are not satisfied with God's way. The Review and the brethren who stand with it have confidence in God and his wisdom. God's plan concerning the training of the young is that fathers bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. How many Christian parents are today giving their children

instruction according to God's plan? Very few. How many talk of the Lord of God when they arise in the morning, walk by the way, sit in their houses, and lie down at night? Practically none. Well, should we not then better give God's plan a trial on the young before we intimate it is a failure and say that we must establish human organizations of "Bible colleges" to train the young? Let us plant an active church in every school center where the young people can go to college and have strong church influence at the same time. Let the churches everywhere have many Bible classes. Let the preacher discourse on Infidelity, and in Bible classes train the young to give a reason for the hope within them against all shades and grades of Infidelity. The same argument of "the good one" is used by the sects likewise for their Endeavor societies, missionary societies, Sunday-school baseball teams, church gymnasiums, etc. A departure from God's word may seem to do good at first, as may soon tear to pieces the Bible it was established to uphold, as Lexington Bible College is now doing" It is hard enough to hold the Church to the right way when we have the Bible to govern it—how much harder (it is impossible) these human organizations which have no word of God to regulate them! God's plan may be slow, but it is safe and sure and approved of Him. Let us give it a chance.

Untold division and strife and confusion have been caused by the advocates of these schools pushing their human organizations onto the brethren. When we try to save the Church from this heresy, and fight for the "one body" which Paul speaks of, against another body of a "Bible college" in which to glorify God, they maliciously call it, "Sommerism," just as the sects call Bible doctrine "Campbellism." Verily they have adopted the tactics of the sects, especially McQuiddy in the Gospel Advocate; for he has permitted many article in the Advocate on what he calls "Sommerism," some of them containing false statements which he will not permit to be corrected, in order to prejudice his readers, it seems, against the real truth on this "Bible college" question which he abruptly cuts out.

The opposers of these unscriptural organizations are not the ones to blame for the division. It was not Moses who caused confusion in Israel, when he came down from the Mount and destroyed the idol and slew three thousand of the people; but it was he that made the golden calf. So it is not he that contends for the "one body" that causes division, but he that contends for another body—the "Bible college"—in which to glorify God. Those men who are teaching in these schools, those who are patronizing, them with either money or presence, those preachers who talk and write for them, those papers such as the Gospel Advocate, Gospel Herald, Firm Foun-

dation, Christian Leader, Pacific Christian, Christian Worker, etc., (all of which papers advertise and work for these human organizations of "Bible colleges" to teach the Bible, which is the work of the Church)—these schools and papers, and the preachers and others who push them, are the ones who are responsible for the confusion and division among the brethren on the subject, and will have to answer to God for sowing discord among brethren!

"What does Paul mean when he says, "Mark them which are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which we learned and turn away from them"? (Rom. 16:17.) May God help us to be satisfied with the "one body," "the Church," and to do what we can to get others to be satisfied, by circulating this article where it is needed.—D. Austen Sommer.

[Armstrong never replied to this article.—D. A. S.]

McQUIDDY'S FIFTH ARTICLE

[After nearly four months Bro. McQuiddy printed the following article without a word in his paper as to why he had quit.—D. A. S.]

BRO. SOMMER CONCEDES THE ISSUE

On page 970 of this issue is an article from D. Austen Sommer commenting on one of my articles which emphasized the necessity of teaching the Bible everywhere. The reader is asked to give his "comments" a careful reading. In a former article published in the Gospel Advocate of April 15, 1920, he quotes from me as follows: "Does my critic deny the scriptural authority to teach the Bible in a school, in a saloon, in a Bible school, in classes, or anywhere else? If so, he should cite the scripture that denies the right." In answer he said: "I now accept our brother's challenge and proceed to give the scripture. The inspired Paul says 'by the church' the manifold wisdom of God is to be made known, and that we should give glory unto God 'in the church.' (Eph. 3:10, 21.)" When, as a Christian, one teaches the Bible anywhere, he is in the church, and, therefore, "in the church" is teaching the Bible. He also said in the same article: "The fallacy in the reasoning of the 'Bible-college advocates' lies in the statement that it is scriptural to teach the Bible in a school, in a saloon, in a Bible school, in classes, or anywhere else." Thus he commits himself to the principle that it is unscriptural to teach the Bible in a school or to teach it everywhere. This is a complete denial of the commission as recorded in Matt. 28:19, 20 and Mark 16:15, 16, where Christians are commanded to teach all nations and to preach the gospel to every creature in all the world. The early church did not interpret the commission as does he, for in obedience to this commission they went abroad, or everywhere, teaching the word of God. (Acts 8:4.) If Christians teach the word of

God "everywhere," as "school" is included in "everywhere," they will certainly teach it in the school.

The early Christians must have been "Bible-college advocates," according to my opponent. But I have even gone further than this in this investigation and have shown that Paul taught the Bible for two years in the school of Tyrannus, and that he has admitted that this was an organized school in a former article. In reply to this, he says in the issue of the Apostolic Review of June 22: "Bro. McQuiddy tries to confuse the minds of the readers by mixing together what is done as part of an organization and what is done incidentally. He does this by harping on Paul's teaching in the school of Tyrannus. Was Paul's teaching part of the work of that organization (if they had organization), or was it simply something incidentally connected with it?" He now wishes to change front again, and whereas before he held that Tyrannus' school was organized, he now seeks to break the force of his own admission by the use of "if" twice. His teaching stripped of all needless phraseology is that Paul taught the Bible "two years incidentally in the organized school of Tyrannus.

Yes, I started out to show that it is proper to teach the Bible in Bible schools and everywhere else that it can be taught, and our brother has now admitted it. In vain does he complain that I will not defend Bible colleges as they exist, for this is not the proposition that I started out to defend. The brother must stick to the issue; for I am willing to affirm now, just as I affirmed in the beginning, that it is scriptural to teach the Bible in schools, even in organized schools, and to teach it everywhere, and I have already proved this by the Scriptures and also by the admission of Bro. Sommer himself. He undertook to cite the scripture that denies this right, but has not done so.

But he says Christians lose their identity so far as their work is concerned in the Bible school. He says: "It is not the individual Christian as an individual that it teaching the Bible, but the college." This asserts the individual loses his identity. Whether a man is employed by a chartered corporation or an individual has nothing to do with the loss of identity, so far as work is concerned. They must not do this. They must always understand that they have a Master in heaven and that they are responsible to him. I do not believe they ought to be in any school or in anything else where they are not allowed to teach the Bible. Teaching the Bible is the chief duty of the Christian; then what right has he to be in a school where he has not the right, in whole or in part, to teach the Bible? I am not "harping" on Paul's teaching in the school of Tyrannus; but it is an undeniable fact, according to the Scriptures, that he taught in that school, which Bro. Sommer says was organized, for two years, and that it was not wrong for him to do so. If it were not wrong in Paul, and could not be wrong

in him, how can it be wrong if other Christians do likewise? But he seeks to break the force of the Scriptures by saying that Paul only taught incidentally, and not permanently, in that school. Very well, but it was not incidentally wrong for him to teach in it incidentally. Then how could it be permanently wrong for him to teach in it permanently? Is it "harping" on this to call attention to a plain and reasonable fact? By no means. Harp as much as you please, Bro. Sommer; but, while harping, see if you can answer these facts. No, I do not try to stir up prejudice against my opponent by showing that he, like the Catholics, is trying to keep the Bible out of the schools. But his position ought to stir up considerable opposition among those who believe that Christians should teach the Bible everywhere they can. Do not complain at me for the kind of company you are in."

