

**Sommer**

&

**Srygley**

**Debate**

1927



The College Question

pressed: "We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law." (Verse 28.)

But to contend that man is not justified by *any law at all* is to *squarely* contradict Paul, who says we are justified "by a law of faith"—that is, acts of obedience which belong to and are produced by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Hence, we read of the "obedience of faith" by the same apostle: "Through whom we received grace and apostleship, unto obedience of faith among all the nations, for his name's sake." (Rom. 1: 5.)

The wrong "classification" of the command to be baptized has led many to *depreciate its importance*, assigning it to things termed "nonessential," while, in fact, baptism *stands in the same relation to faith and justification as does repentance*, because it is a part of "the law of faith" by which Paul declares we are justified.

## DEBATE ON THE COLLEGE QUESTION.

BY F. B. SRYGLEY.

Brother Daniel Sommer has at last decided that he has a proposition he can debate with me on the college and the religio-secular Apostolic Review question. He published again all that I had written on the question and led out in his debate with a two-page article. As the Gospel Advocate has one debate on hand, I am compelled to divide his long article and give only about half of it in this issue.

Brother Sommer introduced my article to his readers with the following: "In my preceding article on this subject in reply to F. B. Srygley I stated that I would meet him on his indefinite, evasive, illogical, and unjust proposition. Here it is: 'Brethren have the same right to found a school through which to teach the Bible that Benjamin Franklin had to found the Review through which to teach the Bible, and that brethren have the same right to teach the Bible in a school founded by man for this purpose that Brother Sommer has to teach the Bible through a newspaper founded by man for the same purpose.' Then I offered certain additional remarks and signed my name. F. B. Srygley answered after the manner indicated in the article that I now offer to the Review's readers, and I state that he drew a pen picture of himself with his own hand. The readers of this paper are kindly requested to consider my speech in response to him. Here is his article as published in the Advocate for March 10."

Following my article in the Review, Brother Sommer gave his readers this kind of a reply:

1. I don't indorse the expression, "teach the Bible." It is accommodative and misleading. One Alexander Hall wrote many years ago:

"Many read, I have often thought,  
To teach the Book instead of being taught."

I protest against that expression, though it is often used, I suppose, without evil intention. We should try to teach persons *in the Bible, in regard to the Bible, and by the Bible*. But in the strict meaning of the expression we *cannot teach the Bible*.

2. The Review was founded by Brother Benjamin Franklin as a journal in which to advocate what he and many others believed with reference to the Bible, and thereby *teach their readers*, but not to teach them chiefly, not even partly, with reference to secular learning. It was not a *religio-secular journal*, but was intended to be *strictly religious*, and was subject to the laws of the United States Government only as individual Christians were and as local congregations were.

3. But this has never been true of any *religio-secular college*. Such college competes in secular learning with the State schools in order to receive credit by the "Board of Education" in the State where such schools exist. Without such competition, all the colleges which have been established in the Southland, to the dividing of the churches of Christ, would soon go out of existence for want of pupils. *Young people would not go to the colleges wherein they could not get credits that would be acknowledged by the State*. And all talk of my opponent about not being

in favor of conferring "pompous degrees" is *against all the colleges that confer them*.

4. As the State furnishes or determines the course of study, and the books to be used, and the titles to be conferred in all the colleges now in controversy, while the church furnishes most or all of the money to erect and maintain the buildings for such colleges, also furnishes the teachers and a large majority of the pupils; therefore such colleges are a **POSITIVE UNITING OF THE CHURCH AND STATE, OR OF THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD!** This may be denied and argued against, may even be ridiculed, **BUT CANNOT BE ANNULLED!**

5. Such union of the church with the State is **JUDAISM**, for it is the union of church and State. The Jewish law was a combination of church and State, and the religio-secular colleges are a connecting link between them, even as those were guilty of making who tried to impose Jewish circumcision on Gentile churches. And this, according to Gal. 4: 21-31, is a uniting of the children of the bondwoman with the children of the freewoman. "Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." *My opponent seems disposed to hold to the bondwoman*.

6. The Jewish law was a *religio-secular arrangement*. The colleges now in controversy are a *religio-secular arrangement*. Paul said, **CAST OUT THE RELIGIO-SECULAR ARRANGEMENT! AND I SAY THE SAME**. My opponent favors such an arrangement, while I oppose it. The reader can judge who is right in this instance. My opponent does not believe in such an arrangement fully, but only partially. But even in this he is wrong, for an educational union of the church with the world, or a religious union of the church with the world, **IS A PHASE OF JUDAISM**, and to that extent is an indorsement of what the Holy Spirit condemned in the apostle Paul's writings on that subject.

7. The statement, "Brethren have the same right to found a school through which to teach the Bible that Benjamin Franklin had to found a paper to teach the Bible"—this is not a fair statement of the resemblances between the school and paper now under consideration. A fair statement would be this: *Brethren have the same right to found a school that is three-fourths or four-fifths secular, in which to teach persons in the Bible and compete with the State in regard to secular learning, that Benjamin Franklin had to found a paper that is strictly religious, except an incidental article, and which does not compete with the State in anything*.

8. Comparing objects which should be contrasted and contrasting what should be compared are common methods of erroneous reasoners. The colleges now in controversy and the Apostolic Review may be justly *contrasted*, but should not be *compared*. They do not belong to the same class of enterprises. The colleges are generally enterprises of begging from their beginning; but this was not true of the Review. The colleges are **NEARLY ALL SECULAR**; but this is *not true of the Review*. The colleges are **EXTRA ORGANIZATIONS** to teach persons in religion; but the Review is a *personal enterprise, without the semblance of an extra organization*. Such colleges and the journal known as "Apostolic Review" **ARE CONTRASTS IN ALL THEIR ESSENTIALS**. This may be denied and talked against, *but cannot be annulled or blotted out!* Those colleges have their literary societies, their social arrangements, their amateur theatricals, their games, and could not exist without such attachments, for students would not enter them if such attachments were ruled out or prohibited. The Review is free from everything of this sort, though it may occasionally offer a report of an incident that provokes a smile, even as we may find in the Bible.

"The Review was founded by Brother Benjamin Franklin." Then it was founded by man. But suppose Brother Benjamin Franklin had founded a school and a journal also, then the founder would have been the same; and if the founder of one is Scriptural, the founder of the other is, for they are both the same man.

The brother says: "The college now in controversy and the Apostolic Review may be justly contrasted, but should not be compared." Why not? The only reason I can see is, one Brother Sommer wants to defend, and the other he wants to oppose. I grant they are different in many respects. One is a school and the other is a journal, but they are both founded by man and are both liable to do wrong. I do not knowingly defend the wrong in either,

but I defend the right in both to teach the Bible to all they can.

