

Concerning the Unscripturalness of Establishing Religio-Secular Schools With the Lord's Money.

CHAPTER I.

"But if any provide not for his own and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." 1 Tim. 5:8 "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Matt. 22:21.

"For this cause pay ye tribute also." Rom. 13:6. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him that there be no gatherings when I come." 1 Cor.16:2. The several scriptures just cited set forth the three-fold financial obligations of Christians, namely, *to their own dependent ones, to Caesar—civil government—and to God—the cause of Christ*. Our own dependent ones must be provided for, and Caesar must be paid what he exacts. If when this is done there is nothing left then we have not been prospered, and therefore we are not required to give anything to the Lord's cause. The Lord does not require us to give him what our dependent ones really *need*, nor what Caesar *exact*s. But all that those dependent on us for support *do not need*, and which Caesar *does not exact* certainly *constitutes our*

prosperity. Supporting our dependent ones and paying Caesar what he exacts will be all that the Lord will require of us if that be all that we can do, after exercising due diligence and economy God would not receive from the Jew as a gift to him what was due to parents (Mark 7:10-13), and he does not require that we as Christians shall give him what is due to parents or to any other dependent ones of our house, nor what is due to the civil government under which we live. To the Jew he said, "I hate robbery for burnt offering," (Isa. 61:8), and there is no evidence that he has ever changed his sentence on that subject.

Having stated what is due from Christians to those dependent on them, and what is due from Christians to civil governments, so that those obligations cannot be misunderstood, and having distinguished such obligations from those that are directly due from Christians to the Lord's cause, so that the distinction cannot be misunderstood, we are now ready to proceed. In so doing we quote, "For I mean not that other men be eased, and ye burdened, but by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want: that there may be an equality: As it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over and he that had gathered little had no lack." 2 Cor. 8:18-15. This last statement of what has just been quoted from Paul was cited by him from Exodus 16th chapter. There we learn that in gathering manna the Israelites were required to gather the same amount for every man, and to leave none of it over till the next morning. To that record Paul refers the Christians at Corinth when writing to them on the doctrine of "equality." That doctrine faithfully observed by disciples of Christ during the first half of the 19th century

would have made the building of Bethany College *impossible*. Had that doctrine been faithfully observed till the present no Other religio-secular school would have been founded by any disciple of Christ, unless as a means for the support of himself and his family. Certainly no such school would have been founded as a church institution. No imagination is sufficiently fertile to conceive the possibility of even so much as a thousand dollars of surplus money being in the hands of any Christian long enough for that one to think of founding with that sum a religio-secular school—a school three-fourths or more secular and one fourth or less religious—if the doctrine of "equality," as, set forth in the New Testament be faithfully obeyed. If we imagine that the death of a relative might leave us with one thousand, or a hundred thousand dollars on hand that we do not need for ourselves, and which Caesar has no right to demand, the New Testament tells us what to do with it all. When disciples, for a time, at Jerusalem were so zealous that they gave not only their prosperity, but all their wealth, to Christ, they "laid it at the apostles' feet." Among the Gentile churches such zeal seems not to have prevailed, but they were commanded to give on the first day of the week as the Lord had prospered them. Beyond this precept an approved example of personal giving is recorded in 1 Cor. 16:17, where Paul said, "I am glad of the coming of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus: for that which was lacking on your part they have supplied." But in such giving there is not the slightest implication nor intimation, reference nor hint, in the direction of establishing a religio-secular institution.

Years ago a professed disciple had a business transaction with a man who overpaid him to the amount of five dollars. He seemed not to know what to do with

that sum, but, after serious reflection, he decided "to buy a Bible with it"! Well, we have all had business transactions with the Lord as well as with men. Now I suppose that the Lord overpays us, or prospers us more than we need or deserve, to the amount of a thousand dollars or more. Shall we give it back to him ; in his own divinely appointed way, or shall we buy or build a religio-secular school with it? The reader will , justly say that the mentioned professed disciple should have given the five dollars which he had been overpaid back to the man who had overpaid him. The same just judgment will decide that all disciples whom the Lord has prospered with a surplus, beyond what they need for their dependent ones and beyond what Caesar has the right to exact, *should give that surplus back to the Lord* in the way that he has directed in his word by precepts and examples therein recorded.

But have not Christians a right to teach school? That depends on the Christians. If they need to do something for a living, and school teaching be the best secular calling in which they can engage, we admit that they have a right to teach school, provided they are sufficiently capable and willing, and thus will not cheat pupils, parents, nor the State. Well, have not Christians who are competent and willing to teach school a right to teach their pupils the Bible? That depends on the time which they take to teach the Bible. They have no right to take any time which the County or State engages for teaching secular things and devote that time to teaching the Bible, unless there be special stipulation to that effect on the subject. We knew a teacher who, by consent of the parents, assembled his school a few minutes earlier each morning than the law requires in order to have time for religious services. Only by such a plan, or some other to the same

effect, can school teachers in the school houses where they are employed to teach secular knowledge scripturally have religious services with the children whom they instruct, A man might as well, so far as the moral feature of it is concerned, think of trying to pay a part of his taxes by putting that much into the Lord's treasury as to teach the Bible on a part of the time which the County or State employs, and pays him for, in order to have him teach secular things. Read Isa. 61:8, and Matt. 22:21 again.

But nothing which has been said or can be said about teaching school or teaching the Bible in connection therewith touches *even at a remote angle* the case of a preacher who can proclaim the gospel successfully, and whose brethren will support him while so doing, settling down to teach secular things three-fourths, or any other proportion, of his time. The preacher's time all belongs to the Lord, except what he needs for his family, and what Caesar demands. And woe to that preacher who deceives himself to think that by some sort of indirect service he can meet his obligations to the Lord!

But some man may ask, Would it not be scriptural to build a religio-secular school or college in order to make a living? Perhaps we should not deal with such a question till we find a Christian simple enough to invest twenty-five thousand dollars, more or less, in founding such a school. Where is the man who would take money enough to make a good living, with a probable surplus, and invest it in such a school in order to make a living? Caesar builds abundant secular schools, and generally of a very good grade. He does his best, and not many of his subjects could do much better. So it would be financial folly for a Christian to invest his living in a religio-secular school in order to make a

living. But nothing that has thus far been said about schools or anything else in which the question of a Christian's living, or support of his dependent ones, is concerned, touches the subject that we are discussing, namely, *The Unscripturalness of Establishing Religio-Secular Schools with the Lord's money.*

What shall we say then concerning such schools? Shall we spend twenty thousand dollars of the Lord's money in brick and mortar, lumber and hardware, skilled and unskilled labor, and sink twelve hundred dollars of interest oil that sum each year, in order to teach as much Bible as one man can teach in a month? Yet this is, substantially, what has been and is being done is the best of the Bible Schools now in existence. The New Testament can be privately read and studied, and then publicly read and considered, from beginning to end, within one month by any company or class of Bible readers, of proper age, that, will lay aside secular employments and devote themselves to the New Testament for that length of time. In the course of three months the entire Bible can be privately read and studied, and then publicly read and considered. All this can be done in a meeting house already built, and thus without spending one dollar of the Lord's money for erecting school and college buildings, and we should remember that the Savior taught economy. After feeding five thousand by a miracle he said, "Gather up the fragments that remain that nothing be lost." John 6:12. Such economy forbids establishing the kind of institutions that we are writing against.

What then shall we say of religio-secular schools established with the Lord's money? We are by inspired scripture authorized to make these statements:

1. They are unscriptural because contrary to the divine doctrine of equality. Strict obedience to that doctrine makes them impossible.

2. They are unscriptural because contrary to the divine doctrine of justice. That doctrine requires that Christians shall render unto God the things that are God's.

3. They are contrary to the divine doctrine of economy. That doctrine requires that even fragments be gathered up that nothing be lost, and thus that there shall be no waste of the Lord's means in piling up brick and mortar structures in which to teach much that is secular and a little that is religious.

Or, by making these statements in another form we have the following:

1. The divine doctrine of "equality" requires all Christians to give according to prosperity in the Lord's appointed ways.

2. The Lord's appointed ways of giving do not embrace establishing religio-secular schools.

1. It does command that riches as to lay up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life. This cannot mean, anything else than that they shall use their riches so as to please the Lord and be finally saved. In using their surplus so as to lay hold on eternal life Christians are required to "do good," and "be rich in good works." In explanation Paul adds, "ready to distribute, willing to communicate." This cannot mean anything else than that they should do as certain brethren did to Paul and as Paul commanded the churches to do on the first day of the week. (See 1 Cor. 16:1, 2,17.) 4. In the use of their surplus means, or prosperity, Christians *must not transgress* or *go beyond* the doctrine of Christ, but must abide in that doctrine, or they will let go their hold upon God and Christ by going outside of that doctrine.

2. Rendering to God the things that are God's in his own appointed ways will take all of the Lord's money out of the hands of individual Christians.

3. Therefore the requirements of the divine doctrine of justice when faithfully obeyed make it impossible for individual Christians to build religio-secular schools.

The following is also true:

1. The divine doctrine of economy requires that nothing be lost.

2. Expenditure of the Lord's money in erecting buildings for religio-secular schools is a loss to the church of money belonging to the Lord.

3. Therefore erecting buildings for the purpose of conducting such schools is contrary to the divine doctrine of economy.

CHAPTER II.

Bible readers of proper age, that, will lay aside secular employments and devote themselves to the New Testament for that length of time. In the course of three months the entire Bible can be privately read and studied, and then publicly read and considered. All this can be done in a meeting house already built, and thus without spending one dollar of the Lord's money for erecting school and college buildings, and we should remember that the Savior taught economy. After feeding five thousand by a miracle he said, "Gather up the fragments that remain that nothing be lost." John 6:12. Such economy forbids establishing the kind of institutions that we are writing against.

