

day on which the disciples met to break the loaf. *Invariably* means *without change*. Now, the apostles had occasion to refer to this day many times, but I find Lord's day used but once. If Lord's day, as used in Rev. 1: 10, does refer to the first day (?) of the week, the apostles have not used it invariably. There was a change.

Since the question has gone this far, suppose we dig down and find God's plain teaching. Words that the Bible uses in terms that cannot be mistaken, I will accept. Will you? I will give the plain, unmistakable application of God's word the preference; rather than applications based upon inference or supposition. Will you? We will see.

I shall now answer Bro. Stone's question, after which I shall ask some. Bro. Stone asks: "If the day that John was in the Spirit was the Lord's day, will Bro. Freed tell us why it should be so-called?" I know of but one way to answer this, according to the principles of any language, ancient or modern, without an inference or supposition. The word *Lord's* denotes a possession. It is in the possessive case. It limits the day. "Why should it be called the Lord's day?" Because it belonged to the Lord.

Bro. Stone, what do you understand John to mean when he says he "was in the Spirit?" How long duration was this Lord's day? If twenty-four hours, how do you know? Does not the word *day* as used in the Bible often mean an indefinite time? Gen. 2: 4; Isa. 22: 5; and even Acts 17: 31. Could not "Lord's day" refer to the duration of John's exile to Patmos? Could it not have reference to the time the Lord chose to make known these wonderful revelations to John? Hence called Lord's day. He chose this time. It was the Lord's time to make known this great revelation to man.

Bro. Stone's argument is, since Christ arose on this day, ascended to heaven, appeared to his disciples and sent the Spirit on this day, that we should call it Lord's day.

I read of Christ doing many other great and good things on other days. Why not call them Lord's days?

I may have an opinion that Lord's day, as used by John, was the first day of the week, but I can not believe it, because I have not been able to find any testimony to that effect. Without testimony there can be no faith. I can give just as many reasons, of the same kind, why the Sabbath should be called Lord's day, as can be given

why the first day should be so-called.

Now, brethren, I press the question, is it not an inference or a supposition to teach that the first day of the week should be called Lord's day? Come, show us by plain, unmistakable teachings of God's blessed truth, or say I can't. "Prove all things and hold fast that which is good."

Yours in hope of immortality.

A. G. FREED.

[The above has been unavoidably delayed.—J. W. J.]

### Pretty Cooling.

J. N. Hall, the pugnacious Baptist editor and preacher, is now in Nashville, delivering a series of sermons or lectures. On last Friday night an immense crowd came out to hear him discuss the action of baptism, as he had previously announced he would. A goodly number of the Methodists came, and among them was parson Biggs, pastor of the Methodist church in Nashville. After being introduced to Eld. Hall by the Baptist pastor, he was seated in front of the pulpit. After they had sung and played they called on Biggs to pray. He did so. He prayed that the heart of the speaker might be warmed, and that he might preach the truth.

Hall's discourse followed, in which he showed that immersion is the act to be performed in baptizing, and that there is not one syllable of authority for sprinkling or pouring. At the close of the sermon another Baptist preacher was called on to pronounce the benediction. While the people all stood, he, with up-lifted hands, slowly, solemnly and distinctly thanked God that, among other things, the prayer of the brother had been answered.

J. R. JONES.

### The Gift of the Holy Spirit.

For the benefit of some give us an explanation of the following scriptures:

"Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts 2: 38-39. A BROTHER.

Keith, Texas.

Peter was preaching to a large multitude of people and had progressed so far in his speech as to convince them of sin and of the

righteous claims of Jesus. When he declared emphatically: "let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom you crucified both Lord and Christ," they were pierced in their hearts and cried out "Men and brethren what shall we do?" Peter answers in the language above given.