The brother says of the Review: "It was not a religio-secular journal, but was intended to be strictly religious." I cannot say what it was intended to be, but I can tell what it is. It seems with our brother that anything religious that has anything secular in it is "religio-secular." I find in the same issue of the Review and from the same pen these words in capitals: "Send at least a thousand new names accompanied by a thousand dollars at an early date." That "thousand dollars" sounds a little secular to me. One of the Review's contributors wrote here to this office: "We do not believe it is right to beg the church for money to build a house and put in it a hired lot of teachers to teach the Bible along with other studies." Well, the Review charges one dollar and fifty cents per year to teach the Bible through it. But the college and the Review ought not to be compared, but contrasted! Where is the contrast here? But the brother says: "Such colleges compete with the State in secular learning." Learning to read, in order to read the Bible for one's self, may be secular learning, but it is very convenient, to say the least of it. I do not believe that God has required the Christian parent to turn his child over to the State to teach him whatever the State wants to teach him. I believe that it is the duty of the parent to teach his own children, if he is able to do so; and if not, he, at least, has the right to say what shall be taught to them.

My brother seems to think that because I defend the right of brethren to organize schools in which the Bible can be taught to their children while they are taught to read, that they may read the Bible for themselves and to others, that I am therefore bound to defend everything that all these schools do or say, whether I indorse it or not. With the same propriety I can say that because he defends his right to teach the Bible through a religious journal, he is therefore bound to defend everything that every religious journal in the country does or says.

Brother Sommer knows as well as I do that I do not defend schools as church institutions. The church of the New Testament is not manifested in any organic way except in the local congregation; and therefore the New Testament church could not own and operate a school or a journal, unless it were owned and operated by a local congregation. There is no congregation known to me that is trying to do this, and all this talk about religio-secular schools or newspapers amounts to nothing.

But everything secular, with Brother Sommer, that has any religion in it is the "bondwoman" and ought to be cast out. Can he not see that everything a Christian does should have Christianity connected with it somehow? But if this is true of institutions through which Christians work, is it not true of the individual Christian? And if it is, is not Brother Sommer himself a little religio-secular when he advocates Christians' voting, holding office in State affairs, and taking up arms and killing men in defense of the State? Speaking about mixing religion with the State, it does seem to me that Brother Daniel Sommer has it about as badly mixed as any one I know, and the "bondwoman ought to be cast out."

The brother is mistaken. I am not disposed to hold to the bondwoman. In my religious teaching I hold to the New Testament only, word for word, and in my secular affairs I try to follow the general teaching of the Bible and try to arrange my life accordingly. I think that the fact that these colleges have literary societies, their social arrangements, their amateur theaters, their games, and "could not exist without" them, proves that as organizations they are no part of the New Testament church, and I think also that the fact that the Apostolic Review was founded by man on a money basis proves that it is no part

of the New Testament church. The brethren who run these schools may be justly criticized for catering to the world, but this fact does not affect my contention that brethren have the same right to found a school through which the Bible can be taught that Benjamin Franklin had to found the Review through which it could be taught.

#### BOLES-BOLL DEBATE.

(Continued from page 463.)

God. Jerusalem or Palestine has no advantage over any other place. America has equal advantages with Judea. When Jews become Christians, then they will appreciate the fact that locality is not an essential element in Christian worship. The converted Jew will lose his desire for Jerusalem as a place of worship.

If the converted Jew should be restored as a nation to Palestine, what advantage will he have? What kind of government will the Jew adopt in Palestine? Will the converted Jew try to revive the old Jewish theocracy? As Christians, they cannot go back to the law of Moses; they cannot revive the priesthood of Aaron; they cannot rebuild the temple and restore animal sacrifice in worship without rejecting Christ as a sacrifice. What will Judea be to Jews without their ancient priesthood, their ancient temple and its imposing ceremonies? Every memory which now endears them to the promised land and to Jerusalem will have been destroyed by the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. Should the Jews as Christians return to Palestine, they will have become a new people, under entirely new laws and in a new institution which destroys the old law and old sacrifices and old institutions. No Scripture can be found which sustains such a position as converting the Jew to Christ and restoring him to the land of his fathers.

#### QUALIFICATIONS AND DUTIES OF ELDERS. No. 3.

BY J. G. ALLEN.

In two former articles I endeavored to stress the importance of letting the Bible settle every question that arises among us, and in this article I shall strive hard to do the same thing.

I know that many good men differ on many questions that arise among us; and they are honest in their differences. But there is one point upon which all agree: That is, where two or more differ on any doctrinal question, it is impossible for both to be Scriptural, hence impossible for both to be right. Both may be wrong, but both cannot be right, for the reason that the Bible reveals but one way.

As we all are agreed that the Bible is a complete revelation from God to man, we may then proceed in the study of the eldership question according to the divine rule as expressed in the Bible. Then, and not till then, will we all reach the same conclusion.

Language cannot be made plainer than the words the Holy Spirit used in setting forth the qualifications a man must possess before God will recognize him as an elder. And if God will not recognize him, then the question comes up, Who does?

For a man to contend that an old bachelor or any other man that lacks the qualifications that God named in 1 Tim. 3 and Tit. 1: 5-8 can be an elder is simply for him to place his wisdom above the wisdom of God. If not, why not? Then for one to insist on placing men in the eldership that do not measure up to God's standard, on the ground that God has not said that we should not, or because we have no one to-day that possesses the qualifications, is wickedly presumptuous and sinful. Both of the above reasons are equally absurd and are a subterfuge of the devil. Yes, the devil has made many good people believe that sprinkling is valid baptism on the ground that it is not forbidden. But we meet such a charge as that by insisting that God has spoken on the question of



Conducted for a half century by D. Lipscomb, E. G. Sewell,  
F. D. Srygley, and J. C. McQuiddy.

#### TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

\$2.00 a year, in advance; to Canada and foreign countries, \$2.50, in advance.

When changing your post-office address, tell us your old as well as your new address; otherwise, two papers might be charged to you.

The date on your tab shows the time to which your subscription is paid. When money is received, the date will be changed, which will answer for a receipt. Two weeks' time must ordinarily occur from the time your remittance is sent before the tab on your paper is changed; if not changed by that time, notify us at once.

Remittances will be at our risk when sent by express or post-office money order, in registered letter, or by draft payable to our order.

This paper is mailed regularly to all subscribers until definite orders in writing are received and all arrearages paid in full. If you wish us to stop your paper, write us to that effect; but do not ask it unless you have paid all arrearages, if there are any. Do not ask your postmaster to attend to it for you, but do it yourself.

Subscribers, after paying for their papers, will favor us by noting whether the date on the address label is changed, and, if it is not changed within a month, by writing to us. We are careful, but mistakes may occur or letters may be lost. Our rule is to change the date on the day payment is received; but the mechanical work of correcting and printing the list takes time, and payments even from near-by places may not appear the first week. Credits for payments from a distance may be even more delayed. Mistakes are easily rectified if prompt notice is given.