"What then shall we say of religio-secular schools established with the Lord's money? We are by inspired scripture authorized to make these statements:

1. They are unscriptural because contrary to the divine doctrine of equality.

The foregoing scriptures when taken together inform us definitely on the following questions:

1. What Christians should do with their surplus money, which is called "unrighteous mammon" by the Savior, possibly because of the unrighteous use generally made of it.
2. Why Christians should use their surplus money as they are divinely directed.
3. Within, what limits Christians must remain in using their surplus money.

Concerning these divine instructions we shall now make a few additional remarks by way of explanation.

1. The Savior teaches his disciples to use their surplus money so as to secure for themselves friends by whom they will be received into "everlasting habitations" when death overtakes them and thus by death they fail on earth. 2. Paul sets forth the same idea when he commands that those who are rich shall so use their riches as to lay up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life. This cannot mean anything else than that they shall use their riches so as to please the Lord and be eternally saved. 3. In using their surplus so as to lay hold on eternal life Christians are required to "do good, "and "be rich in good works." In explanation Paul adds, "ready to distribute, willing to communicate." This cannot mean anything else than that they should do as certain brethren did to Paul and as Paul commanded the churches to do on the first day of the week. (See 1 Cor. 16:1, 2,17.) 4. In the use of their surplus means, or prosperity, Christians *must not transgress* or go *beyond* the doctrine of Christ, but must abide in that doctrine, or they will let go their hold upon God and Christ by going outside of that doctrine.

5. If a Christian transgresses and goes outside of the doctrine of Christ in the use of means, or in anything else, it is dangerous for us to encourage that one or bid him God speed, for in so doing we become "partaker of his evil deeds," 6. But no Christian can build a religio-secular school with his surplus means, all of which belongs to the Lord, while abiding in the doctrine of Christ. On the contrary, all Christians who engage in the business of building such schools with the Lord's money certainly transgress, or *go beyond the doctrine of Christ*, and in so doing they *have not or hold not* to God and Christ as revealed in that doctrine. Therefore the building of such schools with the Lord's money is *unscriptural*.

But some man will, perhaps, say, "There is no special scripture against building religio-secular schools with the Lord's money." In answer to this we state that such reasoning mentions the sandy foundation upon which Rome and all her daughters have built their religious superstructures. What is worse, in their zeal to do as they please, they have, in some instances, ignored what is said in scripture directly against them. For instance what Paul wrote about certain ones, who would depart from the faith "forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats" was adopted by Rome regardless of what was divinely written by that apostle. The same is true of many other sects which advocate justification by faith only. They accept and urge that doctrine regardless of what James wrote against it. Besides, Rome's doctrine of purgatory and penance, infant baptism and infant condemnation have all been adopted on the ground that the scripture says nothing directly *against them*. Then infant church membership, getting religion, the mourner's bench method of converting sinners and sanctifying believers,

with many other shades and grades of doctrine have been adopted on the plea that scripture *says nothing directly against them*. And shall disciples who claim to be apostolic adopt that unscriptural plea on behalf of building religio-secular institutions with the Lord's money, which is a work outside of New Testament precept and example, implication and intimation? They cannot do so without *transgressing* the doctrine of Christ, and if they persist in so doing after their error has been fairly exposed they will *certainly forfeit their discipleship*.

To illustrate the absurdity of trying to justify spending the Lord's money to establish religio-secular institutions in the shape of Bible Schools and colleges, we mention, an instance which was reported to several years ago. A young couple in a certain state wished to marry, and they looked around for some one to "say the ceremony." As no preacher nor justice-of-the-peace was convenient they appealed to the postmaster. He said that he thought he could accommodate them, but not for several hours. So he told them to go to his house and stay till after dinner. They did so. Then he told them that they should remain longer, and then he thought he could marry them. An hour or two later he came to the house and said that it was "all right" and they could at once be married, for, said he "I have examined my post-office guide from beginning to end and I fail to find a section which *forbids* a Post-master marrying a couple and so *it's all right*." But will disciples of Christ adopt such reasoning in order to justify using the Lord's money to establish institutions that are chiefly secular? If so, we again say that they will *certainly forfeit their discipleship* if they refuse to repent been plainly told of their error.

But this is not all. The Savior said, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." Matt. 7:18-20. With these statements of our Savior before our minds let us consider the history of religio-secular institutions whether built Dy the Lord's money or not. In so doing we begin with the Alexandrian school of philosophy in Egypt which in the second century, as Mosheim's history declares, became a kind of theological seminary, and in which was conceived and brought forth what was called the "Neo-Platonic system"—a system that was an admixture of Judaism, heathenism, the gospel, and human philosophy. The formation of that system was the doctrinal corruption of the gospel which opened the way for the speculations that afterwards resulted in the great apostasy which in the ninth century was manifest in the two great branches which still exist, and are today manifest, in the Greek Catholic and the Roman Catholic churches. Those leading churches, with the numerous offspring of the Roman Catholic Church, have been builders of theological seminaries, in which religious and secular learning have been imparted to students in order to build up their respective orders of ministers or clergymen. And whether the religious instruction imparted has predominated over the secular, or the secular has been greater than the religious, yet the result has been the same. In every instance the theological seminary has been the nourishing mother of the clergyman, and the clergyman has been the framer and advocate of human religious creeds. The seminary, the clergyman, and the creed thus belong together, but whether taken together or separately they

may all be justly called *trees which have from first to last been, bearers of evil fruit* when viewed in the light of the gospel of God's dear Son. The good that they have done has been more than overbalanced by the religious conceit which they have imposed and the religious divisions which they have wrought. "Every tree that beareth not good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire."

All this was quite well understood in the early half of the 19th century, yet regardless of the light of it all a large proportion of the Lord's money was devoted to building a religio-secular school called "Bethany College" in what is now known as Brooke county of West Virginia. If not intended to be a theological seminary, yet that is what it became. The example set at Bethany was followed in near or about a score of other places in course of the last half of the 19th century. From first to last those colleges, established with money which should have been regarded as belonging entirely to the Lord, have been chiefly, if not wholly, committed to those who advocate humanism in the worship and work of the churches. In them have been trained the very men who have wrought divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which is set forth in the gospel.

What shall we say then concerning religio-secular institutions of learning established by the Lord's money? They have a bad history in three particulars.

1. They are built by those who do not abide in the doctrine of Christ, but who transgress that doctrine.

2. They are built by those who are guilty of "evil deeds." (See 2 John 9th, 10th, 11th verses).
3. Their history outside of the New Testament is that of an evil tree whose fruit has consisted of clergymen, creeds, and sects. Therefore religio-secular schools establish-

ed with the Lord's money are *unscriptural*.

If we present the foregoing truths in logical form we have the following:

1. Those who build religio-secular schools with the Lord's money transgress or go beyond the doctrine of Christ.

2. Those who transgress or go beyond the doctrine of Christ have not or hold not God.

3. Therefore those who become transgressors of the doctrine of Christ by building religio-secular schools with the Lord's money have not nor hold not God.

Or it may be stated thus:

1. In order to hold to God and Christ it is necessary to abide in the doctrine of Christ.

2. But those who build religio-secular schools with the Lord's money go beyond the doctrine of Christ, and thus do not abide in it.

3. Therefore those who build such schools with the Lord's money let go their hold on God.

Another statement of truth on this subject may be set forth thus:

1. Christ says that a tree is known by its fruit.

2. The fruit of religio-secular schools has been more evil than good throughout the gospel age.

3. Therefore such schools are more evil than good in the gospel age.

If an effort be made to offset the foregoing reasoning by referring to the good done by such schools I answer such reference, first, by referring to the good done by Moses and Aaron, when they said, "Must we fetch you water out of this rock?" Three millions or more of people with their flocks and herds were saved from "famishing, yet God charged Moses and Aaron with *unbelief* and *rebellion*. Num. 20:10, 11; 27:14. My second answer is that all sectarianism pleads the

good that it has done, and is still doing, as its justification. Can such schools and colleges as we are censuring, make no better plea in their defense? If not, then they are certainly defenseless.

CHAPTER III.

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, who is the head of all principality and power." Col. 2:8-10.

In the foregoing statements Paul warns Christians against "philosophy," "vain deceit," "tradition of men," and "rudiments of the world," which things he declares are "not after Christ," and thus are not the outgrowth of following Christ. The apostle then declares that in Christ "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," and finally that Christians are "complete in" Christ "who is the head of all principality and power."

In the light of such inspired statements it may be safely said that religio-secular schools built with the Lord's money, being unauthorized and unmentioned in the New Testament, are unscriptural in the following particulars:

1. They are not the outgrowth of observing any precept or example, implication or intimation of the New Testament, and thus they are "not after Christ."
2. They are the outgrowth of following the teaching or example of uninspired men, and thus are "after the tradition of men" against which Paul forewarns Christians.
3. They are the outgrowth of adopting what are sup-

posed to be wise conclusions of men, and are thus after human "philosophy," against which Paul likewise forewarns Christians.

4. As the institutions against which we write are "not after Christ," but are after "tradition of men," and "philosophy" of men, they are classed with "Vain deceit," and "rudiments of the world," and thus are unscriptural.

5. They ignore the fact that Christians are by the apostle Paul declared to be "complete" in Christ, and for that reason they are unscriptural.

