

1896 – 1899

Our Meeting at Ralston
---December 24, 1896
Questions
---February 1, 1897
My Tour in Missouri
---July 19, 1897
How Glaring!
---May 1, 1899

1900 - 1905

Debate at Perkins
---January 15, 1900
Fashion
---January 27, 1902
OH CONSISTENCY, ETC.
---April 26, 1904
MEETING AT MOUNT TABOR
---August 30, 1904
MISSIONARIES SEVENTY YEARS OLD
---March 28, 1905
Going Too Fast
---March 28, 1905
MASONRY SUPERIOR TO SOFTSHELLISM
---April 4, 1905
WHAT ARMINIANS PREACH
---June 13, 1905
Cayce – Tucker
---July 25, 1905
OCCUPYING SAME GROUND
---July 25, 1905
OUR FATHER IS DEAD
---September 5, 1905
OUR WORK ENDORSED
---October 10, 1905
REMARKS TO J. E. CRON
---October 10, 1905
OUR ASSOCIATION
---October 17, 1905
Who Are The Primitive Baptists?
---November 7, 1905
Cut Them Off
---November 21, 1905
Educated African Turned to Heathenism
---November 21, 1905
Sin Against The Holy Ghost
---November 28, 1905
Luke 13:34
---December 5, 1905
A Debate
---December 5, 1905
Mode of Baptism
---December 12, 1905
Close of Volume Twenty
---December 26, 1905

1906

Introduction to Volume Twenty-One

[---January 9, 1906](#)
[The Black Rock Address](#)
[---January 6, 1906](#)
[Why We Baptize Them](#)
[---January 16, 1906](#)
[Baptists in Georgia](#)
[---January 23, 1906](#)
[Brother Sidwell's Letter](#)
[---February 20, 1906](#)
[Some Plain Facts](#)
[---February 27, 1906](#)
[John 10:12](#)
[---March 13, 1906](#)
[Home From Georgia](#)
[---March 20, 1906](#)
[Elder Hassell Again](#)
[---March 20, 1906](#)
[ELDER WALLACE'S LETTER](#)
[---March 27, 1906](#)
[Brother Vickers' Acknowledgment](#)
[---April 10, 1906](#)
[First Church Association](#)
[---April 17, 1906](#)
[Secret Orders](#)
[---April 17, 1906](#)
[Acts 13:3](#)
[---April 17, 1906](#)
[John 10:12 Again](#)
[---May 1, 1906](#)
[Sunday School Affiliation](#)
[---May 1, 1906](#)
[Does He Want Peace?](#)
[---May 15, 1906](#)
[John 11:39](#)
[---May 22, 1906](#)
[Galatians 3:1; 3; 6:18](#)
[---May 22, 1906](#)
[Matthew 8:22](#)
[---May 29, 1906](#)
[That Basis of Agreement](#)
[---June 12, 1906](#)
[Remarks to J. F. Leonard](#)
[---June 12, 1906](#)
[Who Are The Primitive Baptists?](#)
[---June 26, 1906](#)
[Matthew 24](#)
[---June 26, 1906](#)
[THE SPIRITUALITY OF THE GOSPEL](#)
[---July 24, 1906](#)
[The Word Made Flesh](#)
[---August 14, 1906](#)
[THE PRODIGAL SON](#)
[---August 14, 1906](#)
[Elder Crouse's Letter](#)
[---September 18, 1906](#)

[Acts 26:18,20](#)
---September 25, 1906
[OUR COLORED BRETHERN](#)
---October 2, 1906
[Matthew 12:43-44](#)
---October 2, 1906
[WHAT DOES HE BELIEVE?](#)
---October 9, 1906
[STARS IN THE CROWN](#)
---October 9, 1906
[OF THE WORLD](#)
---October 9, 1906
[DEBATE AND MEETING AT BUFFALO](#)
---October 16, 1906
[BEGAN TWENTY YEARS AGO](#)
---October 16, 1906
[TOUR IN OHIO AND INDIANA](#)
---October 16, 1906
[1 Peter 3:18-21](#)
---October 23, 1906
[SALVATION BEFORE FAITH](#)
---October 30, 1906
[Selah and Luke 16:1-9](#)
---October 30, 1906
[1 Corinthians 3:14-15](#)
---October 30, 1906
[Parable of the Sower](#)
---November 6, 1906
[Matthew 8:11-12](#)
---November 13, 1906
[Hebrews 6:4-5,6](#)
---November 20, 1906
[A WRONG IMPRESSION](#)
---December 11, 1906
[John 8:31,47](#)
---December 11, 1906
[VARIETY OF BAPTISTS](#)
---December 18, 1906
[CLOSE OF VOLUME TWENTY-ONE](#)
---December 25, 1906

1907

[INTRODUCTORY TO VOLUME TWENTY-TWO](#)
---January 8, 1907
[INFORMATION WANTED](#)
---January 8, 1907
[Romans 5:14](#)
---January 22, 1907
[Information Wanted](#)
---January 29, 1907
[EXPLANATION WANTED](#)
---January 29, 1907
[HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF](#)
---February 5, 1907
[ENTER INTO REST](#)
---February 12, 1907
[QUESTIONS BY A PRESBYTERIAN](#)

[---February 19, 1907](#)
[FOR WHOM IS THE GOSPEL?](#)
[---February 19, 1907](#)
[WHEN WERE THEY WRITTEN?](#)
[---February 26, 1907](#)
[PARABLE OF THE TARES](#)
[---February 26, 1907](#)
[WHEN WAS CHRIST BORN?](#)
[---February 26, 1907](#)
[Matthew 24:19](#)
[---February 26, 1907](#)
[CAYCE IS WILLING](#)
[---March 5, 1907](#)
[INFORMATION WANTED](#)
[---March 5, 1907](#)
[THE RIGHTEOUS SCARCELY SAVED](#)
[---March 12, 1907](#)
[Matthew 5:13-16](#)
[---March 19, 1907](#)
[HAS CHANGED](#)
[---March 26, 1907](#)
[IS IT ANNOYING?](#)
[---March 26, 1907](#)
[DEBATE WANTED](#)
[---March 26, 1907](#)
[THE LAW SATISFIED](#)
[---April 9, 1907](#)
[SOME QUESTIONS](#)
[---April 9, 1907](#)
[DEBATE IN MARTIN](#)
[---April 9, 1907](#)
[KEEP A RECORD](#)
[---April 9, 1907](#)
[Romans 8:9-10](#)
[---April 16, 1907](#)
[Galatians 3, Galatians 6:18](#)
[---April 16, 1907](#)
[WOMEN PREACHERS](#)
[---April 23, 1907](#)
[Matthew 5:32](#)
[---May 7, 1907](#)
[CHRIST AND BELIAL](#)
[---May 14, 1907](#)
[NEW WINE IN OLD BOTTLES](#)
[---May 14, 1907](#)
[GOOD REPORT OF THEM WITHOUT](#)
[---May 21, 1907](#)
[TOUR IN INDIANA AND OHIO](#)
[---June 18, 1907](#)
[WHOM DID JOHN BAPTIZE?](#)
[---June 25, 1907](#)
[SALOONS AND CHURCH MEMBERS](#)
[---June 25, 1907](#)
[LIARS NOT ALL DEAD](#)
[---June 27, 1907](#)
[REMARKS TO J. H. HALL](#)

---July 2, 1907
CHRIST OUR SURETY
---July 2, 1907
WOMEN HELPERS
---July 2, 1907
HAVE BEEN BAPTIZED
---July 23, 1907
LADIES' AID SOCIETY
---July 30, 1907
Matthew 23:37
---August 7, 1907
ANOTHER ONE GONE HOME
---August 13, 1907
WITH OR WITHOUT MEANS
---August 20, 1907
Jonah 3:10
---August 20, 1907
KNOW AS WE ARE KNOWN
---August 20, 1907
Isaiah 14:12
---August 27, 1907
REPLY TO M. C. COLE
---September 3, 1907
IN EAST AND MIDDLE TENNESSEE
---September 10, 1907
REMARKS TO V. P. FERGUSON
---September 10, 1907
MISSIONS A FAILURE
---November 5, 1907
Genesis 6:1-4
---November 12, 1907
GREENFIELD-PHILESIC ASSOCIATION
---November 19, 1907
QUESTIONS OF ORDER
---November 19, 1907
Romans 10:13-15
---November 19, 1907
QUESTIONS FROM J. H. KUYKENDALL
---November 26, 1907
Galatians 5:4
---November 26, 1907
VALID BAPTISM
---November 26, 1907
PRIMITIVE
---December 3, 1907
FOOTBALL AND MISSIONS
---December 3, 1907
SOME DIE IN DISOBEDIENCE
---December 10, 1907
CLOSE OF VOLUME TWENTY-TWO
---December 24, 1907

1908

Introduction to Volume Twenty-Three
---January 7, 1908
1 Corinthians 8:8-13
---January 7, 1908

[Sin Unto Death and First Resurrection](#)

[---January 21, 1908](#)

[The Prodigal Son](#)

[---January 21, 1908](#)

[Is Our Faith Wrong?](#)

[---January 28, 1908](#)

[What Do They Think?](#)

[---February 18, 1908](#)

[Questions from W. M. Cross](#)

[---February 18, 1908](#)

[PRIMITIVE AGAIN](#)

[---February 25, 1908](#)

[Elder Mayo](#)

[---March 10, 1908](#)

[Instrumental Music](#)

[---April 7, 1908](#)

[Kind Words](#)

[---April 14, 1908](#)

[John 3:16-17; Hebrews 2:9; Romans 9:15-25](#)

[---April 21, 1908](#)

[Acts 22:16](#)

[---April 21, 1908](#)

[Romans 7:24-25](#)

[---April 28, 1908](#)

[Eleventh Article of Faith](#)

[---April 28, 1908](#)

[Acts 8:16-17](#)

[---April 28, 1908](#)

[Backed Down](#)

[---May 19, 1908](#)

[Sin Unto Death](#)

[---May 19, 1908](#)

[2 Peter 2:2](#)

[---May 19, 1908](#)

[The Slothful Servant](#)

[---May 19, 1908](#)

[Women Preachers](#)

[---May 19, 1908](#)

[John 3:5](#)

[---May 26, 1908](#)

[Hebrews 2:2-3](#)

[---May 26, 1908](#)

[Wonderful Historian](#)

[---June 2, 1908](#)

[Pray For Laborers](#)

[---June 9, 1908](#)

[Information Wanted](#)

[---August 4, 1908](#)

[Converts for Nine Dollars](#)

[---August 18, 1908](#)

[Predestinarian Baptist](#)

[---September 8, 1908](#)

[2 Corinthians 4:3](#)

[---September 8, 1908](#)

[Revelation 22:18-19](#)

[---September 8, 1908](#)

2 Peter 2:22
---September 8, 1908
1 Peter 2:13
---September 8, 1908
Romans 8:1
---October 6, 1908
IS IT TRUE?-SOMETHING NEW
---October 20, 1908
NO MISREPRESENTATION
---October 20, 1908
FAIRCHILD PEACE PROPOSITION
---October 27, 1908
NO FELLOWSHIP
---October 27, 1908
INFANT SALVATION
---November 17, 1908
Genesis 3:22-24
---November 17, 1908
A DOUBLE MINDED MAN
---November 24, 1908
THE SOUL AFTER DEATH
---November 24, 1908
Deuteronomy 6:6-7
---November 24, 1903
THE SCAPEGOAT
---November 24, 1908
CLOSE OF VOLUME TWENTY-THREE
---December 22, 1908

1909

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME TWENTY-FOUR
---January 5, 1909
OUR TRIP WEST
---January 12, 1909
OUR TRIP IN AUGUST
---January 12, 1909
ACCUSATION ANSWERED
---January 12, 1909
FEET WASHING NOT A TEST
---January 19, 1909
WHO IS RIGHT?
---January 19, 1909
NO NON-FELLOWSHIP
---January 26, 1909
AWAY FROM HOME
---January 26, 1909
STILL IN GEORGIA
---February 9, 1909
NOW IN FLORIDA
---February 9, 1909
Hebrews 7:1-4
---February 23, 1909
2 Peter 2:18-21
---February 23, 1909
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
---February 23, 1909
CONDUCT OF DEACONS

[---February 23, 1908](#)
[Zechariah 4:14](#)
[---February 23, 1909](#)
[Matthew 19:8, and Romans 13:1-8](#)
[---February 23, 1909](#)
[STILL IN FLORIDA](#)
[---March 9, 1909](#)
[REPLY TO T. H. COTTON - FEET WASHING](#)
[---March 9, 1909](#)
[THE VERY ELECT](#)
[---April 27, 1909](#)
[THE GREAT INVESTMENT](#)
[---May 4, 1909](#)
[ORDERLY BAPTISM](#)
[---May 18, 1909](#)
[HOW MANY ARE THERE?](#)
[---May 25, 1909](#)
[VIEWS GIVEN](#)
[---June 1, 1909](#)
[RICH MAN AND LAZARUS](#)
[---June 8, 1909](#)
[MILL CREEK THEN AND NOW](#)
[---June 15, 1909](#)
[Matthew 5:32](#)
[---July 20, 1909](#)
[REMARKS TO ELDER A. B. WHATLY ON ORGANS](#)
[---July 20, 1909](#)
[Got His Papers](#)
[---July 27, 1909](#)
[In The Days of Noah](#)
[---August 10, 1909](#)
[Titus 3](#)
[---August 17, 1909](#)
[In Indiana](#)
[---August 31, 1909](#)
[SPIRITS IN PRISON](#)
[---August 31, 1909](#)
[In Missouri](#)
[---September 28, 1909](#)
[Sad Conditions](#)
[---October 5, 1909](#)
[God The First Cause](#)
[---October 26, 1909](#)
[Missions and Methods](#)
[---November 9, 1909](#)
[Organs in Churches](#)
[---November 16, 1909](#)
[Not Surprised](#)
[---November 23, 1909](#)
[Questions](#)
[---November 23, 1909](#)
[Sinners and Ungodly](#)
[---November 23, 1909](#)
[Questions From W. C. Moore](#)
[---November 30, 1909](#)
[Remarks to J. C. Biggs](#)

[---December 7, 1909](#)
[First Cause Again](#)
[---December 7, 1909](#)
[Questions](#)
[---December 14, 1909](#)
[Close of Volume 24](#)
[---December 28, 1909](#)

1910

[Introductory to Volume 25](#)
[---January 11, 1910](#)
[In Alabama](#)
[---January 18, 1910](#)
[Who Will Debate For The Primitive Baptists?](#)
[---February 15, 1910](#)
[That Court Decision](#)
[---February 22, 1910](#)
[John Calvin](#)
[---March 15, 1910](#)
[Baptists in America](#)
[---March 15, 1910](#)
[Predestination](#)
[---March 15, 1910](#)
[Dram Drinking](#)
[---March 15, 1910](#)
[Predestination Again](#)
[---March 15, 1910](#)
[High and Low Seats](#)
[---April 5, 1910](#)
[Gives It Up](#)
[---April 5, 1910](#)
[1 Samuel 19:9](#)
[---April 5, 1910](#)
[1 Corinthians 16:2](#)
[---April 12, 1910](#)
[What Adam Lost](#)
[---April 12, 1910](#)
[John Exiled](#)
[---April 19, 1910](#)
[What Is Changed?](#)
[---April 19, 1910](#)
[Acts 2; Acts 28:31 AND Ephesians 2:10](#)
[---April 26, 1910](#)
[Luke 15:8](#)
[---April 26, 1910](#)
[A Wrong Impression](#)
[---May 3, 1910](#)
[He Will Not Debate – Who Will?](#)
[---May 3, 1910](#)
[Matthew 24:19-22](#)
[---May 10, 1910](#)
[2 Corinthians 12:2-5](#)
[---May 17, 1910](#)
[Jeremiah 23:19-20](#)
[---May 24, 1910](#)
[Record It](#)
[---May 24, 1910](#)

[Debate on Missions](#)
---May 31, 1910
[James 5:20; Mark 9:43; Luke 11:30](#)
---May 31, 1910
[A Challenge](#)
---June 7, 1910
[Watertown Debate](#)
---June 7, 1910
[Baptism](#)
---June 7, 1910
[Debate on Missions](#)
---June 21, 1910
[Ministerial Aid](#)
---June 28, 1910
[Debate on Missions](#)
---July 19, 1910
[Twin Brothers](#)
---July 26, 1910
[The Heathen Question](#)
---July 26, 1910
[That Challenge](#)
---August 2, 1910
[The Footprints](#)
---August 2, 1910
[That Debate on Missions](#)
---August 9, 1910
[Challenge](#)
---August 9, 1910
[Missions Again](#)
---August 16, 1910
[Luke 13:6-9](#)
---August 30, 1910
[1 Corinthians 9:7-15](#)
---August 30, 1910
[Elder Sikes Did Challenge](#)
---September 6, 1910
[Keys of the Kingdom](#)
---September 20, 1910
[Foreign Missions Again](#)
---September 27, 1910
[Our Challenge](#)
---October 4, 1910
[Gifts in the Ministry](#)
---October 4, 1910
[Educate The Japs](#)
---October 25, 1910
[My Impressions](#)
---November 8, 1910
[AUTHORITY TO ORDAIN](#)
---November 15, 1910

[1911](#)

[SELECTED EDITORIALS FROM THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST](#)

[Beginning with 1911](#)

[Introduction to Volume 26](#)

---January 10, 1911

[Tour in Alabama](#)

[---January 10, 1911](#)
[DEADLY PARALLEL ---January 10, 1911](#)
[Information Wanted](#)
[---January 17, 1911](#)
[Luke 17:17](#)
[---January 24, 1911](#)
[He Can Get It](#)
[---February 7, 1911](#)
[Luke 16:19-31](#)
[---February 7, 1911](#)
[Secret Orders](#)
[---February 14, 1911](#)
[The Soul of Man](#)
[---February 14, 1911](#)
[Remarks to C. A. Clemons](#)
[---February 14, 1911](#)
[Wheat and Tares](#)
[---February 21, 1911](#)
[Romans 5:18](#)
[---February 21, 1911](#)
[Luke 5:4,7 AND John 21:11](#)
[---February 21, 1911](#)
[Hulsey - Cayce Debate](#)
[---February 28, 1911](#)
[Authority Again](#)
[---March 7, 1911](#)
[Acts 13:48](#)
[---March 21, 1911](#)
[1 Corinthians 15:22](#)
[---March 28, 1911](#)
[Plagiarism](#)
[---March 28, 1911](#)
[2 Corinthians 7:10](#)
[---April 11, 1911](#)
[John 1:9](#)
[---April 11, 1911](#)
[Can't Help It](#)
[---April 18, 1911](#)
[What Is The Reason?](#)
[---April 25, 1911](#)
[Baptist Missionary Centennial](#)
[---April 25, 1911](#)
[A Right Step](#)
[---April 25, 1911](#)
[Christian Churches Plan Joining Forces Unity Foundation Embraces Protestant, Greek and Catholic Bodies](#)
[---May 2, 1911](#)
[Missionaries Not Wanted Chinaman Writes Book Against Their Activities - Says They Harm His People](#)
[---May 2, 1911](#)
[Foe to Freedom](#)
[---May 9, 1911](#)
[How Can They Help It?](#)
[---May 9, 1911](#)
[Origins of the Denominations](#)
[---May 23, 1911](#)

[False Reports](#)
---May 30, 1911

[Questions](#)
---May 30, 1911

[Mark 3:14,19](#)
---May 30, 1911

[1 Timothy 3:12](#)
---June 6, 1911

[Matthew 18:14](#)
---June 11, 1911

[2 Peter 3:9](#)
---June 13, 1911

[Feet Washing](#)
---June 20, 1911

[That Challenge](#)
---June 20, 1911

[Adultery](#)
---June 20, 1911

[Romans 7:1-3](#)
---July 4, 1911

[Jonah 3: Jonah 4:11](#)
---July 4, 1911

[Wheat and Tares Again](#)
---August 8, 1911

[A Suggestion](#)
---September 5, 1911

[Concerning Organs](#)
---September 12, 1911

[Made It Plain](#)
---September 12, 1911

[The New Birth](#)
---September 19, 1911

[Adultery Again](#)
---September 19, 1911

[Birth and Adoption](#)
---September 19, 1911

[Revelation 12:1-8](#)
---September 19, 1911

[The Commission](#)
---October 31, 1911

[Do You Mean It?](#)
---November 21, 1911

[Nashville, Tennessee](#)
---November 21, 1911

[Question of Order](#)
---November 21, 1911

[Questions](#)
---November 21, 1911

[The Organ](#)
---November 28, 1911

[Elder J. V. Kirkland](#)
---December 5, 1911

[Close of Volume Twenty-Six](#)
---December 26, 1911

1912

[INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME TWENTY-SEVEN](#)

[---January 9, 1912](#)
[Adam's Death](#)
[---January 16, 1912](#)
[1 Corinthians 7:15](#)
[---January 16, 1912](#)
[More Proof](#)
[---February 13, 1912](#)
[Who Are Asleep?](#)
[---February 13, 1912](#)
[A Pleasure Trip](#)
[---February 20, 1912](#)
[Luke 10:30-37](#)
[---February 20, 1912](#)
[The Nashville Debate](#)
[---March 5, 1912](#)
[Acts 8:33](#)
[---March 5, 1912](#)
[Elder Waters With Us](#)
[---March 5, 1912](#)
[Feel Thankful](#)
[---March 19, 1912](#)
[Repentance](#)
[---March 26, 1912](#)
[Here's A Mixture](#)
[---April 16, 1912](#)
[Hebrew Alphabet](#)
[---April 16, 1912](#)
[Questions](#)
[---April 23, 1912](#)
[Not Consistent](#)
[---April 30, 1912](#)
[Galatians 5:17 AND Romans 6:12](#)
[---April 30, 1912](#)
[Two-Seedism](#)
[---April 30, 1912](#)
[Answered Prayer](#)
[---May 7, 1912](#)
[Is This The Doctrine of Primitive Baptists?](#)
[---May 7, 1912](#)
[A Dream](#)
[--- May 7, 1912](#)
[Takes Exception](#)
[---May 14, 1912](#)
[Galatians 4:4-5](#)
[---May 14, 1912](#)
[Denies It](#)
[---June 4, 1912](#)
[Debate in Arkansas](#)
[---June 11, 1912](#)
[Reply to Elder J. B. Hardy](#)
[---June 25, 1912](#)
[Luke 21:31-35](#)
[---July 9, 1912](#)
[1 Corinthians 15:29](#)
[---July 9, 1912](#)
[The Cayce-Srygley Discussion by E. G. S.](#)

[---July 9, 1912](#)
[Questions On The Organ](#)
[---July 9, 1912](#)
[Carnell Inconsistencies](#)
[---July 16, 1912](#)
[Expect to Attend](#)
[---July 30, 1912](#)
[Luke 9:13](#)
[---July 30, 1912](#)
[Missionary Statistics](#)
[---September 17, 1912](#)
[Daily Throgmorton Debate](#)
[---September 17, 1912](#)
[We Got It Next](#)
[---September 17, 1912](#)
[Challenge Accepted](#)
[---September 24, 1912](#)
[Matthew 12:43-44](#)
[---November 19, 1912](#)
[The Jews Chosen](#)
[---November 19, 1912](#)
[Romans 9:7](#)
[---December 10, 1912](#)
[1 Peter 3:21](#)
[---December 10, 1912](#)
[Kingdom of God](#)
[---December 17, 1912](#)
[Close of Volume 27](#)
[---December 24, 1912](#)

1913

[INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME XXVIII](#)

[---January 7, 1913](#)
[The Debate That Didn't Materialize](#)
[---January 7, 1913](#)
[Gambling](#)
[---February 4, 1913](#)
[Matthew 11:12](#)
[---February 18, 1913](#)
[1 Peter 2:10](#)
[---February 18, 1913](#)
[Hebrews 6:4](#)
[---February 18, 1913](#)
[Some Ideas Presented](#)
[---February 18, 1913](#)
[Musical Instruments](#)
[---February 25, 1913](#)
[The Church](#)
[---April 1, 1913](#)
[Questions on Regeneration](#)
[---April 1, 1915](#)
[Matthew 24:19-20](#)
[---April 8, 1913](#)
[Revelation 12:1](#)
[---April 8, 1913](#)
[Luke 23:43](#)
[---April 22, 1913](#)

[Matthew 18:18](#)
---May 20, 1913
[Habakkuk 2; Habakkuk 3:19 AND Malachi 4](#)
---May 20, 1913
[Missions](#)
---May 27, 1913
[Isaiah 45:7](#)
---June 3, 1913
[Romans 8:15-23; Galatians 4:5](#)
---June 3, 1913
[1 Corinthians 7:14,15](#)
---June 10, 1913
[London Confession and Fall of Man](#)
---June 10, 1913
[Questions](#)
---June 17, 1913
[Genesis 6:6 AND Exodus 32:14](#)
---June 24, 1913
[Matthew 16:19](#)
---June 24, 1913
[Warning](#)
---August 19, 1913
[Penick Croaks](#)
---August 26, 1913
[Job 14:10-12](#)
---September 2, 1913
[Bogard Objects](#)
---September 2, 1913
[Cows Laugh](#)
---September 2, 1913
[Job 7:1 AND Job 14:6](#)
---September 9, 1913
[Not Worth Much](#)
---September 9, 1913
[Question of Order](#)
---September 9, 1913
[Good Meetings](#)
---October 7, 1913
[Mormon Questions](#)
---October 28, 1913
[Baptism](#)
---November 4, 1913
[Mark 16:16-18](#)
---November 4, 1913
[Who Are Landmarkers?](#)
---November 18, 1913
[Mr. Slover Denies It](#)
---December 9, 1913
[Mt. Zion Association](#)
---December 30, 1913
[Close of Volume 28](#)
---December 30, 1913

1914

[Introduction to Volume 29](#)
---January 6, 1914
[Tour in Illinois](#)

[---January 6, 1914](#)
[Pour or Spill](#)
[---January 20, 1914](#)
[False Prophets](#)
[---February 3, 1914](#)
[Feet Washing](#)
[---March 24, 1914](#)
[Misrepresentation](#)
[---March 24, 1914](#)
[Reply to Elder Petty](#)
[---April 7, 1914](#)
[Questions Answered](#)
[---April 14, 1914](#)
[Do We Need Baptist Churches?](#)
[---April 21, 1914](#)
[---May 19, 1914](#)
[Fraternal Effort in Religion](#)
[---May 19, 1914](#)
[Baptism](#)
[---June 2, 1914](#)
[He Gives It To Cayce](#)
[---June 23, 1914](#)
[Our Debt to the Missionary Reply to Rev W. Bruce Doyle](#)
[---July 14, 1914](#)
[A Letter That Helps Us](#)
[---July 21, 1914](#)
[Ephesians 2:15 AND Hebrews 1:1-3](#)
[---July 28, 1914](#)
[Isaiah 45:7](#)
[---July 28, 1914](#)
[Adultery and Fornication](#)
[---July 28, 1914](#)
[Man Is To Blame](#)
[---July 28, 1914](#)
[Campbellism](#)
[---August 4, 1914](#)
[Quacks](#)
[---August 18, 1914](#)
[Three Questions](#)
[---August 18, 1914](#)
[General Judgment and Eternal Hell](#)
[---August 18, 1914](#)
[Christmas and Easter](#)
[---August 18, 1914](#)
[Questions on Order](#)
[---August 25, 1914](#)
[Genesis 6:6; Jonah 3:10; Malachi 3:6](#)
[---August 25, 1914](#)
[Wine or Grape Juice](#)
[---September 15, 1914](#)
[John 3; John 14](#)
[---October 6, 1914](#)
[Revelation 22:18-19](#)
[---October 13, 1914](#)
[On A Tour](#)
[---October 13, 1914](#)

[Question Of Order](#)
---[October 20, 1914](#)
[Tour In North Carolina](#)
---[October 27, 1914](#)
[Matthew 25:1-13](#)
---[November 10, 1914](#)
[Hebrews 5:9; John 3; John 5; Revelation 22:14](#)
---[November 10, 1914](#)
[Unknown Tongues](#)
---[November 17, 1914](#)
[Matthew 19:24](#)
---[November 17, 1914](#)
[Pinkstaff and Kirkland](#)
---[November 24, 1914](#)
[Questions on Order](#)
---[November 24, 1914](#)
[Hebrews 10:38-39](#)
---[December 1, 1914](#)
[Jonah 3:10](#)
---[December 1, 1914](#)
[Apostasy](#)
---[December 1, 1914](#)
[1 Peter 2:8](#)
---[December 8, 1914](#)
[Views Given](#)
---[December 8, 1914](#)
[Ezekiel 36:25-27](#)
---[December 8, 1914](#)
[Questions Answered](#)
---[December 15, 1914](#)
[Psalms 55:12-14](#)
---[December 22, 1914](#)
[Romans 14:10](#)
---[December 22, 1914](#)
[Matthew 16:9](#)
---[December 22, 1914](#)
[Luke 18:15-17](#)
---[December 22, 1914](#)
[Close of Volume 29](#)
---[December 22, 1914](#)

1915

[INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME XXX](#)
---[January 5, 1915](#)
[Out of Order](#)
---[January 5, 1915](#)
[Among The Filipinos](#)
---[January 12, 1915](#)
[Revelation 12:7](#)
---[January 12, 1915](#)
[Federal Council of Churches](#)
---[January 12 1915](#)
[Elder J. B. Little](#)
---[January 12, 1915](#)
[Elder Little Objects](#)
---[January 19, 1915](#)
[Foreign Medical Missions](#)

[---January 19, 1915](#)
[Why Did Christ Die?](#)
[---January 26, 1915](#)
[John 6:47](#)
[---February 2, 1915](#)
[Elder Little and Party](#)
[---February 9, 1915](#)
[Christmas](#)
[---February 9, 1915](#)
[Drunkards and Tunkers](#)
[---February 9, 1915](#)
[The European War](#)
[---February 16, 1915](#)
[Foreign Mission Gifts](#)
[---February 16, 1915](#)
[More About Elder Little](#)
[---February 16, 1915](#)
[John 9:6-7](#)
[---February 23, 1915](#)
[Remarks to W. T. Morrisett](#)
[---March 2, 1915](#)
[Foreknowledge of God](#)
[---March 2, 1915](#)
[Exodus 2:12 AND Proverbs 9:1](#)
[---March 9, 1915](#)
[Matthew 5:13 AND Mark 9:49-50](#)
[---March 9, 1915](#)
[Romans 6:1-6, 23](#)
[---March 9, 1915](#)
[John 17:20 AND John 20:31](#)
[---March 16, 1915](#)
[2 Corinthians 5:20](#)
[---March 16, 1915](#)
[Foreknowledge and Predestination](#)
[---March 16, 1915](#)
[Revelation 5:6](#)
[---March 23, 1915](#)
[Jacob and Esau](#)
[---March 23, 1915](#)
[Remarks to Elder C. L. Clark](#)
[---April 13, 1915](#)
[Sunday School Frauds](#)
[---April 13, 1915](#)
[Paul's Regeneration](#)
[---April 13, 1915](#)
[Revelation 22:17-19](#)
[---April 13, 1915](#)
[Hosea 2:3 AND Isaiah 50:1](#)
[---April 13, 1915](#)
[Isaiah 35:6-7](#)
[---April 13, 1915](#)
[Tour in Illinois and Missouri](#)
[---April 20, 1915](#)
[Throgmorton vs Throgmorton](#)
[---April 20, 1915](#)
[Mourners Benches](#)