First he tells them what they must do. "Repent and be baptized." Second, he gives the authority by which these things are to be done, "in the name of Jesus Christ." Third, he tells them the end, purpose, or design for which they are to be done; "for the remission of sins." He did not say be baptized for (in order to) the fellowship of the church; but "for (in order to) remission of sins." The phrase "remission of sins" is equivalent to forgiveness, or pardon. Those who gladly received his word obeyed. Fourth, Peter makes a general promise "ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

Who should receive it? Those who had obeyed the command. See also Acts 5: 32.

"The gift of the Holy Spirit" is a phrase that occurs but twice in the New Testament. The other occurrence is in Acts 10: 45. The six Jews who went with Peter to the house of Cornelius were astonished "because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit." Peter afterwards said of this: "And as I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning." And again—"for as much then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us." From these scriptures we learn that the phrase means *the Holy Spirit as a gift*. Some contend that it refers to a gift, or power to work signs, miracles or wonders. But this cannot alter the sense. No one could exercise these miraculous or supernatural powers without first receiving the Spirit, hence to bestow or give man the powers to work a miracle necessarily implies that the Holy Spirit was first given. But was this gift of the Holy Spirit to confer power? I answer yes. Jesus told the Apostles that they should receive power after the Holy Spirit came upon them. Acts 1: 8. After they received it (the Spirit) we see them exercising power; something they could not do *naturally*. Again Peter quotes Joel's prophecy and says that the giving of the Spirit to them was the fulfillment of it. That prophecy not only promises the Holy Spirit but mentions the effects or what it will bestow when given. Now

placing yourself in the same attitude as were Peter's hearers; having before your eyes and ears a visible manifestation of supernatural power which Peter says is the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy and also further explains as the effect of the Holy Spirit given to them (verse 33) you could not understand "the gift of the Holy Spirit" in any other light than that it would endue the possessor with supernatural power.

How were those parties to receive the Holy Spirit?

There are but two ways conceivable, the direct, and the indirect. We have a record of two instances where the Holy Spirit was given and received directly from God. Acts second chapter, to the apostles, and Acts tenth, to Cornelius and household. These were exceptional cases; the former was "the beginning" of the kingdom or reign of Jesus and marked the opening of the door of faith to the Jews; the latter was God's testimony that the Gentiles should be admitted to gospel privileges and marks the beginning of a new era in the history of the church. By reading Acts 8th chapter we learn how the Holy Spirit was given to those who had obeyed God. Also Acts 19: 6.

"Now when the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John who when they were come down prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit; (for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit." From this we learn that the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit is not annexed to baptism as a design or end; in other words obedience to the gospel was not the condition of receiving the gift. In fact no condition was required. It was promised to a certain class; those who had obeyed the gospel and was given through the laying on of the hands of apostles.

This gift of the Holy Spirit was manifested in various ways, see 1 Cor. 12, 1: 11. It continued with the church during its formative period. When through revelation a perfect law was given for the guidance of the church, and that law had been confirmed by signs, wonders, and gifts of the Holy Spirit Heb. 2: 1-5, this gift of the Holy Spirit ceased. It was no longer given or received.

But says an objector: "Does not Paul say, 'if any man have



not Spirit of Christ he is none of his? Yes, he does but please to show if you can that Paul referred to the gift of the Holy Spirit by this language. But again he says: "received ye the spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" Gal. 3:2. Yes, and he says "for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body \* \* \* and are all made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. 12:13.

The church is the body of Christ; the Spirit of Christ dwells in the church. By our obedience to "the law of the spirit of life" we become members of the body. We are "baptized into Christ," are "in Christ" and God and Christ dwell in us. 1 Jno. 4:15 1 Jno. 5:12. But we are also baptized into the Spirit. Mat. 28, 18-20 and the Spirit dwells in us just as God and Christ does, that is by faith. Eph. 3:17.

Does God or Christ dwell tangibly or personally in the christian? No, neither does the Holy Spirit? But all these dwell in the heart by faith. "Faith comes by hearing the word of God."

