

A WRITTEN DISCUSSION

ON THE

SUNDAY SCHOOL CLASS QUESTION

Between

P. Watson, of Cookeville, Tenn., R. 9

And

O. H. Tallman, of Cookeville, Tenn.

With

An Appendix

THIS BOOKLET

Here I come, a little Missive, Born nineteen thirty-one: I have a mission to fulfill, My work has just begun.

My mission is to hold up truth And error side by side; That all may see and turn from error, And in the truth abide.

Then do not rudely cast me down, But carefully read me through; And you'll be able then to judge, Between the false and true.

PREFACE

Remember, friends, what truth relates,

One side is wrong in all debates:

Both sides cannot be right, we know,

'Twould be absurd to claim it so.

Why should this booklet be brought out and cast forth upon the bosom of the Mighty Expanse and borne onward by the restless waves of the troubled Seas, when there are already afloat innumerable books, journals, periodicals, tracts and leaflets of divers kinds and descriptions?

Seeing the world is being flooded already with millions of various sorts of literature, is there a good reason for publishing and sending forth this discussion? Will it be read? And indeed is there any good that comes of discussion? Evidently there is. It is universally admitted in the literary world that, all the great and good laws of every civilized land have been established through discussion. And it is also admitted that honorable discussion is a powerful means of bringing truth to light, and of exposing and dethroning error.

In the fifteenth chapter of Acts we have a divine precedent for public discussion when things unauthorized are introduced and urged upon the brethren and churches. In this instance the issue was over circumcision, the loyal brethren opposing it. The innovation was thoroughly discussed, having been begun at Antioch, and then transferred to Jerusalem where it was again discussed to the finish, and finally settled by the apostles and elders, the highest tribunal on earth.

And, following the divine example, we must bring every question of difference up to the apostles for final decision and settlement. Their word must be final. And remember, kind reader, that all our differences arise over what uninspired men say, and not over what the Bible says—authorizes or commands.

The peculiar circumstances leading to this discussion, and why it begins with the list of Questions instead of a formulated proposition signed by each of us, the reader will find explained in the body of the work. The proposition is contained in the questions. And the issue is,

Whether the Sunday school class system of teaching be divinely authorized and recorded in the New Testament Scriptures. This, O. H. Tallman affirmed, and J. P. Watson denied.

How well Brother Tallman has succeeded, or how completely he has failed, in his effort to prove his proposition is here left to the readers to judge for themselves. And all I ask of you, kind reader, is a careful, thoughtful, impartial reading, and a prayerful consideration of all that has been said on both sides, viewed in the light of all the scriptures cited, and others on the subject.

That Brother Tallman understood from the beginning of this discussion that it was intended for publication, he is here permitted to testify to this fact in his own words.

In a (personal) letter (May 5, 1931), responding to my request (May 4, 1931), that he help on the publication and share equally with me the tracts, Brother Tallman said:

"When this discussion began I hoped that you were an honorable debater and would do your part in giving the people a high-class discussion that all thoughtful, intelligent people would be glad to read when printed. And if you had not utterly failed on your part I would have gladly stood for half the printing expenses," etc.

Thus Brother Tallman bears witness to the fact that, "When this discussion began," he understood that it was intended for publication, and to be distributed for the people to read. Why then does he persistently refuse to bear his part in the publication since the discussion has been finished? This is significant. Whether such bespeaks an utter failure on my part, or on Brother Tallman's part, is left for the readers to judge for themselves.

As the reader doubtless will notice, the word Bible begins with the small letter (b) instead of the capital

(B) in so many places in Brother Tallman's part of this discussion that it appears to have been so written designedly, and not through mistake or accident. Hence I requested of my printer that he retain the small letter (b) in every instance where it beings the word, thus, "bible" in Brother Tallman's manuscripts and in all quotations made therefrom.

He may have a reason for so writing the word. I, therefore, think it fair and just toward my Brother to allow him the benefit of his new rule of writing the word, thus, "bible."

However, the established rule in the Biblical scholarship of the world is, to always begin the word Bible with a capital wherever it refers to the inspired Scriptures, its being a title of the sacred volume.

The numerous page reference numbers appearing in the manuscripts of this discussion are all exchanged for the page numbers in this book. This change became necessary on transferring this discussion from the manuscript to book form, seeing the pages of the manuscript do not correspond to the pages of the book.

However, as I requested of my printer, no change is made in construction or meaning of any sentence, neither in Brother Tallman's writings nor mine. If any such change be found, be assured that it is only through mistake, and not intended.

It grieves my heart this fact to know— My brethren are divided so: Yet Christ, our Lord, Jehovah's Son, Earnestly prayed that we "be one." . . . (Jno. 17:20-23.)

J. P. WATSON.

QUESTIONS

Cookeville, Tenn., Route 9, Oct. 2, 1930. Dear Brother Tallman: Will you please to answer the following questions in writing at your earliest convenience?

Since you say the "name Sunday school" is not in the Bible, but that the "idea is there in the Greek" (the language the apostles used), will you give me the Greek word the apostles used to represent the idea of the thing called "Sunday school;" that is the system of arrangement of an assembly into different classes, or groups, with its plurality of teachers including both men and women all to teach at the same time their respective classes? Will you also give the true translation of that Greek word in English, citing the chapter and verse where it may be found? Also give me the English word by which that Greek word was rendered in the King James' Translation?

Do you consider that the Sunday school class system is essential to the carrying out of the command to teach God's word? And do you think the word of God cannot be taught systematically without the aid of that system?

Will you please to cite the passage of scripture that records an example where Christ or any of his apostles, or any other inspired person, divided (or authorized to be divided) an assembly into different classes, or groups, for the purpose of teaching them, appointing a separate teacher for each class, including women teachers over some classes?

When division comes over an unscriptural thing who are responsible for such division, they who advocate that thing? or they who oppose it?

When the division came over instrumental music in worship who were to blame for it, they who wanted it and contended for it? or they who did not want it and contended against it?

In case that the Sunday school class system of teaching be found unauthorized in the New Testament Scriptures; and hence, an unscriptural institution, who then are responsible for the division it has caused among the disciples of Christ, they who oppose it? or they who advocate it?

Can a congregation of Christians do their whole duty and be saved in the end without using the Sunday school class system of teaching?

If the congregation reject the class system would that necessarily stop the teaching of the word of God through that congregation?

Has God not given to his churches (congregations) a specific law of order regulating the public teaching of His word?

Dear Brother, please answer at your earliest convenience each of the foregoing questions in full and mail to my address. I thank you in advance for your kindness in doing so. Your urging the class system upon the brethren has called forth these questions.

Sincerely your brother in search of divine law,

J. P. WATSON.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Consisting of Brother Tallman's Answers To The Questions

Cookeville, Tenn.,

Nov. 28, 1930. Mr. J. P. Watson, Cookeville, Tenn., R. 9: Dear Bro.

Your letter of Oct. 2nd is before me and I shall now gladly review and briefly answer your nine questions.

1. The idea of a Sunday school or bible study is found in Acts 2:1-12 and among other places in Acts 19:9. Kaq h|meran en th^ sxolh^ (daily or every day in the school.) Daily includes Sunday, therefore Paul taught in a school that was not only a Sunday school but a weekday school also, with its plurality of classes and teachers. Women teachers are authorized in Acts 21:9, Acts 2:17. Since they prophesied by the power and authority of God, who dare deny women the work God authorized them to do.

Since Paul and the other apostles taught in Sunday schools and since Paul said, Phil. 4:9 "the things . . . which ye heard and saw in me, these things do." Would it not be an insult to Paul and the other apostles to oppose a Sunday school.

This question is answered under No. 1, where the classes and teachers are mentioned in Acts 2:1-12, and where women are authorized to teach Acts 2:17 and Acts 21:9.

They who advocate an unscriptural thing are responsible for the discord and division caused by the same. And the man who opposes a scriptural Sunday school is responsible for the discord that follows.

5. This question is answered in No. 4.

A scriptural Sunday school can never be found unauthorized in the scriptures. Therefore they who oppose it are opposing the word of God.

A congregation of Christians that refuses to follow the teachings and example of the apostles in the Sunday school work is not doing their whole duty.

If a congregation rejects the Sunday school work (classes and etc.), that would stop much of the teaching of the word of God through that congregation.

I come now to examine, by way of review, your answers to my questions which I was glad to receive, and which are now before me under date, Nov. 28, receipt of which I acknowledged by letter the day your communication reached me.

And I wish to say in the outset that no one deplores more than I the sad and divided condition now existing among brethren and churches in Christ in many places that has been brought about, and is being perpetuated, by the many inventions of men, and especially that caused by the modern invention of the Sunday school class system of teaching that is being operated in many places throughout the land in churches claiming to be loyal to the word of God in all things.

Notwithstanding the fact that I was provoked to this controversy, yet, however, I gladly avail myself of this opportunity that the peculiar occasion has afforded me of entering into this investigation with you in hope that some good may result therefrom in bringing the truth to light and of restoring peace and unity where there has been and still exists discord and division.

And, Brother Tallman, as I said to you before, I repeat that, throughout this controversy, I shall endeavor to do to you as I would that men should do to me, as our Lord commands us to do. (Mat. 7:12).

Evidently one of us is wrong, and that wrong will stand on record against that one in the great and final judgment unless it be corrected here in this life. This makes it a very serious matter with me.

Truth, free from error, and not personal victory, is my desire, my purpose, and my aspiration, and shall be throughout this investigation; for the conquest I am seeking is not over you, my Brother, but over your error.

The Real Issue

Remember, and bear in mind, the precise point at issue, which is, whether the Sunday school class system of teaching, as is clearly described in my first and third questions, and which you are endeavoring to defend, is divinely authorized and recorded in the New Testament Scriptures. This you affirm and I deny.

This class system has caused discord and division among the disciples and churches of Christ throughout the land, and its results continue to spread far and wide. But there is a way, I am glad to say, to test it out whether it be of God, or of man. The Bible is the standard, as you no doubt

will agree. What it says must have the right of way. Therefore, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. 8:20).

I come, therefore, I repeat, gladly availing myself of this opportunity (though rather thrust upon me) of putting the thing to the test, and thereby prove who is on the Lord's side. Paul gives us the divine testing rule: "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good." (1 Thes. 5:21).

Now To Your Answers

You certainly did answer "briefly"—too briefly indeed to prove your position true. Though, if untrue (and evidently it is, as I honestly believe), you could not have proven it true had you used ten thousand words both in English and Greek.

I have carefully read and studied each scripture you cite as containing the idea of your Sunday school class system, though I had studied them much before, and had committed them to memory, and I feel impelled by the weight of truth to say, though honestly, candidly, and With all due respect to you, my Brother, that I cannot find the idea of the institution we are discussing under the name "Sunday school" in either of the passages cited (Acts 2:112; 19:9; 2:17; 21:9).

In truth these scriptures are as destitute of the idea of the Sunday school class system of teaching, consisting of an assembly classed off in separate groups with its plurality of teachers including both men and women (or, either men only, or women only), all operating their respective classes at the same time; I say those scriptures you cite are as destitute of the idea of such institution as Mat. 19:14-15; Mk. 10:13-16 are destitute of the idea of the thing called "infant baptism." The pedobaptist, when hard-pressed for proof of his practice of infant baptism, quotes these scriptures as containing the idea; though he admits that the name "infant baptism" is not there, yet he claims it is in the Greek, and if correctly translated that is what it would be, and he wants all to take his word for it as proof.

Precisely so it is in the case before us—You, my Brother, are walking in the steps of the pedobaptist in this discussion: for in your effort at proving your practice of the Sunday school class system of teaching, you do exactly as do the pedobaptists in their effort at proving their doctrine of infant baptism.

You admitted it publicly in your speech at Pippin that the name "Sunday school" is not in the Bible, but said that the idea is there in the Greek, and if correctly translated that is what it would be. And when you are called upon for the proof you cite those passages as containing the idea, assuming without proof, as I will show, that the scriptures authorize your Sunday school class system of work, and you want us all to take your word for it as proof.

In your answer No. 1, you assume without proof that the idea of a Sunday school or Bible study is found in Acts 2:1-12. But you offer no proof of it. Why did you not quote the word or statement in connection of the twelve verses cited that contains the idea? Since you affirm such idea is there, it is your duty to prove it. If you fail to prove it you lose your cause.

Every idea represented in spoken or written language must have a word, or a group of words, to represent that idea; it cannot be thus represented without a word to bear it along.

Now since you affirm that the idea of the Sunday school (such an institution as we are discussing) is in Acts 2:1-12, it is your duty to prove it is there by pointing out in that scripture the very word, or group of words, that represents that idea, and then prove that word or phrase means "Sunday school." But this you did not do.

You also say the idea is found in other places; citing Acts 19:9 as one among the other places, and here you quote a Greek word, or rather a Greek phrase, a group of words, as containing the idea of "Sunday school or bible study" (but to change the name to "bible study" does not in anywise alter or change the institution in its organization nor in its operations—it remains the same unchanged whatever you call it). I now quote that Greek phrase as it is in your letter, with your translation of it which you inclose within marks of parenthesis. It is: "Kaq h|meran en th^ sxolh^." (daily or every day in the school) "Daily or every day in the school"—Is this your own translation of the Greek phrase? or did you quote it from some Version? If from a Version, which Version? I do not find this rendering in any Version of the eight that I have in my library. The phrase, "or every day," does not belong there, for it has no place in the Greek text. "Kath hemeran," the first two words, means "daily," not necessarily "every day," as I will show later. And "en te schole" means "in the school." But the idea of Sunday is neither in that Greek expression nor in your translation of it. Hence the idea of a Sunday school is not in that Greek word, nor in the English rendering of it. The idea of a school is there, but it is not the idea of a Sunday school.

But you assume that "daily" here means "every day," and this you assume without proof. And from this you conclude that "daily includes Sunday" in this place. Then upon these two unproved assumptions, you draw the conclusion that, "therefore Paul taught in a school that was not only a Sunday school but a week-day school also, with its plurality of classes and teachers." But your conclusion here is illogical, being drawn from unproved and unprovable premises. For the reason that, the idea of a Sunday school is a school that is operated on Sunday only; but the school of Tyrannus was operated daily, hence it was not a Sunday school. Remember that the idea of a Sunday school is a school that is operated on no other day of the week than Sunday; but the school of Tyrannus was not operated on Sunday only (even if operated on that day), for it was operated daily (Acts 19:9). And no school that is operated daily can be truly represented by the name Sunday school. Therefore the school of Tyrannus was not a Sunday school. Hence your conclusion here that Paul was teaching in a Sunday school is untrue.

But to further show the unsoundness of your argument here I will illustrate.

In your translation of that Greek expression you make "daily" mean "every day," and thus make it strictly a universal term, as though it always meant "every day" of the week. However, the term is not strictly universal—it does not always mean "every day" in the week, but is often used in a limited sense. I know that daily sometimes includes every day in the week; as, when we say, "The sun rises and sets daily;" for that is a natural occurrence, and, consequently, happens every day in every week. Daily is often used in a limited sense with reference to business affairs; "daily mail," the postman "delivers daily mail," when it is a well known fact that Sunday is not included, but excluded from mail service. Again, when Daily is used with reference to schools and school work it does not necessarily include every day in the week. I know of no school that is operated every day in the week. There are what we call "daily recitations" in certain departments of most, if not all, schools of all grades, when it is well known that Saturday and Sunday of each week are not included, but excluded from school work. But I have already shown that, even if the

school of Tyrannus was operated on Sunday as well as other days, it would not be a Sunday school; because the idea of a Sunday school is one that is operated on no other day than on Sunday, which is not true of the school of Tyrannus. Therefore your argument that Paul was teaching in a Sunday school (Acts 19:9) falls without support, being based upon assumptions unproved and unprovable. But this is not all yet; there is one more point with reference to Acts 19:9 that deserves attention, which I give as follows: It seems significant to me, my Brother, that, in quoting that Greek expression, you, from some cause, skipped over and omitted the very word in that phrase that tells what Paul was doing "daily in the school of one Tyrannus." That word is, in Greek letters, *dialogomenoj* (*dialogomenos*), and is translated "disputing" in our Common, or King James' Version. But H. T. Anderson translates it "discoursed." Therefore, instead of Paul's being a teacher, as one of the faculty of that school, and teaching a class-group while the other teachers were teaching their classes, he was "disputing"—discoursing—"daily in the school of one Tyrannus." And this continued two years; "so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks." (Acts 19:10).

This shows what Paul's business was in that school for two years; that of "disputing"—discoursing—preaching the gospel—"the word of the Lord Jesus" to all who would attend the lecture room at the time of preaching. Now that does not look very much like your Sunday schools, does it?

Question: When you are called upon for one, yes, just one clear example of your Sunday school in one of the many churches of the N. T. age, in which you say the apostles taught in Sunday school classes, why? yes, Why do you pass by all those church Sunday schools, and in preference to one of these, settle down upon the daily school of Tyrannus, a school of heathen philosophy (according to the best information at hand) and offer it as a scriptural model of your Sunday school class institutions you are endeavoring to defend? This is strange to me. It clearly signifies that you absolutely knew of no New Testament example of your Sunday school class system in any of the churches of the New Testament record. But if you have such example, then why? I repeat, Why did you not give it? especially when called upon. And since you say I am wrong, then it is your duty to teach me. So if you have one example, please give it in your next and thus help me out of error. Will you?

Women Teachers

Your next effort is to find women teachers in Sunday schools teaching in classes. So you say:

"Women teachers are authorized in Acts 21:9, Acts 2:17." And then ask, "who dare deny women the work God authorized them to do?"

But here, Brother Tallman, you wander off from the issue, and raise a false issue—a question that is not at all in dispute. For we who oppose your Sunday school class system do not "deny women the work God authorized them to do;" that is, teaching his word. Nay, but contrariwise, we endeavor to faithfully teach and admonish them to do all that God requires of them to do. We also admonish Christian women to not do those things God commands them not to do. And it appears to me, that the man who is not able to distinguish between the things God commands women to do, and the things he commands them not to do—things he does not permit them to do, is not a safe and competent teacher of the word of God.

Remember, we are agreed on everything the Bible says on this question. We are agreed that women are authorized to teach; for the Bible says so. Then wherein do we disagree? We disagree only on what you say, not on what the Bible says. You say that God authorized women to teach in Sunday schools, and that, too, in Sunday school classes; you say this authority is in Acts 2:17 and Acts 21:9. So here are three things you say which the Bible does not say; and hence, herein is where we disagree. I much prefer to agree with you and all of my brethren rather than disagree; however, I cannot agree with you when you depart from the Bible and teach things not authorized therein.

Why did you not answer my Q. No. 2? Did you anticipate difficulties in your way that you were not willing to encounter? I kindly ask you to answer it in your next if you do not see any difficulties involved. I quote it:

2. Do you consider that the Sunday school class system is essential to the carrying out of the command to teach God's word? And do you think the word of God cannot be taught systematically without the aid of that system?

(1) Had you answered affirmatively, that you consider the system essential to the carrying out of that command, and that the word cannot be taught systematically without the aid of that system, then you would have encountered the difficulty of having to prove the impossible; namely, that God's word cannot be taught either systematically or otherwise without the Sunday school class system. But,

(2) Had you answered negatively, that you do not consider the system essential to the teaching of God's word, then you would have been confronted with the difficulty of having to bear the responsibility of teaching a non-essential thing that is causing discord and division among brethren; for no non-essential is authorized in the Scriptures, hence if you had answered No, you would have virtually admitted the thing to be unscriptural, and that you are responsible for its evil results of division.

Therefore, take either horn of the dilemma (answer either Yes, or No) as you may choose, and you are confronted with insurmountable difficulties.

I will now kindly consider your substitute posed as an answer to my Q. No. 2.

Here, as in your No. 1 you raise the unproved assumption that "Paul and the other apostles taught in Sunday schools," and refer to Phil. 4:9 as commanding us to do the same (which is not true unless you can prove they—the Philippians—saw Paul teaching in Sunday school classes, or heard him tell them to do so, but things cannot be proven without evidence), then you ask a serious question which I gladly answer as follows:

Yes, if Paul and the other apostles taught in Sunday schools (such institutions as we are discussing), then it would be an "insult" to them to oppose such schools as authorized by them.

But, on the other hand, since you fail to prove that Paul and the other apostles taught in such schools, or commanded us to do the same, it follows, therefore, that, when you bring in the Sunday school class system, a thing not authorized by the apostles, hence an unscriptural thing that causes discord and division, you not only "insult" the apostles, but also the Holy Spirit, Jesus

Christ our Lord, and even God himself, seeing that the apostles were under their direct guidance. And Rev. 22:18 tells the sad fate of the innovators.

No, Brother Tallman, my Q. No. 3 is not answered in your No. 1, nor elsewhere in your letter as all who read these letters will see for themselves. As I have fully shown in refutation of your answer

No. 1. You did not give an example wherein Christ or any of his apostles, or any other inspired person ever divided (or authorized to be divided) an assembly into different classes, or groups for the purpose of teaching them, appointing a separate teacher for each class, including women teachers over some classes, all to teach at the same time.

Having failed to give such example, you utterly fail to answer my No. 3. So you will have to try it over.

But you say, "the classes and teachers are mentioned in Acts 2:1-12." But what classes and what teachers do you mean? We are now in search for your Sunday school classes, and your Sunday school teachers. Are they mentioned there? You have affirmed it, I deny it and demand the proof.

The apostles are mentioned in Acts 1:26 where "Matthias was numbered with the eleven apostles," and referred to by the pronoun "they" in Acts 2:1; and again mentioned in Acts 2:14 where Peter was "standing up with the eleven," and called upon all to hear him (no indication of all talking at the same time). But these scriptures do not mention the apostles as being Sunday school teachers. They were teachers indeed, but not Sunday school teachers teaching in Sunday school classes each grouped off to itself, as your proposition requires of you to prove.

But your Sunday school classes are not only not mentioned in Acts 2:1-12, but they are not even remotely referred to in any way whatever as being in existence. Had you cited the first verse of the first chapter of First Chronicles that would have been just as appropriate for your purpose here as is Acts 2:112; for these twelve verses are as destitute of the mention of your Sunday school classes, and your Sunday school teachers, as is that verse.

Therefore, since you have utterly failed of proof in these scriptures, I insist that you try again. Cite some other scripture you imagine records an example where an assembly was so divided or grouped by Christ or any inspired person for the purpose of being taught in classes, including, or not including, women teachers, all to operate at the same time after the order of the Sunday schools you are trying to defend. Just one clear example will convince me.

You answer my 4th and 5th correctly (the only ones you do answer correctly). I knew we were agreed on the principles set forth in these two questions; and so I laid these before you as the basis, or foundation underlying the whole argument. I knew that the true answers to these two questions would prepare the way for, lead up to, and show exactly how to answer No. 6. But from some cause you managed to get around it and not answer it at all either way, as to who would have the blame to bear.

My Q. 4 reads: When division comes over an unscriptural thing who are responsible for such division, they who advocate that thing? or they who oppose it? This is correctly answered—"They who advocate" it.

My Q. 5 shows an example (instrumental music in worship) tried and tested by the Scriptures, and found to be unauthorized, hence an unscriptural thing, and you answer correctly that they who advocate it are responsible for the discord and division caused thereby.

Precisely so it is with reference to the Sunday school class system. When we shall have finished this investigation, if the system be found unauthorized in the New Testament Scriptures, hence, an unscriptural institution, then the responsibility of the discord and division caused thereby will rest upon you and others who advocate the unscriptural tiling, and this, according to your own answers No. 4 and 5.

Now it seems most significant to me that, if you had been sure you have the proof at hand that your position is written in the Bible, that the system in dispute is authorized—commanded in the scriptures, you would not have shunned to answer my Question 6. Did you not fear that the scriptural test might go against you, and to avoid the consequence of having to bear the blame for the division, and that, too, at your own decision, you decided not to answer at all? Understand, I am not charging that such is a fact, but that it appears so from your refusal to answer No. 6.

I frankly admit that if the test should turn in your favor—that you show the system in the law of God divinely authorized, then the responsibility falls upon me and all others who oppose it. And I am ready and anxious to have it thoroughly tested out by the word of God. If I am wrong I want to get right. It is to be decided by what is written in the law of God. So I again call, in the language of inspiration— "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. 8:20).

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (1 Thes. 5:21).

"If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." (1 Peter 4:11).

Now if the Sunday school class system be found written in the law of God—declared by an oracle of God, then prove it by the law and the testimony. If you fail in this, then the system is proved to be an unscriptural thing, and stands condemned by the silence of the Bible. But, since you have affirmed it, you have obligated yourself to prove it.

I know, Brother Tallman, that, in this, your undertaking, you have a hard thing to do; that is, prove the unprovable; yet your teaching has obligated you to do it. And your course that led to this controversy has given me this opportunity of assisting you in putting the Sunday school class system to the test. And while I have this opportunity I mean to use it to the best of my ability in testing the thing pretty thoroughly by the word of God that you may see the truth, and get right, lest you lose your soul's eternal salvation, and lead others to ruin, by wresting these scriptures, as many others are doing "the other scriptures to their own destruction." (2 Peter 3:16).

Understand, I do not charge you with doing so intentionally; for I do not know. I leave that altogether with you and the Lord. If to try to make scriptures teach what they do not teach is not wresting the scriptures, please tell me what would be? I know that such is often done from a misunderstanding of the passage, or passages handled. I would prefer thinking it so with you, my Brother, rather than to think you do so designedly.

However, if I am mistaken, and you do know where the proof is, I will be glad to have it in your next. And, as I said, if you convince me, I will gladly give up error; for I am not so fixed in an opinion that truth cannot move me.

Lest you become impatient waiting my reply to your answers, I will submit this part of my review now, and send the other later. Sincerely your brother in search of divine law,

J. P. WATSON.

I would not go beyond the word,

And teach things not divine;

'Twill prove destruction in the end,

As some will surely find.

J. P. W.

Again as usual you get around my Q. No. 7 without answering it, but put in a substitute and answer something I did not ask, posing it as an answer to my question when it is not, as I will show. I quote the question with your proposed answer.

Q. 7. Can a congregation of Christians do their whole duty and be saved in the end without using the Sunday school class system of teaching?

A. 7. "A congregation of Christians that refuses to follow the teachings and example of the apostles in the Sunday school work is not doing their whole duty."

There are three special points of error involved in your proposed answer here which I shall kindly examine separately. I state them thus:

- (1) Your substitution and misrepresentation.
- (2) Not a divine example, but a human tradition.
- (3) Unavoidable difficulties whichever way you answer.

Your Substitution and Misrepresentation

1. By substituting the word "work" for the word system as in both the 7th and 8th questions you misrepresent the position I hold, as will be clearly seen in the following. Though I do not charge you with doing so intentionally.

I did not ask whether or not a congregation of Christians were doing their Whole duty "that refuses to follow the teachings and example of the apostles in the Sunday school work."

No, that is not what I asked, but that is what you answered; therefore you did not answer the question. And in this way you seek to change the issue, it seems, for the issue is over the system

of doing the work, not over the work itself. By substituting the word "work" where I use the word system, both in your 7th and 8th answers, you misrepresent me, making the false impression upon the mind of the reader that I oppose the "work" (of teaching the word of God), when it is only the unauthorized system, used as an agency for doing the "work," to which I object. For the Sunday school class system is one thing, and the "work" done through that system is quite a different thing. In a word, the system of doing the work is not the work itself. I object to the system, because it is an unscriptural—unauthorized agency for doing the work. Just as the Missionary society is an unauthorized agency for doing the work in foreign fields, so the institution of the Sunday school class system is an unauthorized agency for doing the work of teaching at home; that is, in our home land.

If the "work" done through the institution of the Sunday school class system be that of teaching the word of God as it is written, then the "work" is not what I oppose; for I endeavor to the best of my ability to teach the word. But I object to the unscriptural system through which you urge the work to be done; because it is an unauthorized agency for doing the work, and one that causes discord and division. And, for this reason, according to your answers 4 and 6, the responsibility of the evil results of discord and division caused thereby rests upon you and others who advocate the unscriptural agency in doing the teaching. At the risk of being tedious I will illustrate.

Illustration

To preach the gospel by public oration, as from the pulpit, following the example of Christ and the apostles, is a good work.

Now if Sister Tallman, your wife, or some other Christian woman of the Cookeville church should presume to take it upon herself to thus proclaim the gospel from the pulpit imitating the example of Christ and the apostles, even as men do, what would you do about it? Would you tell her she is right, that she is doing a good work, go ahead? Or would you object? But the sisters do not do that. Why? yes, Why? There is a reason. Is it their duty to do so?

Doubtless you would say, No. True, but why? Simply because she is an unauthorized agency for doing that work. Such is a good work, yet, when done by the woman, it is done contrary to the word of God, being done through an unauthorized agency.

Precisely so it is with reference to the Sunday school class system of teaching: the work is done through an unauthorized agency, and, therefore, contrary to the word of God. And just as the woman is to be condemned for serving as an unauthorized agency in the public teaching of the word, so the Sunday school institution, consisting of its classes and teachers, all operating at the same time, will be condemned, not for doing a good work, but for acting presumptuously as an unauthorized agency in doing the work. It would be better not to do a thing at all rather than do it contrary to the commandment of God. This principle is exhibited in the case of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10:1-2).

Therefore you misrepresent me, as many others have done, by changing the issue, and making it appear that I oppose the "work" of teaching the word of God, when it is only your unscriptural institution of the class system that I oppose.

Not A Divine Example, But A Human Tradition

2. But a congregation of Christians cannot follow an example that never existed. And there is no example in the divine record of the apostles having ever used the Sunday school class system of teaching in such schools, nor elsewhere (as you will find before we are through with this investigation); and for this reason, the system is only a tradition of men, and not a divine example.

Hence the congregations that refuse to use that system are not refusing to "follow the teachings and example of the apostles," but are only refusing to follow the tradition of men that they may truly follow the inspired teachings and the divine example of the apostles as it is written.

There is no dispute over the question whether or not a congregation is doing its whole duty that "refuses to follow the teachings and example of the apostles" in anything; for all know that such congregation is not doing its whole duty.

And since you utterly fail to show such example in the New Testament, it follows, therefore, that all congregations using the Sunday school class system are following the tradition of men, and not a divine example. And as Jesus charged on the Pharisees, doubtless he would in this case, that "ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition." (Mat. 15:3).

Question: Just here I ask, What is the "teachings and example of the apostles" pertaining to the public teaching of the word of God? Of course you are able to tell what it is, and where it is. So please answer this question in your next. Will you?

Unavoidable Difficulties

3. Had you answered Q. 7 affirmatively with a straightforward Yes, that a congregation of Christians can do their whole duty and be saved in the end without using the Sunday school class system, then you would have met the difficulty of having it pressed upon you that you are advocating a non-essential thing—one that you are aware causes division. And, consequently, that the responsibility of such division rests upon you and others for advocating the unscriptural—non-essential thing. For it is evident that,

If a congregation of Christians can do their whole duty and be saved in the end without the use of that system, then it must be a non-essential thing. And if non-essential, it is not needed; if not needed, it is not commanded; if not commanded, it is not a duty (because "the whole duty of man" is to "Fear God, and keep his commandments." Ecc. 12:13). Hence, if that system be not commanded (and you have not, as yet, shown that it is), it is not a duty; if not a duty, it is not in the Bible; if not in the Bible, it must be an unscriptural thing. Therefore had you answered Yes, you would have thereby acknowledged that the system is an unscriptural thing. And since it causes division, your answer Yes, would have thrown the responsibility of such division upon yourself for advocating the unscriptural—non-essential thing, according to your answers 4 and 5.

But, on the other hand, had you answered negatively by a direct No, then you would have been confronted with the difficulty of having obligated yourself to do the impossible; that is, prove without evidence that your Sunday school class system is divinely established—authorized by commandment, and recorded in the New Testament Scriptures. For, by your answer No, it is evident that,

If a congregation of Christians cannot do their whole duty and be saved in the end without using that system, then it follows as a logical and necessary conclusion that the system must be a duty commanded in the word of God. But I forewarn you, my Brother, that to prove such would be as impossible for you or any one else to do as it would be for you to prove that the earth is above the heavens, or that the Sun is a body of blackness. Therefore, take either horn of the dilemma you may choose (answer either yes or no) and you are confronted with insurmountable difficulties.

Q. 8. If the congregation reject the Sunday school class system would that necessarily stop the teaching of the word of God through that congregation? The same difficulties stand as a mountain in your way also when you come to answer my 8th. And you again manage to get around it and not answer either way just as you did my 7th. You substituted "work" for system and answered something I did not ask, and pose such as an answer to my question when it is not, just as you did in your 7th.

I did not ask, If a congregation reject the Sunday school work, but the Sunday school class system—the system of doing the work, would that necessarily stop the teaching of the word through that congregation? I did not even ask if such would stop the teaching; but if that would necessarily stop it. If the teaching can be done without that system, then rejecting the system would not necessarily stop the teaching, for the teaching can go on without that system.

Now if you had answered Yes, that to reject the class system would necessarily stop the teaching through that congregation, then you make the Sunday school class system essential to the teaching of God's word. So that the teaching of the word cannot be done without that system. And this involves many difficulties: you could not teach an audience the word of God without separating them into class groups with a different teacher for each class. Phillip and the eunuch would have been required to have traveled on until they found the class system in operation and get into one of the classes before Phillip could have taught him the word of the Lord. These are samples of the many difficulties that arise in your way had you answered Yes.

But had you answered No, then you make the system non-essential, and thereby bring yourself under the burden of bearing the blame for its evil results of discord and division by advocating the non-essential thing, according to your answers 4 and 5.

I will now consider your substituted answer to my 8th question. You say:

8. "If a congregation rejects the Sunday school work (classes and etc.), that would stop much of the teaching of the word of God through that congregation."

But would that necessarily stop it? Of course if the "Sunday school work" be the teaching of the word, sure enough, when they reject that Work that would be rejecting the teaching of the word. But could they reject the class system and yet continue to teach the word? Can you not see?

But let me say, my Brother, that if to reject the Sunday school class system should stop some (be it much or little) of the teaching of the word, let it be remembered that such only stops it by dropping out the unscriptural system of doing it. And that it only stops that part of the teaching that is being done contrary to the divine order by putting out the unauthorized agency through which they were doing the work. Just as you, doubtless would reject the Missionary society on the

ground that it is an unauthorized agency for doing missionary work in foreign fields, so we reject the Sunday school class system upon the very same ground; namely, it is an unauthorized agency for doing the teaching in our home land. The cases are parallel, and the results are the same—both cause discord and division among brethren.

Q. 9. Has God not given to his churches (congregations) a specific law of order regulating the public teaching of his word?

This one you answer by a direct "No." And I ask, What do you mean by saying, "No," to this question? Do you mean to deny that God has given such law to regulate the public teaching of his word?

If that is your meaning (and I so understand you), then, as it appears to me, you involve yourself in more difficulties that you will never be able to overcome while in defense of the Sunday school institution, which I will show in my next. Suffice it to say just here that, when you deny that God has given a law of order to regulate the public teaching of his word, you do not only deny the scriptures on the subject, but you also deny your own claim for the Sunday school class system as being divinely authorized and commanded in the scriptures; for if God gave no law of order for the public teaching, then he did not give the Sunday school law of order, and hence it is not of God, but of man, according to your answer "No," just as I have been telling you.

Remember that, law is a rule of action, when relating to things to be done. God's word is law. Every precept—every commandment of God is law. Everything God authorized to be done is law. And everything God forbids to be done is law; that is, his word directing it is law. I will bring this out more fully in my next.

Questions: 1. If there be no law regulating the public teaching of God's word, why was it always men doing the public teaching in New Testament times, and not any women?

If the Sunday school class system is not a law or command, then do you not go beyond what is written when you bring it in, knowing that the Scriptures thoroughly furnish to all good works?

If there be no law regulating the public teaching of the word, then who is responsible for the disorder and confusion that would arise in case all, or many, should presume to teach at the same time in the assembly? The members so acting would not be to blame, seeing they are under no law of order, and "where no law is, there is no transgression." (Rom. 4:15). And God is not to blame; for Paul declares that "God is not the author of confusion." Who then, shall bear the blame? Your contention throws the blame upon God for not giving a law of order to prevent it.

Now, Brother Tallman, in conclusion, permit me to say that I knew all those difficulties (and more) existed and stood in your way of answering my fair and pertinent questions, whether you answered correctly or incorrectly either by Yes, or No, at the time I gave you the questions. I knew quite well that you could not answer these questions either way without meeting those difficulties. And,

My purpose in asking these questions was to lead your mind to see that such difficulties do really exist and stand in your way, and that others may also see the same when it is shown to them,

which clearly reveals the fact that the Sunday school class system is an unscriptural— non-essential thing, seeing that it involves such inconsistencies and absurdities.

Yet I am not going to say that you anticipated, or foresaw, these difficulties, and that the best way to avoid meeting them in this discussion would be to not answer at all either way, but to put in your answers on something else to fill in space, and thus make it appear that you were answering what I asked when you were not. No, I do not charge this as your reason for not giving direct and true answers to my questions. I shall not impugn your motive in this, but leave it altogether with you and the Lord. There are but two of my nine questions answered correctly, the 4th and 5th. And in these two I laid the foundation upon which to reason, in the light of God's word, and thus draw out those inconsistent and absurd conclusions involved in the doctrine of the Sunday school institution. For I felt sure that if you were strictly honest in heart sincerely desirous of truth alone regardless of consequences, these pertinent questions would lead you to see the existing difficulties involved in your teaching on the subject, knowing that honest hearts will always give up error and accept truth when shown.

However, my Brother, there was something in your way that caused you to manage to get around, substitute, and fail to give the true and direct answers; whether it was those difficulties or something else, you and the Lord know. But one thing I do know; and that is, that you managed to get around and not answer truly, and when these letters are read by others, they will know the same, and it is due them to know it.

With brotherly kindness I submit the foregoing review for your careful and prayerful consideration. And trusting to hear from you at your earliest convenience, and to receive your further arguments in support of your position, I conclude with the following lines.

Praying the Lord that He may bless, And cause the truth to win:

Thus lead the erring soul to light,

And rescue him from sin—

That we may all be one in Him,

As He would have us be:

United in true Christian love,

From every error free.

Sincerely your brother in search' of divine law,

J. P. WATSON.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Cookeville, Tenn.,

Jan. 2, 1931. Mr. J. P. Watson, Cookeville, Tenn., R. 9. Dear Bro. Watson:

Your letter of Dec. 10th with its later supplement is before me, and I am glad of this opportunity to review it in the light of truth. You said I answered "too briefly indeed to prove your position true." Wrong again. It does not take long to tell the truth. It did not take Jesus long to answer his enemies. If I had a false position such as yours, I might have to write twelve pages to make it even resemble the truth. You said, "I was provoked to this controversy," and again that it was "thrust upon me." Surely you meant this as a joke. It would be a good story for the "Funny Paper" if it were not such a serious matter. Just to think of you going about this country for years with a chip on your shoulder challenging people to meet you in discussion and then when I accept your challenge you begin to whine by saying it was thrust upon you. Since you got what you asked for, you might better play the man for you will have to take your medicine now, or surrender to the truth.

The Real Issue. You correctly state that the real issue is "Whether the Sunday School class system of teaching is divinely authorized." This I affirm. I am glad you have a few statements correct, in the midst of your twelve pages of chiefly fiction as the readers will easily see. After stating the real issue correctly you jump clear off it and talk about "An institution" separate and apart from the church. Why did you put up this man of straw? Was it because you know you cannot meet the real issue? If you could meet the real issue why did you fall off of it, as quickly as if you had stepped upon a banana peeling, and grab this man of straw that I never endorsed and no other loyal preacher of the Church of Christ ever endorsed? You have heard me say, and thousands of others have heard me say that the only scriptural Sunday School is that divine institution the Church, working as a Sunday School. If a man is farming he is a farmer. If he builds himself a house we call him a carpenter. When he paints the house he is a painter. If he should teach school, we say he is a teacher. But he is only one man. Being a carpenter does not prevent him from being a farmer. Even so the church, when sending out and supporting missionaries, is a divine missionary society. When it systematically teaches the word of God on Sunday using classes it is a divinely authorized Sunday School. But it is the same institution in each case. Being a Sunday School or a missionary society does not prevent it from being a church, but is simply the church at work. I preach and endorse no Sunday School except the church, working as a Sunday school, as it frequently did in the days of the apostles, as I pointed out in my last letter, but shall repeat.

You spoke of me as affirming "The modern invention of the Sunday School." You certainly are a poor shot. You missed the truth by at least fifteen hundred years. Surely you could do better than that. Surely a man that has been firing at a mark for years should come nearer than fifteen hundred years from the truth. I admire your courage, but personally I would give up if after years of hard fighting I were still fifteen hundred years from the truth.

You say on page 10, "Why—do you pass by all those church Sunday Schools, . . . settle down upon the daily school of Tyrannus." This shot is worse than fifteen hundred years from the truth, for you ought to know and the readers will know that it is false. For I especially called your attention to the Sunday School recorded in Acts 2:1-12, where at least some, if not all the teachers and classes are mentioned and it was on Sunday, therefore a Sunday School. The apostles were the teachers. The classes are named in verses nine, ten and eleven, Parthians, Medes, Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and the parts of Lybia about Cyrene. I did not name these classes in my last letter as I supposed you were able to read when I gave you chapter and verse.

Now to a sample of your fiction on Acts 19:9. You claim that daily does not necessarily mean every day. Well the standard dictionary says it does. The lexicon by Thomas Sheldon Green, M. A., supervised by J. H. Thayer. D. D., Litt. D., gives "every day" as the meaning of the Greek, and Wilson's translation of the N. T. called the Emphatic Diaglott, translates it every day. Any fourth grade school boy should know that daily is only limited by the context, which in this case is two year.