A few years ago in a certain institution of learning an interview was being held between certain students concerning the scripturalness of instrumental music in the worship, and missionary societies with other arrangements in the work of the church. One of those students said to another, "If you oppose all these things, what will you have left?" The answer given was this: "I am surprised at your question, though is easily answered, We'll have *all* left that God gave us—the *Bible* and the *church*. But now it's my turn to ask a question. If you begin to adopt human devices, *where are you going to stop?*" "I see you have the advantage," said the first questioner. The interview just mentioned reveals the principle involved in this discussion. If Christians are complete in Christ, as Paul declares, the religio-secular schools do not need to be built with the Lord's money. If by any method of reasoning we conclude that completeness in Christ does not forbid such schools, then the question arises, *What does it forbid?* Humanly devised missionary societies are *chiefly religious*. The humanly devised schools against which we are writing are *chiefly secular*. Now, what method of just reasoning

will *condemn such societies* and yet *justify such schools*? How can that which is *chiefly religious* be condemn able, while that which is *chiefly secular* be commendable? How can the former be "a curse" to the churches of Christ, while the latter are blessings to those churches? How can the former be "unscriptural and anti-scriptural" while the latter are according to scripture? Woe to the man who undertakes to justify the building of religio-secular schools with the Lord's money while denouncing missionary societies as "a curse" to the churches of Christ, and declaring that they are both "unscriptural and anti-scriptural"! To such a man we must say, "Therefore thou art, inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same , things. And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them who do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God?" Rom. 2:1, 3. , Imagination may stretch her wings and fancy may fly over the entire domain of sophistry, yet no plausible reason can be presented in favor of building religio-secular schools with the Lord's money which cannot be urged with equal justness in favor of near or about all the innovations which have thus for tended to divide and damage the disciple brotherhood. Moreover, no sound objection can be urged by any logician, nor unsound objection urged by any sophist, against the innovationism, which has thus far damaged and divided the disciple brotherhood, which cannot with equal justness be urged against such schools as we are now considering. Therefore we again say, Woe to the man who attempts to condemn the mentioned innovationism and yet justify the mentioned schools! To such a man we may justly say, If thou being an apos-

toxic disciple thinkest not after the manner of innovationists, why advisest thou that apostolic disciples shall spend the Lord's money as do innovationists? And why endeavorest thou to defend such expenditure of the Lord's money as innovationists make in behalf of their devices by trying to defend things equally unauthorized? '

All religious innovationism among disciples is conceived and brought for, urged and introduced on the presumption that Christians are *not complete in Christ*. This presumption contradicts what the Holy Spirit has declared through the apostle Paul in Col. 2:10, and for that reason is condemnable. But what is the difference between presuming that Christians are not complete in Christ with reference to religious worship, or religious work, or religious education? *None whatever*. Each contradicts the apostle Paul *with positiveness*, and each is *equally condemnable* with the others. The first presumption calls for the organ, and perhaps other instruments of music, bought with the Lord's money, and perhaps some other money. The second calls for missionary societies with numerous auxiliaries supported by the Lord's money, and all else that can be secured. The third calls for religio-secular schools and colleges built by the Lord's money, and perhaps some money that the Lord never claimed. Here then we have human devices as aids in *worship*, and *work*, and *education*. These three devices agree in one—yes in two or three particulars. 1. They all ignore and even contradict Paul's statement, that Christians are complete in Christ! 2. They all presume that Christians are *not* complete in Christ, and that the Holy Spirit omitted something or left something lacking!! 3. They all presume that uninspired men are wise enough to discern what was omitted and supply what

is lacking! ! This Is the consummation of presumption.

There is, however, this difference between the human devices just mentioned: *Religio-secular schools are the oldest and most mischievous*. They began to be established in the second century of the gospel age, and from the first they have been institutions wherein the gospel has been doctrinally corrupted. From the Alexandrian school in Egypt down to the latest established religio-secular institution of learning, they have exerted an influence which has been largely, if not chiefly, in favor of sectism or, innovationism, or both. They have all proved to be and have been proudly, called *alma mater*—benign or nourishing mother—of clergymen, and these have been the fathers and advocates of creeds and sects, divisions and strifes, innovations and hobbies, digressions and perversions. The reformers whom they have nourished have often proved to be *deformers*, rather than restorers, of the New Testament teaching.

He who denies the foregoing statements certainly risks his reputation as a historian and a scripturist. College-ism has led to preacher-ism, and preacher-ism has led to sectism, and sectism means both hobbyism and innovationism, and these taken together have led to religious corruption and confusion. The last result has been that with but few exceptions, sinners have not been converted and saints have not been perfected because the Savior's prayer for the oneness of his followers has, by many professed disciples, been ignored. Moreover, the foundation of Paul's exhortation to oneness is ignored by all religio-secular school builders. That foundation consists of one body or church, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all. But there are some who would have us unite upon at least one order of outside institu-

tions, namely, *'the so-called Bible Schools!* But as there is no authority for them we cannot unite upon them, and thus the introduction of them means discord and division, contention and strife. Those who have favored them, especially those immediately concerned in establishing them, are so sensitive in their behalf that intemperance marks their efforts to defend them when their scripturalness is questioned.

What shall we say then concerning religio-secular institutions of learning built with the Lord's money? In the light of inspired doctrine and uninspired history we are justified in making the following statements concerning them:

1. They are not the outgrowth of observing any precept or example, implication or intimation of the New Testament, and thus they are "not after Christ.

2. They are the outgrowth of following the teaching or example of uninspired men, and thus they are "after the tradition of men" against which Paul forewarns us.

3. They are the outgrowth of adopting what are supposed to be wise conclusions of men, and are thus after human "philosophy," against which Paul likewise warns Christians..

4. As the institutions against which we write are "not after Christ,"but are after "tradition of men,"¹ and human "philosophy," they are by the Holy Spirit; classed with "vain deceit," and "rudiments of the world," and thus are unscriptural.

5. They ignore the fact that Christians are by the apostle Paul declared to be "complete*"in Christ, and for that reason they are unscriptural.

6. Adoption and advocacy of religio-secular schools as church institutions admit the very principle by which near or about all innovations which have dam-

aged and divided the disciples brotherhood have been urged and introduced.

7. The uninspired history of such schools as those under consideration reveals the fact that they have been partly, if not wholly, in opposition to the purity and simplicity of the gospel. "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

8. Humanly ordained characters, institutions, arrangements, especially those that are not in any measure exemplified in the word of God, cannot be regulated by the Word of God. Thus Aaron's calf and the worship rendered it; David's cart and his oxen-drivers; Solomon's standing army and his numerous wives; Jewish circumcision among Gentile Christians; the first theological seminary ever established, and the last religio-secular school which wears the name "Bible School," or "Bible College"—such institutions, and all others of similar character, are outside of God's word, cannot be controlled by his word, and are destined to damage the cause of Christ. Such institutions, considered as trees, have been known by their fruits in the past, are known by their fruit in the present, and will be known by their fruit in the time to come.

The foregoing statements may be otherwise expressed after this manner:

1. Whatever in religion is not the outgrowth of obedience to divine precept, or example, implication or intimation as set forth in the New Testament is not "after Christ."

2. Religio-secular schools established by the Lord's money are not the outgrowth of such obedience.

3. Therefore such schools are "not after Christ."

Again:—

1. Whatever in religion is the outgrowth of following

the precepts or examples of uninspired men is "after the tradition of men."

2. Religio-secular schools, built by the Lord's money, are the outgrowth of such following.

3. Therefore such schools are "after the tradition of men."

Again:—

1. Paul warns Christians against following "after the tradition of men" in religion.

2. Religio-secular schools, established with the Lord's money, are "after the tradition of men religiously.

3. Therefore Paul warns Christians against such schools.

Again:—

1. Paul declared that Christians are "complete" in Christ. "

2. Paul declared this when Christians had no religio-secular schools established with the Lord's money,

3. Therefore such schools are not necessary in order' to completeness in Christ.

Again;—

1. All innovationism upon the work, as well as the worship, of the churches of Christ is advocated upon the supposition that Christians are not "complete" in Christ.

2. Religio-secular schools established with the Lord's money are advocated upon that same supposition. 3. Therefore such schools are a species of innovationism.

Again:—

1. Every tree which brings forth evil fruit is thereby known to be an evil tree.

2. Religio secular schools, established with the

Lord's money, or money which should have been regarded as the Lord.'s, have a history of evil fruit when viewed in the light of the gospel,

3. Therefore such schools are evil trees, when viewed in the light of the gospel.

Again:—

1. That is certainly an evil tree whose defense inspires its chief advocate to charge against a Christian of good behavior that "the most charitable view any one can take of his conduct is that he is possessed of a disordered mind."

2. The chief advocate of a certain tree, in form of a recently established religio-secular, college, was inspired by the defense of such an institution to make such a charge against such a Christian.

3. Therefore the mentioned school is an evil tree

Again:—

1. That is an evil tree whose defense requires its chief advocate to become discourteous, ungentlemanly, 1 unjust, and indiscriminating in trying to defend it.

2. A certain tree, in the form of a recently established religio-secular institution call "Bible College" has required such misconduct of its chief advocate in order to make a show of defense in its behalf.

3. Therefore the mentioned college is an evil tree.

CHAPTER IV.

But some man will say, "What shall we do with our young people who wish to become educated? Shall we commit them to irreligious schools where some of the vile and abominable are found?" If we consider such questions in the light of God's written word they will be easily answered; but if we consider them without regard to that word we shall be confused, and, per-

haps, confounded, "But what saith the Scripture?" An apostle answers thus: "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" 1 John 5:4, 5.

Here the Holy Spirit declares that "our faith" "is the victory that overcometh the world." In another place the same Spirit testifies through another apostle after this manner: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." Gal. 5:6. If further testimony be needed we may refer to the eleventh chapter of the letter to the Hebrews where the overcoming faith, as it existed in ancient worthies, is by divine inspiration mentioned and commended. In the light of such testimony we may inquire, Who that believes the Bible can have any doubt about the power that enables Christians to overcome the world?

But some man will say, "That is all right after we are established in the faith, but how about our children before they become established?" In answer I state, "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." 1 John 5:4. Children too young, to have faith in Christ are too young to send to school away from home. The first faith of children is in their parents or guardians; the next should be in God and Christ. While children are too young to have faith in God and Christ so as to control them in their conduct they need to be kept from evil by faith in parents or guardians. What is lacking in religious faith is often supplied by faith in parents called *filial faith*. "My father told me not to do this," and "my mother told me not to do this"—*these* are statements which are sometimes heard from children of tender age. What the

Savior approves, and what he does not approve, should be impressed on the minds of children at the earliest possible age by faithful parents or guardians. In proportion as this is done *it* may be said to each one in after years as Paul wrote to Timothy,— "From a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim. 3:15.