[---April 27, 1915](#)
[Free Moral Agency](#)
[---April 27, 1915](#)
[Ephesians 2:1-5](#)
[---May 4, 1915](#)
[The Christian Sun](#)
[---May 4, 1915](#)
[Missionary Hope of Salvation](#)
[---May 11, 1915](#)
[Gill on Romans 7:2-3](#)
[---May 11, 1915](#)
[Close Communion](#)
[---May 18, 1915](#)
[Heathen Souls](#)
[---May 18, 1915](#)
[Princeton and Billy Sunday](#)
[---May 18, 1915](#)
[A Debate](#)
[---May 25, 1915](#)
[Luke 16:19-31](#)
[---May 25, 1915](#)
[“ Pastor” Russell](#)
[---May 25, 1915](#)
[All Infants Saved](#)
[---May 25, 1915](#)
[Atonement](#)
[---May 25, 1915](#)
[Matthew 25:14-30](#)
[---June 1, 1915](#)
[1 Corinthians 14:34,35 AND 1 Timothy 2:9-12](#)
[---June 1, 1915](#)
[News and Truths](#)
[---June 8, 1915](#)
[1 Corinthians 15:22](#)
[---June 8, 1915](#)
[The Word](#)
[---June 15, 1915](#)
[Mark 16:16-18](#)
[---June 15, 1915](#)
[1 Corinthians 15:29](#)
[---June 15, 1915](#)
[Hebrews 10:26-27](#)
[---June 29, 1915](#)
[Won't Let God](#)
[---July 20, 1915](#)
[Regeneration](#)
[---November 16, 1915](#)
[Statistics](#)
[---November 30, 1915](#)
[About “The Good Old Songs”](#)
[---December 7, 1915](#)
[Remarks On An Experience](#)
[---December 21, 1915](#)
[Endorsement on Regeneration](#)
[---December 21, 1915](#)
[Close of Volume 30](#)

[---December 21, 1915](#)

[1916](#)

[INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME THIRTY-ONE](#)

[---January 4, 1916](#)

[Reply to J. M. Hicks](#)

[---January 4, 1916](#)

[Acts 20:9-10](#)

[---February 15, 1916](#)

[Discipline](#)

[---February 15, 1916](#)

[Difference in Belief](#)

[---February 15, 1916](#)

[King James Translation](#)

[---February 22, 1916](#)

[John 3:5-6](#)

[---February 29, 1916](#)

[Acts 22:3](#)

[---March 7, 1916](#)

[Matthew 10:39](#)

[---March 14, 1916](#)

[Salvation By Grace](#)

[---March 14, 1916](#)

[Questions of Order](#)

[---March 14, 1916](#)

[Should Be Excluded](#)

[---March 21, 1916](#)

[1 Corinthians 15:29](#)

[---March 21, 1916](#)

[Campbell's Movement](#)

[---March 21, 1916](#)

[The Two Witnesses](#)

[---March 28, 1916](#)

[MISSIONARY CLAIMS](#)

[---May 30, 1916](#)

[Matthew 11:21](#)

[---June 13, 1916](#)

[In Georgia](#)

[---June 13, 1916](#)

[The Beloved Disciple ---June 20, 1916](#)

[Campbellite Leaflet](#)

[---June 20, 1916](#)

[The Baptist Church](#)

[---June 20, 1916](#)

[Acts 2; Acts 28:31](#)

[---June 27, 1916](#)

[John 8:30-47](#)

[---June 27, 1916](#)

[Ephesians 1 AND 2 Timothy 1](#)

[---June 27, 1916](#)

[ELDER C. H. CAYCE:](#)

[Trial of the Robbers](#)

[---July 11, 1916](#)

[Matthew 12:28; Luke 11:20; Luke 17:21](#)

[---July 11, 1916](#)

[Greater and Lesser Sins](#)

[---July 18, 1916](#)

[Views Wanted](#)

[---July 25, 1916](#)

[Sunday Work](#)

[---August 1, 1916](#)

[About The Ministry – Questions Answered](#)

[---August 8, 1916](#)

[EXTRACT FROM BOOK OF MORMON](#)

[---August 22, 1916](#)

[A CONTRADICTION](#)

[---August 29, 1916](#)

[A Debate](#)

[---September 5, 1916](#)

[Article Copied](#)

[---September 5, 1916](#)

[The Curtain Raised](#)

[---September 5, 1916](#)

[Elder J. B. Little](#)

[---September 12, 1916](#)

[Curtain Raised Again](#)

[---October 3, 1916](#)

[CURTAIN RAISED AGAIN](#)

[---October 10, 1916](#)

[Questions and Answers](#)

[---October 31, 1916](#)

[An Enquirer](#)

[---October 31, 1916](#)

[Curtain Raised Again](#)

[---November 14, 1916](#)

[The New Birth](#)

[---December 12, 1916](#)

[1917](#)

[Time Salvation](#)

[---January 2, 1917](#)

[Revelation 12:7-8](#)

[---January 9, 1917](#)

[Old Editorial](#)

[---January 16, 1917](#)

[Confusion](#)

[---January 23, 1917](#)

[The Real Issue – An Old Editorial](#)

[---January 23, 1917](#)

[The Resurrection - Old Editorial](#)

[---January 30, 1917](#)

[PLEADING FOR PEACE](#)

[---January 30, 1917](#)

[The Inner and Outer Man](#)

[---February 6, 1917](#)

[The Christian Warfare](#)

[---February 13, 1917](#)

[AN OLD ARTICLE](#)

[---February 20, 1917](#)

[Circular Letter](#)

[---February 20, 1917](#)

[Good Meetings](#)

[---February 27, 1917](#)

[A Pleasant Tour](#)

[---February 27, 1917](#)
[Glorious Hope - An Old Article](#)
[---February 27, 1917](#)
[ORIGIN OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS](#)
[---March 6, 1917](#)
[A DEBATE](#)
[---March 13, 1917](#)
[Romans 6:17](#)
[---March 13, 1917](#)
[Remarks to Elder J. W. Richardson](#)
[---March 13, 1917](#)
[Letter to Elder Leonard](#)
[---May 8, 1917](#)
[The New Birth](#)
[---June 12, 1917](#)
[John 3; John 5](#)
[---July 3, 1917](#)
[Card Playing](#)
[---July 3, 1917](#)
[Debate Postponed](#)
[---July 10, 1917](#)
[A Progressive Mixture](#)
[---July 10, 1917](#)
[An Old Article](#)
[---July 17, 1917](#)
[John 11:39](#)
[---July 17, 1917](#)
[Galatians 3; Galatians 6:18](#)
[---July 17, 1917](#)
[An Oversight](#)
[---July 31, 1917](#)
[McARTHUR SQUEALS](#)
[---August 14, 1917](#)
[Will Not Publish](#)
[---August 14, 1917](#)
[What Shall We Do?](#)
[---August 14, 1917](#)
[Elder Murray's Statement](#)
[---August 14, 1917](#)
[Made Acknowledgment](#)
[---August 21, 1917](#)
[Explanation by Elder Ross](#)
[---August 21, 1917](#)
[A False Statement](#)
[---August 28, 1917](#)
[HAIR AND RAIL SPLITTERS](#)
[---September 4, 1917](#)
[NOT CHANGED](#)
[---September 11, 1917](#)
[REMARKS TO W. R. MOORE](#)
[---September 11, 1917](#)
[WAS HE A MASON?](#)
[---September 11, 1917](#)
[PEACE RESTORED](#)
[---September 11, 1917](#)
[PEACE PREVAILS](#)

[---September 25, 1917](#)
[REMARKS TO ELDER JAMES DUNCAN](#)
[---September 25, 1917](#)
[WILL NOT BE PUBLISHED](#)
[---September 25, 1917](#)
[BIBLE EVIDENCES](#)
[---November 6, 1917](#)
[GOSPEL BAPTISM AND COMMUNION](#)
[---November 13, 1917](#)
[THE YOUNG MEMBERS](#)
[---December 11, 1917](#)
[CLOSE OF VOLUME THIRTY-TWO](#)
[---December 18, 1917](#)

1918

[INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME XXXIII](#)
[---January 1, 1918](#)
[CONSOLIDATION](#)
[---January 8, 1918](#)
[WELCOME TO COME](#)
[---January 15, 1918](#)
[CANNOT SIN](#)
[---February 5, 1918](#)
[ELDER J. B. LITTLE](#)
[---February 12, 1918](#)
[Ephesians 1; Ephesians 6:24](#)
[---February 19, 1918](#)
[Song Service](#)
[---February 19, 1918](#)
[Joshua 24:15](#)
[---March 5, 1918](#)
[Revelation 16:13](#)
[---March 5, 1918](#)
[A Debate](#)
[---July 16, 1918](#)
[Prayer Book](#)
[---July 16, 1918](#)
[Red Cross and Woman Suffrage](#)
[---September 3, 1918](#)
[Church Organized](#)
[---September 17, 1918](#)
[A Debate](#)
[---September 17, 1918](#)
[Government Rulings](#)
[---September 24, 1918](#)
[Close of Volume 33](#)
[---December 24, 1918](#)

1919

[A Breakdown](#)
[---January 14, 1919](#)
[Elder John R. Daily in the Daily-Hughes Debate](#)
[---January 21, 1919](#)
[Some Questions](#)
[June 3, 1919](#)
[Preacher Not Wanted](#)
[---June 10, 1919](#)
[A Magnetic Healer](#)

[---July 1, 1919](#)
[Some Questions](#)
[---July 1, 1919](#)
[1 Corinthians 15:29](#)
[---July 1, 1919](#)
[Wrong To Gamble](#)
[---September 23, 1919](#)
[Questions of Order](#)
[---September 23, 1919](#)
[A CHILD BY BIRTH](#)
[---September 23, 1919](#)
[ELDER C. H. CAYCE:](#)
[Moved](#)
[---November 18, 1919](#)

1920

[NEW WAY OF SALVATION](#)
[---January 6, 1920](#)
[The Small Size](#)
[---January 13, 1920](#)
[What Shall Be Done In The Case of Disorderly Elders or Preachers? - IS IT A PROBLEM?](#)
[---February 3, 1920](#)
[What Next?](#)
[---March 2, 1920](#)
[PAPER SHORTAGE](#)
[---March 9, 1920](#)
[WHO IS TO BLAME?](#)
[---April 20, 1920](#)
[Question of Order](#)
[---June 1, 1920](#)
[Malachi 4:2; Isaiah 58:8; Isaiah 30:15](#)
[---June 1, 1920](#)
[Question on Discipline](#)
[---June 15, 1920](#)
[Remarks To A Letter](#)
[---June 15, 1920](#)
[Mark 12:31](#)
[---June 15, 1920](#)
[Appreciated Gift](#)
[---July 1, 1920](#)
[Judas' Feet Not Washed](#)
[---July 1, 1920](#)
[Heresy](#)
[---July 1, 1920](#)
[Desire To Encourage](#)
[---July 1, 1920](#)
[Debate In Alabama](#)
[---July 15, 1920](#)
[Two-Seed Doctrine](#)
[---July 15, 1920](#)
[Some Questions](#)
[---August 1, 1920](#)
[Some Questions](#)
[---August 1, 1920](#)
[Paper Not Wanted](#)
[---August 15, 1920](#)
[Articles Left Out](#)

1921

[A Misrepresentation](#)

[---May 15, 1921](#)

[Guilty of Robbery](#)

[---May 15, 1921](#)

[Suppose You Try It](#)

[---September 15, 1921](#)

[The Sacramental Supper](#)

[---October 15, 1921](#)

[The Service of God](#)

[---December 1, 1921](#)

1922

[Where Are We Drifting?](#)

[---January 15, 1922](#)

[One Hundred Years Old](#)

[---February 1, 1922](#)

[That Peace Move](#)

[---February 1, 1922](#)

[Christian Conflicts](#)

[---March 1, 1922](#)

[Should Make Acknowledgment](#)

[---May 1, 1922](#)

[To "One In The Woods"](#)

[---May 1, 1922](#)

[Parson Crook\(ed\) Again](#)

[---May 15, 1922](#)

[Should They Be Retained?](#)

[---May 15, 1922](#)

[An Endorsement](#)

[---May 15, 1922](#)

[Baptism In The Name Of The Lord](#)

[---May 15, 1922](#)

[What Do You Say?](#)

[---June 1, 1922](#)

[An Old Circular Letter](#)

[---June 1, 1922](#)

[Hot Shot Objected To](#)

[---June 15, 1922](#)

[Blessed Hope](#)

[---June 15, 1922](#)

[A Suggestion](#)

[---June 15, 1922](#)

[Where Are We At?](#)

[---July 1, 1922](#)

[Secret Order Insurance](#)

[---July 1, 1922](#)

[A Debate](#)

[---July 1, 1922](#)

[Endorsement](#)

[---July 1, 1922](#)

[Should Be Separate](#)

[---July 15, 1922](#)

[Questions Of Order](#)

[---July 18, 1922](#)

[Regeneration After Death](#)

[---July 15, 1922](#)

[Tour In Tennessee And Mississippi](#)

[---August 15, 1922](#)

[Query](#)

[---September 1, 1922](#)

[The Debate Near Lebanon, Mo](#)

[---September 15, 1922](#)

[Sugar Creek Association](#)

[---September 15, 1922](#)

[Mountain Springs Association](#)

[---September 15, 1922](#)

[Old-Fashioned Church Service To Be Presented](#)

[---October 1, 1922](#)

[Wildcat Whisky](#)

[---October 1, 1922](#)

[Position Endorsed](#)

[---October 1, 1922](#)

[John 13:8](#)

[---October 15, 1922](#)

[Explanation Wanted](#)

[---November 1, 1922](#)

[Repentance](#)

[---November 1, 1922](#)

[How To Get Peace](#)

[---December 1, 1922](#)

[1923](#)

[Remarks To Olive Dodd](#)

[---January 15, 1923](#)

[Tour In Alabama](#)

[---January 15, 1923](#)

[Debate At Parrish, Alabama](#)

[---February 1, 1923](#)

[Remarks On A Council](#)

[---February 1, 1923](#)

[Pastor Should Quit](#)

[---February 1, 1923](#)

[Replies To "Where Are We At?"](#)

[---March 15, 1923](#)

[Call For Meeting](#)

[---April 1, 1923](#)

[A Call For Prayer And For Peace](#)

[---April 1, 1923 \(From Gospel Messenger by request.\)](#)

[Request Granted](#)

[---April 15, 1923](#)

[Matthew 18:8-9, 15-17](#)

[---April 15, 1923](#)

[The Debate At Parrish](#)

[---April 15, 1923](#)

[Debate At Watertown, Tenn](#)

[---April 15, 1923](#)

[Questions On Predestination](#)

[---May 1, 1923](#)

[Is He An Absoluter?](#)

[---May 1, 1923](#)

[Debate With Ben M. Bogard](#)

[---May 1, 1923](#)

[Apology and Explanation](#)

[---May 15, 1923](#)
[Peace Meeting At Greenfield](#)
[---May 15, 1923](#)
[Greenfield Meeting](#)
[---May 15, 1923](#)
[Tour In Alabama](#)
[---May 15, 1923](#)
[Gospel Messenger Sold](#)
[---May 15, 1923](#)
[Back On The Staff](#)
[---June 1, 1923](#)
[Trip In Tennessee](#)
[---June 15, 1923](#)
[Remarks To W. R. Blasingame](#)
[---June 15, 1923](#)
[Remarks To A Letter](#)
[---June 15, 1923](#)
[John 9:31](#)
[---July 1, 1923](#)
[On Our Staff Again](#)
[---July 1, 1923](#)
[Acts 19:1-3 AND 1 Corinthians 14:34-35](#)
[---July 1, 1923](#)
[Debate At Leedy, Miss.](#)
[---July 1, 1923](#)
[Remarks To J. T. Jackson](#)
[---July 15, 1923](#)
[Lesson Learned By Experience](#)
[---September 1, 1923](#)
[God's Work Not Man's Work - Remarks To C. D. Willis](#)
[---September 15, 1923](#)
[Bible Conference](#)
[---October 1, 1923](#)
[Do Not Care To Publish](#)
[---October 1, 1923](#)
[Both Sides](#)
[---November 1, 1923](#)
[Association Rule](#)
[---November 1, 1923](#)
[Names Removed From Staff](#)
[---December 1, 1923](#)
[The Mount Olive Association](#)
[---December 1, 1923](#)
[Elder Hull Restored](#)
[---December 15, 1923](#)
[The Cayce-Bogard Debate](#)
[---December 15, 1923](#)
[Close of Volume Thirty-Eight](#)
[---December 15, 1923](#)

1924

[Introduction To Volume Thirty-Nine](#)
[---January 1, 1924](#)
[A Servant Is Worthy Of His Hire](#)
[---January 1, 1924](#)
[Remarks To Elder J. H. Fisher](#)
[---January 1, 1924](#)

[Pray For Zion](#)
---February 1, 1924

[Elder O'Neal's Proposition](#)
---February 1, 1924

[Another False Report](#)
---February 1, 1924

[Special Heresy Issue](#)
---February 1, 1924

[Remarks To James M. Mayer](#)
---February 1, 1924

[Extracts Published](#)
---February 15, 1924

[Matthew 24](#)
---February 15, 1924

[Debate Near McEwen, Tenn.](#)
---March 15, 1924

[Remarks To Elder R. O. Raulston](#)
---March 15, 1924

[We Feel So Thankful](#)
---April 1, 1924

[Enoch Translated](#)
---April 1, 1924

[Carey The Father](#)
---April 15, 1924

[Remarks To Elder J. W. Hoppes](#)
---May 1, 1924

[Remarks To Elder T. W. Lindsey](#)
---May 1, 1924

[Progressives Lose Suit](#)
---May 1, 1924

[Trouble Among Them](#)
---May 1, 1924

[Is It Lawful?](#)
---May 1, 1924

[The Debate Near McEwen](#)
---May 1, 1924

[One Suffers On Account Of Others](#)
---May 15, 1924

[Going To California](#)
---May 15, 1924

[Present For Baby](#)
---May 15, 1924

[Fullerite Lost His Pants](#)
---June 1, 1924

[J. B. Hardy Causing Trouble](#)
--- July 1, 1924

[Trip In California](#)
---July 15, 1924

[Time Changed](#)
---July 15, 1924

[He Got Pinched](#)
---August 15, 1924

[Pamphlet by Elder A. V. Simms](#)
---September 1, 1924

[Trip In Tennessee And Alabama](#)
---September 1, 1924

[Reply From Elder Simms](#)

[---October 1, 1924](#)

[Our Mother Gone](#)

[---October 15, 1924](#)

[Call For A Peace Meeting](#)

[---October 15, 1924](#)

[Our Mother Gone](#)

[---November 1, 1924](#)

[Away From Home](#)

[---December 1, 1924](#)

[A Good Meeting](#)

[---December 1, 1924](#)

[Peace Is Desired](#)

[---December 15, 1924](#)

[Close of Volume Thirty-Nine](#)

[---December 15, 1924](#)

1925

[Introduction to Volume Forty](#)

[---January 1, 1925](#)

[John 6:44-45](#)

[---January 1, 1925](#)

[On The Warpath](#)

[---January 1, 1925](#)

[Good Evidence](#)

[---January 15, 1925](#)

[Elder Wilson's Confession](#)

[---February 1, 1925](#)

[A Question of Order](#)

[---February 15, 1925](#)

[1 Corinthians 16:1-2](#)

[---March 1, 1925](#)

[Remarks to Mrs. C. N. Brown](#)

[---March 15, 1925](#)

[God's People in the Flood](#)

[---March 15, 1925](#)

[Remarks to Mrs. W. M. Hopson, Jr.](#)

[---April 1, 1925](#)

[A New Thing Under The Sun](#)

[---April 15, 1925](#)

["Murder Will Out"](#)

[---April 15, 1925](#)

[What They Desire](#)

[---May 1, 1925](#)

[Peace Meeting Called](#)

[---May 1, 1925](#)

[Private Letters](#)

[---May 15, 1925](#)

[Matthew 8:11-12](#)

[---May 15, 1925](#)

[Some Questions](#)

[---May 15, 1925](#)

[Filling Appointments](#)

[---May 15, 1925](#)

[Church Discipline](#)

[---May 15, 1925](#)

[Remarks Concerning J. T. M'Rae](#)

[---June 1, 1925](#)
[Another Name On Our Staff](#)
[---June 15, 1925](#)
[Our Trip in Virginia and North Carolina](#)
[---June 15, 1926](#)
[Letter from D. V. Spangler](#)
[---July 1, 1925](#)
[Another Editor Added](#)
[---July 1, 1925](#)
[Bear Creek Association](#)
[---July 1, 1925](#)
[Law of God on Baptism](#)
[---July 15, 1925](#)
[Lost in the Flood - Remarks](#)
[---July 15, 1925](#)
[Appointments Called In](#)
[---August 1, 1925](#)
[Would Not Hear Them](#)
[---August 1, 1925](#)
[Woe Because of Immoral Preachers by Price Billingsby](#)
[---August 15, 1925](#)
[Work Legal](#)
[---August 15, 1925](#)
[Don't Want the Paper](#)
[---September 1, 1925](#)
[Acts 10:36-39](#)
[---September 1, 1925](#)
[The Infant Question](#)
[---September 1, 1926](#)
[Mountain Springs Association](#)
[---September 15, 1925](#)
[Elder W. S. Broom](#)
[---September 15, 1925](#)
[Another Move For Peace](#)
[---October 15, 1925](#)
[Heresy and Heretics](#)
[---October 15, 1925](#)
[Isaiah 5:8](#)
[---December 1, 1925](#)

1926

[Introduction to Volume 41](#)
[---January 1, 1926](#)
[More Editorial Help](#)
[---January 1, 1926](#)
[Peace Restored](#)
[---January 1, 1926](#)
[Another Unprofitable and Deplorable Strife of Words](#)
[---January 15, 1926](#)
[Appointments Called In](#)
[---January 15, 1926](#)
[Remarks to Elder Lee Hanks](#)
[---February 1, 1926](#)
[Judas and the Sacramental Supper](#)
[---February 15, 1926](#)
[Ordered Name Dropped](#)
[---February 15, 1926](#)

[The Word Shall](#)
---[March 1, 1926](#)
[What Elder Newman Said](#)
---[April 1, 1926](#)
[Predestination](#)
---[April 15, 1926](#)
[Peace Desired](#)
---[April 15, 1926](#)
[Roger Williams](#)
---[April 15, 1926](#)
[The Meeting at New Hope](#)
---[April 15, 1926](#)
[Questions and Answers](#)
---[April 15, 1926](#)
[Dancing and Such Like Things](#)
---[April 15, 1926](#)
[Makes Acknowledgment](#)
---[May 1, 1926](#)
[Oneness for Twenty-Four Years](#)
---[June 1, 1926](#)
[A Statement](#)
---[June 1, 1926](#)
[Imposed Upon](#)
---[June 15, 1926](#)
[Some Good Meetings](#)
---[June 15, 1926](#)
[Immortality of the Soul](#)
---[July 1, 1926](#)
[An Endorsement](#)
---[July 1, 1926](#)
[Words of Encouragement](#)
---[July 15, 1926](#)
[Church Act](#)
---[July 15, 1926](#)
[God's Determinate Counsel](#)
---[July 15, 1926](#)
[Luke 16:19-23](#)
---[July 15, 1926](#)
[Can They Disobey?](#)
---[August 1, 1926](#)
[1 Timothy 4:10](#)
---[August 1, 1926](#)
[Deuteronomy 11:26; 30:15](#)
---[August 15, 1926](#)
[Union of Separate and Regular Baptists](#)
---[August 15, 1926](#)
[Who Owns The Child?](#)
---[August 15, 1926](#)
[The Dallas Meeting](#)
---[September 15, 1926](#)
[Another Trouble Settled](#)
---[September 15, 1926](#)
[On The War Path](#)
---[September 15, 1926](#)
[Tired Creek Church Settlement](#)
---[September 15, 1926](#)

[Big Sandy Association](#)
---September 15, 1926
[A Trouble Maker](#)
---October 1, 1926
[Flint River Association](#)
---October 1, 1926
[History Suggested](#)
---October 15, 1926
[A Confession](#)
---October 15, 1926
[Not A New Doctrine](#)
---October 15, 1926
[Thinking of Mother](#)
---November 1, 1926
[Our Trip to Tennessee](#)
---November 1, 1926
[Is It Of The Devil?](#)
---November 15, 1926
[Do Not Pay Him](#)
---November 16, 1926
[A Society](#)
---November 15, 1926

1927

[Introduction to Volume Forty-Two](#)
---January 1, 1927
[Lordship Among the Ministry](#)
---January 1, 1927
[Church Evidence](#)
---January 15, 1927
[Elder Petty's Name Dropped](#)
---February 1, 1927
[Back on the Staff](#)
---February 1, 1927
[Should Report Them](#)
---February 1, 1927
[Claim They Are Not Excluded](#)
---February 15, 1927
[The Thing in the Way](#)
---February 15, 1927
[The Dallas Meeting](#)
---March 1, 1927
[Wild Gourds](#)
---March 15, 1927
[A Correction](#)
---March 15, 1927
[Paying the Preacher](#)
---May 1, 1927
[John's Baptism and the Communion](#)
---June 15, 1927
[Missionaries Do Harm in China](#)
---June 15, 1927
[Jesus and His Friends](#)
---August 1, 1927
[Whale Swallowed Jonah](#)
---August 15, 1927
[Published by Request](#)

[---August 15, 1927](#)
[Wine Used in Sacrament](#)
[---August 15, 1927](#)
[Romans 9:13](#)
[---August 15, 1927](#)
[Trip in Alabama](#)
[---September 15, 1927](#)
[Our Trip in Texas](#)
[---October 15, 1927](#)

1928

[Introduction to Volume 43](#)
[---January 1, 1928](#)
[Another Name Added](#)
[---January 15, 1928](#)
[Remarks to John R. Whitfield](#)
[---January 15, 1928](#)
[At Oxford, Mississippi](#)
[---February 1, 1928](#)
[Meeting at Little Rock](#)
[---April 1, 1928](#)
[Elder Fisher's Name Dropped](#)
[---May 15, 1928](#)
[Moving to Thornton](#)
[---July 1, 1928](#)
[Obey God or Man?](#)
[---August 15, 1928](#)
[Remarks to \(Miss\) Inez Vaughn](#)
[---September 15, 1928](#)
[1 Corinthians 15:22-23](#)
[---October 1, 1928](#)
[Elder Hassell Dead](#)
[---October 1, 1928](#)
[Requests Name Dropped](#)
[---October 1, 1928](#)
[Our Association](#)
[---October 15, 1928](#)
[Remarks to Elder D. M. Vail](#)
[---October 15, 1928](#)
[Flint River Association](#)
[---November 1, 1928](#)
[Remarks to Elder J. W. West](#)
[---December 1, 1928](#)
[Brother Hollingsworth's Letter](#)
[---December 15, 1928](#)
[Close of Volume 43](#)
[---December 15, 1928](#)

1929

[Introduction to Volume 44](#)
[---January 1, 1929](#)
[Enjoys the Paper](#)
[---January 1, 1929](#)
[Remarks to Elder W. P. Merrell](#)
[---January 1, 1929](#)
[Thirty-Nine Years Ago](#)
[---January 15, 1929](#)
[Brother Fairchild in Mississippi](#)

[---February 15, 1929](#)
[Deacons and Preachers](#)
[---February 15, 1929](#)
[From the Gospel Standard](#)
[---February 15, 1929](#)
[God Was There First](#)
[---March 1, 1929](#)
[Unreasonable Demand](#)
[---March 1, 1929](#)
[An Anonymous Letter](#)
[---March 15, 1929](#)
[Change Made](#)
[---March 15, 1929](#)
[No Sin, No Salvation](#)
[---April 1, 1929](#)
[Change of Form](#)
[---April 15, 1929](#)
[Evolution Disproved](#)
[---April 15, 1929](#)
[Organs in Churches](#)
[---May 2, 1929](#)
[Secret Orders](#)
[---May 2, 1929](#)
[Matthew 16:18-19](#)
[---May 16, 1929](#)
[Contradicted Himself](#)
[---May 16, 1929](#)
[In Mississippi](#)
[---May 30, 1929](#)
[Christ's Birthday](#)
[---May 30, 1929](#)
[Another Change](#)
[---June 13, 1929](#)
[Trip in Mississippi](#)
[---June 27, 1929](#)
[Billy Sunday](#)
[---June 27, 1929](#)
[An Appreciated Letter](#)
[---June 27, 1929](#)
[Now A Weekly](#)
[---July 4, 1929](#)
[Matthew 10:6 AND Matthew 28:19](#)
[---July 4, 1929](#)
[Can We Not Withdraw?](#)
[---July 11, 1929](#)
[Reply to H. L. Whitehouse](#)
[---July 18, 1929](#)
[Meetings in Little Rock](#)
[---August 1, 1929](#)
[1 Corinthians 5:9-13](#)
[---August 8, 1929](#)
[Ephesians 5:5,23,33](#)
[---August 15, 1929](#)
[Dan River Association](#)
[---August 22, 1929](#)
[Good Meetings](#)

[---August 22, 1929](#)
[More Good Meetings](#)
[---August 29, 1929](#)
[Romans 6:3-4](#)
[---August 29, 1929](#)
[Tour Ended in East](#)
[---September 19, 1929](#)
[Matthew 20:16 AND Matthew 22:14](#)
[---September 19, 1929](#)
[Associations Attended](#)
[---October 3, 1929](#)
[Matthew 22:30,32](#)
[---October 10, 1929](#)
[Too Much of the World](#)
[---October 31, 1929](#)
[Bible Conference](#)
[---October 31, 1929](#)
[A Good Meeting](#)
[---October 31, 1929](#)
[Call An Old Man](#)
[---October 31, 1929](#)
[Absolute Powers of Pope Reveled Legislation and Administration of Vatican City Laws Rest With Pontiff](#)
[---November 7, 1929](#)
[1 Timothy 5:9-11](#)
[---November 7, 1929](#)
[Hebrews 6:1-6](#)
[---November 14,1929](#)
[Jeremiah 23:1-2](#)
[---November 21, 1929](#)
[Ill Health Prevents Going](#)
[---November 28, 1929](#)
[Health Broken](#)
[---December 19, 1929](#)
[Close of Volume 44](#)
[---December 19, 1929](#)

[1930](#)

[Introduction to Volume 45](#)
[---January 2, 1930](#)
[2 Timothy 2; 4:22](#)
[---January 9, 1930](#)
[Many, Many Thanks](#)
[---January 16, 1930](#)
[Price Not High](#)
[---January 16, 1930](#)
[To The Subscribers of The Primitive Baptist](#)
[---January 16, 1930](#)
[Appreciated Letter](#)
[---January 16, 1930](#)
[Matthew 3:5-9](#)
[---January 30, 1930](#)
[Chosen and Predestinated](#)
[---February 6, 1930](#)
[Help Obtained](#)
[---February 6, 1930](#)
[Infant Salvation](#)