Therefore, Paul taught in a school on Sunday. Hence it was a Sunday School. Thus with two examples I have proved my proposition. If "Daily" in this passage does not include Sunday, it does not necessarily include Monday or Tuesday, or Wednesday, or Thursday, or Friday, or Saturday. Therefore there was no school at all, and your argument proves Acts 19:9 false. "Let God be true though every man a liar." You also suggest that the apostle Paul was yoked up for two years with a teacher "Of heathen philosophy." How can two walk together except they agree? You would thereby make Paul out an hypocrite since he taught people to "be not unequally yoked with unbelievers." 2 Cor. 6:14. So you see where your false position leads you.

You said, "In your 7th answer you misrepresent me making the false impression upon the mind of the reader that I oppose the work, when it is only the unauthorized system." Nothing could be farther from the truth. Why did you misrepresent me thus, when I specifically said "Example" which includes method as well as matter, system as well as work. Had I not used the word example there might have been a show of truth in your statement but as it is you are without excuse, unless you did it ignorantly.

You say I misrepresent you and in the same sentence you misrepresent me. You remind me of the thief running down the street with the stolen money in his pocket, but to divert attention he shouts, "Catch the thief!"

On page 16 you ask me this question, "What is the teachings and example of the apostles pertaining to the public teaching of the word of God?" Answer:—On Pentecost they taught first in classes, Acts 2:911, then one apostle addressed the whole assembly, Acts 2:14, this is the same order that we follow Sunday mornings in Cookeville. Acts 8:4 they went everywhere preaching the word. Acts' 19:9, they taught daily in a school. Acts 16:13, Four inspired men taught classes at the same time, hence a school. It was on Saturday, hence it was a Saturday school. After the four taught for a time Paul preached. This again is the order used on Sunday in many churches of Christ. Sometimes they taught one small class, Acts 8:35, and sometimes there were several teachers and classes but only one teacher to each class at the same time.

Your last three questions are answered in the above, since there is no one specific law regulating teaching under all conditions, but general principles governing all and specific laws for specific cases.

I am not now surprised that you cannot see my answers to all your questions when you are so ignorant of language as not to see "Every day" in "Daily" and confess you do not know the meaning of the little word "no" in answer to No. 9. But I hope as you study farther you will be able to see the truth and I shall ever be glad to help you into the Light.

Yours for the spread of Truth,

O. H. TALLMAN.

SECOND REPLY

Cookeville, Tenn., R. 9, Jan. 15, 1931. Dear Brother Tallman: I shall now examine your second affirmative in your letter of Jan. 2 which is before me, receipt of which I acknowledged the day it was received.

You quote what I said, that you answered "'too briefly' indeed to prove your position true," and say, "Wrong again. It does not take long to tell the truth. It did not take Jesus long to answer his enemies." (Your letter, Jan. 2, p. 19).

I was not "wrong" here, because you certainly did not prove your position true, as my letter of the twelve pages show.

"It does not take long to tell the truth." But it was eight weeks before you answered my questions, and then you did not answer but two of them correctly. Surely it was, in part (along with other things that hindered, as you explained, personally, which I accepted), a lack of Bible truth to give on the subject, or, doubtless, you would have answered sooner, or (at least, correctly when you did answer.

When Jesus answered his enemies immediately he answered correctly and with truth. But when you, after eight weeks, pretend to answer, not an enemy, but a friend and brother, you missed the true answers of seven out of the nine questions. What could the reason of this failure be if it were not the weakness and unscripturalness of your position?

Remember, it very often takes more time and space to thoroughly examine and expose error than it takes to state it. And this is the reason why my letter grew so long. I was showing up your many errors, though in brotherly kindness, that I may help you to see wherein you are wrong.

You say, "If I had a false position such as yours, I might have to write twelve pages to make it even resemble the truth." (p. 19).

Remember, I am not trying now to prove my position, but am disproving your position, seeing that you are in the lead affirming, and I am following. My twelve pages show up pretty thoroughly that your position is the one without scriptural foundation, and, therefore, erroneous.

Your position, so far, has proven to be untrue, seeing that you utterly failed to present so much as one scripture that records it, as your letter itself shows even as my reply to it. I know you cited scriptures and quoted some, but each of them is as destitute of a record of your Sunday school class system as certain passages others cite and quote, are destitute of infant baptism, as I told you before.

Your position, therefore, falls without divine support, being unproved and improvable. And, consequently, your few pages will serve your purpose as well as the many. For should you write, not twelve, not twice twelve, pages, but twelve times twelve, twice told, your position would still remain unproved and unprovable. And you could not in all those pages make it "even resemble the

truth" to any one who knows the truth, though you might deceive many who have not, as yet, learned the truth on the subject.

If you were correct, and not commit so many errors in your effort at defense, my letters would not be so lengthy; in fact we would not be in this controversy, for we would be agreed. Let us keep the real issue clearly and constantly before us. This will aid much toward shortening the controversy. It is well that you so readily accepted the issue as I correctly stated it, which I here restate at the beginning of this my second reply.

The Real Issue

The precise point at issue is, whether the Sunday school class system of teaching, as is clearly described in my first and third questions, and which you are endeavoring to defend, is divinely authorized and recorded in the New Testament Scriptures. This you affirm and I deny.

The burden of proof rests upon you, according to the established rules of honorable controversy. Hence, as you are in the lead affirming, it is your duty to bring forward the scriptures you rely on as proof of your proposition. And it is my duty as respondent to show that your proof texts do not prove your proposition. And this is what I did in my review of what you offered as answers to my nine questions. I kept this issue clearly before you throughout my reply of the twelve pages, notwithstanding your statement to the contrary. And I carefully, candidly, and honestly examined, in the light of truth, every scripture cited, and every argument you made and showed clearly that you utterly failed at every point to prove your proposition, seeing that every scripture cited is wholly destitute of the idea of your class system of arrangement for the public teaching of God's word.

But instead of faithfully trying to meet and refute my negative arguments you raise complaint that, "after stating the issue correctly," I left the issue and talked "about an institution separate and apart from the church." But I did not say one word about an institution "separate and apart from the church." My letter stands as proof for itself. You should be more careful to make statements that you can prove true.

If you will show me one false statement I made I will thank you, and will not repeat it. I do not charge you with saying things you do not say. I suggest that you reread my letter of Dec. 10 and you will see that I did not leave the real issue, nor raise a false one, as you would have it appear. When I called the Sunday school class system an institution I stated a truth. If you honestly think it is not an institution, say so in your next and I will prove it. And when I called it a modern invention I again stated a truth. This I will prove equal to a demonstration before this discussion is over.

Let it be understood and remembered, that, in this discussion, I use the word modern to cover the entire period of time from the close of the apostolic age—from the time the New Testament was completely written—down to the present time. Therefore anything that has originated since that age is of modern date; and hence, too late to have a place in the New Testament record. And, for this reason, all such things are not only inventions of men, but they are modern inventions, and, therefore, not divinely authorized.

Therefore when I called your Sunday school class system a modern invention I did not miss it "fifteen hundred years," nor one year, nor even one day, but stated a fact.

But in your claim for that system, that it is divinely authorized in the New Testament Scriptures, you miss the mark, so to speak, almost two thousand years—the entire period of time from the completion of the New Testament record to the present time, more than eighteen hundred years. Thus all can see who is the true marksman. Now this is not "fiction," but truth and fact, as the readers I know can see for themselves. But when you said I talked about "An institution separate and apart from the church" (a thing I did not do), you asked, "Why did you put up this man of straw? Was it because you know you cannot meet the real issue?" Then you try to make it appear that I just jumped off, or fell off of the issue and grabbed "this man of straw," fearing that I could not meet the real issue.

But why all this, in the face of truth and fact to the contrary, if it were not for the purpose "to divert attention," making the false impression on the reader's mind that I am not acting "the man" in this controversy, but trying to escape the real issue, and to raise a false one? whereas my letter shows for itself to the contrary? And here I leave it for the reader to judge between us as to which is represented in your illustration of the thief's running away with the "stolen money" shouting, "Catch the thief to divert attention." The reader can see who holds to the issue and who does not.

But if this thing I have put up to you for discussion be "a man of straw" I am not responsible for its lightness and weakness. And I forewarn you, my Brother, that, in the final day of accounts, your unscriptural institution we are discussing under the name "Sunday school"—consisting of classes and teachers (all operating at the same time in the assembly) will be no more than "straw;" nay, it will, doubtless, be consumed as stubble in the flames of that unquenchable fire (See Mal. 4:1). And my reply to your pretended answers to my questions clearly show that you utterly failed to prove that God instituted that system; and, therefore, it is of human origin, and not divine. And, to use your expression, you have very appropriately designated it "a man of straw," as compared to things divinely authorized.

You may call it "joke," "funny," or "whine" (such terms never appear in my letters except when answering those who use them), or whatever may best suit your taste, yet I stated facts when I said I was provoked to this controversy, and that this opportunity of testing the class system was rather thrust upon me. And I repeat, that, notwithstanding these facts, I gladly avail myself of this opportunity of assisting you in testing that system out by the Scriptures. Remember, Brother, the whining, if there be such, is not at all on my side of the question. I have something far better to give, as my letters show for themselves.

I have never offered a challenge in any unbecoming way. But you were careful not to lift the "chip" off my "shoulder" by politely accepting my fair, open, and standing challenge, but continued to preach up the thing in my presence without extending to me the Christian courtesy of asking me if I wanted a word in reply. And the only hope I saw of getting anything like a discussion out of you was, to write some questions and ask you to write your answers, which you agreed to do; seeing that you were answering questions each night that were being given for you to answer.

If I have challenged, I have had a right to challenge. How can a true loyal servant of God retrain, and continue to refrain, from challenging when he is in the midst of so much false teaching—

misrepresenting, perverting, and wresting of the Scriptures? I have the same right to challenge errors of today as did Elijah in his day. And, like as Elijah, if I do stand alone on this question as a minister of God in this part of the country, as against the "many" on the other side, I have the same assurance that the same God will stand by me that stood by Elijah when he challenged the four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal, and put their doctrine to the test. And my proposition is as fair and appropriate to the case in hand as was Elijah's for that occasion; that is, let the word of God be the standard, and all agree to abide by what it says. And if you all would accept my fair and open challenge as they did Elijah's, and stand to the agreement, then this thing would soon be settled, and settled right. (See 1 Ki. 18:21-25-30). However, I hope and pray that much good may come as a result of this written discussion. The Lord direct the truth to his honor and glory.

And sure I would not offer you a "medicine" that I would not be willing to take myself in case I were down under the same malady, the symptoms of which strongly indicate an abnormal condition of your mental vision; (1) when you can see things where they are not; and (2) cannot see other things where they are, as both your letters show these symptoms as really existing. And as a servant under the great Physician I offer you the only safe and sure remedy—the divine "eye-salve" prescribed in the prescription Book of the great Physician, and if you will faithfully apply the eyesalve as directed therein, it will be a sure cure—the only remedy for recovering from such disorder, (See Rev. 3:18).

Your Attempt to Identify the Church and the Sunday School

On page 20 you say, "the only scriptural Sunday school is that divine institution the church, working as a Sunday school." Again, "I preach and endorse no Sunday school except the church, working as a Sunday school, as it frequently did in the days of the apostles, as I pointed out in my last letter."

It is only your unsupported assertion that you "pointed out in your last letter" that the church worked "frequently" (or even for one day), "as a Sunday school" "in the days of the apostles."

No, you "pointed out" no such thing in that letter nor in this one. Just as I informed you in my first reply, it is an impossibility to point out in certain scriptures what is not in them. Just as you point out your Sunday school class institution in certain passages, the Methodist points out his Methodist church institution in other scriptures; that is, he says it is there, when it is not. Just so, you say your Sunday school class institution is there, when it is not, as every reader of the Bible ought to know.

You "endorse" the Sunday school, and that is all the endorsement it has—human endorsement. The church of God needs no human endorsement. You endorse a thing our Lord did not endorse. It is, therefore, an addition, and Rev. 22:18 shows the destiny of its endorsers.

Remember the issue is over the institution of the Sunday school class system of teaching. We are not discussing the church question. We agree that the church is a divine institution. We are discussing your Sunday school institution, consisting of its plurality of class-groups of a divided assembly, and a different teacher for each class, often including women teachers, all operating at the same time in the public service of the church. Yes, this is the thing we are discussing, the thing you have affirmed and which I deny. When you assert that the church recorded in the New Testament is the same institution we are discussing under the name "Sunday school" you are as

far from the truth in the matter as the North Pole is from the South Pole, and that is as far apart as any two things can be upon the face of the earth.

The very fact that a church goes to "working as a Sunday school" is proof that such church has departed from the scriptures, and is neither a "scriptural Sunday school," nor a true loyal church. There is no such thing as a "scriptural Sunday school;" for the name "Sunday school" is an unscriptural name, and hence, cannot represent a scriptural thing. A scriptural church is one that follows the divine pattern both in teaching and practice, without addition, subtraction or change. There are but few scriptural churches in the land; some have one innovation, and some another. Some have added the instrumental music as an aid to the worship; some the foreign missionary society, and others, yea, many others, including these, have added the Sunday school class institution, until there are but few churches strictly loyal to the word of God in all things.

Talk about a "scriptural Sunday school!" You just as well talk about a scriptural Methodist church, a scriptural Baptist church, a scriptural Dunker church, or a scriptural county fair, as to talk about a "Scriptural Sunday school;" for the Bible is wholly silent on every one of those things. The Sunday school institution has no more place in the scriptures than does the Methodist, Baptist, and Dunker churches; or the County fair, and that means it has no place at all.

The name "Sunday school," you admit is an unscriptural name. This being true, the name cannot represent a scriptural institution; for the unscriptural name would, of necessity, represent the institution as being an unscriptural thing, and hence misrepresent it.

Therefore, Brother Tallman, when you attempt to identify the two institutions, the church and the Sunday school, you displace the divine name by substituting in its stead the humanly devised name, misrepresent the institution, and dishonor the head of the church. I will illustrate.

Suppose your neighbors should presume to call Sister Tallman, your wife, by the name Mrs. Jones, what would you think, and how would you feel about it? Would I not be safe in saying that such would be a misapplication of the name Jones, a displacing of her legal name Tallman, a misrepresentation of your wife, and a dishonor to you? I ask Sister Tallman's pardon for using her name, I do so with a pure motive, to make the point clear and impressive so you can see it, Brother Tallman.

The Lord named his church, and for us to presume to call it by an unscriptural name, as "Sunday school," "missionary society," or any other unauthorized name, would be to misapply such name, displace the divine name, misrepresent the divine institution, and to dishonor the head of the institution. '

But when a farmer goes to building him a house he is not then working as a farmer, but as a carpenter; when he has finished the carpenter's job and goes to painting the house he is not then working as a carpenter, nor as a farmer, but as a painter; when he has finished the painter's job and goes to teaching school he is not then working as a farmer, carpenter, nor painter, but only as a teacher; for no one can do all these different jobs of work at the same time.

Precisely so, when a church member goes to working through the Sunday school institution he is not then working as a church member, but as a Sunday school member. And the same is true of a

church that goes to "working as a Sunday school," it is not then working as the church, but as the Sunday school.

When a church member goes to working through the secret order of the institution of Masonry he is not then working as a Christian—a church member, but as a Mason—a member of the lodge.

Just so, when a member of the church goes to working through the Sunday school he is not then working as a member of the church, but as a member of the Sunday school institution in which he is doing the work.

You say, "Being a carpenter does not prevent him from being a farmer."

But he cannot work both as a carpenter and as a farmer at the same time. When he goes to working as a carpenter he ceases to work as a farmer—at least while he is actually on the carpenter's job.

Precisely so, when a church goes to "working as a Sunday school" it is not then working as the church, but only as a Sunday school.

The church that sends out and supports true loyal preachers, after the divine pattern—as it is written (other things equal), is a true loyal church.

But when that church goes to sending out and supporting preachers through the human institution of the missionary society it ceases to be a true loyal church.

Precisely so, when a church teaches the word in public capacity after the divine order—the scriptural pattern (cither things equal), that church is a true loyal church.

But when that church goes to working through the human institution of the Sunday school class system it ceases to be a true loyal church, having departed from the divine pattern.

But to call the true loyal church by either, or by both, of the unscriptural names, "Sunday school," or "Missionary Society," is to set aside the divine name, and substitute in its stead a human name, and such is presumption, and to do so is to "speak not according to this word"—the word of God (Isa. 8:20); and whoever does so does not "speak as the oracles of God" (I Pet. 4:11).

You say, "Being a Sunday school or a missionary society does not prevent it from being a church, but is simply the church at work."

This is exactly the same argument put up by the advocates of the human invention of the missionary society. They said their missionary society was "simply the church at work," and, therefore, divinely authorized.

If this argument proves your Sunday school class institution to be divinely authorized, it would prove the same for their missionary society. But if it did not prove their claim for their invention of the missionary society (and it did not), neither will it prove your claim for the institution of the Sunday school class system.

And just as sure as their missionary society was not just "simply the church at work," as they claimed, but—only an unauthorized agency for doing the work; so your institution of the Sunday school class system is not "the church at work," as you claim, but only an unauthorized agency for doing the work, as I clearly showed in my letter of Dec. 10, pp. 14-15.

And though the use of the unscriptural agency of their missionary society does not prevent the church using it from "being a church," yet it does, in reality, prevent it from being a true loyal church, in that it has departed from the divine pattern, presumptuously working through an unauthorized agency.

Precisely so it is in the case before us: though the use of the unscriptural agency of your Sunday school class system does not prevent the church using it from "being a church," yet it does, in reality, prevent it from being a true loyal church, in that it has departed from the divine pattern, presumptuously working through an unauthorized agency. (This is more fully explained in my letter of Dec. 10, pp. 14-15.)

We are commanded to "all speak the same thing" (I Cor. 1:10). But we cannot all "speak the same thing," when some are determined to speak only as the oracles of God speak, while others are determined to speak their own opinions.

My Question on Page 10 of My Letter, Dec. 10

No, my question on page 10 of my letter, Dec. 10, is both fair and wholly appropriate. It truly represents the course you took and Which you are still pursuing in this matter, when you set out in search for a model example of your Sunday school institution with its classes and teachers, including both men and women teachers, all operating at the same time in the public service of the churches.

Your "especially" calling my "attention to the Sunday school record in Acts 2:1-12," where you say the "teachers and classes arcs mentioned." And since it was on Sunday, you conclude, that it was, "therefore a Sunday school." When there are no such things mentioned in that scripture, nor elsewhere, as is clearly shown in my other letter, and as that scripture itself shows to a demonstration.

This is exactly like your calling my attention to that Greek word (Acts 19:9) used by the apostles to represent the idea of your Sunday school class system, when (1) that word does not contain such idea; and

(2) it was a word not used by any apostle in any passage of scripture, its being here 'used by the writer of the book of Acts, and this being the only occurrence of the word in the Greek New Testament. All your arguments consist of mere assertions and assumptions unproved and unprovable. Be patient and I will illustrate. The Methodist, when hard-pressed for Bible proof of his Methodist church institution, to give just one example of it in the New Testament record, he cites certain passages in which the church is mentioned; as, Acts 2:47, and others, and says, this is the record of the church; and since they used method in all their church work, it was, therefore, a Methodist church. And so he proves it by his own assertion.

The Baptist, in the same way, proves his institution of the Baptist church. He cites and quotes certain scriptures in which he finds the name church, and says that they taught and practiced baptism after the example of John the Baptist, and therefore, it was a Baptist church. And so he proves it by his own unsupported assertion.

The Missionary Baptist takes the same logic, and says, Since they sent out and supported missionaries, it was, therefore, a Missionary Baptist church. And so he proves it by his assertion.

The Presbyterian also proves his institution by the same logic. He cites certain scriptures where he finds the church mentioned, and then quotes I Tim. 4:14 in which he finds the word "presbytery." And he concludes, Therefore, it was a Presbyterian church. And so he, in like manner, proves it by his own unsupported assertion.

Just so, on and on, the whole way round, every sect and order proves its own peculiar institution and doctrine in the very same way, and by the very same logic you use, Brother Tallman, to prove your institution of the Sunday school with its classes and teachers, and that is simply by your own bare assertions and assumptions unproved and unprovable.

And they have a far better show at proving their church institutions than you have at proving your Sunday school class institution; for they do find the name church divinely authorized with which they join those other names to make out their respective cases. But you do not find the name "school" divinely authorized to which you may add the name Sunday to make out your case of the Sunday school institution.

Acts 2:9-10-11 Not Names of Sunday School Classes, But of the Different Countries From Which the People Had Come

I shall now consider your Sunday school classes that you claimed were in Acts 2:1-12. You say on page 20, "The classes are named in verses nine, ten and eleven, Parthians, Medes, Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and the parts of Lybia about Cyrene."

Here you left off without finishing the list, and say, "I did not name the classes in my last letter as I supposed you were able to read when I gave chapter and verse."

Of course I knew those names were all there, and I "also knew that they were not names of Sunday school classes, as every Bible reader knows who is not blinded by a human theory. No, it was your business to name out your Sunday school classes, since you said they were there, and you are in the lead and I following. So I pressed you to give the names, and now you have committed yourself on this point—that the names recorded in Acts 2: 9-10-11 are names of Sunday school classes. Now I am going to press it further upon you to prove that those names are Sunday school class names. So bring the proof in your next; for assertions without proof weigh nothing with those who go by what is written.

But finding yourself wholly unable to give a record of even one actual example of a Sunday school in any of the New Testament churches, you resort to this passage, and so pervert and wrest it from its connection (in sense) in the context applying it to a subject wholly unknown in the scriptures to make out your case, claiming that since it was on Sunday, it was, "therefore a

Sunday school." But though that was on Sunday, yet it was not a Sunday school, and from the nature of the case it could not have been a Sunday school; because it did not stop its operations with Sunday as your Sunday schools all do, but that work continued daily for an indefinite period of time (See Acts 2:46-47). And no school is a Sunday school except such as are operated on Sunday only. But this church work went on daily. Therefore, even if it had been a school at all it was not a Sunday school. And whoever calls that church a Sunday school speaks presumptuously, and "not according to this word"—the word of God (Isa. 8:20).

You quoted only twelve of those names as though that were all of them. Why did you not quote the other names? You had a reason for omitting them. Was it because you found only twelve teachers for the classes, finding more classes than you had teachers? Who then taught the other classes? Or did they go untaught for the want of teachers? Why did you not just guess at it, seeing you were in the guessing business, and say the women taught the other classes? Those you left off are the "strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians." You claim the women were authorized to teach in Sunday school classes, citing Acts 2:17; 21:9. Why then did you not put the women over the other classes and have the thing complete? Or did you foresee the difficulties in the way that you might have to encounter; namely, that such would have the women teaching in the public assembly in direct disobedience to the commandment of God that the "women keep silence in the churches" (assemblies), not being "permitted to speak" (in public capacity) (I Cor. 14:34-35)? Such difficulties are there as a mountain in your way of the Sunday school women teachers, whether you realized it or not, and the same stand in your way of such practice in our day, even as at that time.

But, my Brother, the plain simple truth of the matter is, that, instead of those names being names of Sunday school classes, they are simply the names of the different countries from which that vast multitude of people had come up to Jerusalem and were at that time "dwelling" there (Acts 2:5).

The first three names here—"Parthians, Medes, and Elamites" designate those who came from those countries, just as we who live in Tennessee are called Tennesseans, and those in Kentucky are Kentuckians, from Alabama, Alabamians. The other names are simply the names of the different countries from which they had come. Those from the country called Parthia were called Parthians, just as we are called Tennesseans. They from the country called Media were Medes, they from the province called Elam were Elamites.

Thus in your ardent zeal and strenuous effort to establish your claim for the Sunday school class institution you have drifted far out upon the sea of difficulties. Be patient, and with me, consider the following

Difficulties

You claim that your Pentecostal Sunday school consisted of its classes named in Acts 2:9-10-11, and their teachers, the apostles. Those classes were the whole multitude of Jews and proselytes "from every nation under heaven" (verse 5).

You claim that in this Sunday school all that great multitude were arranged in separate class-groups, each nation of people being a distinct class grouped off to itself and an apostle over each class, thus leaving some classes without a teacher, since there were more than twelve classes.

And you "endorse" this as a Sunday school. But you "endorse no Sunday school except the church, working as a Sunday school."

Therefore, according to your endorsement, this great Pentecostal Sunday school consisting of many thousands as members of the classes, and their teachers, was "the church working as a Sunday school."

By your making the Sunday school and the church to be one and the same institution, it logically follows that all the thousands of members of the Pentecostal Sunday school, including both believers and unbelievers, murderers and mockers; as well as friends, were members of the church before Peter preached, and, consequently, before they believed in Christ, without repentance and baptism, except the apostles and a few more who probably were present (See Acts 1:15). Quite a motley church was it not?

This Pentecostal Sunday school, as per your endorsement, being "the church at work," the greater part of the membership of that Sunday school church were unbelievers, impenitent, unbaptized, 'unconverted, and unsaved persons, including the wicked murderers of our Lord, all working together in the church which was the Sunday school, these being only two names for the same thing.

What was the subject lesson of that wonderful Pentecostal Sunday school? They did not learn in those classes what to do to be saved; for after the Sunday school was over, and Peter was preaching, they asked him what to do—they did not learn it in the classes.

But here comes another difficulty in your way; namely. The apostles were Speaking with other tongues before your classes came up there. As proof read Verse 4—The people constituting your classes (verses 9-11) were in the city, but not up there in classes (see verse 5 also 6-7-8).

After it was reported down in the city what wonderful speaking was being done up in the temple, the multitude came together, not to recite a Sunday school lesson, but to learn what wonderful thing that was, and when they came they heard the apostles speaking in every one's language, they were "confounded" (greatly astonished), and began to talk to one another about it. Nothing like your Sunday schools there, my kind brother.

Question: Do your Sunday school teachers go to teaching on Sunday morning over in the meeting house before their classes come in? If not then they do not follow this example. But if they do, whom do they teach?

My Argument on Acts 19:9 Not "Fiction"

No, my argument on Acts 19:9 is not "fiction," but sound logical reasoning. And it pretty thoroughly shows up the fallacy, or unsoundness of your argument on that passage. I ask that you and the reader turn to my letter, Dec. 10, and reread that argument; for it is unanswerable. I proved what I said, (1) that the school of Tyrannus was not a Sunday school, but a daily school; (2) that "daily," though sometimes means every day in the week, yet it does not always mean every day of the week. And when I said it does not necessarily mean every day, I meant it does not necessarily include every day in the week. I showed that daily sometimes includes every day in the week, and that sometimes it does not. I showed that even if that school (Acts 19:9) was operated

on Sunday (a thing I did not dispute), it was not a Sunday school, for daily does not mean Sunday, though sometimes includes it.

2. Even if some translations give it "every day" in Acts 19:9, still this would not prove anything for your Sunday school class institution.

And even then it would not necessarily include every day in the week, without first proving that the School of Tyrannus was operated every day in the week without any rest day (but such would be hard to prove). It could mean no more than every day that the School operated. I will illustrate.

Illustration

I have known many students under my observation, both as a, teacher and student, to attend school reciting lessons daily for a term of five months, and their record report shows they had not missed a day. And the average daily attendance most excellent. And it is well known that Saturday and Sunday were both excluded from school work in each week. But your rule of limiting by the context would make daily here necessarily include both Saturday and Sunday as well as every other day of each week throughout the entire term of five months. And I am quite sure the "fourth grade school boy" would beat you a long way on the limitation by the context, for he absolutely knows better, attending school only five days in the week.

3. No. my argument on Acts 19:9, that the school of Tyrannus was not a Sunday school, nor a church school, but (according to the best information at hand) a school of heathen philosophy, does not "prove," nor even intimate, that Acts 19:9 is "false." Neither does it "suggest that the apostle Paul was yoked up for two years with a teacher 'of heathen philosophy'" in violation of II Cor. 6:14.

That philosopher was liberal with the apostle giving him the privilege of preaching in his school. I preached in the house of an avowed infidel in Colorado and I ate with him at his table. He was friendly and liberal toward me, giving me the privilege of speaking in his house. Do you say that I was "yoked up with" that infidel in violation of II Cor. 6:14? Jesus ate with sinners (Mat. 9:10-11). Did he violate his own teaching?

No, my argument here is sound and absolutely unanswerable. But why did you not answer my question with reference to this case given as the concluding part of my argument on this point? I here restate the question, and ask you to answer it in your next.

Question: When you are called upon for one, yes, just one clear example of your Sunday school in one of the many churches of the New Testament age, in which you say the apostles taught in Sunday school classes, why? yes, why? do you pass by all those church Sunday schools, and in preference to one of these, settle down upon the daily school of Tyrannus, a school of heathen philosophy (according to the best information at hand), and offer it as a scriptural model of your Sunday school class institution that you are endeavoring to defend? This is strange to me. It clearly signifies to my mind that you absolutely knew of no New Testament example of your Sunday school class system in any of the churches of the New Testament record. But if you have such example, then why? I repeat, Why? did you not give it, especially when called upon? And since you say I am wrong, then it is your duty to teach me. So if you have one such example

please give it in your next and thus help me out of error. Will you? for your proof texts have utterly failed you so far.

Another thing I intended asking, and I trust it is not out of order to ask it here. You refer to my statement that daily does not necessarily mean every day, and then you say, "the standard dictionary says it does." Will you please quote the very words of the definition of the word daily as it appears in that dictionary, and give the Author's name? for I know of no dictionary that uses the word "necessary," or "necessarily," in defining that word.

Please do not persist in ignoring my questions; for if I am wrong, as you claim, how can I learn from you or any one else when you refuse to answer what I ask?

Your Misrepresentation Again

I stated a fact when I said that, by substituting the word "work" where I use the word system, both in your 7th and 8th answers you misrepresent me, making the false impression upon the mind of the reader that I oppose the "work" of teaching the word of God, when it is only the unauthorized system, used as an agency for doing the "work," to which I object. When I stated this fact I proved it equal to a demonstration. (See my argument in my letter, Dec. 10, p. 14).

1. Your quotation marks are misleading, seeing you did not quote exact. (1) You quote that I said, "In your 7th answer you misrepresent me," etc. But I said, both in your 7th and 8th answers you misrepresent me, etc. (2) Probably you suppressed this term 8th because you had not used the word "Example" in your 8th answer (inserting the comma to indicate the omission). (3) And since you say, "Had I not used the word 'Example' there might have been a show of truth in your statement," etc. (4) But you did not use the word "Example" in your 8th, but made the same substitution of the word "work" for the word system just as in your 7th. (5) Therefore my charge of the misrepresentation may have been "a show of truth" with reference to your 8th answer, and may it not also have the same show with your 7th? Yes, with your 7th also, even as with your 8th. And in all kindness to you, Brother Tallman, honestly I say my statement does indeed have a pretty fair "show of truth," And especially so when, in your effort at denial of this fact, you fully and clearly concede the truthfulness of my statement. For,

2. When you use the word "Example" in your 7th, which you say "includes method as well as matter, system as well as work," you expressly admit that you represent us as not only opposing your class system, but the whole thing—both the matter and the method, both the system and the work: which is, as I showed, a very grave misrepresentation. For I do not oppose the work of teaching the word of God, but only your unauthorized unscriptural system used as an agency for doing the work.

3. Therefore my statement that, by your substitution, you misrepresented me is absolutely true, and you are witness to the fact as against yourself in the case. For by your use of the word "Example" you make it out as appearing that we oppose both the method and the matter, both the system and the work of teaching the word of God. Therefore you witness to the fact that you did so misrepresent me making the false impression upon the mind of the reader that I oppose the work of teaching the word of God, when I only oppose your unscriptural system of doing it.

I knew at the time I said it that I stated truth, and I feel that my word is pretty well sustained, when, in fact, my complainant testifies so clearly, and so specifically in my favor as against himself. And I thank you for this clear and complete concession that my statement is true. And I content myself that all thoughtful readers will see it. And I earnestly pray that you, too, may see it, and also your error of denying this fact before it is too late to correct it. And Just here I again remind you of the fact that both my 7th and 8th questions still remain as yet unanswered; for it is a universally admitted truth that, "No question is answered until answered correctly."

My question: What is the "teachings and example of the apostles" pertaining to the public teaching of the word of God? (My letter, Dec. 10, p. 16). It will be well to bear in mind what called forth this question; for the precise point at issue is involved here. It was based on your substituted answer to my question No. 7 which reads:

7. Can a congregation of Christians do their whole duty and be saved in the end without using the Sunday school class system of teaching? But instead of answering, Yes, or No, you changed the issue here and posed the following as an answer. "7. A congregation of Christians that refuses to follow the teachings and example of the apostles in the Sunday school work is not doing their whole duty."

Thus by this pretended answer to my question you would make it appear that we oppose both the "teachings and the example of the apostles" in the Sunday school "work," which is a misrepresentation as is shown in the preceding and also in my other letter.

Therefore my question: What is the "teachings and example of the apostles" pertaining to the public teaching of the word of God? In your answer you say, "On Pentecost they taught first in classes Acts 2:9-11 then one apostle addressed the whole assembly Acts 2:14."

Then you say, "this is the same order that we follow Sunday mornings in Cookeville." (Your letter, Jan. 2, p. 21.)

1. In this you admit that your class work is that of public teaching, seeing that was a public assembly.

But your operation of the Sunday school class system of work, "Sunday morning in Cookeville," is so radically different from what was done on Pentecost before Peter preached that there is absolutely no similarity between them. Your class work is as different from what was done on that occasion as the blackness of midnight differs from the blazing light of the noon day sun.

It is nothing but your own bare assertion of an unproved and improvable assumption that "they taught first in classes." As I have shown in another section of this letter, the names in Acts 2:9-11 are not names of Sunday school classes, but of the different countries from which that vast multitude had come, and were then "dwelling in Jerusalem" (See Acts 2:5).

But your Sunday school classes (?) of Acts 2:9-11 were not present when the apostles began their wonderful speaking "with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts 2:1-14).

Therefore they were not teaching those people in classes before they came together. And if your life depended on it, you could not prove that when they did come together that they were divided

up into national class-groups for being taught. No one resorts to such perverting and wresting of the scriptures except those who are destitute of Bible proof when in defense of some unscriptural theory.

Question: Since you cite Acts 8:4 in answer to my question on the public teaching, Was that a specific case, or a general case, of public preaching? Or was it general including both public and private preaching? And did they go everywhere getting up Sunday school classes to teach as is done in the Cookeville church Sunday school?

Question: When you say of "Acts 19:9" that "they taught daily in a school," who were the "they" besides Paul? Now do not guess at it, but give chapter and verse, and quote the words that show who did it.

Question: When you say of Acts 16:13 that "Four inspired men taught classes at the same time, hence a school." Where did you get that? You did not get it in that verse. Again you say, "After the four taught for a time Paul preached." Where did you get that? True, Paul preached, the Book shows that, but the "four taught for a time," before Paul preached is not in the Book, then I ask, where did you get it?

If you did not invent this yourself (and I do not charge it to you), you must have received it through tradition handed down from some one who feigned it out of his own heart. (Neh. 6:8). And with this add your class system of arrangement of Acts 2:1-12, and I truly say, in the language of the faithful Nehemiah, "There" were "no such things done" there "as thou sayest," but such was feigned out of some one's own heart.

You say, "Sometimes they taught one small class Acts 8:35." Was this "small class" a case of public teaching? If not, then it was not appropriate to give in answer to my question, as I asked about public, not private, teaching. It seems that every where you go you find classes. But it has been said that, "Whatever one wants to see, he will see it whether it be there or not," But seeing things where they are not, is a sure symptom of an abnormal vision. And this is as true of one's mental vision as it is of the physical vision.

Again, where did you get it that "sometimes there were several teachers and classes but only one teacher to each class at the same time?"

True, there were many teachers, but where do you find the classes? I press it upon you to quote one sentence in the New Testament that mentions classes—such classes as you are trying to defend? You are having a hard time of it, Brother Tallman, as I told you you would. And I still warn you that it is as impossible for you to find your Sunday school classes in the scriptures as it is for the pedobaptist to find his infant baptism there.

Question: Please quote the law that binds just one teacher at a time to each class, giving chapter and verse, will you? that is, to each class-group of a divided assembly, the thing that is under discussion. Please to keep with the issue.

Acts 16:13 Not a Sabbath School, But a Prayer Meeting

"And on the sabbath day we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither." (Acts 16:13).

Again, your presumption that "Four inspired men taught classes at the same time" (Acts 16:13) to make it out "a school" as a model of your Sunday school class institution, is a clear case of perverting and wresting of this scripture to set up a model where there is none in an effort to defend an unscriptural thing that is causing discord and division.

It is nothing but sheer presumption to claim that there were four separate class-groups of women so arranged in that assembly, by the river side, and taught by "Four inspired men" "at the same time," but you have asserted it. Now bring the proof, or else confess that you were mistaken.

Instead of this being a sabbath school out there by the river side, the record shows it was a prayer meeting (Acts 16:13-16). Why do you not revise this passage, or give us a new translation of it, and let it run thus:

"And we went out of the city by a river side, where a sabbath school was wont to be conducted; and we sat down and taught four classes of women which resorted thither." (verse 13)? "And it came to pass, as we went to the sabbath school," (verse 16)? If that had been the way it happened, and had it been so written, then you would have had no trouble in giving scripture proof. But as it is you can prove nothing; for it is impossible to prove things real that are only imaginary, and that without evidence.

You say, "it was a Saturday school." Now since Saturday was the sabbath, if it were a school at all (a one-day school) it would have been a sabbath school. Though the record shows that it was a prayer meeting in which those preachers used the opportunity to preach the gospel. And from verse 16 it appears that it continued for several days.

Question: Since you have at last found, as you imagine, a real scriptural sabbath school (Acts 16:13), Why do you not now "get busy" and put in a sabbath school in the Cookeville church, so as to be apostolic in following this divine example? And (2) Since you found a model example in the daily school of Tyrannus (Acts 19:9), why do you not "get" more "busy" and put in a daily school in the Cookeville church in order to follow your model example of the daily school of Tyrannus, and thus operate your church school daily—every day in every week? to be truly apostolic? (3) If you claim to follow divine example, then why not practice what you preach?

When a preacher of the gospel says a thing he ought to be able to prove it, especially when he claims that such things are in the Bible. And now since you say that there were four sabbath school classes taught by "Four inspired men," before Paul preached (Acts 16:13); and that there were twelve (and more) Sunday school classes grouped off (Acts 2:9-11) and each taught by an apostle all at the same time, I am going to press it upon you to prove it. And since "It does not take long to tell the truth," then it will not take you long to tell it in this case, and thus prove what you say, indeed, if you have the truth on the subject. So be prompt and let the truth come. And again I call— "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. 8:20).

The pedobaptist, I repeat, proves his infant baptism exactly in the same way that you prove your Sunday school class system, and that, too, from the very same chapter (Acts 16). The pedobaptist

sees in Acts 16:15 his infant baptism—that infants were in Lydia's family, and that all were baptized; and says it is there, and so he proves it by his own assertion.

Precisely so, you see in the 13th verse of the same chapter your example of the Sunday school class institution at work operated by "Four inspired men" each teaching a class to himself, and all at the same time. And, like the pedobaptist, you say it is there, and so you prove your Sunday school class institution exactly in the same way he proves his infant baptism, and that is, by your own bare unsupported assertion.

So you and the pedobaptist can now walk together in union—neither can justly disturb the other; seeing that each of you are on an equal footing—each having the same right to his own opinion in cherishing his peculiar doctrine and unscriptural practice. And, since both have landed in Zoar, you may now there abide together peaceably. (See Gen. 19:17-22).

On page 21 you say, "Your last three questions are answered in the above, since there is no one specific law regulating teaching under all conditions, but general principles governing all and the specific laws for specific cases."

1. No, my last three questions are not answered in your letter.
2. I did not ask if there was "one specific law regulating teaching under all conditions." That would have covered all private teaching as well as all public teaching: whereas I did not ask anything about laws for private teaching, but only for the public teaching.
3. But in this statement you admit that there are "specific laws for specific cases" "regulating teaching."
4. Now if your answer, "No," to my Q. No. 9, be correct, then it logically follows that all the special laws of order for regulating teaching are for private teaching only, not one such law for public teaching; for, by your answer "No," you deny that there is any specific law of order for regulating public teaching.

Question: 1. According to your answer, "No," to Q. 9, can you, and will you, give one good reason, and prove it by the Bible, why it was that all "specific laws regulating teaching" were intended for private teaching only? and not one such law for the public teaching? And,

Did the Lord consider the private teaching as being of a more serious nature, and harder to control, than the public teaching? seeing, as you have it, that all specific laws of order are for private teaching, and not one such law for the public teaching?

Will you please give me one example of a specific law of order regulating a specific case of private teaching, and show by the scriptures that that law does not apply to any case of public teaching?

Since you deny that there is even one specific law of order for regulating public teaching, will you please point out some of the "general principles," or laws, that are designed for public teaching, and illustrate by scripture example?

What About I Cor. 14?

1. Is the speaking in unknown tongues (different languages), prophesying—teaching—of I Cor. 14 of public or private capacity?

If you agree that the speaking of this chapter is public, and not private, then you admit that the laws expressed in this chapter are for regulating public teaching, and not private. Then, according to your answer, "No," to Q. 9, you have obligated yourself to prove that not one of the laws of order in this chapter is a specific law; for they all pertain to the public speaking and teaching of the word.

Remember that law is a rule of action when relating to anything to be done. Every commandment of God is law. Read verse 37. The things here given are "the commandments of God." Is this true? If not, show why?

Now tell me, What kind of law is it that required the speakers who spoke in unknown tongues, to do so "by course?" Is it a general, or a specific law? If it be a specific law; that is, a specific command, then your answer, "No," to Q. 9, is untrue; seeing that this specific law was for public speaking.

Read verses 29-30-31. "Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge. If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted." Also read v. 32-33. "And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints."