[Here our nervous brother seems afraid that some one will be impressed with the weakness of his own arguments and so inserts a column of church troubles which have absolutely nothing to do with the arguments of the college question but which he seems to think will turn his readers attention away from his weak reasoning to the terribleness of some of the anti-college brethren. We answered this in last week's Review. We do not propose to be side tracked.—D. A. S.] But as it is not wrong to teach the Bible permanently in a school, since Paul taught it for two years in a school incidentally, as D. Austen has admitted this, my work is done. I shall not allow him to shift the issue by talking about Bible colleges, pastors, clergymen, etc. I will, however, notice some of his weak quibbles, that cannot be dignified by calling them "arguments" in his effort to confuse the minds of our readers. He says: "Bro. McQuiddy is still determined that a negro cook shall not be considered a part of his family." "Well, I am determined I will not consider her a part of my family, for she is not. No one can be a part of my family except by birth or by adoption. When I stated that "family" came from the Greek word "patria," and that "household" came from the Greek word "oikos," I was not considering the derivation of the word, but the translation of both words in the New Testament; and since the New Testament was written in Greek, and not in Latin, "household" is translated from the Greek word "oikos," and "family" from the Greek word "patria," and not from the Latin "familia." No, it is not necessary for me to "brush up" on the Latin in order to translate the Greek. My critic had better look; but, or his father will yet charge him with ignorance. The truth is, he had better "brush up" on the Greek, if there is any brushing up to be done. So far as the synagogue school is concerned, I was simply giving the meaning of the Greek word, and was not quoting from the Bible or translating. I defy our brother to deny that I gave

the proper meaning of the word. This is all that I am trying to get him to understand. Bro. Sommer seeks to change the issue in almost every paragraph that he writes, and in so doing misrepresents the position that I have taken. He says that in my first article I undertook to show that it is proper to teach the Bible in Bible schools and everywhere else and to show that "in school" is the same as "in the church." If his life depended upon it, he could not show where I have attempted to show that in "school" is the same as "in the church." Of course, he would deny that; but he had better deny things that I have affirmed and which he agreed to show were not correct, but now has admitted are correct. The point that I have made is that a Christian should teach the Bible everywhere. A Christian should teach the Bible on the farm, but because I say this it does not follow that "on the farm" is "in the church." The Christian on the farm is "in the church" and is doing the teaching. A Christian is under obligation to teach the Bible in his store, but it does not follow that "in the store" is "in the church;" but the man in the store, if a Christian, when he teaches there or anywhere else, is "in the church." So long as a man is a Christian, he is "in the church" wherever he is. This is all I have ever contended, and challenge him to deny it. Again, having assumed that when one teaches the Bible in a school he loses his identity, he now attempts to show that a man's work loses identity. While I do not accept this, this is not the issue. No one said that when a man was paid to do work on any job, that, after the job was completed and he was paid for his work, he should receive the pay for the job. No individual worker on the job, however, loses his identity, but is paid for the work that he does. If he is a good workman, he draws a good salary; if a poor workman, he draws a poor salary. The work of some workmen is such that it speaks for itself everywhere and on all occasions. But he claims that my workers lose their identity. He is not aware of the fact that the McQuiddy Printing Company is simply J. C. McQuiddy doing business under that name, just as the Apostolic Review is doing business under the name of Mrs. K. W. Sommer, 904 Udell st., Indianapolis, Ind. According to his reasoning, Daniel Sommer, as well as D. Austen Sommer and every other employee in that concern, has lost his identity. But it needs no argument to convince our readers that Daniel Sommer is a unique character and will never lose his identity as long as he lives. Men employed by chartered companies do not lose their identity. Being employed by an individual has nothing to do with the loss of the identity of a workman. Each individual is paid for his individual work -whether done for a corporation or an individual. The school is helping parents do the work of teaching and training their children, Victor Hugo declares: "Those parents

who send their children to a school over the doors of which it is written, 'Here religion is not taught,' ought to be summoned before a magistrate." Sir "Walter Scott says of the value of the Bible: "The most learned, acute and diligent student cannot, in the longest life, obtain an entire knowledge of this one volume. The more deeply he works the mine the richer and more abundant he finds the ore. He will at least leave the world confessing that the more he studied the Scriptures the fuller conviction he had of his own ignorance and of their inestimable value."

Will Bro. Sommer tell us, if he were correcting a bad boy, whether or not he would teach him repentance! If so he would be teaching him the Bible. If he were in school teaching a boy to be truthful, he would be teaching the Bible. If he were to teach him to be honest, he would be teaching the Bible. I repeat with emphasis that the Bible should be taught in school, in the store, in the field, in the shop, and, in fact, everywhere. Ignorance of the Bible is dangerous. We should educate the moral along with the intellectual. The world is coming more and more to a realization of the necessity of teaching the Bible not only in public schools, but in all other schools.

If this article appears scattering, our readers will please excuse it on the ground I am following Bro. Sommer.

SOMMER'S FIFTH ARTICLE

ARMSTRONG QUILTS, AND McQUIDDY TRIES IT AGAIN AFTER PRINTING ABOUT TWENTY-FIVE COLUMNS OF PREJUDICE-MATTER.

The reader remembers that when McQuiddy quit the discussion of the "Bible college" question with us four months ago, J. N. Armstrong took it up in an impersonal way and tried to answer our arguments, and that we replied to him in the Review. Though we sent Armstrong a self-addressed envelope asking him to write us whether he intended to print our article in his Gospel Herald, we have thus far heard nothing from him. He prefers, for reasons best known to himself, not to give our answer to his readers. We have a right to conclude that he does not intend to continue the discussion which he began by reviewing some of the arguments we were presenting to J. C. McQuiddy against the colleges.

Now, after about four months, Bro. McQuiddy takes it up again, but not till we had printed our "McQuiddy Quits" article, and not till he had printed about twenty-five columns of church troubles and church discipline in his paper for the evident purpose of prejudicing his readers against the anti-college brethren. Some of these troubles were efforts of brethren, satisfied with the Church in which to glorify God as Paul commands, to save themselves from the digressing influence of the college people who believe in glorifying God in the college as

well as in the Church. And some of the troubles he mentions have had to do with moral questions only and have had no connection whatever with the college question. But McQuiddy pays no attention to circumstances and thus lends encouragement to such evils in order to find something with which to prejudice his readers against anti-college brethren.