[---February 6, 1930](#)
[Elder Fairchild](#)
[February 13, 1930](#)
[Acts 9:7 AND Acts 22:9](#)
[---February 13, 1930](#)
[Another Editor](#)
[---February 13, 1930](#)
[Baptist Standard](#)
[---February 20, 1930](#)
[Revelation 11:3,7-8](#)
[---February 27, 1930](#)
[Remarks to Elder J. R. Wilson](#)
[---February 27, 1930](#)
[Our Meeting](#)
[---March 6, 1930](#)
[London Confession](#)
[---March 27, 1930](#)
[Falling From Grace Article No. 2](#)
[---April 24, 1930](#)
[Deacons Ordained](#)
[---April 24, 1930](#)
[Falling From Grace Article No. 3](#)
[---May 1, 1930](#)
[Falling From Grace Article No. 4](#)
[May 8, 1930](#)
[Falling From Grace Article No. 5](#)
[---May 15, 1930](#)
[Falling From Grace Article No. 6](#)
[---May 22, 1930](#)
[Falling From Grace Article No. 7](#)
[---May 29, 1930](#)
[Marrying After Divorce In Case Of Adultery](#)
[---June 5, 1930](#)
[Falling From Grace Article No. 8](#)
[---June 12,1930](#)
[Another Editor](#)
[---June 12, 1930](#)
[Falling From Grace Article No. 9](#)
[---June 19, 1930](#)
[Falling From Grace Article No. 10](#)
[---June 26, 1930](#)
[Eternal Life Now](#)
[---July 3, 1930](#)
[Acts 2: 28:31](#)
[---July 10, 1930](#)
[Rules of Decorum](#)
[---July 10, 1930](#)
[Will Not Our People Consider?](#)
[---July 17, 1930](#)
[Questions On Order](#)
[---August 7, 1930](#)
[Remarks to Elder W. M. Brecheen](#)
[---August 7,1930](#)
[Trip to Alabama and Mississippi](#)
[---August 14, 1930](#)
[Remarks to W. H. Hancock](#)

[---August 14, 1930](#)
[Associations Visited](#)
[---August 28, 1930](#)
[James 1:26,27](#)
[---September 4, 1930](#)
[Remarks to Mrs. Emma V. Smith](#)
[---September 4, 1930](#)
[1 Corinthians 16:24](#)
[---September 11, 1930](#)
[Mourners Are Blessed](#)
[---September 11, 1930](#)
[Will They Know Each Other?](#)
[---September 11, 1930](#)
[Communion With Trumpet Folks](#)
[---October 30, 1930](#)
[Christmas Gift](#)
[---December 18, 1930](#)
[Are You "Blue?"](#)
[---December 18, 1930](#)
[Close of Volume 45](#)
[---December 18, 1930](#)

[1931](#)

[Introduction to Volume 46](#)
[---January 1, 1931](#)
[Women Prophets](#)
[---January 1, 1931](#)
[Encouraging Letter](#)
[---January 1, 1931](#)
[Wrong At Home](#)
[---January 8, 1931](#)
[The Progressives](#)
[---January 8, 1931](#)
[Many Thanks](#)
[---January 8, 1931](#)
[Valid Baptism And Some History](#)
[---January 15, 1931](#)
[The Progressives](#)
[---February 12, 1931](#)
[Should Forgive](#)
[---March 5, 1931](#)
[General Meeting](#)
[---March 12, 1931](#)
[Valid Baptism](#)
[---March 12, 1931](#)
[Why Not Save All?](#)
[---March 19, 1931](#)
[Valley Of Dry Bones](#)
[---April 30, 1931](#)
[Glad Tidings Bought](#)
[---May 21, 1931](#)
[Bible Conference](#)
[---July 23, 1931](#)
[Elder T. S. Dalton Called Home](#)
[---August 20, 1931](#)
[Elder J. H. Phillips Dead](#)
[---October 15, 1931](#)

[Merry Christmas](#)

[---December 24, 1931](#)

[Close of Volume 46](#)

[---December 24, 1931](#)

[1932](#)

[Introduction to Volume 47](#)

[---January 7, 1932](#)

[Biographical](#)

[---January 7, 1932](#)

[Things Appreciated](#)

[---January 7, 1932](#)

[The Outlook](#)

[---February 4, 1932](#)

[Elder Hutchens Complains](#)

[---February 18, 1932](#)

[Did Not Like It](#)

[---March 10, 1932](#)

[Thirty Missionaries Waiting To Go](#)

[---April 28, 1932](#)

[Soupy Salvation](#)

[---July 7, 1932](#)

[The Lone "Pilgrinder"](#)

[---September 15, 1932](#)

[Remarks To Geo. W. Langford](#)

[---December 22, 1932](#)

[Close of Volume 47](#)

[---December 22, 1932](#)

[1933](#)

[Introduction to Volume 48](#)

[---January 5, 1933](#)

[How To Organize](#)

[---October 19, 1933](#)

[Papers Missed](#)

[---November 30, 1933](#)

[Close of Volume 48](#)

[---December 28, 1933](#)

[1934](#)

[Introduction to Volume 49](#)

[---January 11, 1934](#)

[Looking Backward](#)

[---January 25, 1934](#)

[Going To The "Bowwows"](#)

[---January 25, 1934](#)

[Getting Mixed](#)

[---February 8, 1934](#)

[Perverse Rulers](#)

[---February 22, 1934](#)

[Changed to Semi-Monthly](#)

[---March 1, 1934](#)

[God the Cause of Sin](#)

[---April 5, 1934](#)

[What Shall We Do?](#)

[---April 19, 1934](#)

[Should Be Truthful](#)

[---April 19, 1934](#)

[God the Cause of Sin](#)

[---May 17, 1934](#)

[Was Mother Right?](#)

[---May 17, 1934](#)

[They Wash Feet](#)

[---May 17, 1934](#)

[God the Cause of Sin](#)

[---June 7, 1934](#)

[An Explanation](#)

[---June 7, 1934](#)

[Light Shines Better](#)

[---June 7, 1934](#)

[What Next!](#)

[---September 6, 1934](#)

[Will You Escape?](#)

[---September 6, 1934](#)

[John 1:11-13](#)

[---October 4, 1934](#)

[Eternal Hell](#)

[---October 4, 1934](#)

[More Help](#)

[---October 4, 1934](#)

[Our Association](#)

[---October 18, 1934](#)

[More Help](#)

[---October 18, 1934](#)

[More Help](#)

[---November 15, 1934](#)

[Efforts Commended](#)

[---November 15, 1934](#)

[Greenfield Association](#)

[---December 6, 1934](#)

[Close of Volume 49](#)

[---December 20, 1934](#)

[1935](#)

[Introduction to Volume 50](#)

[---January 3, 1935](#)

[Crime Increasing](#)

[---January 17, 1935](#)

[Good Articles Left Out](#)

[---January 17, 1935](#)

[Brotherly Advice](#)

[---February 7, 1935](#)

[Church Rights](#)

[---February 7, 1935](#)

[Another Helper](#)

[---February 21, 1935](#)

[Tract Salvation](#)

[---February 21, 1935](#)

[Hymn Book](#)

[---February 21, 1935](#)

[It Is Funny](#)

[---February 21, 1935](#)

[Church Harbors Crime - Minister Won't Reveal Name of "Confessed" Kidnap](#)

[---February 21, 1935](#)

[The Man of Sorrows](#)

[---March 21, 1935](#)

[The Lord Is Faithful](#)
---[March 21, 1936](#)
[Christianity To Export](#)
---[March 21, 1935](#)
[Romans 9:13 and Future Identity](#)
---[March 21, 1935](#)
[Sunday Schools](#)
---[April 4, 1935](#)
[Compulsory Military Training](#)
---[April 4, 1935](#)
[John Newton](#)
---[April 4, 1935](#)
[Thanks, Brother](#)
---[April 18, 1935](#)
[Work Appreciated](#)
---[May 16, 1935](#)
[Fairchild, Hardy, Todd, and Bishop](#)
---[June 20, 1935](#)
[Ministerial Qualifications](#)
---[June 20, 1935](#)
[In A Sad Plight](#)
---[June 20, 1935](#)
[Words of Approval](#)
---[June 20, 1935](#)
[Ministerial Qualifications Article No. 2](#)
---[July 4, 1935](#)
[Fairchild, Hardy, Todd and Bishop](#)
---[July 18, 1935](#)
[Ministerial Qualifications Article No. 3](#)
---[July 18, 1935](#)
[Ministerial Qualifications Article No. 4](#)
---[August 1, 1935](#)
[Requests For Views](#)
---[August 1, 1935](#)
[Sheep and Goats](#)
---[August 15, 1935](#)
[1 Timothy 5:9](#)
---[August 15, 1935](#)
[Faith and Belief](#)
---[August 15, 1935](#)
[Todd's New Paper](#)
---[September 5, 1935](#)
[John 5:39](#)
---[September 5, 1935](#)
[Several Questions](#)
---[September 5, 1935](#)
[Luke 7:28](#)
---[September 5, 1935](#)
[The Last Judgment](#)
---[September 5, 1935](#)
[Sabbath Question](#)
---[September 5, 1935](#)
[Are Agreed](#)
---[September 5, 1935](#)
[More Absolute Doctrine](#)
---[September 19, 1935](#)

[Instrumental Music](#)
---September 19, 1935

[Rich Man and Lazarus](#)
---September 19, 1935

[Matthew 9:16-17](#)
---September 19, 1935

[Jude 1:25](#)
---September 19, 1935

[Matthew 19:27-28](#)
---September 19, 1935

[Another Corresponding Editor](#)
---October 3, 1935

[Revelation 20:12](#)
---October 3, 1935

[Mark 16:16](#)
---October 3, 1935

[1 Corinthians 11:33](#)
---October 3, 1935

[Revelation 12:7-8](#)
---October 3, 1935

[Destruction of Sodom](#)
---October 3, 1935

[Where Was Judas?](#)
---October 3, 1935

[Our Association](#)
---October 17, 1935

[To Our Exchanges](#)
---October 17, 1935

[Galatians 4:22-31](#)
---October 17, 1935

[Non-Attendance](#)
---October 17, 1935

[Who Crucified Christ?](#)
---October 17, 1935

[Psalms 37:25](#)
---November 7, 1935

[Administration of Baptism](#)
---November 7, 1935

[Easter and Christmas](#)
---November 7, 1935

[Elder Webb Withdraws](#)
---November 7, 1935

[Galatians 4:27](#)
---November 7, 1935

[Restoring Excluded Persons](#)
---November 7, 1935

[Some Additional History](#)
---November 21, 1935

[One Talent Man](#)
---November 21, 1935

[Building The Home Christian](#)
---December 5, 1935

[Matthew 4:16-17](#)
---December 5, 1935

[1 Corinthians 7:15](#)
---December 5, 1935

[Genesis 2:15-17](#)
---December 5, 1935
[Elder Newman Gone](#)
---December 19, 1935
[Jeremiah 2:13](#)
---December 19, 1935
[Close of Volume 50](#)
---December 19, 1935

1936

[Introduction to Volume 51](#)
---January 2, 1936
[Our Special Offer](#)
---January 2, 1936
[Holiday Remembrances](#)
---January 2, 1936
[Matthew 5:40 AND 1 Corinthians 6:1](#)
---January 2, 1936
[What Should Be Done?](#)
---January 2, 1936
[W. T. Stegall](#)
---January 16, 1936
[From Belshazzar to Roosevelt](#)
---January 16, 1936
[Radio Sermon](#)
---February 6, 1936
[Pool Halls](#)
---February 6, 1936
[John 13:14-15,17](#)
---February 6, 1936
[First Baptists in Mississippi](#)
---February 20, 1936
[Five Smooth Stones](#)
---February 20, 1936
[1 Corinthians 11:19](#)
---February 20, 1936
[2 Kings 20:1-7 AND Job 14:5](#)
---February 20, 1936
[Elder Stegall Heard From](#)
---March 5, 1936
[Elder Fisher Passed Away](#)
---March 5, 1936
[A False Accusation](#)
---March 19, 1936
[Make The Paper A Weekly](#)
---March 19, 1936
[Romans 8:1](#)
---April 2, 1936
[Ephesians 5:25-27](#)
---April 2, 1936
[Our Trip in Texas](#)
---April 16, 1936
[Revelation 20:4](#)
---April 16, 1936
[Andalusia Peace Meeting](#)
[May 7, 1936](#)
[Who Died in Adam?](#)

[May 7, 1936](#)
[Kind of Death Adam Died](#)
[May 7, 1936](#)
[The First Man](#)
[---May 7, 1936](#)
[Trip in Alabama](#)
[May 7, 1936](#)
[Tour in Alabama](#)
[---July 2, 1936](#)
[Obituaries](#)
[---July 2, 1936](#)
[Church Sovereignty](#)
[---July 16, 1936](#)
[Galatians 6:7 AND Ephesians 5:6](#)
[---July 16, 1936](#)
[An Absoluter](#)
[---July 16, 1936](#)
[1 Peter 4:18](#)
[---August 6, 1936](#)
[The Holy Calling](#)
[---August 6, 1936](#)
[Tour in Mount Zion](#)
[---August 20, 1936](#)
[1 Timothy 4:1-3](#)
[---August 20, 1936](#)
[Future Identity](#)
[---August 20, 1936](#)
[Matthew 18:8-9,15-17](#)
[---September 3, 1936](#)
[Ephesians 2; 6:24](#)
[---September 3, 1936](#)
[Missions](#)
[---September 17, 1936](#)
[Another New Bible](#)
[---November 5, 1936](#)
[A Delightful Trip](#)
[---December 3, 1936](#)
[Whiskey Drinking](#)
[---December 17, 1936](#)
[Close of Volume 51](#)
[---December 17, 1936](#)

[1937](#)

[Introduction to Volume 52](#)
[---January 7, 1937](#)
[Holiday Remembrances](#)
[---January 7, 1937](#)
[Barn Burned](#)
[---January 7, 1937](#)
[Wonderful Order](#)
[---January 21, 1937](#)
[Explanation Wanted](#)
[---February 4, 1937](#)
[Unionism](#)
[---February 18, 1937](#)
[Mutual Rights](#)
[---March 4, 1937](#)

[Questions on Scripture](#)
---[March 18, 1937](#)
[The Organ Question](#)
---[March 18, 1937](#)
[Land, A Trust and Must Be Preserved](#)
---[April 1, 1937](#)
[History of Walker County, Alabama](#)
---[April 1, 1937](#)
[Should Have Peace](#)
---[April 1, 1937](#)
[John 1:1 AND 2 Timothy 4:2](#)
---[April 15, 1937](#)
[Jeremiah 24:1-3](#)
---[April 15, 1937](#)
[Hebrews 12:6-8,12](#)
---[May 6, 1937](#)
[Meeting Suggested](#)
---[May 20, 1937](#)
[After The Flesh](#)
---[May 20, 1937](#)
[Philippians 2: 4:23 AND Jude 1:25](#)
---[June 3, 1937](#)
[Elder Cash Passed Away](#)
---[June 3, 1937](#)
[Proposed Peace Meeting](#)
---[June 17, 1937](#)
[Fenced Vineyard](#)
---[June 17, 1937](#)
[Putting Up Fences](#)
---[July 1, 1937](#)
[Elder Duncan Married](#)
---[July 1, 1937](#)
[Should Be Marked](#)
---[July 15, 1937](#)
[Remarks to A. H. Roden](#)
---[July 16, 1937](#)
[Rev Cayce Pentecost Baptized](#)
---[August 5, 1937](#)
[Call For Peace Meeting](#)
---[August 5, 1937](#)
[Our Union Meeting](#)
---[August 5, 1937](#)
[Meeting at Cross Roads](#)
---[August 5, 1937](#)
[Call For Peace Meeting](#)
---[August 19, 1937](#)
[Our Church Papers](#)
---[August 19, 1937](#)
[Will You, Please?](#)
---[August 19, 1937](#)
[The Nashville Meeting](#)
---[October 21, 1937](#)
[John 8:1-11](#)
---[October 21, 1937](#)
[Excuses](#)
---[November 4, 1937](#)

[Corresponding Editor](#)
---November 18, 1937
[Hens Furnish Church](#)
---November 18,1937
[Would Be Glad To Go](#)
---November 18, 1937
[Advice and Advise](#)
---December 2, 1937
[Close of Volume 52](#)
---December 16, 1937

1938

[Introduction to Volume 53](#)
---January 6, 1938
[Questions on Order](#)
---January 6, 1938
[Back With Us](#)
---January 6, 1938
[Softshell Stung](#)
---January 6, 1938
[Things Appreciated](#)
---January 6, 1938
[Genesis 6:2 Remarks To Reinert Varhang](#)
---January 6, 1938
[Changed Over](#)
---January 20, 1938
[Money Disappears](#)
---January 20, 1938
[Cheap Salvation](#)
---January 20, 1938
[Meddlers and Busybodies](#)
---February 3, 1938
[Mississippi Baptist History](#)
---February 17, 1938
[A Stunner](#)
---February 17, 1938
[Trip Cut Short](#)
---February 17, 1938
[Hardshellism Refuted](#)
---March 3, 1938
[A Young Dog](#)
---March 3, 1938
[An Address To Young Preachers](#)
---March 3, 1938
[Isaiah 45:7](#)
---March 17, 1938
[Preachers Should Not Lie](#)
---March 17, 1938
[Elder Fairchild Again](#)
---April 7, 1938
[Elder Monk Passed Away](#)
---May 19, 1938
[Returned Home](#)
---May 19, 1938
[Elder J. C. Ross Bereaved](#)
---May 19, 1938
[Nashville Meeting](#)

[---June 16, 1938](#)
[Tour in Tennessee and Kentucky](#)
[---June 16, 1938](#)
[Confession Changed](#)
[---June 16, 1938](#)
[Secret Orders "an error corrected"](#)
[---July 7, 1938](#)
[In Arkansas and Oklahoma](#)
[---August 4, 1938](#)
[Pie Supper Planned](#)
[---August 4, 1938](#)
[Another Correction](#)
[---August 18, 1938](#)
[Tour in the North and East](#)
[---October 6, 1938](#)
[Our Association](#)
[---October 6, 1938](#)
[Troubleth Israel](#)
[---October 20, 1938](#)
[Studies in Predestination](#)
[---November 3, 1938](#)
[Encouraging Letter](#)
[---November 3, 1938](#)
[Hardshell Bragging Again](#)
[---November 17, 1938](#)
[Titus 2: 3:15](#)
[---December 1, 1938](#)
[Close of Volume 53](#)
[---December 15, 1938](#)

1939

[INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME LIV](#)

[---January 5, 1939](#)
[Remembrances](#)
[---January 5, 1939](#)
[Triune God](#)
[---January 19, 1939](#)
[When Are We Sheep?](#)
[---January 19, 1939](#)
[Could He Have Kept From It?](#)
[---February 2, 1939](#)
[Bible Classes](#)
[---February 2, 1939](#)
[Meetings Resumed](#)
[---February 2, 1939](#)
[Malachi 4:5-6](#)
[---February 2, 1939](#)
[Holy Kiss](#)
[---February 2, 1939](#)
[Doors Closed](#)
[---February 2, 1939](#)
[John 5:37-42](#)
[---February 16, 1939](#)
[Romans 8:13](#)
[---February 16, 1939](#)
[Scioto Association](#)
[---March 2, 1939](#)

[Elder Morgan Replies](#)
---[March 2, 1939](#)
[Communion Service](#)
---[March 2, 1939](#)
[Views Requested](#)
---[March 16, 1939](#)
[Some Questions](#)
---[March 16, 1939](#)
[Please Have Mercy](#)
---[April 6, 1939](#)
[1 John 2:2,15-17](#)
---[April 6, 1939](#)
[Revelation 3:5](#)
---[April 6, 1939](#)
[A Reminder](#)
---[April 6, 1939](#)
[John 10](#)
---[April 20, 1939](#)
[Ecclesiastes 9:14-16](#)
---[April 20, 1939](#)
[Proverbs 13:22](#)
---[April 20, 1939](#)
[Preaching and Singing Article Number 1](#)
[May 4, 1939](#)
[The Resurrection](#)
[May 4, 1939](#)
[No Weekly Paper](#)
[May 4, 1939](#)
[1 Corinthians 6:1-7](#)
[May 4, 1939](#)
[Condemnation and Salvation](#)
---[May 18, 1939](#)
[Exodus 3:1-6](#)
---[May 18, 1939](#)
[Preaching and Singing Article Number 2](#)
---[May 18, 1939](#)
[They Were Jews](#)
---[June 1, 1939](#)
[Communion Meeting](#)
---[June 1, 1939](#)
---[June 15, 1939](#)
[Resurrection](#)
---[June 15, 1939](#)
[Women Prophesy](#)
---[June 15, 1939](#)
[Preaching and Singing Article Number 4](#)
---[July 6, 1939](#)
[Communion at Bethel](#)
---[July 6, 1939](#)
[Some Questions Asked](#)
---[July 20, 1939](#)
[A Good Meeting](#)
---[July 20, 1939](#)
[Selling Chances](#)
---[July 20, 1939](#)
[Preaching and Singing Article Number 5](#)

[---August 3, 1939](#)
[Millennium and 2 Peter 2: 3:18](#)
[---August 3, 1939](#)
[A Drunken Feast](#)
[---August 3, 1939](#)
[Romans 11:2-5](#)
[---August 17, 1939](#)
[General Address](#)
[---September 7, 1939](#)
[Matthew 1:1 AND 1 Peter 2:9](#)
[---September 21, 1939](#)
[Likes The Good Old Songs](#)
[---September 21, 1939](#)
[God's Way – The Right Way](#)
[---October 19, 1939](#)
[Preaching and Singing Article Number 6](#)
[---November 2, 1939](#)
[Special Meeting](#)
[---November 2, 1939](#)
[Universalism, Rutherfordism, Goats, Esau](#)
[---November 16, 1939](#)
[A Short Trip](#)
[---November 16, 1939](#)
[Great Body Not Gone](#)
[---November 16, 1939](#)
[Preaching and Singing Article Number 7](#)
[---December 7, 1939](#)
[Holiday Greetings](#)
[---December 21, 1939](#)
[Moved To Thornton](#)
[---December 21, 1939](#)
[Desire Expressed](#)
[---December 21, 1939](#)
[Will You?](#)
[---December 21, 1939](#)
[Close of Volume 54](#)
[---December 21, 1939](#)

[1940](#)

[Introduction to Volume 55](#)
[---January 4, 1940](#)
[Double Size](#)
[---January 4, 1940](#)
[Fiftieth Anniversary](#)
[---January 4, 1940](#)
[Kind Remembrances](#)
[---January 4, 1940](#)
[A Tribute to Elder Cayce \(1 of 2\)](#)
[---January 4, 1940](#)
[Some Flowers](#)
[---January 4, 1940](#)
[Well Spent Life](#)
[---January 4, 1940](#)
[For The Trumpet Baptists](#)
[---January 18, 1940](#)
[The Book of Life](#)
[---February 1, 1940](#)

[Organs in Churches](#)
---February 15, 1940

[Is Ours A Christian Nation?](#)
---March 7, 1940

[Preaching and Singing Article No. 8](#)
---March 21, 1940

[An Abomination](#)
---March 21, 1940

[Quietly Passed Away](#)
---March 21, 1940

[Covenant Breakers](#)
---March 21, 1940

[Memorial to Convention](#)
---April 4, 1940

[Not Their Faith](#)
---April 4, 1940
---April 18, 1940

[John 3:8](#)
---May 2, 1940

[Streamlined Religion](#)
---May 2, 1940

[A False Claim](#)
---May 16, 1940

[Our Trip East of River](#)
---June 6, 1940

[Jeremiah 7:17-20](#)
---June 6, 1940

[John 10:16](#)
---June 6, 1940

[Preaching and Singing Article No. 9](#)
---June 6, 1940

[Messenger of Zion Sold](#)
---June 6, 1940

[Something Different](#)
---June 6, 1940

[The Term Church](#)
---June 20, 1940

[Respecter of Persons](#)
---July 4, 1940

[Trip Northwest](#)
---July 18, 1940

[Lest We Forget](#)
---July 18, 1940

[Acknowledgement of Error](#)
---July 18, 1940

[John 14:2-3](#)
---August 1, 1940

[A Great Loss](#)
---August 1, 1940

[Isaiah 14:20](#)
---August 1, 1940

[Ambassadors](#)
---August 15, 1940

[Which](#)
---August 15, 1940

[Remarks to Emerson McAfee](#)

[August 15, 1940](#)
[John 1:11-13](#)
[---September 5, 1940](#)
[Point Remove-New Hope Association](#)
[---September 5, 1940](#)
[Editorial Writings](#)
[---September 5, 1940](#)
[Mountain Springs Association](#)
[---September 19, 1940](#)
[Salem Association](#)
[---September 19, 1940](#)
[Sugar Creek Association](#)
[---September 19, 1940](#)
[Went Back To Trumpet](#)
[---October 3, 1940](#)
[South Arkansas Association](#)
[---October 3, 1940](#)
[Hard on "Hardshells"](#)
[---October 17, 1940](#)
[Associations Visited](#)
[---November 7, 1940](#)
[Experience and Call to the Ministry](#)
[---November 7, 1940](#)
[Trip in Georgia](#)
[---November 21, 1940](#)
[Meeting in Memphis](#)
[---December 5, 1940](#)
[About At An End](#)
[---December 5, 1940](#)
[Do You Want It?](#)
[---December 5, 1940](#)
[Agents](#)
[---December 5, 1940](#)
[Close of Volume 55](#)
[---December 19, 1940](#)

[1941](#)

[Introduction to Volume 56](#)
[---January 2, 1941](#)
[Remembrances](#)
[---January 2, 1941](#)
[A Good Old Letter](#)
[---January 2, 1941](#)
[Is It Sufficient?](#)
[---January 16, 1941](#)
[Trip in Georgia](#)
[---January 16, 1941](#)
[Another Editor](#)
[January 16, 1941](#)
[Acts 18:24-28 AND Acts 19:1-6](#)
[---February 6, 1941](#)
[Temperance Facts](#)
[---February 6, 1941](#)
[Waldensian Confessions](#)
[---February 20, 1941](#)
[What Is That To Thee?](#)
[---March 6, 1941](#)

[For The Poor](#)
---[March 6, 1941](#)
[Little Things](#)
---[March 6, 1941](#)
[1 Corinthians 2:9-10](#)
---[March 20, 1941](#)
[Elder Pittman Passed Away](#)
---[March 20, 1941](#)
[Special Service](#)
---[March 20, 1941](#)
[Book Wanted](#)
---[March 20, 1941](#)
[By Grace](#)
---[March 20, 1941](#)
[Matthew 19:16-26](#)
---[April 3, 1941](#)
[Hope and Belief](#)
---[April 3, 1941](#)
[For The Poor](#)
---[April 3, 1941](#)
[Hebrews 9:27-28](#)
---[April 3, 1941](#)
[Another Good Man Gone](#)
---[April 3, 1941](#)
[Romans 5:6-10](#)
---[May 1, 1941](#)
[Elder Webb's Book](#)
---[May 1, 1941](#)
[Are They God's Choice?](#)
---[May 15, 1941](#)
[A Serious Charge](#)
---[May 15, 1941](#)
[A Pleasant Trip](#)
---[June 5, 1941](#)
[Isaiah 42:3](#)
---[June 5, 1941](#)
[What Unity!](#)
---[June 5, 1941](#)
[Revelation 5:1-3](#)
---[June 19, 1941](#)
[Is It Deception?](#)
---[June 19, 1941](#)
[Requests Not Answered](#)
---[June 19, 1941](#)
[A New Pamphlet](#)
---[June 19, 1941](#)
[Church Organized](#)
---[July 17, 1941](#)
[What To Do](#)
---[August 7, 1941](#)
[Hebrews 13:10](#)
---[August 7, 1941](#)
[Our Association](#)
---[August 7, 1941](#)
[Associations Attended](#)
---[August 21, 1941](#)

[A Good Fight](#)
---August 21, 1941
[Beautiful Feet](#)
---September 4, 1941
[Should Be Careful](#)
---September 18, 1941
[Ahead Of Time](#)
---September 18, 1941
[Baptists In All Ages](#)
---September 18, 1941
[A Wonderful Meeting](#)
---October 2, 1941
[Characteristics](#)
---October 16, 1941
[Two Parents](#)
---November 6, 1941
[Let God Be True](#)
---November 20, 1941
[Tour In Illinois](#)
[December 4, 1941](#)
[Close of Volume 56](#)
---December 18, 1941
[Church Organized](#)
---December 18, 1941

1942

[INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME 57](#)

---January 1, 1942
[Longing For A Home](#)
---January 1, 1942
[Remembrances](#)
---January 1, 1942
[Advocate and Messenger Sold](#)
---January 1, 1942
[Ordination of Deacons](#)
---January 15, 1942
[Charge Delivered by Elder C. H. Cayce to the Church and to the Brethren Ordained to the Office of Deacon, at Oak Grove, La.](#)
---DECEMBER 14, 1941
[Question on Divorce](#)
---January 15, 1942
[Messenger of Zion Bought](#)
---February 5, 1942
[Corresponding Editors](#)
---February 5, 1942
[Receiving the Word](#)
---February 5, 1942
[John 11:48](#)
---February 5, 1942
[Luke 2:52](#)
---February 5, 1942
[Unconditional Election](#)
---February 19, 1942
[Ishmaelites](#)
---March 5, 1942
[What School?](#)
---March 5, 1942

[May Be Too Late](#)
---[March 19, 1942](#)

[Church News](#)
---[March 19, 1942](#)

[Eternal Punishment](#)
[May 7, 1942](#)

[For Our Boys](#)
[May 7, 1942](#)

[Romans 8:8-10](#)
---[May 21, 1942](#)

[All Alike](#)
---[May 21, 1942](#)

[From A Soldier Boy](#)
---[May 21, 1942](#)

[Recent Survey](#)
---[June 4, 1942](#)

[We Will Do Thee Good](#)
---[June 18, 1942](#)

[A Stranger](#)
---[June 18, 1942](#)

[Is This The Morning Or Evening Of Civilization?](#)
---[June 18, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)
---[July 2, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)
---[July 16, 1942](#)

[To Our Soldier Boys](#)
---[July 16, 1942](#)
---[August 6, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)
---[August 20, 1942](#)

[Complainings](#)
---[August 20, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)
---[September 3, 1942](#)

[What Will Men Not Say?](#)
---[September 3, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)
---[September 17, 1942](#)

[Carcass and Eagles](#)
---[September 17, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)
---[October 1, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)
---[October 15, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)
---[November 5, 1942](#)

[No Objection Then](#)
---[November 5, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)
---[November 19, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)
---[December 3, 1942](#)

[Then and Now](#)
---[December 3, 1942](#)

[Election and Predestination](#)

[--December 17, 1942](#)
[Holiday Greetings](#)
[--December 17, 1942](#)
[CLOSE OF VOLUME 57](#)
[--December 17, 1942](#)

1896 – 1899

Our Meeting at Ralston

---December 24, 1896

We had a pleasant meeting indeed with our home church, at Ralston, Tenn., on the first Sunday and Saturday before, in this month (Dec. 5 and 6). Elders K. M. Myatt and W. W. Sammons were with us, and preached both days.