That is the quotation in full of the five verses. And so I ask: Question: 1. When one prophet was speaking in the assembly, and the Lord wanted another to speak, the law was, "let the first hold his peace" (cease speaking). Now is it a general, or a specific law, or command, that "the first hold his peace?" If it be a specific law, then your answer, "No," to Q. 9, is untrue; for this specific law is here for regulating public speaking.

2. The law of order regulating the speaking to "one by one" in all the assemblies of the saints, is either a general, or a specific law. Will you deny that it is specific? If it is not specific, then there is no specific laws at all for anything. If it be specific, then your answer, "No," to Q. 9 is untrue, seeing that this specific law is for regulating public speaking.

The Specific Law of Order Relating to the Women

"Let your women keep silence in the churches." Is this a general, or is it a specific command? If it is not specific, then there is no specific law.

"For it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home." Why? Answer, "for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." (I Cor. 14:34-35).

Is it not a specific law that women be silent—not being "permitted to speak," narrowing it down to the specific point of asking a question in the public teaching service of the churches.

Was this prohibition upon the women of the church of Corinth only? or did it apply to them "in all the assemblies (public meetings) of the saints?" (See verse 33 also I Cor. 1:1-2).

Will you deny that the laws of order here pertaining to the men and the women are specific, and that they are of general application for all the public meetings of the saints?

It has been my observation for the last forty years, as a general rule, that, when in controversy, a disputant resorts to such tactics as to ridicule or belittle his antagonist as being "ignorant of language," with other unbecoming expressions, as personal reflections, it is a pretty sure sign that he is beginning to realize the weakness of his cause, and that he cannot meet the real issue in fairness. And that he decides that he must try to make it appear that the unanswerable arguments that are being put up to him are only "fiction," fit for nothing but the "Funny Paper," or "a man of straw," with other like expressions that his opponent is "ignorant," and knows no better. And if he can succeed in getting his hearers, or readers, as the case may be, to think so, he feels that he has made a point, at least with them. When, in truth, deep down in his heart, he sensibly and keenly feels it within his own consciousness that he is making an utter failure at proving his proposition.

If I am "ignorant of language," then teach me. Remember that the record says, "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise," (See I Cor. 1:27).

But you again misrepresent me when you say that I "confess" that I "do not know the meaning of the little word 'no' in answer to No. 9." All who read will see that I did not confess such thing. I only asked what you meant by saying, "No," to my Q. No. 9. For knowing the meaning of that little word "no," I knew you had missed the true answer if you used the word in its common or accepted meaning. Your answer "No" to that question being the direct opposite of the truth, it was astonishing that a man of learning, having a knowledge of language, and preacher of the gospel, would presume to answer, "No," to that question, seeing it is the very opposite of the true answer. I trust that you can now see those specific laws of order so clearly and specifically expressed in I Cor. 14, and other places; for they appear to be so exceedingly plain that it seems there is no room for any one to misunderstand them. Understand I do not attribute your failure here at proof to a lack of scholarly attainments, but to the fact alone that you have obligated yourself to do the impossible; that is, to prove your Sunday school class institution to be divinely authorized and recorded in the New Testament scriptures; which is as impossible for one to prove as it would be to change the Ethiopian's skin, or the leopard's spots (See Jer. 13:23).

And you may now be "surprised" when I tell you in truth that I can see, and did see, your answers to all of my nine questions. But you may not be surprised when I tell you in truth that I have not as yet seen your true answers to any of the nine questions except the two to which I called your attention in my other letter.

To answer at a question and miss the answer, is not answering the question, as most school boys know by experience. Of my original list of the nine questions there remain as yet unanswered the 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9. And others asked in my other letter (Dec. 10). To show it exceedingly plain I will illustrate.

Illustration

Now, Brother Tallman, should you decide to go to teaching school, you would have to go before the board of education and be examined for a certificate. So when the questions are all written and set before you to answer, if you should answer no better than you have answered my list of the nine questions given you—answering only two and missing seven out of every nine, you could not get a certificate, no, not even of the lowest grade. No, the superintendent would tell you that you would have to go back to school and inform yourself before he could give you a certificate.

And when you did succeed in getting the certificate and enter the business of school teaching, should you so misrepresent and pervert the teachings of the school text books, as you have the teachings of the Bible on this question, the faithful superintendent would dismiss you from the school on the ground of your being an incompetent and unsafe teacher, and select another teacher in your stead.

This illustrates the truth that no question is answered until answered correctly. I have about two more pages written, but not typed, but I will leave off for the present, and conclude with the following lines. Do not resent the truths I write, But weigh them in your heart: Be honest with yourself and God, And from those wrongs depart.

Though popularity you may lose,

And earthly friends beside;

You'll gain a home with God at last,

And with him e'er abide.

I once stood on that side myself, And thought that I was right; Until I heard and learned the truth,
That brought me to the light.

I labored hard and earnestly,

The issue fair to meet: On every point I tried to make, I met with sad defeat.

But when I saw that I was wrong, No longer did I halt: I weighed the thing well in my heart, And laid it in the vault.

With me the Sunday school was dead, So far as I was concerned; And for the sake of being right,
Away from it I turned.

I knew the world would frown on me, And brethren would despise: But in the hope of seeing God, I made the sacrifice. Trusting to hear from you at your earliest convenience, and to receive your further arguments, I remain

Your letter dated Jan. 15, arrived yesterday Jan. 28, 1931, which I will now gladly review. On page 22 you said I "pretended to answer." That statement breaks the rules of all parliamentary discussions. Why if an ordinary low down sinner would make such a charge against an opponent in the legislative hall in any civilized land they would make him humbly apologize or leave the

hall. And just to think that you a minister of the Gospel would stoop so low almost in the very beginning of this discussion break the rules of honorable debate, and line up with the enemies of Jesus Christ, who called Him a deceiver. I am sorry for you for God sees, and everyone who reads this discussion will see how far you have fallen below the rules of honorable discussion.

You frequently speak of "Your Sunday School institutions." Here again you miss the truth more than 1900 years for as you know; since I have repeated it several times that the only Sunday School that I affirm is the Church working as a Sunday School, as it did on pentecost. Acts 2:1-12. "Where at least some, if not all the teachers and classes are mentioned and it was on Sunday, therefore a Sunday School." Any systematic teaching of the word of God on Sunday is a Sunday School. You misrepresented me when you suggested that I left some classes without teachers. I did not say there were only twelve teachers, therefore you are without excuse unless you did it ignorantly. If there were only twelve classes having teachers it would still be a Sunday School and I have proven my proposition. So your misrepresentation served only to let the readers see your own failure and weakness. On page 30 you refer to the different classes of people dwelling in Jerusalem and present at the Sunday School Acts 2:9-11, and you say "They are simply the names of the different countries." Surely you could not be so ignorant unless you have been in darkness so long that you have lost the power to see. What country is "Medes?" Where do you find the country "Elamites?" Where is the country known as "dwellers in Mesopotamia?" In the next sentence you contradict yourself then on page 35 section a you contradict your contradiction. So which of your contradictions do you expect us to believe?

On page 31, Section 7 you ask "What was the subject lesson of that wonderful Pentecostal Sunday School?" That question is answered in Acts 2:11. "The wonderful works of God." On the same page you ask the question, "Do your Sunday School teachers go to teaching on Sunday morning over in the meeting house before their classes come in?" Sometimes I have been at teachers meetings before the Sunday School opened and sometimes to an early prayer-meeting. The apostles were not always there first. In Acts 16:13 the teachers were the last to come so either would be following the divine examples. Acts 2:11 shows not only the subject of the lesson but shows the different classes heard at the same time for the same tense is used (hear) and since God is not the author of confusion the necessary inference is that the classes were separated sufficiently to prevent confusion. If this is not so then you make God out a liar (the author of confusion) which is impossible. Thus all who read, can see (if seeable) that my proposition is established, by the word of God. So if you are satisfied with God's word you must surrender to it, cease fighting the Sunday School.

You suggest under your imaginary difficulties No. 4 and 5 page 31 that since the church on pentecost was "working as a Sunday School," that all the unconverted were in the church, and thus in your unkind manner speak of a "Motley Church." When the church meets on Lord's Day for worship we speak of it as the church and you understand exactly what we mean even though there may be one hundred or more unconverted present. Why then, can't you understand the same language when I speak of the Sunday School. Is it ignorance or are you wilfully misrepresenting the church at work. Again you say on page 31, "After it was reported down in the city what wonderful speaking was being done up in the temple, the multitude came together." What could be farther from the truth? Bold, brazen, assertion without a word in the Bible to sustain it. Again you are lining up with sectarians and adding to the word of God. You say I am following in the steps of the Pedobaptists and others. When that is the very thing you are doing. And as I

said before you are still running down the street acting like the thief (ignorantly I suppose) who had the stolen money in his pocket but to divert attention shouts "Catch the thief."

Remember that it is a serious matter to thus add as you so boldly did to the word of God Rev. 22:18. In Acts 2:2 God says "there came from Heaven a sound." In verse 6, God says "When this sound was heard the multitude came together."

One moment (on page 23) you say you "did not say one word about an institution separate and apart from the church" then you talk immediately about the Sunday School as a modern institution. You speak of the man made missionary societies, Methodist church and so on. Yet you say these are not separate and apart from the church. How do you expect us to have any confidence in you at all. You contradict me. You contradict God, and you contradict yourself. You have given us in your last letter nearly seventeen pages of false statements and contradictions and then you complain of me speaking of your ignorance. Well I want to be as charitable as I can. I certainly don't want to think that you are wilfully making these false statements and misrepresentations and thus sinning against God and your brethren.

On page 24 you are still whining about this controversy being thrust upon you. When the people know that it was not thrust upon you. Another one of your false statements. I did not complain of you going about for years with a chip on your shoulder. You have a right to challenge people to defend what they teach. But I do object to you whining about it, and making so many false statements about it after I accepted your challenge. Here is a sample of your false statements. "You were careful not to lift the 'chip' off my shoulder by politely accepting my fair, open, and standing challenge." The people at Pippin are witnesses and know that the statement is false for they know that I accepted your challenge and offered to meet you there or at McBroom's or anywhere else nearby if we were invited. But when no church near by wanted the debate I was the one that suggested this written discussion. Another false statement is "The only hope I saw of getting anything like a discussion out of you was, to write some questions and ask you to write your answers." Why do you make this false statement when many witnesses heard me ask you to write your questions and I would give you written answers. Can't you tell the truth anymore? Have you been preaching your false theory so long that you don't know when you do tell the truth?

Another of your brazen false statements, after you challenged me you said I "Continued to preach up the thing in my presence without extending to me the Christian courtesy of asking me if I wanted a word in reply." Bro. Watson, can't you tell the truth at all? The whole congregation at Pippin the last night of the meeting are witnesses and know that your above statement is false. For they heard me at conclusion of the service kindly invite anyone who had anything to say to come up and say it. You accepted the invitation and had your say, and now you deny it. What is the matter with you, brother. What will the readers think of you when they read from your pen so many statements that they know are absolutely false? And yet you claim to be a preacher of the gospel.

On page 26, you say "The name Sunday School is an unscriptural name and hence cannot represent a scriptural thing." What ignorance? What logic? Let us examine your logic with a few parallelisms. The name Grandfather is not found in the Old Testament therefore they had no grandfathers then. The expression Christian man is not in the bible therefore a Christian man is un-

scriptural. And so you see how ridiculous your ignorance and false statements makes you appear before intelligent readers.

You say that you didn't say one word about an institution separate and apart from the church and then you use nearly all of pages 26 and 27 to prove the Sunday School is separate and apart from the church. What will the Lord think of such false statements and inconsistencies. To prove that you did not tell the truth you use my wife's name to illustrate that the church and Sunday School are distinct and separate institutions. You say "Suppose your neighbor should presume to call Sister Tallman, your wife, by the name Mrs. Jones, . . . Would I not be safe in saying that such would be a misapplication of the name Jones, a displacing of her legal name Tallman, a misrepresentation of your wife and a dishonor to you?" Therefore you claim it is wrong to call the church a Sunday School or a missionary society. Well even in your illustration it seems that you cannot tell the truth. For Mrs. Tallman is not Sister Jones. If you call Sister Tallman, my wife or my housekeeper then you would tell the truth. Being my wife and housekeeper does not prevent her from being Sister Tallman. Even so the church, being a Sunday School or a missionary society does not prevent it from being a loyal church, but simply tells us that the church is loyal to God and doing the work God enjoins upon it as it did on Pentecost and at Antioch.

Again the farmer-carpenter-painter illustration. A man being a farmer, then a painter does not prevent him from being a man but simply proves that he is a working useful man. Even so The Church working as a Sunday School or a missionary society does not prevent it from being a church but simply proves it to be a loyal working church as at Jerusalem and at Antioch.

After calling your attention to the church on Pentecost working as a Sunday School you say on page 28, "There are no such things mentioned in that scripture or elsewhere." You remind me of the man who didn't believe there was such an animal as the giraffe, and when he was taken to the circus and saw one, after looking closely he says "There is no such animal."

Again to refute my argument on Acts 19:9 where the inspired writer actually called it a school and it was daily, thus included Sunday which you confess you do not deny. Therefore a Sunday School as well as a week day school, (I have taught as Paul did the word of God in a school seven days of the week.) You ask me where the plurality of teachers are in this case. The Bible Acts 19:9 says Paul reasoned (taught) daily "in the school." If he were the only teacher at that time he would have taught "the school," but Luke says he reasoned "in the school." So the necessary inference is more than one teacher at the time. But you say near the close of page 28 that this is "the only occurrence of the word in the Greek New Testament." Well, well, no wonder the infidel let you preach in his house in Colorado. If you handed out as many false statements as you have in this controversy I am sure you would do more damage to the cause of Christ than the infidel 'himself could have done. And now you refuse the Sunday School because God only said it once, — Page 28 near the close. How many times does God have to speak to tell the truth? I cannot think of a greater insult to God than that. No wonder the infidel encouraged your work in Colorado.

On page 32 you make a statement that contradicts itself. You say "I showed that even if that school (Acts 19:9) was operated on Sunday it was not a Sunday School." What a wonderful logician you are. Shades of ignorance! According to your logic—

A school operated daily is not a daily school.

A school operated on Sunday is not a Sunday School.

A school operated in summer is not a Summer School.

A school operated in winter is not a winter school.

It seems strange that you could be so low in the muddy rut of a false doctrine that you can't see your own ridiculous fallacies. Surely it must be dark down there.

You still like the ignorant thief shout misrepresentation concerning my answers to your 7th and 8th questions. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In the one I mention the example of the apostles and in the other I mention the classes. So how could any intelligent man misunderstand me? I cannot see how anyone able to read could be so ignorant as not to see that I plainly and correctly answered both these questions. I don't believe anyone could make it clearer. Is it because you cannot refute the scriptural position on those questions that you make such a fuss and falsely cry misrepresentations? Or is it simply ignorance?

On page 34 you suggest that I should have answered by yes or no. (Question No. 7.) And like the enemies of Christ you thought you had me trapped. They asked Jesus if it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar? You no doubt see their trap as you tried it on me but when he answered them indirectly they found they were in the trap so when I correctly answered your question you were trapped and whined misrepresentation.

On page 36 you ask me "Where did you get it that sometimes there were several teachers and classes but only one teacher to each class?" The answer is found in I Cor. 14:40. "Let all things be done decently and in order." The only exception to this is such as in Col. 3:16. If you deny this you deny Paul and hence reject the Lord who sent him.

Again on the same page you quote Acts 16:13 a part of which says "and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither." And you say "your presumption that four inspired men taught classes at the same time." Well you honor me by calling it my presumption for it is Luke's and Matthew's. For as sure as they sang at the same time Matt. 26:30 so sure did they teach at the same time in Acts 16:13. For the same time is used. And just as sure as Paul told the truth in I Cor. 14:40 they must have separated in classes. And if you knew the Jewish custom of Jewish speakers you would understand that "We sat down and spake" teaches that it was an orderly affair without confusion. So again just as sure as the Bible is true my proposition stands and you are found denying and opposing the word of God.

Since you admit you believe what the Bible says about women teachers there is no occasion for me to discuss it in this letter. When you deny it as you likely will and double-cross yourself and falsify the truth as you have so many times in this letter it will be time for me to turn the light of Heaven's truth upon your false theories.

On page 26 you said "The Lord named His church." Please give me the name with chapter and verse?

You made so many false statements, contradictions and misrepresentations in your talk on public and private teaching that I think it only right and charitable for me to have mercy on your ignorance and give you another chance to untangle your false theory before I reply. Surely you can't make it any worse for yourself. So here is hope that you can do better next time and if possible see and accept the truth.

O. H. TALLMAN.

THIRD REPLY

Cookeville, Tenn., R. 9, Feb. 15, 1931. Dear Brother Tallman: I shall now reply to your letter of Jan. 29, 1931, which is before me, receipt of which I acknowledged by letter the day it came to hand.

In the first place I wish to state that it has been truly said, "One's character is seen and read in what he writes." Your letter that is now before me manifests a spirit incompatible with the Spirit of Christ and of Christian fraternity. We are brethren, and should "love as brethren" (I Pet. 3:8). Remember that the word of inspiration says, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." (Rom. 8:9).

The Spirit of Christ in his disciples will lead them to follow and imitate his example. All your hard speeches about me, trying to make the false impression upon the reader's mind that I just won't tell the truth, and that I have written "nearly seventeen pages of false statements and contradictions," charging that I deny the word of God and "make God out a liar," are all untrue as my letter shows for itself. No more serious charges could be made than these against an honest truthful man. Such will reflect upon yourself and injure you far more than it will me. I give you the kind rebuke that Jesus and Paul gave. (Mat. 7:1-2; Rom. 2:1).

There are no just grounds for such charges, nor have I misrepresented you, my Brother, on anything you said. If I have it was not so intended. But you fail to show such at any point. You will have those charges to meet at the judgment, not I. And all I ask of the readers is a fair and an impartial reading of all your letters and mine, and I will be perfectly satisfied for them to judge for themselves in the matter. And I am glad to know that God is to be my judge in the last day. So I am not at all bothered about what the people may think about me. What I am most concerned about personally is to do my part in this controversy in the way that God will be pleased with it, and to be helpful to others who desire the truth on the subject. For,

Realizing that in the last day I shall have to give account to God for every word I say in this discussion, I mean to say nothing that I would not be willing to meet in that great day. What I have said, has been said in honesty and sincerity of heart, and "in all good conscience" toward God and man. And I mean to continue the same course to the end of our discussion. And I will have nothing to regret afterward in view of the judgment.

Jesus told the people of their wrongs, but he never misrepresented any one in any way on any matter at any time. He never charged any one with doing or saying things he did not do or say. If I be wrong I am honestly mistaken, then show wherein I am wrong—condemn my errors, and not my honesty. This is what I am doing for you. I know you are wrong on this question just as you know the pedobaptists are wrong on their doctrine of infant baptism. You know they are

wrong on their doctrine of infant baptism, because you know it is not authorized in the word of God. And just so I know you are wrong on your doctrine of the Sunday school class institution for the very same reason; namely, I know it is not authorized in the word of God. Since it is not mentioned in any passage of scripture, your doctrine here falls being condemned by the utter silence of the Bible.

1. When I said you "pretended to answer" my questions (the seven of the nine) that still remain as yet unanswered, I stated a truth, a fact. And I know enough about the "rules of parliamentary discussions" to know that no honest unbiased parliamentary body would even criticize a speaker for stating such fact when they knew, as well as he, that he was stating the fact in the case, just as I have stated the fact in this and throughout my letter.

But what would a parliamentary body do for a speaker in following his opponent in debate in the legislative hall who should presume to make such unparliamentary expressions, consisting of personal thrusts, misrepresentations and denial of truths and facts, with which your letter of Jan. 29th abounds from the first to the last (not every sentence, but many of them), when they, being fully acquainted with the subject matter in hand, and all the facts and circumstances connected therewith, knew he was palpably misrepresenting the facts in the case? If they were to "make" any one to "humbly apologize" or dismiss him from the hall, most assuredly that would be the man deserving the punishment. And should that speaker persist in pressing such in his speeches, there is no doubt that he would be permanently expelled, not only from the hall, but also from being recognized as a member of that legislative body henceforth and forever, unless he thoroughly repent, come back and make proper amends for what he had done.

And here I gladly answer your question which you repeatedly give: "Can't you tell the truth?" Certainly, Brother Tallman, I can, and do, tell the truth. This is a principle my father and mother carefully implanted in my heart in my early childhood, and one that I have ever loved and cherished, and endeavored to keep from my youth up. A principle I would not barter, or exchange, for all the gold and silver of this world, for without it I would be poor indeed for all eternity.

My letter to which you refer (Jan. 15, 1931) as being full of false statements, misrepresentations, and contradictions, in connection with yours to which it is a reply, stands as proof for itself that I am not guilty of the charge. And if such be your general method of trying to prove your propositions, when in discussions, you would be recognized in the field of polemics as a poor debater. But I cannot think that you pursue such course when you are on the right side of a question; for I am sure you then have something far better to give. Though I do not claim to be perfect, I admit that I am fallible, and consequently, liable to err. If I have made one false statement I am not aware of it. And if you will show it clear to me that I have made one such statement, I again say that I will thank you, and will not repeat it. But you have not proven one statement of mine to be false including all I have written to you. I know you have made a strenuous effort to do so. However, your effort here fails you even as your effort utterly fails to show your Sunday school class system to be divinely authorized and recorded in the New Testament scriptures. Which I repeat is as impossible for you to do as it would be for you to prove the earth is above the heavens, or that the sun is a body of blackness.

But, Brother Tallman, it is worse than time wasted and space unnecessarily used, to continue to parley over such irrelevant matters, of which your letter abounds, as the reader can readily see.

In brotherly kindness I, therefore, insist that you drop all such personalities out of this discussion that it may be more helpful to the readers who want the truth, and come back to the real issue, and with me discuss it upon its merits, or its demerits, whichever it may possess.

And again I call, in the language of inspiration, "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. 8:20). If your Sunday school class system be authorized and expressed in the law of the Lord, then read or quote it to me in the very words of this law. But since you fail to do this you "speak not according to this word," and as the Lord declares, the reason is, you have no light in you (on this subject). Though you may have plenty of light on some other subjects, yet on this question the very scriptures you quote and cite, witness against you that you have no light in you on this question; for you certainly do not speak "according to this word"—the word of God, when you speak up your Sunday school class institution. This is fully shown in my letter of Jan. 15, 1931, and of Dec. 10, 1930. Instead of repeating here I cite you to my arguments in those two letters, where I have explained in detail, even so plain that the "fourth grade school boy" can readily see it.

I spoke of "Your Sunday school (class) institutions" in exactly the same way that you speak of other unscriptural things that you oppose as belonging to those who advocate them, seeing that such do not belong to God, hence must belong to those who advocate them. So "wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself" (Rom. 2:1).

Your saying it "several times that the only Sunday school that" you "affirm is the church working as a Sunday school," does not prove that the church of God in New Testament times worked "as a Sunday school" of this age works, neither on Pentecost, nor any other time. My argument on this point in my letter of Jan. 15 is sound, logical, and unanswerable. And I cite you to it and not repeat here.

It seems that you cannot but misrepresent. I did not charge you with saying "there were only twelve teachers." But I did say that you found only twelve teachers (Acts 2:1-12). And I proved that those teachers were not Sunday school teachers. But did you find more than twelve? Who were they? and in what verse do you find them? If you did not find other teachers, then did you not leave the (so-called) classes you did not name without teachers? How could you leave them with teachers when you found no teachers for them?

And again I ask, Why did you not just guess at it and say that women taught the other classes, seeing you are in the guessing business, and thus have the thing complete, having both men teachers and women teachers, all teaching at the same time in the church, since you claim women are authorized to teach in Sunday school classes? and that this authority is in Acts 2:17; 21:9? especially so since you claim this as a model example of your Sunday school class system? making the Sunday school and the church the same.

Or did you foresee the difficulty that you would most likely have to meet; namely, that such would put the women to teaching—speaking—in the church in direct violation of that divine specific law of order that expressly forbids it? and which God says is "a shame for women" to do? (I Cor. 14:34-36; I Tim. 2:11-12).

And just here I will again say that I believe every thing the Bible says about the women's teaching; and everything the Bible says about the men's teaching. So now if you believe every thing the Bible says on these two points of law, then we agree on everything the Bible says on the subject. And again I ask, Wherein do we disagree? And the answer is, We disagree right where you leave the Bible and say things the Bible does not say. We disagree only on what you say, not on what the Bible says.

The Bible says, "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak" (in the churches). . . . Again: "it is a shame for women to speak in the church" (See I Cor. 14: 34-35). We agree that the Bible says this. But when you say, the women are authorized to teach in the churches we disagree. For you say the Sunday school is the church, and if this be true, then when women speak— teach—in the Sunday school, they are teaching—speaking in the church. Therefore, they are doing what God commands them not to do, and which God says "is a shame" for women to do. (See I Cor. 14:34-35).

Again the Bible says of the prophets (teachers), "ye may all prophesy"—speak "one by one that all may learn, and all may be comforted." We agree that the Bible says this. So God's order of the public speaking is, to take it "by course" (verse 27), "one by one" (verse 31), or one at a time. But when you go beyond what is written on this and say more than one are authorized to speak— teach—in the church (assembly) at the same time you say what the Bible does not say, and hence we disagree again.

I am satisfied with God's word just as it is written, without addition, subtraction, or change. And this is my weapon—the sword of the Spirit—with which I am "fighting the Sunday school." And it is the cry of almost all innovators when they find themselves wholly unable to successfully meet and refute the unanswerable arguments put up against their human inventions, they want us to "cease fighting" their unscriptural institutions and human theories. This sword of the Spirit must be used and not laid up to rust. So you will find me ever using it faithfully until I come to lay my armour down. But if you would lay down your unscriptural doctrine of the Sunday school institution, and be yourself "satisfied with God's word" as it is written without those additions, then we would be happily agreed, and that, too, upon the right thing.

When I said that those names (Acts 2:9-11) were not names of Sunday school classes, but of the different countries from which those many thousands of people had come, I stated a truth. And I explained it so clearly that even a "fourth grade school boy" can readily see it.

But you ask, "What country is 'Medes'? Where do you find the country 'Elamites'?" and "Where is the country known as 'dwellers in Mesopotamia'?" as though you did not know that those people of the different nations were designated by the names of their respective countries from which they had come.

My experience as teacher for years was that it took much more time, patience, and explaining in detail for some students to understand than for others. And in my observation and experience with preachers in religious discussions, I find the same is apparently true of preachers who are on the wrong side of a disputed question. It seems exceedingly difficult for them to understand the plainest and simplest statements of a logical argument, even when thoroughly explained in detail.

However, I am exercising patience, and sparing no time nor space in my earnest effort to help you to see the truth on the subject. So I will further explain.

Look on the map in your Bible and you will find every one of the names of the countries from which those thousands of people had come. (Acts 2:9-11). And the different nations of people were designated or called by the name of their respective native countries in which they dwelt.

There was the country by the name Parthia. Those who came from Parthia were designated "Parthians," called by the name of their native country. There was the country called Media, and those from that country were called "Medes," being designated by the name of their native country. And there was a country named Elam, and those from Elam were designated "Elamites," being called by the name of their country. And some were from the country called "Mesopotamia" wherein they were "dwellers," etc. So all were designated by the names of their countries where they dwelt. Just as we who live in Tennessee are called Tennesseans, designated by the name of our native state; those in Kentucky, are Kentuckians, called by the name of their native state.

What are the names of your Sunday school classes in Cookeville? If that was a Sunday school and those names were the names of the classes, then to follow the example, you should have your classes named. Who teaches the "Parthians" class? Who the "Medes" class? Who the "Elamites" class? And who teaches the "dwellers in Mesopotamia" class? If you cannot find any Sunday school class names in the Bible for your classes in Cookeville, as those names on Pentecost, I kindly suggest that you just guess at it and call all the classes by the one name "Elamites." And if this class name does not fit in as designating them by the name of their country as it did those on Pentecost, it would fit in very appropriately, in that of designating them by the name of the man Elam—the father of their Sunday school literature. Brother Elam once published a letter in the Gospel Advocate addressed to him, in which the writer said that Elam was the father, and that his literature was the son, and where he, the father, could not go, he could send his son, etc. (the date not remembered). This letter being published without comment gave consent to its contents, virtually admitting the relation as father and son. Therefore all Sunday school classes using Brother Elam's literature may appropriately be called "Elamites" classes, being designated by the name of, not the country Elam, but of the man Elam, the father of their class literature.

Now, Brother Tallman, if you cannot find those names on the map in your Bible—the names of those countries by which those people were designated, get in your car with Sister Tallman and drive down some evening and take supper with us (we will give you of the best we have), and my baby boy will take pleasure in pointing out those names for you as they appear on the map.

When I asked, What was the subject lesson of that wonderful Pentecostal Sunday school? I did not doubt that you would say it was "The wonderful works of God." But since I have shown, and since that scripture itself, as it stands unperturbed, shows that there was no such arrangement on Pentecost, as you say, but that was the subject of discourse spoken by the apostles "as the Spirit give them utterance" (verses 4 and 11).

But you did not answer my question: Do your Sunday school teachers go to teaching (the subject lesson) on Sunday morning over in the meetinghouse before their classes come in? No, you did not answer, though you know they do not. Neither did the apostles do such a thing; for they were not teaching in Sunday school classes, neither before nor after the multitude came together, but

preaching the "wonderful works of God." And as the people gathered in they all heard, every man in his own language.

I quote from your letter (p. 42): "Acts 2:11 shows not only the subject of the lesson but shows the different classes heard at the same time for the same tense is used (hear) and since God is not the author of confusion the necessary inference is that the classes were separated sufficiently to prevent confusion. If this is not so then you make God out a liar (the author of confusion) which is impossible."

No one disputes that "they" (the multitude) "all heard at the same time." But you affirm that the apostles all spoke at the same time. And this you affirm without one word of evidence. Such is, therefore, nothing but your own bare assertion of an unproved and unprovable assumption; and your "necessary inference" is only necessary to your unscriptural doctrine of your imaginary class division. For such inference is not necessary to prevent confusion when God's law of order is observed; which provides (1) that the men may all speak, though in the order of "one by one" (I Cor. 14:30-31); which is the same as taking it "by course" (verse 27); (2) that the "women keep silence in the churches," (verses 34-35); and (3) that "all things be done decently and in order." (verse 40).

But, Brother Tallman, when you say it is a "necessary inference" that what you call the classes were "separated sufficiently to prevent confusion," you thereby virtually admit that your doctrine makes God the author of confusion; For (1) if he authorized the class system, as you claim, which naturally creates confusion; but (2) did not provide a law in connection therewith to prevent the confusion; (3) it would follow as a logical and necessary conclusion that God is the author of the confusion by authorizing the thing that makes the confusion without giving a law in connection therewith to prevent the confusion, leaving it with every one to infer some way of his own to prevent it; thus leaving us to direct our own steps when he has declared that "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." (Jer. 10:23). Therefore your doctrine that God authorized the class system makes God the author of the confusion by not providing a law to prevent it. But the truth is, that, since God is not the author of the confusion, he is not the author of the class system that makes the confusion. They who authorized the class system and encourage its operation in any place are the authors of the confusion it brings, not only the confusion of words and sounds in the class work, but for the discord and division among brethren and churches. And according to your answers No. 4 and 5 you will have to bear your part of the responsibility of such direful results in the day of judgment.

Those Difficulties Again

If those insurmountable difficulties to which I called your special attention in both of my letters (Jan. 15, 1931, and Dec. 10, 1930) be only "imaginary difficulties," and not real, then the only logical and just conclusion that can follow is, that the doctrine itself that necessarily involves such is only imaginary and not real. But if your doctrine of the Sunday school class system, including the identity of the church and Sunday school, be true, then those difficulties really exist and stand as an impassable mountain in your way, and hence not imaginary. But if those difficulties are imaginary and not real, then your doctrine is necessarily untrue that involves such. Those difficulties stand or fall with the doctrine that involves them. My purpose in making those deductions from your statements of the Sunday school class doctrine was to lead you to see the absurd consequences that logically inhere in the doctrine, which is proof that the doctrine is at

fault. This is a sure way of testing the unsoundness of a doctrine, for no true doctrine involves any such difficulties.

And I did not mean to give it in an "unkind manner" when I showed you the real mental picture of that wonderful mixture and mingling of all sorts of folks as constituting the church of God on Pentecost, which you yourself made out by identifying the church and Sunday school, as being one and the same institution. For if that was a Sunday school and all those people were members of it, as you claim, then they were members of the church, or else the Sunday school is not the church.

And just here I will explain further, that though the church and the Sunday school are two distinct institutions, yet the Sunday school is not "separate and apart from the church," but is connected with the church, and is operated in the church. And so I say again, Quite a motley church indeed, is it not, if your doctrine be true?

Yes, I understand, "when the church meets on Lord's day for worship" and "we speak of it as the church," we do not mean that the "one hundred or more unconverted present" constitute any part of the church. But when you speak the same of the Sunday school (what you called Sunday school) on Pentecost, including all the unconverted thousands present as being members of your Sunday school, and then say that was the church at work, you have them all members of the church. So now when you speak of the church on Pentecost you include all the many thousands of the "unconverted present" as constituting the greater part of the membership of that Pentecostal Sunday school church (?). All!

my Brother, can you not see those difficulties are logically deducible from your doctrine? But this is not all yet, for there are numerous other difficulties involved in the doctrine of the identity of the church and the Sunday school, making them one and the same institution. Some of which I give here that I left off in typing my other letter as it was growing to be so long.

Other Difficulties

There are many difficulties involved in the doctrine of identifying the church and the Sunday school as being one and the same identical institution. I here give some that I left off in typing my other letter, all of which are logically drawn from your statements.

1. You assume without proof that the church and the Sunday school are one and the same institution, being only two names for the same thing.

You "endorse no Sunday school except the church, working as a Sunday school."

You "endorse" the school of Tyrannus (Acts 19:9) as a Sunday school.

4. Therefore you make the (Sunday?) school of Tyrannus to be the "church, working as a Sunday school."

5. This forces the logical conclusion that the school of Tyrannus is the church of God, working as a Sunday school.

6. Therefore, by your assumptions and assertions you have (theoretically) identified the church of God and the school of Tyrannus as being one and the same identical institution. The church is "of God." Here we agree because the Bible says this. But is the Sunday school "of God?" You say it is, and so here we disagree. Why? simply because it is a thing the Bible does not say.

7. But the (Sunday?) school of Acts 19:9 was "of Tyrannus," and not "of God." Will you accept the record?

8. The conclusion, therefore, follows that, if the school of Acts 19:9 was a Sunday school, and that Sunday school was the church at work, it must have been the church "of Tyrannus," and not the church of God, seeing it was the school of Tyrannus, and not the school of God.

9. From these we draw another logical conclusion; namely, your Sunday schools and your model example, the school of Tyrannus, are exactly alike in the one point of agreement, and that is all are of man, and not of God.

Difficulties Continue to Multiply

The absurdity of making the church and the Sunday school to be one and the same identical institution is clearly seen in the following inconsistent and absurd consequences that are logically and necessarily involved in the doctrine.

If the church and the Sunday school be one and the same identical institution, as you have attempted to show, then the conclusions logically follow:

(1) That all the members of the church are members of the Sunday school; (2) that all the members of the Sunday school are members of the church; otherwise they could not be the same institution. For the reason that, when two names are used to represent one and the same institution, the membership of that one institution are exactly the same when represented by the one name as when represented by the other name. (3) And since some infants are members of the Sunday school class institution, your doctrine has infant membership in the church; (4) and since some adults are members of the Sunday school that have not been baptized, and are not religious, you have membership in the church of unbaptized non-religious adults along with your infant membership; (5) and since there are some sectarians members of the Sunday schools in some places, you have sectarian membership in the church. Quite a mixture, is it not? But this would all be true if your doctrine be true that the Sunday school and the church be the same institution. And (6) since you teach that none can enter into the church without baptism, it logically follows that none can enter into the Sunday school without baptism. So I leave it here for you to fix up all these difficulties.

The Origin of This Written Discussion

I heard you deliver the last three discourses at Pippin and one before that in the tent meeting at Cookeville, and in each of the four services you made it convenient to speak on the Sunday school class question. But in neither of the four services did you extend to me the Christian courtesy of asking me, Bro. Watson, would you like to have a word in reply? It was at the close of the last service at Pippin that you gave the general invitation (which is always customary at the close of a meeting) asking, Is there any body here that wants to say anything.

The Challenge

After having heard you on the Sunday school question at Cookeville, and on Wednesday night (the first time I was present at the Pippin meeting), without any invitation to say a word in reply, I asked you, after service closed that night, if you would discuss the question with me there where the people had heard you on the subject. After talking a few words about it, you agreed to do so if the brethren wanted it. Then Thursday night you spoke again on the same question, and again closed the service without giving me any invitation to say a word in reply. And having learned that the brethren did not want the debate, that appeared to me that there would be no debate. Hence I saw no hope of having the discussion with you, except to write some questions and ask you to write your answers, and with this view of the situation, after service closed, I went to you and said I had learned the brethren did not want the debate, seeing they did not have the Sunday school there nor at the Chapel, and hence did not need the debate. I then suggested that I would write some questions and asked if you would write your answers, to which you agreed. I told you my first question would be about that Greek word you said meant "Sunday school," but did not tell you what the others would be. At my suggestion you agreed to write your answers. Hence I was the first to suggest this written discussion. Remember, this was Thursday night, and the meeting was to close the next night, and so far, no invitation to me in any way to say a word in reply.

Late Friday evening, having been busy all day, I wrote my questions hurriedly just before going to the service. I handed you the questions just before that last service began, requesting that you put them in your pocket and read them afterward as it was then about service time, which you did without reading them. By accepting my special challenge at Pippin you did not accept my open and long-standing challenge to which you refer. And this challenge that I have had hanging over the Sunday school advocates "for years," still remains unaccepted. Hence you have not lifted the "chip" off my "shoulder" by politely, or otherwise, accepting my fair, open, and long-standing challenge.

Therefore the arrangement for this written discussion was made— completed, and my questions all written, delivered to you, and you had them in your pocket before the last service began, and, consequently, before you offered that general invitation for any one to speak.

Knowing that this general invitation included me, I arose and announced to the audience that I had written some questions and had given them to you and that you had agreed to write your answers and mail them to me, and that in this way we would discuss the question. This was the first statement made to the audience concerning the matter. After I made this announcement, you then of course talked some with reference to the same, telling the people that you would write your answers. Instead of your asking me to write my questions, the questions were already written and in your pocket. And in your remarks after I had announced the arrangement for the discussion you said some things that I thought it prudent that I say one more word, and I kindly asked you to give me one more word, but you refused, saying, "No, no, we're not going to have a debate here tonight." I insisted that what you had said, demanded that I say one more word, but you still refused to grant it until one of the brethren spoke out and said, "Give him one more word." Then you granted it and I made the statement I wanted to make. Thus your refusal to grant me one more word showed it plain to the audience that you was not anxious for a discussion with me. And since you did not accept my long-standing challenge, but only the special challenge I gave you at Pippin, my statement is absolutely true, that, I have never offered a challenge in any unbe-

coming way. But you were careful not to lift the "chip" off my "shoulder" by politely (or otherwise) accepting my fair, open, and standing challenge, but continued to preach up the thing in my presence without extending to me the Christian courtesy of asking me if I wanted a word in reply. And the only hope I saw (this being Thursday night after service) of getting anything like a discussion out of you was, to write some questions and ask you to write your answers, which you agreed to do; seeing that you were answering questions each night that were being given you to answer. What I said was true in that statement in every detail thereof. And though you may continue to deny these facts, yet they will still remain as facts.

Report, or Rumor

When I said, After it was reported down in the city, the multitude came together, I did not miss the truth at all. I know the Revised Version gives it as you quote, "When this sound was heard the multitude came together." (verse 6).

While it is admitted that the R. V. is superior to the Old V. in many respects, yet it is also admitted that the Old, or Common Version, is better on some texts than the New V., and this text (Acts 2:6) is one of these.

The apostles were all there in one place. (Acts 2:1). "There came from heaven a sound," and this sound "filled all the house where they were sitting" (verse 2). There is no evidence that the sound filled the city, or that the people in general dwelling in the city heard that sound. There appeared to the apostles "cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them." (verse 3). "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." (verse 4). Then verse 5 tells of the people in the city, and (verse 6) the Common Version reads: "When this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language." And here "noised abroad" means reported—rumored.

The Interlinear Greek-English Translation gives it: "But the rumor of this having arisen the multitude came together," etc. But H. T. Anderson (our own brother) translates it, "When the report of this had gone abroad the multitude came together." (Acts 2:6). And certainly when the report "went abroad" it went about in the city, and this report brought the people together.

Then the Greek word here translated "report" is defined by Liddell and Scott (IV.), "a report, rumor." Citing LXX Gen. 46:16 and Acts 2:6 where the word is used in this sense. And Webster defines rumor: "Flying or popular report; a current story passing from one person to another, without any known authority for the truth of it." And rumor, as a verb—To report; to tell or circulate a report. (Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary).

But even if the Revised Version be admitted as true on this word, still you gain absolutely nothing at all here for your Sunday school class institution. For it matters not when the multitude came together, nor what caused them to come, there is absolutely no evidence whatever that they were so divided in national class-groups, and each sent away off from the others, as you claim.

Your so-called "parallelisms" fail you; for not one of them is a true parallel with the unscriptural thing called "Sunday school." Though the name "grandfather" is not in the Bible, yet the thing, or the being, called "grandfather" is mentioned in the Bible under another name—the very name

that is used to define the term grandfather, "mother's father" (Gen. 28:2); and "fathers' fathers" are grandfathers. (Ex. 10:6). "Grandmother" (2 Tim. 1:5). Yes, they had grandfathers back there, but they did not have the thing called Sunday school; for the thing did not exist in Bible times. Though the expression "Christian man" is not in the Bible yet both these names are in the Bible—and each is used to represent the same being,—the being called man, when he submits to the will of Christ he then becomes a Christian. But not so with reference to the thing called Sunday school; because the thing itself is not a scriptural thing not being mentioned in the Bible under any name. Therefore your illustrations all fail you, for they are not parallel. And, for this reason, no scriptural name can represent the thing called Sunday school.