And now, after four months, he takes up the college question again, yet with nervousness; for after he had printed about a column of the college question he seemed to think some of his readers might be struck with the weakness of his arguments, and so without even a paragraph he inserted a column of church troubles which have absolutely nothing to do with the college question. Then he felt safe enough to finish his college argument. His cause must be weak when he must resort to such unfair means as that! Nowhere have we agreed, to publish all he may say about church troubles through many years, but we gladly publish what he says on the college question. Let him keep to the arguments and give his reader less of this prejudice stuff, and the readers will have a better opinion of his fairness.

He says he did not add the word "school" to the text of the Bible, but we showed clearly that he said that Paul taught "in the synagogue school" while the text of the Bible says he taught "in the synagogue." He was trying to prove by the Scriptures that Paul taught in a school. The words "synagogue" and "synagogue school" are no more synonymous than "church" and "church school," than "parish" and "parochial school." And he certainly added to the word of God when he used the word "school" in that place and under the circumstances which existed.

To show that the Bible teacher in the "Bible college" loses his identity so far as work is concerned, and that his work becomes the work of the organization, I brought up the illustration of McQuiddy's family with its possible negro cook, and showed that his friends praise his good meal though he did not do the cooking. I said that the negro cook was part of his household. But he rebuked me for using the word "household" and said that he was talking of his "family," and that the cook was no part of his "family." I then showed that according to both Cicero and Caesar, his "familia," or family, did include his cook. Now he turns from the word "family" back to "household" which he denied me the privilege of using at first, and says he is talking of "household" as mentioned in the Greek of the New Testament. But the Greek of the New Testament has absolutely nothing to do with this illustration, for it was not taken from the New Testament. He said at first that he was talking of "family" and not "household," but when we showed that even "family" includes his cook, according to good authority, he says he is talking of

a household" as found in the Greek. He reminds us of Noah's dove which "found no rest for the sole of her foot!" Yes, my brother, the work of your negro cook is lost in your family, or household (whichever you please), and you get the glory of her work; just as the work of the Bible teacher in the "Bible college" is lost in the organization, and the organization gets the glory. But Paul says, "Unto God be glory in the Church." The McQuiddy Printing Company is an organization, for our brother admitted that, so there is no use in discussing that point; but we deny that the Apostolic Review is an organization. Daniel and D. A. Sommer are not working for Mrs. K. W. Sommer, but merely with her. Co-operation is abundantly taught in the New Testament, but not human organization. The Standard Dictionary says that an organization is "a systematic union of individuals in a body, where officers, agents and members work together for a common end." The Review has no president, secretary, treasurer, or other officers, outside of a Christian family. The writers and the other religious workers are simply "workers together" with God (2 Cor. 6:1), without an organization, or body. The workers one week may be mostly different in personnel from the workers the next week. When it becomes another "body" then I shall oppose it just as I oppose the "Bible colleges" which are "bodies." These colleges are incorporated, and the word "incorporate" comes from the Latin "corpus" which means "body." But Paul says there is "one body," while the "Bible college" advocates have another religious "body," the college. He says that I admitted that the school of Tyrannus was an organized school. If I admitted any such thing it was "simply for the argument's sake, to show that, even if it were, the college brethren could get no authority in that for their school, for what Paul did there was incidental and not part of the organization, (if there was one). But the Bible does not say that school was an organization, and neither I nor McQuiddy nor any one else can truthfully say that we know it was! Many private schools have been run as mere individual affairs without an organization as such. In order for the school of Tyrannus to be any argument for the "Bible colleges" today, these college-crazed brethren will have to show that the school was organized and that Tyrannus appointed and hired Paul to teach in it, and regulated him; for that is the way the Bible is taught in the "Bible colleges."

He wisely passes by what we said about camp pastors, for that explains clearly this school of Tyrannus and the part Paul took in it. The illustration brings out the very point in the whole controversy, and he should notice it! In the Great War, camp pastors taught the Bible in the camps, but they were in reality no part of the organization of the camp—their work was incidental as respects the camp though they continued it

a year and a half, just as Paul's was incidental in the school of Tyrannus though he continued it two years; but the chaplains taught the Bible in the camp permanently, and as part of the organization of the military camp. Paul "disputed daily" in the school of Tyrannus as no part of an organization (if there was one), much as these camp pastors did their work; while the teachers of the Bible in the "Bible college" are appointed, hired and regulated by the "body" called "Bible college" to teach the Bible, much as the chaplains are appointed, hired and regulated by the body called "U. S. Army" to teach the Bible in the camps. Brethren in the South who are opposed to Christians taking part in civil governments, and especially to their taking part in war, can see this point clearly. None of them was opposed to preachers acting as camp pastors—going among the boys and working simply as individual Christians; but perhaps all of them were opposed to those preachers becoming chaplains and being appointed, hired and regulated by the U. S. Army to preach to the boys, for then the preachers would be part of the military organization. Is there any wonder that our erring brother ignored our reasoning on this? (Tyrannus to McQuiddy: "Goodby, my brother! You have squeezed me too hard already in order to get your 'Bible college' out of me, but truth will out—I won't stand for it any longer. I hate to leave you in the lurch, but—goodby!")

Paul says there is "one body," the Church; "Bible college" advocates say there are at least two—the Church and the organization, or body, called "Bible college." Paul says, "Unto God be glory in the Church;" "Bible college" advocates say, "Unto God be glory in the Church and in the college!" Which shall we follow? "If any man shall add unto these things God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book."

After about four months of deliberation on our arguments he also decides not to answer our reducing to an absurdity argument, in which, according to his reasoning, their colleges are not organized though they say they are. If the teaching of the Bible in them is a mere individual work and not the work of the organization which appoints the teacher and supports him and regulates him, as McQuiddy, Armstrong and, others try to make us; believe, then the teaching of mathematics, languages and science is also mere individual work and the work of the president and other officers is likewise entirely individual; and there is no organization at all though they take out a charter as an organization? Why did he not answer this? If he had spent that third of his article in trying to extricate himself from his inconsistencies instead of trying to work in some matter to prejudice his reader, the people would have thought more of him and his fairness.

If the work of the teacher of the Bible in the "Bible col-

lege" is mere individual work, as our erroneous brother says, then the work of an individual in an aid society or secret order is also the work of the mere individual as such. If a man is glorifying God in the Church, when he becomes part of an organization of a "Bible college" and teaches the Bible through it, or supports such work, then he is still glorifying God in the Church when he does other good works through the secret order, aid society, missionary society, etc. !! And when Paul commanded Christians to glorify God "in the Church" he was talking nonsense; for, according to McQuiddy, Armstrong and other "Bible college" advocates, they cannot glorify Him anywhere else, for doing work in a human organization is doing it in the Church, according to them. Here I am reminded that he denies that he has said that glorifying God "in the Church" and "in the college" are the same. If they are not the same in the points under discussion, then all his reasoning has been in vain, for that has been the burden of all his arguments—to show that one is glorifying God in the Church when he is teaching the Bible in the college.