A few words now relative to the 36th verse of Acts 2nd. "The promise" mentioned in this verse is the promise of salvation or blessing to all the families of earth through Jesus. It is expressed more fully in Acts 3, 25-26 where Peter is still speaking to Jews "Ye are the children of the prophets and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham. And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first God having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." It (the promise) cannot refer to the gift of the Holy Spirit mentioned in Acts 2:38 for as we have seen that gift has reference to the supernatural power bestowed or given to the church. For the present this must suffice. J. W. JACKSON.

#### LOVE.

"And now abideth faith, hope and charity, these three but the greatest of these is charity."—1 Cor. 13:13. "And though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries and all knowledge and though I have all faith so that I could remove mountains and have not charity I am nothing." 1 Cor. 13:2.

The word charity means love. If we have not love we have nothing. When we look at Abraham's faith it seems that nothing could be greater, but the apostle says love is greater.

We turn to hope. See what a power it is to prompt men to great works. The farmer toils in the heat and cold and waits for the harvest; the merchant invests his money in hope of gain; the sailor ventures out on the surging waves of the angry ocean to carry out his purposes, and yet love is much greater than hope. It originated with God, for God is love. He first loved us, even when we were enemies. No wonder that John says: "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God." We should, therefore, love God with all our souls. If we love Him as we should, we show our love and zeal by keeping His commands. And if we love God we will love one another and carry that love with us through life's weary journey. Let us love Him and each other with pure hearts fervently for our love will not be in vain.

W. T. WEBB.

Calvert, Texas.

#### Notes.

"Follow peace with all men and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord." "We should do good unto all men and especially unto the household of faith."

The world needs the truth as nothing but the truth will save. Then let the truth as it is in Jesus be faithfully taught, let all the world know that the "doctrines and traditions of men make void the commandments of God."

We can never have peace, happiness and prosperity among men until all bow to the authority of Christ—until all are satisfied with the Bible. The human creeds that have been adopted by the denominations show to all thinking men that they are not satisfied with the Bible.

Brothers, we must expose every form of error. We can never convert the world by conforming to its ways. We must fight on until all enemies are conquered and make an unconditional surrender to the authority of the Christ of God. G. L. TOMSON.

#### Church Polity.

In this article we will speak of the organic structure of "the body of Christ." As respects the phrase, body of Christ, it signifies an organized community of christians. The term "church," denotes an assembly lawfully called together for any purpose; but it does not necessarily mean an organization of any kind; while the body of Christ invariably signifies an organized community.

This word body, or phrase, body of Christ, is frequently misapplied. An organized community of christians does not constitute a body of any sort. We have seen that the whole family of God constituted "but one body." We read of "churches of Christ," but never read of bodies of Christ. The reason is obvious. There are a plurality of congregations, but not a plurality of organized institutions. There is but one body, and that body is the entire church when properly organized.

An organized institution, must of necessity, have suitable officers. These officers must be qualified in every respect to do all the official work assigned them in the constitution by which they are governed. In the gospel economy we find a definite law setting forth in plain language, the qualifications of each official agent, and the official work assigned to each officer.

1. In order to make converts and thus to increase the body or family. Missionaries are indispensable. A missionary is one sent by the authority of Christ to preach the gospel to the aliens and to immerse believing penitents into the one body, by the authority of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and to teach those converted to observe all things which the apostles enjoined upon their brethren. Neither more nor less. To this end all missionaries are thoroughly furnished unto their mission work, by the gospel preached by the apostles, under the guidance of the Spirit, by virtue of the apostolic commission. Here we find precept and example.

The word "evangelist," denotes "a preacher of the gospel, a teacher of the christian religion." This word is often misapplied. It is generally applied to none but travelling preachers, while it signifies all who preach the gospel at home or otherwise. A missionary must of necessity be an evangelist. Yet all who preach the gospel are not qualified to do the work assigned to a missionary. All missionaries should be fully qualified in every respect to do all the official work assigned to a bishop or overseer, because it becomes their duty not only to preach the gospel to aliens, but to "set all things in order and ordain elders" in the congregations under their supervision. This is very important work and is not assigned to ordinary evangelists, as some vainly teach and practice.