My Illustration

Since you assume the boldness of presumptuously charging me with not telling the truth in my illustration in which I used Sister Tallman's name with no other than a pure motive to illustrate the point in dispute, I will here quote that illustration in full; for the statement of the illustration stands as witness that no reflections whatever were cast upon Sister Tallman in making that illustration.

To get the point to be illustrated clearly before the reader I will quote two statements just preceding the illustration. I said:

The name "Sunday school" you admit is an unscriptural name. This being true, the name cannot represent a scriptural institution; for the unscriptural name would, of necessity, represent the institution as being an unscriptural thing, and hence misrepresent it.

Therefore, Brother Tallman, when you attempt to identify the two institutions, the church and the Sunday school, you displace the divine name by substituting in its stead the humanly devised name, misrepresent the institution (the church), and dishonor the head of the church. I will illustrate:

Suppose your neighbors should presume to call Sister Tallman, your wife, by the name "Mrs. Jones," what would you think, and how would you feel about it? Would I not be safe in saying that such would be a misapplication of the name Jones, a displacing of her legal name Tallman (to the extent that name be used), a misrepresentation of your wife, and a dishonor to you? I ask Sister Tallman's pardon for using her name, I do so with a pure motive, to make the point clear and impressive so you can see it, Brother Tallman. (My letter, Jan. 15, p. 26).

Now that is my illustration, the whole of it. And it is so plain that any one who is not totally blinded to the truth on the subject, can see that it aptly and clearly illustrates the point, and that I did not call Sister Tallman Sister Jones, and that the plain illustration is wholly honorable, casting no reflections whatever upon Sister Tallman.

This argument is sound, logical, true, and unanswerable, that to call the church by unscriptural—unauthorized names would misapply such names, displace the divine name (to the extent the human names are used), misrepresent the church, and dishonor Jesus Christ, the head of the church. Since the church is Christ's "bride"—his "wife," the illustration is wholly applicable to the church even as it would apply to my wife, your wife, or any other one's wife. And the only reason I can see for your unjust complaint at this illustration is, that it completely refutes and exposes

the fallaciousness of your unscriptural doctrine of identifying the church and the Sunday school, and of thus calling the church by this unscriptural name.

But when I said, The Lord named his church, you asked for chapter and verse as though you would dispute it. I cite you to the following:

Acts 20:28; I Cor. 1:2; II Cor. 1:1; Gal. 1:13; I Tim. 3:15; Heb. 12:23. Locally, "churches of God," I Thes. 2:14; "churches of Christ," Rom. 16:16. "The church of the first born." "The first born" was Christ. "The whole family in heaven and earth is named" of him (Eph. 3:15). Thus we find the names divinely given; "church of God"—"churches of God"—church of the first born" (which was Christ)—"churches of Christ," etc. Every member being named "of him" in that they are "called Christians" (Acts 11:26). All of them as a whole—"the church of (Christ) the first born"—"the church of God."

Your "giraffe" illustration fails to illustrate; for he denied that there was such animal, having never seen one. But I do not deny that there are Sunday school institutions, having seen many of them, all of which operate in direct violation of divine law (I Cor. 14:30-31-34-35). But if there be any point of similarity in the two cases it lies in this; namely, like as that man denied the truth when shown to him that there was such animal, and still held his old error that there is no such animal; just so you deny the truth when shown to you that the Sunday school institution is not mentioned in the Bible, and still hold to your old error that such is there when it is not.

A man is surely hard-pressed for Bible proof of his human tradition when he has to resort to I Cor. 14:40 and force the "several classes" into that verse, and make it say that each class must have but one teacher only, at a time and then virtually admit that it is not so mentioned, but that it is only an "inference," claiming it as a "necessary" one. But this assumption is only necessary to your other unproved and unprovable assumption of the class system. But one unprovable assumption requires another assumption to support it, and so, on and on, you go piling assumption upon assumption. And hence just as the pedobaptist you finally rest your cause upon assumption unproved and unprovable, there being not one scripture that even mentions your institution of the Sunday school class system. And, let me again forewarn you, my Brother, that your eternal salvation is at stake, and your record in this discussion will stand against you in that last and great day, unless you repent and obtain pardon. I pray that you may not go on thither under the burden of such an unbecoming record as you are making it. I stated truth, which I here repeat, that, if your life depended on it, you could not show a record of the mention of your Sunday school class institution in any passage of scripture. Your effort in your three letters stands as absolute proof of this fact. And every text of scripture stands as an infallible witness against you in this matter. And again, in the language of an inspired apostle, I ask, "Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth?"

I quote that verse: "Let all things be done decently and in order." (I Cor. 14:40). This covers the whole ground including every thing that is required to be done in the public service of the churches. And certainly that part expressed in Col. 3:16 is not an exception to this. And when I say this, I do not "deny Paul," nor "reject the Lord who sent him." But have faithfully defended his word against your unscriptural doctrine of the class system which always violates divine law when in operation.

And I again speak the truth against your unwarranted assumption when I say that the language of Acts 16:13; "and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither," does not even indicate that "four inspired men taught classes at the same time." But such is nothing but your own bare and unsupported assertion. And you may have all the "honor" of such unprovable assumption to yourself; for you cannot palm it off upon Luke and Matthew, for neither of them is guilty of such assumption. It is only your assumption unprovable that "as sure as they sang at the same time, Matt. 26:30, so sure did they teach at the same time in Acts 16:13." And you give as a reason for this assumption that "the same tense is used." The singing naturally includes all voices at the same time, there being no law restricting the singing to "one by one." But the speaking—teaching of the word in the churches is thus restricted to the order of "one by one" (I Cor. 14:30-31). The "same tense" being used does not imply that they all spake at the same time, just as they all sang at the same time. The very nature of the song service requires that all sang at the same time, there being no restriction to the contrary. But not so with the teaching service; for the very nature of this work demands that one speak at a time, and the specific law of restriction being expressly given; (1) that all may prophesy—speak—teach, but in the specific order of "one by one;" and (2) that the "women keep silence in the churches." (I Cor. 14:30-31, 34-35). And just as sure as Paul told the truth in I Cor. 14:40, and just as sure as they obeyed his commands in this verse and in the other verses cited, just that sure they did not divide into classes nor have a plurality of teachers all teaching at the same time in direct violation of the divine law just given that binds them to speak "one by one." This specific law of order (verse 31) obeyed prevents all confusion that would naturally result from more than one's speaking at a time. And I repeat that since "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints" (verse 33), he is not the author of the class system operated under a plurality of teachers all teaching at the same time, which naturally creates the confusion. Therefore your human tradition of the Sunday school class system operates in direct disobedience to the divine specific law given by Paul. And Paul did not contradict himself by commanding them to speak "one by one" in all the churches, and then authorize that more than one speak at the same time. Your Sunday school doctrine of the class system makes Paul the author (or rather makes God the author) of two conflicting and contradictory laws for the teaching service of the churches; namely, one law that all the prophets speak in the order of "one by one," and then require that they operate a plurality of teachers at the same time.

This is virtually charging God with folly, and self-contradiction, and the author of confusion. And, my Brother, I repeat that no scripture was ever more grossly perverted and wrested to teach a sectarian doctrine than the passages you use are so treated to prove your unscriptural doctrine of the Sunday school class institution.

And "just as sure as the Bible is true" your proposition falls without one scintilla of support from the divine record, being condemned by the utter silence of the Bible.

And your last statement (p. 21) demonstrates the fact that you art walking in the shoes of him who ran away shouting "Catch the thief," to divert attention away from the real issue, and to make folks think you are doing something by saying something, when, in reality, you are doing nothing toward proving your proposition, but making an utter failure.

In every instance where I said you misrepresented I proved it to be a fact. And I will here repeat that if I have made one false statement I am not aware of it, and if you will show me such state-

ment in any letter of mine, I will thank you and will not repeat it. Who could offer any fairer than this? All I ask of the reader is a careful and an impartial reading of my letters with yours, and I shall be satisfied with my part of this discussion, as to what they may think about me, though it matters not so much what the people may think of me, my special desire being to please the Lord, and to seek the honor that comes from God only, and with this to help all who desire to know the truth on the subject.

My Logic, Irrefutable

On page 45 you again refer to, and grossly misrepresent and pervert, my argument on Acts 19:9, for there is no contradiction, and my logic is sound and true. I stated truth when I said, "I showed that even if that school (Acts 19:9) was operated on Sunday (a thing I did not dispute), it was not a Sunday school; for daily does not mean Sunday, though sometimes includes it."

No, my logic does not say that, "A school operated daily is not a daily school." This is a direct contradiction to my logic which says, A school operated daily is a daily school. Neither does my logic say that "A school operated on Sunday is not a Sunday school." But my logic here is, that a school operated both on Sunday and also on other days of the week is not a Sunday school, because the idea of a Sunday school is one that is operated on no other day of the week than on Sunday. Therefore the school of Tyrannus (Acts 19:9) was not a Sunday school, since it was not operated on Sunday only, but a daily school, seeing it was operated daily.

And, furthermore, my logic does not say that "A school operated in summer is not a summer school," but that a school operated in all seasons of the year is neither a "summer school" nor a "winter school," but a yearly school, even as one that is operated daily is a daily school. My logic shows that a school operated in summer only is a summer school; and one operated in winter only is a winter school. Just so a school operated on Sunday only is a Sunday school. Therefore you misrepresent the school of Tyrannus (Acts 19:9) when you call it a "Sunday school," for the name Sunday, as a designating title, would falsely represent that school as operating on no other day of the week than on Sunday, whereas it was operated daily. This is plain enough for the "fourth grade school boy" to see the soundness of my argument here.

My logic is both sound and true, As I have here explained to you: But your logic's all out of joint; You do not reason to the point.

There was no way you could invent, By which to meet my argument: Hence you resort to ridicule, In defense of your Sunday school.

Again (page 45) you show that you sensibly feel the irresistible force of my invincible argument exposing your palpable misrepresentation set forth in your pretended answers to my 7th and 8th questions, where you substituted the word "work" where I used the word system in both my 7th and 8th questions, making the false impression upon the mind of the reader that I oppose the "work" of teaching the word of God, when I specifically stated that it is only your unauthorized system, used as an agency for doing the work, to which I object.

And when you expressly admitted that, by your use of the word "Example" in your 7th, you included both "method and matter," both "system and work" as being what we refuse, you made yourself a direct witness to the fact that my charge is true, as I showed in my other letter.

As my argument at this point is so clearly stated in my letter of Jan. 15, 1931, pp. 33-34; also in that of Dec. 10, 1930, pp. 14-15, I cite you and the readers to what I said in those letters, and not repeat here. Kind reader, please read that argument in those two letters, and you will know that what I therein said is every word true, and that my argument is unanswerable.

The Lord spoke by the prophet Jeremiah:

"Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my words every one from his neighbor.

"Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that use their tongues, and say, He saith." (See Jer. 23:30-31).

Question: 1. How did those prophets steal God's words "every one from his neighbor" in that age?

2. Is there any such stealing of God's words in this age of the world? If so, in what way?

Now, Brother Tallman, seeing that you persist in claiming that you answered my 7th and 8th questions, and the others, as well, that I said remain unanswered, I again repeat it that, there still remain the seven of the nine questions yet unanswered, and my argument is irrefutable.

And along with your proposed answers my illustration of the fact shows it equal to a mathematical demonstration, that each of those seven questions still remain as yet unanswered. (See my illustration, letter, Jan. 15, 1931, p. 40).

"Trap"—"Trapped"

When Jesus answered the question, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?" (Mat. 22:17,21), by saying, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's," he answered it correctly and in the affirmative. He did not put up a substitute and answer something not asked.

But you did not answer my 7th and 8th either directly or indirectly. But as I said, you put up a substitute and answered something I did not ask. I cite you and the reader to my first letter (Dec. 10, 1930, pp. 14-15; and also Jan. 15, 1931, pp. 33-34), where it is clearly explained, and not repeat here. And as I said before, I repeat that,

When I gave you those nine questions I knew then, as well as now, that those difficulties to which I called your special attention were in your way whichever way you answered, whether affirmatively or negatively. I did not call it a "trap," but since you have used that word, it very appropriately represents it. And when you agreed to write your answers to those questions and accepted the questions you were then in the "trap," so to speak, seemingly before you knew it. And you could not escape by answering either way affirmatively or negatively without being caught; for, as I showed, had you answered "Yes," or affirmatively as Jesus answered, you would have been confronted with insurmountable difficulties. But had you answered "No," or negatively, still you would have met other insurmountable difficulties, and so you did not answer either affirmatively or negatively. Whether your foreseeing this trouble was your reason for not answering I did not say. I left that with you and the Lord, and I still leave it so.

Every one of the other five unanswered questions, may also be appropriately designated by the term "trap" even as you have designated the 7th and 8th; for the reason that when you answer it matters not what your answer might be you are "trapped," and cannot escape these difficulties that fall in the way of your Sunday school class doctrine. The only way possible to escape those difficulties would be to abandon the doctrine itself. And your very expressions, "trap"—"trapped," show that you must have viewed it as a "trap."

Jesus asked certain errorists a question, and they reasoned about it, and viewing it as a trap, they saw if they answered either way they would be trapped, confronted with difficulties they were not willing to meet; and hence they said, "We cannot tell." (Mat. 21:25-26-27). Now if you had done as these did you would not have been so badly entangled in the trap of difficulties, though you would not have been clear, seeing you still hold your error. (One more word on Acts 19:9).

You say (p. 44), "Paul reasoned (taught) daily 'in the school.' If he were the only teacher at that time he would have taught 'the school.' But Luke says he reasoned 'in the school.' So the necessary inference is more than one teacher at the time."

There may have been many teachers there present constituting the faculty of that school who, at the time, were listening to Paul, but there is not one word of evidence that any other teacher taught while Paul was reasoning, teaching "the word of the Lord Jesus," in that school. And there is absolutely no such "necessary inference" in the case. Such inference has been invented as a necessity where men, not being satisfied with God's word as it is written, have set aside God's specific laws of order for regulating the public teaching of his word (I Cor. 14:27-35 inclusive), and substituting their own way instead.

Your logic would have it that a preacher cannot reason in his discourse delivered in a school unless other teachers be also teaching at the same time in the same school which is absolutely untrue.

Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and of judgment to come" before Felix (Acts 24:25), and no other teacher teaching at the same time. Now if Paul could reason in his discourse on one occasion without other teachers teaching at the same time in the same assembly he could have so reasoned on any other occasion where no other teachers were teaching at the same time. Therefore it is not a "necessary inference" that other teachers were teaching at the same time Paul was discoursing—reasoning—teaching—preaching "the word of the Lord Jesus" "daily in the school of one Tyrannus."

Your logic is a fallacy of the worse kind. There never was a more fraudulent specimen of false logic practiced in support of a false doctrine than is your logic in this case in your effort to defend your unscriptural doctrine of the Sunday school class institution.

But just such specimen of logic shows that a man is in a hard place, being hard-pressed for Bible proof and finding none in support of his unscriptural theory.

If all would follow the divine order of teaching in all the assemblies of the saints, there would be no separation of an assembly into class-groups to be taught; there would be no "confusion" of voices caused by more than one's teaching at the same time in the churches. Confusion would be avoided, and peace and good order would be maintained in all the churches of the saints. And

your "necessary inference" would necessarily pass out of existence, and never more cause "confusion," disturb the peace nor break the unity of brethren, bringing discord and division in the Spiritual body of Christ. But all would dwell together in unity, all being of one mind, and one spirit; keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, as we are commanded to do. And the word of God would be taught both to the children and to adults as God commands that it be done.

I proved that my argument does not make Acts 19:9 "false," nor "suggest that Paul was yoked up with a teacher of heathen philosophy," in violation of 2 Cor. 6:14, as you charged.

And seeing you could not sustain your charge by argument you insinuate that the reason that infidel extended to me the courtesy as an honorable gentleman, to give me the privilege of preaching in his house, and to eat with him, was that I lined myself up with him in that of partaking of his evils. And this you do without any evidence whatever. Such is, therefore, wholly unjust and untrue. And again I cite the words of Jesus and Paul as a kind rebuke at this point: "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged," etc. (Mat. 7:1-2). . . . "For wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." (Horn. 2:1). These are the words of the Lord, not mine. And I am sorry to have it to say, nevertheless, it is true, that that infidel extended to me more manly courtesy, and manifested a better spirit, than some of my preaching brethren have done, notwithstanding the fact that I preached as firmly and faithfully against infidelity in his presence as I have preached against the innovation of the Sunday school class question. I have always endeavored to speak in the right spirit when treating disputed subjects.

And I conclude this part of the subject by saying that, at my request, that infidel explained to me what caused him to become skeptical, which was, that he saw so much evil, both in word and deed, exhibited by so many who claimed to be Christians—speaking falsely, and committing crimes that he would not do himself. Such course in so-called Christians is calculated to make many infidels, but no believers.

Come back now from your rambling tour,

And meet the real issue:

And if you have the truth to give,

Prove your position true. .

To those 'Unanswered questions go, And answer if you can: Thus prove your Sunday school divine, That it's Jehovah's plan.

But though you read the Scriptures through, And in them carefully look: I'm sure you'll never find the thing Recorded in the Book.

If I could not the scriptures show, For what I b'lieve and teach; I would give up the thing, I know, And help to heal the breach.

I called your attention to the fact that every scripture you cited is as destitute of the idea of your Sunday school class institution, as are those passages cited by the pedobaptists destitute of the idea of their doctrine of infant baptism. And that you are walking in their steps, in that you offer as proof of your doctrine of the class system your assumptions and assertions unproved and unprovable.

You fail to answer my questions on page 38 of my last letter (Jan. 15, 1931). On page 21 of your letter (Jan. 2) you admit that there are "specific laws for specific cases" "regulating teaching." But, according to your answer, "No," to my Q. No. 9, that God has not given a (one) "specific law" of order regulating the public teaching of his word, it follows as a logical and necessary conclusion that all those specific laws of order are for "specific cases" of private teaching, and not one such law for the public teaching. And here I repeat the questions:

1. According to your answer, "No," to Q. No. 9 (the original list), will you, can you, give one good reason, and prove it by the Bible, why it was that all "specific laws" "regulating teaching" were intended for private teaching only? and not one such law for the public teaching? And,
2. Did the Lord consider the private teaching as being of a more serious nature, and harder to control, than the public teaching? seeing, as you have it, that all specific laws of order are for private teaching only, and not one such law for the public teaching?
3. Will you give me one example of a specific law of order regulating a specific case of private teaching, and show by the Scriptures that that law does not apply to any case of public teaching?
4. Since you deny that there is even one specific law of order for regulating public teaching, will you show that the law of order providing that the prophets (teachers) speak "one by one" (I Cor. 14:31) is for private teaching, and not for public teaching?
5. And is the specific law providing that the "women keep silence in the churches"—that it is a "shame for women to speak in the church," is for private teaching, and not for public teaching? (I Cor. 14:34-35).
6. Will you give me the general law that liberates women to teach in the churches (the Sunday schools being the churches, according to your claim), or the specific law that commands women to teach in the churches? and show that it does not conflict with that specific law that expressly forbids it? (I Cor. 14:34-35; I Tim. 2:11-12).
7. We agree that God commands women to teach, because the Bible says so. We also agree that God commands women to be silent and not teach, for the Bible says so. We also agree that God does not contradict himself, hence these two commands do not conflict the one with the other, but are in perfect harmony. We also agree, or would you dispute, that those two laws pertaining to the women's speaking and being silent are each specific?
8. But according to your answer "No" to Q. No. 9, both of these specific laws pertain to the private teaching and silence of the women, seeing that you deny that any specific law is for the public teaching.

9. Please explain the difference between a specific law and a general law? What could be more specific than your Sunday school class law of order (1) to divide an assembly up into different classes for the specific purpose of teaching them? (2) And of placing one teacher only over each class? And (3) all to operate at the same time?

10. When you deny that God has given a specific law for regulating the public teaching, you deny that he authorized your Sunday school class law of order.

11. Does the prohibition upon the women (I Cor. 14:34-35) apply to the women of the Corinthian church only? Or does it apply to "all the churches of the saints" everywhere? (See I Cor. 1:1-2).

12. Why did you leave my illustration untouched (My letter Dec. 10, 1930, p. 15)? And here I press the question, What would you do, and say about it if one or more of the sisters of the Cookeville church should presume to take it upon themselves to proclaim the gospel by public oration, as from the pulpit, imitating the example of Christ and his apostles, even as men do? Would you tell them that they are right, they are doing a good work, go ahead? Or would you object?

But the sisters do not do that. Why? yes, why? There is a reason. Is it their duty to do so? Or are they forbidden to do so? If it be their duty, show the command for such? If not their duty, cite the scripture that specifically forbids it? And in that same scripture you will find the specific law that forbids the women to speak in the churches, even limiting it down to the specific point of asking a question for information on "anything." Am I right in this or not?

Such preaching of the word is a good work, yet when done by the woman it is done contrary to the word of God, being done through an unauthorized agency.

Precisely so it is with reference to the Sunday school class system of teaching—the work is done through an unauthorized agency, and therefore, contrary to the word of God, just as in the case of the woman. And so sure as the woman is to be condemned for serving as an unauthorized agency in the public teaching of the word, even so the Sunday school institution, consisting of its classes and teachers, all operating at the same time in the churches, will be condemned, not for doing a good work, but for acting presumptuously as an unauthorized agency in doing the work. And I repeat that, It would be better not to do a thing at all rather than do it contrary to the commandment of God. This principle is exhibited in the case of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10:1-2).

I insist that it is in order that you discuss the woman question. And be sure to not just guess at it, but quote the scriptures that authorize women to teach—speak—ask and answer questions in the churches in the public teaching of the word of God. Come on and let us have some real good debating and that upon the high plain of honorable controversy that the readers may be benefitted, and God's name glorified.

I have more written, but why continue? Seeing that I have taken every argument from you that you have put up, and left you, as it were, far out upon the sea of difficulties in the midst of the dense fog and clouds of human traditions, without chart or compass, drifting in the darkness of traditional assumptions and assertions in support of an unscriptural doctrine and practice.

I conclude with this prayer for you, my dear Brother, that you lay down this human tradition, and come back to the divine law of order, and let peace and unity be restored, and let us be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment, and all speak the same thing, having no divisions among us, and that we may all be one in Christ as he and his Father are one. And thus cease hindering Christ's prayer from being answered (Jno. 17:21), that the world may believe in Christ.

Trusting to hear from you at your earliest convenience, and to receive your further arguments, I remain as ever Your brother in search of divine law,

J. P. WATSON.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Cookeville, Tenn., Feb. 26, 1931. Dear Brother Watson: Your letter of Feb. 15 reached me Feb. 23 and I shall hasten my reviews as I wish to finish this controversy before my revival meetings begin this spring.

On page 46 you endorse the quotation "One's character is seen and read in what he writes." Then I am sorry for you Bro. Watson, for the readers will see in your scores of false statements, misrepresentations and illogical conclusions a character unbecoming to a professed Christian and especially unbecoming to a Gospel preacher. I am afraid the readers of your letters will not be as charitable toward you as I am. I am trying to believe that you are honest and that your terrible blunders are because of ignorance or blindness but I fear (and my fears are justified by those who have already read your letters) that many indeed will believe you either crazy or a wilful perverter of truth and righteousness. I exhort you as I would my own father if he had thus fallen to repent and prove that you are trying to tell and live the truth and I'll do what I can to help the people to regain their lost confidence in you.

On page 66 you say "Let us have some real good debating and that upon the high plain of honorable controversy." That sounds good, but why then did you break the rules of all honorable discussion and stoop lower than a wicked low down sinner is allowed to stoop in parliamentary debates, and use such ungentlemanly and unchristian statements as I "Pretended to answer" and that I was "Trying to make the false impressions." These statements are unparliamentary, unchristian and unscriptural. (I Cor. 2:11). Again you line up with the enemies of the Lord who said He was a deceiver. You ask for an honorable discussion, then you stoop far below all honorable, decent discussion. You teach one thing and practice another. What do you call yourself? Surely I am very charitable when I say you must do it ignorantly. In your own language let me say "Let me again forewarn you, my Brother, that your eternal salvation is at stake, and your record in this discussion will stand against you in that last and great day unless you repent and obtain pardon. I pray that you may not go on thither under the burden of such an unbecoming record as you are making." You say "Condemn my errors, and not my honesty. This is what I am doing for you." This last sentence is another of your false statements. For you condemned my honesty when you said "Pretended to answer" "Trying to make the false impression." So again you preach one thing and practice another. Ignorantly I suppose.

You still are unable to meet my arguments, and, then put up your man of straw the "distinct institution" from the church. Funk and Wagnall's Standard Dictionary says distinct means "separate"

"standing apart" and yet you ignorantly yes, falsely deny that you said one word about an institution separate and apart from the church. You better ask your "baby boy" the meaning of the words distinct and separate. You talk about the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, and the Sunday School as a distinct institution and then say you didn't say a word about an institution separate and apart from the church. It would be more manly and Christian for you to confess your sins and repent than simply repeat your false statements. You may repeat your false statements a thousand times, but that will never make them true. They will still be false when they meet you in the Judgment.

The only Sunday School that I ever endorsed or affirmed is the Church of Christ teaching the bible systematically on Sunday, as was done on Pentecost Acts 2:1-14 or in part (part of church) as in Acts 19:9. And unless the church does teach as in the days of the apostles it is not a loyal apostolic church.

On page 49 you repeated your false statement "That the names (Acts 2:9-11) were not names of Sunday School classes, but the different countries." I guess you must have asked your "baby boy" for later on in same page you contradict your false statement and say that they refer to the people. Hence the Parthians were from Parthia another class from Media called Medes and so we have several classes speaking different languages, and listening to the apostles teaching the wonderful works of God, each class hearing in their own language and as you say the same "tense" is used and since "Tense" means a form taken by a verb to indicate the "time of the actions." (Standard Dictionary). These teachers were all speaking at the same time and the classes must have been separated sufficiently to avoid confusion I Cor.

14:40. And as you admit I found twelve teachers, and since I have proven they taught classes at the same time, my proposition is established by divine authority. And he who opposes the same opposes this apostolic method of teaching.

A man is a farmer who farms. He is a painter if he paints his house or a carpenter if he builds a house even so a church is a missionary church, if it sends out and supports missionaries. It is a worshiping church when it meets on Lord's day to worship God and it is a Sunday School when it is teaching the bible systematically on Sunday. When we see the church doing this work we know it is a loyal working church.

Probably you can understand your own illustration better if we bring it nearer home, and with all due apologies to Sister Watson I simply use your illustration. If Sister Watson should do the work of, and act as the wife of a Mr. Jones then she might be called Mrs. Jones. But unless she does, it would be a slander and an insult to call her Mrs. Jones. Even so if the church does the full work of a Sunday School, that is teach the bible systematically on Sunday it would or could truthfully be called a Sunday School. If the Church sends out and supports missionaries it might be called a missionary Church, and unless it does these things it is not a loyal working church.

On pages 53-54 you have some more of your imaginary difficulties. You speak of "infants" and "unbaptized" adults in the Sunday School, therefore they must be in the church. Well the Sunday night meeting is a church meeting, and frequently there are infants and unbaptized adults present, therefore you have them in the church. Your own argument condemns you.

Yes I endorse no Sunday School except the church working (in whole or in part) as a Sunday School. On Pentecost the whole church as far as we know were present. In Acts 19:9. Evidently a few members specialized in the school work both a weekday school and a Sunday School. This school was on Sunday, therefore a Sunday School. It continued throughout the weekdays therefore a weekday school.

The T. P. I. has school in the summer therefore it is a Summer School. It continues throughout the winter therefore it is also a Winter School. If you can't understand this just ask your "baby boy." I am sure he can explain it to you.

We call a certain school after David Lipscomb, but that does not prevent the teachers being faithful members and workers in the Church of Christ. We may call a school after Tyrannus but that does not prevent its teachers being faithful members and workers in the church of Christ.

Your False Statements Concerning the Challenge

At Pippin you told me that I would be surprised to know how many had refused to meet you in debate, and asked me if I would, and I accepted your challenge right on the spot and then you absolutely, falsely stated that I have not accepted your fair, open and longstanding challenge. You surely don't expect us to believe anything you say now. Until you repent and confess.

When we saw the people did not want the oral debate you asked me if I would answer a question for you and I said I would if you would write your question and I'd give you my answer in writing. I was the one who suggested the written discussion. Yet in spite of facts and many witnesses to the same, you falsely state that you suggested the written discussion.

Then again on the last night of the meeting I invited anyone to speak and you confess the same on page 55. "Knowing that this general invitation included me." Yet in spite of you knowing and confessing that I invited you, you say falsely again that I did not have the Christian courtesy to ask you if you wanted a word in reply. Remember now that you made this false statement long after I invited you to speak and you had accepted the invitation and had spoken about ten minutes and now you say I did not invite you. You confess in one breath I did, and deny it in the next and God knows and more than a hundred witnesses know that your denial is as false as any statement the devil ever uttered. I am sorry the people are losing confidence in you but what can I do when you have apparently no regard for the truth.

On page 60 you say, "If I have made one false statement I am not aware of it, and if you will show me such statement in any letter of mine I will thank you." I have pointed out about a dozen samples of the same so I am sure you will appreciate it. And I believe God is ready to forgive if you will repent and reform.

On page 64 another false statement is "Since you deny that there is even one specific law of order for regulating public teaching." I wish you could tell the truth and not misrepresent me so much and we could get ahead faster. The devil did no worse in the garden of Eden than you did here. The devil added one word (not) and of course made the statement false. Even so you like your leader changed my language making it false. In my letter of Jan. 2, 1931, page 21 you can read. "There is no one specific law regulating teaching (public, I mean) under all conditions."

Why did you leave out the last phrase? Why did the devil add the word "not" when talking to Eve? The devil added one word but you left out three words.

On page 63 you said my reference to your preaching in the infidel's house was "wholly unjust and untrue." On page 44 of my letter of Jan. 29, 1931 I said "If you handed out as many false statements as you have in this controversy—no wonder the infidel let you preach in his house in Colorado." I believe the above is perfectly true. I believe an infidel could not do as much harm to the cause of Christ as you are doing, and did you not confess that "Christians, speaking falsely"—"is calculated to make many infidels." Surely he believed you would build up his cause in Colorado "if you handed out as many false statements as you have in this controversy."

One of your difficulties seems to be that you fail to distinguish between the public and private work of the church. The church is a public institution—"whosoever will may come"—yet there is much private work to be done in the same. Now since the Sunday school is simply the church doing that particular work, then there is much private work in the Sunday School. The Gospel is for the public Mark 16:16 yet much private work is required in delivering it to the people.

It is right for your wife to teach a class of little children in your home on Sunday (Sunday school). It is right for my wife to teach a class of little children in our home on Sunday (Sunday school). Then it is also scriptural for an older sister to teach the younger Tit. 2:3, 4, 5. It is scriptural for a man to teach a bible class Acts 20:17-18. Now since it is scriptural for these different teachers to teach privately their classes at the same time in their homes or elsewhere, why not bring them to the church-house at the same hour on Lord's Day for convenience and let them use different classrooms so they will be separated far enough to avoid confusion? By what law of order can you teach a class in the auditorium and forbid me to teach one in another place (class room) at the same time? The law of order in I Cor. 14:31 "one by one" you should know refers only to the meetings mentioned in verse 23 when the whole church is in one place. In the Sunday School the whole church is not in one place but in several places therefore you cannot apply that lesson. Also you have no right to apply Paul's instructions to women, verses 34 and 35 to the Sunday School when Paul tells us plainly he is talking of the meeting when the whole church is in one place. Verse 23. It seems strange that any man could be so blinded by his false theory as to lead him to so twist and misapply the word of God.

We believe any honest reader can easily see that I have completely proven my proposition. That it is perfectly in harmony with the word of God for the church to meet with as many as will come, in different classes separated sufficiently to prevent confusion and study the bible thus. Moreover I might add that a church that does not thus study the word of God is not making use of its opportunities and hence not doing its whole duty, and will be held responsible for this sad neglect at the Judgment day.

Yours for the spread of truth,

O. H. TALLMAN.

FOURTH REPLY

Cookeville, Tenn., R. 9, Mar. 20, 1931. Dear Brother Tallman: I shall now reply to your letter of Feb. 26, 1931 which is before me, contents of which I have very carefully read and reread repeatedly (which I always do before replying as respondent in discussion).

The more experience I have with men in discussion the more I realize the truthfulness of the statement that "One's character is seen and read in what he writes." This your last letter demonstrates it more fully, even from the beginning to the end thereof, that you are doing your utmost to make the readers believe that I won't tell the truth, but that I am "ignorant," or else woefully misrepresenting you, and that wilfully, and pose such as pretense of charity, when your letter shows most plainly for itself that your course in this matter is the very opposite of sympathy and charitableness toward me. Yet, understand, that I am not indisposed toward you for all your hard sayings against me, and the many misrepresentations, denial of facts and truths, with which your letter abounds throughout, as any and all thoughtful readers will clearly see for themselves when they read your letters and mine.

And again, in the beginning of this reply, I plead earnestly that you drop out of this discussion all such irrelevant matter, and come back to the issue, and let us have some real good debating that will be more profitable to our readers, an honor to the cause of Christianity, and pleasing to the Lord.

I am sorry that you resented the truths I stated when I said you pretended to answer certain questions of the list of the nine original questions given you, I certainly did not mean to offend you by that statement, nor the other where I said you were trying to make the false impression upon the reader's mind when you substituted the word "work" where I had the word system, which made the impression that I opposed the "work" of teaching the word of God, when I had so plainly expressed it that I oppose, not the "work," but only the system you advocate for doing the work of teaching the word in public capacity. I will very kindly explain so any one who reads may see, and that you, too, may know that I stated truth in both these expressions.

1. By your substituting the word "work" instead of the word system in my 7th and 8th questions, and answering something I did not ask, posing such as an answer to my questions, when it was not, was a misrepresentation. This misrepresentation that I opposed the "work" of teaching God's word would make the false impression upon the mind of the reader. And since you were trying to make that impression, and its being a false one, whether you knew it were false or not, nevertheless, it was false. This, my letter and yours will clearly show (See your letter, Nov. 28, 1930, answers 7th and 8th, and my reply, Dec. 10, 1930; also yours of Jan. 2, 1931, with my reply, Jan. 15, 1931).

When a man tries to make an impression by words, if that impression is false, then he is trying to make a false impression, though he may honestly think it is a true impression. Therefore, whether you knew it was a false impression or whether you did not know it, you were trying to make it. And I know it was not a true impression. I therefore stated truth when I said it. And I leave it wholly with you and the Lord whether you knew, and so intended, or not. So in stating this fact I did not impugn your motive.

2. It is noticeable that you have offered no proof at all that I stated untruth when I said you pretended to answer certain questions. You only complained, charging that it is a "false statement."

Why did you not prove it false? Your saying that statement is "false" is like your saying many other things which you do not prove, and which you could not prove if your temporal and eternal life depended on it.

Now let us reason. (1) If your pretended answers are true, the questions all being answered correctly, and if you can make such proof, then your pretentious would be "well-founded." But (2) since some of your answers are not true, as I showed in my first letter, even as in all my letters, which may be demonstrated at any time by comparing the questions and your proposed answers, it follows as a logical conclusion that your pretensions are "ill-founded," as Webster explains, having no proof to sustain them as true. Pretense, pretensions may be true or false according as they are "well-founded," or "ill-founded." (See Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary). Therefore, I stated truth when I made those two statements. And these charges of yours are samples of your misrepresentations of what I have written.

Remember, Brother, the expression, "separate and apart from the church," is not my expression, but your own; for it does not appear in my letter to which you referred when you made that untrue and unjust charge, nor in any other Letter of mine since that one, except as I quote it as your unjust charge.

In my first letter (Dec. 10, 1930, p. 7) I stated the real issue, and in the letter repeatedly spoke of the Sunday school institution. But not one time in that letter (or any other since that one), did I speak of it as being "separate and apart from the church."

Again, in that letter I did not even mention the Methodist church, nor the Baptist church, nor any other denomination.

Therefore when, in my second letter (Jan. 15), I denied the charge of having said one word about "An institution" "separate and apart from the church," I stated truth. And at no time in any letter did I speak of the Sunday school class institution as being "separate and apart from the church," my letters stand as proof in the matter. Let him who doubts read and be convinced. And my denial of this unjust charge had no reference at all to the Methodist church, the Baptist church, nor any other denominational institution, but alone to the Sunday school class institution, the only unscriptural institution that I had mentioned at the time you made that untrue charge. Therefore my statement, to which you refer in my letter of Jan. 15, when I said, I did not say one word about an institution "separate and apart from the church," is true.

And in my letter of Feb. 15, p. 52, I again explained that though the church and the Sunday school are two distinct institutions, yet the Sunday school is not "separate and apart from the church," but is connected with the church, and is operated in the church. And in saying this I state facts. And again that scripture is applicable just here, that, "Wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same thing." (Rom. 2:1). Therefore, when one charges another with making "false statements" when such charges are wholly unfounded, the true situation is that he is guilty of having done the same thing himself, according to the word of the Lord. (See also Mat. 7:1-2). It is evidently wrong to thus pervert one's language and to misrepresent truth and fact.

But it is not so strange, after all, when one has so perverted and wrested the inspired statements of the apostles to make them teach what they do not teach; namely, the Sunday school class institution, when the thing is not even mentioned in any passage of Scripture, the apostles not having said one word about such an institution. I say when it is found that one so perverts the apostles' statements, it is not so strange that he would also pervert my statements.

And all such perverting of my statements, trying to make the impression which is wholly false that I made so many false statements, is unjust and out of place, when my letters show to the contrary. Once more before leaving this part of the subject,

Should I ask my baby boy to give the meaning of the words "distinct and separate," I feel sure he would give me the true definitions even if he had to take up the dictionary for it; he would not just guess at it and give his opinion, as I have known some preachers to do when in a hard place, especially when the true definition in the dictionary was pointedly against their positions.

I will illustrate. The flock of sheep and goats graze together on the same pasture, eat from the same feed box, and lie in the same shelter through the night. Thus the sheep and the goats dwell together, yet the sheep and the goat are two distinct animals; the goat and the sheep are not one and the same animal, but are two different individuals though they associate together, eat together, and sleep together, yet the sheep is a distinct animal, a different individual from the goat, and the goat distinct from the sheep. And each sheep is a distinct, a different animal as individuals. The same is true of the goats, each is a distinct individual animal. But they are all together, and are not separate from one another.

A man and his wife being one flesh joined together in the marriage relation they live together in love and pleasure, not "separate and apart" from each other. Yet each of them is a distinct being. They live together, and work together in harmony; while the man is a distinct being, different from his wife in that of being a distinct individual, so with the wife. Just so, the church is one institution and the Sunday school is another institution; thus they are two distinct institutions, as the sheep and the goat are two distinct individual animals, though not separate from each other, so the church and the Sunday school are two distinct individual organizations, yet they are not "separate" from each other in places where they both operate together. Therefore, though the Sunday school is a distinct institution, yet it is not "separate and apart from the church," but is connected with the church, and is operated in the church. The reader can see, but if you cannot, Brother Tallman, there must be something radically wrong with your mental and spiritual vision. It would be well for you to look up the unabridged dictionary on those two words.

You may continue to "endorse" the Sunday school and call it the "church of Christ teaching the bible;" for it needs endorsement, and all the endorsement it has, as I told you, is human endorsement; and that is all it has ever had, or ever will have, is human endorsement, seeing that it is not endorsed by divine authority in the inspired Scriptures, and God has not promised to send any new message to the church to endorse any modern innovation of man's invention to do the work he assigned to the church.

On page 67 you again refer to those names in Acts 2:9-11, and again make the unjust charge that I stated false with reference to them. My explanation is clearly stated in each of my other letters

(Jan. 15; pp. 29-30-31; Feb. 15, pp. 49-50-51). Instead of repeating here I cite you and the reader to those letters, where it is unmistakably plain that I stated truth.

That scripture itself shows that those names were not names of Sunday school classes. And, why do you persist in claiming that for which there is absolutely no authority? When you call those names Sunday school class names you certainly do pervert and wrest that scripture to make it teach what it does not teach. I have never known a disputant to so pervert any passage of scripture in discussion as you have that one, except when hard pressed for Bible proof of his unscriptural doctrine and finding none.

And I stated truth when I said, It is nothing but your own assumption and assertion unproved and unprovable that the apostles all spoke at the same time on Pentecost in their speaking with other tongues.

It was much easier for you to say you "have proven they taught classes at the same time" (that is, that the apostles were all teaching classes at the same time), yes, it was far easier for you to say this than it is for you to prove it.

And since you have utterly failed to prove such by any scripture, not finding one word of scripture for it, your only proof, as I told you before, is absolutely nothing but your own bare assumption and assertion unproved and unprovable. And I repeat, if your present and eternal life depended on it you could not prove such by divine authority. Your saying you have proven it by divine authority is exactly like your saying many other things that you have not proven, and could not prove by the Bible, things that are as impossible for you to prove as it would be for you to take the "wings of the morning" and fly away to the moon; or to take a piece of hyssop, dip it in black ink, and strike it toward the heaven and blot out the light of the noon-day Sun. It is absolutely impossible to prove things without evidence. And there is not one word of evidence that the apostles all spoke at the same time on Pentecost, or at any other time in one and the same assembly.

Again, it is just as impossible for you to prove that the people of all those nations, when they came together on Pentecost, were separated into different class-groups to be taught, as it would be for you to prove the things just mentioned above.

Yea, as I informed you before, I repeat, that each scripture you cite is as destitute of the idea of your Sunday school institution, with its class-grouping, and a plurality of teachers all operating their classes at the same time, as those scriptures cited by the pedobaptists are destitute of their doctrine of infant baptism, and of infant membership in the church.