The following is a far-reaching principle which our erring brother endorses, "Neither the missionary society nor any other associations of Christians is wrong because it is a human organization. Whether a human organization is right or wrong depends ALTOGETHER upon what it does. If nothing were done by individual Christians through a missionary society but preach or teach the gospel, neither Bro. Sommer nor anybody else could show that it is wrong." This is a revolutionary statement among professed loyal disciples, and contrary to one of the chief arguments used by the Advocate and other Southern journals against the missionary society, etc. Stanford Chambers, a college man, says in a recent number of "Word and Work" concerning the man who organizes a society through which to do some good work, "It seems never to occur to his mind that the Lord has already provided the organization by which he purposed every good work to be carried on and through which he would have all his saints to serve!" G. H. P. Showalter, publisher of the "Firm Foundation," when condemning missionary societies and saying that Christians are complete in Christ, said this of the apostolic Christians, "They did not have to establish an independent organization to do local or domestic missionary work." F. W. Smith, one of the prominent writers of the Advocate for many years, says this, in emphasis, in a recent number of that journal, "There is not the slightest intimation in the New Testament of any organization for any purpose whatever other than the local congregations, which were independent of each other." These men are all "Bible college" men, but are opposing missionary societies with the same argument I am using against the colleges; and the great majority of the college breth-

ren have opposed the societies for the same reason, perhaps sometimes along with other reasons. Thus they stand with us and against McQuiddy on this point, even though they are inconsistent, for the "Bible college" is just as much an "independent organization" (using Showalter's expression) as the missionary society.

Brother, do you get the full force of this principle advocated by our digressing brother, that "neither a missionary society" nor a such like organization "is wrong because it is a human organization?" Now, an organization is a body, and he consequently

advocates the principle that missionary bodies and such like bodies of Christians are all right. McQuiddy says that several bodies are scriptural, but Paul says there is "one body." Our zealous brother must contradict Paul in order to defend your religious body called a "Bible college" which was established to teach the Bible—the work of the "one Body," the Church. Will you stand with Showalter, Smith and Chambers and be inconsistent in opposing a human organization of a missionary society and endorsing a human organization of a "Bible college"? Or will you be consistent with McQuiddy, and contradict Paul, and say there is more than one body! Or will you not rather with the anti-college brethren, reject all human religious organizations, bodies—the "Bible college" as well as the missionary society—and be both consistent and scriptural?

The words of practically all the "Bible college" advocates show that they believe that it is "the school," not the individual as such, which is teaching the Bible—in other words, that the work of the individual is lost in the work of the organization for which they work. Several years ago Bro. Elam, who was an editor of the Advocate and writer of the McQuiddy Sunday-school literature, admitted in his discussion with me that the Nashville Bible School "teaches the Bible." In his catalogue for 1920-21, J. N. Armstrong, president of Harper College, says, "The SCHOOL is unique in this particular: IT exalts the Book, the Bible, to the first place in the education of every child"; which simply means that these college brethren are exalting the Bible, and hence glorifying the God of the Bible, in "the school," when Paul commands them to glorify Him in "the Church." And in the catalogue of the Nashville Bible School for 1914-15, of which the president now is managing editor of the Gospel Advocate, we have this, "The supreme purpose of THE SCHOOL shall be to TEACH THE BIBLE as the revealed word, of God to man and as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice, and to TRAIN those who attend IN A PURE BIBLE CHRISTIANITY.

The main point which our brother has made in this college discussion is that the teaching of the Bible in a "Bible college" is only a "method" of teaching it in the Church—in other words; that when a Christian teaches in a "Bible college" it

is the Church which is teaching the Bible and making known the manifold wisdom of God. But Elam, Armstrong, the president of Nashville Bible School, and others, in their unguarded moments express the case just as it is in their hearts and as it is in fact, and blurt out the truth that "the school" "teaches the Bible."

Inasmuch as it is "the school" which is teaching the Bible, the supporters of these human organizations of "Bible colleges" to teach the Bible—work of the Church—are disobeying the command of Paul for "the Church" to make known the manifold wisdom of God and for Christians to glorify God "in the Church." And—inasmuch as John says, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed: for he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds"—are not those brethren partakers with them in this disobedience when they uphold those preachers and those journals such as the Gospel Advocate, Firm Foundation, Christian Leader, Pacific Christian, etc., which plead for these human organizations in which to glorify God? Can people be saved while in point-blank disobedience to the commands of God? Brethren, let us be safe for eternity. Some of the church troubles which Bro. McQuiddy has revengefully cited to stir prejudice have been simply an honest effort of brethren to keep themselves and others from becoming partakers. in these digressions.

In these investigations we have discussed only the scripturalness of these organizations, "barely mentioning the fact that they are a hot-bed of a clergy which is rapidly pushing the God-given eldership into the background, and that they are fostering a system which makes an unofficial preacher the feeder of the church Lord's day morning and night, year after year, when the bishops should lead and guide and teach the flock. Thus among the college brethren the pastor system is being rapidly installed, and the "Bible college" is the chief promoter of this unscriptural system. Stop and consider this, my brother, before you are entirely enslaved by a new "kingdom of the clergy."—D. Austen Sommer.

McQUIDDY QUILTS AGAIN

As it has been several weeks since we replied to Bro. McQuiddy on the college question and he has not published our reply in the Advocate, I wrote him a letter asking him if he expected to print my reply and continue the investigation. He declines to continue, on a technicality. That technicality is this: he printed a detailed account of the Denver affair, and I replied to it. He then reprinted a rehash of it, and I printed what he said in the Review and did not reply to it as I had done that in my reply to his first article on that affair, and I wished to discuss fully the college question which was the cause

of that and many other such troubles. He then printed another account of the same thing, and because we did not publish that he makes our refusal to publish his third article a reason for closing the college discussion. He tried to lead us away from the discussion of the college question, but we would not lead, and his refusal now to go on with the college discussion is on this technicality, though he has printed an article from us since we refused to be led off into by-paths, thus his actions giving the lie to his present technical excuse. He then seemed to think it wise to publish about twenty-five columns of prejudice matter on "Sommerism," as he and his writers term it, which is chiefly an effort to keep his human organization of "Bible college" from fastening its claws into the churches of Christ. Our brother had the first and last article in the Advocate, refusing on this technicality to publish my last, though I was really entitled to it in his columns. So, since he says in his private letter, "I am perfectly satisfied with what has been accomplished in the discussion for the truth," we shall consider the debate closed.