2. The next official work to which we call attention, is that of a bishop. The words bishop, over-

seer, shepherd, pastor, presbyter and elder, are used interchangeably to point out the same officer in the church. The official work of a bishop, is that of teaching and ruling. This the word overseer or shepherd, necessarily implies. A shepherd has the care of a flock. The owner of the flock covenants with the shepherd to oversee and control his flock. To this end he gives special directions what to do and how to do it. Thus the shepherd is "thoroughly furnished" unto the work assigned him. So he is the servant, not of the flock, but of the owner of the flock; hence the shepherds are amenable, not to the flock, as many suppose, but they are responsible to the owner of the flock for the care, protection and preservation of all the flock. If any member of the flock suffers for want of protection, the overseers are responsible to Christ for it. If any are lost or misled by false teachers—grievous wolves—the shepherds collectively are held responsible for the loss. They are divinely appointed to watch for the souls under their supervision. For proof see Ezek. 34:10, "Behold I am against the shepherds, and I will require my flock at their hands." Paul to the brethren writes: "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God." Again: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves." (Why so?) "For they watch for your souls, as they that must give account."—Heb. 13:17. Here the apostle agrees with Ezekiel. Those who are appointed to rule the body of Christ, watch for the souls of those under their protection, for they must account to the owner of the flock, (which flock is the church collectively).

So the proof is too plain to be misunderstood, or ignored. The official work of the bishop is confined to the church. The apostles ordained elders (i. e. elderly men) in every congregation, that the entire family should be protected and ministered to as the gospel directs. Bishops are but joint partners in the work assigned them. In our next, will speak more particularly of the officials in the body. A. ALLISON.

Anger and haste hinder good counsel.

A pious cottager residing in the center of a long and dreary heath, being asked by a visitor, "Are you not sometimes afraid in your lonely situation, especially in the winter?" replied "O no! for Faith shuts the door at night, and Mercy opens it in the morning. Selected.



## FIRM FOUNDATION.

(ISSUED WEEKLY)

Entered at the postoffice at Austin, Tex., as second class matter.

Office of publication, 119 East Ninth Street, Austin, Texas.

Subscription, IN ADVANCE: \$1 per yr. Six months, 50c. Rates of Advertising furnished on application.

A. McGARY, } EDITORS.  
 E. HANSBROUGH, }  
 J. W. JACKSON, OFFICE EDITOR.  
 G. J. STECK, BOOK-KEEPER.

## CONTRIBUTORS.

J. N. GIBSON, Field Editor, and General Agent.

## TREAS.

JNO. S. DUNST, A. J. MCCARTY, Killeen,  
 Junction City.  
 J. D. TANT, J. W. STRODE, Appleby,  
 Hamilton.  
 W. F. RICHARDSON, G. T. WALKER, Morkel,  
 Stubblefield.  
 A. ALSTUP, G. A. TROTT, Rising Star,  
 Colina, Florence.  
 W. L. SWINNEY, INDIANA

I. G. BROWN, Shelbyboro, TENNESSEE.

F. C. BOWELL, Andrew, O. E. HOLT, Milton,  
 W. T. KIDWILL, Decherd,

\*Besides these there are many others who will favor us with articles and correspondence.

## THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Relative to this Bro. D. L. says:

"The promise of the Holy Spirit is a direct and clear promise to lead to repentance and remission of sins. 'For the remission of sins' is an indirect promise. As shown in our first article, it is a declaration of the purpose or end to which God will bring man when he repents and is baptized. Telling what God will do is only an indirect promise to make us love God, and so obey him from love. How can we say it is needful to understand when and where an indirect promise may be enjoyed, but may drop out the direct promise in the same sentence altogether?"