It needs only to be stated in order to be understood, that mankind need an *internal brace*. That good surroundings in early life may contribute, "in many instances, to establishing such a brace may be admitted. But a pure home is not a guarantee against a corrupt life. Even where children have been educated in a pure home they often go astray in later years. There is no combination of favorable outward circumstances which fully assures parents that their children will not become partakers of vice and even of crime. But the conviction produced in Hagar's mind when she said, "Thou God seest me" (Gen. 16:13), this conviction is of more value than all the favorable surroundings which can be arranged about any and all classes and conditions of mankind. Belief in God and Christ, acquaintance with the divine attributes conviction of personal responsibility to God—*these* constitute the *internal brace* which is beyond comparison with all favorable surroundings which tongue or pen can describe. Without this internal brace mankind of all ages are but the creatures of circumstances. Except when possessed of the impulses of ambition, pride, or animal courage, mankind are all weaklings when destitute of the overcoming faith. Even when possessed of such impulses mankind are still weaklings, for when disappointment comes upon them they are liable to fall into the depths of degradation if they lack the faith

that overcomes. This being true the energies of all parents who wish their children well should be bent in the direction of producing in them the faith "that overcometh the world." Such faith produced, and kept bright and clear, is the only guarantee against being corrupted by the world.

But some man will say, "May not some good be done by surrounding children both at home and while in , school with favorable circumstances? Yes, but woe to that man who"robs the Lord's treasury, or withholds from that treasury by refusing to give as the Lord has prospered him, in order to fence the devil off. It is like the plan of robbing a church treasury to pay a pastor to keep the devil off the church," as I once heard a brother say. The pastor can't accomplish that important end, except as he succeeds in using the divine world so as to produce the faith that overcomes the; world. "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." James 4:7. This is the doctrine. But this *resisting*. is an individual matter, and it must be done by reason of personal faith in God and Christ.

Now hear the apostle Paul. "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators: yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world." 1 Cor 5:9, 10. This, statement shows how numerous were vile characters in Paul's day on earth, and who will say that they are not equally numerous now? What then? There is nothing left to depend on except the faith which overcomes the world.

But this is not all. Just as soon as a school is established in which are offered special advantages in regard to moral and religious training many parents, who have wayward children whom they have failed to con-

trol at home think that in such school is their hope. As a result the school in which best moral and religious inducements are offered is liable to be crowded with toughs, and these will likely corrupt the purest lives in the school. Such toughs will sometimes make a profession of religion, and a show of extreme piety, in order to divert attention from their former life, and gain such confidence, as will enable them to go on with their Satanic work. Even the word *Bible* inscribed on a school or college building is no guarantee against the devil's work. He can't be fenced off in that way.

In order for mankind, whether young or old, to have the overcoming faith they must be led to *think for themselves*. And mankind are so constituted that the outworking of evil, in many instances, will cause more serious thinking than the outworking of good. Has total abstinence from tobacco on the part of fathers tended more to keep sons from using tobacco than has filthy indulgence in its use? Will the example of one excellent temperance man have more influence for sobriety in a community than the example of a vile drunkard? These questions present curious problems for the moralist, and especially for the Christian. Does the outworking of good when fairly presented have more influence for good than does the outworking of evil when fairly presented? 'Does the one *attract* more than the other *fore warns*? We may not be able to decide these questions by our own observation and experience. But here is evidence on which we can rely: *The Bible is about one-half devoted to setting forth, what is good, and the other half is devoted to setting forth what is evil*. In harmony with this fact Paul declared that inspired scripture is profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction. The doctrine and instruction are *affirmative* and refer to that which is *good*, while

the reproof and correction are *negative* and refer to what is *evil*. In harmony with this Paul enjoined upon Timothy to preach the word, reprove, rebuke, exhort. The first and last; of these requirements are affirmative and refer to what is good, while the second and third of them are negative and refer to what is evil. Had God proposed to fence us in with good, and fence off all evil, he certainly would not have devoted about one-half of his book to a record of evil. Therefore, in view of the kind of book that *God* has given us there is but one conclusion that is reasonable, and this conclusion is unavoidable, namely, *God intended that mankind should be exposed to evil, but should have the victor through the faith that overcomes*. In harmony with this conclusion is the fact that God suffered our first parents to be tempted in the garden of Eden, and subjected them to temptation on the outside of the garden. Before the flood and after the flood, during the patriarchal age and the Jewish age, through Christ's personal ministry and under the fulness of the gospel dispensation—in all ages mankind have by divine arrangement, been subjected to trials and temptations. The Bible informs us that those whom God intended for the highest and most responsible positions he subjected to the severest trials. This is evident from the records given of Abraham and David in the Old Testament, and of Paul in the New Testament. According to Rev. 12th chapter even angels were subjected to trial, and by reading the gospel records we learn that the Savior was not exempt from trial. The Father did not fence his Son around nor send an escort of angels to keep the devil off. On the contrary, he subjected his only begotten and well beloved Son to trials and sufferings of the severest kind, in order to prepare him for the exalted position "which he now occupies as our great High Priest. "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." "For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor [help] them that are tempted." Heb. 2:10, 18.

In the light of such testimony as that just presented it is evident that the conduct of good men and women who have withheld from the Lord's treasury money which should have been placed there, and then have used that money to build a school or college intended to be so sanctified as to keep the devil from having a chance at young men and women while securing a secular education, *is unscriptural in every particular.*

But some man will, perhaps, say, "Well, according to the doctrine just set forth we ought to thrust our children out into the very worst society and the sooner the better." Paul dealt with some of that man's class, in Romans 3rd chapter. He said that they slanderously reported him as saying, "Let us do evil that good may come," and he said of them, "whose damnation is just" That is all that I need to say concerning that class of reasoners. Those who constitute that class will say anything, even that which is false and malicious, in order to make one who exposes their errors appear ridiculous. Paul says that their "damnation is just," and I am satisfied with his sentence. Our children will all be exposed to temptation soon enough in the ordinary course of events, so that we need not make special efforts to expose them. At the same time let us not rob the Lord's treasury, and thereby endanger our own salvation, in order to shield our children from that which God has ordained as necessary in order to show devotion to God and Christ.

by divine arrangement all angels and mankind, likewise Christ and his followers, have been subjected to temptation, and the divine purpose in such an arrangement is clearly revealed. Whoever attempts to improve on that arrangement is guilty of presumption, and in the end will make a failure.

"For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." Gal. 5:6. On the same principle it is true that in Christ Jesus neither favorable surroundings nor surroundings that are unfavorable avail anything, "but faith which worketh by love." Those in whom that faith exists in a whole-hearted degree can be trusted anywhere, and those in whom it does not exist can be trusted nowhere. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews tells what faith accomplished in ancient believers, and the book of martyrs for Christ's divinity and headship of the church tells what faith has accomplished under the gospel reign. Faith enables those possessed thereof to walk with God and Christ, to resist the devil, to overcome all evil. If the one possessed of the faith which works by love thinks that he needs books besides the Bible he secures them, and then studies them with the best results. The most learned man that I know never graduated at any college, and, so far as I know, never attended a graded school. But as a man of faith he secured books and studied them. As a result he became extensively and accurately learned, and, in the strength of his manhood, could, probably, have detected and corrected errors in the English of the professors in all colleges where English is taught. For it is shamefully true that even presidents of colleges in the United States, and perhaps elsewhere, are often, if not always, ignorant of the constructive philosophy of the language

which they speak. But faith—the faith which works by love—whole-hearted faith in God and Christ, inspires those possessed thereof to become learned in secular things just in proportion as they need to be learned in them. All that is of value in human learning which can be communicated has generally, if not always, been committed to books which may be secured and studied by the child of faith. Moreover the child of faith, as a lone student, feeling his responsibility to God and Christ, can study undisturbed by the spirit of rivalry, envy, jealousy, hatred, so frequently developed in schools, to say nothing of ill health and shortened life resulting from ambition to excel in schools. "And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." 1 John 5:4, , Before leaving this subject I wish to write it down as my deliberate conviction that the crowded, hurried school and college life in America is unfavorable to both physical and mental health and development. Such life tends to stir "emulation" or rivalry, but this is a work of the flesh and will rule those possessed thereof out of the kingdom of God. (Gal. 5:19-21.) ,That a knowledge—a sort of knowledge—an imperfect knowledge—of languages and sciences may be rapidly obtained in a hurried college course may be admitted, but it is generally obtained at the expense of physical health, and mental individuality, to say nothing of moral character and religious convictions. Under the influence of ambition and rivalry young people of religious profession not unfrequently besmirch their consciences by what is commonly called "cheating." Those who are not professors of religion become acquainted with this and their estimate of religion is thereby lowered. Thus it is in modern school life generally, even as it is in army life. *Anything to keep up appearances*

and get through, this is often, if not generally, the motto of crowded students as well as of crowded soldiers. Moral lectures and even Bible lessons to the contrary of this have but little effect on wearied brains, especially when not possessed *of* the overcoming faith.

One fact more should be mentioned. In a certain professedly sanctified institution of learning a certain book on "The Authorship of Deuteronomy" is being studied by a class. The writer or compiler of that book may be justly called *a prince among compromisers of the gospel*. Being an educator he has, probably, done more to send forth compromising preachers than any other man who has professed to be a disciple of Christ. Now, then, what will be the natural result of using such a book in the mentioned institution? It cannot be otherwise than that in proportion as young men are led to confide in its author they will be led to imitate him. And herein lies a curse of collegiate life: *Before young people are possessed of the overcoming faith, or are developed in regard to individuality, they are crowded with the worlds of uninspired men*. As a result their confidence in the Bible is divided and compromised, if not shaken and shattered. Confidence in God and Christ is supplanted by confidence in men. Students at college are generally so much crowded that they study text books as fawning sycophants, and not as independent thinkers. As a result their individuality is dwarfed and their admiration for learned authors is developed. The Germans are right when they say, "Man is what he eats," and Paul is right when he says, "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap."