Note.—Many brethren need to read this discussion. Have you sufficient interest in truth to loan your copy of this tract to one after another of your brethren who need it, till all have read it? Whether friend or foe of the "Bible collages," you should be a disciple—a learner—and should try to carry out the Commission and make disciples of all nations—disciples of Jesus, and hence the truth.

"SOMMERISM"

McQUIDDY'S TWENTY-FIVE COLUMNS OF PREJUDICE STUFF

Six or eight months ago we commented on the work of J. C. McQuiddy at Denver, Colo., in upholding voting for Elders at that place and upholding the appointing of old bachelors for that office. We also answered his arguments on the "Bible college" question. In the discussion which then arose in the Review and Advocate concerning the matter, the college question was kept to itself and the local Denver affair was discussed separately. After a few articles McQuiddy stopped the discussion of the college question and started in, it seems, to work prejudice against the anti-college people by printing an account of all the church troubles he could come across where any man was connected who endorsed the Review. He has gone from California to Pennsylvania, from Arizona to Alabama stopping at Colorado on the route, in his effort to find some one who has a word to say against Sommer and the things for which he contends. He printed this prejudice stuff though he did not print my last article on the college question of three months ago. Not till after we wrote an article on "McQuiddy Quits," did he decide to publish my last article on the college, and then not till he had. completed about twenty-five columns in his paper of

the prejudice-stuff against the anti-college people. He seemed to think that he must off-set the truth which he had presented in his columns against that human organization to do work of the Church and must prejudice their minds against anything they might see in the future. Now he has published my last article of three mouths ago, on the college question; but, becoming nervous lest some one might accept some of the truth, it seems, he thinks it best to insert into the middle of it more than a column of more prejudice-stuff. Surely his cause must be weak to resort to this. When we refused to publish all this stuff, he says we have violated our agreement. Nowhere have we agreed to publish all such stuff. Several articles on the local Denver affair from the pen of McQuiddy were published in the Review, and we gave him the last statement of facts in the Review without any reply to that article; then he started in to tell the whole thing again himself and through Evans, the bachelor bishop, whom he endorsed for such office. We objected to going over the whole matter again and called on him to argue the college question which was at the "bottom of all the trouble. We have said that we would publish what he said on the college question, and we will, but we do not propose to be led away from the foundation of the trouble between the college and the anti-college brethren.

In order to try to stop the dissatisfaction at Denver, brethren suggested that several men be appointed to look after the church till such time as they were developed fully to be appointed to the office of bishop, but McQuiddy and his co-workers in the college cause at Denver decry that as something terrible and choose rather to appoint men to the office of bishop who have very few of the qualifications, one of the men being an old bachelor; their method of selecting these men being by vote—one of the greatest heresies in the Church. In order to off-set our expose of this, J. C. McQ. cites a case somewhere else where he says such a proposition was made and that Daniel Sommer opposed it. The proposition which Daniel Sommer opposed reads thus, as quoted by McQuiddy, "I would suggest in place of an eldership that a number of brothers be appointed to take charge of the church's affairs." Who would not oppose this proposition, for there was an eldership there?—and this proposition was to do away with the God-given eldership and substitute this work. The proposition of the brethren in Denver was simply a temporary affair and was an effort to quiet discord till these men were developed for the Eldership; while the other proposition was "in place of an eldership." J. C. must be hard-pressed for prejudice-stuff.

Through a slip of the memory I have stated that McQuiddy appointed Bachelor Evans to the bishopric, but he did worse than that! These people elected their men for office of bishop by vote, McQuiddy being in the chair part of the time and

overseeing in part the business of the meeting. Then Evans, the bachelor-elect bishop said, "By the authority invested in me as an evangelist, I appoint you men to this office to which you have been elected," and then he named the men, himself being first on the list. Thus, bachelor-bishop Evans, to whom McQuiddy has granted ten columns of his paper in which to take his spite on the anti-college brethren, appointed himself to the eldership! Say, reader, if Evans and his 'crowd had believed

in the laying on of hands, an many in the South do, would not that have been an interesting performance—to see Evans lay hinds, on himself!!

And McQuiddy endorsed this proceeding, even saying after the meeting that night that Evans (the self-appointed; vote-elected, bachelor-bishop) was a "God-given elder to that church!" (Query for McQuiddy: If evangelists appoint themselves into the Eldership, is not this some of that "evangelistic assumption" you have been decrying in about twenty-five columns of your paper?)

In order to justify his work at Denver, he has gone so far as to try in the columns of the Advocate to prove from the Scriptures that voting is all right, and that an old bachelor is O. K. for the bishopric, though the Bible says he must be the "husband of one wife." In order to do this he quotes from sectarian authorities, most of whom believe in single men for their bishops or other officers! He might as well take them to prove that it is scriptural to baptize infants, etc. ! Surely our erring brother is hard-pressed for argument! But not all his readers will swallow his bachelor-elder acts and arguments, for, in a late number of the Advocate, W. H. Carter, one of their prominent writers, says, evidently with McQ. 's arguments and acts in mind.

Of these qualifications there is no evasion. God says a bishop must possess them. No one has a right to change them. When God says he must be the "husband of one wife," it is a SIN, an alteration of God's law, to say that an unmarried man is eligible. If one has the right to change this so as to take in an unmarried man, why not another the right to change "not given to wine" to one who is given to wine, or "apt to teach" to one who is not apt to teach, or "not greedy of filthy lucre" to one who is greedy of filthy lucre? If God has not meant what he said, he would not have said it. God does not say one thing when he means another. Right here, in my judgment, is where the greatest cause of the lack of efficient eldership lies. Men in whom the brethren have confidence [like McQuiddy, I suppose he means.—D. A. S.] have dealt out to them speculative theories, notions, and opinions instead of the "Thus saith the Lord." The result is a careless indifference in regard to the eldership.

This is pretty hard on J. C., is it not, when one of his prominent writers tells him he deals in "theories, notions, and opinions," and says that he alters God's law* and is a sinner! My book says that he that adds to or takes from God's law

will have added to him the plagues in that Book and will have his part taken from the Tree of Life. So W. H. Carter, one of McQuiddy's right hand men, tells him plainly that he is going to be lost for such teaching as he is presenting. No wonder that our erring brother is mad at us, and is printing so much to stir up prejudice against us! We are turning his own men against him by showing them his unscriptural ways.

And now our erring Bro. McQuiddy has opened the columns of the Advocate for Floyd M. Edwards to air his personal troubles, which he does by blaming them all on Daniel Sommer and the Review, when Daniel Sommer had absolutely nothing to do with the matter and the Review simply published the report of Edwards' trial by the judge whom Edwards himself appointed, to hear his case. His boasting, gloating, revengeful spirit in his article shows what it was which got him into his troubles.