After the brethren had preached on Saturday the church went into conference, and after attending to all other business coming before the church, agreed to postpone the ordination of Brother C. H. Cayce until next day (Sunday). It was also agreed that we have services at our homes every night (up to the next Friday night) during the week. Sunday Elders Myatt and Sammons both preached. Then the writer made a few remarks and gave an opportunity for the reception of members, when Sister Mattie Blacknall came forward and was received into the fellowship of the church as a candidate for baptism. We then gave a few minutes intermission, after which the church came together, and, during the singing of a song, the congregation reassembled. Next, proceeded to ordain Brother C. H. Cayce (my son) to the work of the gospel ministry, as follows:

MINUTE OF PRESBYTERY

The Primitive Baptist Church of Christ at Ralston having requested, or called upon Elders W. W. Sammons and K. M. Myatt, and they, in answer to that call, having met with said church at the time of their regular meeting in December, 1896, together with Elder S. F. Cayce and Deacons W. I. Tucker and T. P. Rawls, all formed themselves into a presbytery and proceeded with said ordination as follows:

The Moderator called upon the church for one of her members to act as spokesman, when Brother I. P. Rawls was appointed to so act.

1st. Examination of the candidate by Elder Sammons.

- 2nd. Prayer by Elder Myatt.
 - 3rd. Charge delivered by Elder Cayce.
 - 4th. Laying on of hands by the presbytery.
 - 5th. Hand of fellowship extended by the church.
- W. W. SAMMONS, Moderator.
S. F. CAYCE, Clerk.

As stated above, the meeting was a very pleasant one indeed; the brethren both preached with good liberty and greatly to the comfort, seemingly, of all our brethren and sisters. Not only did we enjoy their preaching, but the writer felt greatly encouraged because of the fact that they both endorsed our views, or believe just as we do, on the question of Christian obedience, time or "common" salvation. Brother Sammons stated that he had never heard me advance a single idea or express any sentiment whatever that he did not fully endorse. This was very encouraging indeed. So much so, that I could but let our brethren know (after he was done preaching) that he had heard me at his own (the Mississippi River) association, in October upon the very points, and in expression of the same ideas for which I have recently been denounced as an Arminian. I know that when I first became identified with the Baptists in this country (in 1866) they ALL believed that our eternal salvation is wholly unconditional, altogether the work of God, but that the time salvation, or Christian enjoyment, of the children of God (those already born of God) in this life depends greatly upon their obedience, and that it (their timely salvation) is in that sense conditional. And I know that this is what I believed and tried to preach when I first began to speak in public. Hence it is very encouraging to have such brethren as Elders Myatt and Sammons visit us and preach to our brethren at home just what we try to preach wherever we go.

The brethren both preached at my residence Saturday night, and Brother Myatt preached Sunday night at the Presbyterian church house in Martin. They had good liberty also at these meetings, as well as at our church house. Elder Sammons bade us farewell and boarded train for home at 3 o'clock Monday morning, and Elder Myatt left that day at noon. We feel to hope these dear brethren will visit us again soon, and can assure them that our brethren and sisters of Ralston church would be glad to have them come at any time. According to agreement, on Saturday, we (self and wife, and after Monday night Claud also) visited brethren through the week and held services at their homes "from house to house" as follows: Monday night at Brother W. I Tucker's; Tuesday night at Brother Doe Staulcup's; Wednesday at 3 o'clock p. m. at Brother John Lewis'; Wednesday night at Linn' Staulcup's; Thursday night at Brother

Haywood Ellis'. An opportunity was given every time for the reception of members, and on Wednesday night Brother Polk Fields came forward and related a reason of his hope in Christ and was received into the fellowship of the church as a candidate for baptism. And on Thursday at 2 o'clock p. m. we met at Mr. Clint Moore's pond (near where Brother Ellis lives) where the writer baptized the two candidates (Sister Blacknall, who was received on Sunday, and Brother Fields, who was received Wednesday night).

Friday night the writer filled an appointment at Brother J. W. Stanfield's house where we had no Baptists to hear us except Brother and Sister Stanfield and Brother Polk Fields, who conveyed me next morning to Sandy Branch. This closed our weeks meeting with the brethren and sisters of Ralston Church, and it was, indeed, a glorious time with the unworthy writer. To the Lord be all the glory. C.

Questions

---February 1, 1897

1. Does God will the eternal salvation of all mankind?
2. Will all mankind be saved eternally?
3. If not, is it true that God does all His pleasure?

A. HARDSHELL

ANSWER

1. We answer emphatically, Yes. **(II Peter 3:9)**, "Not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." All who come to repentance will be eternally saved, therefore it is the will of God to save all.
2. No! All mankind will not be saved. "And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." - **(Revelation 20:15)**.

Yes, it is true that God does all His pleasure. "But it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." You see the pleasure of our Lord is to save those only who believe in His Son through the preaching of the gospel.

Why can't God will to save the race through faith in His Son, and yet do His pleasure in saving only those who believe, and condemning those who live and die impenitent?

Provisions were made in the death of Christ sufficient to save all Adam's race, but all will not accept offered mercy and hence must be lost. "He was made under law to redeem them that were under the law," but not whether or no. "He came to seek and to save that which was lost." All men were lost, hence He came to save all through His own appointments. Man must accept or be eternally lost.

Baptists can answer any question pertaining to their faith without contradicting themselves. Do you see?

The above appeared in the Baptist Reaper of December 17, 1896, a Soft-shell paper published in Martin. I have been requested to pay some respect to the same, and according to promise will proceed to "make it pleasant for Tommy" for a little while.

1st. Elder Moore says "yes," and quotes a part of **(II Peter 3:9)**. Here is the whole verse as it reads in the Bible: "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Then he says, "all who come to repentance will be eternally saved, therefore it is the will of God to save all." Let us quote **(Romans 2:4)**: "Or despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" Elder Moore says God does all His pleasure, and tries to prove that it is God's will that all the race repent. We have shown that God leads those to repentance who do repent. If God does all His pleasure, and His pleasure is that all the race come to repentance, it follows that He will lead all of them to repentance; and according to Elder Moore's position Universalism would be the truth. That is not all. Peter says God is not slack concerning His promise. Hence, as God leads those to repentance who do repent, it follows, if God's will is that all come to repentance, He will certainly lead them to repentance. According to Elder Moore's position God is very slack. The Elder is not like Peter in his belief. Elder Moore's position says God is slack. Peter says he is not slack. I guess Peter was correct, and Elder Moore mistaken. Elder Moore quotes a part of **(I Corinthians 1:21)**. Here it is as it reads in the Bible: "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." According to Elder Moore's position it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save the unbeliever. The text shows conclusively that the preaching of the cross is foolishness to the world-to the unbeliever. No man will believe any proposition that is foolish to him. It may be ever so sensible to you, but as long as it is foolishness to him he will never believe it. Hence, according to Elder Moore's position, no one will ever reach heaven and immortal glory.

The Elder says Baptists can answer any question pertaining to their faith without contradicting themselves. If you can do so, you will have to try it again, for you failed this time. See these two statements: "Therefore it is the will of God to save all." "You see the pleasure of our Lord is to save those only who believe in His Son

through the preaching of the gospel." God wills to save all the race, and His pleasure is to save only a part of the race-yet no contradiction!

"He was made under the law to redeem them that were under the law." If the purpose was to redeem them that were under the law, and He fails to do so, was not the coming of Christ in vain? The text Elder Moore quotes a part of is (**Galatians 4:4-5**), and reads as follows: "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." The next verse says: "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." This shows conclusively that those for whom Christ was made under the law are redeemed from under the law, and that God sends forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts crying, Abba, Father. Not only so, but it shows that they are all sons-or children-of God, hence heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ. If one of those for whom Christ was made under the law fails to be redeemed from under the law and its curse, then all may fail, and heaven be a blank at last-so far as the redeemed family of our God is concerned.

But Elder Moore quotes another text: "He came to seek and to save that which was lost." Brother Moore, please tell us why you contradicted this text. You say mercy is offered. This text does not say a word about such a thing as offered mercy. It plainly says He came to seek and to save.

If He came to seek and to save, He did not come to offer to save those who would accept. If the salvation of a sinner depends upon his seeking God, then none will be saved, if Paul told the truth, for in Rom. iii. ii he says "there is none that seeketh after God."

Elder Moore says provisions were made in the death of Christ sufficient for the salvation of all the race, but he failed to tell where the text is in the Bible that says so. He has good reason for not doing it-because it is not there. Jesus says, in (**John 10:15**), "And I lay down my life for the sheep." In verse 26 He says, "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you." This shows conclusively that He did not make provision for the salvation of all the race, as Elder Moore affirms. If He did make provision for the salvation of those who were not His sheep, it was not made by His death, because He did not die for them. He died for the sheep, and did not die for those who were not sheep.

Softshell Baptists cannot answer many questions propounded by "Hard-shells" without contradicting themselves and also the Bible. Do you see?
C. H. CAYCE.

My Tour in Missouri

---July 19, 1897

I left home on Thursday night, May 27, to visit the churches of the Current River and Cape Girardeau Associations in Missouri, and some other churches in Arkansas. I visited New Hope, Buffalo, Antioch, Ellsinore, and Mt. Zion churches, of the Current River Association, and Macedonia, Little Hope, Bethel, Providence and Harmony, of the Cape Girardeau Association, then Little Flock, Harmony, and Mt. Zion, in the Harmony Association in Arkansas; then El Bethel and Indian Creek, in the Mississippi River Association, in Tennessee. I was away from home thirty-five days; delivered forty-four discourses, and traveled nearly 800 miles. I baptized eleven dear saints on the trip—two sisters into the fellowship of the church at Buffalo, three sisters and three brothers at Ellsinore (dear Brother Pace has already given an account of the meeting there), two sisters at Providence, and one sister at Mt. Zion, near Jonesboro.

At Jonesboro I learned that the church at Memphis had not published the appointment for me there, though I would not have known it had it not been for the kindness of a dear brother who lives in Mississippi. They did not want me because I do not believe and will not preach that God unconditionally predestinated all things whatsoever come to pass, whether good, bad, or indifferent, and that people cannot help doing the meanness they are guilty of.

Just here I want to say that I will not preach such God-dishonoring doctrine as that if every Baptist Church in the universe closes her doors against me. But I have no fear of that, for it is impossible for me to go to all the places where I am requested to go. I do not mention this Memphis matter to wound the feelings of any dear brother or sister, but feel it to be my duty to do so for the sake of other brethren in the ministry.

One circumstance I want to mention about the meeting at Ellsinore which Brother Pace said nothing about. On Saturday evening or Sunday morning when Brother Hill learned that his wife had joined the church, he raised his hand and cursed me and the church. On Monday night before services at Elm Branch he told me about what he had said and done, and told me also that on Sunday when I arose and had been talking only a few moments he was made to see how wrong he had done, and that he then loved me; and he fell on my

shoulder and wept like a whipped child and said, "Mr. Cayce, I love you more than any man on earth, and if you can find it in your heart to do so, I beg you to forgive me." I told him that I would forgive him as freely as I ever did anything in my life. As Brother Pace has already stated, he joined on Thursday following, and I baptized him on Friday morning. I thought of the language of one of old, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes" The sister I baptized at Jonesboro was only 14 years old. I feel to hope that the dear Lord was surely with me on that tour; and I feel amply repaid for all of the toil and suffering I endured to make the trip, it is no use for one to tell me that there is no such thing as reward in the service of God. As certain as I am, indeed, a servant of God, that certain it is that He rewarded me on this tour. Such reward as I felt to realize is worth more to me than all the combined salary of the Arminian preachers of the universe for twelve months. I would rather know that I am a called minister of God, and that I had been of benefit, and that even the least of the Lord's humble poor had been comforted by my weak and feeble efforts in trying to preach, than to be president of the United States. When I have the evidence that one of the dear saints of God is benefited by my weak efforts, it is enough to pay me for the toil and pain and afflictions that I endure in trying to preach Jesus and Him crucified.

I met many dear brethren and sisters on this tour, and their kindness to me shall never be forgotten. May our dear Redeemer abundantly bless each of them. And I want all of them who see this to just consider this as a personal letter to them.

In conclusion, I desire to ask an interest in the prayers of all God's dear people. James says, "The fervent effectual prayer of a righteous man availeth much." It would do me good to know that the least one of God's humble poor was sending up a petition to the throne of God's rich grace in my behalf.

Yours in humble hope of a home where there is no more toil, pain, sickness, sorrow, sin nor death,
C. H. CAYCE.

NOTE:-The church in Memphis, Tenn., in the foregoing article is not the Morris Memorial Primitive Baptist Church now in Memphis of which Elder James Duncan is at present the pastor. The above incident occurred before the Morris Memorial Church was constituted.

How Glaring!

---May 1, 1899

I have thought all along since the trouble has been up among the Baptists that I would keep out of print-that is, I would not write on the questions that are causing strife and confusion. All are aware that

so far I have written but little, if anything, on these questions. Many times I have had a deep desire to put in a "little mite," but have resisted until now. I believe I could resist longer, but don't think I will. I see some statements that are so glaringly contradictory in themselves, and some that are so foreign to truth, that I want to say a few things.

In the first place, I want to say that I have before me a copy of a paper called "The Standard of Truth," vol. 2, No. 8, published by Elder Wm. R. Welborn, Mecca, N. C. If the "editor and proprietor" would change the name of his sheet, and call it "The Standard of Untruth," the title would not then be so misleading. Yet the name may-and does-signify the disposition of those who believe the doctrine advocated. If anyone fails to drink in and advocate the doctrines held to by them-that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated all things that come to pass, and that man is an irresponsible machine, and no matter what meanness he does, he can't help it-he is at once branded as an Arminian, or some other epithet is thrust at him, and they at once declare non-fellowship for him. This simply means that whatever their opinion is, it is the standard, and all must come up to the standard, or be left out. But I want to show the inconsistencies of some expressions over the signature of the editor of the aforementioned sheet. On page 13, volume and number mentioned, under the head, "Two Salvations," he says:

Some of the brethren claim that there are two kinds of salvation taught in the Scriptures; and they charge me with teaching that there is but one salvation taught in the Bible, which is not true. I have always tried to teach just what the Holy Scripture teaches, and that is that God is an unchangeable God. That salvation is of the Lord from first to finish. That is not of him that willeth, nor him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy, i. e., that all of God's blessings bestowed upon us are purely by grace. That God has delivered and will yet deliver us; not because of righteousness that we have done, but because of His mercy and grace. That God is but one, and besides Him there is none other, and has but one salvation, and that is salvation by grace.

Now there are different salvations spoken of in the Bible, but only one, as touching the salvation of God's people, whether in time or eternity. W. R. W.

Now, notice this expression: "And they charge me with teaching that there is but one salvation taught in the Bible, which is not true." Now look at this: "I have always tried to teach" -what have you always tried to teach? Among other things, you say you have tried to teach "That God is but one, and besides Him there is none other, and has

but ONE salvation!" It "is not true when they charge you with teaching there is but one salvation, yet you say you have always TRIED to teach it! We can only conclude that if they had charged you with trying to teach that there is but one salvation taught in the Bible, then their charge would have been true. Will you please tell us how we are to know when to believe what you say?

Now look at this expression: "There are different salvations spoken of in the Bible, but only one, as touching the salvation of God's people, whether in time or eternity." If there is only one salvation spoken of in the Bible as to God's people, and yet there is more than one salvation spoken of in the Bible, then there must be a salvation of others than God's people spoken of. Will Elder W. please tell us who are embraced in the "different salvations" spoken of? If you say God's people, we will not think you believe it, for you have said there is "only one, as touching the salvation of God's people," or you did not believe this last expression when you wrote it. According to what the Elder says, he does not believe Timothy was a child of God. Paul said to him, **(I Timothy 4:16)**, "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." Paul says he shall save himself and them that hear him. Elder W. says there is only one salvation spoken of, as touching the salvation of God's people. Hence, Timothy was not a child of God, and those that hear him were not children of God either!

I believe if I could not get up a better pet theory than this thing you brethren have gone into, I would quit. It would be a long ways better for you just to own up that you are wrong, and quit advocating such heresy, for when one is in such a "pinch" that he has to contradict himself as Elder Welborn has in the above, he is bound to know he is wrong, and not contending for the right way. C. H. CAYCE.

1900 - 1905

Debate at Perkins

---January 15, 1900

Debate began at Perkins' Mill, twelve miles east of here, August 21st, and continued four days; subject, "Identity of the Church;" each affirming two days; W. D. Craig of the Church of Christ, Bibby, Miss., and C. H. Cayce, of the Primitive Baptist Church, Martin, Tenn.

Principal points discussed: Origin or Establishment of the Kingdom or Church; Conditionality of Salvation; Possibility of Apostasy; and Close Communion.

Brother Cayce is a strong man and a very rapid speaker; a year communion and foot washing; but these points he would not try to defend. Elder Cayce was very indefinite as to the origin of the church, and was at times very rough towards Brother Craig, calling him names, "Campbelite," "Little Pope," "Godfather," "Ain't he a pretty-looking Thing," etc. This was not argument, but sounded ugly, Let us hope that he will not indulge again in such methods. Elder Cayce is a strong man and a very rapid speaker.

Brother Craig spoke in an earnest manner and with telling effect. He compared Baptist teaching with Bible teaching, and tried to get Elder Cayce to harmonize the two. Elder Cayce's failure to do so, I think, placed the cause of Christ in the front. I think the debate will do a great deal of good. One lady made the confession at the close of the debate.

Tillatoba, Miss, Sept. 21, 1899.

J H. HARRISON.

REMARKS

The above "item" was copied from the Christian Standard of October 7th, 1899, published at Cincinnati, O., and sent to me I am not surprised nor astonished. I don't know how the gentleman learned that I was "a year communion and foot washing," unless he learned it from Mr. Craig, his godfather, for I never said so. The people who were present know that I did defend our practice of feet washing, and that Mr. Craig did not refute the argument. He only made one very weak objection to its being a church ordinance. Mr. Harrison knows-as well as all persons present-that I showed from the Scriptures just when and where the church was organized, and how many and who were the members, and traced the church on down to the present time by history. But what hurt so badly, was, I showed by an abundance of testimony that Mr. Craig's church was set up by Alexander Campbell, at Brush Run, Washington county, Pa., in May, 1811, with thirty members. Hence Mr. Craig is a Campbellite. Poor boy! he is ashamed of his father. If the father was living today, I believe he would be ashamed of his child. I did not use the term, "Little Pope" during the discussion, but I did call him by names that he assumed in his own arguments and assertions. Of course the whole thing "sounded ugly" to Mr. Harrison and some others of the Campbellite persuasion when I was talking; but it would not "sound ugly" for Mr. Craig to say, "it's none of your business!" and other like expressions, in answer to decent and pertinent questions! No; God bless his little sweet soul-he couldn't do ugly-no, no! not for the memory of his mother! Dear me, I wonder what he could do if it was not for remembering her!

Yes; Elder Craig spoke with telling effect-and the affect was that the unbiased and unprejudiced persons present could, and did, plainly see the fallacy and rottenness of Campbellism, as championed by Mr. Craig.

"Elder Cayce" harmonized Baptist doctrine with the Bible; but he was not required to harmonize everything with the Bible that Elder Craig might be pleased to call Baptist doctrine; and I would be a fool if I should undertake such a job, for he has very little idea of what Baptist doctrine is. And he was so bewildered in that discussion that when I would tell him, he did not seem to remember it long enough to make one speech. Yes; I think, too, that the cause of Christ was placed in the front, which is unmistakable evidence that the cause of Campbellism (which was championed by Mr. Craig) was left in the rear. Glad Mr. Harrison was honest enough to acknowledge it. So did Mr. Craig's moderator acknowledge his defeat. I took the train at Coffeerville for home. While I was there waiting for the train, I was in a store belonging to one Mr. Hall. Mr. Craig's moderator entered the room and began a conversation with me. In the conversation I asked him: "Now, be right honest with yourself and with me; are you not bound to acknowledge that your brother was not equal to the task?" He replied that he was bound to admit it-that Mr. Craig was not equal to the task. I have witnesses that he made this admission.

Yes; one lady "made the confession" at the close of the debate. I had heard of the lady before the last day of the debate-so I was not surprised. But she was certainly mad when she "made the confession," for her countenance betrayed her feelings. I have heard that she was not baptized for some time after the debate; and it may be that she has not yet been immersed. Poor woman! according to Elder Craig's theory, if she dies without being immersed, she will go to hell after all! If Campbellism is true. Talmage was correct, sure enough, when he said, "Procrastination is hell's deception." Are you not glad that Campbellism is not true? I am.

I, too, think the debate did good. I remained there for four days following the close, and held meeting each day. During the meeting seven were received into the fellowship of the church, and I had the privilege of baptizing them while there. Some of them said they were fully convinced during the debate that the doctrine believed by the Primitive Baptists was the doctrine of God our Saviour-the doctrine taught in the Bible. I learn that the Campbelites had been rather expecting one of the seven to join them, and they were very much disappointed and chagrined when they heard what had taken place.

The reason the Campbelites were so badly defeated is simply this- they have no solid ground (or rock) upon which to stand. They can't stand on water. One must have a stronger and more solid foundation-the eternal Rock of Ages, the Lord Jesus Christ-and that's what Old Baptists have.

Mr. Craig doesn't want any more of it. He had thirty minutes time for his last speech, in closing the discussion. When he had been speaking about fifteen or twenty minutes, he said: "Well, I believe I am done; and, so far as I am concerned, the debate is over with!" I don't blame him. If I had been in his position it would have been over sooner than that, I think, for every day's work only made it worse for him and his theory. I actually felt sorry for him sometimes-and so did others

If the Campbelites want more, perhaps we can find some one to "pass the ham" for them again.

C. H. CAYCE.

Fashion

---January 27, 1902

"Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein." -(**Jeremiah 6:16**).

Did the Lord command these Israelites to "walk therein," and also "absolutely predestinate" that they should not do so?

Did the Lord command them to "walk therein," and promise them rest as a result of doing so, and "absolutely predestinate" that they should say, "We will not walk therein?"

If God "absolutely predestinated" that they should not "walk therein," was it possible for them to do so?

If it was not possible for them to "walk therein," why did God command them to do so?

Is any doctrine true which is not in harmony with all the divine attributes of Jehovah?

Is not Jehovah a God of justice, and is not justice one of His attributes?

"Hear, O earth: behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts, because they have not hearkened unto my words, nor to my law, but rejected it." -(**Jeremiah 6:19**).

Those Israelites did not "walk therein." If God had "absolutely predestinated" that they should not, then they could not.

Where is the justice in commanding them to "walk therein," at the same time having "absolutely predestinated" that they should not, and bringing evil upon them for not doing so?

Is not such what would be called "double-dealing?" And, does God deal that way?

How old is the term "absolute predestination of all things?" Was not Elder Gilbert Beebe the author of it?

Was that term ever heard of before Elder Beebe invented it?

If Elder Beebe is the author of the term "absolute predestination of all things," and the inventor of it, is it any older than Elder Beebe?

If it is no older than Elder Beebe, is it not a "new way," or a "new path?"

Should we be "for the perpetuation" of the new path? Or, should we "ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein?"

Is it not a fact that in the division between the Baptists and the Missionaries, the Missionaries went to an extreme on the one hand, and those who advocate the doctrine of the "absolute predestination of all things," and use the term without any qualification, went to an extreme on the other?

As both are extremes, are they not both wrong?

Would we not do well to "ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein," and find rest to our souls, and let both these extremes alone?

Yours for the "good old way,"

C. H. CAYCE.

OH CONSISTENCY, ETC.

---April 26, 1904

In the Signs of the Times of April 15th, 1904, is a communication signed by J. B. & Lavinia Dawson. The following are some extracts from the communication:

I am not a member of the visible church, but my wife has been for many years, and my parents were members. I believe in the predestination of all things, and the Signs has always been the firm advocate of that doctrine.

It is plain to me that God has a purpose in everything, both good and bad. It has pleased the Father to reveal to His children as much as He wants them to know.

Moses, when told by the Lord that he must go and bring Israel out of the land of Egypt, did not feel equal to the task, but desired to be excused. Finally the Lord asked of him, "Who hath made man's mouth?" But you know all these things better than I can speak of them. There are many, yes, very many, such proofs that God rules all

things, that He never fails to make His people willing in the day of His power.

The foregoing has been written because I could not help it; it is in the providence of the Almighty if it be right; if it be wrong, it is of the evil one, over whom we know God rules according to His will and to His own glory.

I have no apology to make for writing this.

To the writer of the letter from which the above extracts are taken there is a short admonition given, which is signed "Ed." "We see no good reason why the dear aged friend who wrote the above good letter should not become a member of the church. They that gladly received the word were baptized on the day of Pentecost, we are told. In the New Testament we read of no delay in any case when one had come to believe in Jesus as the Saviour of their souls."

There are a few things in the foregoing extracts I want to notice. I do not wish to appear conspicuous; neither do I wish to be out of place. I trust I sincerely have in mind the fact of the advanced age of all the writers in the foregoing, and I have all due respect for them from that standpoint. But I have more respect for the teaching of God's word than I have for any man or set of men. Hence, the remarks I wish to make are, I trust, made with all due respect.

The writer says it is plain to him that God has a purpose in everything, both good and bad, meaning, we suppose, that God wants everything to take place just as it does. If it is so plain to him, I wish he would tell us what God's purpose was in the assassination of Lincoln, Garfield and McKinley. Was Citeau right when he argued that he could not help killing Garfield, that he was doing God's will; that God predestinated from all eternity that he should do this very thing, and that he could not have done otherwise? What is God's purpose in the many instances of murder, crime, theft and robbery, that are being committed all through our country from Maine to California? Where is the Scripture that says God has a purpose in everything, both good and bad? If there is no Scripture that plainly says this, how can it be plain to the writer that it is true? If the Scriptures do not say it, and it is plain to him, did God make it known to him by a direct revelation? Where is the Scripture that says God makes all these things known by direct revelation? if the Scriptures do not say this, shall we believe such a revelation comes from God? If God reveals this to some of His children and does not reveal it to others, I suppose He tells some things to some of His children that He will not tell to others. So, He is better to some of His children than He is to others.

If it has pleased the Father to reveal as much to His children as He wants them to know, why does the Saviour say, **{(John 5:39)}** "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me?" And why did Paul say, **{(II Timothy 2:15)}** "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth?" And why did the Saviour say, **{(Matthew 28:19)}** "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations?" Who can tell why these things were said? If God reveals as much to His children as He wants them to know, then no one can teach them any more, unless they are taught more than God wants them to learn. What purpose does God have in a man being taught more than He wants him to know?

Again, in regard to God making His people willing in the day of His power. Amos I to understand by the argument made that as long as Moses was unwilling to lead the children of Israel it was not the day of God's power? Is not that the inevitable conclusion of the argument? if it was not the day of God's power, pray tell whose power? Is not every day the day of His power? If not, why not? Are not God's people given a righteous will in regeneration? If so, is not that a manifestation of the power of God? And is not that "the day of His power?"

The writer says the foregoing has been written because he could not help it, and that he has no apology to make for writing it. If he could not help it, we do not ask for any apology. There is no apology needed or required of anyone for doing that which they cannot help. According to this argument, or statement, rather, Giteau was correct in saying he could not help murdering Garfield. Now, I am going to take your own sword and say, according to your own statement, the whole foregoing is a conglomerated mess of contradictions and inconsistencies, and I have written this "because I could not help it." Will you take your own medicine? If not, for the sake of consistency, if for nothing else, do not try to force others to take it.

The editor says he sees no good reason why the writer of that letter should not become a member of the church. Why, dear brother, that is plain enough. As young and as ignorant as I am, I can understand that. According to his own statement in regard to doctrine, and which he says has been the doctrine of the Signs, it is because God has predestinated that he should not join. The day of God's power has not yet come. God has a purpose in his staying out of the church. He could not join the church. He can't even try to become a member. When the day of God's power rolls round in the annals of time, if it ever does, then he will do as the Pentecostians did, be baptized.

When God no longer has a purpose in his staying out of the church, then he will become a member. Dear brother, don't you see why he doesn't become a member? It seems to me your and his doctrine settles the matter as to why everything takes place just as it does. And your brother, Elder R. H. Boaz, swore that a man could not do or will to do a sinful act unless God predestinated that he should do it. Don't you think it would be more honoring to God to abandon such doctrine and such expressions, and be consistent in admonishing God's people to duty? Don't you think it would be better to tell them that God has no pleasure in wickedness, than to tell them that God has purposed it, and that it is His will? Do you not think it would be better to tell them that God was not well pleased with many of the children of Israel on account of their disobedience, and that He is not pleased with the disobedience of His children now, than to tell them that God has a purpose and is pleased with all these things? Don't you think it is better to advocate a doctrine that is consistent with itself and with the Scriptures, than to advocate the doctrine expressed in the extracts above?

I have written the foregoing-not because I could not help it-because I hope I love the truth, and because the inconsistencies were so glaring I felt a desire to notice them. I do wish God's people would wake up and study the Scriptures, and thus come to a knowledge of the truth. May the Lord grant to bless us all with wisdom, and then may we improve what God has blessed us with, and get knowledge.
C. H. C.

MEETING AT MOUNT TABOR

---August 30, 1904

For some time I had a desire to visit Mount Tabor Church once more, where Elder W. W. Sammons held membership at the time of his death. Elder J. C. (Clark) Sammons is the pastor of the church. I have visited this church frequently in years gone by, as well as other churches in the same section of the country. I left home on Friday afternoon before the first Sunday in July and went to Toone, Tenn., and on Saturday morning went with A. S. Anderson and his wife, Sister Anderson, to Mount Tabor Church, about eighteen or twenty miles. This was their regular meeting time, and they were not aware of any intention of mine to be there until they arrived at the church and found me present. I tried to preach on both days, and we had a very enjoyable meeting and a most pleasant time, especially on Sunday. I tried to preach the same doctrine there that I have been trying to preach ever t since I first began, and which I have believed all the time since I have had membership among the Baptists, and

which I used to preach when I visited those churches so often. I tried to show by the plain teaching of the Scriptures, as well as by the Christian experience, that our eternal salvation is all of the Lord-that it is all by the work of the Lord for us and in our hearts, and that we are blessed in obedience. I tried to show that the child of God receives blessings in obedience which cannot be realized or enjoyed by those who live in disobedience. The brethren all endorsed what I advocated, and Brother Sammons stated that it was the doctrine he believed. He also said he had heard many things about what I preached, but that he could endorse all I had said there, etc. I hope the brethren will see that it is a great mistake to condemn anyone before they are heard on any point. We should never do this. I do feel to hope that some good may come of this meeting. I was glad to be there, and they all expressed themselves as being glad also, and insisted that I visit them again, which I hope to do at some time. I believe these are good brethren, and I trust the Lord may bless them, and they may be guided aright in all they do. C.H.C

MISSIONARIES SEVENTY YEARS OLD

---March 28, 1905

Brother Pigue expresses his ignorance in saying that the Missionary Baptists are but seventy years old. The records of history contradict him, and the records of God's word utterly overthrow his bald assertions.-Baptist Flag, March 3, 1905.

Brother Pigue did not miss it so much after all. You Softshells held your one-hundredth anniversary meeting in 1893. The minute of one of your associations that year said "This is our centennial year." Brother Pigue did not miss the truth on that as far as you do in claiming to be the church of Christ. You miss the truth on that claim about 1900 years. The Hall is too small to hold the Pig(ue).
C. H. C.