All communications should be addressed to Gospel Advocate, 110 Seventh Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.

Entered at post office at Nashville, Tenn., as second-class matter.  
Published weekly at Nashville, Tenn.

## EDITORIAL

### THE DISCUSSION CONTINUED.

BY F. B. SRYGLEY.

I here give some more of Brother Sommer's strange reasoning in support of his proposition that it is right to found and publish a newspaper through which to teach the Bible and wrong to found and operate a school for the same purpose.

9. And here is another unfair statement from my opponent: "Brethren have the same right to teach the Bible in a school founded by man for this purpose that Brother Sommer has to teach the Bible through a newspaper founded by man for the same purpose." I say this is *not a fair statement*, because the first plea made for the colleges now under consideration was that the State colleges were teaching pupils against the Bible—were perverting them by enforcing on them the so-called "higher criticism," and later the charge was made against them because of their doctrine of "evolution." But the pupils generally came from churches of Christ where they could be taught in the Bible, and no extra place was necessary to be established in which to teach them in the Bible. And this reminds me that in my skirmishes with B. F. Rhodes I plainly set forth this statement in my first speech at that time: "This is a discussion with reference to THE BIBLICAL RIGHT TO ESTABLISH AN INSTITUTION OF LEARNING WHICH IS CHIEFLY SECULAR, IN ORDER TO FURNISH AN OCCASION TO TEACH PUPILS IN THE BIBLE."

10. And here is the question between my opponent and me at this time. It is not a question of the right to teach persons in the Bible in a school building already established. But it is a question of the Biblical right to establish religio-secular schools—this means schools that are three-fourths or four-fifths, and perhaps nine-tenths, secular—IN ORDER TO FURNISH AN OCCASION TO TEACH PERSONS IN THE BIBLE. My opponent at this time might have learned what my position is if he had only read with care what I set forth twenty years

ago. And if he had learned that position, he might have saved himself from the mistakes he is now making.

11. Every one of the colleges now in controversy between my opponent and me implies that the meetinghouses and the homes of disciples of Christ ARE NOT SUFFICIENT TO TEACH YOUNG PERSONS IN THE BIBLE. This implication is as false as perverted human nature and even satanic ingenuity could suggest! Wherever a church of the New Testament order is established is the best place to teach persons in the Bible, and what is true of persons generally is true of children especially. Besides, it is certainly more economical, and more satisfactory for parents, to keep their children at home and send them to a home school than to send them away from home. And if young people wish a college education, let a college town be selected where a church of Christ is, and there let the State attend to the secular education and the church attend to the religious education. This is what is true with reference to scores of pupils, if not hundreds of them, each year in Bloomington, Ind., where a part of the State University is, and where two churches of Christ are.

It will be remembered that the Review has persistently called the brethren who teach the Bible in schools founded for that purpose "new digressives," while it calls those who use missionary societies and instrumental music "old digressives." I call his attention to the fact that the brethren started schools in which to teach the Bible long before they had missionary societies or instrumental music, either. I judge that Brother Sommer himself attended one of these schools before the missionary society or the instrument was extensively used. He went to Bethany College, which was founded by A. Campbell several years before the society was founded or the instrument was used. Surely the brother knows what "old" and "new" mean; but if he does, his religious journal he so faithfully defends does not use these words correctly.

The brother says I make an unfair statement when I say that "brethren have the same right to teach the Bible in a school founded by man for this purpose that Brother Sommer has to teach the Bible through a newspaper founded by man for the same purpose." I had not thought about the fairness of the statement; but I am concerned about its truthfulness, and it looks perfectly true to me. Brother Sommer says it is not fair "because the first plea made for the colleges now under consideration was that the State colleges were teaching pupils against the Bible." I am unable to see any *because* in that. It appears to me to be a very sound reason for Christians to establish schools in which the Bible is taught instead of patronizing schools where pupils are taught "against the Bible." I am unable to see why a school should be condemned for "furnishing an occasion to teach pupils in the Bible." I might be condemned for something else, but certainly not for that. And I am also unable to see why a Christian teacher should be condemned for using the occasion and teaching the Bible in the school. Even if it is true that the pupils generally come from churches of Christ to these schools, what bearing could that have on the question at issue?

The brother says: "It is not a question of the right to teach persons in the Bible in a school building already established." Then I suppose it is not wrong for a Christian to teach the Bible in a school already established. That lets me out, so far as my conduct is concerned, for I never established a school, but I did teach the Bible in one that was already established. I suppose, then, I have a clean bill of health from Brother Sommer. Now we ought to get along together. It will be remembered that I am not expected to prove that it is right to establish a school through which to teach the Bible, but I am to prove that the brethren have the same right to found a school through which to teach the Bible that Brother Benjamin Franklin had to found the Review for the same purpose.

The brother admits that the Review might be a little

secular, but it is not as secular as the Bible schools. He thinks the schools "are three-fourths or four-fifths, and perhaps nine-tenths, secular." How much of the secular can a paper or a school have before they get to be "religio-secular?" I have shown that the Review charges one dollar and fifty cents per year just like any other paper. If this is not secular, what is it? Publishing the Review is a business, like farming or teaching school. I think Christian brethren have a right to teach school and publish papers just as they have a right to farm; but all Christian business men should teach the Bible wherever they are. I do not believe it is right to try to saddle a newspaper on the churches any more than it is right for brethren to establish schools and saddle them off on the churches. Some school-teachers may feel that their schools are an essential adjunct to the church, just as some owners of papers may feel that their papers are essential to the church. I think some of the admirers of the Review feel that it is an essential adjunct of the church which Jesus built. In the Review of 1923, A. R. Moore, Kansas City, Mo., writes: "Without the Review, what would the churches do?" The editor says: "Can't we have more of these? Write them out and send them in for publication. This is real human stuff, interesting in a high degree, and should be a powerful incentive to urge our readers to greater efforts in spreading the Review circulation. What has the paper done for you or your friends? Let's hear of it." It will be noted that the brother asked the question, "Without the Review, what would the churches do?" And the editor says: "This is real human stuff." The church is religious; "human stuff" is either secular or human. Then, if the Review is not religio-secular, it is religio-human; and if a religio-secular college has no Biblical right to exist, neither has the Review.