McQuiddy said at first in his paper that he would not publish it, but perhaps after he felt the sting of Carter's calling him a sinner, he decided that it was prudent to permit another dig at us. J. C. McQ. opens his columns to this affair to show still further the errors of the chimera of "evangelistic assumption," but this case proves the opposite of what he intended. The elders of the church in Kansas City excluded Floyd's sister on a most serious charge, based on the public confession of the man in the case. Floyd didn't like it, and went among the churches doing everything he could against the K. C. church. Floyd is an evangelist and is trying to tear down the God-given Eldership. This must be that "evangelistic assumption" that McQuiddy is talking about; and yet, strange as it may seem to one who has read McQuiddy's prejudice-stuff, the Review is against the evangelistic assumption and McQuiddy and the Advocate are upholding it! Thus, this case proves the very opposite of what our erring brother intended!

The K. C. elders then brought charges against Edwards at Chillicothe, his home church, where there are no elders. To hear this case, Edwards agreed to choose a man, the K. C. elders a man, and these two a third—all evangelists—to bear his case and decide his innocence or guilt. The K. C. man could not go, and so those elders agreed to leave the whole matter to the evangelist whom Edwards alone chose to hear his case. The trial was held, and Edwards and the Kansas City elders were permitted to bring in all the testimony they wished. Thus, Edwards was permitted to choose entirely his own judge—an unusual thing in his favor; and yet this Judge whom he chose decided that he was wrong and called on him to change his ways. When he refused, part of the small band at Chillicothe held with Edwards and part with the judge whom Edwards himself had appointed to hear his case, and the Review simply published what the judge whom Edwards alone chose to hear his

case, had to say. Thus, Edwards refused to abide the decision of the only judge in the case and whom he himself alone appointed And McQuiddy and the Advocate uphold such rebellion by printing a tirade from Edwards against his judge whom he himself alone appointed, and against those who uphold this judge whom Edwards himself alone appointed. All the evangelists in this matter and in the brotherhood have been warm friends of Bro. Edwards, and it is with reluctance we give him up; but we are friends of Truth more. I do not now know of an evangelist in good standing in the whole brotherhood who stands with Edwards in this matter, except a blind man who eats at his table, and—J. C. McQuiddy. And the former is not now in good standing among faithful churches by reason of his position in upholding Edwards in his rebellion against the Kansas City elders and against the very judge whom Edwards himself alone appointed to hear his case. And thus McQuiddy lines up with the very thing he says he is opposing—"evangelistic assumption!"

The methods adopted by J. C. McQuiddy" to prejudice his readers against opposition to his human organization of a "Bible college" to teach the Bible, work of the Church, is a two-edged sword. To show the fallacy of such methods, all we need to do is to cite examples of trouble where college men have been involved, giving no heed to the circumstances. As mentioned in a former article, F. B. Srygley, a preacher and prominent college man in Advocate circles, went to Winchester, Ky., with J. W. Shepherd and T. Q. Martin, and formed what the opposition called "a tribunal," and lorded it over God's heritage there. This is "evangelistic assumption" of the kind J. C. McQuiddy seems to be fighting. Strong language was used by college men of the opposition to this "tribunal." And the Gospel Advocate, of which J. C. Mc. has been managing editor, stood behind this "tribunal." We do not have to inquire concerning the details of this affair, but the fact that some one has denounced the Advocate is sufficient to show that collegism is a terrible thing, to use McQuiddy's arguments!!

For several years there has been a conflict between R. H. Boll and the Advocate. Though he was given the honor of writing on the first page of that paper for years, yet now they turn him out and tramp him in the dust because he presumes to teach something on the prophecies which they do not believe. The Advocate has charged him with falsifying, and Boll the same with them. Scores of pages have been written against Boll and his doctrine in the past few years, and opposition from the other side has been strong against the course of McQuiddy and the rest of the Advocate editors. Does not all this show that Mc. and his fellow-editors are lording it over God's heritage, trying to dictate the minute details which a man shall and shall not teach on the prophecies!!!

Jorgenson had some trouble in the church where he preached in Louisville, and some characters were turned out. The editors of the Advocate, who did not belong to that church, take up the matter and do everything in their power against Jorgenson and against the "action of the church there. What right had the evangelists on the staff of the Advocate in another State to mix up in that matter? This must have been some of that "evangelistic assumption" which McQuiddy has been spending from twenty to twenty-five columns in trying to tear down. Better clean up your own back yard, my erring brother!!

Don Carlos Janes has been enthusiastic on missions and has had much to do with getting two men to go to India. The missionaries have not turned out as McQuiddy and his fellow-editors think they should, and so they have jumped onto Janes. They have dictated to him just what months' contributions should not be sent to them and what should. They have denounced the methods of selecting the missionaries, and called for other methods to be used in harmony with their views. Thus they seem to be generalissimos of foreign work in India and of the methods to be used by the churches in sending to them. Of course, when using McQuiddy's method of reasoning against Daniel Sommer and the anti-college brethren, we do not need to inquire which side is right or wrong. All we need to do is to follow his example and find opposition to the Advocate and its principles, and conclude immediately that they are wrong, for such is his method against us.

And then they have jumped onto McCaleb, the missionary to Japan. After upholding him and his work for more than a quarter of a century, they throw him aside. They use columns in their journal against him. They dictate to him whom he shall leave in charge of the work in Japan while he is home. They shut him out of the Advocate in his defense so that he has to go to Armstrong's paper.

In other words, J. C. McQuiddy and his fellow-editors try to dictate about church affairs in Louisville, hundreds of miles away, and about the general work in the U. S. of appointing missionaries, etc. Their arms of authority have extended from Japan, about 8, 000 miles to the west, to India, about 12, 000 miles to the east. Some editorial seat, that in the rooms of the Gospel Advocate, Nashville, Tenn. ! Some diocese, that of J. C. McQuiddy and his fellow-editors! I believe Nashville has been called the "Athens of the South" because of its educational institutions. Perhaps we would better call it "Rome of the world," for there seems to be a papal chair there. I guess this is what J. C. calls "evangelistic assumption."!!!

Several months ago one of our readers in the South wrote us that something was "doing" around Nashville. Suddenly A B. Lipscomb becomes managing editor of the Advocate and president of David Lipscomb College, and Leo Boles, who for

so long had worked hard for the college, suddenly disappears. E. A. Elam, who for decades has been a chief man on the Advocate and editor part of the time, and writer of McQuiddy's Sunday-school literature, suddenly disappears from his editorship, and I have seen no explanations in the Advocate. A couple of years ago, J. C. McQuiddy and his fellow-editors would not print an article from Elam which consisted of nothing but scripture quotations. Did the pope get into a fight with some of his "Swiss guards" and put some of them out of business, and create a new guard? While McQuiddy is describing "evangelistic assumption" in the North, he might give us the details of things nearer his door; yes, inside his editorial doors, and his beloved Bible college.