Going Too Fast

---March 28, 1905

But in our judgment we need some one to put on brakes and check us up, we are going too fast. In a short time we will land in the main thoroughfare of Rome unless such men as Millard are stopped-Baptist Flag, Fulton. Ky., March 23, 1905.

That's what we have thought for a long time. We had little idea that Parson Hall would "own up," but he has. We don't think you are very, far from that main thoroughfare now. Don't be uneasy; the trip is not such a long one but what it can be made quickly without traveling so fast as to take your breath.

C. H. C.

MASONRY SUPERIOR TO SOFTSHELLISM

---April 4, 1905

Some of the brethren in their write-ups, claim that they do not believe in Masonry. Brother, how do you know? It does not require much qualification to disbelieve any sort of proposition. Unbelief is only negative in its character. Masonry does not claim to save people, neither does it claim to be a church, but it is far superior to many so-called churches.- J. K. P. Williams, under "News and Views," in American Baptist Flag.

"But it is far superior to many so-called churches" -yes, superior to all Softshell Baptist churches. Masonry does not claim to save people; Softshell Baptists do. Masonry does not propose to do what Christ alone can do and has done; Softshell Baptists do. I think I would quit the Softshell mess, and if I could do no better, would be a Mason. I am not a Mason, and do not want to be; but I would rather be that than to be a Softshell-so-called Baptist. C. H. C.

WHAT ARMINIANS PREACH

---June 13, 1905

Dr. Cayce says Arminians do really believe and preach some things that are true. That shows that debates do good, for Penick has learned our Hardshell brother that there are some other folks in the earth besides Hardshells.-Baptist Flag, June 8, 1905.

Yes, some Arminians do really preach some things that are true-but some of them are like Parson J. N. Hall-they will contradict it afterwards. We knew there were Softshell tree-frogs before we ever saw Elder Penick. We knew Parson Hall before we knew Elder Penick. Say, Parson, isn't your hat too small?

C. H. C.

Cayce – Tucker

---July 25, 1905

They sure had a bantam fight of it when Claud Cayce (Hardshell) and W. G. Tucker (Campbellite) met in debate. Each disputant should have been furnished with a rattle and a rubber ring to harden the gums.-Baptist Flag, July 20, 1905.

Claud Cayce-Hardshell, as you call him-doesn't need to have his gums hardened to chew the "stuffin" out of your Softshell bombastic hallucination.

C. H. C.

OCCUPYING SAME GROUND

---**July 25, 1905**

When all the Hardshell Baptists get back to the Missionaries, from whence they started, we wonder what little trundle bed we can get for our little Bro. Claud Cayce? He is a sweet little fellow.-Baptist Flag, July 20, 1905.

“When all the Hardshell Baptists get back to the Missionaries!” Who ever did hear of such a thing as one getting back to a place they have never been? The Primitive Baptists stand just where we did before the division, which was brought about by the organization of a missionary board by Fuller and Cary in October, 1792; and we have been occupying the same ground all the while. Your own people did the starting from primitive grounds, and you have gone so far, after the starting, that you said, yourself, “We need some one to put on brakes and check us up, we are going too fast. In a short time we will land in the main thoroughfare of Rome,” etc. You'll never need your trundle bed, parson, for little Claud. He is going to stay where he is. The Lord has reserved to Himself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal, and there is yet a remnant according to the election of grace. We don't know whether Parson Hall is sweet or not. We have never tried Softshell eggs.

C. H. C.

OUR FATHER IS DEAD

---**September 5, 1905**

Our father is dead! Oh, how solemn, how heart-rending are those words! It seems to me I can hardly bear the great trial. Many of you never had the sweet pleasure of being associated personally with him, but you have read his able and humble writings, and thereby you learned to love him. He was just as kind and tender in his home and in his office and in every place as he was in his writings-he manifested the same kind and humble spirit everywhere. In the death of Elder S. F. Cayce we have sustained a loss that cannot be estimated. My own loss in giving him up is more than I have ever endured heretofore, and it is hard for me to be reconciled to it. While it is true that father has given but little attention to the financial matters connected with THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, or with our business, for several years, yet we who had these things to attend to always had his safe and conservative advice and counsel. We could

always go to him and ask him what to do, or what would be best, and his kind advice and loving admonitions, I believe, were always right. Mother has lost one of the best-if not the best-of husbands. He was kind, considerate and affectionate. We children have lost as good a father as ever lived. Is it out of place for me to thus say so much about my dear sainted father? If so, please pardon my weakness. I cannot say as much as I would say-for words fail me. He was kind to all with whom he came in contact, and was generous to a fault. I do not believe any poor, destitute one ever asked him for help and for pity that was sent empty away. He was always ready to administer to those who were in need.

His loving admonitions and kind advice will be missed by us, his children; we have no father now to advise us as to what is, or is not, best for us to do. Oh, how lonely and sad we feel! We can only put our trust and confidence in Jesus, the blessed Saviour, and hope He will heal our broken hearts and give us to be perfectly reconciled to our lot, and enable us to say with our whole hearts, "Not our will, O Lord, but thine be done." Lord, help us.

THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST was founded by Elder S. F. Cayce at Fulton, Ky., on January 1, 1886. In the latter part of August of the same year he moved to Martin, Tenn., with his family, and bought an interest in the printing office here, which was owned by J. B. Gilbert. Mr. Gilbert was owner and editor of the Martin Mail, a county newspaper which was published in the office. Mr. Gilbert and my father continued their partnership in the office for some time-I do not remember how long-until my father bought Mr. Gilbert's remaining interest. On the first day of September, 1886, I did my first work in the office; and ever since that time I have been closely connected with my father in the work and business of the office. It is true that for a short while at one or two different times since then I was not connected with the business on account of poor health, but even during that time I was informed as to how his affairs were progressing. All this being true, I feel that the Lord has wonderfully and abundantly blessed me with his sweet company, kind and loving advice, and godly examples for so many years.

His whole heart and life were devoted to the service of the Lord, his blessed Master. His whole desire was for the welfare of the Old Baptist cause, and it was such an earnest desire of his heart that THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST be conducted in a way to be of the greatest benefit and comfort to them. He expressed to me at different times his wishes that I should continue to conduct the paper as he had tried to do when he should pass away. I do now feel so much and so forcibly my inability to take his place. I feel that no man on earth can

fill his place, much less a poor, weak sinner like I am. I promised him the day he left home that I would do the best I could, and I can only try to conduct the paper like he did conduct it. Oh, I feel so weak and so imperfect, and that I am altogether inadequate to the task. Dear readers, will you please pray that the dear Saviour my father served so faithfully will help me to continue editing and publishing the paper in such a way as that it may still be a great blessing to the dear Old Baptist cause? Pray that the Lord may direct me in wisdom's ways, and bless me with strength and holy boldness that I may have the same undaunted courage of my sainted father to always contend for the true principles of the glorious gospel of Christ and for the ancient landmarks and principles that have always identified our people as separate and distinct from the world. Lord help me also to fight a good light and to keep the faith.

Dear brethren and friends, father spent his precious life serving you. He was never daunted by hardships; it was never too hot or too cold; he has gone away from home when some of his family were afflicted, for no other purpose than to serve you. He always answered your calls when it was possible for him to do so, either to proclaim to you the glad news of salvation through the merits of a crucified and risen Redeemer, or to defend the cause we love so well in face to face combat with those who would oppose the truth he and you loved. It is sad to know he can answer no more of our calls. He died in our service.

As to his finances, I want to say that he died in debt. His home was not paid for, besides the office is in debt. We, his children, are proposing to assume every debt he owed, and we are going to do our very best to pay it all. So, dear brethren, we need your help and assistance in this way too. Mother has spent many a lonely hour at home while father was away from her, preaching to your comfort and joy, and we pray you may remember her now, and that you will help us by renewing your subscription and sending us all the new subscribers you can. We want to pay all he owed and we will do so as soon as possible, and we humbly ask your help in this way.

Once more I want to say that a great responsibility has fallen on the unworthy writer, and no one but Jesus can enable me to bear it. I know that I am not able to bear it alone, and I do feel to have a longing desire to live in such a way as to never bring reproach on the blessed cause of our heavenly Master, and never cause strife and discord or confusion among the dear Old Baptists. May God grant that there may never be such a thing among Baptists as a Cayce party. And may the blessed Saviour help me to conduct THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST in such a way as to be a comfort and benefit to His dear

people, and to continue it in the way marked out by my precious sainted father, so that the standard to which it has attained may never be lowered, and that the blood-stained banner of King Immanuel may still be upheld in its columns. Dear readers, pray for us to this end.

In much sorrow, yet with a sweet trusting hope in Jesus, I am your poor unworthy brother,
C. H. CAYCE.

OUR WORK ENDORSED

---October 10, 1905

We are much gratified to be able to say that at the present time we can state to our readers that many dear and able brethren, many churches, besides union meetings and associations, have directly and indirectly endorsed the action of our union meeting held in Martin on Friday, Saturday and fifth Sunday in July, in dropping Fulton Church from our union. We have already published letters in our columns from a number of brethren, and in our issue of September 26, we published the minute of the proceedings of a union meeting in the West Tennessee Association endorsing our act. We also have letters from several other able brethren endorsing the same act, which will yet be published. Our association, the Greenfield-Philesic, corresponds with the Big Sandy, Forked Deer, Obion, Predestinarian and Soldier Creek Associations. At the time we are writing this editorial all the associations named, except Soldier Creek, have met, and this one is to meet before this issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST is sent out.

The Big Sandy Association was held with the church at Mud Creek, Carroll county, Tenn., beginning on Friday before the first Sunday in September, 1905. Elder E. B. Simmons was chosen moderator and J. S. Browning clerk, both of Huntingdon, Tenn. The following appears in their minutes as the eighth item of their proceedings on Friday: Unanimously agreed that we heartily endorse the action of the union meeting of the Greenfield-Philesic Association in dropping Fulton church from their union while in session with the church at Martin on Friday and Saturday before the fifth Sunday in July. 1905, and we request that this endorsement be published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST and that other papers of same faith and order please copy. The Forked Deer Association met with the church at Flowers Chapel, near Rutherford, Gibson county, Tenn., on Friday before the second Sunday in September, 1905. Elder John Grist, of Friendship, Tenn., was moderator, and L. J. Law, Trenton, Tenn., was clerk. The

following appears in their minutes as the third and fourth items of their business on Saturday:

By motion and second, agreed that we adopt as the sense of this association the action of five of our churches as expressed in their letters, that we declare non-fellowship for the idea of a federal form of government, that the commission was given to the church and not to the apostles or ministry, that it is the duty of the ministry to admonish the alien sinner to repent and believe the gospel, and against affiliation in and with secret institutions

The messengers from Mt. Moriah and Shady Grove withdrew from the association and called for their letters and contribution. The money was given them by their request, but we retained their letters. By motion and second, we agreed to admonish Mt. Moriah and Shady Grove churches to rid themselves of their disorderly pastor, Elder J. V. Kirkland.

The Predestinarian Association met with the church at Turman's Creek, Decatur county, Tenn., on Saturday before the fourth Sunday in September, 1905. Elder W. M. Weaver, Sardis, Tenn., was moderator, and W. B. Williams, Beech Bluff, Tenn., was clerk. On Saturday, Elder S. E. Reid, Henderson, Tenn., and J. M. Malone, Muffin, Tenn., were appointed as a committee to draft suitable resolutions for the consideration of the association on Monday. The following appears in their minutes in Monday's proceedings:

Called on the committee on resolutions. They reported the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

Whereas, Information has reached us, the truth of which we have no reason whatever to doubt, that certain ministers of the church at Fulton, Ky., within the bounds of the Greenfield-Philesic Association, viz., Elder J. V. Kirkland and Elder R. S. Kirkland, are, and have been, introducing new doctrines and practices among the Primitive Baptists, which are contrary to the time-honored principles of the fathers, and is destructive to the peace of the Baptists, to-wit: "federal government of the churches," "that the commission was given to the churches," "a national publishing house for the "Baptists," affiliation with, and membership in, secret organizations." Now, therefore, Be it resolved by the Predestinarian Association, now in session, that we consider all the above things unauthorized by the word of God, contrary to the principles held by the Primitive Baptists for hundreds of years, and is a complete surrender of the principles for which the church has contended since its organization, and we heartily endorse the course of the union meeting held at Martin Church of the Greenfield-Philesic Association in withdrawing fellowship from Fulton Church for holding to and endorsing the principles and practices set

out above; and we make this declaration that all our correspondents, and the Primitive Baptists in general, may know where we stand on this question, and further, that we do not desire these things advocated in the churches composing this association.

Resolved, further, that it is the wish of this body that a copy of these resolutions be published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST that our brethren everywhere may know at once where we stand on these questions.

Respectfully submitted,

ELDER S E. REID,

J. M. MALONE.

Committee.

The Obion Association was held with the church at Nelson's Creek, Henry county, Tenn., on Friday, Saturday and fourth Sunday in September. In another column of this paper is a letter from the clerk of that association, in which he states that they heartily endorse the action of our union meeting.

This includes all our corresponding associations except the Soldier Creek, which has not yet met.

The writer attended the West Tennessee Association at Burns, Tenn., on Saturday and third Sunday in September and Monday after. They showed very plainly that they recognized the action of our union, by their appointing and not appointing ministers to preach during the meeting, besides the statement was plainly made in the beginning by one of their ministers who is now an old father in Israel, and who stands high as a minister, and was moderator of the association several years, that Fulton Church was in disorder.

In another place in this paper will be found a general corresponding letter from the Salem Association in Indiana. It can readily be seen that they are with us. The letter speaks for itself. We think, just as they do, that those who are not satisfied to be plain Old Baptists, and who are wanting to introduce new measures among us, should go to a people who are practicing those things and leave the Old Baptists in peace. In fact, we think it much more honorable to do as Elders Todd, Hackleman and Strickland-leave the Old Baptists and unite with the Missionaries-than to try to remain with us and advocate new measures to the destruction of the peace and the confusion of the brotherhood. If the time should ever come that we are not satisfied to be an Old Baptist, of the same kind they were when we became a member, sixteen years ago, and of the kind Elder S. F. Cayce was when he established this paper in January, 1886, and as he was when he baptized the unworthy writer in September, 1889, and as he was when he was called to his blessed eternal home on Aug. 27,

1905,-we say if that time should ever come, we will leave the Old Baptists in peace, and not try to "make the division larger on our side." We want to be a plain Old Baptist as long as we live in this world, for it is the visible, organized kingdom which Christ set up or established while He was on earth; and it is today organically the same that it was in the days of the apostles, although "of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Let us be meek and humble followers of Jesus, and not followers of men, and then we will have peace. May the Lord help us so to do, is our prayer.

C. H. C.

REMARKS TO J. E. CRON

---October 10, 1905

Such letters as the above are a great encouragement to us. They give us courage to press onward, following our dear sainted father, as he was "also a follower of Christ." Yes, by the help of our Lord, we are determined to press onward in his footsteps as much as we can. We feel that although the Lord has promised to never leave Himself without a witness, yet no one can ever fill our dear father's place. Again we ask you all to pray the Lord to enable us to conduct THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST in such a way as that the standard it has attained to may be maintained and that it may continue to be a comfort and benefit to the dear Old Baptists and all lovers of truth who may read its columns. We desire to always be found doing as the Lord commands:

"Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." -Jer. vi. 16 Our dear father preached the introductory discourse in our union meeting in Martin in July using that language as his text. This was his last discourse in our little church at home. May the Lord help us to continue in the good old way until we, too, are called away. Brethren, pray for us. C. H. C

OUR ASSOCIATION

---October 17, 1905

Our association met with the church at Little Zion last Friday, according to announcement and agreement. Elder Hopper, of the Obion Association (we do not remember his initials or post office), Elders J. W. Lomax, J. L. Butler, J. M. Johnson and J. K. Stephens were with us. The preaching was all a unit, from first to last, and there was a season of rejoicing, although there was a feeling of sadness on account of some being called away since the last

association. There was also a feeling of sadness because of the work it was necessary for us to do because of the new measures that have lately been advocated by some brethren in our association.

In accordance with the action of the union meeting which was held at Martin beginning on Friday before the fifth Sunday in July, 1905, and in accordance with the action of our churches, the following motion was adopted:

By motion and second agreed that we drop Fulton Church from our association, as they have withdrawn from us, and until they put themselves in order, because we do not think the Baptists should have a federal form of government; neither do we think the commission was given to the church, but to the apostles or ministry; neither do we think it the duty of the ministry to admonish the alien sinner to repent and believe the gospel, which things are being advocated by the ministry of Fulton Church; neither do we think it to be good order for Baptists to hold membership in and affiliate with secret institutions, which some of their members are doing. We beg them to cease advocating and practicing these things, and to come back to us without them.

We think all of our churches, except Little Zion, are almost, if not altogether, a unit, and will continue to stand firm against these measures. We publish this so that Baptists everywhere may know where we stand. C. H. C.

Who Are The Primitive Baptists?

---November 7, 1905

In July, 1887, a debate was held at Fulton, Ky., between Elder W. P. Throgmorton and Elder Lemuel Potter, the question being, "Who are the Primitive Baptists?" Elder Throgmorton represented the Missionary Baptists and Elder Potter represented the "Regular Old School Baptists." The debate began on Tuesday, July 12, and continued four days and two nights. Elder J. V. Kirkland, then of Farmington, Ky., now of Fulton, Ky., was moderator for Elder Potter. In the committee on the publication of the debate the "Regular Old School Baptists" were represented by Dr. H. C. Roberts and Elder S. F. Cayce. We know that Elder Potter was recognized as being a representative man among our people then, and we yet consider that he was. Elder J. V. Kirkland certainly recognized him then as such. There are a few things in that debate that we wish to give our readers the benefit of, and we feel that all our brethren everywhere would do well to take heed to them at the present time. First we give a statement, as it appears on page 18, in Elder Potter's first speech in

the debate, while Elder Throgmorton was affirming that the Missionaries are the Primitive Baptists:

Brother Throgmorton, in his speech, has represented the Missionary Baptists as very liberal. I want to show you some of his liberality, according to his speech. However, I wish to make this statement; and I want him to understand that I shall have use for it (and if he does not agree with me, I want him to say so); I claim that if an organization of any kind be rent by the introduction of new rules, regulations or doctrines, that the innovators, and not the party that adheres to the old rules, regulations and doctrines, are the seceding party. That is my position. It occurs to me that it is sound doctrine. I apprehend that he will have no objection to that. I am going to take it for granted that he agrees to it.

Please notice that he speaks of Elder Throgmorton's "liberality" This refers to the "liberality" of the Missionary Baptists in tolerating and fellowshipping so many different kinds of doctrines and practices. By reading Elder Throgmorton's speeches you will observe that he claimed his people were the Primitive Baptists because they had no bars to fellowship. Now observe that Elder Potter said, "I claim that if an organization of any kind be rent by the introduction of new rules, regulations or doctrines, that the innovators, and not the party that adheres to the old rules, regulations and doctrines, are the seceding party." From this it is evident that the party who introduces the new measures is the party who departs from the original ground, and not the party who puts up a bar to the new measures. The party who puts up a bar against the innovations, new rules, doctrines or practices, is the party standing on the original platform or order of things in the organization. Elder Kirkland accepted Elder Potter's position then as being a correct and true one. We accept it now. When the new measures were introduced among the Baptists that finally brought about the division between our people and the Missionaries, those who introduced the new measures plead for "liberality" on those things, and Elder Throgmorton gives us to understand they yet have the "liberality." So it is at this time-those brethren who have introduced the new measures that are causing distress in our beloved Zion are pleading forbearance and "liberality." But it is now as it was then- the innovators, and not the party that adheres to the old rules, regulations and doctrines, are the seceding party. The innovators claimed then that "liberty" should be allowed on those things, as they were not sufficient to cause a division. So, the brethren who are now advocating the measures causing the distress in the church say liberty should be allowed; as the things are not sufficient to cause a division and are not fundamental, but are

minor points. We would ask, in all candor, if they are minor points, and are not fundamental, why not cease advocating and contending for them? And if they are minor points, if they are not fundamental, then why does the minute of the St. Louis meeting say they are vital points? The word vital means, "Being the seat of life or that on which life depends; contributing to life; essential to or supporting life; necessary to existence or continuance." If they are vital; if they are the seat of life of the church of Christ; if they are that upon which the life of the church depends; if they are essential; if they are necessary to the existence or continuance of the Old Baptist church, then are they minor points?-are they not fundamental? If they are necessary to all these things, why say they are not fundamental? If they were vital one year ago, are they not vital now? If not, why not? If they were vital one year ago, were they not vital from 1792 to 1832? (Remember that some of these things were involved in that period.) If not, why not? Do principles ever change? If they were vital one year ago. they were vital in 1832; and if they were vital in 1832, then the Missionaries were right in the division, and are now the original Baptist Church, or else the points are unscriptural. One of these two things are bound to be true-there is no escape. If we believed the points to be Scriptural, we would also necessarily conclude that the Missionaries are the original order of Baptists; and if we believed that, we would certainly leave the Old Baptists in peace and unite with the Missionaries. But we do not believe they are Scriptural; so we must conclude that the "Regular Old School Baptists" are the original or Primitive Baptists.

How did Elder Potter stand in the debate above mentioned? On Thursday, July 14, 1887, Elder Potter began in the forenoon in affirming that our people are the Primitive Baptists. We quote from Elder Potter's first affirmative speech, beginning on page 179 of the Throgmorton-Potter debate:

I am happy to have the opportunity of standing before you today, in order to set forth the principle features of what I deem to be the gospel truths of Christianity. As a matter of course, from the position in which I stand, you will expect me especially to set forth what is known by the people throughout this country as the features of the "Hardshell" Baptists. When I am through, whatever you may think of my claims to the church of Christ must be optional with you. I feel thankful to God that we have the liberty of exercising our own judgment upon these important things; that there is no law to govern us religiously, outside the Bible, except our own conscience. You have been listening to the discussion for a few days in which my friend has affirmed that his denomination, or the Missionary Baptists, are the

Primitive Baptists. I am now to affirm that the Regular, or Old School Baptists, commonly known and universally called by my opponent, "Hardshells," are the Primitive Baptists. I hope that you will pay respect both to the speakers and the arguments that may be introduced, the application of evidence and the general conduct of the discussion.

In the first place, I will state that I believe that God has a church in the world; -that He is the author of it Himself, through His Son; -that it was predicted by the Prophet Daniel, in the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, when he said, "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed. And the kingdom shall never be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever" - (Daniel 2:44). I believe that all Bible scholars that I have any knowledge of, on this passage of Scripture, agree that Daniel, in the Scripture, had allusion to the gospel church; and the time he alluded to was in the days of the Roman powers. Even Pedo Baptist scholars admit that this is the proper interpretation of that Scripture. I presume there will be no controversy between us as to the date of the origin of the church of God; also that we agree that it has stood from the time it was first established until now. There is one more feature that we Baptists claim, that from the time of its organization on earth, it has stood distinct and visible, until the present time. The reason we claim that is, because the prophet says it shall never be destroyed. It was said to Peter, "On this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Any statement that may be made by any person, coming from any quarter, that would have the tendency to make the impression that the church died for a while or was entirely out, contradicts God's word. Another feature of this church is, that Jesus Christ was its only law-giver. I want all parties to pay particular attention to that feature, that Jesus Christ was its only law-giver, so that no person is to be held under obligation by the church to observe any ordinances or perform any religious services, for which there can be found no warrant in the word of God. It does not matter how great that service may seem to other people; it matters not how popular that service may be, nor how zealously its claims may be urged by its advocates as great means in the hands of the Lord to facilitate the salvation of men, if there is no intimation of such a thing in God's word, it occurs to me that a Christian might conscientiously leave it entirely outside of all the catalog of religious duties or services. We stand upon that platform. We contend that the Bible teaches all that we ought to know, believe and do religiously.

We limit our knowledge of the will of God to what the Bible says. We limit our obligations, religiously, to what the Bible requires. We believe in nothing, religiously, that we cannot find a warrant for in God's word. We believe that Jesus Christ Himself instituted the church; that it was perfect at the start, suitably adapted in its organization to every age of the world, to every locality of earth, to every state and condition of mankind, without any changes or alterations to suit the times, customs, situations and localities. We claim that a great many things change, but principles never change, that when the revelation of God was closed, that we have no right to make any demands upon the people religiously, that are not found therein.

I predicate the arguments I have just made upon the commission, recorded by **(Matthew 28:19-20)**. "Go, ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world Amen. Now remember that here is a commission given by the Saviour, directly, to His apostles. While a great many people seem to notice the grand scope of this commission, who rejoice at the duty of conquering the world, I do also find a limitation to that commission, and it occurs to me from what I see here, that there are men that fail to see that limitation; that the minister is required to go and preach, I do not question, neither do "Hardshells," as we are called that is charged upon us by my opponent and we deny the charge. We think it is our duty to preach everywhere. We contend that it is our duty to preach to every person wherever we go; both to saint and sinner.

And we think it is the duty of the minister who has been called of God to the holy work to make this his first calling, paramount to everything else pertaining to life. It is his business to preach. Now, then, as he goes forth to teach all nations and baptize them, in addition to teaching in accordance with the commission-it says, teaching them, the people, that is teaching them whom you baptize, to observe all things that are right and expedient. No sir! What then? "All things whatsoever I have commanded you."

I wish to make a statement here. That is, it is even charged that we do not believe in good works. I stand here to speak for my people. I am going to make a proposition now and we will have opportunity perhaps to be corrected in this matter. I claim that our people do every good work, as a people, that is enjoined upon the people of God in the New Testament. If we do not, if there is anything we have

overlooked, we will do it if it is pointed out to us. Brethren, are you all willing to do that?

Voices in the audience: Yes, sir; yes, sir! point it out.

Mr. Throgmorton: You have proved it, Brother Potter.

Mr. Potter: Brother Throgmorton is learning. Perhaps our brethren are as willing to do everything that the Bible says do, as any people in the world. I make this remark in order to show that the charge against us, that we do not believe in good works, is a false charge that we do everything that the New Testament enjoins upon us as Christians to do; that we do not oppose good works. If we do not, let him show us wherein we do not and we will go at it. The brethren have pledged themselves to do so. While we make this proposition I wish to quote also another text of Scripture upon which we base this principle, which will be found in Timothy somewhere. I will vouch for the quotation if it is questioned: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." We take it for granted that all good works are to be found in the Scriptures. All the catalogue of good works are there, and if so, then those works, that are deemed to be good works, that are not to be found in the Scriptures, are entirely outside of the catalogue of good works; and we leave them entirely undone, with as clear a conscience as any other people on earth do them.

I will make a statement of our religious principles. That is this, our faith is that if the church and minister will teach exclusively what the Bible teaches, and practice just precisely what it requires, that all the good results that God intended to accomplish by the means will be brought about. That is our position. We are not uneasy for fear that the Lord will leave something back that is essential to the salvation of the people or the glory of His name.

I presume that my opponent will not deny that the church continued until the days of Constantine, or even until now. I want to show you some of its distinguishing features. You have heard a great deal said upon foreign mission work. I wish to travel out on that road and give you some of our views on that subject. Because I wish to set ourselves right before this people, on the subject of the ministry. I have objections to the foreign missionary work, not because I think it is likely to spread the gospel. That is not it. My friend urges that as our position on the foreign missionary work; that is not it. We object to it because of the plea for it. As I have clearly shown during this discussion, that it is indirectly preaching the doctrine of the universal damnation of all people that do not hear the gospel. I object to

foreign mission work with that plea. I would not contribute to that sort of doctrine I think this doctrine is unscriptural and unwarranted; that God is going to damn a majority of the race of men because they do not hear the gospel. That is the very foundation of the foreign mission work, as I intend to prove before the close of this discussion. I object to it on another ground. I do not believe it is warranted in God's word. Because in order to find even a shadow of authority for it in the Scriptures its advocates say that the great commission was given to the church, instead of the apostles and ministers. Remember the position that I am here to prove is that the Missionary Baptists believe that doctrine, and that the advocates of modern missions say that the great commission was given to the church, instead of the apostles and ministers. To prove that they do put forth that claim I wish to quote from the "Great Commission and its Fulfillment by the Church," by Mr. Carpenter He says, in speaking of the great commission:

"All forms of evangelistic work and enterprise are based upon these words. (That is the words of the great commission.) Not ministers only but all Christians, ordained and unordained, male and female, old and young, are bound by them. Some can go further than others but all are to go on this errand of mercy; some are to give more than others, but all are to give, according to their ability, the means requisite for saving the lost; some are to preach officially and more regularly than others, but all are to preach in the sense of communicating saving truth to those in spiritual darkness; and all are to contribute to that great unceasing volume of earnest prayer which has only to become general and tenderly importunate to secure the salvation of a great multitude of God's elect who are now wandering unsaved on the mountains of sin in every land."

A Missionary document says that the commission is assigned not only to the ordained but the unordained, male and female; that all are bound by the words of the great commission all are to go. Some may go further than others, for the commission is given to the church and that is the meaning of the commission, that the church must send ministers abroad in obedience to the commission. The Saviour said in the commission, "Go ye into all the world He did not say "send." It would have been proper to say "send" if it was given to the church. But He said, "Go ye into all the world," talking directly to the apostles. They understood it that way and preached it that way. Turn to **(Matthew 28:20)**:

"Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw Him they worshipped Him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake

unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

To whom did He speak this language? To the eleven, not to the church, but to the eleven, so says the text itself. Let us also notice **(Mark 16:14-16)**: "Afterward He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen Him after He was risen. And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." To whom was this commission given by this text? To the eleven, not for the church. The church was not included there. But He gave it to the eleven, to the apostles, to the ministry. It belongs to them. And the command of Jesus comes to the minister and tells him to go; it does not come to the church and tell her to send.

Elder Potter went on to show how that the apostles went in obedience to the command, but we have not space to give more along that line. This is abundance of proof that we are occupying the same ground on this point that the Baptists occupied then. But we wish to give another extract from this same speech. We find the following language on pages 194 and 195:

(Acts 13:1-2,3): "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas and Simeon, that were called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them to school? No, not to school, "sent them away." The Lord had called them. He called upon the brethren of the ministry and they laid their hands on them and sent them away. He said, "Separate me Barnabas and Paul for the work whereunto I have called them." That is, they ordained them, if I understand it. If I am not correct in thinking that they were to be ordained, let my brother correct me. I claim they were to be ordained, and set apart for the work-that is, to the full functions of a gospel minister, because God had called them to it. "And when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." I know that sometimes the Missionaries claim that text.

In the next place I will ask my opponent, if he has anything to say about it, if he thinks that the whole membership of the church laid their hands on the apostles and sent them away, or was it a presbytery of ministers whose work it was to ordain them and set them apart for the work of the ministry. If not the whole church it does not suit his cause very well. The Lord had called them to the work, and instructed the brethren to separate them from the world, and "they laid their hands on them and sent them away." Was this a mission board? Is not this the way our brethren do, when the Lord calls one of our brethren to the work of the ministry? If he gives proof of his ministry among us, we believe that we are authorized by the same Spirit to ordain him and send him away. We pray and lay our hands on them, and send them away, and we implore the blessings of God upon them and upon their labors. We send them to where ever God in His providence may cast their lot. They did not send Paul to any particular place. They had no mission board, if they did travel extensively. He preached at Antioch for a long while, he labored at Antioch, Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus and other places. Still, if those brethren who laid their hands on them and sent them away designated any particular place on God's earth where they should go, the record fails to give us any account of it.