The above statement is somewhat confusing. Bro. L. has one promise "direct and clear," leading man to another promise "indirect," and, of course, obscure. "Telling what God would do is only an indirect promise" and this Bro. L. thinks is all the force or meaning in the phrase "is the remission of sins." I suppose he thinks "the gift of the Holy Spirit" is a "direct promise" because Peter said "you shall receive," etc. Well, to "be baptized is the remission of sins," is equivalent to "shall receive the remission of sins through the name of Jesus." Acts 10:43. This makes remission of sins a "direct promise." Again, Peter quotes Joel as telling what the Lord would do in the latter days, viz: "pour out His Spirit on all flesh," then this gift of the Spirit was an indirect promise. But which one of these "promises" is directly connected with baptism? I answer, that remission of sins is directly connected with baptism, and that the gift of the Holy Spirit has no connection with it as a design or end to be obtained by obeying it. This I will endeavor to show in this article.

The command "be baptized is the remission of sins" is direct and positive, but men are not commanded to be baptized is the gift of the Holy Spirit. Baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus is a necessary condition in order to receive the re-

mission of sins; the gift of the Holy Spirit it was received both before and after baptism; therefore baptism is not a necessary condition in order to receive it. But Bro. L. thinks this promise one of the motives preached to move men, and that I select and exalt the one motive, "for the remission of sins," to the exclusion of all others. I preach God's love to man; the grace of our Lord Jesus in becoming poor for our sakes; his love exemplified in the death on the cross; his promise of salvation; the certainty of death and the judgment; the promise of eternal life and the condemnation of the wicked, as motives to influence man to love Jesus and determine to obey him. Then I preach to him just as Peter did to the pentecostians and to Cornelius, a specific command for a specific purpose.

I do not preach to people, "ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" as a motive to influence them to obey the Lord in baptism. Because to do so would lead them to expect something that men of this age do not receive either before or after baptism. At least, I have never seen one who claimed to have this gift who could prove his claim by a *manifestation of the Spirit*.

1. What is meant by the gift of the Holy Spirit? The phrase occurs only twice in the New Testament, never in the Old Testament. The places are Acts 2:38, Acts 10:45. The Greek word *dorea* here used occurs eleven times in the New Testament. "The gift of God," John 4:10, Acts 8:20, Acts 11:17, evidently refers to the same as above. The Holy Spirit is the gift of God. Peter's language, Acts 10:45-47, explains that the gift of the Holy Spirit is the Holy Spirit given to man.

2. This gift of the Holy Spirit is the fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel, quoted in Peter's discourse. Acts 2:17, 18, Joel 2:28, 29. True, Peter speaking of the baptism with the Holy Spirit on pentecost, says, "this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel," and also that Jesus, "having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit," hath shed forth this you see and hear. "The promise of the Father" had been made known to the apostles, John 14:15-17, *et al*, and the exalted Jesus was the administrator of His bounty (*dorea*) in sending the Holy Spirit and promising "the gift" to others.

3. But to whom was this gift promised? The prophecy said "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Jesus did not tell the apostles that they were the only ones who should receive this promise of the Father; though it is highly probable that none others received the same measure of the Holy Spirit as did the apostles. Jesus, himself, had the Spirit "without measure," John 3:34; evidently then, others had it by measure. On pentecost the Holy Spirit was given to the apostles; at the house of Cornelius the Spirit was given to unbaptized persons; in Samaria the Spirit was not given for some time after

baptism, and then only through the laying on of the apostles' hands. Peter's language, Acts 5:32, is often quoted to prove that the Spirit is promised to all who obey God. But the passage does not so teach. It states a fact that had occurred. "God hath given the Spirit to them that obey Him." For after this (Acts 10) God gave the Spirit to some before they obeyed. From all this it is evident to my mind that the gift of the Holy Spirit is not connected with baptism as a condition to be obeyed in order to its reception. And those who now preach and emphasize the command "be baptized . . . and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," simply put a stumbling block in the way of many earnest ones. These believe they will receive the gift but after waiting and praying for it they are conscious of not receiving it and some are turned back to the world. Fortunately for others, before driven to infidelity, they learn to properly divide the word of truth; and in so doing learn that all the parties who received this gift were able to manifest or demonstrate it. This gift of the Holy Spirit, then, was given according to God's will. As a general rule it was given to those who had obeyed him, but so far as we know, only through the laying on of hands. Acts 8:14-16. Acts 19:1-5.