The brother says: "Every one of the colleges now in controversy between my opponent and me implies that the meetinghouses and the homes of disciples of Christ are not sufficient to teach young persons in the Bible." Notwithstanding the brother says, "This implication is as false as perverted human nature and satanic ingenuity could suggest," I will say that the apostles and early Christians did not depend wholly upon meetinghouses and the homes of the disciples of Christ for places to teach and to speak the word. The angel of the Lord said to the apostles: "Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life. And when they heard that, they entered into the temple early in the morning, and taught." (Acts 5: 20, 21.) "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." (Acts 8: 4.) He says: "Wherever a church of the New Testament is established is the best place to teach the Bible." I say, wherever a Christian is, with an opportunity to teach the Bible, is the right place to teach it. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." I do not use the strong language of my brother and say that his effort to limit the teaching of the Bible to the meetinghouses and the homes of the disciples of Christ is "perverted human nature" or suggested by "satanic ingenuity," but I do say it is contrary to the teaching of the Holy Spirit.

#### A WORD OF COMMENDATION.

BY F. W. SMITH.

I wish to commend *most heartily* what Brother E. A. Elam had to say in our issue of May 12 about Brethren Lipscomb and Sewell.

While I do not believe any of the brethren who know of the great work done by the former editors of the Gospel Advocate would intentionally detract one *iota* from the *just* praise and *honor* due those saintly servants of God, yet there is danger of even those of us who knew and loved them so well for their work's sake writing and

speaking in a way to depreciate their great sacrifices and battles fought for the truth of God.

I am wholly *incapable* of expressing what Brethren Lipscomb and Sewell have been to me, with any adequate degree of justice, and any tendency whatever, either *intentionally* or *unintentionally*, to detract from the great work they did in the interest of the truth brings to me regret and sorrow.

#### MEN FOR THE TIMES.

It seems that in all the great crises of the world God has discovered and brought forward the very men needed to meet the great issues involved. In harmony with this feature of the divine administration of affairs, we can but conclude that God used the powers of Brethren Lipscomb and Sewell, which were so thoroughly consecrated to his service, for the maintenance of the purity of New Testament doctrine.

Those who lived not many years ago can recall the battle that waged between Brother Lipscomb and the *destructive* higher critics. He fought such men as Longan and Proctor, who were endeavoring to spread among the churches the *infidelity* derived from German philosophers, repudiating the miracles of the Bible and the truth of a divinely inspired revelation to man. It required the strength of an intellectual giant to cope with such men as Longan and Proctor, but Brother Lipscomb fully demonstrated his ability to meet the issue and rout the enemy from the field of conflict. Who will dare say that God was not using this man to accomplish that which no ordinary man could have done? God had endowed David Lipscomb with wonderful intellectual powers; and when he unreservedly consecrated those rich gifts to the service of God, he proved to be the right man in the right place to maintain the truth of God against mighty foes.

#### INNOVATIONS UPON THE CHURCH.

To stay the onswEEPing tide of human innovations upon the simplicity of the gospel, loading the church down with departures from the truth, God used Brethren Lipscomb and Sewell as, perhaps, he could not have used any other men at the time. Those men stood foursquare to every assault, and absorbed more abuse and ridicule, perhaps, than any men since the days of apostolic persecution.

#### DAVID LIPSCOMB CARICATURED.

Those "high up" in the councils of the departures from the New Testament represented David Lipscomb as an old woman with a broom attempting to sweep back the oncoming tide of ocean waves. They said that the societies had come to stay, and for one to oppose them was comparable to the old woman's trying to sweep back the waves. But none of these things moved God's man, and he kept on steadfastly hurling Heaven's thunderbolts of truth against the very citadel of human inventions, and God alone knows how many churches and individuals David Lipscomb saved from the wreck of human inventions, the departures from New Testament teaching. Some of his severest critics have lived to see the *wisdom* of the stand Brethren Lipscomb and Sewell took in such matters, and are now lamenting the sad situation which they assisted in bringing about.

#### WISHING TO BE RID OF SUCH MEN.

The prejudice was so strong against Lipscomb and Sewell because of their opposition to those innovations that, during a convention in the city of Nashville, when *seemingly* everything would be lovely but for such men, the writer heard with his own ears a very prominent society man say with much *feeling* and *emphasis*: "The society will not succeed in Tennessee until there are a few first-class funerals, and I would not be averse to attending said funerals." This meant, of course, that

with "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, meekness, self-control."

Much is said in the Ephesian letter about the temple of God—its foundation, its chief corner stone, the material of which it is built, and its purpose—"the habitation of God in the Spirit." The heart of each individual Christian is a temple of God, of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit; for Christ dwells in the heart through faith.

All the people of Ephesus and of all Asia were familiar with the temple of Diana, one of the seven wonders of the world. It was four hundred and twenty-five feet long, two hundred and twenty feet broad, surrounded, some say by one hundred and seven and others by one hundred and twenty marble columns, sixty feet high and less than four feet apart. Two or three temples like Solomon's, it is said, could stand within this colonnade. Within this temple was an image of the Ephesian goddess, which the idolaters claimed fell down from Jupiter. (See Acts 19: 23-36.) Two hundred and fifty years were spent in completing this wonderful piece of architecture. This was the most wonderful building of which these idolaters knew.

Contrast this with the church or temple of God. The temple of God is the "habitation of God in the Spirit;" its foundation is the unfathomable love of Christ; its height reaches unto heaven; its breadth embraces all the family of God in heaven and upon the earth; and its length reaches throughout eternity. Therefore, it can never be destroyed, but will stand forever.

Paul struck the temple and worship of Diana a mighty blow while he was in Ephesus, from which time her worship began to wane. In the course of time this grand and magnificent temple was not only plundered, but became buried twenty feet beneath the ruins of the city itself.

As the beauty and greatness of this heathen temple have faded and it has crumbled into dust, the glory of the church has increased,

"Fair as the moon,  
Clear as the sun,  
Terrible as an army with banners."

"Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto him be the glory in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations forever and ever. Amen."

#### THE BIBLE COLLEGE AND THE REVIEW, AGAIN.

BY F. B. SRYGLEY.

It will be remembered that Brother Daniel Sommer has been trying to prove that the Review founded by man through which to teach the Bible is right, while Bible colleges founded by man for the same purpose are wrong. Owing to the length of his last article, I was compelled to divide it, and I now give to the readers of the Gospel Advocate the last of his article:

12. Before ending this article I copy one wish from my opponent. Near the close of his article to which I am replying he stated: "I do wish Brother Sommer would stop lending the influence of the Review to dividing churches over the question of teaching the Bible in schools." I resent that wish as based on a false foundation and as strictly incorrect! But it is the kind of wish that innovators generally have expressed directly or indirectly concerning me and the Review, while they are the ones that have been diligent in dividing churches over musical instruments and certain other devices. But this is not all. I may safely say to my opponent, "Thou art the man!" For I am here in Long Beach, Cal., at the time of this writing. And this is the place where the church has lately been divided over the college by the persistence of one D. R. Dial, formerly of Mangum, Okla. He was full of the college idea, and persisted in advocating it till he deceived a young preacher that is here, named Ernest Beam, and as a result the church here is divided and the cause of Christ again disgraced by

division contrary to the doctrine of Christ. I have his article in the Gospel Advocate for December 30, 1926, before me, under the heading, "Rid of a Hobby." And this is a sample of what innovators have been doing for the last seventy or eighty years among the churches of Christ. *Don't tell me that this is not true!* I have been an eye and ear witness to the spirit of innovationism and its insidious operations for about fifty years, and the disposition of those that contend for the musical instruments and missionary society, and those that contend for the colleges now under consideration, IS THE SAME INSIDIOUS AND DIVISIVE DISPOSITION AT ALL TIMES!