It is not a matter of a misunderstanding, on my part, of the illustrations I give you. The trouble seems to be with you. I well understand them, and I have presented them so plain that even the "fourth grade school boy" can easily understand them. And all our readers will see how completely my illustrations show the unscripturalness of your claims for the unscriptural institution of the Sunday school class system, for they will see that you have not given one scripture that records the Sunday school.

Your illustration, using my wife's name instead of Sister Tallman's name, confirms my illustration, that I would be safe in saying that to call her by the name Mrs. Jones would be a misapplica-

ation of the name Jones, a displacing of her name Tallman (to the extent the other name be used), a misrepresentation of your wife, and a dishonor to you.

Just so, for us to call the true loyal church by the name "Missionary society," or "Sunday school," the names of human institutions, would be to misapply those names, displace the divine name (to the extent those names are used), to misrepresent the church, and to dishonor Jesus Christ the head of the church.

But when the true loyal church, teaching the word of God as commanded (I Cor. 14:27-35 inclusive; I Tim. 2:11-12), having the public teaching done by the men, and in the order of "one by one" (verse 31); that is, one at a time, as "by course" (verse 27), and the women being silent (verses 34-35), I say when such a true loyal church leaves this divine law of order in the teaching service of the church, and goes to working as a Sunday school of today works, setting aside this divine specific law and puts the class system into operation having more than one teacher teaching at the same time in the church including women, that church by such action ceases to be a true loyal church; because it has set aside God's commandments and following the tradition of men, and thus making the commandment of God of none effect by their tradition, by serving as the Sunday school, an unauthorized agency, teaching the word in direct violation of the commandment of God (I Cor. 14:27-35 inclusive), by using the man-made law of the Sunday school class system. Just exactly (in principle) as you explained, if my wife should become disloyal to me, she would be an unloyal wife. Just so would the church become an unloyal church that so departs from the divine order of teaching and follows the unauthorized system that makes the divine law of none effect (See Mat. 15:3-6; Mk. 7:7-13 inclusive). It is dangerous to set aside God's commandments and substitute the traditions of men instead.

No, my wife does not teach in the Sunday school class institution, neither at home nor "in the church," for she finds no authority in the Scriptures for women's teaching in such classes. Sister Watson is content to follow God's law and do as He commands Christian women to do. She is ready and willing to teach any one, so far as she is able, when there is an opportunity; and we, wife and I, do not wait till Sunday morning to teach our children the word of the Lord: this is a daily business with us, and has been all the while since our first one became old enough to be taught. And when teaching our children at times when other children happened to be in our home we taught them the same as our own. And as Priscilla, with her husband Aquila, took Apollos unto them, and taught him the way of God more accurately, my wife would be glad to engage with me in bringing you home with us, whenever you are willing to come, as Apollos went with them, and assist me in teaching you the way of God more accurately on the divine order of teaching in public capacity. My wife believes the word of God that "it is a shame for women to speak in the church" (assembly—public capacity), which law is found in I Cor. 14:34-35. And she believes I Tim. 2:11-12. Having followed the example of Eunice who taught her son, Timothy, the Scriptures, she is ready now to follow the noble example of Lois, and teach her grandchildren, and thus help to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (See Ephe. 6:4; also II Tim. 1:5; 3:15). Timothy was taught at home the word of the Lord and his mother and grandmother were faithful home teachers.

Read Deut. 11:19. The home teaching was specifically emphasized under the Old Testament. Speaking of the words of the Lord, it says, "And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down,

and when thou risest up." Read the context. Paul says, "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning," etc. (Rom. 15:4). The same principle prevails in the New Testament (See Ephe. 6:4).

In the foregoing we learn God's way of having his word taught to the children at home. Now read Deut. 31:12-13, which gives the order for the public teaching under the old covenant. It reads:

"Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God and observe to do all the words of this law."

"And that their children, which have not known any thing, may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God, as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over to possess it." (Deut, 31:12-13). Read the whole context. And the assembly was not divided into class-groups to be taught after the modern system of class teaching in Sunday schools. For proof read Nehemiah 8:1-8.

"And all the people gathered themselves together as one man into the street that was before the water gate; and they spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel.

"And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month.

"And he read therein before the street that was before the water gate from the morning until mid-day, before the men, and the women, and those that could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law." (Neh. 8:1-3). That shows God's order regulating the public teaching under the law of Moses. All were together in the assembly "as one man." Not separated into class-groups, although there were several teachers present (verse 4). But each teacher did not take a group off to itself, so all could have the chance to teach at the same time. And the same order prevails in the gospel covenant (See I Cor. 14:27-33).

There were no women teachers in the list of those that were appointed to assist Ezra in the teaching of the people. The law was for them to be silent in the service of public teaching, as is found in I Cor. 14:34-35, and this is the law in the gospel covenant. Paul says, "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." (I Cor. 14:34-35).

Thus we have, both under the old and the new covenant, God's order of having the children taught both publicly and privately. But man's way is quite different from God's way in this matter. And like Jesus told the Pharisees, men now set aside God's commandments, relating to the public teaching of his word, that they may keep their own tradition. (See Mk. 7: verses 8 and 9 and 13.)

On page 69 you refer to classes being taught at home, citing Tit. 2:3-4-5, that it is scriptural for the elder sister to teach the younger, and then you say, "It is scriptural for a man to teach a bible class," citing Acts 20:17-18. It is certainly right for both men and women to teach privately, for the Bible expressly teaches it. But your class idea is not a Bible idea. There was no such thing as

a division of an assembly into classes in the gospel age of the church. When Paul called to him the elders of the church of Ephesus (Acts 20:17-18) that was not called a Bible class, and it was not a Bible class being taught as your Bible classes in your Sunday school institution.

But you ask, "Now since it is scriptural for these different teachers to teach privately their classes at the same time in their homes or elsewhere why not bring them to the church-house at the same hour on Lord's day for convenience and let them use different class rooms so they will be separated far enough to avoid confusion?"

To this I reply: (1) It is scriptural for both men and women to teach privately, but there is not one word of scripture that authorizes classes for private teaching or public teaching. (2) Because God has not authorized the class-rooms for so separating the assembly to avoid confusion in the teaching service. And (3) Because God has provided a specific law of order that both precludes and excludes the man-made institution of the class arrangement, and God's order prevents the confusion. And all who set aside God's order for man's way of teaching are walking in the steps of those Pharisees whom Jesus charged with "laying aside the commandment of God," and holding "the tradition of men;" of "making the word of God of none effect through their tradition" which they had delivered, and many other such like things. When all come to a place where God's word is to be taught, the divine law of order is for the teachers to speak "one by one" that "all may learn, and all may be comforted." And God made no provision for your traditional class arrangement. Therefore no church can use the man-made class system for teaching the word of God without laying aside the commandment of God that fully provides for the public teaching in a way that avoids the confusion.

Again you say, "By what law of order can you teach a class in the auditorium and forbid me to teach one in another place (class room) at the same time?"

This question is answered by Paul in these words: "Ye may all prophesy (teach) one by one, that all may learn, and that all may be comforted. And the spirits of the prophets (teachers) are subject to the prophets. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints." (I Cor. 14:31-33). When I am with you or other teachers in any public gathering where God's word is to be taught, I am content for one to teach at the time while all listen. And then let another teach and all listen to him. This is God's order. And he has provided this one way, or order for avoiding the confusion that would naturally arise from more than one's speaking at the same time.

It is evident that God did not want the class-rooms arrangement as a means of preventing the confusion; for had he wanted such, there is no doubt that he would have commanded it. But since he did not command it, but gave a law that prevents the confusion, and one that both precludes and excludes your man-made law of the class arrangement, it is evident that your Sunday school class system operates in direct conflict with the divine order, and contrary to the will of God. It is a plain case of men's presumptuously setting aside God's way, that they may have their own way. An example of which we have in the case of King Saul (I Sam. 15th chapter). The command was to "utterly destroy" every thing both man and beast. But he spared one man and the best of the sheep and oxen. He listened to the voice of the people, and obeyed their voice instead of God's voice (See verses 9 and 24). Read carefully the connection from verse 9 to the end of verse 24. This is a case of substituting one's own way, or accepting and following the people's way, instead

of God's way. Read verses 22-23, to obey the voice of the Lord is "better than sacrifice." Kind reader, please to consider King Saul's case, then note that he twice affirmed he had obeyed the word of the Lord when he had not, then note his final confession that he had not (verse 24).

Many preachers are today doing as did King Saul, obeying the voice of the people instead of obeying God's voice. And just as sure as Saul met his sad fate as the result of such presumptuous sin, they who do likewise in any matter (the Sunday school class order not excepted), will find, when it is too late to correct it, that they will be rejected and refused an entrance into the eternal city of God.

On page 69 you say, "The church is a public institution," quoting as proof, "whosoever will may come." Just so the Sunday school "is a public institution," for "whosoever will may come," and participate in the Sunday school. Is the Sunday school not open and free to all who may wish to enter into it and be taught? or is it a private institution? Now if, as you claim, the church and the Sunday school be one and the same institution, then it follows as a logical conclusion that if the church is a public institution, so is the Sunday school a public institution. But in reality the Sunday school is a public institution, and yet it is not the same institution as the church, they being two distinct institutions. Both are public, being open for all who will. And while there is much private work to be done by church members, yet there is no private work to be performed in public church capacity (public assemblies). If you think so, please to give proof of it, that private work is to be done in public capacity?

Again you say (next page TO), "The law of order in 1 Cor. 14:31 'one by one' you should know refers only to the meetings mentioned in verse 23 when the whole church is in one place."

Well I understand that it takes every member in any locality to constitute the "whole church" in that community. Therefore, if, on any occasion, one member happened to be absent, then the order of speaking "one by one" does not apply, according to your interpretation. Therefore, if on any occasion one member fails to come, then God's law of order is made null and void, and does not apply. Now I ask, Where did you learn that the law of order in I Cor. 14:31—"one by one"—refers only to the meetings mentioned in verse 23 when the whole church (every member) is in one place? as if that order would not apply when one member was absent. There is no such idea affirmed in verse 23. I quote it, but will first state that Paul is here reasoning on spiritual gifts. He shows that speaking in tongues (different languages) is for one purpose, serving for the unbeliever, while prophesying was for another purpose, serving for the believer. (See verses 21-22). Verse 23 reads:

"If therefore the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?" Verse 24 reads:

"But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all," etc.

There is not one word of evidence that every member of the church in a locality has to be present that the law of order in I Cor. 14:31 may be applicable to the occasion. And since there is absolutely no evidence that any assembly was ever so divided into classes to be taught at any time or

place in the New Testament age, it is presumption to use that system today in any assembly of the saints. For Paul specifically declares that the effects of this order of "one by one" is to prevail "in all the churches (assemblies) of the saints;" that is, peace—good order, as in verse 40. And there is not one word of evidence that God did not intend that law of order to be used except when every member was present in one place. And there is not one word of evidence that, at any place of public gathering, the people were bunched off in different groups to be taught.

Therefore your Sunday school class institution is wholly without scriptural authority. It is an innovation, an addition that supplants the divine law of order, a similar example of King Saul's error—that of rejecting the word of God and following the ways of men.

Now as a sample of your inconsistencies and self contradictions, I call attention to the following.

1. You have repeatedly said that the apostles spoke at the same time on Pentecost.
2. You now say that the law of order, in that of speaking "one by one" in I Cor. 14:31, refers to meetings only when the whole church is in one place.
3. And now you admit that so far as we know, "On Pentecost the whole church" . . . "were present."

Now let us reason. 1. According to your statements the law of order (I Cor. 14:31) of speaking "one by one" was for the meetings only when the whole church had come together into one place. 2. On Pentecost the whole church were present ("as far as we know"). 3. Therefore, on Pentecost the apostles spoke in the order of "one by one;" for the whole church were present. But this contradicts your claim that the apostles all spoke at the same time on Pentecost. Though you say they were separated from each other far enough to prevent confusion. But this is nothing but your assertion unproved and unprovable. The Book does not say that. But the Bible says, "they were all with one accord in one place" when the Spirit came and they began to speak with other tongues. (Acts 2:1-4.) And verse 14 shows they continued in one place; that is, they continued standing together—"Peter standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice" and called upon all to hear him. This shows (1) that the apostles were all standing up together while the speaking was being done on Pentecost; (2) that the order of their speaking was one at a time, "one by one," which order you admit is to be used when the whole church are together in one place. Therefore, according to your own admission, the apostles spoke in the order of "one by one" on Pentecost. And this the record itself shows.

If you could show one, yes, just one clear example in any one of the New Testament churches where your Sunday school class system was operated under its plurality of teachers all teaching at the same time, then you could prove your proposition. Your utter failure to show one such example, or even one command for such, is sufficient proof that you know of no such command or example. And your cause goes down unless you do present the scripture that records the one example or the precept for such. But you have given neither precept nor example of your class system in operation in any New Testament church. As I said before, I repeat, Every scripture you cite as proof is as destitute of such record as are those passages cited by the pedo-baptists destitute of their doctrine of infant baptism, and of their infant membership in the church.

I asked you to tell me what it is to pervert and wrest the scriptures, and you did not tell. Why did you not tell me? Was it because you felt the weight of the guilt of having done that very thing yourself? If trying to make certain scriptures teach what they do not teach, or to not teach what they do teach, is not perverting and wresting the scriptures please tell me what would be?

You have repeatedly tried to make certain scriptures teach your Sunday school class system of arrangement when the idea of such an institution is not in either one of the passages. Your claims here are, therefore, without scripture foundation. Hence your pretensions to such doctrine are, as Webster says, "illfounded," having no proof to sustain them.

You frequently speak of my "false theory," when you know it is not my theory—not my position that is under discussion, but your own theory. And I have pretty thoroughly shown that it is wholly untenable, being unscriptural, and, therefore, unauthorized. And, according to your answers 4 and 5 in your first letter, you will be held responsible for the discord and division caused by your unscriptural doctrine and practice to the extent you advocate it. I have no "theory," but contend alone for what is written.

The Origin of This Written Discussion

The origin of this debate, I will again to you relate: I stated truth and fact I know, Which I repeat herein below.

Though you deny it as you do, Yet every thing I said is true: If you continue truth to deny, You'll rue it when you come to die.

Or you'll regret in the judgment That you did not from such repent: You will regret many things you've said, When you are raised up from the dead.

I heard you deliver the last three discourses at Pippin, and one before that in the tent meeting at Cookeville. And in each of the four services you made it convenient to speak on the Sunday school class question, and in neither of the four services did you extend to me the Christian courtesy of asking me, Bro, Watson, would you like to have a word in reply? It was at the close of the last service at Pippin that you gave the general invitation (which is always customary at the close of a meeting) asking, Is there any body here that wants to say anything? (See my letter, Feb. 15, p. 54).

But my statement to which you refer as being false is on page 24 of my letter, Jan. 15, 1931. I here quote it with the preceding sentence:

But you were careful not to lift the "chip" off my "shoulder" by politely accepting my fair, open, and standing challenge, but continued to preach up the thing in my presence without extending to me the Christian courtesy of asking me if I wanted a word in reply. And the only hope I saw of getting anything like a discussion out of you was, to write some questions and ask you to write your answers, etc.

This, my statement, refers to a time before I had said a word to you about a written discussion. I referred to the time when I first contemplated asking you the questions in hope of getting a written discussion. And, of course this was before the last service, its being on Thursday night just at

the close of service. Thus it was at the close of service on Thursday night that I first thought of arranging for a written discussion. And with this idea in my mind after service I went to you and told you that I had learned the brethren did not want the debate (to which I had challenged you the night before—Wednesday night), and so I suggested I would write you a question if you would write your answer, to which you agreed. I then said I would have some more questions with that one if you would write your answers to them all, to which you agreed.

Remember this was Thursday night after service when I suggested to you and arranged this written discussion. And remember I proceeded to make this arrangement at the time I saw no hope of a discussion in any other way. And all this happened before you gave that general invitation to any one which I accepted, which was the next night after I saw a hope of a discussion in this written form.

Then it was true, that you had preached up the Sunday school in my presence at the time referred to (Thursday night) being three times, and closing each of the three services without asking me in any way if I wanted a word in reply. And then when I had arranged with you on Thursday night for this written discussion, I wrote the list of the nine questions late Friday evening just before going to the service, and just before the last service (Friday night) began I handed you the list of the questions, and you put them in your pocket before you began the last service, which was before you had given that general invitation, which you yourself admit was at the close of the last service. And my statement to which you refer as false, refers to Thursday night, which was before you gave me any invitation whatever, and every word of it is true.

And though, as you say, I made that statement "long after" you gave me that general invitation and I had spoken, yet the statement is true, and if I should repeat it twenty-five years from that time, it would still be true, because it was a fact, and facts never change with time.

Had I made the same statement in my short talk on Friday night at the time I accepted your general invitation, it would have been true, for it was then a fact, though I did not at that time state it. I could have said the same thing on Friday night, I repeat, in the short talk I made, at the time I announced the arrangement we had made for this written discussion. I have taken the time and space, and exercised patience to explain in detail, inasmuch as you so strenuously and so positively charged me with stating falsely in this matter, so the reader can easily see that I stated truth. Hence this explanation is specially drawn out at length in detail for the readers to see who has stated truth, and who has not.

And I repeat that, when you accepted my special challenge at Pippin, that was not accepting my long-standing challenge to which you refer in your second letter. The only challenge you accepted was the special one I gave you at Pippin. And to use your expression,

This one you accepted "right on the spot," But my long-standing one you did not: Leave off such things I plead with you, And let's debate the real issue.

God's word is the standard, Brother, To test this thing, and every other: So to the Book, go, take your stand, And prove the thing is God's command.

But this, so far, you fail to do, And what I say God knows is true: Yet, try again and do your best, For we must make a thorough test.

I've stated truth, and truth repeated, Your arguments are all defeated: To speak "one by one" is God's rule, Which does preclude your Sunday school.

The women must in silence learn, While each man speaks in his own turn: When all agree on the right thing, Then no one will division bring.

You say, "On page 64 another false statement is 'Since you deny that there is even one specific law of order for regulating public teaching.'" To this I reply as follows:

1. When I said (p. 64, Feb. 15), Since you deny that there is even one specific law of order for regulating public teaching, I was not quoting your statement, but only stating what I understood you had denied by your answer, "No," to Question No. 9, taking your answer, "No," here in its most common and accepted application, which is to deny the fact as such set forth in the question, knowing that the application of "No" is most commonly used to make a negative, and not an affirmative, answer according to authoritative usage, in answering questions of this form containing the adverb not. For, instead of that's being a quotation from your letter, it was, in substance, simply the statement of the fact as set forth in my 9th question, as being denied by your answer, "No," to that question. And hence the "three words" you say I left out do not belong in that sentence of mine; for that phrase is not in my 9th question. If you meant to deny the fact set forth in that question by your answer, "No," then my statement was correct, but I used the word public in my statement you quoted. Why did you not charge that I added one word (public) as did the devil, as well as leaving out three?

2. Now to show that I did quote you correctly, and did not leave out a word, go to my letter of Jan. 15, 1931, p. 37, where I made the quotation.

On page 21 of your letter, Jan. 2, 1931, you say, "Your last three questions are answered in the above, since there is no one specific law regulating teaching under all conditions, but general principles governing all and specific laws for specific cases."

Now that is your statement just as you made it, and just as I quoted it. I, therefore, quoted you correctly, neither adding to nor taking from it. But in your statement here you did not use the word public. You did not say, "There is no one specific law regulating public teaching under all conditions." No, but you now add in that word public in your statement, and say that is what you "mean." But is that what you meant then? If so, why did you not say what you meant at the time you said that? If you meant "public" teaching at the time you said that, then you did not say what you meant, and did not mean what you said. And you had a reason for not saying what you meant, and for not meaning what you said. And here I ask, why did you leave out the limiting term public if you meant public, not including private, teaching? It was the public teaching you were proposing to consider. You had a reason for leaving out that word. And to use your language, did you here do as bad as did the devil in the garden of Eden?

In my letter of Jan. 15, after quoting your statement including these words (as quoted above), "since there is no one specific law regulating teaching under all conditions," etc., I explained as follows:

1. No, my last three questions are not answered in your letter.

2. I did not ask if there was "one specific law regulating teaching under all conditions." That would have covered all private teaching as well as all public teaching: whereas I did not ask anything about laws for private teaching, but only for the public teaching.

3. But in this statement you admit that there are "specific laws for specific cases" "regulating teaching."

4. Now if your answer, "No," to my Q. No. 9 be correct, then it logically follows that all the special laws of order for regulating teaching are for private teaching only, not one such law for public teaching; for, by your answer, "No," you deny that there is any specific law of order for regulating public teaching, viewing your answer, "No," as a negative answer.

Question: 1. According to your answer, "No," to Q. 9, can you, and will you, give one good reason, and prove it by the Bible, why it was that all "specific laws regulating teaching" were intended for private teaching only? and not one such law for the public teaching? And,

Did the Lord consider the private teaching as being of a more serious nature, and harder to control, than the public teaching? seeing, as you have it, that all specific laws of order are for private teaching, and not one such law for the public teaching?

Will you please give me one example of a specific law of order regulating a specific case of private teaching, and show by the scriptures that that law does not apply to any case of public teaching?

Since you deny that there is even one specific law of order for regulating public teaching, will you please point out some of the "general principles," or laws, that are designed for public teaching, and illustrate by scripture example? (See my letter, Jan. 15, 1931, pp. 37-38).

My Q. No. 9 reads: Has God not given to his churches (congregations) a specific law of order regulating the public teaching of his word?

Now, since I have completely shown that your answer, "No," to this question is erroneous from the view of its being a negative answer, if you shift to the other horn of the dilemma, and say you meant to affirm, then I am ready to meet you on the other horn—the affirmative, even as I have met you on the negative, and show you some of the unavoidable difficulties that logically and necessarily confront you, when you hang yourself upon that other horn of the dilemma, if you do so commit yourself. So I again ask, What did you mean when you said, "No," to my Q. No. 9?

If you meant Yes, when you said, "No," Then come out plain and tell me so: Or did you thus equivocate, To shield your cause in this debate?

Come, let's get right down to business, Discuss the real issue: And let the readers see which side Is wrong, and which is true.

Let's take the Bible for our guide, Be earnest in our preaching; And follow out the Bible rule, In all the public teaching.

The law of order God has given, Through Jesus Christ his Son; Is that the brethren may all speak,
In public "one by one."

That from speaking in the churches, The women are made free: For in the public teaching service,
There they must silent be.

Those two specific laws are in First Corinthians, fourteen: From verse thirty-one to thirty-five,
Those laws are clearly seen.

But men now set God's laws aside, And bring their own way in: And all such tampering with
God's word,

Is a presumptuous sin.

If you should presume to call the T. P. I. school and the David Lipscomb College the church, or the Sunday school, you would certainly misapply those names, and misrepresent those institutions, because neither of those institutions is the church, nor the Sunday school. Therefore to call them by these titles would be a misapplication of those names and a misrepresentation of those institutions.

And the school that is operated in both' the summer and the winter is neither a summer school, nor a winter school, but a summer-winter school. One of the terms alone does not correctly represent the institution; it would take both the names together as one name to correctly represent that institution when designating it by the time of its operations.

And I proved it equal to a demonstration (mathematically considered) that no school is a Sunday school except such as are operated on Sunday only. To call a daily school by the title Sunday school would be a misapplication of the name Sunday and a misrepresentation of the school. Therefore the school of Tyrannus was not a Sunday school, but a daily school. And I proved that "daily" does not always mean every day in the week. (See Acts 19:9).

But you did not quote, as I requested, that definition from the "Standard dictionary" that says, "daily" "necessarily" means every day in the week. Will you please to quote it verbatim for me, and give the author's name, for I sure would like to see it. Is it there? or did you just guess at it? after your custom of guessing at your Sunday school record, and many other things for which you have no proof? If you still refuse to quote it I cannot but think you guessed at it, and missed it even as you missed it on your guessing at the Sunday school record in the New Testament.

On page 70 you say, "It seems strange that any man could be so blinded by his false theory as to lead him to so twist and misapply the word of God."

That is certainly a strange thing that men will suffer themselves to become so blinded by their false theory to the extent that they so twist and misrepresent the word of God. Remember that, in the case now on hand, it is your "theory," Brother Tallman, that is under review. It is not my "theory," but your own. I have no theory, but am content to abide by what is written, without addition, subtraction, or change. But as I have told you before, I repeat, that no errorist, so far as known to me, has ever more perverted, wrested (twisted), and misrepresented the word of God to teach an erroneous doctrine than you have so dealt with the scriptures you cite and quote to try to

prove your unscriptural doctrine of the Sunday school institution. It has been my lot to have many discussions with advocates of denominationalism. And, so far as I am able to judge in the matter, not one among them has ever more grossly perverted and misrepresented any scripture in their effort at defense than you have the scriptures you cite in your effort at defense of your untenable position on the question we are considering. It is most dangerous, yea, it is presumption, to so handle the word of the living God.

Your method of proving your proposition is exactly similar to that of other errorists who quote and cite certain scriptures, and then assert, without one word of proof, that their position is proved. When their doctrine is not even mentioned in those scriptures nor any other. Thus they prove their "false theory" simply and alone by their own bare assumptions and assertions unproved and unprovable.

Precisely so, you prove your human "theory"—your unscriptural doctrine of the Sunday school class institution in exactly the same way;

that is, you prove it by your own bare assumptions and assertions that are unproved and unprovable.

But God's order of having the public teaching done, both in the Old Testament age, and in the New Testament age, was that of "one by one," as is expressed in I Cor. 14:31; also verses 27 and 30, "by course." See the following scriptures. Deut. 31:12-13; Jos. 8:35; Nehe. 8:1-2-3-8.

Deut. 6:7-9; 11:18-20; Ephe. 6:4; II Tim. 1:5; 3:15, Home teaching.

The law pertaining to the women was the same in the old law as in the new; namely, they were required to be silent in the public teaching service. (See I Cor. 14:34-35; I Tim. 2:11-12.) Women are to teach but not in public (See Tit. 2:4).

Now, Brother Tallman, in these scriptures cited we have God's law of order for regulating the public teaching of his word, both in the old and the new dispensations, both by precept and example; and there is not one word of evidence that any assembly was ever divided to be taught in classes, and, therefore, such is an innovation, an addition, and again I warn that Rev. 22:18 tells the sad fate of the innovators. And here I must say, that if you do not believe these divine laws how can I expect you to believe what I say?

So far as speaking falsely I am not guilty of the charge. Though I have logically and justly drawn out many of the false conclusions and absurd consequences of your doctrine of the Sunday school class institution. If your doctrine be true, then all those conclusions are necessarily true. But if those conclusions be false, then your doctrine itself is false that necessarily involves such difficulties.

I will, therefore, say that, if there be "many false statements" in my letters, remember, I am showing up many of your errors; and of course the statements of error and of its absurd consequences must be false. When Moses was directed to write, he wrote not only the true statements of the Lord, but also the false statements of Satan. He said, "Ye shall not surely die." (Gen. 3:4). Just so, if you find "false statements" in my letters you may know they are quotations from

your letters or the consequences of your unscriptural doctrine of the Sunday school tradition, which show pretty thoroughly that your doctrine itself is erroneous.

I have pointed out many of the inconsistencies, contradictions, and absurdities which are logical and necessary consequences of your doctrine of the Sunday school class invention. I have plainly shown that all these stand as unavoidable difficulties in your way. If those difficulties are not real, but imaginary, and false, then the doctrine that necessarily involves such difficulties must also be false; for no true doctrine involves such difficulties.

The many insurmountable difficulties to which I called your special attention in each of my other letters you denounce as false. And the reason they are false is, because your doctrine itself is false that necessarily involves such absurd consequences. For, in truth, those difficulties, as clearly shown in my other letters, are logical deductions from your own statements of your doctrine of the Sunday school institution. I have not claimed that those conclusions, consisting of such difficulties, are really true. No, indeed, I know they are untrue. Yet they are real deductions from your doctrine of the Sunday school class institution, and are as real as is the doctrine itself that involves them.

And I have faithfully and logically drawn out all those consequences from your own statements of your claims for the purpose of showing you and the readers the falsity, unsoundness, and unscripturalness of the position you are endeavoring to defend. If your claims here be true, then all those consequences really exist and are true. But if they are not real, but only imaginary and false, then it logically and necessarily follows that your position itself is false, imaginary, and not real. For no position can be true that involves such absurd consequences.

Therefore, Brother Tallman, when you see those logical deductions that necessarily come of the doctrine you are endeavoring to defend, and pronounce them false, you thereby virtually admit that your doctrine itself is false from which those conclusions are logically drawn. It could not be otherwise. It would be absurd, or impossible, for the doctrine to be true and its consequences false.

Illustration

Just as Paul reasoned on the resurrection (I Cor. 15:12-20) I reason on this question. Paul here reasoned logically and correctly that, if the doctrine be true, that some among the brethren had avowed; namely, that "there is no resurrection of the dead" (verse 12), then the logical conclusions would necessarily follow.

1. That Christ is not raised, (verses 13-16.)
2. That Paul and the other apostles are "false witnesses of God," having testified that God raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not." (verse 15.)

That the apostles' preaching is vain (being false) (verse 14).

That the brethren's faith is vain (believing what was false, verses 14-17).

That they were yet in their sins (verse 17).

That the dead in Christ are perished (verse 18).

The above is a specimen of sound logic divinely applied. Here are six statements in this part of Paul's letter which he gives as logical and necessary consequences of the doctrine he was examining, and exposing as false. And all those six statements would be true if that doctrine be true. But those consequences here stated by Paul, as deductions from that doctrine, are all false conclusions, because the doctrine itself is false from which they are logical deductions. And by showing that those false conclusions are necessarily involved in the doctrine they had avowed the apostle proved that the doctrine itself is false.

Now in the same sense, and by the same logic, that Paul drew out those false conclusions as logical and necessary consequences of their false doctrine concerning the resurrection, I have drawn out those conclusions from your statements, as logical and necessary consequences of your unscriptural doctrine of the Sunday school class institution. And if those conclusions be false (and they are), then it follows as a necessary conclusion that your doctrine itself is false from which they are logically drawn. But if your doctrine on this question be true, then all those conclusions—all those difficulties to which I called your attention in my other letters, are real and true, and stand as an impassable mountain in your way. And the only way possible to rid yourself of those difficulties is to abandon the doctrine itself, and come back to the divine order of teaching God's word in public capacity as commanded in I Cor. 14.

Conclusion

Much more in prose I'd like to say, But I'll leave off till another day:

And close out with some thoughts in verse, Before they bring your shroud and hearse.

The questions that remain as yet Unanswered of the nine;

Come, answer each of them and prove, Your Sunday school divine.

First, please to give me that Greek word, You said meant "Sunday school:"

Yes, that Greek word the apostles used, When they made out that rule.

The scripture that you cited me, Does not that word contain:

And if you think it can be found, Then you should try again.

Then answer all the other six, Including No. Nine:

And if at last you make the proof, Then I will fall in line.

Q. No. 9

I knew you could not answer this, By either yes, or no:

And shield yourself from being "trapped," As I'm prepared to show.

"To tell the truth" when you know it, It will not take you long:

Then come with all the answers; Be earnest, brave, and strong.

Then why not quote the passage where The Sunday school is found?

And prove it was divinely built, Upon pure gospel ground?

Why thus withhold the "bread of life," If you have it to give?

Please hand it out to hungry souls, That we may eat and live.

Remember that the word of God Alone will satisfy, The hungry soul that longs for truth— The pure bread from on high.

Then give us not your mere opinion, But only truth divine: And when you prove it by the Book, Then we will fall in line.

But we cannot agree with you, Until the proof you show; When in God's word you point it out, Then with you we will go.

But since you fail of proof, Brother, You sure will be to blame, For the division and discord, That brings reproach and shame.

What will you then in judgment do, When fin'ly cast away, Into the fire to suffer woe, Through an eternal day?

Once more I warn you as a friend, And brother in the Lord: Drop out the wrong, accept the true, And gain a rich reward.

If you will show that I am wrong, I'm sure I will get right: I do not want to spend eternity, In that eternal night. Trusting to receive your further arguments at your earliest convenience, I am as ever Your brother in search of divine law,

J. P. WATSON.

Supplement to Letter, Mar. 20, 1931:

Since you contend that the church and the Sunday school are one and the same institution (Your letter, Jan. 2, 1931, p. 20), it follows as a logical and necessary conclusion that,

When women teach in the Sunday school institution they are teaching in the church. For whatever is done in the Sunday school is done in the church; and whatever is done in the church is done in the Sunday school, according to your claim that they are one and the same institution. Therefore, if in this you are correct, when women teach in the Sunday school they teach in the church.

But God does not permit women to speak in the church, but commands them to be silent in church (public capacity), and declares that "it is a shame for women to speak in the church" (See I Cor. 14:34-35; I Tim. 2:11-12).

Therefore when women teach in the church—in the Sunday school which you say is the church, they are doing so without divine permission—without divine authority, seeing God has not authorized—not permitted—they to speak in the church. Hence women, when teaching in the churches (Sunday schools) they are not only doing so without divine authority—divine permission, but also in direct disobedience to the specific commandment of God that forbids it in the scripture above cited. And in view of this I ask the following

Questions: 1. Why was it that, in choosing the twelve apostles, Jesus did not select a woman to be one of the number among the apostles?

When Jesus selected the seventy and sent them out to teach and preach, why was it that he did not select any woman, not even one, to be among them?

When evangelists were appointed to go and teach the word, why was it that men only were made evangelists, not one woman evangelist chosen?

And again, when the time came that the churches needed elders as special teachers (feeders), and when elders were appointed in all the churches, why did it happen that not so much as one woman was appointed to the eldership in any of the New Testament churches?

Yes, Why did it happen that not one woman was ever appointed to any of those positions as a public teacher, indeed, if women are authorized to teach in public capacity?

It seems most significant that men only (and not one woman), were appointed to all those positions as public instructors in the churches in the apostolic age. But it is all plain when we consider that God declares that it is a shame for women to speak in the churches (public assemblies). (See the scriptures cited above).

I leave the matter with you now, Until I hear from you: Praying that you may yet discern,
Between the false and true.

As ever your brother in search of divine law,

J. P. WATSON.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

Cookeville, Tenn.,

April 3, 1931. Dear Bro. Watson,

Your 18 pages of chiefly irrelevant and immaterial matter is before me, and in your letter you say "I plead earnestly that you drop out of this discussion all such irrelevant matter and come back to the issue." Why don't you practice what you preach? Do you know what a man is, who does not practice what he preaches? Unless like Saul you did it ignorantly.

The Watson Sunday School.

I see on page 75 you acknowledge that you have a Sunday school in your home, as well as a week day school, a summer school as well as a winter school. And just as much of a Sunday school institution as I have ever advocated. When ever there is systematic teaching it is a school, and if on Sunday it is a Sunday school. You say you teach "the word of the Lord daily," that includes Sunday. You say "When there is an opportunity" that again includes Sunday. You say you have done so "All the while since our first one became old enough to be taught." Hence again you include Sunday. So three times you impress in your letter that you have a regular Sunday school in your home. I notice that the Watson Sunday School is just as public as the one we have in the church house in Cookeville. You say you are "Ready and willing to teach any one."

You say "When other children happened to be in our home, we taught them the same as our own." And again you invite me to your Sunday school and offer to teach me. So here three times you impress the fact that your Sunday School is as public as the one in Cookeville being open to "Whosoever will may come." I note also and am glad to see that in your Sunday school you have at least one woman teacher your "wife," who is "willing to teach any one," old or young, boys or girls, men or women. In the Cookeville Sunday school, the women do not teach the men, however, I will not criticize Sister Watson for possibly your Sunday school is a little more progressive than the one here. I also am glad to know that your Sunday school teachers are operating in the church, since they are all members of the church. That of course is scriptural as we are to glorify God in the Church. That is just what we do here in Cookeville. Our Sunday school here is simply the church in whole or in part teaching the word of the Lord on Sunday to "Any one" who will come. I am glad to know that you have such an up-to-date Sunday school in your home. A class is simply a company of students and we here in Cookeville like in your home never have two teaching the same class at the same time.

You here confess that you have been teaching a Sunday school for many years, yet at the same time you have been condemning others for doing the same thing. You condemn in others what you do yourself. Why don't you practice what you preach? Why don't you come out clean and stop acting the part of the hypocrite, (ignorant though you may have been) "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness and pray the Lord" Acts 8:22. If you confess your sins—He is faithful and just to forgive you and cleanse you from all unrighteousness. The Lord can yet use you and the people may regain their lost confidence in you if you thus cease to oppose the very thing you are yourself doing.

You say you want a discussion that will honor "the cause of Christianity," and then you continue to wallow in filth that would not be allowed in any legislative hall, and use statements which a low down sinner would not dare make, being unparliamentary and which a gentleman would be ashamed to make. "Pretended to answer" carries with it the idea of dishonesty, a wilful deceiver. It challenges a person's motives, which is contrary to the word of the Lord, I Cor. 2:11, and Matt. 7:1, and also contrary to common decency. And the sad part of it is that after your attention is kindly called to it, instead of coming out of the dirt you still wallow therein.

Your Low Brow Illustrations, Pages 72-73.

You state the Sunday school is not separate and apart from the church, but is connected with the church and is operated in the church, "and illustrate by sheep and goats (distinct and different animals). You then prove that the goat "is not separate and apart" from the sheep "but is connected

with" it *and operates in it,* then you illustrate by a man and his wife that they are not separate and apart but connected and *one operates in the other.* I know your friends will be ashamed of you and I wonder if the devil in hell does not blush for shame when he sees a minister of the gospel stoop so low and fall so far and thus drag down a religious discussion into the dirt. You may think I can't follow you but I hereby warn you that whenever you hide in the dirt I will dig you out and expose your position that others may not fall there in and also that you may have a better chance to repent and clean up. During my many public discussions I have had two other opponents who stooped about as low, and when I dug them

* [FOOT-NOTE—The two expressions I have marked by the stars (*.....*) above under sub-head line, "Your Low Brow Illustrations," are Brother Tallman's own expressions, not mine. Such thought is neither expressed nor implied in the language of my illustration referred to, as every reader may know by rereading my illustration which appears in my fourth reply, Mar. 20, on pages 72-73 of this book. Why then, should my "friends be ashamed" of me for what Brother Tallman himself has said in this debate?

Knowing that such expressions are unbecoming of a Christian gentleman, and wholly unworthy of a place in a record of an honorable discussion, I went to Brother Tallman personally, and in a kind spirit advised him as a friend and brother to cancel his statement containing those unbecoming expressions before these letters are published, advising that, if he did not, such would reflect on him when it goes before the reading public. But he refused to cancel it.

Then afterward I wrote him insisting that he cancel it; also the whole paragraph, but especially that part of it. But he still refused to cancel it.

Therefore, kind reader, if those expressions of Brother Tallman's should cause any good people, or Satan, to "blush," be it known to all concerned, that Brother Tallman himself is wholly responsible for such effect, not I. No such unbecoming expressions appear in any of my letters. I never suffer my writings to "flow on such low under-current," but always endeavor to direct them "over and above board," ever aspiring to write upon the higher plain of honorable controversy and common decency.

Who then is guilty of causing Satan to "blush for shame when he sees a minister of the gospel stoop so low and fall so far and thus drag down a religious discussion into the dirt" by such unholy expressions? And here, Brother Tallman, the answer comes, in Bible language, "Thou art the man." (II Sam. 12:7). And thus every one can see that, in this, Brother Tallman has brought himself into "shame" by the same expressions he prepared for me, even as Haman was hung on the same "gallows that he had prepared for Mordecai." (See Esther 7:10).

J. P. WATSON.] up and exposed them, one cleaned up and played the man and the other quit the debate. I hope you will repent and come to the blood.

One thing you confess by these illustrations is that the Sunday school you oppose is as separate and apart (different) from the church as a goat is from a sheep. And you have written about eighteen pages in this letter and, also other letters condemning a Sunday school that is as distinct from the church as a goat is distinct from a sheep. Now since I have never advocated such a Sunday school and since none of my brethren with whom I work advocate such a Sunday school you

have proven that you have forsaken the true issue and are fighting your man of straw. This is why I said your letter was made up chiefly of irrelevant matter. Which you now have proven. Then you ask me to leave irrelevant matter out of the debate. Practice what you preach. No wonder the brethren are losing confidence in you. If you cannot meet the real issue it would be much manlier to quit and acknowledge the truth than to put up a man of straw that is simply a camouflage (whether you know it or not).

Among your many misrepresentations and false statements you still say you suggested this written discussion, which with others is absolutely false. I have lost all confidence in your ability to tell the truth in connection with this discussion. I am not surprised that it is hard for you to find places where they want you to preach any more. The brethren are getting acquainted with your weaknesses and cannot afford to put a man in the pulpit that cannot be depended upon.

From your letter of Feb. 15, 1931, page 49, I quote "When you—say more than one are authorized to speak—teach at the same time in the church assembly you say what the bible does not say." Some more of your man of straw work. When you can't find anything wrong with what I teach you put up your man of straw and say it is not in the bible. Is that honorable debating?

The Sunday school class is never in the church assembly. You should have asked your "baby boy" to teach you and saved the humiliation of yourself in making so many false statements. When the church in whole or in part assembles for the Sunday school work then I take my class and we withdraw from the assembly so do all the other teachers and classes withdraw from the assembly. My class and the other classes are just as private as your class in your own home and hence since you say I Cor. 14:31-34 is a rule of order for the public assembly you thereby confess that it does not apply to the different Sunday school classes. So your false theory of condemning a scriptural Sunday school fails again as it always will.