In conclusion I state that nothing which I have said on this subject is intended to have reference to secular colleges for secular purposes. Medical, Dental, and other scientific colleges are important to accomplish certain scientific ends. But what I have , written, on this subject is intended to be solely and strictly against disciples of Christ using the Lord's money to establish religio-secular schools and colleges, and thus to engage in uniting the church and the world by means of such institutions.

CONCERNING THE UNSCRIPTURALNESS OF APPLYING SACRED NAMES TO THINGS OF HUMAN ORIGIN.

CHAPTER V

For whatsoever things were written afore time were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope. Rom. 15:4. "And the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die: it shall be a statute forever throughout your generations: and that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean." Lev. 10:8-10. "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and the profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my sabbaths, and I am profaned among them. Therefore have I poured out mine indignation upon them; I have consumed them with the fire of my wrath: their own way have I recompensed upon their heads, saith the Lord." Ezek. 22:26, 31.

These several scriptures taken together set forth the following facts: 1. The Old Testament was written for our learning. 2. The Jewish priests were required to put difference between the holy and the profane, the unclean and the clean. 3. In course of time the Jewish priests failed to do as God required, but profaned God's holy things, and, for that reason, with others, God poured out upon the Jews his indignation. Then by referring to Lev. 22: 14, 15 we may learn that if the

holy food which was to be eaten by priests was at anytime eaten by any one else than a priest, or one of the priestly family, such food was thereby profaned. Finally, by reading Matt. 12:5 in connection with Num. 28; 9, 10, we may learn that even a technical violation, of the sacredness of the Sabbath was called *profaning* the Sabbath. When all this, which has just been presented, is scripturally considered, we can not be otherwise impressed than that Christians—the New Testament priesthood—should be very careful not to misuse anything that is holy or sacred by applying it to anything that is of human origin.

For whatsoever things were written afore time were written for our learning." , Rom. 15:4. "And It shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi [my husband]; and shalt call me no more Baal [my Lord], For I will take away the names of Baalim [the plural of Baal] out of your mouth." Hosea 2:16,17.

As the name Baal means lord it was justly applied to God, and it seems that God did not object to, it except by reason of its association with a heathen God. But because of such association he proposed to take it out of the mouth of his people. This shows that God's regard for names is such that he requires not only that a name shall be *right in itself*, but that it shall be of right *association* in order to be acceptable to him. He requires *right* names, *rightly* applied, and of *right* association.

"Whatsoever things were written afore time; were written for our learning." Rom. 15:4. "I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy loving kindness and for thy truth: for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." Ps. 138:2; From this we learn that which should cause Christians; to tremble at the thought of applying a sacred name

found in the word of God, to anything of human origin. The name of God is the, highest name in the universe.. In Deut. 28:58 we learn that to the Jews his name was spoken of as "this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD," Yet David, who testified, saying, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue" (2 Sam, 23:2), plainly said of God, "THOU HAST MAGNIFIED THY WORD ABOVE ALL THY NAME." In the light of such scripture, which Paul declares was "written for our learning," certainly nothing less than the grossest ignorance or, irreverence, or both, will permit any one to apply a sacred name—a name peculiar to the word of God—to anything of human origin. "Whatsoever things were written afore time were written for our learning," Rom. 15:4. "He sent redemption unto his people he hath commanded his covenant forever: holy and reverend is his name." Ps. 111:9. Here we find the words "holy" and "reverend" applied to the name of God,;, In the New, Testament we learn that Christians are called "holy brethren, ", and a "holy nation," (Heb. 8:1; 1 Pet. 2:9). But we do not find in the New Testament the words "holy" and "reverend" applied to any, humanly given names, nor to human beings as such. This side of the New Testament, however we find those words applied to the Pope of Rome, and the word "reverend" has been "adopted by multitudes of preachers who have followed the Pope's example. Apostolic disciples have always refused to follow that example, regarding it as irreverent and presumptuous. But if it be irreverent and presumptuous to apply the sacred name "reverend" to a being that was created in the image of God, and claims to be renewed in the image of Christ, what must it be to apply the words *Bible* or *gospel*, or apply:

the way, as used in Matt. 7:14, to an enterprise, or a thing wholly of human origin? Does some one say, The word "reverend" is applied to the name of God, while these other words are not, and that makes a difference? If so we say to that one in the language of David, "THOU HAST MAGNIFIED THY WORD, ABOVE ALL THY NAME." If this language of David concerning , God is not the end of controversy, on this phase of the subject before us, then divine testimony is of no value.

But some man will say that the word *Bible* is from the Greek *biblos*, which simply means *book*, and was never by any inspired writer applied to the entire collection of sacred writings, but that such application of the word *biblos* is wholly of human origin.

Let us examine this with care. Christ is called "The "Word," and "The Word of God." John 1:1, 14; Rev. 19:13 Christ said, "He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken the same shall judge him in the last day." John 12:48. Paul said, "Whatsoever things were written afore time were written for our learning." Rom. 15:4. Again: "These things happened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition." 1 Cor. 10:11. We also read, "For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law, and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." Rom. 2:12.

By the foregoing scriptures we learn "the following divinely stated facts: 1. Christ is called the Word of God. 2. Those to whom the words of Christ, have come or shall come will be finally judged by his words. 3. The words of Christ, and thus the New Testament, taken in the light of the Old Testament, will be the standard by which those will be judged who will have had access to both the New Testament and the Old. 4.

The Old Testament will be the standard by which those will be finally judged to whom it was specially given,, and who lived and died while it was in force.

Now in the light of what has just been submitted let us consider Rev. 20:12. "And I saw the dead small and great stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." Here we find the Greek word *biblos* twice used in a form of the plural of that word and applied by the apostle John to those books out of which, or by which, *the dead will be finally judged*, and those books we previously learned consist of *both the Old Testament and the New*. What now becomes of the assertion that *no inspired man ever applied the word biblos to the entire sacred writings*, and that such application of the word *Bible* is *wholly of human origin*? Like all else that is said against the truth, *it is strictly false*. Yet such an assertion seems to be the Gibraltar of defense behind which those endeavor to shelter themselves who apply the word *Bible* to things of human origin. But, as we have seen, it is a deceptive and thus an "insecure shelter.

Still some man may say that in Acts 19:19 Luke applied the Greek word *biblos* in the plural form to bad books. In answer we state that this is true. But as people are known by the company, that they keep so words are known by the connection in which they are found. The books mentioned in that connection were doubtless books of "curious arts." The word *biblos* not in itself more sacred than the word *baptismos*, yet the connection in which each word is found determines its sacredness, and we have learned that the word *biblos* is divinely applied in Rev. 20:12 to the entire.

sacred writings, by which those to whom they have come, and finally will have come, shall be judged in the last great day. Last of all it is true that those to whom the sacred writings have come, have, by unanimous consent, designated them by the word *Bible*. Thus we find that the word *Bible* is a sacred word, that is, it is sacred in both *divine* and *human* application

What shall we say then of those who have applied the word *Bible* to religio-secular institutions of learning? Certainly we do them no in justice when we make the following statements:

1. They have failed to learn what is written in the Old Testament on the subject of putting difference between the holy and the unholy, the sacred and the profane, or secular.

2. They have failed to learn that the Holy Spirit said through an Old Testament writer that God had magnified his word above his name.

3. They have adopted a principle which will prevent them from consistently rejecting the title "reverend" for preachers, or any other sacred title which the apostasy has applied to men.

4. The application of sacred names to things of human origin, and as proper names by which to designate them, can only have a show of defense by such false reasoning as is commonly called "special pleading" and which dishonors both the head and heart of any professed Christian by whom it is adopted

5. Those who have applied the word *Bible* to institutions of learning that are chiefly secular should answer this question: In thus applying the word Bible did they use it in the sense of the "books" mentioned in Acts 19:19, or in the sense of the books "mentioned in Rev. 20:12 But they will not answer this question.

It exposes their false reasoning. So it should be answered for them. They *did not* apply the word *Bible* to their human institutions in the sense of *bad bibles* or *bad books* mentioned in Acts 19:19. Than they, *must* have used that word in the sense of Rev. 20:12. But in that sense it is applied to all the sacred writings. This leaves them no escape from the charge of having applied a sacred name to a thing of human origin. What is worse, they have applied the sacred name *Bible* to a thing of human origin which is *chiefly secular*. If this be not *misusing* a sacred name, *making light* of a sacred name, and *falsifying* in so doing, then what is it or what should such use of a sacred name be called?

CHAPTER VI.

"For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it" Isa. 28:20, Thus an Old Testament prophet was instructed to write concerning a certain false confidence of ancient Israel, and thus we may write concerning the false reasoning of certain men connected with modern Israel. On no subject is such reasoning more certainly insecure and insufficient than in regard to applying sacred names to, things of human origin.

"Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit 'sacrilege?'" Rom. 2:22. But what does the word "sacrilege" mean? The Greek word translated "commit sacrilege" literally means "to despoil temples," and in Acts 19:37 one form of that word is translated "robbers of churches" in the Common Version of the Sacred Text. The word therefore means to misuse, or make light of sacred things, and consequently; means a desecration of sacred things, as when Belshaz-

zar used sacred vessels for drinking wine. (Dan. 5th chapter,) This being understood we now inquire, What is it but sacrilege to apply the name *Bible*, which is of sacred application and association, to a religio-secular institution of learning wherein probably three-fourths of the time is given to that which is strictly secular? If such application of that name be not making light of a sacred word—misusing that word—desecrating that word—then what would or could be? In other words, if the word *Bible* may be applied to an institution which is *chiefly* secular, then why not apply it to institutions *wholly* secular? If the word *Bible* may be used to represent what is *much*, secular why can it not be used to represent what is *more* secular? If one lesson a day in the *Bible* in an institution of learning makes it a "Bible School" or a "Bible College," then why will not one lesson a week in the Bible have the same effect? In answer to such question no response can be made, except what is strictly arbitrary, or the result of perverseness. Divine revelation, the right use of reason, and the proper exercise of moral sentiments will each fail in every effort at response to the foregoing inquiries. But subterfuge, fallacy, the cuttle-fish policy—these must be the resort of those who would make a show of defense for having applied the word *Bible* to an institution chiefly secular.

As an illustration of false reasoning in behalf of such misuse of the Bible as that which we are now considering we mention again the reference previously made to Acts 19:19. It may be supposed by some that because Luke applied the Greek word *biblos*, from which we have the word *Bible*, to *bad books*, therefore the name *Bible* is not a sacred name, and may be justly applied to an institution of human origin. In opposition to this we have stated that "sacred application and association" determine

the sacredness of names. Besides, we inquired whether the word *Bible*, when applied to a school or college by certain brethren, was used in the sense of Acts 19:19 where it is applied to *bad books*, or in the sense of Rev. 20:12 where it is applied to *all the Sacred Writings*? To this question there are but two possible answers, either of which will prove fatal. To say that the word *Bible when* applied to a school or college was used in the sense of *bad books* would be at once false and absurd. To say that it was used when applied to a school or college in the sense of *all the Sacred Writings* exposes the fallacy of referring to Acts 19:19. Even if the word *biblos* in the Greek Testament were used a thousand times with reference ; to bad books, yet if those who applied the word *Bible* to a school or college *did not then and there use ,it in that sense*, then it is nothing less than subterfuge, fallacy, sophistry, or cuttle-fish policy to refer to Acts 19:19, and such reasoning is dishonorable man ordinary"man, to say nothing of a professed Christian.

"Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?" Thou that abhorrest misusing the name "Reverend," dost thou misuse the word *Bible*? Thou that refuseth a title applied to God or Christ in the Sacred Text, dost thou, apply a title applied to the entire Sacred Text to an institution that is chiefly secular? "Thou that sayest that men should not misuse sacred names, dost thou misuse a sacred name? Thou that sayest that a man should be honorable, doest thou use sophistry?

"But be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon earth: for one is your Father, who is in heaven." Matt. 23:8,9. The words "master "and "father" are both applied in scripture in a secular, or

an earthward, sense, yet in a spiritual sense they become *sacred by association*. The same is true of the word Bible, Call no man *matter*, and call no man *father*, in a spiritual sense, is a command, and when extended in its scriptural bearings it forbids that we should call any human being *Reverend*, and that we should call any Human institution *Bible*. If this be not admitted then a special prohibition may be demanded in order to rule out every special evil, and if the prohibition be not given then the evil may be supposed to be hot designated, and thus not proved to be an evil. Such has been the position of innovators upon the truth in all ages. They say—*What is not forbidden as wrong is to be tolerated as right*. This is the position which must be assumed by those who apply the word *Bible* to institutions of learning that are chiefly secular, or they must confess that such application of the name *Bible* is wrong.

But this is not all. If a sacred name may be justly applied to a thing of human origin, then is the relationship between things and names abolished, and a *name* of human origin may be justly applied to a sacred *thing*. In other words, if the word *Bible* may be applied to a *religio-secular school*, then the name *Paul* may be applied to *the church of God*. If not, *why not*, except that it is forbidden? Again, if the word Bible, without modification, may be justly applied to that which is only one-fourth *biblical* then the word *Christian* may be justly applied, without modification, to that which is only one-fourth *Christian*. Moreover, if the spending of one-fourth of the time of pupils in a school with the Bible makes it a *Bible* school, then the spending of one-fourth of the time of pupils in studying Greek would make it a *Greek* school. On the same principle we could have a school named from any other study on

which pupils might spend one-fourth of their But if the chief or leading characteristics of a school be not those which should determine its name, then the relationship between *a characteristic name* and *the thing which it characterizes* is ignored. But this/is neither more nor less than to ignore that important, heaven-born something called TRUTH. When truth is defined—correctly defined—it must be declared to be the exact relation between the *sign* and the thing *signified*, whether that sign be a *word*, a *phrase*, a *clause*, or a *sentence*. But no one will be bold enough to say that the names "Bible School" and; "Bible College" express the exact relation of those names to that which they signify when applied to institutions of learning which are three fourths secular!! Thus to apply the word *Bible* to religio-secular institutions of learning is not only *Sacrilegious*, but it is a *violation of truth !!!*

But some man may say that the catalogue of such schools clearly mentions the several courses of secular study therein set forth, and thus there is nothing misleading about the name. In answer to this we state that should I receive a catalogue titled "Nashville Commercial School," or "Potter Business College," and ; then should find upon examination that three-fourths of the courses of study required would *be strictly Biblical*, or at least *religions*, what would be my conclusion? *Misnomer!* I would exclaim. I would pronounce it a *misnamed institution* Who could blame me? Besides, if I were disposed to be severely just I might say something about the intelligence and honesty of educators who would send out a catalogue which carries a considerable contradiction between its *title* and its contents. But even such titles for such catalogues would be susceptible of a better explanation than those that we are now considering. For the

teachers in a commercial school, three-fourths Biblical, could quote in their favor. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge," and again, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Prov. 1:7; Ps. 111:10. But no such quotations could be made in favor of the secular departments of a so-called "Bible School." There is no scripture which says, The study of Greek, Latin and Mathematics is the beginning of religion!

"Hearken Sinners! I have a book which every sporting man should read. Two hundred and sixty-eight pages chuck full of good things and no nonsense. Send 50cts to the Rover Publishing Co., and get the book by return mail."

The foregoing was an advertisement purporting to have appeared at intervals in certain city papers. Its author would send to all who ordered the book a small copy of the New Testament! No one will say that his advertisement was not *strictly true*, yet everyone will say that it was a *falsehood* because it was misleading. The New Testament is a book "which every sporting man should read," and it is "full of good things and no nonsense," Thus the advertisement and the book advertized were in perfect harmony. Still, as it implied that it was specially for "sporting men," it was misleading—*intentionally* misleading. Of course, if assailed on this point, the author of the mentioned advertisement could plead that Christ said, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Matt. 9:13. But even such a plea could not be made in favor of the evident lack of truth that there is in calling a religio-secular school a "Bible School" or a "Bible College." What shall we say then concerning those who have

applied the *word Bible* to religio-secular institutions which are about three-fourths secular and one-fourth religious? We may safely make these statements:

1. They have misuse the name Bible so as to be guilty of a species of sacrilege.
2. They have misnamed their religio-secular institutions so seriously that they have violated truth.
3. They have admitted a wrong principle which makes it inconsistent for them to reject the title
“Reverend ”for the names of preachers, or to reject the misuse of any other sacred title.
4. They can only make a show of defense of their misuse of the word *Bible* by such reasoning as will dishonor their profession as Christians.
5. Impulsive, passionate, unscriptural reasoning, are accompanied by flagrant and false personal charges seem to be the chief reliance of those who have thus far tried to defend the application of sacred titles to human institutions.

CHAPTER VII.

"I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." Isa. 42:8."Thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." Psa. 138:2. Let the foregoing statements of the Old Testament, which were written for our learning, be reverently considered, and then we must conclude that when those statements were made God was certainly jealous for his *name* and for his *word*. This conclusion is justified by the following directions and precautions which were given to the Jews: "Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, test it be for a snare in the midst of thee. But ye shall

destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves. For thou shalt worship no other God: for the Lord whose name is jealous is a jealous God." Ex. 34:12-14. But the Israelites, afterwards called Jews, disregarded the precautions which God gave them on this subject. One of their Kings married many strange women, who turned his heart away from God. Then the kingdom was divided, into two kingdoms or houses of Israel. Finally both of those kingdoms, at different periods, went into captivity, one to remain about two hundred years, and the other to remain seventy years. Their entire history was written for our learning and shall we refuse to learn "thereby, that God is jealous for his *name also* for his *word* which he has *magnified above his name*?

But some man may say, "I can't *see any harm* in calling a school where the Bible, is in any measure taught, by the name "BIBLE SCHOOL. " In answer we state that some people say that they cannot see *any harm* in sprinkling water on an infant, nor in asking, 'adults to bow at a mourner's bench. But we tell them that those who would serve God acceptably must "walk by faith, not by sight," 2 Cor. 5:7. Next we tell them that doing the divine will is not a question of *how* things *appear to us*, especially while ignorant of God's word on the question involved, but "what saith the scripture"? If there be no harm in calling a man *an honest man* who is three-fourths of his time *dishonest*, and no harm in calling a man a *sober man* who is three-fourths of his time *drunk*, and no harm in calling that a *wheat* farm which is three-fourths covered with a crop *at yellow corn*, and no harm in calling that a *dry goods store* while three-fourths of its business consists in selling *whiskey and beer*, then is it no harm from the viewpoint of truth, in calling that a *Bible School* or *Bible College* which is

three-fourths devoted *to secular learning!* But, as we have previously learned, the untruthfulness and consequent unjustness of such names for such schools do not constitute the only viewpoints from which the so-called "Bible School" and "Bible College" should be considered. But the application of the , word *Bible* to such' schools is a *misuse of a sacred name*, which involves a *principle* that opens the flood-gate for nearly all manner of looseness and irreverence in the use of sacred titles. The extreme to which Rome and her daughters have gone must then be admitted, A man may then call himself "reverend," "ambassador," "witness," "apostle," or by any other name which describes only one-fourth, or even one-tenth of his real character. But the assumption of high titles is one of the marks of the apostasy, and shall apostolic disciples pursue a course which will give them one of those marks?