My respondent does not seem to like the use of big capitals. I use them with the hope of attracting his eyes so that he will give due attention to at least a part of what I offer to him. And now I express a wish. I could wish with all my heart that Brother Srygley would read *with care* what I have offered to him, and consider it in view of the Final Judgment. I could wish also that he would read *with care* my several publications on the college question. Then I think he would know too much to write to me and my friends after this unhandsome manner: "Stop your kicking, brethren, and go to work teaching the Bible in every place you can." This implies that we are not doing what we can to teach persons in the Bible. I am now, in consequence of the division caused here by collegeites, teaching and preaching in the auditorium of the Lincoln School Building in the city of Long Beach, Cal. And this is not the only time I have spoken in a secular school building and tried to teach persons in the word of God in such a building.

And here is another wish. I could wish with all my heart that my opponent would never again write nor otherwise express this sentence: "Such a religious denomination as the Methodist Church has a right to exist." I don't think he believes it, except that it has a constitutional or civil right to exist. Yet he made the statement in the article to which I am replying. Then in his conclusion he inserted the word "Scriptural," which is not in either of his premises! This is a violation of logic, and I think he knows it. Logic requires that the minor premise must not have in it more than the major premise, and that the conclusion must not have in it more than is in the premises! Yet F. B. Srygley has put the word "Scriptural" in his conclusion *without having it in either of his premises!* And what is strictly untrue is his statement, "It will be noted that this last syllogism is exactly like his, only I have substituted the Methodist Church for the Review and John Wesley for Benjamin Franklin." I DENY IT! Here is my major premise or first proposition: "Such a religious journal as the Review has a Scriptural right to exist." Here is his: "Such a religious denomination as the Methodist Church has a right to exist." I said "a Scriptural right;" he says "a right," and yet says "this last syllogism is exactly like his." I DENY IT! And the reader can see that my denial will remain. He inserted the word "Scriptural" in his conclusion without having it in either of his premises, which is a violation of logic, and then says his syllogism is exactly like mine. This is horrible! DANIEL SOMMER.

The brother copies from me the wish that he "would stop lending the influence of the Review to dividing churches over the question of teaching the Bible in schools." Of that the brother says: "I resent that wish as based on a false foundation and as strictly incorrect! But it is the kind of a wish that innovators generally have expressed." I resent that answer. But it is the kind of an answer that the Review generally has expressed. When it cannot answer one's argument, it generally calls him an "innovator" or a "new digressive," as though that answers everything. It seems that any one who dares to differ with the Review is an "innovator" or a "new digressive." I have been called names so much that it does not stop me.

I can see very well how the introduction of an organ into the worship would force a man who was conscientiously opposed to the use of the organ out of a congregation, because he would be compelled, in worshiping God, to take part in something which he believed to be wrong. But what wrong would Brother Sommer be doing to worship with Brother D. R. Dial at Long Beach, Cal., because Brother Dial deceived a young preacher by the name of Ernest Beam? Brother Dial did not intend to deceive.

No doubt he thought that one had the right to study the Bible in a Bible college. He was not asking Brother Sommer to attend a Bible school or found one. Then what right did Brother Sommer have to take up a few of his friends and admirers and start up an opposition church in Long Beach? Brother Sommer (!) did not divide the church at Long Beach, but he did "attend Brother Larimore's meeting one night and got fourteen that would stand by him, and preached to them the next night." Why did he not back Larimore up? Larimore was preaching the gospel and not trying to found a religio-secular college or a religio-secular Review, either. Any one who dares to disagree with Brother Sommer or the Review has "the same insidious and divisive disposition at all times," in his estimation.

The brother complains that I addressed him and his friends in an unhandsome way as "kicking mules." He is the one that introduced the farmer's mule that strained himself kicking at nothing, and because I saw fit to make use of his mule he blamed me with the whole thing. No, my brother; it is your mule; and if it is unhandsome, you are to blame for it. I only used your mule a little. Why do you introduce unhandsome things in this controversy and then blame me with it?

I thought it was strange that the brother would concede in the first part of his article that I was right in teaching the Bible in a Bible college, but that the wrong was in founding them. But now I can see why he made the concession. In his own words I give you his reason for giving up half of his proposition: "I am now . . . teaching and preaching in the auditorium of the Lincoln School Building in the city of Long Beach, Cal." I reckon those who went to hear the brother teach and preach in a secular school building studied or learned the Bible while he was teaching in the Bible, and still he and his little company had left the church because some one believed he could teach the Bible and be taught it in a building built by Christian people for the purpose of teaching the Bible and other useful things not forbidden in the word of God. I think Brother Sommer and the Review have about lost the issue.

I will accept the brother's wish, and never again will I express the erroneous conclusion forced upon me by his logic: "Such a religious denomination as the Methodist Church has a right to exist." It was his logic that forced that conclusion; and I thought that as he and I both admitted that the Methodist denomination had no Scriptural right to exist, he would certainly be able to see the fault in his logic.

But he says I left one word out of my proposition. If I did, it was an oversight in me. His major premise was: "Such a religious journal as the Review has a Scriptural right to exist." This premise assumes the controversy; and if he will give me that assumption, I can prove that anything in this world is Scriptural. Still he thinks that he has proved by his syllogism that the Review is a Scriptural institution. This is pathetic.

I like Brother Sommer, and I want him to be prepared for the glory world, but he should cultivate a little more forbearance toward his brethren whom he believes to be in error on the question of "religio-secular colleges" and newspapers. He should remember that he attended one of these colleges and never learned for years and years that it was wrong; and that he conducted schools or "Bible readings" for years before he learned that it was wrong; and that some of the Review friends are still running these reading schools and are not opposed by the Review. I hope he will also remember that in the first part of this article he seemed to think that the meetinghouses and homes of the disciples were enough to teach the Bible in, and in the latter part he found himself

teaching and preaching in a secular school building. Be patient with us, brother, and give us time to get out of our errors. I believe we are about as liable to get out of our entanglements as he is to get entirely out of his.

If these three replies of mine appear in the Review, I shall be glad to allow him to explain himself in the Gospel Advocate.