In your letter of Feb. 15, 1931, page 51, you say "No" one disputes that they (the multitude) all heard at the same time." Thus again you have acknowledged the scripturalness of the classes on Sunday all hearing at the same time Acts 2:6 and 11. "We hear them (the teachers) speaking." We, refers to the different classes named in verses 9 to 11. So here we have a scriptural Sunday school the same as we have at Cookeville. Yet you are like the man looking at the giraffe who said, "There is no such animal." When we show it to you, you say it is not there.

To cap the climax of your foolish so called arguments, to refute my unrefutable position that the teaching at the same time was just as certain as the teaching of Col. 3:16 was at the same time. You say "The singing naturally includes all voices at the same time" Col. 3:16. After saying many times "To the Law and to the testimony." After telling me to come to the word of God and saying you are satisfied with it. Here you turn your back upon the "law and the testimony," upon all your laws of order and worship God in the way that seems natural. You follow the example of the wicked Jews who forsook the law of God and did that which was natural (seemed right in their own eyes). God punished them for doing what you say you do. Do you think He will let you go clear, when He is no respecter of persons? Your rule of following natural inclinations will not do in the worship and work of the Lord—this very rule of yours has caused most all divisions among religious people. I understand now why the scriptural Sunday school seems so foolish to you, for Paul says I Cor. 2:14 "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him." Your statement "The singing naturally includes all voices at the

same time" is a direct contradiction of the word of God in the very next verse, v. 17. Where God says "whatsoever ye do in word (including singing) or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." I plead with you to repent therefore of this thy wickedness and pray the Lord if perhaps the thought of thy heart shall be forgiven thee. Acts 8:22.

In I Cor. 4:16 the inspired apostle to the Gentiles said "I beseech you therefore, be ye imitators of me." What do we see Paul do? We see him separate a class from the congregation of the church at Ephesus, Acts 20:17-18, and we see him teaching them privately (away from the rest) and this very lesson is in the bible hence a bible class. Therefore if I respect Paul's exhortation, I will separate a class from the congregation as I have opportunity and take them off to a private place such as a classroom and teach the word of the Lord to them. If you respect the word of the Apostle Paul you will do the same as you have opportunity. But if you have no respect for the word of God you may criticize and condemn your brethren who humbly obey the command of I Cor. 4:16.

I Cor. 14:23 was no more speaking of spiritual gifts than in verse 31 for there Paul says "for ye all can prophesy one by one." If verse 31 refers to the public assembly, order of worship, then verse 23 refers to the same, and what God hath joined together let not Bro. J. P. Watson part asunder. One is descriptive, of the meeting as well as the other. Why do you accept the passage that suits your false theory and reject the other. The rule in verse 31 is only here enjoined in the meeting of verse 23 and if you change it you pervert the law of God to the endangering of your own soul, we often use the expression "whole church" as it is used in verse 23, we say let the whole church sing. The "whole church" turned out today. Mark 1:5 gives us a similar expression "and there went out unto him all the country of Judea and all they of Jerusalem." I am sure no man who is reasonably rational would say that is not true if a single person was not there. I am sure no man would ever question that I Cor. 14:31 belongs only to the meeting of verse 23 if he was not blinded by a false theory. So you see that I Cor. 14:31 does not apply to the Sunday school classes for each one is in a private place by themselves and not the public assembly. Also the whole church is not together in one place. Therefore you cannot apply it to the Sunday school without perverting and twisting the word of God.

Yours for the whole truth,

O. H. TALLMAN.

FIFTH REPLY

Cookeville, Tenn., R. 9, Apr. 8, 1931. Dear Brother Tallman: I shall now reply to your letter of the 3rd inst. which is before me, contents of which I have very carefully considered.

Since you have offered no new arguments in support of your position, and since your arguments already offered are all completely refuted, it will be unnecessary that I go into detail in this letter as I have in my former ones; seeing that every thing you have said in this your letter, is covered in my refutation of what has been said, in my other letters.

1. The reason I am handling so much irrelevant matter is, because irrelevant matter is the material mainly that you have been putting up for me to reply to; seeing that you are in the lead affirming, and I am following you.

2. And if it be found at any point that I have gone down "into the dirt," and "wallow therein," as you express it, remember I am following you. And, of course, where you go in the lead, you should not complain if I go down after you, and try earnestly to lift you out of the "dirt."

3. My letter of Mar. 20 shows most clearly that I have not "confessed" that I have a Sunday school in my home as your Sunday school in the Cookeville church, and other places.

4. Your reference to Col. 3:16 to show that "the teaching at the same time" (such teaching as was done by the apostles on Pentecost) in an assembly "was just as certain as the teaching of Col. 3:16 was at the same time." Your letter, (Apr. 3, pp. 93-94), fails to prove your claim here. It is plain that, when the singing is going on in the assembly, all who sing sing at the same time, which is the nature of the service in song, and the meaning of the words sung have instruction as well as melody in them. But when prophesying (which is the regular teaching service) is done in the assembly all do not teach at the same time. In this service the divine law is that they (the prophets—teachers—all may speak, but in the order of "one by one" (I Cor. 14:31, also verses 27 and 30). In no place are we commanded to sing "one by one"—one at a time. Therefore you lose your argument on Col. 3:16. And your reference to I Cor. 2:14 is wholly irrelevant, because the word "natural," as here applied to the man, does not apply in the same sense to the teaching service and the song service in worship, and he who is not able to distinguish the difference, at least that there is a difference, is not a safe and competent teacher of the word of God. But your logic is that, if all voices sing at the same time (which is the nature of the song service), such would not be doing it "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (as in verse 17). Evidently you are mistaken in this, or else the Lord requires us to sing "one by one" which is not the case.

5. On page 94 you cite I Cor. 4:16 where Paul said, "be ye imitators of me." But you are mistaken when you say, "We see him separate a class from the congregation of the church at Ephesus, Acts 20:17-18, and we see him teaching them privately (away from the rest), and this very lesson is in the bible hence a bible class."

This is another assumption unproved and unprovable. You could not prove it if your life depended on it, that this was an example illustrative of your Sunday school class arrangement for teaching. It is wholly irrelevant, for it is in no sense similar to your Sunday school class arrangement for teaching.

"Therefore," according to your reasoning here, "if" you "respect Paul's exhortation," in that of following it as an example, you will, to do likewise, have to be away from Cookeville under unavoidable circumstance, yes, and send to Cookeville requesting the elders of the Cookeville church to come to you, not into some class-room in the meeting house, or some place near by, but away up to some city as Paul was at Miletus, and instead of teaching them a Bible lesson after the order of your Sunday school lessons, you would give them special warning, as overseers of the flock, as Paul did.

Again, there is nothing at all to even indicate that, when those messengers Paul sent to Ephesus had arrived in the city, the church was assembled in congregated capacity. It was not essential that it be so, and there is no evidence that it was so. Therefore it is an assumption unproved and unprovable that Paul "separated a class from the congregation" (or assembly).

Your resorting to this passage and others shows that you know of no recorded example of your Sunday school class separation into groups for teaching. And this is pretty sure evidence that a man is hard-pressed for Bible proof of his theory and finding none when he resorts to passages like these that are so irrelevant, having no bearing at all on the question at issue. Why do you not point out the Sunday school class arrangement in some passage showing it in one of the churches of the New Testament age where it was actually in operation? If you could do this you could prove your position, and that one example would convince me and many of the brethren, indeed all of us who oppose that system. But in the absence of evidence I cannot accept your theory, which is unsupported by divine authority. Hence you completely lose your analogy here, for there is absolutely no comparison between this incident and the separating of classes in an assembly for your Sunday school teaching.

I Cor. 14:23-24 includes both the speaking in different tongues and the prophesying in the public assembly, while verse 31 pertains only to the prophesying. And both passages are applicable to the public assembly neither including private teaching or speaking. And while, in the strictest sense of the term "the whole church" includes every member in a locality, yet the term may be used figuratively when not including strictly every person or thing involved in the strictest sense, as in Mk. 1:5, to which you refer. But even this does not prove any thing for your position of separating an assembly into different class-groups to be taught, and especially so when the law of order to speak one at a time, "one by one," is specifically stated in the context.

But you say, "I Cor. 14:31 does not apply to the Sunday school classes for each one is in a private place by themselves and not the public assembly." (p. 94).

(1) How could "each" class be "in a private place by themselves and not in the public assembly" where there is but one room and the house full of people to be taught? Would you send them all (except one class) off out of the house to some shade tree or elsewhere, to prevent the confusion? Here is work for you.

(2) You applied this law of teaching, "one by one," to each class in a former letter where you said no class is to have more than one teacher at the same time. But now you say this law does not "apply to the Sunday school classes." If you are correct in this last statement, then you are incorrect in the former, where you say each class is to have one teacher only at the same time. The one statement contradicts the other. If the one be true the other must be untrue.

(3) But if the "one by one" law (I Cor. 14:31) does not "apply to the Sunday school classes," as you affirm, then each class may have more than one teacher teaching at the same time, and not violate that specific law. "Think on these things." I am your friend trying to help you.

On page 93 you say, "When the church in whole or in part assembles for the Sunday school work then I take my class and we withdraw from the assembly so do all the other teachers and classes withdraw from the assembly."

Question: Can you, and will you, quote the scripture that says, "When the church in whole or in part" assembled on any occasion in any place in the New Testament (for the service of teaching and being taught, which you are pleased to call "Sunday school work"), that Paul, or any one else

took his "class and" that they withdrew "from the assembly," and that "the other teachers and classes" withdrew "from the assembly?"

My dear Brother, this separating the assembly into class-groups for teaching, and this withdrawing from the assembly, is not a Bible doctrine—such is not in the Book. The scriptures you rely upon as teaching such idea are as void of such doctrine as other scriptures are void of infant baptism, or any other unscriptural doctrine devised by uninspired men.

But why continue further, when my explanations are clear and pointed in my other letters? I am sincere in stating that, as I see, every argument you have made is taken from you and completely refuted. And, to speak figuratively, your argument as a whole has fallen dead, and hence my application of the figurative expression in my other letter, your arguments being dead (refuted) the "shroud and hearse" may be brought to bury your lifeless arguments. I have heard brethren use the same figure many times with reference to one's arguments when fully refuted. Probably you have had occasion to use the same figure at times, as well as hearing others use it.

But if there be such example of each teacher with his or her class withdrawing from the assembly to a private place, it is your duty to point it out to me, for I want to be right. So I plead again: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. 8:20).

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (I Thes. 5:21).

"If any man speak, let Him speak as the oracles of God." (I Pet. 4:11).

When you separate an assembly into class-groups to be taught, and have each class with their teachers "withdraw from the assembly," you do what is not commanded, what is not written in the Bible. And when you speak such, you do not "speak as the oracles of God;" for it is not in "the oracles of God." And when you thus speak, you do not "speak . . . according to this word"—"the oracles of God." You have neither "the law, nor the testimony for such division and withdrawal. The Bible is wholly silent on such action. Such is, therefore, an addition to the word of God; and Rev. 22:18 gives ample warning against all such adding. "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" (Gal. 4:16).

Honestly, my Brother, I do think you should be willing to cancel the whole of your paragraph on page 92 including its subhead line. Especially do I again ask that you cancel the second period (or sentence) in that paragraph, as I requested before. If you do, it will be better for you, because, as I view it, it would reflect upon you when it is read by the people. If you will cancel it, then when this is sent to the publisher I will also cancel this statement as a reference to the matter. What do you say? let me know in your next.

When I repeatedly called upon you to drop out of this discussion all such irrelevant matter and let us debate the real issue, you ask why do I not drop out such myself and thus practice what I preach? And I gladly explain.

(1) You are in the lead and affirming, while I am following. And if I am dealing in irrelevant matter, it is because that is the kind of material you have been placing before me to reply to. If you would not put up this irrelevant matter, then I would have no occasion to deal in such, and would

not. But since you put it up as affirmant, I reply to it as respondent, because that is mainly the kind of material you have been putting before me to work up. And if you find me going down "into the dirt," and "wallowing therein," remember you are in the lead affirming, and I am following you, and in following you I go where you go (though you use some expressions I will not suffer to have in my articles), so if I am in the "dirt," as you express it, I have gone down after you. If you would stay up out of such, then I would not thus go down after you. It is my duty as respondent to work up such material as you place before me. Though some expressions you use I will not quote, but simply call upon you to think about them as unbecoming in Christian men. And again in kindness as a brother in the Lord, I call upon you to leave out such irrelevant matter, and let us finish the discussion upon a higher plain of honorable controversy.

The Real Issue

10. Now back to the issue—the real issue. What is it? I quote from my letter of Dec. 10, 1930, p. 7.

Remember, and bear in mind, the precise point at issue, which is, Whether the Sunday school class system of teaching, as is clearly described in my first and third questions, and which you are endeavoring to defend, is divinely authorized and recorded in the New Testament Scriptures. This you affirm and I deny.

The Sunday school class system; that is, the system of arrangement of an assembly into different classes, or groups, with its plurality of teachers including both men and women all to teach at the same time their respective classes. That such system is divinely authorized and recorded in the New Testament Scriptures, is the precise point at issue. This you are affirming and I am denying.

And I say it in all kindness to you, my Brother, that, so far, you have utterly failed of proof. You have cited scriptures and quoted scriptures and claim that it is there. But using your expression, your "shot"—your continual shooting entirely missed the mark, so to speak. And I am just here reminded of your last words in the meeting just before dismissing the audience—your illustration of the man shooting at an opossum up in a tree, having failed to bring it down by shooting repeatedly, and his friend came and looked up and told him there was no OPOSSUM up there, he was only shooting at an imaginary animal. So your illustration fits very well on your side of the issue. You have been shooting now several times at a thing that is really not in the Scriptures, just as the opossum was not in the tree, and I have, as your friend, been telling you and showing you that the thing is not there, that it is 'only an imaginary thing. And every shot you have made has utterly failed to bring that imaginary institution down in view, showing it is real in the Book. That is, that you have not shown it to be a real scriptural institution. For, as I have repeatedly told you, every passage you cite is wholly destitute of such record.

11. I now call your special attention to the questions of the original list of the nine that remain unanswered. And I repeat that no question is really answered until answered correctly.

Question No. 1 of the original list has not been answered. "What is that Greek word the apostles used to represent the idea of the thing called Sunday school, consisting of an assembly divided into class-groups with its plurality of teachers including both men and women teachers, all teaching their respective classes at the same time? The Greek word, or rather the Greek phrase you gave as meaning "Sunday school" does not contain the idea, even according to your translation

of it, or the translation from which you quoted. The Idea of "Sunday" not being in the expression. So I kindly ask you to try again in your next. You said the name "Sunday school" is not in the Bible, but that the idea is there in the Greek, and if correctly translated that is what it would be. (Your public speech at Pippin).

Now if there be a Greek word in the New Testament used by the apostles that means "Sunday school," as you affirmed, then that word or phrase should have been translated "Sunday school." But since there is no translation that so translates any term by the term "Sunday school," it is evident that there is no word in the Greek New Testament that means "Sunday school," or else every translation that has ever been made from the original Greek into English is a false translation at that particular passage. Is it possible that You have found that all the greatest scholars who have participated in translating the scriptures into our language failed on that one word or phrase, leaving it for you to find it and to correct their awful blunder in translation?

Question No. 2 is not answered. You did not tell me whether you consider the Sunday school class system essential in the carrying out of the command to teach God's word? And you did not tell me whether you think the word of God cannot be taught systematically without the aid of that system. Had you answered, Yes, then difficulties would have confronted you; for if that system be essential, then the word of God could not be taught without it. Phillip could not have taught the Eunuch until they had traveled on to where there was a Sunday school class arrangement, and he get into one of the classes before he could have been taught. But if you had answered, No, then you would have met the unavoidable difficulty that you are advocating a nonessential thing that is causing discord and division in the spiritual body of Christ, and hence, according to your answers 4 and 5 you shall have to bear the blame for such division.

Q. No. 3 still remains unanswered. You have not, as yet, presented one passage that records an example of the Sunday school class system, such an institution as we are discussing. You have not shown it yet.

Questions 4 and 5 you answer correctly, the only ones you did answer correctly, as I told you at first.

Q. 4 is, When division comes over an unscriptural thing who are responsible for such division, they who advocate that thing? or they who oppose it? And you answer correctly, they who advocate it.

Q. 5, When the division came over instrumental music in worship who were to blame for it, they who wanted it and contended for it? or they who did not want it and contended against it? and this you answer correctly as No. 4, that they who advocate it are to blame.

Precisely so respecting Q. No. 6. Since we have tested the Sunday school class system and found it wholly unscriptural and hence unauthorized, it follows as a logical conclusion that they who advocate it are responsible for its evil effects of discord and division, according to your answers 4 and 5. This conclusion is logical and true.

My refutation of your proposed answers to my 7th and 8th questions is found in my letters (Dec. 10, 1930, pp. 14-15-16; Jan. 15, 1931, pp. 33-34; Feb. 15, 1931, p. 61). I will not here repeat. But if any doubts, turn and read.

Q. No. 9 you answered, "No," which I have shown to be an incorrect answer, directly opposite the true answer, which is, Yes, God has given a specific law of order regulating the public teaching of his word. And this law of order is specifically expressed in I Cor. 14:27-35 inclusive, and I Tim. 2:11-12.

(1) This law provides that the men do the public teaching of God's word, and that in the order of "one by one" (verse 31); and (2) that the women "keep silence in the churches," not being permitted to speak, even to the asking of a question in the teaching service. (Verses 34-35; I Tim. 2:11-12).

My other letters show that I have completely refuted your answer, "No," to Q. No. 9, especially my letter of Mar. 20, pp. 82-83-84.

Honestly, Brother Tallman, as I illustrated on page 40 of my letter of Jan. 15, 1931, I cannot but think that, if any man on examination for a certificate to teach school, if he should miss answering correctly the questions in the ratio of seven, or even six out of every nine, he would fail to get a certificate. Had you answered those questions correctly you would have met with insurmountable difficulties in the way of your position. Yet I do not know your motive in not answering them correctly.

Just here I am reminded of the timely statement by Brother Wallace in the last service of the Cookeville meeting on the subject of "unity." I quote it in substance from memory as follows:

Every division that has ever been over religious matters has come over, not what the Bible says, but over what the Bible does not say. Yes, every division has been caused by something that is not in the Bible—something the Bible does not authorize—something the Bible does not command.

I was very much impressed with the force of this statement when I heard Brother Wallace make it, though I had heard it many times and read it in the papers, and had used it myself. I believe the statement true. Do you not believe it is true?

If that statement be true, then, since the Sunday school class system is a thing over which much division has come, it logically follows as a necessary conclusion that the Sunday school class system is not in the Bible—something the Bible does not authorize—something the Bible does not command. And therefore the Sunday school class system is unscriptural, and hence the responsibility of the discord and division it causes rests upon those who advocate it. And this according to your answers 4 and 5. If this conclusion is not true, then the statement quoted from Brother Wallace is not true. But if the statement be true (and all admit it is), then the conclusion must be true that they who advocate the Sunday school class system are responsible for its evil results of discord and division. If you would not go beyond the Bible, and say things the Bible does not say, then we would be agreed, and agreed on the right things.

Christ is "head over the body, the church" (Col. 1:18). Who is head over the Sunday school?

"Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up, (Mat. 15:13). God planted the church, but not the Sunday school.

Your reference to churches not calling me to preach, is wholly out of place in this discussion. However, I can truly say that if, to get a call by the churches to preach, I must preach the theories and notions of uninspired men, I shall never be called. In truth, I am not looking for a job, and have never advertised for a job. I have been here almost thirty years, have done much preaching. But have never withheld any truth, or refused to oppose any error, so far as I could understand, in any church. I believe the Lord has been with me, and is with me still.

Yet I have known preachers to be located for only a short time at a place, and then have to look out some other place. The better he pleased the people—the brethren, the longer they would keep him. I pray, Lord, that the time may come, When divisions may all cease; When peace and unity may be restored, That thy word may greatly increase,

That all may truly love Thee, Lord, And all in Thee "be one;" Submitting to God's will alone, Through Jesus Christ his Son. Trusting to receive your further arguments I submit this letter as all others in kindness to you. Your brother in search of divine law,

J. P. WATSON.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE

Cookeville, Tenn.,

May 10, 1931. My Erring Brother Watson:

In this, my sixth letter, I wish to briefly sum up some of the unrefuted and unrefutable arguments that show that it is the duty of the church to teach the bible in classes on Lord's day as we do here in Cookeville, which is sometimes called a Sunday school. Not only is it our duty to teach on Sunday but on every day that opportunity affords.

The day of Pentecost was Sunday. The whole church was in Jerusalem. Luke 24:47. There were at least twelve teachers and they were all teaching at the same time, Acts 2:11. Several classes of people were present. Acts 2:9-11, and these classes were being taught at the same time (verse 11) and they were separated far enough to avoid confusion, I Cor. 14:33. So here we have a model Sunday School and until you can prove the bible untrue, the New Testament not the word of God it will be not only our privilege but duty to have Sunday schools. We have gone "to the law and to the testimony" and if you speak "not according to this word, it is because there is no light in you." Isa. 8:20. Let me plead with you kindly and seriously, my erring brother, repent of your sins, stop fighting against God. Don't be an Elymas any longer. God showed his displeasure then, Acts 13:8-11, and certainly He will not be pleased when you act the Elymas today, and interfere with the teaching of God's word, as it was taught on Pentecost. Acts 2:11.

In this country we have schools with just one teacher. We say she taught "the school." Some schools have several teachers, all teaching at the same time. Then we speak of one of them teaching "in the school" as in Acts 19:9. But they are all schools, whether of one or more teachers. Funk and Wagnalls High School Standard Dictionary defines "school," as "a body of disciples" "any sphere or means of instruction." So we see where teaching is being done there is a school, and if on Sunday it is a Sunday School. So we see Paul as one of the teachers, teaching in a Sunday School, Acts 19:9. There were other teachers for the bible says he taught "in the school."

It was a "daily" school. Therefore it was both a Sunday and a weekday school. Just as the T. P. I. is both a winter and a summer school. So "to the law and to the testimony" we have gone again, and we see Paul teaching with other teachers in a Sunday school, and he says "Be ye imitators of me," I Cor. 4:16. With the Lord's help I intend to obey this charge. In so doing I am obeying the Lord. For the Lord says "he that heareth you heareth me." Luke 10:16. I plead with you my erring Brother, to stop fighting these God authorized Sunday schools and let us work together in this great work and teach classes the word of God as we have opportunity.

In Acts 8:30-38 we see Philip teaching a class of one. If it was on Sunday it was a Sunday School according to the definition in the Standard Dictionary given above. This case is a one teacher school.

In Acts 16:13 God has given us another example of a school where the bible was taught in classes. This time four teachers all working at the same time. "We sat down and spake unto the women." "We sat down" according to Hebrew language suggests that they had a message for them. "We.....spake" shows that the four delivered the message at the same time. They must have been separated far enough to avoid confusion. I Cor. 14:33. So here we see a Saturday school of four classes each one having a teacher. The only difference between this and our Sunday School is, the one is on Saturday and the other on Sunday. Paul was one of these teachers and he says, "Be ye imitators of me." I am willing to obey and have taught bible classes along with other teachers every day of the week just as the bible says Paul did.

Again we have called your attention to Acts 20:17-18 where Paul called a class from the church at Ephesus and taught them a bible lesson, and we often do the same, even teaching the same lesson. It makes no difference whether he separated them twenty feet or twenty miles, whether he taught one day or every day, the principle is the same. He took a part of the church (one class) by themselves, and taught them the will of the Lord and Paul says, "Be ye imitators of me." That's just what I do every Sunday, and several other teachers here obey the same command, and I know the Lord is pleased with us in obeying this apostolic command. Every time we teach a class in the Sunday school we are simply obeying this apostolic command. All the Watsons and Elymases in the world can't make me turn my back on the Lord and his word.

Since a school may have but one teacher every time "a body of disciples" are being taught on Sunday we have a Sunday School. Our Sunday night meeting is a Sunday school. Our meeting for teaching Sunday morning is a Sunday school. So our meetings (Sunday schools) are according to the divine pattern, sometimes with one teacher and sometimes several teachers at the same time. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20. So you see where you stand when you oppose these God authorized Sunday Schools.

These Sunday school classes are not in the public assembly when being taught, but have withdrawn from it to a private place, hence come under the head of private teaching. Just as in Acts 18:26 where a woman assisted in the teaching of a class. In Titus 2:3-4, the aged women are commanded to teach a private class, separated from the rest. So we see that the women as well as the men are commanded to teach private classes. If on Sunday it is a Sunday School, the same as we have in Cookeville where the teachers, both men and women take their classes to themselves, (Acts 18:26), and teach them the way of the Lord more perfectly. In your letter of April 8, page

96, you say in reference to I Cor. 14:23 and 31, "Both passages are applicable to the public assembly, neither including private teaching or speaking." Thus you admit, and rightly so, that I Cor. 14:31 does not refer to any private Sunday School classes, separated from the rest. Thus by your own confession your last straw, "one by one" order is taken from you and the Sunday School still stands approved of God, and he who opposes it is found fighting against God. So just as certain as God is God and the bible is His word my proposition is proven by the word of God and confirmed by your confession.

Again I call your attention to your letter of March 20, page 75, where you tell us of the Watson Sunday school in your own home. Just as much of a Sunday school institution as I ever advocated. You claim you have systematic teaching of the word of God on Sunday, therefore a Sunday school. Three times you emphasized that you taught regularly on Sunday, and I accept your word for it that you have a Sunday school in your home.

I also notice that the Watson Sunday school is just as public as the one we have in the church house in Cookeville, as you say you are "ready and willing to teach any one" who may come. You also invited me to your Sunday school. Or in other words "Whosoever will may come." You also stated that you have at least one woman teacher in the Watson Sunday school. We also have women teachers in the Cookeville Sunday school. In the Cookeville Sunday school the women do not teach men, but I see in the Watson Sunday school your woman teacher is willing to teach men. I suppose your Sunday school is a little more up-to-date. I am glad to know that your Sunday school teachers are operating in the church, since they are all members of the church. This of course is scriptural as we are to glorify God in the church. Eph. 3:21. Our Sunday school in Cookeville is simply the church, in whole or in part, teaching the word of the Lord on Sunday to "any one" who will come and I see the Watson Sunday school is exactly the same. So here you confess that you have had a Sunday school in your house for many years, yet at the same time you have been condemning and fighting other Sunday schools. Again let me say why don't you come out clean and practice what you preach. You may know what the Lord called people who did not practice what they preached. How can you hope to escape when you walk in the footsteps of those hypocritical Pharisees?

You misquote "from memory" Brother Wallace and hence misrepresent him. You say, "Every division that has ever been over religions matters has come over, not what the Bible says, but over what the Bible does not say." Then you say, "Do you not believe it to be true?" No I do not believe it to be true. No intelligent, loyal preacher of the Church of Christ believes it to be true. Brother Wallace is not that ignorant, to make such a statement unqualified. That statement refers to one class only, of divisions. There are many divisions that do not come under that class. Here are a few examples.

The Pharisees and Sadducees were divided over angels, spirits and the resurrection. These are all in the Bible.

The Fundamentalists and the Modernists are divided over the miracles of the bible.

Infidels reject all the Bible.

The Sadducees rejected angels, spirits and the resurrection.

The Modernists reject the miracles of the Bible.

Christian Scientists reject the baptism of the Bible.

Bro. J. P. Watson rejects the Sunday school of the Bible.

So you see how nicely you line up with the Infidels, Sadducees, Modernists, and Christian Scientists to fight the word of the Lord. No wonder then that infidel in Colorado encouraged you by allowing you the use of his house, for he knew you were on his side, only not as consistent as he was for it is more consistent to reject all the bible than simply the part that does not suit your hobby. Now I beseech you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to stop 'your stubborn rebellion against God and accept the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth on the Sunday school question.

You say on page 101, Christ is "head over the body the church," Col. 1:18. Who is head over the Sunday School? Answer, Christ. Let me illustrate this Bible truth. You are Mrs. Watson's husband (Head Eph. 5:23), when she is cooking for you (your cook). Who is her husband when she is nursing you in sickness (your nurse)? Are you not still her husband? Who is her husband when she is mending for you, (Your seamstress)? Are you not still her husband? Who is her husband when she is writing your letters (your secretary)? I would think that even Bro. J. P. Watson could understand that he is, or should be head of his wife at all times when she is faithfully doing his work as above stated. Even so the Lord is head of the church when at 11 A. M. Sunday it is a worshiping church, Acts 2:42. When it is helping the needy, Acts 6. (A benevolent organization). When it is sending out and encouraging missionaries. (A missionary organization), Acts 13, and when it is teaching classes Sunday morning (a Sunday School). Acts 2:11. The church that does these things is simply a faithful bride of which Christ is the head. Eph. 1:22. The only Sunday school that I ever advocated is the Church of Christ in whole or in part, teaching the word of the Lord on Sundays in one class, or in many classes as opportunity affords us. Acts 2:11 and Acts 19:9. We oppose all organizations for doing religious work, except the Church of Christ. But you slander and misrepresent the church when it does this work, by calling it another organization or institution different from the church. You think you see another institution where there is none, and you have been wasting your time, strength and ammunition firing at something that does not exist. Like the story you referred to in your last letter, page 99, where Rastus shot all his ammunition at what he thought was a possum in a tree, but afterwards learned that it was only an insect on his eyebrow. So the trouble is with you, Bro. Watson, and not with the Sunday School.

And also since the Bible and all loyal preachers, including myself, never advocate a Sunday school that is a distinct institution different from the church, then all your talk and arguments against the modern Sunday school, system, institution, etc., is irrelevant matter. It is simply your man-of-straw that you introduced into this discussion. It is simply the insect on your eyebrow. You cannot truthfully say you are following me in this, for I have never once in this or in any other discussion advocated a Sunday school institution other than the church teaching all who will come for that purpose. So you see and all who read this discussion will see that you have refused to follow me as an honorable debater but have put up your man-of-straw, your modern institution, distinct from the church and have been wasting your time firing at that which I have never advocated. Therefore I truthfully stated that your letters were largely made up of irrelevant

matter. While you falsely stated that you were simply following me in this. For you were the one that introduced your man-of-straw.

Now concerning your low-down dirty illustration. You ask me to cut out my exposure of the same. Well if you are now ashamed of your wallowing in the dirt and wish to withdraw your dirty illustration then you may cut out my exposure of the same. You were the one who used that illustration first. You falsely stated that you followed me in the dirt. You should have some respect for the truth and not tell things that all who read will know to be false. Whenever you hide in the dirt as you did then, I will pull you out and expose you at the same time try to clean you up if I can.

On page 97 you misrepresent me again when you say, "You applied this law of teaching" one by one "to each class." I have said time and again that I Cor. 14:31 did not refer to the private Sunday school classes. It is the general principle of I Cor. 14:33 that applies to these classes. It seems an easy matter for you to misrepresent me, to misrepresent Brother Wallace, to misrepresent the Sunday school and to misrepresent the word of the Lord. You seem to be a specialist in this line.

You say I have utterly failed to prove my proposition. Well I have given you bible examples of the Sunday School, but if the Bible does not satisfy you then I have failed to satisfy you. But remember, my erring brother, when you reject the word of the Lord (Acts 2:11; Acts 19:9; Acts 20:17-18) you are rejecting your Saviour and you are rejecting God who sent him.

Again on page 99 of your last letter you misrepresent me when you add, "and if correctly translated that is what it would be." Then unkindly, unchristian-like and falsely add, "or else every translation that has ever been made from the original Greek into English is a false translation at that particular passage." If you were not so ignorant, and knew even the first principles of translation you would have saved yourself this humiliation and exposure. You should know that it is the idea that is translated, and that ideas may be clothed in different words, yet be the same correct idea. Because a boy is wearing a different suit of clothes that does not make him another boy. Who could be so ignorant as to think, a boy dressed in different clothes is not the same true boy? Or a church divided in classes is not the same faithful church? Or an idea clothed in another set of words is not the same idea? You started out with the false statement which you manufactured, "If correctly translated that is what it would be." Hence your conclusions are false. [See Foot-Note by J. P. W.]

Your repeated illustration on pages 100-101, "I cannot but think that, if any man on examination for a certificate to teach school, if [FOOT-NOTE—To show that the expression, "If correctly translated that is what it would be," is not my "manufactured" "false statement," I here give reference to some of the many witnesses that heard Brother Tallman make the statement. To Whom It May Concern:

This Is To Certify That: We, the undersigned, were present at the Pippin meeting referred to, and heard Brother Tallman say that he he should miss answering correctly in seven or even six out of every nine he would fail to get a certificate." Then you suggest that I failed to answer 7 out of 9 of your questions correctly. Honestly if the examiner was as ignorant as Bro. J. P. Watson, if he did not know the meaning of simple words like "No," and "daily" and could falsify and misrep-

resent his friends on every hand. If he could unblushingly add to, and take from the students language, and deny plain facts before his eyes I am sure that the outcome of such an examination would be in doubt. But I am willing to take my nine answers to your nine questions and place them before any three educated, intelligent people and let them judge the correctness of my answers, and all who read can easily see that I have answered each question correctly, and have proven my proposition by God's own word in which we find the God authorized model of the Sunday school, and all necessary instruction as I have clearly proven.

If you could have refuted my arguments why did you quit following them, and add many pages of your irrelevant matter about your man-of-straw, that I never advocated? Why did you add to my language and take from it so as to change the meaning? Why did you whine about this debate being "thrust upon" you when you know you first challenged me? Why did you make so many false statements about the challenge and other irrelevant matters? Statements that more than one hundred witnesses know to be false. Why did you hide in the dirty low down illustration mentioned above? Why have you broken the rules of honorable discussion in almost every letter? Using language that a low down sinner would not be allowed to use in any legislative hall? Why did you contradict yourself upon several occasions? And when I called your attention to these serious mistakes why did you not come out clean and correct them as any Christian should? May the Lord give you yet another chance to repent, and in at least your last letter to come out clean before the world and let all who read these letters see that at last you can play the man, and do the right thing. And I am ready, and all other true followers of the meek and lowly Jesus are ready to help you in any way we can to higher ground, to solid ground, where whatsoever you do in word of deed you can do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Your Brother for peace and unity as God requires,

O. H. TALLMAN.

knew the name "Sunday school" is not in the Bible, but that the idea is there in the Greek, and "if correctly translated that is what it would be." We remember very distinctly that he said, and if correctly translated that is what it would be.

Signed: Matt Brewington, R. 9. Cookeville, Tenn.,

Mrs. Matt Brewington, R. 9, Cookeville, Tenn.,

Mrs. U. S. Gilley, 609 Stephen Ave., Huntsville, Ala.

Among other witnesses is Brother Atwell Rector, of Cookeville, Tenn., R. 4, who also says he well remembers that Brother Tallman made the statement—And if correctly translated that is what it would be.

Brother Brewington and wife and Brother Rector are faithful members of the Pippin church, these two brethren being leaders in the church work, highly honored and respected by all the members.

If any be inclined to doubt, please to write to either or all of these four witnesses whose addresses are given above. They will state to you the facts. J. P. WATSON.]

SIXTH REPLY

Cookeville, Tenn., R. 9,

May 25, 1931. Dear Brother Tallman:

I now come to review your sixth affirmative (which I take to be your final effort in this discussion, as you suggested six letters each in the beginning). In this you say you "wish to briefly sum up some of the unrefuted and unrefutable arguments that show that it is the duty of the church to teach the bible in classes on Lord's day as we do here in Cookeville," etc. But honestly and candidly, and with all due respect to you, my Brother, I will say that—

1. Your summing up of what you call "some of the unrefuted and unrefutable arguments that show that it is the duty of the church to teach the bible in classes on Lord's day as we do here in Cookeville," etc., is just like the summing up by the pedobaptist what he called his "unrefuted and unrefutable arguments" that show that "infants are to be received into the church by baptism administered by sprinkling or pouring water upon them in the name of the Holy Trinity." Yes, your arguments are just like his, every one of them being not only refutable, but fully and completely refuted, as my other letters with yours clearly show.

The pedobaptist read scriptures and cited scriptures and asserted without one word of divine evidence that he had proven his proposition, that the church is to receive infants into its membership by baptism administered by sprinkling or pouring.

Just so, you have quoted scriptures and cited scriptures, and asserted without one word of divine evidence, that you have proven your proposition, that the Sunday school class system of teaching is divinely authorized and recorded in the New Testament scriptures—"that it is the duty of the church to teach the bible in classes on Lord's day as" is done there in Cookeville.

But, Brother Tallman, I again call your attention to the fact, that your Sunday school class system of teaching is not even mentioned so much as one time in the Bible. It is, therefore, not a Bible institution, and, for this reason, it is an unscriptural thing.

I also call your attention again to the fact, that each scripture you quote and cite stands as an infallible witness against you on this question; for the thing is not mentioned, or even remotely referred to, in any of those passages, nor elsewhere in the Bible.

Therefore your proposition falls without one scintilla of divine evidence to its support. It is, therefore, unproved and unprovable. And again I remind you of the universal and self-evident truth that, It is absolutely impossible to prove things without evidence.

I called your attention to the fact, that it is as impossible for you to prove your doctrine of the Sunday school class institution as it is for the pedobaptist to prove his doctrine of infant baptism and infant membership; for the Bible is as silent on the one as it is on the other.

I also called your attention to the fact, that it is as impossible for you to prove by the Bible that your Sunday school class system (such as is operated in the Cookeville church) was operated in

any of the New Testament churches, as it would be for you to prove the earth is above the heavens, or that the sun is a body of blackness.

I repeatedly called, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa. 8:20).

I called attention to the fact, that, when you speak up your Sunday school class system of arrangement for teaching in classes, you "speak not according to this word"—the word of God; for it is not recorded in God's word. I also called attention to the fact, that, when you so speak, you do not "speak as the oracles of God" (See I Pet. 4:11), because your Sunday school tradition is not an oracle of God. The inspired Scriptures thoroughly furnish the man of God to "all good works" (See II Tim. 3:16-17). And I called attention to the fact, that the Scriptures do not furnish the man of God to this work of dividing an assembly into class-groups for teaching, and of each class and teacher withdrawing from the assembly to some private place. I called attention to the fact, that the passages you cite on this point are as destitute of such idea as certain other scriptures are destitute of infant baptism.

I repeatedly called upon you to show that your Sunday school class system is commanded, seeing you claim it is commanded. I quoted, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (I Thes. 5:21). You utterly failed to show it is commanded, you failed to show it is an actual example, you failed to show it a necessary inference; therefore you utterly fail to prove the thing divine. Therefore, in this investigation we have proven the Sunday school class system and found that it is not a divine institution, that it is not in the law of God, not a divine oracle, and hence we have proven that your class system of dividing an assembly to teach them in class-groups, and of withdrawing each group from the assembly, that more than one may teach that assembly at the same time, is not a "good work," because such prepares to have the teaching done contrary to the plain express commandments of God as found in I Cor. 14:27-35 inclusive, that the men are required to speak in the order of "one by one," and the women to be silent, not even to ask a question for information on anything. (See I Cor. 14:34-35; also I Tim. 2:11-12).

God spoke by Solomon: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man." (Ecc. 12:13).

Now since we have tested the thing and found that it is not a commandment of God, its not being recorded in God's Book, such is, therefore, not a "duty of man," since "the whole duty of man" is couched in the commandments of God.

Therefore it is not "the duty of the church to teach the bible in classes on Lord's day" (or any other day), "as" is done in Cookeville and other places. Hence the church, having no commandment from God to teach in classes, but being under command to have the teaching done to the assembly by the men in the order of "one by one," and the women to be silent, all being done "decently and in order" (See verses 3031-34-35), it is evidently certain that the church can do its whole duty without using the unscriptural system of the man-made class arrangement for teaching.

Having now tested the class system of the Sunday school invention and found that to divide an assembly up into class-groups for the purpose of teaching them, and then to have each class-

group with its teacher "withdraw from the assembly" are not commandments of God, it follows, therefore, as an absolute certainty that such are the commandments of men. Hence all who teach the brethren and churches to use that man-made system are teaching and following the doctrines and commandments of men.

"The whole duty of man" (Ecc. 12:13)—every duty of man—is commanded in the Scriptures. The Sunday school class system of teaching is not commanded in the Scriptures; therefore it is not the duty of man nor of the church to use that system.

And here again I call your attention to the fact that every argument you have offered in this discussion to show such to be the duty of the church to so teach is wholly fallacious, and fully refuted as my other letters clearly show.

2. I called your attention to the fact, that your assertion that the twelve apostles "were all teaching at the same time" on Pentecost is nothing but an assumption unproved and improvable. Acts 2:11 cited as proof bears no such idea. It reads (that is, the part to which you refer):

"We do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God." Your logic is that since the same tense is used (hear), "we do hear them speak," etc., all the twelve spoke at the same time. But this is no evidence that they all spoke at the same time.

Your logic is all out of joint,

You do not reason to the point.

Because the pronoun "we" here includes all the people that are designated as being present (Acts 2:9-11) which you, in your last letter call "several classes of people." Now, if they all—all the apostles—spoke at once—all at the same time, and if "we"—all those people did "hear" them all "at the same time," then it is evident that those people were not divided into class-groups and separated so far from each other that the one class could not hear the others, the confusion being overcome by the distance you put the classes from each other. All! it has been truly said, "The legs of the lame are unequal." If "we" (all the people of Acts 2:9-11) did, as you say, "hear them" (all the apostles) "speak at the same time," which is your doctrine, then this necessarily kills your doctrine of separating those people so far the one from the other as to prevent the confusion of voices that would be were all to speak at the same time in the assembly. Your last interpretation puts all the classes (as you call them) together in one assembly, and has all the apostles speaking to all of them at the same time with no vacant space between the classes to prevent the confusion.

No real scholar who has no unscriptural theory to defend would so presume to claim that the present tense of the verb "hear," in the expression, "we do hear them speak" (Common Version), "hear them speaking" (A. S. R. Version), signifies that all were speaking at the same time. And more especially so since such speaking all at the same time to an assembly is directly contrary to the Spirit's order, as is given in I Cor. 14:31.