"Bible things should be called by Bible names." This was one of the wise sayings adopted early in the 19th century by those who endeavored to restore the New Testament order of things. That saying implies that things not strictly Bible things, should not be called by Bible names. This is the suggestion of common sense; it is the demand of common honesty; it is a requirement of truth; and *it is the teaching of God's word.*

What shall we say then of those who have applied the word *Bible* or the word *gospel* to an enterprise of human origin, and which is largely devoted to secular things? They have gone contrary to common sense, common honesty, common truth, and the Bible, Common sense suggests that all things be named according to their characteristics, common honesty demands it, common truth requires it, and the Bible commands it, saying, "Wherefore, putting away lying, speak every man

truth with his neighbor"; and again, "Lie not one to another seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds." Eph. 4:25; Col. 3:9.

But suppose that some man would call an enterprise of human origin "The Way," and refer to Matt. 7:14 as divine authority for so doing. He might as well call his enterprise "The Gospel of Christ" and refer to Rom. 1:16 as divine authority for so doing, or he might call it "The Resurrection and The Life" and refer to John 11:25 for authority, or he might upon the same principle call it "The Way, The Truth And The Life" and refer to John 14:6 for authority, or he might as reasonably call his enterprise "The Christ," or "The Son of the Living God" and refer to Matt. 16:16 as authority.

But some man may say that there is no more harm in calling a paper by such a name than there is in writing an article under such a name, and certainly it would be lawful to write on "The Way," "The Gospel of Christ" or under anyone of the other headings just named. In answer we make the following statements:

1. The idea of naming a paper "The Gospel of Christ" should frighten the man who entertains it,

2. The idea of naming a paper "The Christ" or "The Son of the Living God" ought to paralyze the brain that holds it.

3. The name of a paper is a *proper name*. So is the name of a *school or college*. But the heading of an article is a *prepositional phrase* as it always implies a preposition before it. As an illustration take the heading of this series of chapters. We might have written under this heading: "The Unscripturalness of Applying Sacred Names to things of Human Origin." But the word "Concerning" would have been implied. The same is true of all other headings of articles or chapters of a series. Therefore the heading

of an article is a *prepositional phrase* while the name of a periodical is a *proper name*. At the same time the name of a journal is a proper name, and is *intended* to be descriptive of its characteristics or contents. The one who cannot understand this much, or understanding it will not confess it, is outside of the domain of reason. "And what shall I more say? For the time would fail me to tell of all the historians and reformers who have called "the church of God" which consisted of "the churches of Christ" by the name "Christian Church," and of those who have given human names to divine things and divine names to human things. "Young Men's Christian Association" is the name of a popular institution which has a building in many cities. In going through one of those buildings we found a bowling alley and poolroom, a gaming table and other devices which are as widely separated from Christ as darkness is from light.

Nor is this all. Sectarian churches generally like to be called "Christian Churches," and the same is true of all churches which have entered into a defection, from those churches of Christ which are struggling to maintain apostolic simplicity. Truth has been reproached and condemned while error has been commended and advanced by being misnamed. Christ was called "Beelzebub," and Paul was called "babbler" the pope is called "Father" and his priests are called "Reverend," while schools chiefly secular are called by the name "Bible School" and "Bible College." But enterprises of human origin, whether chiefly secular or chiefly religious, are not divine and thus cannot be regulated by the word of God. Such enterprises may be presumptuously named after God's word, but the president of a so-called "Bible College" and the prin-

cipal of a so-called "Bible School" are not, in such capacity, really Bible characters and cannot be controlled by Bible teaching. Even an editor of a paper, whether wholly or only partly religious, seldom remains a Bible character very long. If he be a Christian when he begins he not unfrequently permits the editor to absorb or discard the Christian. Then a passage of scripture, even correctly applied has no more weight with him when he goes wrong than one of Aesop's fables would have. We have had observation on this subject and know whereof we affirm. The editor who remains a Christian will reverence every scripture justly brought to bear against him when he goes wrong, but the one in whom the Christian is engulfed in the editor is both blind and deaf to scripture, which is brought against him. What shall we say then of religious things and characters of human origin? They cannot be controlled by the word of God and are destined to evil. They cannot be corrected, cured, nor saved by inscribing on them Bible names. Sooner or later they will be known by their fruits and will go to their own place. Then the inappropriateness of their Bible names will be known and read of all men. "For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it." Isa. 28:20.

But some man will say, "How about the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW?" In answer we state that it is justified by the example of inspired men writing letters to Christians, and this example is sufficient. Inspired men *wrote* the truth as well as *preached* the truth, and their example is as strong for Christians to *write* the truth to their fellow mortals as it is for us to *preach* the truth to them. Inspired men preached inspired sermons and wrote inspired dissertations and letters.

If the fact of their *preaching* is an example for us to follow so is the fact of their *writing* an example for us to follow. Then as the OCTOGRAPHIC REVIEW is a private, personal enterprise it cannot be justly classed with public institutions, especially with those that are partly secular, or with those on which a sacred name has been unscripturally inscribed as their proper title, The name OCTOGRAPHIC is *scriptural* because in harmony with scripture—every scripture which enjoins, truth—but it is not a *scripture* name because it is not found in scripture,

But some man may ask, Did you not for a time publish a journal which you called *The Helper*, and is not that a scripture name? In answer we state that near or about a dozen years ago we published twelve lectures, and called the magazine in which they were sent forth—"The Helper." We intended the name "Helper" to be used in the ordinary sense of *lending aid* or *rendering assistance*, and thus referred to no scripture as designating its meaning. If we had referred to Heb. 13:6, which says, "The Lord is my helper," then we would have shown that we meant the name of our magazine to be used in the sense that the Lord is spoken of as our "helper." But in the absence of such a reference it seems to us both common sense and common honesty would require that no one should charge us with having intended that our magazine should have a Bible name, nor charge us with giving it a Bible name. But when an editor calls his paper "The Way" and quotes what is said in Matt. 7:13,14 of the narrow gate and narrow way to indicate the sense in which he intends that the name of his paper shall be regarded, then both common sense and common honesty *demand* that he should be held responsible for giving his human enterprise a Bible name. Moreover, it needs only to

be stated that such an editor has made a *misuse* and a *misapplication* of a Bible name. The word "way" in Matt. 7:14 refers to *the way of life* or *the gospel*, and in John 14:6 the Savior said of himself, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." This shows that Christ, who is the gospel in person, calls himself *the way*. In the light of all this we have stated, and now repeat, that to use the words "The Way" as a name for a human enterprise is *misusing* or *making light of*, what is sacred and that is *sacrilege*. This may be *denied*, but it will not *remain denied*.

CHAPTER VIII.

In this chapter I wish to set forth and expose the rationalism which underlies all human institutionism in religion.

Atheism means no-God-ism. The word *atheist* comes to us from the Greek language and is generally applied to one who does not believe that there is any being who created this world and who thereby deserves to be called God. Atheists say that it is contrary to their reason, or *rational minds*, to believe in such a being, and on that account they deny his existence. Therefore *atheism* is the deepest or intense degree of rationalism.

Deism means one-God-ism. The word *deist* comes to us from the Latin language and is commonly applied to one who believes that there is a being worthy of the name God in the high sense of Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor. But the deist denies revealed religion, and, therefore, rejects the divinity of Christ. He discards the Bible, and pretends to believe that *reason*, or man's *rational mind* is a sufficient guide. This is a modified or second degree of rationalism.

But there is another degree of rationalism which is known simply by the name *rationalism*. The word rationalist comes to us from the Latin language, and is usually applied to one who professes to bring everything in religion to reason as the highest standard by which mankind can measure. Atheists and deists profess to do this, but they are definite in their unbelief, and constitute definite classes of unbelievers. This is not true of those commonly called *rationalists*. They are indefinite, unpronounced, unclassified. They are too unprincipled to adopt either atheism or deism, as these isms are unpopular. On the contrary, they profess to believe in God, and in Christ as God's Son, in a modified sense, and to accept the Bible, but they reject the records therein given of miracles. They say that they will not "stultify" their reason and therefore cannot accept miracles. They profess to think that miracles are contrary to reason, and say that, therefore, they will not accept them.

Non-essentialism is another degree of rationalism. The word *non-essentialist* may be justly applied to those religionists who profess to believe the whole Bible, but do not regard certain requirements of the New Covenant scriptures as essential to the salvation of a sinner or to the perfection of a Christian. For instance, they profess to think that water baptism is not necessary to bring the alien sinner into the church of Christ, and that the weekly observance of the Lord's supper is not necessary for the perfection of those who are already in the church. When censured for their non-essential ideas on these subjects they generally say that they "can't *see* how outward ordinances could have anything to do with saving the soul." If told that "we walk by faith, and *not* by sight" they generally answer that, they mean *mental vision* when they say that they "can-

not see how outward ordinances can be necessary to the soul's salvation." Such answers show that such religionists are only another class of *rationalists*. Because it does not seem *reasonable* or *rational* to them that salvation from sin should depend on observance of ordinances, or commands which require outward obedience, they reject the doctrine which so teaches as untrue. This is the very principle of reasoning that is adopted by those commonly called rationalists. It is likewise the principle adopted by those who are called Deists, and those called Atheists. They all profess to accept what is in harmony with their reason, or rational powers, and to reject such things as are contrary to those powers.