#### HOW GOD NOW SPEAKS TO MAN.

(Sermon preached by S. H. Hall in a revival at Port Arthur, Texas, as reported in the Port Arthur News.)

In the first and second verses of the first chapter of Hebrews we have these words: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds."

From this Scripture we learn that *God has spoken*. We not only learn that he has done this, but we learn to whom he has spoken and through whom he has spoken. It declares that God spoke unto the fathers through the prophets, but that this same God has spoken unto us through his Son. It should be remembered that God has no message for us directly through those prophets, nor did God speak to the fathers through his Son. Just let the grand old Book speak, and let that end all controversy. One of the great causes of confusion in the religious world to-day is that teachers of the Bible pay no attention whatever to the plain-as-day instruction in 2 Tim. 2: 15, where we have this command: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

Here we have the command to *study*, but we are told how to study and teach Jehovah's word. We must "rightly divide" it, or, as the American Revised Version gives it, "handle aright the word of truth." No teacher is doing this that fails to recognize the difference in the messages given unto the fathers through the prophets and the message God gives us through his Son. The message he gave to the fathers through the prophets come to us only in an indirect way, but applied to the fathers directly. The message that has direct application to us comes through his Son. If we to-day want to learn what to do to be saved, we must let Christ talk to us, for God speaks to us only through him. If we want to learn what God wanted our fathers to do in their day, we must go to the Old Testament and see what he said to them through the prophets. We cannot learn what to do to be saved from the prophets of the Old Testament, nor through them how to work and worship in the church. All of this we must learn by listening to what our Lord says. I am safe in saying that not one word does Jehovah speak to us to-day with direct application to what we must do to be saved, except what he says through his Son.

Here it would be well to exemplify the point, that there be no misunderstanding. Suppose a man should come to me to-night and say: "Brother Hall, I have sinned, and I want to know how to obtain the remission of my sins." Well, I answer by turning to what Jehovah said to the fathers in Old Testament days through his prophets back there, and say to him: "You shall bring your trespass offering unto the Lord, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, even a ram for a trespass offering. And the priest shall make an atonement for you with the ram of the trespass offering before the Lord for your sin which you have done: and the sin which you have done shall be forgiven you." I say, if I should so answer, how many in this audience would say that I answered correctly? Most certainly you all would know that I answered incorrectly. I have taken what Jehovah said to the fathers through his prophets about the sin of adultery

(Continued on page 520.)



Conducted for a half century by D. Lipscomb, E. G. Sewell,  
F. D. Srygley, and J. C. McQuiddy.

#### TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

\$2.00 a year, in advance; to Canada and foreign countries, \$2.50, in advance.

Remittances will be at our risk when sent by express or post-office money order, in registered letter, or by draft payable to our order.

When changing your post-office address, tell us your old as well as your new address; otherwise, two papers might be charged to you.

This paper is mailed regularly to all subscribers until definite orders in writing are received and all arrearages paid in full. If you wish us to stop your paper, write us to that effect; but do not ask it unless you have paid all arrears, if there are any. Do not ask your postmaster to attend to it for you, but do it yourself.

Subscribers, after paying for their papers, will favor us by noting whether the date on the address label is changed, and, if it is not changed within a month, by writing to us. We are careful, but mistakes may occur or letters may be lost. Our rule is to change the date on the day payment is received; but the mechanical work of correcting and printing the list takes time, and payments even from near-by places may not appear the first week. Credits for payments from a distance may be even more delayed. Mistakes are easily rectified if prompt notice is given.

The date on your tab shows the time to which your subscription is paid. When money is received, the date will be changed, which will answer for a receipt. Two weeks' time must ordinarily occur from the time your remittance is sent before the tab on your paper is changed; if not changed by that time, notify us at once.

All communications should be addressed to **Gospel Advocate**, 110 Seventh Avenue, North, Nashville, Tenn.

Entered at post office at Nashville, Tenn., as second-class matter.  
Published weekly at Nashville, Tenn.

## EDITORIAL

### GREETINGS FROM THE GOLDEN GATE.

BY T. B. LARIMORE.

#### THE CHURCH OF CHRIST BY THE GOLDEN GATE, AGAIN.

Having, last week, made an appeal to all my friends everywhere, requesting each and every one of them to send me a birthday contribution, little or much, to help build a meetinghouse in Berkeley, beautiful Berkeley by the bay, a work so near and so dear to my heart, a few additional words seem to be necessary, are certainly proper, that every man, woman, boy, girl, to whom that appeal was made, may clearly understand the situation.

The important and pressing need of a meetinghouse here: In the East Bay Cities, as they are called—Alameda, Oakland, Berkeley, Albany, El Cerito, Richmond—there are approximately half a million people, and our membership is drawn from all these places, there being no church of Christ in all this populous territory except our little band of about seventy, now meeting in the Berkeley Y. M. C. A. Building. We want to build in Berkeley, that being about the central point of our membership. The University of California, recently adjudged the largest university in the world, is in Berkeley, and our meetinghouse will be near enough to the university to enable all the university students who will to attend our services. This, we think, affords us a wonderful opportunity to do great good, especially so as we have one member—a good one—on the teaching force of the university. He can teach Latin, Greek, English, and I know not what else, except the Bible, and we know he teaches that regularly and satisfactorily in our Sunday school.

Our lot will cost us, including all items connected with

the transfer, about three thousand dollars. It is a corner lot, fifty by one hundred feet, and is the very lot on which to build the meetinghouse we—and that "we" includes us and all our friends everywhere—hope, by the grace of God, to build in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and twenty-seven. I believe my desire for all my friends together to help us build the house of which I write is an unselfish desire, for all of us know I have but few more days or years at most in which to enjoy it, and may not live to see it built, notwithstanding, so far as I know, I have never enjoyed better health than I am enjoying to-day. So, I neither murmur nor complain, but thank God, take courage, and press my plea.

We expect to build a neat, comfortable, commodious house, in keeping with its general surroundings, spending what we spend for comfort and convenience, not a cent for show. The house must be in keeping with its surroundings, however, as otherwise we could not secure the consent of the Berkeley Zoning Commission to build it, regulations governing the erection of buildings in Berkeley being very strict. The lot is in a good neighborhood; and when our house is built, it will be surrounded by plain, substantial people, who, we believe, will be interested in our work, and many of whom we hope to teach the word of the Lord effectively.

I will see that the deed is so written as to properly, hence perfectly, protect the property.

We have no rich people in our congregation. It is a church of honest, intelligent toilers, very few of them owning a home. In that respect, at least, they are as was our Savior, who said: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." He had no home. Notwithstanding their lack of riches, however, when a call was made a few weeks ago, as I told you last week, for pledges to the building fund, within twenty minutes promises were made amounting to four thousand six hundred dollars. But we shall need more than that, much more than that, to buy the lot and build our house, of course.