As already stated, these extracts are abundantly sufficient to show that we are occupying the same ground now we were then. We are sorry our brethren will not continue in these same principles; but by the help of the Lord we expect to remain there while our mortal life lasts. The Baptists occupied that ground when we united with them sixteen years ago, and we do not believe all of them will ever forsake those principles. The Lord has promised to never leave Himself without a witness.

Let us all try to "let brotherly love continue" by standing firm on the time-honored principles given to us by the one great King and Lawgiver, for which many of our fathers have hazarded and given their lives, sealing them with their blood. And let us also be kind and gentle, and forbearing, where and as long as forbearance is required by our King.

Brethren, pray that the Lord may sustain us and enable us to hold up the blood-stained banner of Prince Immanuel. C. H. C.

Cut Them Off

---November 21, 1905

The following was written as a private letter, but since writing it we have decided to publish the same. So much has been said lately

about Scriptural authority for "cutting off" that we thought perhaps it might do no harm to call attention to this one place as pretty good authority. Many other places in God's word the same idea is taught, we think. It is true that it is painful when we cannot reclaim, or "convert," or "save" a brother from the error of his way; but when we cannot do so, there is only one thing left for us to do, if we obey the teaching of our Master, and that is to "cut off," or "withdraw." If the brother is a great man-a "hand," or "foot," or "eye" -that does not release us from the duty. May the Lord guide and direct us aright, and sustain us, and help us to contend earnestly, yet humbly, for the right way. C. H. C.

THE LETTER

ELDER W. W. POLK: Dear Brother-Your question propounded to my father, Elder S. F. Cayce in your letter mailed Aug. 5, did not reach his hands until just a few days before his death.

For myself I would say, I think the Scripture referred to **{(Matthew 18:8-14)}** teaches, first, that we should try to save our erring brethren from the error they may be in; and that if we fail to save them, or convert them, **{(James 5:19-20)}** then to "cut them off," or cast them from us. It is better to be without them, no matter how much they may be esteemed, or how important they may seem to be, than for the whole cause to be allowed to suffer on their account. It is better to lose a member who is highly esteemed by the church, than for the whole church to be led astray. Much could be written along this line, and many other passages, I think, teach this same lesson. But as the question was asked my father, I will offer only these thoughts, trusting the same may be blessed of the Lord to our benefit. Your brother in hope,
C. H. C.

Educated African Turned to Heathenism

EDUCATED AFRICAN TURNED TO HEATHENISM

---November 21, 1905

The following account of the education of a heathen and making a missionary of him, and his "falling away," was clipped from the Indianapolis (Ind.) News.

This is only one more instance, out of many, which shows the utter failure of the modern mission system to Christianize the world. The return of Wilberforce to heathenism only proves again that it is impossible for men to "bring souls to Christ." The question naturally arises, was he really regenerated? If so, did he apostatize, and go to hell? Or was he really regenerated, and a backslider? Men-made

Christians often return to their former ways. But comment is unnecessary. The following is what appeared in the Indianapolis News, Aug. 12, as a special from Huntington, Ind.:

A message received in this city from the Rev. A. F. Stolts, a missionary in Freetown, West Africa, says that Daniel Flickinger Wilberforce, the educated African, whose escapades have interested the religious world, is dead. For years Wilberforce was one of the powers in the missionary field and was attached to the United Brethren church. After long service as a missionary he became a backslider and returned to heathen customs, indulging in plural marriages and other vices of heathen Africans.

His is a strange story. Nearly forty-five years ago Dr. Daniel Kumler Flickinger was secretary of the board of missions of the United Brethren church. He was a frequent visitor to the mission fields of Africa, and one day, while in the interior, learned that a baby had been born in one of the tribes. He was asked to name the baby. He christened it Daniel Flickinger Wilberforce.

MEETS THE BOY IN NEW YORK

Twelve years after the christening Dr. Flickinger was in New York packing some goods to be shipped to Africa. He was at the office of the missionary society and asked for a boy to assist him. A black youngster came forth and Dr. Flickinger asked his name.

"Daniel Flickinger Wilberforce," answered the youth.

The incident of twelve years before was recalled. The boy had come to America as a servant in a missionary's family. He had been promised an education, but his friend, the missionary, died shortly after arriving in this country. Wilberforce was adopted by the missionary society of the United Brethren church and given an education. He did much lecturing in America and accomplished a great deal of good for the cause of missions. He was sent to his native land to preach to his people. But he fell from grace. As soon as he became associated with his countrymen and their customs again he began to recede from Christian ways, and finally became a heathen and a backslider from the Christian faith. He was removed as a missionary, and the United Brethren church finally swept his name from its roster. After that he became a devil worshiper and was made a chief of one of the native tribes. He adopted every heathen custom and became thoroughly bad.

Wilberforce has two sons in this country at the present time. They are being educated at Otterbein University, Westerville, O. It is not known whether they have received word of the death of their father or not.

Sin Against The Holy Ghost

SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST

---November 28, 1905

Brother C. H. Nicholas, of Arkansas, has requested us to give our views on "sinning against the Holy Ghost." A great deal has been written on this subject. Our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, wrote some editorials on the subject, which appeared in our columns some time ago, and so we do not feel like writing much now on that line. We know, too, that there is some difference of opinion among the brethren as to who it is that sins against the Holy Ghost. Some brethren have argued that the child of God is in possession of the Holy Spirit, and that, therefore, the child of God, only, can sin against the Holy Ghost; that the unregenerate (or those who are finally lost) are not in possession of the Holy Spirit, and therefore cannot sin against the Holy Ghost. We do not think this position is correct. We might give more than one reason why we do not think so. We do not think it is correct because all the sins of all God's people were laid on Christ, and He bore their sins in His own body on the tree and put them away by the sacrifice of Himself. See **(Isaiah 53)**; **(I Peter 2:24)**, and **(Hebrews 9:26)**. Hence every sin they commit was laid on Christ, and He bore every one of them; so their sins are all against the Son, or the second person in the Trinity, and shall all be forgiven, on account of what He has done for them.

Again, there is one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus. A mediator is one who interposes between parties who are at variance in order to reconcile them. Christ, the second person in the Trinity, interposed or came in between His people and the Father to reconcile them. He stands between them and the Father. Hence, as He interposed or came in between them, and stands between them as a mediator, all their sins fall to His account, and are not against the Holy Ghost.

Again, the Saviour said, in **(Mark 3:29)**, "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." Not one of those people whose iniquities were laid on Christ is in danger of eternal damnation because He put their sins away and their sins are all forgiven because of what He has done for them. Every sin not atoned for by the blood of Christ is directly against the Holy Ghost, it not being charged to the account of Christ, and the person who commits the sin is in danger of receiving the just punishment for his sins, which is eternal

damnation, or everlasting banishment from the peaceful presence of God.

The foregoing are some of our thoughts on the subject. We do not write them to call forth controversy. Neither do we give them as infallible. We realize our weakness and know very well our liability to do wrong. We have given these few thoughts for no other reason than that the brother asked for our views. May the Lord bless the same to the benefit of our readers.

We desire here to ask all to write on the things that may be a comfort and benefit and instruction to the dear children of God, and for the advancement and upbuilding of the cause, and the unifying of the brotherhood on the principles of the gospel, that there may be a oneness in the faith; and let us not strive about words to no profit. Let us all strive to "keep unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" by writing and talking on those things that make for peace, and that will have a tendency to bring the Lord's people together in love and fellowship. Preaching the gospel will not have a tendency to divide them and destroy their fellowship. It is the preaching of something else, beside the gospel that does that.

May the Lord help us all to write and speak such things as will be for the benefit and comfort of His people. Brethren and sisters, pray for us.

C. H. C.

Luke 13:34

---December 5, 1905

Brother S. M. Hayes, of Ramsey, Ill., requests our views on the above passage of Scripture. It reads as follows: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not."

This is the language of the Saviour, and was spoken to Jerusalem, or to national Israel. They were God's chosen people as a nation. It was not said to any of the Gentile nations around. We know this language is often quoted and applied to the alien sinner, and the argument made that Christ would save him, but that the sinner "would not." A friend once quoted this text in conversation with us to prove that the sinner had something to do. We asked if he thought the text had a universal application or was applicable to all the race. He said he thought it was to all the race. We then asked if he had ever stoned or killed a prophet, or a preacher. He promptly denied having ever been guilty of doing such a thing. We then assured him we had already found one to whom the language was not addressed. It says,

“Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee.” The language is plainly addressed to Jerusalem, and they had killed and stoned the prophets. Elijah certainly realized that they had done this. Read **(I Kings 19:10)**, “And he said, I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts: for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword: and I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away.” The 14th verse reads the same way.

It is very clear that the Saviour was talking to the people who were guilty of killing and stoning the prophets, and that people were Israel. The oracles of God (the law and the prophets) were committed unto the Jews, God's chosen nation. They often failed to keep the law, and the result was the curses of the law fell upon them, and they perished by the sword. Many times they killed the prophets the Lord had given and sent unto them, and they were slain by their enemies. But now one has come in the name of the Lord, who is greater than any of the prophets. That one is Christ. Just as many of them had rejected the prophets and had stoned and killed them, even so they rejected Christ, rejected His teachings, and sought to slay Him. They had been seeking His life from His birth. To this same people the Saviour said, in **(Matthew 23:34-35,36)**, “Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily, I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation.” Then Matthew records the same expression of the Saviour as is found in **(Luke 13:34)**, in nearly the same words, “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!” -verse 37. The Saviour here tells these people that all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from that of Abel unto Zacharias, shall come upon them, for they were doing just as their fathers had done. In the 38th and 39th verses of this same chapter, Matt 23, He says, “Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.” **(Luke 13:35)**, gives the same expression. All the righteous blood shed upon the earth shall come upon these people, that generation to whom the Saviour was talking

at that time; and now their house is left unto them desolate. They and their fathers had continued to kill and stone the prophets the Lord had sent unto them, and now their house is left desolate, on account of their rebellion and disobedience. They had refused to obey the Lord and to keep His commandments, and now they are to receive chastisement for their sins. The prophets foretold some of the misery and desolation of this same people. The Saviour refers to the prophecy of Daniel concerning these things in **(Matthew 24:15)**. All this was literally fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem before that generation had passed away. Such abominations and such desolations had never been seen in all the world as were seen at the destruction of Jerusalem. Their house was left desolate in the utter destruction and entire ruin of the city of Jerusalem.

It is true, we think, that there may be an application made of the language now to the church of Christ. "Thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee." We think a church may sometimes now kill or stone the minister the Lord sends to her. We do not mean that they take his natural life, or that they stone him physically; but they may not regard him and esteem him as God's gift to them, as they should. They may cast him aside, instead of showing appreciation of him. And we think the Lord sometimes "removes the candlestick," because they "stone" His ministers. Their house is left desolate. Just as the prophets were given by the Lord to His people, the Jews, as a nation, so the true minister of the gospel is a gift of the Lord now to His church. See **(Ephesians 4:11-12,13)**. The true minister is humble; and he will refrain from advocating things that destroy the peace of the brotherhood, and that confuse and divide the church. We should love and esteem all such ministers as this, as God's gift to us. We should not worship them, but we should love and care for them, and thank God for His having given them to us. A true minister, one given by the Lord, is not given as a ruler, or to be a ruler. He is a servant, and not a ruler. We should all try to remember this fact, as well as the other. It is not the business of the minister to make laws and regulations to govern the church. There is only one law-giver. The same one who has given the laws to govern the church, also gives ministers to them to be His and their servants. To be a servant of Christ and His church is the highest calling on earth. On the other hand, we think, it is very shameful for a minister to manifest a spirit of rule or ruin, for him to appear to have a desire to be a ruler and not a servant. When one manifests such a spirit as this, and is advocating things that are causing confusion, and will not cease doing so, the church does not violate the law or commandment of her only law-giver in rejecting that man.

In fact, the Scriptures just as plainly and positively teach us that we should reject one who does this, {see **(Galatians 1:6-10)**} as they teach that we should esteem that one as the gift of God, who is truly occupying the place of a servant. Let us all, who profess to be the ministers of Christ, manifest that spirit of humility which we feel in our hearts; and let us always try to advocate those things, and those only, that make for peace. If we are advocating something that the brethren will not receive, and that is causing division among them, let us cease advocating those things. Let us remember that the Lord has said, **(Jeremiah 3:1)**, "Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture." Let us also remember to love and esteem, but not worship, the true humble cross-bearing minister, who manifests a desire to be a servant and not a ruler, who is willing to risk his cause in the hands of his brethren. May the Lord help us to remember and to consider well all these things.

The above thoughts are given to Brother Hayes, and to our readers, with the humble prayer that they may be blessed of the Lord to our good. We do not give them as being infallible, for we are as liable to err as our brethren.

Since writing the above, we notice that Brother Hayes requested that we or some of the other brethren give our views on the text. We do not desire that what we have said keep other brethren from writing on the subject. If other brethren feel like writing, we want you to be at liberty to do so.

Again we wish to ask an interest in the prayers of our readers, that the Lord may guide and direct us aright, and uphold us in contending for His truth. C. H. C.

A Debate

A DEBATE

---December 5, 1905

One year ago Elder S. F. Cayce and Elder A. Malone had agreed to debate the following propositions in the vicinity of Day's Cross Roads. Since the death of our father, the brethren in that section have requested the writer to meet Elder Malone in the proposed debate. We have agreed to do so, and the discussion is to be held at Bethany church, we think about fifteen miles from Lamentations Fayette, Tenn., and will begin (D. V) on Tuesday, Dec. 12. The following are the propositions:

Prop. 1. The Scriptures teach that sinners are regenerated, born of God, by the direct or immediate work of the Holy Spirit, independently of, or without, the written or preached word as a

means in order to that end, and that too, without any agency on their part.

C. H. Cayce Affirms.

A. Malone Denies.

Prop 2. The Scriptures teach that regeneration is effected by the Holy Spirit through the instrumentality of the gospel.

A. Malone Affirms.

C. H. Cayce Denies.

Prop. 3. The Scriptures teach that all for whom Christ died will be saved in heaven.

C. H. Cayce Affirms.

A. Malone, Denies.

Prop. 4. The Scriptures teach that in the death of Christ provision was made for the salvation of all the race of Adam.

A. Malone Affirms.

C. H. Cayce Denies.

C. H. C.

Mode of Baptism

MODE OF BAPTISM

---December 12, 1905

Elder Cayce-Please give through the columns of Ten PRIMITIVE BAPTIST your views on **(Matthew 3:11)**, and **(Matthew 12:43-44,45)**. Do the words, "baptize you with water," mean that the element used was applied to the subject baptized, or the subject baptized applied to the element used?

The above request was on a postal card addressed to our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, and was received only a short time before his death. So we will try to comply with the request by writing a few thoughts on the mode of baptism, for it is clear that what the writer of the card wishes to know is, did John baptize by immersion, or by pouring? The text he refers to reads, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." **(Mark 1:8); (Luke 3:16)**, and **(John 1:26)**, all have the same expression, "baptize with water." If one of them means that the water was applied to the subject, they all mean that. If the expression in Matthew does not mean that the water was applied to the subject, then the others do not. The expression in Matthew must of necessity mean the same as the expression in Mark, for both refer to precisely the same thing. In **(Mark 1:8)**, John says,

"I indeed have baptized you with water." The fifth verse says, "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." In the original (Greek) the same word which is translated "with" in the eighth verse-with water-is translated "in" in the fifth verse-in the river Jordan. If the expression "with water" in the eighth verse means that he applied the water to them, or that he poured or sprinkled the water on them, then the fifth verse should read, "and were all baptized of him with the river of Jordan," because the word "with" in the eighth verse and the word "in" in the fifth verse are both from precisely the same Greek word. John baptized them with the river of Jordan! How ridiculous! But it is not ridiculous if he applied the water to the subject. John baptized those people in water, for he baptized them in the river of Jordan-not with the river of Jordan, in the sense of applying the river to them. John immersed these people in Jordan. He immersed them in water. When he immersed them, they were buried and were completely covered with water. One does not have to apply the water to the subject to bury or immerse the candidate. The word "with" does not necessarily mean that the element is applied to the subject. Let us prove that. Take your knife now, and lay it down, with the blade open. Now strike the edge of the blade with your finger-that is, apply your finger to the blade with force. Now what have you done? Cut your finger? Yes. What did you cut your finger with? The knife? Certainly; but you did not apply the knife to the finger. So, the expression "with water" does not necessarily mean that the water is applied to the subject.

(John 3:23) says, "And John also was baptizing in Aenon near to Salim, because there was much water there." If baptism may be performed by pouring or sprinkling a little water on a person's head, why the necessity for "much water?" A small pitcher full of water would be an ample supply to pour or sprinkle a little on the head of a great many persons. But pouring or sprinkling is not baptism; therefore "John was baptizing in Aenon near to Salim, because there was much water there." More than a pitcher full was needed for John to administer baptism, because he did not baptize by pouring or sprinkling. Hence he did not apply the water to the subject. He was baptizing where there was much water. He was immersing the people in the pools that were in Aenon near Salim.

The word "baptize" is a Greek word, the word simply being transposed into English by changing the Greek to the English letters, the last letter being changed from the Greek "o" to the English "e." Hence the word is Greek "baptizo," which is from "baptoi" and this

means "to dip, plunge, immerse. So those people were "dipped," or "plunged," or "immersed" by John in the river of Jordan, or were baptized of him in Jordan.

We do no violence to language if we take a word out of a sentence and put another word in its place that means the same thing as the word taken out. If we do this we are doing no violence, and are not changing the meaning of the sentence. The word sprinkle means "to scatter in drops or small particles." Now let us try the language, "And were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan." The sentence reads all right that way, and is found in **(Mark 1:5)**. Remember, we do no violence by removing or taking a word out, and placing the true meaning of the word in the sentence in the place of it. So, "And were all dipped of him in the river of Jordan." The sentence still reads all right. "And were all immersed of him in the river of Jordan." It is all right yet. "And were all scattered in drops or small particles of him in the river of Jordan." The sentence is all wrong now. Why? Because baptism is not sprinkling; it is dipping, immersing. Read the account of the baptism of the eunuch in the eighth chapter of Acts and apply the same rule, and you will have it that Philip scattered the eunuch about in drops or small particles. He did not do this, but "they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch," and Philip "baptized him," dipped him, immersed him.

Suppose some of your dear friends or near relatives were to die, and some person should carry their body to the cemetery and pour or sprinkle a little dirt on their head, and then say we have buried your relative or friend. Would you consider the people to be your friends who would do this? No; you would consider them as your enemies. Now read **(Romans 6:4)**: "Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death." The apostle here plainly says we are "buried with Him by baptism." If we are buried by baptism, then baptism must be a burial-it must be an immersion. Anything short of a burial, therefore, is not baptism, for we are buried by it. Then as baptism is a burial, how can we claim to be Christ's friends when we say we baptize His friends who are dead to sin by sprinkling or pouring a little water on their heads? Let us prove our faith by our works. We have faith that Christ died, was buried, and rose again. Let us show that faith by being buried with Him by baptism, and arising to walk in newness of life.

Much more might be written on the subject, but lack of time forbids us writing more now. May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of our readers, is our prayer.

C. H. C.

Close of Volume Twenty

CLOSE OF VOLUME TWENTY

---December 26, 1905

With this issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST another year of its publication closes. Twenty years ago the first issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST made its appearance at Fulton, Ky., with Elder S. F. Cayce as editor. Since then time has brought many changes. Many of the dear brethren and sisters who were readers of the paper and who wrote for its columns during that year have passed to their reward. Even during the year just now drawing to a close there have been many changes. One year ago our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, wrote the editorial, "Close of Volume Nineteen," but now his hands are still, and he writes no more for our comfort and encouragement. Others, too, have been called to their reward during the past year, who have written for our paper, and whose writings were able and comforting, and whose names will be missed from the pages of our paper for perhaps years to come. We wish here to give an extract from the pen of our father in his editorial one year ago, in the close of volume nineteen:

Another year with all its sorrows, disappointments, mournings of soul and bleedings of heart, as well as its joys, pleasures, gladness of heart and rejoicing of soul, has past and gone, and the year 1904 will have passed before another issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST reaches your homes. Not only so, but we are all, both editors and publishers, and readers, one year nearer the end of our pilgrimage on earth. As the year 1904 has passed and all the occurrences and happenings of same are, or soon will be, numbered with the things of the past, so also will we all soon be numbered with the dead; the times and places that know us now, will soon know us no more forever. Many who wrote for the columns of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST during the first year of its publication, 1886, and many dear brethren and sisters who were readers of our first volume have stepped off the stage of action, been called to try the realities of a world unknown to us; their souls being present with the Lord and their bodies being asleep in Jesus. Every year only brings us that much nearer the end of our journey, or stay in this world. How careful, therefore, we all ought to be, to make good use of our time and talents while life lasts. Little did we realize one year ago that our father was so near the end of his journey, and that we would soon be deprived of reading his able writings, and of hearing his sweet preaching, and having his able service in defending the blessed cause of our heavenly Master. But

the Lord has called him to Himself, and he is now resting from his labors, and much of the great burden has fallen on us, and our humble desire is to fight a good fight and to keep the faith. The faith that was once delivered to the saints still remains the same, and we believe THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST has contended for that faith all of the past twenty years, and it is our humble desire that if the writer lives and continues to edit the paper for the next twenty years that it may still be said that the paper is the same in doctrine as it was at the first. In regard to the principles and doctrine, we wish to give another extract from the same editorial by Elder S. F. Cayce, as published last year. The extract was in close of volume eighteen and copied last year:

The doctrine of God our Saviour is the same now that it was then, and we love, have tried to preach, defend and publish the same "doctrine-on all parts of the ground" -during our eighteenth volume (now nineteenth) that we did during our first volume, or that we did eighteen (now nineteen) years ago. But while this is true, "as true as gospel." so to speak, and while it is also true that the doctrine which we try to preach, and are publishing abroad, the doctrine believed and advocated by all true Primitive Baptists, the doctrine of God our Saviour-we might say-will stand as unsullied truths "amidst the wreck of worlds and the crush of nature" yea, stand untarnished after everything else, as we humbly believe, has failed, yet we feel that we will soon be done battling for these blessed truths, that we will soon have to "lay our armor by," that our race is almost run, that we will soon reach the end of our journey, that all our labors will soon be numbered with the things of the past, for we have reached and passed over the top of the hill of life and are fast going down, as it were, on the other side. Besides our physical frame and constitution has been greatly impaired by the ravages of disease, having passed through three or four very long spells, or attacks of sickness. Hence we desire to be faithful in the discharge of our duties what little time remains for us to spend in the service of God, and in trying to serve His people.

We humbly ask the prayers of all our readers that the Lord may enable us to continue to contend earnestly for the holy principles of the doctrine of God our Saviour, and never bring reproach on the cause of our heavenly Master.

Our father lived to see THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST established on a firm basis, although he was not out of debt, and we can say that the financial condition of the paper is better at the close of this year than it has been for many years-at least we think it is, and we trust the brethren will continue to lend us their patronage and support. We will

certainly appreciate it for any of our brethren to send as many new subscribers for the paper as possible. And we also hope the brethren will renew promptly. There are a great many of our subscribers whose time expires with this issue, and we trust you will all renew promptly. Again we ask an interest in your prayers, and ask you all who feel impressed to do so to write for the paper on such things as will have a tendency to make for peace. C. H. C.

1906

Introduction to Volume Twenty-One

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME TWENTY-ONE

---January 9, 1906

It is with a deep-felt sense of our insufficiency for the task that we enter the present year in editing and publishing THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. We feel our inability to even write a proper introductory to the present volume. With this issue of the paper it enters the twenty-first volume. For twenty years the paper has been published and sent to its readers, and it now enters its twenty-first year. Many joys and pleasures, as well as many trials and sorrows, have been passed through during these twenty years. It was with a feeling of great comfort and satisfaction in his heart when the first issue of the paper was sent out twenty years ago by our dear father, Elder S. F. Cayce. From that time until his death on the 27th of last August he was the editor of the paper. In all those years he earnestly and fearlessly contended for the everlasting principles of the faith that was once for all delivered unto the saints. He feared no man. He unflinchingly contended for what he believed to be right, with the single aim to be obedient and faithful to his heavenly Master. The following extract is taken from the introduction to volume twenty, which he wrote one year ago:

Our custom is to give an editorial "Introductory" with the beginning of each volume, and we suppose our readers will expect it with the beginning of this, the twentieth, volume, or year, of our publication. We began editing and publishing THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST Jan. 1, 1886, nineteen years ago; hence we begin, with this issue, our twentieth volume; but, though this be true, we feel our weakness and inability, and the great responsibility resting upon us, as editor of a religious periodical, as forcibly, perhaps, as we ever have in life. An old adage, as we all know, is that "practice makes perfect." But this does not seem true with us in editing and publishing an Old Baptist

paper. No more so than in preaching. It seems that we feel, with regard to preaching the gospel or editing a religious paper, like David, (**Psalms 139:6**), that "Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it." But, while we feel inadequate to the task-altogether incompetent-so far as our own power or ability is concerned-to either preach the gospel-orally-or to edit and publish a Baptist periodical, yet we feel impressed to try, in our weakness, to do both, and feel also that, if not deceived, our impressions are of the Lord. Not only so, but we look to Him-to Him who is the giver of every good and perfect gift, the author and finisher of our faith, the upholder, protector and preserver of His people-to strengthen, guide and direct us in our efforts. And, in this connection, we do most sincerely ask and request all our readers-all our dear brethren and sisters in the Lord-to pray for us. Will you, dear kindred in Christ, pray the good Lord to be with us, not only in the introduction, or beginning, of this year's work, but through the entire year? Pray Him to so strengthen and guide us by His Spirit, that we may be enabled not only to preach the gospel of Christ to the comfort, instruction, development and upbuilding of His dear children; but that we may also be enabled to edit and publish THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST through the year 1905-if indeed our life should be spared-in such a manner that it will prove a greater blessing to the people of God than ever before.

If Elder S. F. Cayce felt his weakness and inability to properly edit and conduct THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, it is no wonder we realize our insufficiency for the task. We realize the great responsibility, especially in these perilous times, that rests upon us in editing THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, as well as in preaching. It is a grave responsibility that rests upon an editor and upon a minister of the gospel. He is responsible to God, the Creator of all this vast universe, not only for what he teaches, but also for the way he teaches. We realize that we are under obligation to God to earnestly contend for the truth, the doctrine of God our Saviour, and that we are as much required to contend in meekness as we are required to contend for the truth. "In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves," is the instruction given by the inspired apostle. We humbly ask all our readers to pray the Lord to guide and direct us by the sweet influence of His Holy Spirit, so that we may be enabled to heed this admonition of the apostle, and that we may be kept humble, with a desire to live at the feet of our brethren. Just here we want to say that a number of years ago we thought the Old Baptist Church was so far beneath us that we could never condescend to go down to where it was and live with its members.

But a change was wrought. There was no change wrought in or with the church. The Old Baptist Church stands now on the same high plane it has ever occupied. The blessed King and only Law-Giver established His kingdom in the top of the mountains, far above all the kingdoms of this world, and the promise of Jehovah was that it should not be left to another people, and that it should not be broken or destroyed. It has continued to occupy the same high position all along the line. The change was wrought with us, and then we realized that the church was so far above us as to cause us to feel that we would never be able to climb up to where it was and ask for a home there. Never, since then, have we felt that we have been sufficiently exalted as to be able to elevate the church. But we do feel a great desire that the brethren would reach down to where we are and lift us up high enough for us to be at their feet, and let us live there while our stay on earth lasts. Dear brethren, will you please hold us up in your prayers, and help us live in such a way as to honor and glorify our heavenly Master?

No doubt we will make mistakes. We know we are weak and liable to err. If we do err and make mistakes, please do not be hurt or wounded, but throw the mantle of charity over our imperfections and watch over us for good. If you see a mistake in us, please do not take it to others, but come to us with it and show us our wrong, and we will do our best to correct it and make amends for it.

It is our desire that THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST be a comfort and benefit to every lover of truth, and to that end we desire to contend for the ancient landmarks. We do not wish to introduce anything new among God's people, and thereby cause strife, confusion and discord in the church. God forbid that we should ever do so. "Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture!" is the sentence pronounced on such by the God of the whole earth. We desire to publish only such things as will have a tendency to bind the brethren together in love and fellowship on the true principles of the gospel. "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." There is nothing more pleasant than for brethren to dwell together in unity; and there is nothing more unpleasant and disagreeable than for brethren to dwell together in strife and confusion. It is unpleasant for people to dwell together where there is not unity. If the time ever comes that we cannot dwell in the Old Baptist Church in unity with them, we will not stay with them and destroy their peace and happiness—at least we do not now think we would do so. With these desires and intentions before us we enter upon the arduous task before us in editing and publishing the

twenty-first volume of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, and again ask an interest in the prayers of all our readers.

C. H. C.

The Black Rock Address

THE BLACK ROCK ADDRESS

---January 6, 1906

For some time we have noticed that some of the brethren who are advocating the idea that the commission was given to the church seem to take great delight in quoting a part of a sentence from the address of the Black Rock convention of 1832. For this reason we thought it might be profitable to give space in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST for the entire address. We earnestly request all our readers to study the address carefully, and see for yourselves what those brethren believed.

The sentence, or part of the sentence, that some brethren have been quoting so much of late is, "The Lord has manifestly established the order, that His ministers should be sent forth by the churches" Now, this expression, taken alone, would make it appear that the brethren believed the obligation of the commission rested on the church, when they believed no such thing. That they did not believe it is very apparent from this expression contained in the address: We will now call your attention to the subject of missions. Previous to stating our objections to the mission plans, we will meet some of the false charges brought against us relative to this subject, by a simple and unequivocal declaration, that we do regard as of the first importance the command given of Christ, primarily to His apostles, and through them to His ministers in every age, to "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, and do feel an earnest desire to be found acting in obedience thereunto, as the providence of God directs our way, and opens a door of utterance for us." Please study the address carefully. It is directly opposed to the very thing these brethren are now teaching who argue that the commission was given to the church, and that the church should send the gospel. Note, also, that they say, "Formerly not only did preachers feel themselves bound to devote a part of their time to traveling and preaching among the destitute, but the people also among whom they came dispensing the word of life, felt themselves bound to contribute something to meet their expenses. These were the days when Christian affections flowed freely." This was "formerly" -before the mission spirit was among them-before the idea sprang up among them of sending the gospel. Christian affections flowed freely then.

So would they flow freely now if brethren would leave off advocating such things.

Please also study that part of the address relative to making associations a kind of legislative body. Read it over two or three times, and see now that corresponds with the federal government idea suggested, and which was advocated in St. Louis, and which is now advocated in a paper at Fulton, Ky. The Black Rock brethren positively and fully condemn such a move, and let us know they have no fellowship for it.

Another point some have been saying a great deal about is bars to fellowship. It is plainly seen that in this address these brethren have put up a strong bar to fellowship against some of the very things being advocated now. How can the brethren who are advocating those departures, and are raising such a cry against "bars" claim to be in line with those Black Rock brethren? The claim is absurd, as any unprejudiced person can readily see if they will study the matter carefully.