4. Were all the parties to whom the Spirit was given able to manifest it by some act of supernatural power? To answer this scripturally, note the distinction between the gift (*dorea*) of the Holy Spirit, and the spiritual gifts, (*charisma*). The Holy Spirit himself, is the gift (*dorea*), and the (*charisma*) gifts are the different manifestations of the Spirit. In the first the Holy Spirit is given, in the second the Holy Spirit gives the power to act. So I understand Paul to teach 1 Cor. 12:3-11, where after enumerating the various manifestations or *charisma*, he says: "Now all these worketh that one and self-same Spirit dividing to every man severally as he will."

He also says, "but the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal," or for the profit of all. A manifestation is something seen or made apparent, just as Paul says, "by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience," etc. If Paul had to preach and act the truth so as to show to the people that he had the truth, so those possessing the Holy Spirit must, by the exercise of the gift (*charisma*) bestowed upon each, show that the Spirit was in them. This is also seen in Paul's language, 1 Cor. 2:4, where he says his preaching was "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." This could mean nothing else than that Paul by an exhibition of supernatural power convinced these people of his divine mission.

Take what is above said and compare it with the record as to those who are said to have received the Holy Spirit, and we are forced to the conclusion that every one, who, in apostolic times, received the



Holy Spirit was able to manifest or demonstrate the possession of it by the exercise of some supernatural gift.

After the confirmation of the word of God, supernatural gifts ceased. Hence the conclusion is that since the apostolic age no one has received the gift of the Holy Spirit herein spoken of.

To return now to Acts 2:38 and Bro. L.'s objection. He makes the language, verse 39, "for the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," apply to "the promise" of the gift of the Holy Spirit. This also I think an error. Salvation is the prominent thought in Peter's sermon, and the promise was the one made to Abraham, "in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Peter announced in the beginning of his sermon, "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved," and closed the discourse with an exhortation to "save yourselves." What motives other than salvation did Peter preach to them? What other end, purpose or design, did he present in connection with baptism? The gift of the Spirit? No, for that gift as we have seen, did not have any connection with baptism. It is not a design of baptism, neither was baptism a condition of receiving it. Hence the usual arguments based upon "understanding this promise also" in order to acceptable obedience fall to the ground.

In conclusion, I wish to forestall some critics by stating as plainly as possible that I fully believe that "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his," and again, that God dwells in the church by His Spirit. Eph. 2:19, 20. At another time I may write more on this subject but for the present give this thought for study: "As you have received Christ Jesus so walk you in him." "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." How do men receive Christ? How does he dwell in the heart? Settle these two questions and you will solve two others. How do men receive the Spirit? How does he dwell in the heart?

J. W. JACKSON.

Dear Bro. Jackson:

It may be of interest to the brethren to know something about the church of Christ at this place.

We began work here in Jan. with this noble band of disciples. The church is in good working condition, and in peace and harmony. We have no church house but worship in a large tent at the cor. Alberson and Bow St., North Tyler. Commenced a meeting first Lord's day in May, we are still continuing with good and attentive audiences every night, two accessions by confession and baptism up to date, and more are confidently expected to follow. The cause goes gradually forward, and we are greatly encouraged.

Any church wanting my services in extra meetings can write me at 203 South Scott St., Tyler, Texas.

Yours fraternally,

Tyler, Texas.