So I cite the example in Neh. 8:1-8, Where "all the people gathered themselves together as one man" (verse 1), and while all the people listened Ezra and the teachers that stood by him read in the book of the law. Verse 8 reads:

"So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading."

"They read." The same tense ("read"), past tense, is used, as the present tense was used in the other case. But this does not show that they all read at the same time. All reading and explaining at the same time would have been disorder and confusion, of which God is not the author (See I Cor. 14:33).

And the thoughtful reader will notice that Neh. 8:1 shows that the people all gathered together as one man, and that the congregation was made up of not only men, but also of women and (children) "all that can hear with understanding" (verses 2-3).

God's law required them to bring the children ("all that could hear with understanding") together to be taught in the same assembly with the men and the women. "Gather the people together, men and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law: "And that their children, which have not known any thing, may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God," etc. (Deut. 31:12-13).

From the foregoing scriptures we learn that, under the old covenant, when the people came together to be taught, instead of being divided up into class-groups and sent off each class from the other, they remained together and listened "as one man." That the men, women, and children, and also their strangers were taught in the assembly undivided, that several teachers stood together and taught the people the words of the Lord. And that the teaching was in the order of "one by one," which is God's way of having the teaching done to avoid confusion (See I Cor. 14:27-33 inclusive), and that the women did not teach even parts of the assembly, we find in verses 34-35 which the law said also the same as the gospel requires.

There was no provision under the law, nor the prophets for the modern class division of an assembly, and of this withdrawing of class-groups from the assembly to some private place to be taught.

This same order prevails under the gospel covenant; and in this covenant no provision is made for such division and withdrawing from the assembly, when the people come together to be taught.

Therefore, whosoever encourages such procedure does so presumptuously and contrary to the revealed will of God.. This I have shown in my other letters.

I repeatedly called your attention to the fact that, in your effort to establish your class division, class grouping, and class withdrawing where and when people had come together to be taught, you have perverted every scripture you quoted and cited as teaching such an arrangement; for such is not only not mentioned, but it is not even remotely referred to in any scripture you quote or cite, or any other. Therefore you have perverted every scripture used to make out your unscriptural claim for the Sunday school class system of arrangement.

But it seems, Brother Tallman, that with your great pretensions to such high scholarly attainments, you would know better than to so pervert the scriptures to teach a doctrine that no man

has ever been able to read out to us in the written word of God. If you know no better you should cease teaching such till you learn better.

I also called your attention to the law of God pertaining to the home teaching of the children (Deut. 11:18-20), as was required under the law of Moses. I also gave you Eph. 6:4 which requires us to "bring up" (our children) "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

Thus I have shown that, when people come together to be taught the word of God, both under the old covenant and the new, God's order is, that the assembly be taught by men in the order of "one by one" while the women teach not, but learn "in silence." (I Cor. 14:30-35; I Tim 2:11-12).

But men have brought out many inventions, and claim to have found a "better way" than the way God has revealed in his word. But the Lord says:

"My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." (Isa. 55:8-9).

God's way of having his word taught when people come together is as much higher (superior and better) than man's way (the Sunday school class systematized arrangement) of having it done, as the heavens are higher than the earth.

So I'm content to teach God's way, Regardless of what men may say; And the result leave with my Lord, Knowing he will give a just reward.

If all would follow heaven's rule, No church would have the Sunday school; God's word does not produce the thing, That does so much division bring.

Your personal thrusts and ridicule, Bear no proof of your Sunday school: Though such doth clearly indicate, That you've lost out in this debate.

You may boast of your great learning, While gospel light on you I'm turning: Your boasting so seems all in vain, Not one point do you sustain.

For every scripture you quote and cite, Witness against you with all their light: Hence no Bible proof do you bring, Not one passage mentions the thing.

Therefore your claims fall to the ground, Because your doctrine is unsound:

Though carefully you may search and look, You'll never find it in the Book

3. I called attention to the fact, that the "school of one Tyrannus" (Acts 19:9) was not a Sunday school, even if operated on Sunday, because the term "Sunday" does not truly represent any school as a designating title except such schools only as are operated on no other day of the week than on Sunday, and the school of Acts 19:9 was operated daily, hence not a Sunday school. I showed that "daily" does not always include Sunday, and especially so with reference to schools and school work. I showed that we have daily recitations in most, if not in all, established schools of the age, when it is well known that those schools are not operated every day in the

week, Saturday and Sunday of each week being excluded from school work. I showed that your strenuous effort to make out a Sunday school (Acts 19:9) was a complete failure. And the very fact that you give this scripture as a record-model of your Sunday school class institution is evidence that you are in a strait, hard-pressed for Bible proof and finding none. For the school of Tyrrannus, according to the best information at hand, as I showed, was a school of heathen philosophy, and not a church-school. I called attention to the one point of analogy between your Sunday school institution and this school of heathen philosophy; and that is, they are both of man, and not of God. Therefore you have entirely lost your unscriptural claim as an argument on Acts 19:9, even as you have lost out on every other scripture you use.

4. "And on the sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither." (Acts 16:13).

I called attention to the fact, that instead of this being a Saturday, or sabbath, school, as you claim, it was simply a prayer meeting, as the passage itself shows. Those preachers went out to the place "where prayer was wont (accustomed) to be made," and used the opportunity of preaching the gospel to the women who had come to the place of prayer. Not one word in the whole context about a Saturday (sabbath) school. "And it came to pass as we went to prayer" (verse 16), a certain damsel acted in a way that attracted attention, "And this she did many days" (verse 18). This shows the prayer meeting continued many days; therefore a daily prayer meeting. It was neither a Saturday school, nor a Saturday prayer meeting. A Saturday prayer meeting would be one that was conducted on Saturday only, and on no other day of the week than Saturday.

But you pervert the language (Acts 16:13); (1) when you say, "'We sat down' according to Hebrew language suggests that they had a message for them"; and (2) when you say, "We.....spake" shows that the four delivered the message at the same time." (Your letter, p. 103). And (3) when you say, "They must have been separated far enough to avoid confusion," citing I Cor. 14:33, you pervert the passage, misrepresent the facts, and add to the word of the Lord. And thus you would deceive the readers who do not know better who have confidence in you.

(1) Acts of Apostles was not written in Hebrew, but in Greek.

And being written originally in Greek, and the Greek bearing no such suggestion, no true translation from the Greek of the passage into Hebrew, or any other language, could bear such unauthorized suggestion. Therefore, the expression, "we sat down" does not suggest "that they had a message for them." If such be true, then every one of those women that went out to that prayer meeting and sat down must have had a message for (the rest of) them. And wherever any body goes and sets down, when he sets down that would mean he has a message to tell. All! talk about "ignorance!"

(2) Again you pervert the simple English of the passage when you say, "'We.....spake' shows that the four delivered the message at the same time." Any one who knows any thing about the simple rules of English grammar knows that "we.....spake" does not suggest, or bear the idea, that they all spoke at the same time. "Wespake" simply expresses a fact as past.

If "we.....spake" bears the idea that they all spoke at the same time (Acts 16:13), then the expression, "Let the prophets speak two or three," would bear the idea that the "two or three" were per-

mitted to speak at the same time. Would you avow such? Again, "ye may all prophesy" would suggest that they may all prophesy at the same time. But God's law is that "all may prophesy"—speak, but in the order of "one by one." (I Cor. 14:30-31). And that this law of order obtains "in all the assemblies of the saints," is evident from verse 33, which states the good results of this law, that of avoiding "confusion," and maintaining peace and good order. (See also verse 40). Any intelligent school boy of the eighth grade knows better than to claim that "we.....spake" means that we all spake at the same time. But it is a true proverbial figure that, "Some men soar so high upon the wings of imagination in self-esteem that they lose sight of little simple things below them."

5. Acts 13:8-11 you have misapplied; for in this discussion I am not the Elymas, neither are you the Saul (that is called Paul). You have, as I have shown, perverted every scripture you quote and cite as a record of your unscriptural institution of the Sunday school class system. Therefore a true application of this passage in this discussion, would be to put it in exactly the reverse order. I have contended against your perversions of the "right ways of the Lord" on the order of teaching the assembly (public gathering). Who, then, is the Elymas, perverting the "right ways of the Lord" in this case? And, in the language of Nathan to David, the answer comes clear and straight, "Thou art the man" (II Sam. 12:7).

Luke 10:16 you also misapply; for, in this discussion, you are advocating a thing the apostles did not authorize. Therefore you are the one who refuses to hear the apostles on this question, and substitute your own system instead.

"For laying aside the commandment of God," (I Cor. 14:31-35), "ye hold the tradition of men" (on this question for the full time that your class system is in operation), even as did certain Pharisees and scribes on other questions, as Jesus charged on them. (Mat. 15:3-6; Mk. 7:5-13).

Hence not being satisfied with what the apostles have said on this question of teaching the public assembly, you lay their words aside and bring your own sayings in: and thus "transgress the commandment of God by your tradition"—the Sunday school class system. Who, then, refuses to hear the apostles, Christ, and God? And again the answer comes in the language of the Bible, "Thou art the man." (II Sam. 12:7).

7. Titus 2:3-4 you pervert when you make it appear that the aged women are to take the young women out of the public assembly to one side in the order of your Sunday school class arrangement to teach them. No such idea is borne by this passage nor any other.

We agree that the old women are to teach the young women; for the Bible says so. And you have finally agreed with me that their teaching is private. But when you go beyond the word of God and try to make it out that those aged women were to wait till the people had come together in public capacity, and then separate the young ladies from the rest of the people, and slip off to a private place to teach them, I say right there is where we disagree. For every difference between us (religiously) is over what you say, not over what the Bible says. This I have shown most clearly in my other letters to you.

8. You are correct in saying that "I Cor. 14:31 does not refer to any private Sunday school classes, separated from the rest." There were no such classes "separated from the rest" in that age

of the church; and of course that scripture could not refer to something that did not exist. But verse 33 shows that the law of speaking "one by one" (verse 31) was applied "in all the assemblies of the saints" (Anderson's Translation). And each class-group is an assembly, and you yourself apply this law of "one by one" to each class assembly, when you say, "sometimes there were several teachers and classes but only one teacher to each class at the same time." (Your letter, Jan. 2, 1931, p. 21).

9. I showed equal to a demonstration (mathematically considered) that you had missed the true answers to seven of the nine original questions given you, answering only two of them correctly. (See my letters, Dec. 10, 1930; Jan. 15, 1931, etc.).

I called attention to the fact, that, if on examination for a certificate to teach school you should fail to answer correctly seven of the questions out of every nine, you would fail to get a certificate. And it matters not how "ignorant" you may count me, what I here state are irrefutable facts. It seems to be a trait in most all errorists that, when they see that every argument they have made is completely refuted, and the arguments against them are absolutely unanswerable, they leave the question at issue, and try to divert attention by crying down their antagonists as being "ignorant"—"ignorant"—"ignorant;" and all to cover up their defeat. It appears that, if they can get the hearers or readers to think their opponents are ignorant—that they do not know language, they feel they have made a point, at least with the people, when in reality, deep down in their hearts they know and sensibly feel their utter defeat. Whether this be your own experience in this case, or not, I leave it wholly with you and the Lord; for you and the Lord know. And thus I do not impugn your motive; however, I state a fact that it so appears to me, and the readers may decide it for themselves.

10. On page 107 you say, "If you could have refuted my arguments why did you quit following them, and add many pages of your irrelevant matter about your man-of-straw, that I never advocated? Why did you add to my language and take from it so as to change the meaning?"

To this I reply: Honestly and candidly, and with all due respect to you, Brother Tallman, I say the truth when I tell you, (1) that I did not "add to" your "language," nor "take from it," "so as to change the meaning." This charge is like many others you have made against me in this discussion, all of which are wholly groundless. (2) I have followed you in your arguments, and have clearly shown that not one of them is sustained by the word of God.

I called attention to the fact, that if I am dealing in irrelevant matter, as you complained in another letter, it is because you had put up so much of that kind of material for me to work on, seeing you are in the lead affirming and I am following. I showed that your irrelevant matter does not sustain your unscriptural position.

I also called your attention to the fact, that if what I had put up to you for discussion be a "man-of-straw," I am not responsible for its lightness and weakness. And again I warn you, my Brother, that, in the final day of accounts, your unscriptural institution that we have been discussing under the name "Sunday school"—consisting of its classes and teachers (all operating at the same time in the assembly, either divided or undivided), will be no more than "straw;" nay, it will, doubtless, be consumed as stubble in the flames of that unquenchable fire (See Mal. 4:1).

And my letters of this correspondence together with yours clearly demonstrate that you have utterly failed to prove that God instituted and authorized your Sunday school class system, having failed to present one scripture that even mentions the thing in any way, either directly or indirectly. And I called attention to the fact, that every scripture referred to witness against you that the system is not in the Bible, and, therefore, not divine. And, to use your expression, you have very appropriately designated it as being a "man-of-straw," as compared to things divinely authorized.

My letters and yours stand out as witnesses, as all thoughtful readers will clearly see, which one of us is guilty of using unbecoming language—such as would not be allowed to be used in a legislative hall. I am not ashamed of what I have written, and as proof of this fact, I am willing to bear my part of the expense on the publication of this discussion in tract and make it a free donation to all who will read it. Now if you are not ashamed of anything you have written, then prove it by offering to do your part in bearing half the expense of publication, and let it go free to a reading public. It is a true maxim that, "Actions speak louder than words."

I called your attention to the fact, that the Lord named his church. Then you called for the proof, as though you would dispute it. I gave you a number of scriptures as proof; and you made no reply in any letter since. But you preached it in my presence (at Pippin) that the Lord did not name the church—that the church was nameless—that it had no name. You said "church of God"—"church of Christ"—that these expressions show who the church belongs to instead of being the name of it.

But afterward (at the Chapel) you said it publicly that we (the brethren here) should put up as a sign the name of the church— "church of Christ"—upon our meetinghouse to show that the church of Christ meets here. Thus you cross yourself. You say the church has no name—it is without a name, then you say it has a name and give "church of Christ" as being its name. This is Tallman against Tallman. "And if a house be divided against itself" shall not stand, as Jesus said, then how can Tallman stand, since he is divided against himself? (Mk. 3:25).

13. I again call attention, that I stated naught but truth and fact concerning the challenge and the origin of this written discussion. And I know, and I know the Lord knows, that what I said is true, every word of it. And if you do not know the same, then you have forgotten it.

However, it matters not how this discussion originated; such is an insignificant matter. Had I not suggested it, there is no doubt that we would not have entered this discussion. And in a discourse at Pippin you certainly used the expression, "and if correctly translated that is what it would be," when you said you knew that the "name Sunday school is not in the Bible," but that "the idea is there in the Greek,.....and if correctly translated that is what it would be."

If you do not remember having said it I will not hold you responsible for your forgetfulness, but only for your denial of the fact. (See Foot-Note, pages 106-107).

14. My illustration by the sheep and the goat (pp. 72-73, Mar. 20) that the church and the Sunday school are 'two distinct institutions is both apt and honorable; and hence is not unworthy of a place in an honorable debate, seeing it clearly illustrates the one point intended, which is, that the church and the Sunday school are not one and the same, but are two distinct institutions, though

not separate and apart the one from the other, even as the sheep and the goat are not one and the same, but are two distinct animals, though not separate and apart from each other, being associated together.

Kind reader, open your New Testament at Mat. 25:31-33 and read. You see a similar illustration, in which Jesus used the same terms, "Sheep" and "goat," to illustrate a fact. Hence, Brother Tallman, you would just as well charge our Lord with making "a low-down dirty illustration" when he used those two names to illustrate a fact, as to charge such on me when I use the same two names to illustrate another fact.

But the truth of the matter is, that, to call a sheep a goat does not make it a goat, neither does calling a goat a sheep make it a sheep.

Just so, your calling the church the Sunday school does not make it the Sunday school, neither does your calling the Sunday school the church make it the church. They still remain two distinct institutions regardless of what you call them. And I repeat that, though they are two distinct institutions, yet the Sunday school is not "separate and apart from the church," but is connected with the church, and is operated in the church. In saying this I state an irrefutable fact, notwithstanding your statement to the contrary.

And I still grant you the privilege of withdrawing your unbecoming expression by canceling your paragraph on page 92 of your letter of Apr. 3. In this paragraph you not only use unbecoming language, but you pervert my illustration and misrepresent me by adding thereto, and in this you went down "into the dirt," to use your expression, as I said to you before.

I have not drug this discussion down into the dirt, and when you so charge, you judge your brother wrongfully, and again the scripture is here appropriate that says, "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged," as Jesus declared, (Mat. 7:1-2). "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." (Rom. 2:1). Therefore, when you pass this untrue judgment that I drug this debate down into the dirt, as you have repeatedly charged, you have done the very same thing yourself, according to the word of the Lord. If you dispute this fact, you dispute the word of the Lord.

And again I repeat, if I am found going down "into the dirt," remember I am following you. seeing you are in the lead affirming, and I am replying to what you put up for me to work on. So I am after you trying faithfully and earnestly to induce you to come forth out of the dirt. And therefore, I insist that you cancel that part of your letter of Apr. 3 above referred to, as I requested, before these letters go to the press for publication. Because that whole paragraph will reflect upon you when it goes before the reading public. I will treat you perfectly fair, so far as my "ignorance" will allow. (See Foot-Note by J. P. W., p. 92).

In your answer, "No," to Question No. 9 you emphatically deny that God has given a (that is, not one) specific law regulating the public teaching of his word. (Your letter, Nov. 28, 1980).

Then in your letter, Jan. 2, 1931, p. 21, you admit that there are specific laws regulating teaching, explaining that the "specific laws (are) for specific cases," but did not say whether for private or

public teaching. However, your emphatic, "No," to Q. 9 excludes all those specific laws from the public teaching restricting them alone to the private teaching.

But when you saw the ridiculousness of such claim exposed in my reply you charge me with misquoting you, and you quote your statement adding the word "public," and explain in parenthesis thus, "(public I mean)."

And here again I went down after you, after this manner. I requoted your statement and said:

Now that is your statement just as you made it, and just as I quoted it. I, therefore, quoted you correctly, neither adding to, nor taking from, it. But in your statement here (quoted) you did not use the word public. You did not say, "There is no one specific law regulating public teaching under all conditions." No, but you now add in that word public in your statement, and say that is what you "mean." But is that what you meant then? If so, why did you not say what you meant at the time you said that? If you meant "public" teaching at the time you said that, then you did not say what you meant, and did not mean what you said. And you had a reason for not saying what you meant, and for not meaning what you said at the time you said it. And here I ask, why did you leave out the limiting term public if you (at that time) meant public, not including private, teaching? It was the public teaching (not private teaching) that was under consideration, and Which you were proposing to consider. Again I ask, Why? yes, Why? WHY did you so evade the very point at issue, if you at the time meant "public" teaching?

All! Brother Tallman, had you said "public" teaching in that statement—that "There is no one specific law regulating public teaching under all conditions, but general principles governing all and specific laws for specific cases," as you say you "mean," you would have thereby contradicted your answer, "No," to Q. No. 9 as being absolutely false, even as I showed you from the beginning.

At first you denied that there is a specific law for the public teaching, (a law means one law). But now you say there are "specific laws for specific cases" of "public" teaching. Thus you have contradicted, condemned, and slaughtered your answer, "No," to question No. 9. It seems you are learning some things by this discussion. Or if you knew better and answered falsely on purpose, it seems that there could be no other reason for such except to shield your unscriptural position from being exposed by the true answer to that question. However, I leave it with you and the Lord as to your motive, though your course strongly indicates such. And here I asked you another question that you did not answer, passing it by in silence. It is in verse as follows:

If you meant, Yes, when you said, "No," Then come out plain and tell me so: If by "No" you meant to affirm, You certainly used the wrong term.

Your Lake, Desert, and Pipe Illustration, In a Discourse at Pippin

My Questions, Nos. 2, 7, and 8, were suggested, and called forth, by your false illustration in a discourse at Pippin that made the Sunday school class system of teaching to be the only medium through which to teach the word of God to the people. I do not think you intended to make the illustration so exclusive in your application, yet that is the way you left it.

Your Illustration: There was no way or means of conveying the pure water from the lake to the desert plain until a pipe was put in for the purpose. This pipe (the only means of conveying the water) supplied the people of the desert with water from the lake for a While.

But it came to pass, after a time, that the water stopped flowing. From some cause the water supply was cut off. On examination it was found that some one had put a block or chunk in the pipe up at the lake, which stopped the water-flow.

In the illustration you made the pipe to represent the Sunday school class system of teaching. And since the pipe was the only medium, or means, of conveying the water to the people of the plain, this logically made it out that the Sunday school class system was the only medium through which to teach the people the word of God. As the chunk put into the pipe cut off the water supply, just so the objector stopping the Sunday school (class system) stops the teaching of God's word. This was the force of your illustration, if it had any force at all,

But since, as you know, the Sunday school class system is not the only medium for teaching the word, it logically follows that your illustration is false, being fallacious, deceptive, and misleading.

It was this fallacious illustration that suggested to my mind, and called forth, the three questions, Nos. 2, 7, and 8, included in the list of the nine original ones.

When you made this fallacious illustration at Pippin, you urged the brethren to "get busy" (put in the Sunday school class system) and go to "teaching systematically;" thus making the impression that the word cannot be taught "systematically" without the aid of that system. Here I quote my Q. No. 2, as suggested by that illustration. It is,

2. Do you consider that the Sunday school class system is essential to the carrying out of the command to teach God's word? And do you think the word of God cannot be taught "systematically" without the aid of that system?

Your illustration demands an affirmative answer to this question. But as I showed, you did not answer it either affirmatively or negatively. Had you answered affirmatively, according to your illustration, that the Sunday school class system is essential to the carrying out of the command to teach God's word, you would have thereby obligated yourself to do the impossible; that is, to prove (without evidence) that the word of God cannot be taught either systematically, or otherwise, without the aid of that system. You could not teach an assembly the word of the Lord without dividing it up into classes. Phillip could not have taught the eunuch until they had traveled on to where there was a Sunday school class arrangement in operation, and they get into one of the classes. These are unavoidable difficulties that would have confronted you had you answered Q. No. 2 affirmatively.

But, on the other hand, had you answered negatively—that such system is not essential, you would have met the difficulty of having to bear the blame for advocating an unscriptural non-essential thing that is causing division, and that, too, according to your own decision in your answers 4 and 5. A negative answer would have completely refuted your position, even without an argument from me on the other side of the issue.

I did not charge that your foreseeing those difficulties caused you to shun answering the question. I left that with you and the Lord. But I here repeat how it appeared to me, and, doubtless, will so appear to the readers.

(1) That since you could not do the impossible, you would not answer affirmatively; and (2) since you did not want to admit the responsibility of having to bear the blame for the division over your non-essential Sunday school class system, you would not answer negatively. And, therefore, you decided not to answer either way. But you filled in with something else not asked, as a substitute, posing such as an answer when it was not.

All! my Brother, such course as this is not the course pursued by those who know they are on the right side of a question with Bible proof at hand.

But errorists are often forced, Such course as this to take;

While they who come with Bible proof, Do no such blunders make.

This is a sample of just how Your other answers go: Your other six fallacious ones, My letters clearly show.

Your answers do expose themselves,

As being thus fallacious: And though I'm showing up your errors, My heart to you is gracious.

If I could do no better than, You show that you have done, I think I'd give the whole thing o'er, And try to answer none.

Your answer, "No," to question nine, Is evidently wrong: Although "to tell the truth," you say, "It does not take" one "long."

But when I showed that God had given, Such law, beyond a doubt, You did admit that it is true, Which cuts your answer out.

The strange thing of it is, Brother, Since you have seen the light: You still contend your answer, "No," To question nine is right.

15. In my other letter (Apr. 8, 1931) I made special reference to the seven unanswered questions of the original list of the nine handed you at Pippin, expecting this to be my last letter of this discussion, so as not to have too much in my last one. Hence just a few words here on that matter will suffice. I kindly ask the reader to (1) read the list of my nine questions carefully again, (2) then read carefully your proposed answers, and it will be plain to all that only two of my nine questions are answered correctly.

And just here I call attention to the fact, that there are quite a number of other questions that I have given you in my letters that you have not answered, and many of them you have not even pretended to answer, passing them by in silence, while some you entirely miss in your effort to answer. All of such is most significant that you are in defense of an erroneous doctrine, without one syllable of Bible proof to its support, whether you are conscious of such or not. Correct an-

swers to all of my questions would thoroughly refute your unscriptural position on the question we are discussing, even without another argument from my side of the subject.

Remember that the home teaching, private teaching, is not under discussion, but the public teaching is what we have had under review in these letters. And in my negative arguments I have not departed from the Standard Dictionaries on the meaning of any word involved in this discussion. But your unscriptural doctrine of the humanly devised plan of the Sunday school class system of having the public assembly taught after coming together in public capacity to be taught, sets God's law of order aside, at least for a time, and breaks up the public assembly into so many fragments—classgroups, and each withdraw from the other, in order to have your own way of teaching the public assembly, and thus you wisely contrive to beat the Lord out of his way of having the public assembly taught. Whether you intend it so or not, that is exactly the status of the situation, even as you say of the sects, which thought I put in verse.

Not being satisfied with what The apostles say: Men divide the assembly up, And teach in their own way.

Thus laying aside the word of God, They follow after men: Hence like King Saul they do commit, The great presumptuous sin.

For though Saul did the greater part, He left a part undone; And thus it was he disobeyed, The mischief then was done.

And though he twice affirmed he had, The voice of God obeyed; But that Saul's claims were false, the Lord, To Samuel had conveyed.

So Samuel called upon the king That he remain or "stay," And he would tell him what the Lord, To him that night did say.

And when he heard the story—sad— The prophet did relate, It grieved Saul in his heart to know, That he must meet his fate.

I warn that whosoever turns From what the Scriptures say; Shall meet their fate as did King Saul, In the great and final day.

To speak the truth I am content, I would not you misrepresent;

I would not do you wrong, my Brother, In this way nor any other.

Questions Yet Unanswered

Nine questions fair and pertinent, To you at first I did present; Of which you answered only two, Correctly, as I said to you.

Your missing seven out of the nine, Leaves you below the honor-line: The lowest percent that lets one in, I think, is seven out of ten.

Though you pervert and substitute, Yet all of such I did refute: You could not answer either way,
And shield your doctrine in the fray.

All! did you dream it in your nap, That I had set for you this "trap?" And did you find when you
awoke, That it was real, and hence, no joke?

If all would take my timely warning, 'Twould bless them in the judgment morning: To repent and
pray 'twill be too late, When "Turned away from the beautiful gate."

Many other stanzas I'd like to give, But I'll have mercy and let you live: Perhaps you'll give up
your wrong some day, At least for this I humbly pray.

16. That Greek word again which you said meant "Sunday school." I took a special note of your
statement you made in a discourse at Pippin, and I quoted you correctly. You said, you knew the
name Sunday school was not in the Bible, but that the idea is there in the Greek, and if correctly
translated that is what it would be.

Though you deny saying, "if correctly translated that is what it would be," yet, whether you said
it or not, such would be true if that idea be in the Greek New Testament. But I remember very
distinctly that you said it. And I know enough about "the first principles of translation" to know
that when an idea expressed in Greek may be clothed in different words in English, those differ-
ent words are synonymous terms, each bearing the same meaning, for otherwise they could not
represent that idea.

Therefore if the idea represented by the name Sunday school be in the Greek New Testament,
then the true translation of that idea into English would be "Sunday school." And since the term
Sunday school does not appear in any translation in English, and since there is no word in any
English version that means Sunday school, it follows as a logical and necessary conclusion that,
if the idea of Sunday school be in the Greek New Testament, then every translation that "has ever
been made from the Greek into English is a false translation at that particular passage. Why?
simply because there is no word in any English Version of the New Testament that means Sunday
school. But the truth of it is, as shown so clearly in my refutation of your proposed answer to Q.
No. 1, that NO SUCH IDEA is in the Greek New Testament.

I called your attention to the fact, that such was only your assumption and assertion unproved
and unprovable—that such Idea is in the Greek.

I called on you to give me that Greek word you said means Sunday school, and what did you
give? Kaq h|meran en th[^] sxolh[^]. (kath hemeran en te schole). I asked you to give me the true
translation in English of that Greek word that means Sunday school, and what did you give? You
gave, "(daily or every day in the school)." (Your letter, Nov. 28, 1930).

But "Daily or every day in the school" does not mean "Sunday school." Why did you not trans-
late it Sunday school? If it means Sunday school, then it should have been so translated. And I
proved it equal to a demonstration that the school to which you refer (Acts 19:9) was not a
Sunday school. Therefore the idea represented by the name "Sunday school" is not in the Greek
New Testament. And this is the reason why the Sunday school idea does not at all appear in any
English Version of the New Testament.

In giving your preferable translation (whether your own, or only quoted) you left out the word Sunday. Why did you not say, "(daily or every day in the Sunday school)?" All! my Brother, that would have rendered your language ridiculous; for it would be absurd to have a thing occurring "daily or every day in a Sunday school." For as I have abundantly shown, a Sunday school is one that is operated exclusively on Sunday; that is, on no other day of the week than on Sunday. But the school you mention (Acts 19:9) was operated daily (not necessarily on every day of the week, but on successive days). The secular schools of this country are operated daily; but none of them are operated on Sunday, so far as known to me.

Thus failing on answering my first question, that means a failure throughout. For your absolute failure to show the Sunday school idea in the Greek New Testament completely refutes your claim; because no idea can be translated from the Greek text into the English text that is not in the Greek. And if such idea as that of Sunday school be found in any English Version that may yet be brought out (for it is not in any present Version), such would be forced into the English text, and not translated.

My Q. No. 1, therefore, successfully brings down your unscriptural position to the ground, even as did little David's first stone of his five brought the champion of the Philistines to the ground at his first throw (I Sam. 17:49).

The idea not being in the Greek, it is impossible to translate it into any English Version. It could not be brought in except by forcing it into our English text.

Therefore your Sunday school must be A thing of modern date: To be divinely authorized, It came in far too late.

I warn you as a friend and brother, Be careful what you speak: You fail to show your Sunday school, Recorded in the Greek.

And failing here your theory falls, With no support divine: No one can read it in God's Book, Not in one scripture line.

And since it is not in the Greek, 'Tis not in English found: Fallacious are your arguments, Your speech has proved unsound.

"To the law and to the testimony," I called on you to go: But neither law nor testimony, Did you bring up and show.

The Scriptures you quote and cite, Do not record the thing: I knew it well when you began, You had no proof to bring.

When we do all in Jesus' name, Then no one can the other blame: "Confusion" of voices we avoid Which so often has annoyed.

But some build walls to check the sound, As their voices echo round: Thus they defy the Lord and say, We have found a "better way."

Thy rule, Lord, is good in Paul's letter, But we have one we think is better: Why it is better we explain, It does the "best results obtain."

Thy rule, Lord, cannot reach the masses, Hence we decided to teach in classes. Our many teachers make greater show, For "one by one" is far too slow.

17. I did hope you would not introduce your pet term "hobby" into this discussion. But since you have at last brought it in, I feel that I should give it some attention.

(1) What does the word "hobby" mean, as used in religious discussions? and (2) Why is it so used? For the benefit of the readers who have no unabridged dictionary I quote the definitions from Webster, as follows:

"Hobby, Hobby-horse, n. A strong, active horse, of middle size; an ambling (pacing) horse; a nag; a stick, or figure of a horse, on which boys ride; a subject upon which one is constantly setting off; a favorite theme of discourse, thought, or effort." (Webster's Condensed Dictionary). I further quote from Webster:

1. "A strong, active horse, of middle size, said to have been originally from Ireland; a nag; a prancing horse; a garran."

"A stick, or figure of a horse on which boys ride."

"Any favorite object; that which a person pursues with zeal or delight."

"A stupid fellow." "Hobby-horse. A hobby; a wooden horse on which boys ride." "The favorite object of pursuit."

(Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary).

Now, kind reader, you have before you the meaning of the word, "hobby," as defined by Webster.

I never use the word "hobby" except when replying to some one who uses it. It is an unbecoming epithet, and when 'used in religious discussions it is generally intended as repulsive in effect. And, as a rule, it is used when argument fails, for the purpose of belittling one's antagonist, and to cover up defeat.

As I told you, Brother Tallman, at Pippin, publicly, after you had repeatedly charged me with having a "hobby," and riding a hobby, I here repeat: If I am riding a hobby, be it known to you and all our readers, that the "hobby" belongs to you, not to me. It is your "hobby," not mine; and I am riding with you on your own "hobby."

The Sunday school class question seems to be Brother Tallman's favorite object of pursuit, which he pursues with great zeal and delight—A favorite theme with him, on which he has been "constantly setting off" since he has been in our vicinity. He, like the little boy, takes delight in riding his "hobby-horse," and complains at another who mounts his hobby to take a ride.

The Sunday school "hobby" is not mine; for it is a thing I do not like, I do not pursue it with zeal and delight; for it is what I am opposed to; because it is a thing God has not authorized. Therefore, it is your "hobby," Brother Tallman, not mine.

As a general rule they who are constantly using the word "hobby," crying out, "Hobby," "hobbyrider," are the ones that have the thing called "hobby." And what they call hobby-riding is simply our showing them that their position is unscriptural, and refuting their every argument, and pleading with them to leave off all such innovations, and adhere strictly to the word of God in all things. Yes, this is what the hobby owners call "hobby-riding." And it appears to me that it is resorted to, to divert attention from the real issue and to cover up defeat. Though I do not say it is a fact in this case, I leave it wholly with you and the Lord, for you and the Lord know. Yet all symptoms point that way.

Illustration

When the instrumental music hobby, and the society hobbies were constructed and brought out by the so-called "digressives," there were plenty of riders ready to mount and go. All conscientious objectors were called "hobby-riders"—"church-dividers." Do you not remember, Brother Tallman, though you were quite young, that the able brethren, loyal to the word on the music question, bravely mounted, and, with gospel spurs, so to speak, rode those hobbies to the full dissatisfaction of their owners?

Just so it is now, my Brother, since you and your co-adjutors have brought out your Sunday school class "hobby" into the open where riding is accessible, I, and others, loyal to the word of God on the divine order of teaching the public assembly, are riding (as you are pleased to call it riding) your "hobby" to your utter discomfiture, as the symptoms strongly indicate as viewed from the contents of your letter, even as it was in the case of the music question. But since you charge the "hobby" as being mine, I will say:

If mine, why then complain at me

For riding my own stock?

Such symptoms strongly indicate,

You've had a mental shock.

My arguments have had effect,

The truth disturbs your mind

Because you fail at every point,

The Bible proof to find.

And thus you cry out "ignorance," ign'rance, "wilful,"

To make it thus appear,

That I am not at all worthy,
For any one to hear.
Yet patiently, for Jesus' sake,
I'll bear reproach and shame;
And try to do all that I do,
In his dear blessed name.

While this question of hobbies and hobby-riders is up (your having introduced it), let me offer some timely suggestions as to how brethren and churches everywhere may successfully "rid themselves" of all their (troublesome) hobby-riders.

- (1) Let all hobby-makers cease making hobbies, and let no more hobbies be made;
- (2) Let all hobby-owners destroy all their hobbies now on hand: then there will never be any more "hobby-riding," nor "hobby-riders" to raise trouble among hobby-owners over their unscriptural things. Peace and unity will then prevail and reign universally among God's people: God's name be honored, and his will "be done in earth as it is in heaven." (Mat. 6:10).

And I will assure you, my Brother, that, when these results obtain, I will no longer be found riding your Sunday school "hobby;" for it will then be dead and forever buried, and I do not propose to ride any one's "hobby" any further than to death. But, remember, Just so long as you continue, To boost up your dear hob, Continuing to ride him out for you, I'll do an honest job.

18. On page 105 you say, "We oppose all organizations for doing religious work, except the Church of Christ."

If this statement be true, then you "oppose" the very thing you are endeavoring to defend; for, as I have fully shown in my other letters of this discussion, the institution of the Sunday school class system is not the church of Christ. And I do not "slander and misrepresent the church" when I call your Sunday school an institution distinct from the church. I called attention to the fact, that though the Sunday school class institution is connected with the church, and is operated in the church, yet it is not the church.

No, you are mistaken again, for I do not "think" I "see another institution where there is none." But I do actually see the thing, and I see it where it is. It is in the Cookeville church and many other places where I have actually seen it in operation. Hence the thing does "exist" now in this age, but that institution did not exist in the New Testament age. And if you think you see it in the New Testament record as in operation in any church of that age, you "think you see" it Where it is not, and at a time when it did not exist.

I have, in my former letters, repeatedly called your attention to the fact, that you are the man that seems to see things where they are not. I specially called attention to the fact, that your seeing the Sunday school class system (such an institution as is operated in the Cookeville church) in Acts

2:1-12, and other passages you cite, is a sure symptom of an abnormal condition of your mental and spiritual vision. Because the Sunday school class institution is not there. And when you see (seem to see) a "Saturday" (sabbath) "school" in Acts 16:13, you again see a thing that is not there, a thing that did not exist at that time. Who is it then, that thinks he sees (or seems to see) the Sunday school institution where there was none? And the answer comes in the language of inspiration, "Thou art the man." (II Sam. 12:7).

And I have not "been wasting" my "time, strength and ammunition firing at something that does not exist." But have calmly used the gospel weapon firing with deadly aim at the real thing that exists, and it has fallen dead, so to speak, so far as relates to argument.

19. I called attention to the fact, that when you identify the two institutions—the church and the Sunday school—you entangle yourself in many unavoidable difficulties, some of which I here repeat.

If you are correct that the Sunday school and the church be one and the same identical institution, then it would necessarily follow as logical conclusions:

(1) That all the members of the Sunday school are members of the church; (2) that all the members of the church are members of the Sunday school: otherwise they could not be the same institution. For the reason that, when two names are used to represent one and the same institution, the membership of that one institution is exactly the same when represented by the one name as when represented by the other name. (3) And since some infants are members of the Sunday school institution, your doctrine has infant membership in the church;

(4) and since some adults are members of the Sunday school institution that have not been baptized, and are not religious, you have membership of unbaptized, non-religious adults in the church along with your infant membership; (5) and since there are some sectarians members of the Sunday school in some places, you have sectarian membership in the church. Quite a mixture, is at not? But this would all be true if your doctrine be true that the Sunday school and the church be one and the same institution; and (6) since you teach that none can enter into the church without baptism, it logically follows that none can enter into the Sunday school without baptism. And here I left it with you to fix up all these difficulties. But I see you have left them all unfixed, and your part of the discussion is over. And though you should decide to recruit and yet write six more articles, yet those difficulties would still remain unfixed and unfixable—unmoved and unmovable. They stand as an immovable and impassable mountain in your way.

I called attention to other difficulties (Feb. 15, 1931, page 53).

Your endorsing no Sunday school except the church of Christ, and your endorsing the school of one Tyrannus as a Sunday school, makes the school of Tyrannus the church of Christ. And I called attention to the fact, that, according to the best information at hand, the school of Tyrannus (Acts 19:9) was a school of heathen philosophy in which Paul was permitted to preach the word of the Lord to all who would attend the lecture room at the time of preaching. Thus your peculiar endorsements logically involve the absurd consequence of making the church of Christ and the school of Tryannus (Acts 19:9) to be one and the same institution. All! my Brother, I called your attention to these absurd consequences of your Sunday school doctrine in my letter of Feb. 15,

1931, p. 53. And you have let such difficulties alone, only charging that such are false statements. And your charge virtually admits that your doctrine of identifying the church and the Sunday school is false. Because it is a universally admitted truth that any doctrine that necessarily involves absurd consequences is itself false. Therefore, if the statements of such absurd consequences be false, it is because your doctrine itself is false that necessarily involves such. And I specially called your attention to this very fact in my letter of Mar. 20, 1931, pp. 86-87.

20. You and I agree that Christ is "the head of the body, the church," because the Bible says so (Col. 1:18; Ephe. 1:22-23). But when, incorrectly answering my question, you say that "Christ" is head over the Sunday school, you say something the Bible does not say—something that is not in the Bible; and here again is where we disagree. Hence the division here is over what you say, not over what the Bible says.

Yes, I am still my wife's husband when she is working and nursing as a faithful wife, as God requires (Col. 3:18; Ephe. 5:24).

But should my wife depart from God's law in this matter, and begin to do things in her own way contrary to my will when my will is in subjection to God's law (Col. 3:19; Ephe. 5:25), she would then cease to be a true, loyal wife, though I would still be her husband.

Precisely so, when the church (Christ's wife—bride) submits to Christ her husband in all things, she is a true, loyal wife—bride to Christ—a true, loyal church.

But when that church presumes to do things in her own way contrary to the revealed will of Christ her husband, she ceases to be a true, loyal church, even as an unloyal wife in such case.

It is the will of Christ that the public assembly, day or night, Lord's day, or any other day, be taught by men only, and in the order of "one by one," and that the women be silent, not even to ask a question. And the church that divides up into classes to be taught, and has more than one teacher teaching at the same time, (including, or not including, women teachers), departs from Christ's will, dishonors Christ her head—her husband, and ceases to be a true, loyal wife to Christ—ceases to be a true, loyal church. Every illustration you have made fails you,

And leaves you nought on which to stand,

Except the moving, sinking sand:

21. According to the definitions of the words institution and organization, the Sunday school class arrangement is both an institution and an organization. It is an organized institution.

(1) Every commandment authorized either by the Lord or by men is an institution, according to Webster. Any thing God has commanded is a divine institution: what uninspired men have commanded is a human institution.

(2) Among other definitions of institution, Webster gives, "That which is instituted or established; established order, or method, or custom." (Webster's Condensed Dictionary).

(3) Now since the Sunday school class system has been established as an order, or custom, or method of arrangement for teaching, it is, therefore, an institution.