Some may think we should not try to build under such circumstances, but we cannot succeed in our struggle to save souls situated as we now are. Moreover, the way is clear, and we have the name: The Church of Christ by The Golden Gate!

I do hope and pray that every friend I have on earth will gladly, promptly, and helpfully respond to my recent call and this reminder, coming, as it does, from the borderland of the boundless Beyond—respond with a contribution, little or much, about the time previously suggested—about July 10, 1927—my eighty-fourth birthday. God will get the glory, man will get the good, and I am sure my friends will be glad to make me glad by contributing to a work the hallowed influences of which may reach "from the rivers to the ends of the earth."

So mote it be.

### THE REVIEW'S CONVENTION, AGAIN.

BY F. B. SRYGLEY.

Under "Office Notes" the Apostolic Review talks about me in these beautiful (?) words:

Brother "Wigley," of the Gospel Advocate, comes out in nearly two pages against "my" conference. It must be mine, for he says it's not in the New Testament and no one else seems to want it. All right, I'll take it and keep it to myself and say no more about it, and make an apology to the real churches of Christ (not the "Bible college" churches) for ever bringing it up. He asks why I don't come out like a man and admit I was wrong about it. Now, anything that's "manly" in me ought to be "manly" in Wigley. Why don't you come out like a man and admit that you're wrong on the "college" business? Don't tell us you don't defend "Bible colleges," for no one will believe you. And when you quote this Scripture, as you did—"And ye are complete in him"—and make it apply to "my" conference, and can't see that it will

JUNE 20, 1927. June 23, 1927. GOSPEL ADVOCATE. Gospel Advocate 587

also wipe your "Bible college" off the map, you can't blame your "wiggling" on me.

When he makes the statement, "It must be mine, for he says it's not in the New Testament," does he mean that there is any doubt about its not being in there? I showed that the passage he used to prove that a convention of uninspired men is right was not applicable, and he offers no other. It will be noted that he adds to this statement, "and no one else seems to want it." What does that have to do with his decision? He certainly does not mean that he would favor the convention if others wanted it, whether it is in the New Testament or not. He says he will take it and keep it to himself and "say no more about it." That is what he ought to have done before he put it in his paper. The last half of this sentence seems to me to contradict the first—"and make an apology to the real churches of Christ." How can he make an apology without saying something about it?

But he is to make an apology to "real churches of Christ." Does Christ have any churches that are not *real churches*? These unreal churches of Christ, according to my beloved friend, are "'Bible college' churches." The church I belong to is not a "Bible college" church, neither is it an Apostolic Review church. No doubt there are some members in many of the churches that feel that brethren have the same right to establish a school through which the Bible can be taught that Benjamin Franklin had to establish the Review through which to teach the Bible. To be perfectly frank with my dear friend, I am willing to confess that I believe they have the same right, though I have never established one.

Yes, I am willing to admit that anything that would be manly in him would be manly in me; and if I have tried to defend a school as a church school, owned and controlled by the church, I am sorry for it, and I ask my brother and his Review church to forgive me.

The brother tries to dictate to me what I shall not tell when he says: "Don't tell us you don't defend 'Bible colleges,' for no one will believe you." How does he know that *no one* will believe me? I have never had a Bible-college teacher to talk to me that way. When I undertake to tell the truth, I do not stop to consider who will believe me. A great many people did not believe Christ, but that was worse for them. I do say that I do not defend Bible colleges as church-owned and church-operated schools. I defend them only as individual enterprises just as I defend newspapers. I defend the teaching of the Bible in schools and in newspapers. When I quote that passage, "And ye are complete in him," I think it leaves the Bible college out as a part of the church, and it leaves the Review out also. Whether you believe me or not, you shall not get away from this issue. Your lack of dignity and brotherly kindness shall not move me from the issue. Brethren have the same right to found a school through which to teach the Bible that Brother Franklin had to found the Review for the same purpose, and I have the same right to teach the Bible through a school that C. W. Sommer has to teach it through the Apostolic Review.

Further along in these "Notes" the brother says: "They've divided church after church over their college, which can't show anything that looks like a Scriptural reason for its existence." I can show the same reason for its existence that C. W. Sommer can for the existence of the Apostolic Review; and as for dividing churches, I see no reason for those who accept the position of the Review leaving a church because some in the church believe they have the right to attend a Bible college. It would not injure these brethren even if it were wrong. No one asks them to believe it or to patronize a Bible college. Their faith or conduct is not involved in the least.

No, beloved, it is not a question of your doctrine or

practice. The Review lent its influence to a division in Brookport, Ill., and it was purely a question over the preacher. I quote from a letter written to me from Brookport, January 6, 1927:

W. G. Roberts is now holding a meeting for the faction here. I attended their meeting three nights, and I had Roberts to spend the day with me yesterday. Had a good talk with him. I found him like all of the other Sommer-faction preachers. Here is what he told me: "There is no difference between you brethren, and I cannot see why you cannot unite. All you brethren will have to do is just keep the college preachers away and have nothing to do with them." I said: "Brother Roberts, it may be all right for you to teach against the college; but when you tell us we must keep the college preachers away to have union, I cannot and will not submit to such unreasonable demands."

This letter is signed by E. S. Kerr. Now you have it. The church must be dictated to by these Review preachers in order to have union with them, and still I am dividing churches! No difference in doctrine or practice, but it all depends on where you get the preacher. Those they call "college preachers," many of them, never say a word about the college, much less try to get one of them to patronize a college, but still they must have a Review preacher or be branded as dividing the church. I consider this a serious matter, and your lack of politeness will not deter me from trying to point it out to you.

Following this statement my critic says: "And now you try to wiggle out of the whole rotten mess by saying that you have no schools, and therefore have none to defend. You really don't expect any one to believe that, do you, Wigley? Why, the Gospel Advocate would throw you out the next issue if they believed it." The Advocate fully understands my position and gives me credit for being sincere. Any one can accuse a man of falsehood, but it is a different proposition to prove it. Why would I misrepresent my position? I have had several discussions in my life, and I have always noticed that when a man cannot answer me, he abuses me. That does not get you anywhere, brother. If I had a school, it could easily be proved. Why does he not prove it instead of abusing me and accusing me of being a hypocrite? There is an old saying that "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." This weakens Brother Sommer's contention.