R. B. HEWITT.

## ELECTICISM.

If we could embody in one congregation the economy and charity of the Catholics; the zeal and business sagacity of the Methodists; the educated ministry and respect for law and conscience maintained by the Presbyterians; the brotherly love manifested by the Congregationalists; the tenacity of the Baptists; the dignity of the Episcopalians; a financial system as successful as that of the Mormons; the house to house visiting of the Adventists; the missionary zeal of the Moravians; and the doctrines of the Christian Church; we should have a model church—a church which would in a goodly degree be a reproduction of the ideal Church of Christ.—John L. Brandt, in *Christian Standard*.

This might be justly styled the eclectic method of reproducing the true Church.

Why did not the brother mention the moral systems of Buddha and Confucius? Must we traverse the wilderness of Romanism and sectarianism in order to find the whole truth of Christianity? Might we not with equal propriety say that, if we could condense all the lesser lights of the solar system into one great light, we would have a light equal to that of the sun? Impossible, my brother, to find the whole truth of Christianity in this way.

According to this system, eclecticism in religion, if we want to take a lesson in economy and charity, we must study Catholicism.

To learn zeal and business sagacity, we must study the Methodist system.

The true standard of ministerial education, and a proper respect for law and conscience are learned from the Presbyterians.

We must watch the Congregationalists to learn brotherly love. Tenacity is learned from the Baptists. Mormonism is the system which insures financial success. But I am tired. A shorter, and by far, a safer route to the whole truth is accessible. All the good things in Baptistism, Methodism, Presbyterianism, and all otherisms are found in, and legitimately belong to, the Bible.

These systems contain nothing good that is not found in the Bible. All candid men admit that the whole truth can not be found in any one of them, and I feel perfectly safe in saying that, were these systems thoroughly ransacked, and every particle of truth found therein brought together, there would still be many other truths in God's storehouse of truth of which the advocates of these systems are perfectly ignorant.

Listen, while an inspired apostle speaks, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3:16, 17.

Not doctrines do we need, but the doctrine. Paul says: "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in so doing thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." 1 Tim. 4:16. Again he says: "For the

time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Tim 4:3, 4. A man living in the present century could not draw a truer picture of the religious condition of the people, than did Paul more than 1800 years ago. That's it. *They will not endure sound doctrine.* But a shorter route to the whole truth is easily found. Let us take a straight course to Jerusalem, and there, at the feet of inspired apostles, sit and learn. Here we get doctrine—the doctrine. "But," says one, "We may get the doctrine in this way, but there are many other things of great value: hence we must use skill in gathering from every available source, all the best and most effective ideas and plans." This is a circuitous route, and leads through bogs, mires, brush and smoke, and contains an atmosphere filled with the deadly poison of those whose mouths "speak great, swelling words against the Most High, and who think to change times and laws." Let us avoid all such fruitless efforts. Did not the Church of Christ in apostolic times possess all the elements of growth and prosperity? Certainly it did. Let us see. LOVE, ZEAL, DILIGENCE, and respect for law and conscience, are all found in the one body. Not only these, but everything pertaining to life and godliness is found therein. *Preach the Word.* O. E. HOLT.

## WHAT ABOUT IT?

Bro. J. W. Denton warns the brethren against one Locke a blind preacher who claims to be a Christian, says: "He is a mixture of Universalism, Adventism and Christadelphianism." Suppose the brother means that this man Locke preaches some of each of the above doctrines. Universalism says all men will be saved finally. Russellism in the "Millennial Dawn" says about the same. It teaches a second chance after death, therefore it is Universalism in a modified form. Adventists teach the doctrine of soul-sleeping, that when man dies he is like the little boy's dog "Rover; when he died he died all over." Christadelphians teach that Jesus Christ is not king. They deny that he is now reigning as king and consequently has no kingdom. There is some difference between these sects and their doctrines and there is some agreement. They all teach some truth and much error like the whole sectarian world. Bro. Jackson you tell Bro. Denton that I know of a man who is a Christian preacher and a man of ability, too, and he is not blind either and he boldly preaches all of the above doctrines. Will some body tell us what ought to be done with preachers who go around and palm off such doctrines and opinions on the congregations of Christ? I do wish brethren would quit their foolishness and preach the word.