In a late number of the Advocate appears an item under the heading, "All differences of a Business Nature Amicably Settled." This trouble, which was of such importance that its settlement needed to be mentioned before the thousands of readers of the Advocate, was between J. C. McQuiddy and J. W. Shepherd. F. W. Smith, the writer of the item, seems to have been the peace-maker. He says, concerning his making the statement, "I do this the more cheerfully from the fact that some have commented unfavorably on the situation." Even in a business way, J. C. McQuiddy has had those who were opposed to his ways. Was our prejudice-stirring brother trying to exercise in his business the same tactics he has been using in religion against the anti-college brethren?

There are in Tennessee strong "Bible college" men who oppose the popish ways of J. C. McQuiddy. Price Billingsley, one of them, has even started a journal called "The Advance," it seems, to oppose some of his ways. On one question J. C. Mc. seems to have changed fronts in the past few years, and will not permit anything further to be said on the subject in his columns. Concerning this, Billingsley says, or permits to be said, in his paper concerning McQuiddy, "If the ruling of this PETTY BOSS is the correct gauging of the sentiment and purpose of the great host of God's loyal teachers of today, I am utterly mistaken. No, Bro, McQuiddy, no man can serve two masters or successfully carry water on both shoulders." When one remembers that this was not written by some anti-college man, but was written by men on the scene and who evidently know what they are talking about, it comes with force. It seems from these descriptions of him in college journals of his own State and even his own Advocate, as a dealer in "speculative theories, notions and opinions," and as a "petty boss," and as a man of "sin," that the next time he starts in to scour the country for examples of "evangelistic assumption" he would better sit down before a mental mirror and take a picture of himself! Now if there is any correct reasoning in the twenty-five col-

ums of prejudice-stuff which this college advocate prince has through his paper, then J. C. McQuiddy is an unworthy leader in almost every particular, for we have adopted his method of reasoning. He seems unwilling to leave to the candid reader our arguments on the "Bible college" question but stops the discussion three months while he prints about twenty-five columns of church troubles, to prejudice, it seems, the mind of the reader. Some of these troubles were the honest efforts of men, satisfied with the Bible, to keep such men as McQuiddy from foisting upon them in one way or another their human organizations of "Bible colleges" to rob the Church of its glory by doing work which God said should be done through it, when Paul said, "Unto God be glory in the Church." Others of these troubles which McQuiddy mentions were of a moral nature and had nothing whatever to do with the "Bible college" question. Hard-pressed for argument indeed must be the college people, when, to accomplish their purposes of working prejudice against the anti-college brethren, they must place themselves on record as J. C. McQuiddy has done!

THE ATTACK OF EARNEST C. LOVE AND HIS "PACIFIC CHRISTIAN" ON WHAT HE CALLS "SOMMERISM"

Bro. McQuiddy is not the only one who is trying to put out of business the anti-college brethren. Earnest C. Love is spending many columns of his "Pacific Christian" in picking up every little hobbyist, who has a grudge against the Review because we oppose his hobbyism, and in permitting him to air himself. There was comparative peace on the Pacific coast till he started to work up influence for his other "body," the college, to sap life out of the "one Body," the Church. He now has an "Academy" which takes children from the first grade on into some high school studies. A picture of his school a year or so ago made one think of a kindergarten. In other words, he wishes parents where his school is located to take their children out of the common schools and educate them, at the expense of the Church in his "Academy" for the benefit of the Bible lesson which he gives them every day, which God commanded fathers (and indirectly mothers) to give their children. He defends these human organizations which rob the Church of its glory; and calls opposition to his human device "Sommerism," much as the sects have called the pure Bible doctrine "Campbellism;" and then condemns the spirit of those who oppose his "plant which the heavenly Father hath not planted."

But let us for a moment examine the hobbies of this brother, and his inconsistency. He has taken a radical position in his paper against individual communion cups, and in order to try to be consistent he has taken the position that there should be one cup only in the communion. Here are some of his radical,

illogical inconsistent statements::

"It was a mistake to use more than one cup. It never pays to violate God's law even in a seemingly innocent way. The plural cup has put club into the hands of innovationists [those who favor individual cups] to strike us with. But now what shall we do? When we find ourselves wrong on a point, shall we go on and grow worse and worse? The writer recommends the latter course; and every church he has established, he has started them in with just one cup, as taught in the Bible. The word of God is plain; Christ took a cup; and said, 'Drink ye all of it,' or, 'all of you drink of it.' This positively could not be said of any congregation using separate cups. If the cups are put in a congregation, then those satisfied with remembering Christ in his appointed way should do as they did when the organ was introduced. They should meet elsewhere."

Bro. Love tries to make himself think that there is a "little difference" between two and four cups, and forty or fifty cups, but his reasoning is childish; yet he says at the same time it is a "mistake" and "wrong" to have more than one cup. He even says that when they have "cups," one should create a faction by separating from such disciples and "should meet elsewhere." And yet Earnest C. Love has met and worshiped with scores of congregations that have had two or more cups which he says is "wrong," and has not gone off and met "elsewhere." In an account of a late trip into the South he even commends churches which have more than one cup, which he says is "wrong." He is shunning to declare the whole counsel of God in not opposing to their face what he says is "wrong," and is not free from the blood of all men, according to the Scriptures. He advocates that you should cause division in a church which uses individual cups; and the same argument which he uses against the individual cups—that there was only one cup when Christ gave the communion to his apostles (they did not need any more)—can be used against two or more cups; so the only legitimate conclusion, which we can reach is that he advocates division when a church has two or more cups. Our erring brother can not get away from the fact that he is advocating division where there is more than one cup. Why does he not contend that the Lord's Supper should be observed in the evening and in an upper room in a reclining position, because the first one was? (But here I am reminded faintly that our confused brother did once hold to such unreasonable ideas.) And yet this is the brother that wrote to McQuiddy when he first began his tirade on "Sommerism," saying, "The only fault I find is, that the Advocate waited too long to begin the fight, and I am afraid they will quit too soon." And this illogical, divisive and inconsistent brother spends columns in his sheet against the Review and the anti-college brethren; and Mc-

Quiddy opens his columns gladly to this man who advocates that you should divide a church by meeting elsewhere when they have more than one cup in the communion! The Review considers itself flattered to have such inconsistent, illogical and divisive characters against it rather than with it. As we have said, Bro. Love talks and preaches and writes in favor of human organizations of Bible colleges to teach the Bible—work of the Church—contrary to Paul's command to glorify God "in the Church;" and much of the confusion on the Pacific coast has been caused by him and his paper trying to introduce this humanism. There was generally peace before he started it and his other hobbies. Will not he have to answer to God for this confusion?