(4) Webster defines the word "organize." "To distribute into suitable parts, and appoint proper officers, that the whole may act as one body," like as an army is organized. Hence,

(5) To divide the assembly into different groups, or classes, is to "distribute into suitable parts"—each class a part; and appointing the teachers competent to teach and manage the classes and the work corresponds exactly to the appointing of officers in other organizations; for the teachers are really the officers in their respective classes.

(6) Therefore all the teachers and classes thus arranged and co-operating together in general for the same end constitute an organization in the true sense of the term. And there is not a living man that can prove to the contrary.

(7) But to further develop the thought, I give Webster's illustration. "So we say, a club, a party, or a faction is organized, when it takes a systematized form." (Webster's Encyclopedic Dictionary).

(8) Precisely so it is with reference to the Sunday school: it is "organized, when it takes a systematized form," and in the same sense that "a club, a party, or a faction is organized, when it takes a systematized form." For since there is a Sunday school class system, it has been systematized—reduced to a system. And you yourself say it is a systematic way of teaching. And the highest authority on the meaning of the words of our language says that such is an organization.

(9) Therefore, according to the true meaning of the words, I have fully shown that the Sunday school class system is both an institution and an organization—that it is an organized institution. And being wholly of human origin and construction, it is a human institution—a human organization.

(10) And since I have fully shown, by the absurd consequences necessarily involved, that the Sunday school and the church are not one and the same institution, but that they are two different institutions, it follows therefore, as a logical conclusion that the Sunday school class system of arrangement is an organization distinct from that of the church. And though it is a different organization, its not being the church, yet it is not "separate and apart from the church," because it is connected with the church, and is operated—conducted in the church, as I have repeatedly explained before. Therefore the reader can easily see that the Sunday school is one organization and the church is another—that they are not the same.

Your Sunday school is an organization, Different from the church indeed: As thoughtful minds will clearly see, When they these letters read.

Come, let us publish all these letters; This I request of thee: And let the people have the truth, Whatever that may be.

Brother Wallace's Statement

If you know I "misquoted 'from memory' Brother Wallace and, hence, 'misrepresented him,'" then why did you not give the exact quotation just as he said it, seeing you were present and heard what he said? I here repeat the quotation as I gave it from memory. It is,

Every division that has ever been over religious matters has come over, not what the Bible says, but over what the Bible does not say. Yes, every division has been caused by something that is not in the Bible, something the Bible does not authorize, something the Bible does not command.

I did not claim to quote verbatim; that is, his exact words, but only the substance, and so I did not use the quotation marks, stating I quoted from memory. I do claim to have quoted the thought correctly, though it may not be in his exact words, and hence I did not misrepresent Brother Wallace.

I believe the statement true, notwithstanding your charge that, "No intelligent, loyal preacher of the Church of Christ believes it to be true." (Your letter, p. 104). You say, "That statement refers to one class only, of divisions." But you did not tell us what that "one class only," is, as distinct from all other divisions. You name out some divisions that do not "come," as you say, "under that class."

But the examples you give are not exceptions, no, not one of them, taken in the light of Brother Wallace's statement, as I will now proceed to show.

1. You say, "The Pharisees and Sadducees were divided over angels, spirits and the resurrection." And "These are all in the Bible," you say.

So is instrumental music in the Bible. But it is not in the Bible in the sense of being authorized—commanded in the worship of the church. Hence the division has come, not over what the Bible says about instrumental music, but over what uninspired men say about it. Men say it should be used in church worship; but the Bible does not say this. Therefore the division has come over, not what the Bible says, but only over what men say about instrumental music.

Just so The Pharisees and Sadducees were divided over, not what the Bible says about angels, spirits, and the resurrection, but over what the Sadducees said about those things. (1) The Pharisees believed and said just what the Bible (the Old Tes.) said about angels, spirits, and the resurrection. (2) The Sadducees disbelieved the Bible record of those things, and in expressing their unbelief they said something the Bible does not say. Therefore the division between the Pharisees and Sadducees came over what the Sadducees said, not over what the Bible says.

Precisely so it is in this case; you say what the Bible does not say, while I contend for just what the Bible says, no more, no less. Hence we disagree over what you say, not over what the Bible says.

If you believed and would say just what the Bible says, no more and no less, then you would believe and say just what I believe and say; and both of us believing and saying just what the Bible says there could be no division between us.

Had the Sadducees said nothing but what the Bible says about angels, spirits, and the resurrection, then there would have been no division between them and the Pharisees. If you would say nothing but what the Bible says about the order of the teaching when people come to the public place to be taught the word of God, then there could be no division between us. (1) You say, divide the assembly into separate class-groups; (2) give each class-group a different teacher; (3) let

each teacher with his class-group "withdraw from the assembly" "far enough to avoid confusion;" and (4) let all the teachers teach at the same time.

Here are four things you say which the Bible does not say; and hence we disagree over what you say, not over what the Bible says.

2. You say, "The Fundamentalists and the Modernists are divided over the miracles of the bible."

When "the Modernists" reject the miracles of the Bible they say something the Bible does not say. Hence the division between them and the Fundamentalists came over what Modernists say about the miracles of the Bible, and not over what the Bible says.

3. "Christian Scientists reject the baptism of the Bible." In their rejection of the baptism of the Bible Christian Scientists say something the Bible does not say; and their unscriptural sayings bring division between them and all who believe and say just what the Bible says about baptism. Hence the so-called Christian Scientists cause division over what they say about the baptism of the Bible, and not over what the Bible says.

4. "Infidels reject all the Bible." But the Bible does not authorize the doctrine of infidels. The division between infidels and true believers came over, not what the Bible says, but over what infidels say. Infidels say something the Bible does not say, and this brings division. Therefore the division between infidels and true believers is not over the Bible, but over what infidels say about the Bible. For if infidels would say just what the Bible says they would say just what true believers say, and hence there could be no division between them and true believers.

I have now shown that not one of your "examples" is an exception to the statement quoted from Brother Wallace. Every division over religious matters has come over, not what the Bible says, but over what the Bible does not say—over what the Bible does not authorize— does not command.

When infidels reject the Bible, Modernists the miracles of the Bible, Christian Scientists the baptism of the Bible, and the Sadducees the angels, spirits and resurrection of the Bible, they reject what the Bible says with reference to those things, and substitute their own sayings instead. Hence the divisions caused by those parties have come over what they say, and not over what the Bible says.

But when "J. P. Watson rejects the Sunday school" class system of teaching, as is operated in the Cookeville church—such an institution as we are discussing under the name "Sunday school"—he does not reject anything the Bible says, but only what uninspired men say.

No, he does not "reject 'the Sunday school of the Bible,'" for there is no such thing as a "Sunday school of the Bible," as I have fully shown in my letters of this correspondence. And here again I call attention to the fact, that every scripture you quote and cite as a record of such an institution is an infallible witness against you on this question, because the thing is not mentioned, or even referred to in any of those passages.

Therefore they who advocate that 'unscriptural system say what the Bible does not say; and the division they have caused has come over something the Bible does not say—something the Bible

does not authorize—something the Bible does not command—yes, over something that is not in the Bible, just as Brother Wallace stated. And, according to your answers 4 and 5. you are responsible, for such division to the extent you advocate that unscriptural institution.

No, indeed, I am sure that Brother Wallace was not so "ignorant" as to make his statement refer "to one class only, of divisions," and thus put an untrue limit upon a universal statement that covers the whole ground (religiously), including all divisions of every species and order, as "No intelligent loyal preacher of the Church of Christ" will dispute after having learned the truths and facts concerning the matter.

And this is enough, even if I had not said another word on the subject in this discussion. For this one argument, drawn from the statement quoted from Brother Wallace, completely refutes every thing you have advanced in this discussion as argument in your effort to prove your proposition.

Whatever men teach or practice that causes division is an unscriptural thing—a thing not authorized in the Bible—a thing the Bible does not command. And it now appears so exceedingly plain that it does not require a Solomon to decide in any case of division, whether the thing causing that division be authorized or not authorized in the Bible. If a thing be found causing division, that is an unscriptural thing—a thing the Bible does not authorize.

The final conclusion follows, therefore, as a necessary consequence, that, since the Sunday school class system of teaching the public assembly is causing division among brethren and churches of Christ, it is an unscriptural thing—a thing the Bible does not authorize—a thing the Bible does not command—yea, a thing that is not in the Bible, just as Brother Wallace stated.

Then be it understood and remembered, that No divisions come over what the Bible says, but only over what uninspired men say. Therefore your proposition has fallen without one scintilla of divine support, there being not one word about your Sunday school class institution in the Bible, as every verse in the Bible shows for itself, all standing as so many infallible witnesses against your proposition.

My part of this discussion is, Just now about complete: So come with yours and help me publish, And give our friends a treat.

Many mistakes I may have made, In some way or other: If I have done you wrong at all, I ask your pardon, Brother.

Many mistakes I may have made, In grammar and in spelling; And yet the thoughts I give are true, The things that I've been telling.

Though you should quote ten thousand texts, And twice that number cite; Not one of them, nor all combined, Would prove your class rule right.

The Sunday school is not "of God," It came in far too late, To have a place in his good Book, Hence it shall meet its fate.

It "shall be rooted up" some day, . . . (Mat. 15:13). As our Lord Jesus saith: It is a "way that seemeth right," The end of which is death.....(Prov. 16:25).

Just as I warned you heretofore,
You're "out at sea, and far from shore;" "Without Chart, Compass, or Guiding Star;"
Your Capital Errors have driven you far.
I've taken time and patience, too,
To point your errors out to you: Though you do not accept the light,
I shall no hard things to you write.
Remember Nadab and Abihu;
No doubt they thought their way would do: But 'tis a fact, the Scriptures state,
They met their sad and awful fate. . . . (Lev. 10:1-2).
I do not impugn your motive,
'Tis facts alone I state: I've tried to treat you right, my Brother,
Throughout this writ'n debate.
And when we stand before the Judge Of all "the quick and dead;" We then must give account to
God, For all we've done and said.
Both in my poetry and my prose,
I've shown 'up how this matter goes: I now conclude, my name I sign,
Your brother in search of law divine.
J. P. WATSON.

APPENDIX

The two following letters are not parts of the regular discussion, yet are so related thereto as to deserve a place in the Appendix of this book.

Cookeville, Tenn., R. 9, July 19, 1931. Dear Brother Tallman:

On the Fourth of July (more than a month after the date of the last letter of our discussion) I wrote Brother Wallace the following. Dear Brother Wallace:

Will you please to give me the same statement by letter that you made in your discourse on "unity" in the last service of your meeting at Cookeville, pertaining to causes of divisions, in which you illustrated by Nicodemus "came to Jesus by night?"

The best I remember, you said, in substance, that,

All the divisions that have ever been (over religious matters) have come over, not what the Bible says, but over what the Bible does not say—over what is not in the Bible—over something the Bible does not authorize—something the Bible does not command.

On the 17th of July I received the following reply to the above from Brother Wallace.

Fort Worth, Texas,

July 14, 1981.

Dear Bro. Watson: The statements I made in the sermon on unity, as I remember it, were substantially as quoted in your letter—

Sincerely,

FOY E. WALLACE, Jr.

Now there is Brother Wallace's own word for it confirming the fact that I quoted him correctly, in substance, hence did not "misrepresent him." He says his statements referred to "were substantially as quoted in" my "letter." Therefore by your own words you stand condemned when you say, "You misquoted 'from memory' Brother Wallace and hence misrepresented him." (Your letter, May 10). And again you condemn yourself when you say, "Brother Wallace is not that ignorant, to make such a statement unqualified." And when you tried to make it appear that Brother Wallace made that statement refer "to one class only, of divisions," you misrepresented both Brother Wallace and the facts in the case, and again exposed yourself. And when you say of that statement (quoted from Brother Wallace), that "No intelligent, loyal preacher of the Church of Christ believes it to be true," you virtually charge that Brother Wallace is not an "intelligent, loyal preacher," for he evidently "believes it to be true," or he would not have said it. How would you like for Brother Wallace to read what you have said with reference to this matter?

Will you now contend that Brother Wallace is "ignorant"—that he does not know what he is talking about? Or that he is a "wilful perverter" of truth and fact?

The foregoing is a sample of your many misrepresentations and perversions throughout this discussion.

All! Brother Tallman, that statement, if true (and it is absolutely true), thoroughly refutes your proposition in toto. For it is a fact, as all know, that the Sunday school class system causes division. It is, therefore, an unscriptural thing—something the Bible does not say—something that is not in the Bible—something the Bible does not authorize—something the Bible does not command. And you are responsible for such division to the extent you advocate that unscriptural thing; and that, too, according to your own decision in your answers to questions 4 and 5.

When confronted with this unanswerable argument, the only way of escape for you (as it appears to me) was to misrepresent both Brother Wallace and me, and pervert the statement by thrusting upon it an untrue limit. And so I ask:

Who now has exposed his own "ignorance?" Or, otherwise, shows himself a "wilful perverter" of truth and fact? And again the answer comes in the language of an inspired prophet, "Thou art the man." (II Sam. 12:7).

Understand, I mean for this to go in the tract when published, and if you wish to make reply to it, do so, and I will review same and let yours go also with my review of it. Your brother in Christ,

J. P. WATSON. To the above I received no letter of reply—J. P. W.

Under date, Sept. 16, 1931, I wrote: Dear Brother Tallman:

To show you that I mean to deal perfectly fair with you in every respect, I make this one more (my final) appeal to you, asking you to help me publish our discussion by bearing half the expense of printing, and share equally with me in the tracts. Your letters and mine show that we both understood that our debate was to be published. . . .

If you have succeeded in your effort, and if I have failed, as you have strongly intimated, then so much the better for your side of the question.

Under date, Sept. 17, 1931, responding to the above, after making some serious and groundless charges against me, Brother Tallman said: "I feel sorry for you Bro. Watson, you have my sympathy, and it would be unkind and unchristian for me to pay out good money to advertise your ignorance and false statements before the world. People are finding you out without me helping in this manner.

"If there is anything I can do to help you repent of your unchristian conduct, and to help you work with God's people enjoying true Christian fellowship in our Master's work, may God use me in the same."

Replying to the above, Sept. 25, 1931, I gave the following.

Dear Brother Tallman:

5. The reading of the discussion will show that it is not "ignorance," nor any "unchristian conduct" that you find in me, as your excuse for not helping on the publication. As I see it, if you would come out plain and disclose your real reason for not bearing your part, it would be entirely different from anything you have given as an excuse.

Your expressions of sorrow and sympathy for me would be appreciated if the spirit and contents of your letters did not show to the contrary.

If you are right in your contention for the Sunday school class institution, then I am wrong in my opposition to the same. And though you have made a complete failure to prove your proposition here, yet I will grant that, if you are able to prove your proposition true; namely, that the institution is divinely authorized and recorded in the New Testament Scriptures, then you would be able to "help" me "repent" of the sin of opposing such.

(1) If you could show that there is a word in the Greek New Testament that means "Sunday school," and prove by the Greek Lexicons that that Greek word means Sunday school;

- (2) If you could point out in the N. T. Scriptures one clear example of your institution as having been actually in operation in any of the many New Testament churches;
- (3) If you were able to show that the apostles divided that vast assembly on Pentecost into class-groups, and that each apostle took a class off to a private place to be taught, and that they all taught at the same time;
- (4) If you were able to prove that Acts 16:13 were a record of four men's teaching in classes, and all at the same time;
- (5) If you could show either precept or example in the N. T., that a woman took a class of young women (or other persons) out of a public assembly to a private place to teach them, or to a different part of the same room;
- (6) If you were able to prove by divine evidence that the church of Christ and the school of Tyrannus (Acts 19:9) is the same institution;
- (7) If you could prove that your Sunday school class institution is the church of Christ;

Yes, I say, If you could prove these seven things by the Scriptures, then you would be able to help me repent of the sin of denying that the Scriptures teach them. For if the Scriptures teach such, then it would be sin to deny that fact. But since the Scriptures do not teach them, it is not sin to state this truth, but it is sin to so teach.

Therefore there is nothing at all that you can do to help me repent of speaking truth, in that of denying what I know to be untrue. . . .

I conclude by calling your attention to another insurmountable difficulty that stands in the way of your unscriptural doctrine that makes the church of Christ and your Sunday school class institution to be one and the same thing. And that is, if your theory be true, then you do not take the Lord's supper with the best members; for the best members are the innocent infant members of your Sunday school. If the Sunday school is the church, then since they are members of the Sunday school they are members of the church, as I showed in the discussion. (See my Third Reply, pages 53-54 under "Difficulties Continue to Multiply".) So I ask:

Why do you not commune with your best members? Why do you not urge the brethren and sisters (the adult members) of the Cookeville church to minister the Lord's supper to their purest and best members—the infant membership? God's little children should not be debarred from eating and drinking at the Lord's table. Why do you withhold from them the communion?

All! Brother Tallman, the infant children in your Sunday schools know better than that. They know the Sunday school is not the church; for they know they are not members of the church. If you do not know better—if you still think the Sunday school is the church, then ask the infant members of your Sunday school and they will gladly teach you better. And remember that it does not take a child advanced to the "eighth grade" to know that the Sunday school is not the church. Your brother in Christ, J. P. WATSON.

To this I received no reply.

LETTERS OF COMMENDATION

INTRODUCTION

Were it not for the severe charges against Brother Watson which we found on reading the discussion and the County paper, the following letters would not have appeared in this book. But under the circumstances a number of us who have known Brother Watson so long, and having read much of the discussion, thought it just and prudent to give our statement with the church at Samaria, and ask others to voluntarily do the same. And with such prompt and liberal response from the brotherhood, we feel that God is blessing us in the undertaking. And doubtless, many other brethren and churches would gladly and freely respond if they knew of the situation.

Understand, I, Monroe Maberry, not Brother Watson, suggested these letters of Commendation for the book; and this for the good of the cause of Christ in general rather than for Brother Watson in particular.

For if this discussion in book form were confined to communities alone where Brother Watson is so well known these statements would not be needed, and would not have been called for to be used in this book. But doubtless, the book will go to many places where Brother Watson is not known. Hence the following statements of Commendation will show to strangers that Brother Watson still holds the confidence of his brethren.

MONROE MABERRY, R. 2,

W. C. CLOUSE, R. 5.

When the thought was first suggested to me that some brethren had purposed to give some statements of Commendation for this book, it was through due deliberation and with some reluctance that I submitted to their wish and gave my consent. I have never coveted the praise of men. However, when brethren see proper to commend a brother when they feel that the existing conditions demand it, and when done through pure motive, it can be nothing but right to do so. Such course is scriptural and pleasing in the sight of God. (See II Cor. 3:1; 5:12; 12:11).

J. P. WATSON.

R. 2, Cookeville, Tenn., Oct. 25, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: This Is To Certify That, We, the Church of Christ at Samaria, Putnam County, Tennessee, have known Brother J. P. Watson, of Cookeville, Tenn., for a number of years; that he has labored with us and for us; that we love him for his work's sake; that he has our highest confidence as being an honest, truthful, sincere, and trustworthy Christian gentleman; and that we know him to be a self-sacrificing, faithful minister of the gospel, true to the Word of God, and well qualified to defend the truth against error both in oral and written discussion. And we do hereby heartily commend him as such, and as being worthy of the confidence and fellowship of all true Christians everywhere. Done by order of the Church and signed by the following members.

M. W. BUMBALOUGH, MONROE MA BERRY, A. W. RANDOLPH, J. B. BUSSELL, Elders,
R. 2; D.

C. RANDOLPH, R. 2; D. R. BUMBALOUGH. W. N. MILLS, Deacons, R. 9; and CARMAN WATSON,

R. 6; BILLIE CLOUSE, JOHN PHY, from the Antioch Congregation, R. 5.

R. 1, Livingston, Tenn., Oct. 11, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: This is to certify that we, the Church of Christ at Holly Springs of Overton County, Tennessee, have known Bro. J. P. Watson, of Cookeville, Tenn., for a number of years and that we take this privilege to express to the public our confidence in him as being a true gospel preacher and an upright gentleman whose life is consecrated to the cause of Christ, and who endeavors to "Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent." By order of the Church and signed by the following:

T. C. COFFMAN, L. K. BILBREY, W. H. ALLRED, W. L. CARTER. L. C. FLEMING, W. L. HUNTER, Minister of the Gospel, M. F. OGLETREE.

Hilham, Tenn., Oct. 13, 1931.

To The Whole Brotherhood: We, the undersigned brethren of the Church of Christ of Hilham, Tennessee, commend to the brethren elsewhere our Brother in the Lord, J. P. Watson, as a sound gospel preacher, who in years past has labored with us, and presently is holding a series of meetings with the Holly Springs congregation near here.

J. B. UPTON. E. F. CRAFT, M. L. FISK, E. M. AYERS, LEO G. UPTON. CORLIS LANGFORD. G. C.. WARD. DR. T. A. LANGFORD, LEWIS CHRISTIAN, J. B. AYERS, B. P. UPTON.

Burr, Ky., Nov. 1, 1931.

Letters of Commendation—To Whom It May Concern: This is to certify that the Church of Christ at Burr, Ky., do hereby gladly commend Brother J. P. Watson as an honest, truthful, sincere Christian gentleman and a true, loyal preacher of the gospel, and worthy of the confidence of the Brotherhood anywhere and everywhere. Done by order of the Church and signed by the following:

J. O. SMITH, W. L. WHEAT; A. L. OWENS, , G. W. FREDERICKS, A. B. THOMASON. F. HALCOMB, R.

W. HENDERSON.

Gainesboro, Tenn., Nov. 22, 1931.

We, the Elders of the congregation at Center Grove Church of Christ, have known Bro. J. P. Watson for a number of years and had him preach for us. We know him as honorable in all things, able as the ablest and one whose devotion to the cause of Christ and the love of the truth are unquestioned. Signed by the Elders,

L. H. FLATT, C. A. JOHNSON.

R. 2, Cookeville, Tenn., Dec. 4, 1931.

To Whom It May Chance to Concern: As to public or private recommendation of Brother J. P. Watson, of Cookeville, Tenn., R. 9, I have known him for thirty-five years or more. And during all these years I have not personally known, or heard (by any one who has known him), any low, degrading unchristian-like conduct about Brother Watson. But, on the other hand, he is considered, by those who know him, as being a true, conscientious, reliable, good citizen. And not only so, but as being true to the Word of God in his convictions and understanding of the gospel as recorded in the Bible. But on some points of controversy there are many who do not, agree with him. And about all I have heard against him by those who know him, and who differ from him is, that he is "too precise," "too particular," that he "sticks too close to the Book"—the Bible. I have never known any preacher or writer that comes nearer proving by the Bible everything he teaches than does Brother J. P. Watson. So I have no hesitancy in conscientiously recommending him to all who may chance to read the discussion in (this volume between Brother Watson and Brother Tallman. Sincerely a brother in Christ, MONROE MABERRY.

Hilham, Tenn., Oct. 13, 1931.

I make the following statement in regard to Bro. J. P. Watson as I have known him for the last thirty years. I have utmost confidence in him as a Christian gentleman. I believe him to be a sincere, self-sacrificing gospel preacher of the highest type. B. P. UPTON.

114 Franklin St., Cookeville, Tenn., Dec. 4, 1931. I wish to state that I have been knowing Bro. Watson for a number of years and have always found him to be a good, honest, upright, conscientious Christian gentleman and an earnest contender for the "one faith." CARLOS N. WILMOTH.

Wedowee, Ala., Dec. 5, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: I have known Bro. J. P. Watson several years and worked with him in several meetings. I consider him an exemplary Christian gentleman and one of the ablest exponents of the gospel I ever knew. I unhesitatingly endorse him as a preacher of the gospel and to meet error in every form.

W. L. SHELNUTT.

203 Spring St., Cookeville, Tenn., Dec. 11, 1931. I have known Brother Watson for 37 years; and as to preaching the gospel there is none clearer, or any more confidential with all posted brethren that I have met. His record for this time is clear. E. W. JACKSON.

Robstown, Texas, Nov. 4, 1931.

Having known of Bro. J. P. Watson for about fifteen years, and having read his writings on various subjects pertaining to the teaching and practice of the Church of Christ, I unhesitatingly endorse him as being sound in the faith, an able defender of the same, and honorable in discussion. Yours in Christ, J. N. COWAN.

Boaz, Ala., R. 1, Nov. 8, 1931. To Whom It May Concern: We, the Church of Christ at Blessing recommend Brother J. P. Watson as a true preacher of the gospel and worthy of the confidence of any and all of the brethren anywhere. Signed by the Elders, W. P. MAYO, W. D. PAYNE.

LaGrange, Ga., Oct. 19, 1931.

To the Brethren in Christ, Greeting: The Church of Christ at this place wish to commend Brother J. P. Watson, of Cookeville, Tenn., and his work as a gospel preacher. In our association with him in meetings, and in our homes, we learned to love him and his work. His honest and frank way in dealing with God's word, and especially the meekness in which he always used it, would draw any honest seeker of truth closer to God. With best wishes and success for every undertaking in the Master's work, we commend him to the brotherhood in Christ. Signed by the following members:

D. A. MCDONALD, WALTER MEACHAM,

T. R. WILLIAMS, H. L. LESTER.

Bloomington Springs, Tenn., Nov. 25, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: We, the undersigned of the Church of Christ at Bloomington Springs, Tenn., have known Bro. J. P. Watson and his work for a number of years as a minister of the gospel and take this opportunity to recommend him to the brotherhood at large as an honorable Christian gentleman and an able expounder of God's word of first rank and one in whom we put utmost confidence. Signed:

H. M. McBROOM, MARIAN LOFTIS, M. P. TAYS, J. O. BILLINGSLEY, P. W. LOFTIS, O. B. HENSLEY, W. R. McBROOM, G. B. McBROOM, J. A. CHAFFIN, LEE LOFTIS, A. W. FLATT, N. B. LOFTIS.

Cookeville, Tenn., Nov. 22, 1931.

For several years we of Freewill community have known and known of evangelist J. P. Watson and have always held him in highest regard. His faithfulness to the cause; his true Christian character; his scrupulous honesty and his fairness toward brethren and sectarians in discussion all bespeak for him the utmost confidence and love of the brethren.

Signed: A. P. CHAFFIN, H. B. GENTRY, NOAH LOFTIS, J. J. GENTRY, W. O. BALLARD, Elders,

Church of Christ, at Freewill.

Celina, Tenn., Nov. 29, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: This is to certify that we, the Church of Christ at Arcot, Clay County, Tennessee, regard Bro. J. P. Watson as a loyal preacher of the gospel and a Christian gentleman, and have full confidence in him as such. The Church at this place so orders that this statement be made. Signed

HERBERT FARRIS, M. D. CHERRY, LONNIE CROWDER, O. N. CHERRY.

Scott, Ga., Nov. 12, 1931.

Dear Bro. Watson: It has been brought to our attention, that you are to publish a debate on the Sunday School question, between you and O. H. Tallman, of Cookeville, Tenn. We, the undersigned members of the church here wish to endorse you as an able defender of the truth. We wish also to state for the benefit of all concerned that you are one of the most humble, loving, kind and fearless servants of Christ our King, that we have ever known. Your association in our homes were such that the lessons taught by example, made us feel our own weaknesses, thereby making us strive harder to humbly work in the cause of our Master. We wish you greatest success in your every undertaking to advance truth in the cause of Christ. Very sincerely,

JOHN W. LAMPP, ANGUS C. KESSLER, B. J. EVERETT.

Gilpin, Ky., Nov. 25, 1931.

To Whom This May Concern: This is to certify that we, the undersigned, have heard Brother J. P. Watson preach, and, in our estimation, he is not only a man of high intellectual powers, but one, also, who is well-educated, and understands how to explain the word of Truth. Besides this we believe him loyal in every sense of the word.

JAMES F. THOMAS, Minister and School Teacher.

J. E. THOMAS, Minister.

Gilpin, Ky., Nov. 25, 1931.

From what I have learned of Brother J. P. Watson, my estimate of him, both as a man and as a preacher, is very high. I have benefitted much by the reading of several articles from his able pen. I was indeed glad to hear that he was having his discussion with Brother Tallman put in book form, as I am sure that it will be an instrument for untold good. I hope it will be read extensively.

O. B. PERKINS, Minister, and Editor, "Loyal Guide."

R. 1, Box 109, Central Point, Ore., Nov. 3, 1931. Brethren in Christ, Greetings: It has been our happy privilege to have known Bro. J. P. Watson, of Cookeville, Tenn., for many years, and we can truthfully say we have never known a more godly man. He is honest, humble and a deep student of the Bible. Honorable, scriptural, and logical in debate and uses both wisdom and discretion in his evangelistic work. Congregations for whom he has labored esteem him very highly. Yours in the one faith,

WILLIAM F. and E. HABICHT.

Baxter, Tenn., Nov. 16, 1931.

To Whom This May Come: This is to say that for twenty years I have lived near Brother J. P. Watson. Have heard him preach. And in many communities where I have been preaching for years, I have heard much of him as a man and of his preaching and discussions with sectarians. But have never heard of anything detrimental to his life or works; to his conduct in discussion; to his truthfulness or of anything that would reflect upon him as an honorable worthy devoted Christian gentleman. And the extended conversations I myself have had with him, easily lead me to conclude that Brother Watson is able; is fair, and is of the purest Christian character.

C. W. COLEMAN.

Sparta, Tenn., Nov. 30, 1931.

Brother Maberry: We (wife and I) are glad to state that we have known Brother J. P. Watson about twenty or twenty-five years. We have all confidence in him. We do not believe he would add to, or take anything from, the Word of God. He will stick to what he believes is truth regardless of what any man may say. We do not believe there is a more honest, trustworthy, truthful, sound gospel preacher than J. P. Watson. We would trust him anywhere with the truth of God in his hand, and believe it would be taken care of. And we will stand by him anywhere in defense of the truth. Fraternally, J. D. STEWART.

R. 4, Roanoke, Ala., Dec. 3, 1931.

This is to certify that I have been a leading member of the Church of Christ at Taylor's Cross Roads for more than 30 years and will say that Bro. J. P. Watson has held two meetings for us within the last eight or ten years. And will say that every member of our congregation was well pleased with Bro. Watson and we will all vouch that he is a good Christian preacher, and a complete Christian gentleman in every way, and we feel sure that he is qualified to defend himself on any Bible subject. Your Brother in Christ,

J. J. WALDREP.

Nashville, Tenn., Nov. 19, 1931. Mr. Monroe Maberry, Route 2, Cookeville, Tenn.

Dear Bro. Maberry: This will acknowledge receipt of your kind letter of November 10. I appreciate your writing me again. I have no desire to say or do anything that will injure another brother; I want to help all that I can. I have known Brother J. P. Watson nearly all my life; he was a very dear friend of my father and they preached together much. I have kept up with him and his work all these years. I consider Brother Watson a humble, consecrated preacher of the gospel. He is faithful, and willing to sacrifice for the Cause of Christ. I think that his opposition to teaching the Bible on Lord's Day in classes commonly called "Sunday School," has done him and the cause of Christ much harm. I regret his persistent opposition to such good work. I believe him to be conscientious in his opposition, but conscientiousness does not atone for an error. I love him as a brother. Yours fraternally,

H. LEO BOLES, President, David Lipscomb College.

REMARKS

I very much appreciate Brother Boles' statement of Commendation for this little book, especially so under the peculiar conditions that made it prudent, as some brethren considered, to call forth the statement with others of like nature. And I also appreciate the frankness, and the kind spirit in which Brother Boles expresses himself with reference to my "opposition to teaching the Bible on Lord's Day in classes," etc.

I readily admit that my "opposition" here has done me "much harm." Such has rendered me very unpopular with the majority of the brethren who believe in that system of teaching, and has, evidently, cut off much of their fellowship from me, leaving me poorer financially (though, I trust none the poorer, but richer, spiritually). I would rather be right than popular.

And besides this, instead of giving me Bible proof when called upon, many brethren have resorted to personal abuse, ridicule, and misrepresentation—speaking evil of me falsely. And all (as it appears to me) because they find no way to meet the issue in fairness. However, with patience I gladly suffer all this "harm" done to me by my brethren for the sake of truth and being right with God. When I found the Sunday school class system was not of God I gave it up.

I knew the world would frown on me,

And brethren would despise;

But in the hope of seeing God,

I made the sacrifice.

I believe my faithful "opposition" here has done the cause of Christ much good and no "harm" at all.

I agree with Brother Boles that, if my opposition to the Sunday school class system of teaching be "an error," my "conscientiousness," though thorough, can never "atone for" the "error." Consequently I must be convinced and give up the error, or be forever lost.

I, therefore, humbly and sincerely call upon Brother Boles, one whom I love in the Lord, and in whom I have great confidence as being conscientious in all he teaches, to prove to me that the system is divinely authorized and recorded in the New Testament Scriptures. The proof of this will convince me and save me from the error. . Why do we oppose "instrumental music in worship?" Is it not because it is not divinely authorized? This is why I oppose the Sunday school class system—I cannot find it divinely authorized. If you fail to prove the system authorized in the word of God, you fail to prove my opposition to it to be "an error." Consequently the error lies with those who advocate the system. And their conscientiousness can never "atone for" the "error."

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." (I Thes. 5:21). The inspired Scriptures thoroughly furnish to "all good works." (II Tim. 3:16-17). Now prove that the Scriptures thoroughly furnish you to the Sunday school class system of teaching, and I will cease my opposition to it at once.

Now, Brother Boles

If I am wrong I do not know it, So, Brother, will you please to show it? Will you tell me just where to look, That I may find it in the Book?

Just show it is Jehovah's plan, Then I'll accept it like a man: But I cannot agree with thee, Until the proof is shown to me.

So here in patience I will wait, To hear whatever you relate: And if you prove it is divine, I will give up and fall in line.

Faternally,

J. P. WATSON.

Box 144, Union City, Ga., Oct. 21, 1931. Mr. J. P. Watson, Cookeville, Tenn. My Dear Brother and Co-worker in Christ: Since learning that you are publishing your debate with Brother O. H. Tallman on the Sunday school class question, I wish to state to the brotherhood in general, that,

In my evangelist work I have preached at many places where Brother Watson has labored, and I find that the brethren at these places all love him as a man, and especially as a faithful, humble, well qualified gospel preacher, and endorse him as such to any one and to all.

And in my Western work I have had the pleasure of meeting most of the loyal preachers, and they every one endorse him as a writer and qualified to defend the truth against all error. With best wishes and a wide-spread of the debate, I am yours for truth, J. A. DENNIS.

Brother R. F. Duckworth, Editor of the Apostolic Way, 3922 Metropolitan Ave., Dallas, Texas, sends the following statement under date, Oct. 28, 1931, which afterward appeared in his paper. "Brother Watson is an able and scholarly writer, very exact, dependable. I feel sure that this tract will be interesting and profitable to all who read it..... R. F. DUCKWORTH."

Lamar, Ala., Nov. 1, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: We, the Church of Christ at Mt. Carmel, Randolph County, Alabama, have had Bro. J. P. Watson to labor in our midst. We consider him to be one of the ablest preachers in the brotherhood: clean in doctrine and morals. We fully endorse him as a preacher and defender of the faith. Respectfully,

H. B. CRENSHAW, C. C. CRENSHAW, BILL SPRADLIN, WINSTON PRINCE, H. G. DANIEL.

Westmoreland, Tenn., Nov. 8, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: We, the undersigned members of the Church of Christ of New Liberty and Westmoreland congregations wish to state that we believe and wish to commend our Brother J. P. Watson as an honest, truthful, and faithful Christian gentleman and sound gospel preacher, worthy of the confidence and fellowship of the brotherhood everywhere.

J. M. DENNIS, of the Westmoreland Church.

W. C. STEWART, J. T. TOOLEY, of New Liberty Church.

The Church of Christ,

Jos Campau and Hancock, Detroit, Mich.

To Whom It May Concern: We are glad to state that we recommend Bro. J. P. Watson, of Cookeville, Tenn., as an honest, truthful, sincere, and faithful Christian gentleman, and a minister worthy of the confidence of the Brotherhood everywhere. We have had Bro. Watson, with us in two series of meetings, and most of us have known him personally for a number of years.

E. L. NETHERTON, WEAVER WATSON, 14643 Park Grove, Detroit, Mich., ALFRED McBROOM, HOUSTON GIBSON, J. T. WEST, J. B. WATSON.

Rincon, Ga., Oct. 22, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: We, the undersigned members of Oak Grove Church of Christ have known J. P. Watson, of Cookeville, Tenn., for the past ten years and to our own knowledge he is a Christian not only in name but in the life he daily manifests along life's journey. Brother Watson is above reproach and we take pleasure in commending him to the brotherhood as an humble, sincere Christian who is worthy of his brethren's fellowship.

W. B. DASHER, H. J. FINELY, C. L. RAHN, I. W. RAHN, F. P. RAHN, II. L. KESSLER, S. A. RAHN,

J. N. McLEOD, H. D. DASHER.

Wedowee, Ala., Nov. 1, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: Bro. J. P. Watson, of Cookeville, Tenn., has assisted us in several successful meetings, and we consider him as having but few equals and no superiors in expounding the gospel of Christ in its purity and simplicity. And we, unreservedly, endorse him as a preacher and defender of the faith against all error. Respectfully,

Signed by Leaders of Napoleon Church of Christ,

W. L. SHELNUTT, J. N. LANGLEY, J. H. LANEY, N. A. LANGLEY, D. A. LANEY.

R. 5, Cookeville, Tenn., Dec. 12, 1931.

I gladly state, for whosoever may read this discussion, that I have known Brother J. P. Watson for at least twenty-five years. And I can say that he has done the greatest work in this mountainous country of any man that has ever preached here and stood closer to the Bible truth than any one I have known. I also wish to state that I know of his work at many other places, as worthy and commendable. I feel that he has been a father to me in the gospel.

W. C. CLOUSE.

R. P. D. 3, Piedmont, Ala., Nov. 22, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: This is to certify that we, the Elders of the Church of Christ at Antioch, in Cherokee County, Alabama, R. F. D., 3, Piedmont, Ala., have known Bro. J. P. Watson, of Cookeville, Tenn., for a number of years, having had him as a preacher in several protracted meetings and do heartily recommend him to any and all people as a sound, faithful and able gospel preacher. Sincerely,

J. D. HOLT, NOAH HOLT, W. T. HANSORD, J. F. HENDON.

R. 4, Roanoke, Ala., Dec. 3, 1931.

We, the members of the Church of Christ at Taylor's Cross Roads, Do hereby endorse Bro. J. P. Watson to be a minister of the gospel, well able to stand his hands with any man on any subject in the Bible. And we do believe him to be an honest, truthful, conscientious, Christian gentleman. And one that we all learned to love. Yours respectfully,

The Members of the Church of Christ at Taylor's Cross Roads, by ROY C. WALDREP.

Church of Christ at Pippin,

R. 4. Cookeville, Tenn., Dec. 6, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: We, the undersigned, do commend Brother J. P. Watson as being a truthful, loyal teacher of the Word of God—one who believes in speaking where the Bible speaks, and being silent where the Bible is silent, and who is worthy of the confidence of the whole Christian brotherhood

GARRET CHAFFIN, MAT BREWINGTON (R. 9), L. B. PALK, H. P. McBROOM, JOE Mc PIPPIN, J.

B. QUALLS (R. 9), J. E. PIPPIN.

SPECIAL

NOTE—Dear Brethren: Do not wonder when you see that my home congregation (McBroom Chapel) where I have lived and labored for nearly thirty years has not a statement of Commendation in this book along with the others. I am sorry to say that a number (not all) of the members here, if I understand them, are really in heart on the other side of the question, and some would be pleased to have the class system in operation at this place.

They could and would give me a Commendation for general purposes, at any time when called upon. But some of them say they do not believe in debating, and they would not want to give a statement to go in this book with reference to the debate, as some of them explain. Be it known to all readers that, for this, I have no ill-will toward my brethren here. While I would be glad we were "all of one mind" on this question, yet I do not fall-out with my brethren for not believing as I believe. I shall continue to pray that we may yet become united in mind with reference to this and all other differences, and that, upon the word of God alone—that we "be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment," all speaking "the same thing," having "no divisions among" us. (I Cor. 1:10).

"Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," Will bring true joys that will never cease. . . . (Ephes. 4:3).

J. P. WATSON.

Montebello, Calif., Dec 7, 1931.

Dear Bro. Mayberry: This is to certify that I have known Bro. J. P. Watson, of Route 9, Cookeville, Tenn., since October, 1923, and during this time I have become acquainted with his manner of discussion, and I do not hesitate to say that he is one of the most humble, pious and Godly men that I have ever had the pleasure of knowing. His life, and his manner of preaching, are above reproach. And his manner in discussion is hard to excel. He knows language. He loves the truth. He endeavors to sustain his position by argument and fairness. The brethren generally have great confidence in his sincerity and ability. Bro. Tallman should be thankful that he has had such a man with whom to discuss this vital question.

J. D. PHILLIPS, Editor "The Old Paths."

Cookeville, Tenn., Dec 18, 1931 Bro. Monroe Mayberry, Cookeville, Tenn.

This is to certify that I have known Bro. J. P. Watson about thirty years and I take pleasure in saying that he is strictly honest and truthful. He is a worthy Christian gentleman, clean in conversation, fair in discussion, and in preaching labors earnestly and sincerely for the truth. And is worthy of the confidence of all good people.

J. S. HOLLOWAY.

At the beginning we had no thought of so many responding by giving statements; but it seems that the suggestion was borne onward from one to another, and statements kept coming in. And, to show no partiality toward anyone, we decided to give space to all statements received.

I appreciate the kind expressions of confidence by all as appear in the foregoing letters, and thank every one and the Lord for the same. These expressions make me feel more humble, and stimulate me to strive the harder to attain to higher grounds of Christian living.

And now Brethren, your having read these letters of personal confidence, I wish to advise all to dismiss these from your minds, think no more on me, but turn your attention back directly to the arguments set forth in the discussion, reread, meditate, and retain the truths presented therein.

Fraternally and sincerely,

J. P. WATSON.

Here is warning for every brother: "Speak not evil one of another." (James 4:11).