The brother begins another note in these words: "Brother Srygley takes up Brother Michael's letter and messes it all up, misses the point, and then asks me to answer a question that he frames up that isn't there, and then accuses me of sidetracking." Why did he not give his readers what I said about Brother Michael's letter and let them see whether I had messed it up and missed the point or not? I felt sure I could not have misunderstood Brother Michael, and I know I had no desire to misrepresent him. I wrote Brother Michael a letter and asked him if I misunderstood him or in any way misrepresented him, and I received the following reply:

Pittsburgh, Pa., 425 Cedarhurst Street, June 9, 1927.—Mr. F. B. Srygley, Nashville, Tenn.—Dear Brother: Yours of June 2, 1927, to hand this day and contents noted. After reading both of your comments on my letter to the Apostolic Review, it seems to me that you understand my position very well in regards to the conference; therefore, you did not misrepresent me.

I don't understand how Brethren C. W. Sommer and Kirby et al. can call for a conference and at the same time claim to be apostolic. Surely that would be "messing things up" (whatever that is) for the elders of the churches of Christ to have a conference. I am watching the Apostolic Review very close now, for it seems to me that Brethren Kirby and Sommer et al. will tell the brotherhood that they had a fancy idea and it exploded.

Fraternally, CHARLES J. MICHAEL.

It seems to me that while apologizing to the *real*

churches of Christ for proposing an unscriptural convention, he ought to apologize to Brother Michael and me for misrepresenting us. He does not appear to understand us any better than he does the Bible. I asked his father, Brother Daniel Sommer, if he indorsed the Apostolic Review in favoring a call for a convention of elders.

#### RELIGIOUS PUBLICATIONS.

BY F. W. SMITH.

The ostensible purpose of publishing religious papers is to teach the truth as it is revealed in the holy Oracles, and unless such papers meet this demand they are unworthy the esteem and patronage of the public.

#### AN UNREASONABLE OBJECTION.

It is sometimes urged that people have the Bible, containing the full revelation of God to man, and why, then, should we have religious papers? The same objection could be made against living preachers with fully as much reason, and yet those who object to the papers do not hesitate to *hear* preachers and even *give their money* in support of them. The religious paper does for the eye exactly what the preacher does for the ear; and if one is wrong, it does not require a Solomon, nor the son of a Solomon, to see that the other is also wrong.

#### HOW CAN RELIGIOUS PAPERS RUN?

Good will is a fine thing in so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough in the publication of a paper unless it leads one to support the paper by subscribing for it. A paper can no more be maintained simply on "good will" than a horse can pull a plow on wind and water. You must put oats, corn, and hay to a horse if you expect service from that animal, and, likewise, you must give to a paper your *financial* aid if you expect it to live.

Religious papers are the most difficult of all publications to maintain because of their limited circulation and the lack of friends to increase their subscription lists. This is a *fact* whether it should be so or not.

#### ADVERTISING MEDIUMS.

Some object to advertisements in religious papers; but if it were not for the revenue from that source, very few religious papers could run at all.

The Saturday Evening Post, while not a religious paper, yet with the largest subscription list of any paper in the land, could not exist without the revenue from advertising.

Quoting from an exchange, we have the following:

The Southern Baptist Church is noted for its denominational loyalty. Above most communions does it seek to provide honestly for its own house. No religious body in America is more intensely evangelistic than Baptists, and an evangelistic church is interested in reading the news of the kingdom. And yet—but the story hangs on that "yet," so it must not appear too early.

These Southern Baptists have made a survey of their denominational papers, and they are trying to open the eyes of their people to a startling situation.

#### FEWER THAN ONE-THIRD OF THE BAPTIST HOMES TAKE ANY BAPTIST PAPER.

The cost of publishing Baptist papers has increased two hundred per cent since 1910, while the subscription price has remained the same as it was then. The subscription price per paper is \$2, and the survey reveals that the cost of production is \$2.41. The other source of income is advertising. And here is another surprise. Commercial advertising has dropped off to an alarming extent. The reason? Well, religious papers are actually the best advertising mediums on earth; but advertising experts, receiving much publicity themselves in daily papers, advise business men to avoid "class" publication, and religious journals come under that head. Altogether it is not surprising to learn that the group of Southern Baptist papers ended the year 1926 with a deficit of \$20,578.24

merely to excite sympathetic cooperation with the excellent journals of our religious neighbors. We wish them every prosperity, but we tell their story for selfish reasons. We hope that it will cause our own brethren to take an inward look.

#### WHAT OF YOUR OWN CHRISTIAN COURIER?

Have you thought of its problems? Do you bear in mind that the price of subscription to none of our own journals pays the cost of production? Some thoughtlessly speak of how much Saturday Evening Post they can get for a nickel, not knowing that this great magazine gets from \$7,000 to \$12,000 per page for its advertising, \$17,000 for its double center page, per week. A hundred pages a week at an average of \$8,000 per page is \$800,000 per issue for advertising. That is why they can sell it for 5 cents when it costs from 12 cents to 15 cents to produce it. Give us \$800,000 for advertising space in a single issue of the Courier and we would be willing to pay the brethren a dollar apiece to go to the post office after it!

Some, I fear, have a wrong conception about the financial status of the Gospel Advocate, which is probably the reason they object to its advertising. Now, not one of the editors of the Advocate receives a *penny* for the work he does on the paper. They give their time and labor simply for the sake of teaching the word of God through its columns, and most certainly it is not asking *too much* of others to take the paper and read it, thus contributing to its support.

Many homes are supplied with what are called "secular" papers that cost five or six dollars a year, and yet they cannot afford (?) a religious paper that costs only two dollars per year! Something is *wrong somewhere*; and if it is with the religious paper, it should be clearly pointed out.

#### AN INCONSISTENT ATTITUDE.

Strangely enough, some object to religious papers as being *controversial*, while at the same time seemingly unaware of the fact that the Bible itself is the most *controversial* book that has ever been written. Hence, if religious papers are to be rejected on *that ground*, so must the Bible be rejected on the *same ground*.

But when controversies in religious papers assume the nature of *bitter personalities*, they are unfortunate and should be condemned by all right-thinking people. However, the mere fact of pointing out the religious errors of men or religious denominations, even calling the names of the men or denominations, should not be condemned, for both Christ and the apostles did that very thing time and again.

If a woman is married to a man who differs from her religiously, and a paper comes to her home pointing out clearly the errors of her husband, she should be anxious for him to see the truth. But, unfortunately, this is not always the case, and very frequently such women complain that they are afraid to let their husbands read such papers.

#### THE WRONG OF MISJUDGING.

No one should contend for anything that he does not *firmly believe* to be the truth; and in thus believing, he should contend with an *earnestness* and *firmness* born of honest convictions. Such contention may be, and doubtless often is, *erroneously* considered as "unkind" and "unchristian." Who can read the Bible without being deeply impressed with the *firm* and *positive* manner in which it condemns sin and all false doctrines? Hence, the mere fact of either a writer or speaker using "plain" and "positive" language in opposition to others is no evidence of a bad spirit. Such a conclusion would condemn Jesus Christ and his apostles.

#### NOT A BEGGING PROPOSITION.