Another one of his hobbies and inconsistencies is that he persists in making Paul contradict himself on the woman question. He looks at the statement, "I suffer not a woman to speak," much as a sectarian looks at the statement, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shall be saved and thy house," and refuses to consider what is said elsewhere on the same subject. Paul regulates the head-gear of the woman (a peculiar custom of that day or country), when they did speak by praying and prophesying. He can not harmonize Paul's language by his position that a woman may not do anything in a public way. Is a reasoner like this safe—when he makes an inspired man contradict himself?

But now he announces that he has bought a piece of land at Fresno for twenty thousand dollars where he proposes to move his Academy, paper and printing plant. The brethren already are begged for money for this land, and no doubt many more thousands will be asked in the future to put up buildings, etc., etc., etc. So you brethren out in California don't need to bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord yourself—you can simply send them to Love's school and pay him to do it. Why, oh why, are not men satisfied with God's plan of doing things, inasmuch as he has said that all things that pertain to life and godliness have been given!? Is it because they do not receive enough glory out of God's plan to satisfy their ambition?

THE POLICY OF THE "CHRISTIAN LEADER" ON THE COLLEGE AND OTHER QUESTIONS

While we are on this subject we might as well speak of this journal, too, which has lined up with the Bible colleges, where in fact it has always been. There are many hundreds of the readers of the Leader opposed to these human religious organizations, yet who can not but see that that journal favors these humanisms in which to glorify God instead of "the Church" alone. All the editors of the Leader are college advocates, and its publisher too. For many years it has advertized these hu-

man organizations to do work of the Church. Recently, F. L. Rowe, the publisher, said when he visited the David Lipscomb School, "The Lord indeed is blessing this institution." Those who push the Leader, or encourage those helping to divide the Church of God by helping push upon it a human organization to do work which Paul commands to be done "in the Church." (Eph. 3:21). It will not do to say, as some of the Leader people do, that there is no college in their community, that their congregation has never contributed to a Bible college, and that therefore nothing should be said on the subject. The Missionary society people said the same thing when they began to introduce their human organization to do work of the Church. The society men crept in, and did their work privately, and led off hundreds of churches in that way. The thing to have done would have been to keep such teachers out of the congregation. Can we not learn a lesson from the past? A college preacher may not say anything publicly at first in favor of his human organization to do work of the Church, but may do his work privately. In the course of time, however, the work will be done, and we shall be responsible for ever allowing such to get into the church,—we shall be "partakers with them in their evil deeds" of exalting another "body" when the Book says plainly that there is "one Body." If you wish "the pastor" and a clergy in general, then establish Bible colleges, for they have been a hot-bed of such in the past, and they are rapidly developing "the pastor" where they have great influence, as in the South. And the Leader continually fights us for contending for the "one Body" of the New Testament and against their other "body," the college.

Besides, the publisher of the Leader seems to have no scruples about literature which he gives to the people. His book by Thompson against official elders and deacons today, and his book on "Indictment of Eternal Torment," which denies the eternal punishment of the wicked, the immortality of the soul, and thus the divinity of Christ—show how he cares not for the brotherhood as a Christian publisher should.

Furthermore, the Leader never has paid much attention to church discipline. Almost any one can write for it, in good standing or not. Just one sample will be sufficient. A certain woman was excluded from a church on the charge of adultery, her companion in sin confessing. Her brother, a preacher, who was a warm friend of the Review and its principles, took the side of his sister and decried where he went the action of the church against her. The church brought charges against this preacher, and permitted him to choose, entirely his own judge (there were no elders in his home church). This judge whom this preacher alone himself selected, decided against him; then this preacher would not abide the decision of this judge whom

he alone selected to hear his case. The woman, evidently backed by her preacher brother, brought suit against those who tried to save the church from such immorality by publishing the case, and gave them all the expense and trouble they could. But now the case has been dismissed by this woman! And why? Evidently because she' does not care to go on the witness stand and face her companion in sin who was willing to testify against her! What a disgraceful affair—disgraceful, not really for the true people of God, but for that preacher who has upheld her and disgraceful for the publisher of the Christian Leader for opening its columns to this preacher, and for publishing and advertising a tract in an indirect defense of himself; disgraceful for T. S. Hutson for encouraging this preacher in the columns of the Leader under such circumstances; and disgraceful for J. C. McQuiddy for opening the columns of the Gospel Advocate for this preacher who upholds such evil conduct, to berate those contending for the purity of the Church of God. This preacher was a warm friend of the Review and its principles before this incident, and all the preachers stood with him; but now I do not know of a preacher who stands with him in such spiritual anarchy except a blind man who eats at his table and the Gospel Advocate and the Christian Leader. When men will . take up such doubtful characters in order to overthrow the anti-college brethren, they reveal a spirit which certainly can not be commended by the true people of God. I believe that Brethren McQuiddy, Rowe and others who have encouraged this preacher in upholding immorality in the Church of God will have to answer to God in the last great day for their encouragement of this wrong doing among Christians. But this is only a sample of the evil the Leader has encouraged. And opposition to such wrong doing and to these human plants of Bible colleges which the heavenly Father did not plant, it calls Sommerism.

CONCLUSION

No doubt the Review has made mistakes, for its managers and writers are made of imperfect clay. I would not endorse everything that has appeared in the paper, nor the spirit which has sometimes been displayed; I do not endorse everything I have done myself. But all of us should be trying each day to grow wiser and better. The reader can see, however, what are our grounds of contention against hobbyism and for the purity of the doctrine and the people of God, and for the Church alone in which to glorify Him. The twenty-five columns. of prejudice matter of J. C. McQuiddy which he published in the Advocate are from the pen of hobbyists, of. those who push human, organizations to do work of the Church, of a bachelor bishop (ten columns from him on "Sommerism"), of those who endorse voting in religious matters, and even from the pen of those who are upholding immoral characters in the Church—men and

women who are angry at us because we try to save the Church from all such evil ones.

We contend for the Word alone in matters of faith and practice, and we disclaim all responsibility for any division which may result from such contention. Who splits the log—the man who drives the wedge, or the man who says, "Don't drive it"? Who is causing the confusing in the churches—the man who introduces human organizations of Bible colleges, etc., or the man who says, "Don't bring them in?" It was not Moses who caused confusion in Israel when he came down from the mountain and rebuked and punished the people for their idolatry, but he that made and those who worshiped the golden calf. So it is not the Review and its sympathizers which is dividing the Church over the human organizations of Bible colleges to do work of the Church, but such men as McQuiddy, Love, Rowe, Showalter, Armstrong and their supporters who are trying to add this "body" of their own devising to the "one Body," the Church. If you are in favor of this "One Body" alone in which to glorify God, send \$1. 50 to Apostolic Review, 904 Udell St., Indianapolis, Ind., for a year's subscription and see for yourself more about this great plea. Humbly and prayerfully I submit this discussion and review to the candid reader for his careful perusal, with the hope that we all will remember that we must one day answer for the acceptance and advocacy of truth contained therein.—D. Austen Sommer.