Expedientism is a word which expresses what may be called the fifth degree of rationalism. The New Testament in two places makes mention of things "expedient," but in both places the word "expedient" is used to *exclude* and not to *include*. It is also used in a more limited sense in both places, than the word "lawful" is used. In 1 Cor. 6:12 Paul said, "All things are lawful unto me; but all things are not expedient." Then in 1 Cor. 10:23 he said, "All things are lawful for me, but all things edify not." In both of these passages Paul referred to the lawfulness of eating meats which had been offered to idols, and he taught that such eating was not "expedient" when it was offensive to others. But very few religious people have considered this restricted and exclusive use of the word "expedient" as found in the New Testament. As a result they have very indefinite ideas of the doctrine of expediency. What is worse, they have a very *erroneous* idea of that doctrine. It is not only erroneous in that it is *contrary* to the truth on the subject, but it *contradicts* the truth. It is the *very opposite* of the truth in the case. With

Paul the word "expedient" *excluded* things that were "lawful," or permitted by the law of Christ, as "meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them that believe and know the truth." 1 Tim. 4:3. But with a majority of religious people the word "expedient" is used to *include* things which God did not create, and which Christ did not adopt, but which are wholly on the outside of the New Testament worship and work. Under this heading musical instruments, church choirs, and individual communion. cups are found in connection with the worship of many, while, as aids in church work, societies of many kinds, devices of many kinds for raising money, educational institutions of many kinds, and entertaining amusements of many kinds, may be found. When those who advocate such things are censured for so doing they plead that they are "expedient" When pressed for evidence of their expediency they generally say, "Oh, look at the *good* done by them. We've increased our audiences very much; we have raised much money, and built many meeting houses; we've sent out many missionaries, and thousands have been converted by them." If further pressed they will, generally add, "And we can't see any *harm* in them, and where's your scripture *against* them?"

The foregoing we believe is a fair statement, briefly given, of the position and reasoning of those who, for whatever reason, do not adopt the apostle Paul's idea of expediency, but, on the contrary, adopt the opposite or contradictory idea. Their reasoning in defense of their idea is both affirmative and negative. What they say affirmatively may be called *goodism*, and what they say negatively may be considered as *no harmism*, and *no-scripture-against-it-ism*. This last named ism may be justly designated as the last and meanest ism which

has been born into this world. It was conceived in mischief and brought forth in falsehood, ditch-begotten and hag-born. It is evil-nourished and perdition-tending. It ignores every scripture which shows that mankind are to manifest obedience to God by doing what he has *required* and not by doing things *not required*. Prominent among those scriptures are these: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed," and again, "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath [holds] both the Father and the Son." John 8:31, 2 John 9th verse. But this modern doctrine of *no harmism*, or *no-scripture-against-it-ism*, teaches that mankind can be Christ's disciples, and hold God and Christ in their knowledge by doing things which Christ's word never even suggested! That doctrine even advances the idea that disc I pie ship to Christ is largely manifested by diligently doing such things, and is not mach manifested by those who omit and oppose such things! But whatever may be the out-workings of that doctrine it is a species of rationalism—pure and unadulterated rationalism—for it advocates and defends itself by an appeal to the human mind as a standard of religious measuring, or to that false conclusion of the human mind that whatever, is not by name forbidden in scripture is not divinely condemned.

Alexander Campbell began to be a rationalist when in 1837 or 1838 he decided that he could do good by giving money into the treasury of two Bible societies which were of sectarian origin and organization, and partly if not wholly, of ungodly membership. He further showed his disposition to rationalism in the year 1840 when he thought that he could do good by establishing an educational society called Bethany College, and still further showed that disposition when, in 1849, he allowed himself to be made president of the

organization which was called "American Christian Missionary Society." But he was then over sixty years of age, and had been long over worked. Therefore he should not perhaps, be regarded as being strictly accountable at the date in his life when he become president of a missionary society. Be this as it may, yet it was *rationalism* on the part of those representatives of the one hundred churches who formed that society. What we have called *goodism*, on the one hand, and *no-harm-ism*, together with *no-scripture-against-it-ism*, on the other hand, pervaded the minds of all who contended for the organization of such a society. Those isms have pervaded the minds of all others who have contended for humanly devised instruments, and humanly organized religious, and religio-secular, institutions for both worship and religious work. If at any time, in trying to defend such devices and institutions, an appeal has been made to scripture it has been at the expense of common sense and common honesty. No command nor example of the Sacred Text, no unavoidable conclusion, nor even clear inference, from what is said in the Sacred Text, no explicit statement, replication, nor intimation of that Text, can be justly cited in favor of such devices as we have named. But the human idea that *good* can be done by them, and that there is *no harm* in them, and that there is *no* scripture against them—*these* are the earth-born ideas which are urged in their favor. But the urging of these ideas is an appeal to *human reason as a standard* and this appeal is *rationalism* when made in regard to religious worship and work. What human reasoning on religious questions can do is manifested in heathenism, and the manifestations which the heathen have made in this respect ought to be sufficient to convince all people in Bible lands that their religious.

safety can be found only in remaining within the limits of divine revelation rightly applied. Alexander Campbell's example in the direction of rationalism was followed by many who have become princes among perverters of the gospel. Such have shown themselves mighty men for mischief. Their zeal has rivaled that of many ancient fanatics, and their false reasoning compares favorably with that of certain ancient sophists. Not only so, but on the principle of sowing the wind and reaping the whirlwind (Hosea 8:7), and of sowing to the flesh and reaping corruption (Gal. 6:8), those zealous, false-reasoning rationalists of whom mention has been made are reaping a harvest of division and disgrace, worldliness and iniquity. Near or about one-half of their number is rapidly going into the skepticism of so-called "higher-criticism," and the nothingness of so-called "church federation." The other half is endeavoring to maintain a conservative position for the present, not knowing, it seems, that in their own rationalistic reasoning in behalf of human devices in religion they are sowing and nurturing, or planting and watering, the very same seeds which have already brought forth an alarming harvest among their less cautious brethren.

Having set forth the foregoing manifestation of rationalism among those whom apostolic disciples may justly regard as their enemies, I now mention the rationalism which has been adopted by disciples, whom most apostolic Christians are still disposed to regard as their friends. I refer to the rationalism which, in the form of *goodism*, *no-harmism*, and *no-scripture-against-it-ism*, has been used to justify the establishing of what is called "Nashville Bible School" in Nashville, Tenn., and what is called "Potter Bible College," near Bowling Green, Ky. I challenge the founders, the

principals, and all the teachers in both of those institutions to produce a single argument in their favor which I cannot use with equal emphasis in favor of the missionary society of the Christian Church. I challenge them to use a single scripture in favor of such institutions which I cannot use with equal emphasis in favor of any and all man-made missionary societies. I further challenge them to frame a single OBJECTION to such societies which I cannot use with equal emphasis against the educational institutions which they advocate. I go further, and promise to show that man-made evangelistic societies which are *chiefly religious* are more nearly justified by the word of God than are man-made educational societies which are *chiefly secular*, but are misnamed by being designated "Bible School" and "Bible College." Finally, I challenge any and all advocates of such institutions to make even one apology for using the word *Bible* in naming them which I cannot urge with equal emphasis in favor of calling preachers by the title *Reverend*, and I challenge them to show even one objection to such use of that title that I cannot urge with equal emphasis against that use of sacred names to which I have presented objection.

I write all this in sorrow, but not without hope. I have sorrow because my southern brethren who had more money than they needed did not use it as the Lord directs, and did not allow the mistake that was made by Alexander Campbell in the year of 1840 to suffice to forewarn them against the mistake of establishing an educational society with the Lord's money. Yet I am not without hope that the idea of a religious college will yet be abandoned by them, and that the institution at Nashville, and that near Bowling Green will both be turned into something which will be in har-

mony with the New Testament, and thus will be to God's honor and glory.

But if this suggestion be, for whatever reason, rejected, it will require no divine inspiration "to foretell correctly what the results will be. Year after year students in those schools will ask, "How can I defend this school and yet condemn the missionary society? And very few of them will be satisfied with the rationalistic reasoning, or special pleading, which will be done in response to such a question. After students will have left those schools they will sooner or later, be called on to tell why a religious evangelistic society is *condemnable* while a religio-secular educational society is *commendable*, and with one accord they will conclude that their chief preceptors taught them "mere fooleries" on these questions, and will either condemn the institutions, where they received their education, as unscriptural, or will go over to the advocacy of man-made missionary societies. As a further result hundreds of churches will be betrayed into society-ism which could not otherwise be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. Thus what the devil cannot accomplish through an evangelistic society presided over by a missionary board, he will accomplish through an educational society, presided over by an educational board. Such, at least, is my conclusion in view of past and present history of what is called "The Disciple Brotherhood." Certain educators have defended missionary societies in the work, of the churches while opposing instrumental music in the worship of the churches. Their pupils could see no consistency in such a position and have generally decided to advocate both societies and instruments of music, while a few have decided to oppose them both. Thus it has been and thus it will be. As a result the end accomplished

will prove to be the very opposite to that which the founders of the "Nashville Bible School" and the "Potter Bible College" intended. Certainly nothing less than the Divine Father's special interposition in behalf of his church can prevent such a disastrous result from being accomplished.

The idea that Bible colleges should be established to counteract the influence of the infidelity now being taught in many colleges is like "fighting the devil with fire." Paul wrote thus: "For though we walk in the flesh we do not war after the flesh. For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds." 2 Cor. 10:3,4. In view of such declarations from Paul, where is the authority for spending the Lord's money to build one humanism in order to oppose another? Where is the wisdom in so doing, seeing that the devil has already captured nearly all the humanism which have thus far been built to oppose him? He has even captured all that part of the church which has adopted humanism In its work or worship. Can we make a success in fighting the devil with fire? Does he not understand the fire business too well for us to succeed, in such a warfare?

Here I end, for the present, my remarks in regard to misusing the Lord's money in establishing religio-secular schools, and misnaming human institutions by applying sacred names to them. The Savior said, "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten; be zealous therefore and repent." Rev. 3:19. That saying of the Savior, and all else bearing in the same direction, have together impelled me to write what I have written on this subject. "Blessed are they who do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled." Matt. 5:6.

DANIEL SOMMER