Again, we would ask the question, "Who are the Primitive Baptists?" If those brethren assembled at Black Rock were Primitive Baptists, so are we who propose to do as they did-withdraw from those who are advocating and teaching such things as are contrary to the things they taught.

May the Lord help us all to stand firmly on primitive grounds, and to be humble and faithful, and to be honest in all our dealings, is our prayer.

C. H. C.

Why We Baptize Them

WHY WE BAPTIZE THEM

---January 16, 1906

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Sir and Brother-Why do we baptize Missionaries and Methodists, and what Scripture have we, as Primitive Baptists, to do such things? Please answer me through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST or by letter.

Yours truly,

ELDER I B. BARREL

321 Windelkin St., Dallas, Texas.

In answer to the above question we would say, first, that baptism is administered by the servant of Christ, or minister of the gospel, who has been called of God and set apart by the authority of the church of Christ, or come under the imposition of hands of a presbytery.

Baptism must be administered by one who has been set apart by the church to the work whereunto God has called him, if it be gospel baptism. "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus." - **(Acts 13:2-4)**. Here we have the called ministers of Christ set apart by the church for the work whereunto the Lord had called them. It is a part of the work of the ministry to administer the ordinances. Those who are commanded to teach, as ministers of the gospel, are the same who are to baptize. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." -(Matthew 28:19,20). In this text the same persons who are commanded to go teach are also commanded to baptize. It is the work of the ministry to go teach the things concerning the kingdom of Christ, and it is the work of those who teach these things to baptize those who are taught. The Primitive Baptists are the only people, in our judgment, who are teaching as Christ commanded. They are teaching the true doctrine of God our Saviour. Those who are teaching that doctrine are commanded to baptize. Hence, the Primitive Baptist ministers are the persons who are authorized by the Saviour to administer baptism. Others are not teaching the doctrine of God our Saviour, are not teaching the things commanded by the Saviour, so are not authorized by Him to administer baptism. If they baptize, it is without the authority of Christ. Baptism administered without the authority of Christ is not gospel baptism. This is a good reason why Primitive Baptists do not receive the baptism administered by Methodists, Missionary Baptists, or other people. We do not think the doctrine or principles they hold to and teach are true, and the baptism they administer is no better than the doctrine they teach.

"And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." -Luke 22:29,30. The Saviour has appointed a kingdom for His people here in the world, that they may have a blessed home here on earth, that they may eat and drink at His table in His kingdom. His kingdom is only one. He did not appoint kingdoms, but a kingdom-only one. "There are three-score queens, and four-score concubines, and virgins without number. My dove, my undefiled is

but one; she is the only one of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bare her." - Solomon's

(Song of Solomon 6:8-9). The church of Christ is but one. There are many institutions, but of all the institutions in the world, only one is the church of Christ. The Saviour has never authorized the queens nor concubines nor the virgins to administer the ordinances of His house. These queens, concubines and virgins represent the many institutions that are in the world. Jesus has never commanded that His ordinances be administered in these institutions. His love, His dove, His undefiled, is but one. That is His church or kingdom, which is but one. He has authorized and commanded that His ordinances be administered in this one kingdom. They cannot be administered elsewhere so that they will be recognized or approved by Him. He does not approve of anything being done in a place where He has not commanded. We think the Primitive Baptist Church is the true church of Christ, the kingdom He set up while He was on earth. If it is, then that is the place where the ordinances are to be administered. This is another reason why we do not accept the baptism administered by other people. If the Primitive Baptist Church is the church of Christ, the others are not. If any of the others are the church of Christ, then the Primitive Baptist Church is not the church of Christ.

"Wherefore, my brethren, ye are also become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God" -Rom. vii. 4. Those who are dead to the law are those who have been born again. They are dead to the law, and they should now be married to Christ. In order that they be married to Christ the marriage ceremony must be performed by one who has the proper authority to perform it. If two people desire to marry, in order that they carry out the desire, they must have the ceremony performed by one who is authorized to do so. They may get a good man to pronounce the ceremony for them, but unless he has the proper authority, the marriage would not be legal. It would make no difference how good the man may be who pronounces the ceremony, his goodness and honesty, or sincerity, would not make the marriage legal. To be married to Christ, the rite must be performed by one authorized to perform it. Baptism is the ceremony, or the rite, by which God's people are married to Christ. It is the work of the ministry who are set apart by His church to administer baptism, they are the persons who are authorized to administer the ordinance. They are the only persons who can

perform the marriage ceremony. Others may go through the form, but it is not recognized by the Saviour. The form may be all right, but a form without reality or authority is without value. So the baptism administered by others is without authority, hence without value, so far as the true church of Christ is concerned.

These are some of the reasons why we Primitive Baptists do not recognize the baptism administered by other people. Many other reasons and Scriptural proof texts could be given, but want of time and space forbid us writing more at present. We pray that these few thoughts may be blessed of the Lord to the benefit of our readers. This is written while we are at the home of Brother Jackson Denmark, near Groveland, Ga. We left home one week ago today, and have met some good humble brethren here in Georgia. We find them here who are standing firmly on the time honored principles of the fathers, contending for the ancient landmarks, and who love the good old way, though there are some few in this country, as in our own, who do not seem to be perfectly satisfied with the church as it came to us from the fathers. May the Lord sustain us all, and keep us by His grace, and help us to walk in the good way and find sweet rest to our souls, and thereby let brotherly love continue, and fellowship abound throughout the borders of our beloved Zion. Brethren, pray for us.
C. H. C.

Baptists in Georgia

BAPTISTS IN GEORGIA

---January 23, 1906

At this writing, on Friday, Jan. 12, we are at the home of Brother L. M. Lanier, near Pembroke, Bryan county, Ga. We left our home two weeks ago today, and arrived in Statesboro a little after night on Saturday.

On Sunday we attended a general meeting at Upper Mill Creek Church. It was a three days meeting, and began on Friday. There were quite a number of brethren present on Sunday, but not more than half as many as would have been there had the weather been fair that day. It was a rainy day, and the weather very unfavorable, and a goodly number were present, considering the inclemency of the weather. Since we left the general meeting we have visited eleven other churches. We have found many good humble brethren and sisters who love the doctrine of God our Saviour, and who are contending for the ancient order of the gospel, and who are content to be plain Old Baptists; and they want to hold to the ancient order of the gospel and to the principles that have ever characterized the

church of Christ as a people separate from the world. Elder F. H. Sills, of Model, Tenn., was at the general meeting mentioned, and has been with us during these two weeks. We have appreciated his company and association.

The brethren have all been kind and good to us, and we have been heartily received by them. We do pray that the Lord may bless our visit among them, and help us to preach to their comfort and encouragement. We ask an interest in the prayers of our readers. Pray the Lord to bless us in ministering to His people, and pray for our loved ones at home, that the Lord may sustain them and keep them from harm in our absence. C. H. C.

BROTHER SIDWELL'S LETTER

---February 20, 1906

In another column in this issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST is a letter from Brother I D. Sidwell, of Woodson, Mo., in which he expresses the idea that the ministers always get all the temporal things they need. We trust Brother Sidwell will not become offended at us if we offer a few words of warning on this point. Remember, dear brother, that it is possible for us to go to an extreme on either side of this question. We do not think it will do to say that all our ministers are neglected, and that they do not have the necessary carnal things administered to them; we think some of them are well cared for. Neither do we think it correct to say that all of them have all the necessaries of life ministered to them. If they do, then the church always does her duty in this respect, and we think it is possible for a church to fail to do her duty in this particular, as well as in other matters. So, we think that our poor and afflicted ministers-especially the pastors-are sometimes neglected by the churches or brethren. While this is true, we do not feel like condemning our brethren on this account. The Old Baptists are the best people in the world, and there is no people on earth who are more willing to do their duty than the Old Baptists, when they understand what their duty is. It may be that some of our brethren in the ministry fail to teach the brethren their duty along this line, and then the brethren fail to do their duty because they have not been taught what that duty is; and in such cases the minister is at fault and the brethren are not. We do not think a salaried or contract system is Scriptural, and such a system should not be taught by the ministers or tolerated by the churches, and the duty of the minister is to kindly warn his brethren against the evils of such a system. At the same time, the Scriptures abundantly teach that it is the duty of the church, the duty of the brethren, to

minister of their carnal things to those who minister spiritual things to them, and the minister is under obligation to lovingly and kindly teach this duty. It is just as much right that he teach this duty as it is right for him to teach the people of God any other duty. So far as we are concerned we have no complaint to make against our brethren. We feel that our efforts among them in ministering spiritual things are poor and weak, but they have been good and kind to us. We do not feel to be worthy of their love and esteem and sweet fellowship, and we have not written these things because we feel they have not been good to us, for we do not feel to deserve the many acts of kindness they have shown to us in the many different places where we have been among them; but we want to kindly and lovingly ask our dear brethren to be conservative and not go to an extreme either way. Let us try to be found contending lovingly for the right way. We should be careful and not go to an extreme on one side just because some go to an extreme on the other side. May the Lord direct us aright, and keep us humble and at the feet of our brethren, in the "good way," is our prayer.
C. H. C.

Some Plain Facts

SOME PLAIN FACTS

---February 27, 1906

For some time we have been in possession of some plain facts which we felt the brethren everywhere should know, but we have waited quite a while withholding them, in the vain hope that the Elders Kirkland, and those who are with and following them, would abandon or cease advocating the principles they have been teaching, and which are dividing the Baptists; but as it clearly appears that they are determined not to do this, we have decided, after prayerful consideration, that we should make these things known to the brethren generally. We are indeed sorry that circumstances are such as to call forth from us statements concerning these things, but we love the cause of Christ more than we love any man, and we feel under obligation to the Lord to tell our brethren of some things they may not be aware.

As some of our readers know, Elder J. V Kirkland started a paper last fall at Fulton, Ky., called the Apostolic Herald. In this paper he has been defending his positions previously taken, that the Baptists should have a federal form of government, that the commission was given to the church, that it is the duty of the ministry to admonish the alien sinner to repent and believe the gospel, and that the

Baptists should tolerate affiliation with the institutions of the day, etc. He has also raised a great cry against bars to fellowship, and has said that we have gone contrary to the advice of the brethren who met at Fulton, Ky., in 1900.

With reference to the question of bars, we will say that Elder J. C. Ross, of Greenfield, Tenn., who was in the meeting at Fulton, has already written an article on that question, and we wish to say only a few words on that matter, but will quote the following language from the general address of that meeting:

We do most solemnly and prayerfully beseech all our churches and people that they raise no bars of fellowship against any Primitive Baptist with whom they are agreed on fundamental principles—such as the eternal salvation of sinners, wholly by grace and entirely unconditional on the sinner's part, and who are sound and orderly in the ordinances of the church, administering baptism by immersion to penitent believers only by ministers of the gospel clothed with authority by the gospel church, and administering the Lord's supper to such baptized believers only, and who manifest a willingness to labor for the peace, union and fellowship of the whole body.

Heresy being so positively forbidden by the Scriptures, we deem it important to have a clear, accurate, and concise understanding of what the word implies. We take heresy to mean a departure from the teachings of the Scriptures as explained in our acknowledged Confession of Faith, but not mere differences of opinion upon immaterial points of doctrine and practice upon which the Bible makes no positive statements.

The Bible does not state the day nor the hour upon which members shall be received in the church, nor the Lord's supper administered. It mentions neither hymn books, associations, formal letter correspondence, nor general hand shaking. So upon all such matters liberty should be allowed, provided that everything is done in decency and in order, and the books used are sound in sentiment.

No doctrine or practice that violates neither the Scriptures nor acknowledged confession should be construed as heresy. The treatment of heresy requires but little comment. The Bible plainly states that a heretic, after the first and second admonition, shall be rejected, **{(Titus 3:10)}** but let it be fully known that an action or doctrine is heresy before action is taken against it. We deem it unsafe to deal with a man as a heretic unless he avows the heresy.

In the first paragraph quoted above we are asked to not declare non-fellowship for any who contend for certain principles, "And who manifest a willingness to labor for the peace, union, and fellowship of the whole body." This is manifestly one thing Elder Kirkland has not

done. Instead of manifesting a willingness to labor for peace, he has all along stoutly continued to advocate measures and principles that were causing confusion and discord among the churches and brethren. He has done this, too, when brethren were lovingly and humbly begging him to cease advocating those things. A certain person, whose name we can give if necessary, and who is very close to Elder J. V Kirkland, said in Martin, while at the home of the writer, concerning some of the things Elder Kirkland is advocating: "He has not been a month or a year getting this up, he has been studying it for years; and you need not think he will quit advocating it, for he will not do it. He always has had followers, and he will have them this time." The person who said this was then, and is yet, in a position to know. This all shows he was not laboring for peace, but for followers. As to heresy, the address, as quoted above, says, "We take heresy to mean a departure from the teachings of the Scriptures as explained in our acknowledged Confession of Faith," etc. Elder Kirkland's teaching is "a departure from the teaching of the Scripture as explained in our acknowledged Confession of Faith," so it must be heresy. He has repeatedly expressly avowed those principles. So we took the advice of the general address, as quoted above-" The Bible plainly states that a heretic, after the first and second admonition, shall be rejected."

Before Elder Kirkland began the publication of the Apostolic Herald he sent out a circular letter, a copy of which was sent to us by Elder P. E. Whitwell, of Bennett, Mo. The following is a copy of said circular letter:

Dear Brother-You doubtless have noticed that the union meeting at Martin, Tenn., has dropped the church at Fulton, Ky., from the union for reasons, as they stated them, which are trifling and foolish, and in open violation of what we all agreed upon in the National Convention at Fulton, Ky., in 1900.

After asking me to not agitate the question discussed at the St. Louis meeting, but to let everything get quiet and save a division of our people, and I had held up in hope of saving a division, they have gone right on with all the opposition against us, and by private manipulations have induced the churches to drop us and break our fellowship, which shows clearly that they were not aiming to avoid the division, but trying to make it small on our side.

Now, I am fully decided to begin the publication of a paper, not through revenge at all, but in defense of our cause against these awful abuses, and, if possible, avert this dreadful combination, which seems bent on the destruction of a number of ministers in our denomination who are full of light and piety, and on whom much of

the success of our cause depends. If they are allowed to take them, one at a time, and can keep the rest quiet, they can, and no doubt will, continue to, in some way, drive them from our Zion, and destroy their usefulness to our blessed cause. They cannot now say that I will cause a division by starting a paper, since they have forced the division, while we were all laying quietly and begging for peace. It will not only tend to stop the division, and if that is impossible, it will unite all of us who are for peace on fundamental principles, and make our side of the division larger. I am sure if something is not done to avert this destructive influence, that it will completely discourage our people, and bring us to desolation. I have received letters from brethren in all directions since the union meeting at Martin, expressing sympathy for us, and stating that they will not recognize the action of that union meeting.

At a union meeting in the Forked Deer Association, which convened with a church that I am pastor of, and where the pastor of the church where the union is held is the moderator of the union there was a persistent effort made to knock me out of the moderatorship of the union. Elder Cayce and four other preachers, who took part in the union at Martin, were present, and used their influence against me, but they made a complete failure; and their effort initiated in my favor and against them. The church unanimously voted for me to start a paper at once to defend the cause against those dreadful abuses, and they voted a donation of \$17.35 to help in starting the paper, and almost every family represented in the church subscribed for the paper. I received a letter from a brother in Mississippi last evening, who said that he would subscribe \$100.00 for the support of the paper, and named four more members of his church that would give \$25.00 each. I believe that our people are ready for the paper, and will lend a helping hand, and sustain it. I feel assured in my soul that God will bless it to the good of our afflicted cause and the glory of His matchless name.

I think I will call the paper the Apostolic Herald. I aim to start it at once. The price will be \$1.00 per annum. You will please do all you can for it, and send me as large a list of subscribers as possible.
Yours in hope, J. V KIRKLAND.

We have already shown that our dropping Fulton church from our union was not a violation of the advice or agreement of the Fulton meeting.

It will be noticed in the above that Elder Kirkland says he had held up in hope of saving a division. To this we would say he had not held up. He has all the while since the St. Louis meeting been defending and contending for those same principles, by private correspondence, and

would not agree to cease advocating them. Elder J. N. Wallace, of Providence, Ky., and others wrote him a number of letters begging him to just say he would quit advocating those things, and he would not agree to do so. Again he says they "were all laying quietly and begging for peace." As Elder Kirkland said in the pulpit in our church here in Martin, "I would not be afraid to have my cause plead before intelligence; if it were, I am sure it would be sustained, but if it were plead before ignorance and superstition I am sure it would be rejected," we will not assume to criticize his grammar, but will simply say he surely knows that the brethren who oppose those measures he has been advocating were the ones who did the begging, and he has positively been deaf to their pleadings. Then as to their being quiet, will say he was quiet so far as the columns of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST were concerned, for the simple reason that our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, who was editing the paper, refused to publish more in defense of those principles. At the time the discussion was stopped through our paper Elder Kirkland had no right to complain, as some brethren were deprived of the opportunity of replying to some things he had said, yet he sent us one or two more long articles in defense of his position, one of the articles having fifty-four pages of note paper, closely written. So it is clear that he was not "holding up" because he was desiring peace, but because we wanted peace, and would no longer give space in our columns for the things that were destroying peace.

Note again that he urges in this circular letter that the starting of his paper "will unite all of us who are for peace on fundamental principles, and make our side of the division larger." This clearly shows again his determination to have followers-make his side of the division larger. How can a man truthfully say he loves peace, and wants peace, and desires no division, and at the same time begin the publication of a paper with the avowed purpose of making a division larger? We leave the question for our readers to answer for themselves. As to uniting those who are for peace on fundamental principles, we suppose the fundamental principles are the "vital" measures advocated and proposed at St. Louis, as the purpose of the paper is to make the division larger.

With reference to the union meeting in the Forked Deer Association, we will say that Elder J. B. Halbrog, of Greenfield, Tenn., was moderator of that meeting. The circular letter, it is plainly seen, conveys the idea that Elder Kirkland moderated, which is a wrong impression. The union accomplished all they desired-that some one other than Elder Kirkland be put in the moderator's seat, and that was done.

On Friday before the second Sunday in October we were at the Soldier Creek Association in Kentucky. Elder J. V. Kirkland was there. At our association the year before Elder Kirkland agreed to bear our correspondence to the Soldier Creek at the above time. Then before he went to the Soldier Creek Association his church had been dropped from our union meeting on Friday before the fifth Sunday in July. Not only so, but his church had by her own act withdrawn from our union and association. Yet, notwithstanding all this, when they called for the correspondence from our association, Elder Kirkland promptly arose and read our letter, which was printed in our minutes, and had his name enrolled on their minutes as a messenger from our association. Now, you may draw your own conclusion as to an action of this kind.

On our way home from this association we were thrown in company with Elder J. N. Hall, who was editor of the Baptist Flag, and who lived in Fulton, Ky. We remembered having read an editorial in the Flag with reference to the Elders Kirkland, so we determined to question Elder Hall. We asked him if he had held any conferences with them, and if it was no secret we would like to know if he knew anything about their intentions. He very promptly told us that he had several conferences with them, and that so far as he was concerned it was no secret; that they had told him they felt that they should be engaged in preaching the gospel to the lost, but that they could get no hearing among our people (the Primitive Baptists) and could have no cooperation among them in that work; and that they felt that they would like to be represented where they could have a hearing and cooperation in that work. Elder Hall stated that he and they were agreed in being opposed to the board system. He also said that it had been his expectation that they would represent in their meeting in the fall at Texarkana, which was an anti-board Missionary meeting; but that he did not know Elder Kirkland's intention since he had started his paper; that he might conclude he could be heard sufficiently through that. All of this plainly shows the movement which has been on foot to unite the Primitive Baptists with the anti-board faction of the Missionaries. It would be a blessing to the cause of Christ if those who are advocating those departures would leave the Old Baptists in peace and go on to the Missionaries where they belong. Now, in support of what we say Elder Hall told us, we here give the editorial from the Flag of Aug. 24, 1905:

In Hardshell circles we are having some interesting developments. It is known pretty generally that Elders J. V and R. S. Kirkland are about the most active and able preachers of that denomination in the South, if not in the whole country. These two brethren have fully

reached the conclusion that their people are not doing their duty in refusing to send the gospel to lost sinners, and they are not willing to sit down and whine over the doctrine of unconditional election and predestination while sinners are going to hell. This has enraged a big portion of the "Can't-help-its" until they are determined to kick the Kirklands and their followers entirely out. But the Kirklands are not losing much sleep over the situation, for they know they are merely aiming to do the will of the Lord. God bless them in this noble purpose.

This editorial from the Flag very clearly establishes our statement, and has never been denied by Elders Kirkland. We have patiently looked for a denial from them, but have never seen it.

Now, these are plain statements of facts. We do not publish these things to persecute anyone. It is not persecution to tell the truth on anyone. We feel that the cause demands that the brotherhood know these things. It is not pleasant to be engaged in affairs of this kind, and we hope it will not be necessary for us to take the matter up again.

May the Lord give us all grace and courage and Christian fortitude to enable us to stand firmly against all innovations and to expose all error, from whatever source it may come, and may the Lord deliver us from ever introducing things among His people to the destruction of their peace and fellowship.

We are now in Southwest Georgia. We have been from home now seven weeks in this state, and have met many good, humble and faithful brethren who are standing firmly with us on the time honored principles of the Baptists. We feel greatly encouraged. May the Lord be praised, and may He help us to continue in the path our fathers trod. Brethren, pray for us.

C. H. C.

John 10:12

(John 10:12)

---March 13, 1906

Brother T. G. Bridges, of Crump, Tenn., asks for our views on this text; he asks, "Does the wolf catch the hireling or the sheep?" The 11th, 12th and 13th verses of the chapter read as follows: "I am the good Shepherd; the good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep. But he that is an hireling, and not the Shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep." The

hireling sees the wolf coming and he runs away. When the wolf gets there the hireling is not there to be caught. If he was there, the wolf is not after the hireling. The wolf is after the sheep. When the wolf comes, the hireling runs away, and the wolf catches what he wants—sheep. “The wolf catcheth them” The word “them” is a personal pronoun and must have an antecedent, and must agree with its antecedent. “Them” is in the plural number, denoting more than one. “Hireling” is in the singular number; hence it cannot refer to the hireling. If the hireling were caught, the language must read “catcheth him, and scattereth the sheep,” but it says “catcheth them.” The true meaning of the text is that the hireling runs away and leaves the sheep at the mercy of the wolf, and we know the wolf has no mercy, so he catches and scatters the sheep—he “catcheth them (the sheep) and scattereth (them) the sheep” C. H. C.

Home From Georgia

HOME FROM GEORGIA

---March 20, 1906

We arrived home from our tour in Georgia on Monday night, March 12, at midnight. We were gone from home on this tour ten and one-half weeks. We missed four appointments in that time on account of bad weather, and traveled about 3,000 miles. We met many good brethren and sisters, who were kind to us, and who tried to make our stay among them pleasant. We shall ever remember their many acts of kindness. We were heartily received, and the brethren generally, so far as we know, endorsed our feeble efforts in trying to preach Jesus as a full and complete Saviour of sinners, and in trying to contend for the sufficiency of His kingdom as He left it here on earth as a home for His humble children while they stay here. We had much to comfort and encourage us on the way. Many of the dear brethren assured us of their endorsement of our positions, and that we should have their hearty cooperation in extending the circulation of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST in that country.

The lists of appointments that were published in our columns for us will show that we were at quite a number of churches. We believe we missed only two or three of the places entirely. We met many dear brethren in the ministry, and were treated kindly by all of them. We had a pleasant tour, and we wish each one we met to accept this as a personal letter to them, and as an expression of our heart-felt thanks for the many kindnesses shown to us while we were among you. The brethren and sisters were all kind and good to us, and we have no complaint to make. We felt to be so unworthy of the love and

kindness manifested to us. May the Lord bless every one of you, is our humble prayer. We trust the Lord may open a way for us to visit you all again at some time in the future. But if we meet no more on earth, we hope to meet you where sorrows and trials never come. Remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Elder Hassell Again

ELDER HASSELL AGAIN

---March 20, 1906

From the February issue of the Gospel Messenger we clip the following question, which was asked Elder Hassell, the editor of the Messenger, together with his reply:

Question: Was the commission or commandment of Christ to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature and baptize believers, and teach them to observe all His commandments, given to the church and ministry or to the ministry exclusively, and, if to the ministry to the exclusion of the church, how can we escape receiving alien baptism if we admit that God has called any man to preach who is not a member of the visible church of Christ? From whom does the minister receive his authority to baptize, from the church or from Christ, and, if from the church, is she not in some sense included in the commission? Do you consider it in good order for us to invite into our stands the elders of the church in Fulton, Ky., who maintain that the commission was given to the church?

Answer: To my mind and to the minds of nearly all Primitive Baptists, and I think to all intelligent, candid, and unprejudiced minds, it is not more certain that two and two make four than it is certain that Christ's command in **(Matthew 28:16-20)** and **(Mark 16:14-16)** to go everywhere and preach the gospel and baptize and teach was, according to His plain and simple language, given to the apostles as representing the gospel ministry; certainly He did not command the whole church to go into all the world and preach and baptize believers and teach His commandments. And all the churches in the world cannot now call and qualify one single man to preach the gospel of Christ. We know that this is the work of Christ, as well as we know our own existence. But, when Christ calls and qualifies a man for the work, the church will see the gift and gladly recognize it, and help him on his way, as in the apostolic times. And if the church can be present, he will certainly prefer for them to be satisfied of the regeneration of an applicant before he baptizes him; and if the church, or men whom she appoints for the purpose, cannot be present, she will be satisfied with the baptism of an

applicant by the chosen minister of Christ; but if the minister is not a member of the visible church of God' the church will consider the nominal baptism as no real baptism. The authority to baptize comes from Christ in the commission, and the church will always gladly recognize this authority. I think that those who have an opportunity should lovingly labor with the elders of the Fulton church, and try to induce them to abandon their preposterous perversion of Christ's commission or commandment to His apostles to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature and baptize believers and teach them to observe Christ's commandments. I cannot understand how any sane mind, that knows anything of the meaning of words, can possibly believe that all His church, male and female, were to do these things. It is impossible for the elders of the Fulton Church to believe it. Unless they abandon this transparent and monstrous perversion of God's word, I do not see how any church can ask them to preach.

The foregoing from the pen of Elder Hassell needs no comment from us. Suffice it to say that Elder H. E. Pettus, one of the ministers of Fulton church, we are informed, has lately been in the eastern part of our state (Tennessee) preaching for and affiliating with an excluded faction from the Powell's Valley Association. Their works clearly show that they are determined to divide the Baptists, and to carry as many with them as possible, even if they must get the following from those who are excluded. How any church that is sound and orderly in the faith and practice, and loves order in God's house, can receive these brethren into her pulpit and preach them until they abandon their present positions and put themselves in order with their brethren at home, is something we cannot understand. For a church to invite them into her pulpit and affiliate with them is to partake of their disorder and encourage I them and bid them God-speed in it, which is plainly and positively forbidden in the Scriptures, {see **(Romans 16:17-18); (II Thessalonians 3:6); (II Timothy 3:1-5); (Titus 3:10-11); (II John 1:13)**} and is to disregard order in the house of God. We earnestly request all our readers to take your Bible now and turn to all the above references and read them, and may the Lord give us grace and courage to humbly obey His instructions. C. H. C.

ELDER WALLACE'S LETTER

---March 27, 1906

There are just a few things we want to speak of that are mentioned in Brother Wallace's letter on another page in this paper. We love Brother Wallace and think he is a good man, and he says the best

men may make mistakes. This is true; and we will add that "the man who never made a mistake never made anything." So, we know we have made many mistakes; we make them every day we live. Knowing and realizing this, we do not desire to kill anyone because they make mistakes. Neither do we desire to kill anyone because of every little wrong they may do. We do not desire to kill Brother Kirkland, either, because of his views, nor because he has made mistakes, as we think. We do not desire to kill him at all, and we are very sorry to see him continue to advocate some principles he is advocating. No, indeed, we do not wish to kill Brother Kirkland, and if he will only say he will stop advocating these things that are causing so much trouble in our beloved Zion, we will gladly give him our hand, and take him into our embrace as a brother, and will walk with him. We are perfectly willing to allow him liberty of conscience to believe the things, but we think it is wrong for him to advocate them, when he surely can see it causes confusion. If Brother Kirkland really thinks the points are not fundamental, then he cannot say it is unreasonable to ask him to not advocate them, as doing so disturbs the peace of the brotherhood. If they are fundamental or vital, as the minutes of the St. Louis meetings say-then we think it is wrong for him to divide the Old Baptists by advocating those things among them. It seems to us that if the points are fundamental, it would be better to advocate them among a people who would receive them and who would not be divided on account of them. So, it seems to us that Brother Kirkland is making a very serious mistake, whether the points are fundamental or not; and we would again beg him, as a brother, to lay these things down-just say he will advocate them no more, and allow us all to walk together to the house of the Lord once more. If he cannot do this, then it looks to us like he is trying to force his views on the Baptists. We make this appeal in all good feeling, and we are confident this would settle all the trouble.

Now, we want to say a few words in regard to associations. We are aware that associations conducted as a kind of higher court, to which an appeal must be made to settle or decide troubles, have often been a source of extending troubles, instead of settling them. We think it is right and Scriptural for brethren to meet together for worship and mutual edification, but we do not think it is right that an association be a legislative body. We do not think, either, that it is exactly right to condemn associations as a whole because some of them have been conducted as a kind of higher court or legislative body.

Nine hundred and ninety-nine times out of a thousand, trouble in the Old Baptist Church originates with the preachers, and is agitated and kept up by them. Because this is true is no reason why all preaching or all preachers should be condemned. The wrongs should be

condemned, no matter where they are; but it should be done in love and meekness and humility.

We think it is sometimes the case that the preachers are the "bosses." The churches should remember that the ministers are given them by the Lord as servants and not lords. The true minister is the servant of the church, and is not a ruler, and is and should be amenable to the church.

As to religious papers, would say that our papers are not owned or controlled by the church. The Old Baptist Church does not engage in the publication business. If they did, they would be engaged in something that is unscriptural. All the Old Baptist papers are owned and published by individuals as private enterprises, and it is no more unscriptural for a member of the Old Baptist Church to engage in publishing a periodical in defense of the principles of the church, than it is for another to engage in farming, or any other honorable business for an honest living. The Scriptures do not tell us whether we should make a living by farming, or by running a printing office, or by building houses. We are required to live right, but we are not required to engage in any certain specific occupation. But it is true that a religious periodical may be conducted in such a way as to be a disadvantage to the cause. It will not be a blessing to the cause, and will not tend to unite the Old Baptists, when the columns of the paper are used to disseminate unscriptural doctrine or practice. When the paper is used for such a purpose as this-to promulgate a wrong doctrine or practice-the tendency will be to bring strife, confusion, discord and division in the church. Preaching a false doctrine or practice from the pulpit will do the same thing, and there is where it most always begins. Some preacher introduces a new theory, and some faithful servant raises a warning cry, either through the pulpit or press, after having, perhaps, labored privately, and then the faithful servant is sometimes called "a troubler," "a kicker," "a moss-back," "a sore-head," "hide-bound," "old fogy," "jealous," "ignorant," "superstitious," or some other such name. The one who raises the warning cry is not the one who causes the trouble. The trouble is caused by the introduction of the things the faithful servant raises the warning against. The faithful servant who condemns the wrongs, either from the pulpit or through the press, may be assured that he will be called "a troubler" of Israel by those who introduce the things he condemns. It was true in the case of Ahab and Elijah. The servant who will not raise a warning cry and condemn a wrong doctrine or practice is not faithful, and he will have to give account for his unfaithfulness. We should be kind and gentle, yet firm and faithful. We should regard the feelings and views of our brethren, but

we should have more regard for the cause of Christ than for these. We know we have no desire to injure anyone, but if we are not deceived in our own heart, we do desire to be found faithful to our trust, even if we have to condemn some things taught and done by some brethren we have walked with and loved.

We would be glad to see all the dear brethren united once more in love and fellowship, and perfect peace restored and reigning throughout all the borders of our beloved Zion. May the Lord help us all to labor to this end, and help us all to earnestly and faithfully labor for the things that make for peace, is our prayer.

C. H. C.

Brother Vickers' Acknowledgment

---April 10, 1906

On another page of this paper is a communication from Elder W. R. Vickers, of Broughton, Ill., in which he makes an acknowledgment to the brethren. We want to say to you, dear brother, that you have our warmest love and fellowship. We are so glad, indeed, to see you make such a full confession. It does us much good, and we pray the Lord to abundantly bless you.

If those brethren would only say they would cease advocating and agitating those questions, it would settle all the trouble at once. We have said this before, and many have begged them to do so. We do not want to kill those brethren, neither do we want to be idle and say nothing while those things are being advocated. We feel under obligation to beg our brethren to let those things alone. We think they are a departure from original Baptist principles, and it grieves us to see brethren depart from the original principles of the Baptists. We think, too, that whatever is Baptist is Scriptural. If it is not, then the Primitive Baptist Church is not the church of Christ. Some may say, sometimes, "I do not care so much about what the Baptists have always believed or practiced; I only want to know what the Bible teaches." It is true that the Bible is our only divinely authorized rule of faith and practice; yet if the Baptists, as a denomination, have not been occupying Bible ground all the while, then the Baptist Church is not the church of Christ. We believe the Primitive Baptist Church is the church of Christ, and that all that is Baptist is Scriptural, and that whatever is Scriptural is Baptist. We must admit this, or we must admit that the Primitive Baptist Church is not the church of Christ. One or the other is bound to be true.

We do humbly trust our dear brethren everywhere will prayerfully study these things, and not be led into them. We trust that many

other dear brethren will see the good example of Brother Vickers and do as he has done.

May the Lord help us all to see our errors and wrongs, and give us grace and Christian fortitude to acknowledge them and turn from them, and help us all to labor for peace is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

First Church Association

FIRST CHURCH AND ASSOCIATION

---April 17, 1906

Brother J. B. Miller, of Shepherd, Ga., has asked us to give the date of the organization of the first Baptist Church and association in the United States. The first Baptist Church constituted in America was at Newport, Rhode Island, in 1638, by Dr. John Clark (a physician) and eleven other persons. The pastors and members of this church were Predestinarian Baptists-like the Primitive Baptists are now-until about the year 1820.

The Welch Tract Church, near Newark, Newcastle county, Delaware, is the oldest Primitive (or Old School) Baptist Church in the United States. It was constituted in the spring of 1701, by sixteen Baptists, in South Wales. They moved, as a church, to the United States, and first settled near Philadelphia, where they remained about a year and a half. Then they purchased a tract of land where the church is now located. They moved there in 1703.

The Philadelphia Association was formed in 1707; the Charleston in 1751; the Sandy Creek in 1758; the Kehukee in 1765. The Kehukee Association stands today upon the ancient order of the gospel, just as they did when constituted.

C. H. C.

Secret Orders

SECRET ORDERS

---April 17, 1906

Some brethren in some portions of the country seem to be under the impression that the whole trouble among the Baptists in this part of the country is on account of secret orders. We wish now to state again, once for all, that this is not the case.

The Baptists here do not believe the commission was given to the church, and this was being preached among us. Neither do we believe it to be the duty of the minister to admonish the alien sinner to repent and believe the gospel, and this was also being advocated

among us. These things were causing confusion and trouble in the minds of our brethren before the secret order question was made an issue in our association. The secret order question is not the sole trouble. If those brethren who have lately gone into this were to quit it, and yet continue to advocate the idea that the commission was given to the church, and that it is the duty of the ministry to admonish the alien sinner to repent and believe the gospel, this could not settle the trouble in this country. The Primitive Baptists in this country do not believe in mission boards; neither do they believe in the so-called gospel mission plan.

The brethren have been begged and plead with both publicly and privately to agree not to advocate these things, but so far as we have been able to learn, all these pleadings have been in vain.

As to secret orders, we will just say this, that it has been against the rules of the Baptists of the South to allow their members to affiliate with them- such as Free Masons, Odd Fellows, etc. This is so well known in this country that everyone, who knows anything at all about our people here, knows it is against our rules. To try to "reform" the churches here and press upon them the idea that they should no longer hold to this rule, would simply divide our people and cause a disruption. Perhaps in some places the churches have allowed their members to affiliate with those things. Where this is the case, if one should endeavor to "reform" them, and try to force upon them to withdraw from those institutions, it would cause a disruption in those churches-cause a division among them. To try to force those churches to withdraw from them would cause a division. So, to try to force our churches in this country to tolerate them would do the same thing- cause a division. We would say further that we do not think Baptists should affiliate with those institutions, and we think we have good reasons for thinking as we do, but do not deem it necessary now to state any of our reasons. We think enough has been said on that line for the present, at least, and we humbly suggest to our brethren that we do not write any more on that question for a while.

Let us all try to be patient and humble, and pray the Lord to sustain us.

C. H. C.

Acts 13:3

---April 17, 1906

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Will you please give your views on **(Acts 13:3)**? What does the word "they" in that verse refer to?

Please answer privately or through the paper, and oblige, your sister in hope of eternal life.

Macoupin, Ill., R. 26.

Miss DAISY RUSHER.

OUR ANSWER

In order to have a fair understanding of what the word "they" refers to in the third verse it is necessary to read the first and second verses of this chapter. The first verse reads, "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul." The second verse reads, "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto. I have called them." The third verse reads, "And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."

The word "they" in this third verse are the same persons who are referred to by the term "they" in the second verse. Those referred to in the second verse ministered to the Lord and fasted. These are the same persons referred to in the first verse as prophets and teachers. There were five of them named, three besides Barnabas and Saul. These prophets and teachers "ministered to the Lord, and fasted;" as they did so, "the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Then when these prophets and teachers had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on Barnabas and Saul, they (the prophets and teachers -Simeon, Lucius and Manaen) sent them (Barnabas and Saul) away. It was not the church that sent them away-so it seems to us-but these prophets and teachers, for the word "they," it seems, refers to them in both the second and third verses.

Gill, in his commentary, says, "Now when they had thus prayed for them, and wished them well, they sent them away; to do the work they were called unto; not in an authoritative way, but in a friendly manner they parted with them and bid them farewell."

The Interlinear Literal Translation of the Greek New Testament renders the third and fourth verses thus, "Then having fasted and prayed, and having laid hands on them, they let them go. They indeed therefore having been sent forth by the Spirit the Holy (or by the Holy Spirit), went down to Seleucia," etc.

We trust these thoughts may be of some benefit to you, Sister Daisy, and that the Lord may not only bless them to your good, but to the benefit of all our readers.

C. H. C.

John 10:12 Again

---May 1, 1906

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother in the Lord-I read your views on **(John 10:12)**, and your view was the wolf caught the sheep. Does the wolf represent the devil and the sheep God's people? If so, did the devil catch one of God's people?

Yours in hope, W. M. MANESS. Montezuma, Tenn.

ANSWER

We will again give the reading of the text referred to: "But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep." Again, we would say that the word "hireling" is in the singular, and the pronoun "them" is in the plural. This being true, it follows that it is impossible for the word "them" to refer to "hireling."

In answer to the question, "Does the wolf represent the devil, and the sheep God's people," we answer, yes. Then, "If so, did the devil catch one of God's people?" We say no, because the Saviour is not a hireling. The Saviour here uses a flock or natural sheep as an illustration. A hireling may be caring for a flock of sheep, and when he sees danger approaching he will flee to escape the danger himself, and will leave the sheep to the mercy of the enemy. We know that in nature this is true. But the true shepherd, who is the owner of the sheep, will not leave the sheep in time of danger, but will stay with them and protect them to the extent of his power and wisdom. The Saviour is the true Shepherd, and owns the sheep, and will not flee when trouble or danger approaches. He is the good Shepherd, and as such laid down His life for the sheep. In nature the hireling will flee when the wolf approaches, and leave the sheep to be caught and scattered by the wolf. The true shepherd, or owner of the sheep, in nature, will not leave the sheep when the wolf comes. The Saviour is teaching the fact that He is the good Shepherd, and not a hireling, and that, therefore, He will not leave them to be devoured by the enemy. If the devil catches one of God's people it would be because the Saviour is a hireling and flees from them and leaves them to the mercy of the devil. The true shepherd does not leave the sheep, and Jesus is the true Shepherd, the good Shepherd; so He stays with them and protects them from the power of the devil. As the true shepherd in nature, who is the owner of the sheep, will protect the flock to the extent of his power and wisdom, it follows that not one of his sheep would ever be destroyed, or caught by the wolf, if he has power and wisdom to prevent it. Jesus, the good Shepherd and

Bishop of our souls, has all power and is perfect in wisdom. So He has power and wisdom sufficient to protect His sheep, His people. All this being true, the lesson taught is that all the Lord's people are kept safe and secure from the destructive power of their enemy, and will be brought off more than conquerors at last through the power and wisdom of the good Shepherd.

We trust we have made our position sufficiently plain now, and that the Lord may bless these thoughts to the benefit of Brother Maness and all our readers.

C. H. C.

Sunday School Affiliation

SUNDAY SCHOOL AFFILIATION

---May 1, 1906

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Will you please say through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST what you think of the propriety of, or is it orderly for a member and deacon of a Primitive Baptist Church to affiliate with, or act as superintendent of a Sunday School? A SUBSCRIBER.
OUR ANSWER

To the question above, propounded by "A Subscriber," we answer that we do not think it proper for a deacon or any other member of the Primitive Baptist Church to affiliate with modern Arminian Sunday schools. The avowed and expressed object of these schools is to bring children up in such a way as to make Christians of them-to give them such training as that they will accept Christ as their Saviour, and thereby ultimately reach the climes of glory. This object of the Sunday school we know to be an open violation of the teaching of Holy Writ. "All thy children shall be taught of the Lord," says the prophet. The Lord is the teacher. This teaching is in the work of regeneration, and is by a direct and immediate work of the Holy Spirit. For this reason Primitive Baptists should have nothing to do with them.

It is also claimed that the Sunday school is a nursery or help to the church. The church of Christ has no such helps or nurseries; nor does she need them. If the Sunday school had been needed by the Lord's kingdom, then the Saviour would have instituted it. The modern Sunday school was instituted by Robert Raikes, of Gloucester, England, in the eighteenth century, and is, therefore, an institution of man. The ancient Waldenses "held in abhorrence all the inventions of men in the affairs of religion as an abomination in the sight of God," and the Primitive Baptists of today, as a body, do the same thing, and all her members should do so.

The Scriptures teach everything we ought to believe or practice religiously, and a Sunday school is mentioned at no place in the Bible. So we should let it alone. The idea that we are at liberty to practice anything religiously that the Bible says nothing about, we think is erroneous. The Scriptures are given that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works, and therefore teach everything we ought to practice religiously. This being true, we should practice nothing religiously which is not commanded in the Bible.

Other reasons could be given why Old Baptists should not affiliate in the modern Sunday schools of today, but we think these are sufficient. We would be glad for all Old Baptists to "touch not, taste not, handle not the doctrines and commandments of men," and stand aloof from the world in all our religious service, and join not house to house, nor field to field, with the nations around us. It is right and proper for us to be neighborly, friendly and sociable with them in our worldly or secular affairs, but in religious matters we should be a separate people. May the Lord help us to so live as to say by our life that there is a reality in the profession we make, that the Primitive Baptist Church is the true church of Christ, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Does He Want Peace?

DOES HE WANT PEACE?

---May 15, 1906

On the 19th of April we went to Fulton, Ky., to see Elders J. V. and R. S. Kirkland and to confer with them, and to try to draft a basis of agreement for a settlement of the differences, or one upon which we all might agree, so as to settle the existing troubles among the Baptists on the points that have been troubling us so much lately. Although so many have said we were so fond of confusion, yet we felt to be willing to make every possible concession to bring about peace, and to save a division in our beloved Zion, and to reconcile the differences. At the home of Elder R. S. Kirkland, in Fulton, we three, Elders J. V. and R. S. Kirkland and the writer, talked and wrote until about midnight, writing the agreement. The article was finally completed, and all three of us signed it. Of course we signed it only as individuals, and there was no church authority in it. We (the editor of this paper, THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST) put our name to it in good faith, with a sincere desire, if we are not deceived, for the good of the cause. This was on April 19th. Since that time we have carefully guarded our columns, trying to keep everything out of the paper

containing reference to these things, and trying to keep everything out of the paper reflecting on Elder Kirkland's position. We here give the first three paragraphs of the basis of agreement:

Whereas, There has been so much written and spoken on the subjects of the "Commission," "Repentance," and other things of late, and

Whereas, It seems there has been much misunderstanding, and our denomination has been thrown into a state of confusion in so many places, and

Whereas, We greatly desire to do all in our power that is lawful, or Scriptural, and right in order that peace and harmony be once more restored throughout the borders of our beloved Zion; and after careful and, as we humbly trust, prayerful consideration of all the circumstances and points involved, we have thought it best to submit the following as an explanation of what we all believe on the points involved, and agree to the same as a basis of agreement and settlement of our troubles, and to come together once more in peace, and labor to live together as brethren in the Lord.

Notice carefully the expression in the latter part of the last paragraph quoted above, "we have thought it best to submit the following as an explanation of what we all believe on the points involved, and agree to the same as a basis of agreement and settlement of our troubles, and to come together once more in peace, and labor to live together as brethren in the Lord." In this, you see, it was agreed that we would "labor to live together as brethren in the Lord." After this follows a statement on the questions of the commission, federal government, repentance and secret orders. We do not think it is necessary to take up space in the paper to give the statements on these four points, but will here give all that follows these statements in the agreement:

We do sincerely think that these subjects as above explained are not sufficient to destroy our peace and fellowship, and that all should come together upon this and mutually forgive each other and live in peace, and where any churches on either side of any of these issues have made actions interfering with fellowship over these questions that such actions be removed, and all come together in love and fellowship; and we do solemnly and prayerfully beseech all of our dear brethren that they now cease agitating these differences and manifest a tender regard for the feelings of each other, and be guarded in their expressions about each other and not indulge in such language nor manifest such a spirit as to hurt the feelings of others, nor to be so exacting as to make a brother an offender for a word, and endeavor to use such words as will not justly give offence to any.

Trusting that the Lord may bless the foregoing to the sweet peace and good of our beloved Zion, and that union and fellowship among us may be restored, we hereto mutually and cheerfully subscribe our names.

J. V KIRKLAND.

C. H. CAYCE.

R. S. KIRKLAND.

Now, notice carefully the expression in the above, "And we do solemnly and prayerfully beseech all of our dear brethren that they now cease agitating these differences and manifest a tender regard for the feelings of each other, and be guarded in their expressions about each other and not indulge in such language nor manifest such a spirit as to hurt the feelings of others, nor to be so exacting as to make a brother an offender for a word, and endeavor to use such words as will not justly give offence to any. If we know our own poor heart, we do desire the peace and welfare of the Old Baptist Church, and we were hopeful that this agreement would be the means of getting the agitation of these questions stopped, and we hoped that the troubles might be thereby settled; but we were altogether disappointed in this, for although we had guarded the columns of our paper, as stated above, to keep out reference to these things, yet the Apostolic Herald contained some very harsh expressions over the initials of J. V Kirkland in the issue of May 1st. So it is very clear that Elder J. V Kirkland has gone contrary to the agreement. Remember that the agreement was signed on April 19th, and the Herald was dated May 1st. We here quote from Elder Kirkland's remarks to a letter written by Mrs. L. M. Lovelace. Sister Lovelace wrote to Elder Kirkland. He published the letter and made some remarks following it, and the following language was used in said remarks:

This good, kind, faithful letter from dear Sister Lovelace, was a sweet comfort to my wounded heart, and greatly lightened the burden of my weary soul. I feel glad that such true noble saints, who have known me so long, believe me to be true and faithful to God according to my sincere convictions, notwithstanding all the flood of abuse and hard sayings that have been poured out upon me for the last eighteen months, and the great industry and artful efforts employed to represent me as a vile person, and to thereby destroy the confidence of my brethren in me. I know, if I know anything about honesty and sincerity, I have been honest and sincere in all I have done in my religious life. I have always groaned over my weakness and imperfections, but I have been true to my conviction. Oh! how unfeeling and destructive is human tradition, backed by

prejudice and jealousy, when it gains hold in the hearts of the people of God. It seems to have no respect for truth, honesty, sincerity, years of faithful service, gray hairs, tears, piety nor learning. Where such is the case all are frequently sacrificed in order to protect some deformity of human creeds, which will not bear the light of investigation.

Now, notice that he says a flood of abuse and hard sayings have been poured out upon him for the last eighteen months. Of course he must mean that this has been done by those who have been opposing him in his views. Then he says, "Oh, how unfeeling and destructive is human tradition." This must also refer to those who have differed from him; so, according to this, all of us who have differed from Brother Kirkland have been only following human tradition, and are all unfeeling, or without feeling. Not only so, but he must mean that our human tradition has been backed by prejudice and jealousy. Does it not seem that he accuses us, all who have opposed his views during the past eighteen months, of being humanly traditionized, prejudiced and jealous? It seems to us that the language not only has this in it, but that our human tradition, backed by our prejudice and jealousy, "seems to have no respect for truth, honesty, sincerity, years of faithful service, gray hairs, tears, piety nor learning." If we can understand the meaning of words this certainly means that all of us who have opposed him during the past eighteen months have no respect for truth, honesty, etc. How does that compare with the expression in the agreement, "and we do solemnly and prayerfully beseech all of our dear brethren that they now cease agitating these differences and manifest a tender regard for the feelings of each other, * * * and endeavor to use such words as will not justly give offence to any?" Is it manifesting a tender regard for the feelings of each other to write in such a way as to leave the impression, to say the least of it, that we are actuated by human tradition, backed by prejudice and jealousy, and have no respect for truth, honesty, sincerity, years of faithful service, gray hairs, tears, piety nor learning? We repeat, is this manifesting a tender regard for feelings? Is using such language as this laboring to live together as brethren in the Lord? Is this "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace?" If it is any of these things we admit that we have not "so learned Christ." We do not profess to be so wise as many, and we would prefer to be a poor ignorant sinner, saved by the grace of an all wise God, than to boast of our "learning," if we knew it all. "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words, which man's wisdom teacheth." "For ye see your calling, brethren; how that not many wise men after the

flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise," etc. Again, can the use of such language as that of Brother Kirkland "justly give offence to any?"

Perhaps if we were to say he has no respect for truth, honesty, etc., it would justly give offence-or if we were to intimate such a thing perhaps it would justly give offence. But as Elder Kirkland has used the language about those who have differed from him we suppose he thinks it will not justly give offence, and if anyone becomes offended at it, they do not justly do so. If it would justly give him offence for us to use such language with reference to him, why should it not justly give us offence for him to use such language about us? Are all those who differ from Brother Kirkland so utterly insignificant and so unlearned, illiterate, ignorant and worthless that they could not be justly offended at anything he might say?

We are sorry to have seen such a spirit manifested by Elder Kirkland right in the face of the agreement signed on April 19th, but there it is, staring us in the face, and we must admit is there. After seeing the paper we tried to give the matter prayerful thought as to what we should do, and as to what such a course as all this means. We could arrive at no other conclusion than that Brother Kirkland had failed utterly to keep the agreement. We could only conclude that he is not desiring peace-if he is, why should he have written such after signing that agreement? We tried to pray over the matter, and tried to ask the Lord to direct us aright. And being able to come to no other conclusion than that stated above, we wrote a letter to Elder Kirkland on May 9th, of which the following is a copy:

ELDER J. V KIRKLAND:

Dear Brother-Your letters of the 5th and the 8th were forwarded to me here and I received them this morning, and hasten to write to you.

I saw a copy of the Herald of May 1st a few days ago, and I was somewhat surprised at its contents. I must say, my brother, that I do not, at all, consider the contents of that paper to be at all in harmony with the agreement, nor with the advice it contained. I was hopeful that all parties would hold to the agreement, and govern themselves according to it; but I see it seems my hope was in vain. Your remarks to Sister Lovelace, as well as some other things you had in the paper, it seems to me, are contrary to the agreement. I have tried to carefully guard the columns of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, and keep everything out that might have the least tendency to be offensive. I had even laid aside a number of communications that made reference to these things. But now, my dear brother, in all kindness I must ask

that you simply erase my name from the article, and that my name be considered with it or in connection with it no more. I feel that under the circumstances it is my duty to write this to you at once. So I say, in kindness, that as long as this state of affairs exists I am done making any further effort along the same line as that contained in the agreement. I signed it in good faith and so far as I am concerned, would have had no more to say on these matters but for the facts stated. So that now, so far as that agreement is concerned, I shall consider that I am loosed from it. So for the present it is all at an end. I trust you are all well, and remain,

Yours in humble hope,

C. H. CAYCE. Eagleville, Tenn.

We will now only say further that it seems to us that all our dear brethren everywhere who have been thinking we were too severe on Brother Kirkland, and that he wanted peace and fellowship, can surely see now that we have made a fair and earnest effort to settle the trouble, and Brother Kirkland has failed to abide the agreement. Dear brethren, we beg you to think of these things and ponder them well, and may the Lord guide and direct us aright and sustain us by His grace, and help us to walk in and follow the right way, is our humble prayer. These things are trying to us, and we humbly ask an interest in the prayers of all the brethren.

C. H. C.

John 11:39

---May 22, 1906

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Sir and Friend-When you have the time I would like for you to write a short editorial on **(John 11:39)**, that is if you think there are any spiritual applications beyond the historical fact that Lazarus was dead. Christ went to the grave and said, "Take ye away the stone." I have heard two Arminian friends preach from this text, but to my mind they got it somewhat mixed. They would apply the stone to the stony heart, and would say to their penitents at the altar to take away the stony heart. But it seemed to me that the stone was placed over the grave of Lazarus to make it more secure; if so, then the above is no part of a spiritual application. I guess I had better quit before I say too much. Come and see us sometime.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH B. ANDERSON.

Ponder, Mo.

OUR ANSWER

We suppose Brother Anderson merely wishes our opinion of the expression, "Take ye away the stone." He says he has heard two Arminian friends preach on that text, and that, to his mind, they got it somewhat mixed. We would be somewhat surprised if they did not get things mixed. Their whole theory is a "tangled hank," from first to last.

It seems to have been the custom in those days that a stone be placed over a grave or sepulchre. A stone was placed over the sepulchre where the Saviour was buried, and the women who went to His grave early in the morning of the first day of the week said, "Who will roll away the stone?" The stone over the grave of Lazarus has no reference whatever to a stony heart. It simply shows that Lazarus was dead, and that he was buried according to the usual custom. In the resurrection of Lazarus was a wonderful display of the power of God. He could have raised Lazarus just as easily without the stone being rolled away as after it was taken away. The stone being over the grave did not binder His ability to raise Lazarus. But if He had raised him without the stone being first taken away, then those unbelieving Jews would have said it was all a "sham" and that Lazarus was not dead. Then the question might be asked, why did the Saviour not roll the stone away Himself? We answer, it was not necessary that He roll it away. They could do that themselves. They could not give life to Lazarus, but they could roll away the stone. The Saviour did what they could not do. So He tells them to roll away the stone, and when it is taken away, they can see Lazarus lying there now dead, and "behold he stinketh." Now, the Saviour cried with a loud voice, "Lazarus, come forth," and he obeys, the Saviour imparting life with the command. They have seen Lazarus was dead, and they have seen that life was imparted to him, and he came forth. There is absolutely no room to dispute the fact that the dead was raised. Hence this is a wonderful display of the power of Christ, showing that He has power to raise the dead. Even so now He has the power to raise the sinner out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ.

The sinner is not commanded to take the stony heart away, or to take the stony heart out of his flesh. In **(Ezekiel 11:19-20)**, the Lord says, "And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh; that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances and do them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God." Here we have the positive promise of the Lord, the God that cannot lie, that He will take away the stony heart and that He will give a heart of flesh. He does not tell us to do what He

has promised to do for us, and He does not promise to do for us what He commands us to do. Having the stony heart taken away, and a heart of flesh given, is equivalent to being born again, and sinners are no where commanded in God's word to be born again. This taking away of the stony heart and giving of a heart of flesh is something the Lord will do "that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them." Then the stony heart must be taken away in order that acceptable obedience be rendered to the Lord. If the stony heart must be removed in order that acceptable obedience be rendered to the Lord, then the stony heart must be removed before the sinner obeys. So, if the Lord commands the sinner to remove the stony heart, and the sinner cannot render acceptable obedience until the stony heart is removed, and the Lord cannot or will not save the sinner until the stony heart is removed, it looks to us as though there is no hope for the poor sinner. They do get it somewhat mixed, sure enough. But the Lord takes away the stony heart and gives them a heart of flesh and puts a new spirit within them. The Lord thereby qualifies them for His service.

But someone might ask, "Does not the Lord somewhere command somebody to purify their hearts?" Certainly He does, but He is not talking to alien sinners. **(James 4:8)** says, "Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double minded." James is not talking to unregenerate sinners; he is talking to the brethren, to children of God, those to whom the Lord has given a heart of flesh. In the 11th verse he says, "Speak not evil one of another, brethren." He uses the term "brethren" all along in different places, so it has no application whatever to the unregenerate. Some brother, then, might ask, "How are they to purify their hearts?" Peter tells us how. **(I Peter 1:22-23)**:

"Seeing ye have purified your SOULS in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." They purified their souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit. To obey the truth through the Spirit, one must first be in possession of the Spirit, or must have the Spirit before they obey. Then they do not purify their souls unto eternal life, but unto the unfeigned love of the brethren. They are in possession of the Spirit before the obedience is rendered; and the Lord promised to put a new Spirit within them, and when the Lord puts that Spirit within them they are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which

liveth and abideth forever." All the Lord's dear children, to whom the Lord has given a heart of flesh, should endeavor to "purify their souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren." We think Brother Anderson should do this. We pray the Lord to bless these thoughts to your good, and to the good of all our readers. Dear brethren and sisters, pray for us. C. H. C.

Galatians 3:1; 3; 6:18

---May 22, 1906

In another column in this paper is a communication from Brother H. L. Morgan, of West Grove, Iowa, in which he requests our views on **(Galatians 3:27)**, which reads as follows: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." We do not wish to set up our view as a standard, for we realize our weakness, and that we may be wrong; so we do not wish our readers to accept our views only so far as they are in keeping with inspiration. So we ask that what we may say be compared with the Bible, and unless it holds good and is sustained by the Bible, do not receive it.

To our mind this text represents our becoming in possession of eternal life as being baptized into Christ. To be born of God is to be baptized into Christ. To be baptized into Christ is to pass out of a state of death in sin into a state of life in Christ; is to be killed to the love of sin and made alive to the love of holiness. It is to be quickened into divine life; it is to be raised up together with Christ. It is also set forth in Scripture as a regeneration, being born again, born of God, begotten again, being translated; and other figures are used to represent the same thing.

This becoming in possession of eternal life is called being baptized into Christ, because a true baptism signifies that the one baptized is dead to sin, has become dead to sin, and is alive unto God. So, in becoming in possession of eternal life one dies and is made alive at the same time—they are become dead to sin and alive unto God at the same time. So, to be baptized into Christ is to be killed to sin, killed to the love of sin, and made alive to God, alive in Christ. It is to be raised up into a state of life in Christ. This baptism is not a water baptism. It is a baptism of the Holy Spirit. John, who baptized the Saviour and those in the region of Jordan, said of Jesus, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."

The Apostle Paul, in **(I Corinthians 12:13)**, says: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into

one Spirit." To be baptized into one body is to be baptized into Christ; it is to be baptized into the body of Christ. The redeemed of the Lord are represented as being the body of Christ. To be baptized into the body of Christ, or into Christ, is to be brought into the family of the redeemed, or into the heavenly or spiritual family. This is not done by many preachers, but by one Spirit; it is a work of the Holy Spirit.

There is a washing in baptism. In water baptism there is an outward washing which is a symbol or figure of the inward washing by the Holy Spirit.

The baptism or washing of the Holy Spirit is an inward work, and it is the work which brings us into a saved state, or into Christ, or the body of Christ. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." -**(Titus 3:5-6)**. In this text it is expressed as the "washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." It is a work of washing or cleansing by the Holy Ghost. So by one Spirit we are baptized into one body, baptized into Christ. In this work the Holy Spirit comes in direct touch or immediate contact with the heart. In water baptism, the outward washing, the water comes in direct touch or immediate contact with the body or person baptized. So in the inward washing or cleansing, the Holy Spirit comes in direct touch or immediate contact with the heart or soul.

These are some of our thoughts in connection with the text. We haven't time to write more now. At some time in the future, perhaps, we will try to comply with Brother Morgan's request to write some few thoughts on the other subject mentioned in his letter. If we overlook the matter he is at liberty to call our attention to it again. We trust the Lord may bless these thoughts given to his benefit, and we pray the Lord to bless him in his declining years.

This is written at the home of Brother J. H. Hay, near Eagleville, Tenn. We are now on a tour among the churches of the Cumberland Association. We ask an interest in the prayers of all our readers. C. H. C.

Matthew 8:22

---May 29, 1906

Brother James Tubb, of Magazine, Ark., asks us to give our views of **(Matthew 8:22)**, which reads, "But Jesus said unto him, Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead." Perhaps it would be better to give

some of the connection. Beginning with verse 18 we have the following language: "Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about Him, He gave commandment to depart unto the other side. And a certain scribe came, and said unto him, Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay His head. And another of His disciples saith unto Him, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. But Jesus said unto him, Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead."

We do not think the idea is intended to be taught here that if our father or mother dies a physical or corporeal death we should not bury them, or see after their burial. It is right and proper for us to perform our duty toward them, not only in this particular, but also while they are living. We think this language teaches that we should let nothing come between us and our duty to God. We should not let father, mother, nor anything else come between us and our blessed Saviour. He has done for us what father and mother, or even all the world, could not do for us. While our fathers and mothers and friends are all good and kind to us, and perhaps have been, and would be, glad to do for us everything in their power to promote our happiness and well being, yet they could not do for us what the adorable Redeemer has done. This being true, we should not allow anything to come between us and our service to Him. Our duty to the Lord should be considered first. We should "seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness. We "ought to obey God rather than man."

Sometimes we are ready and anxious to find some excuse for not serving the Lord, but our excuses are not sufficient. We have often thought that if we would, all of us, be always as ready to remove the excuses we might think we had for not serving the Lord as we are to look for them as reason for not engaging more in His service, we would all get along much better. If we would always try as hard to serve the Lord as we sometimes try to find an excuse for not doing so, how much better it would be for us, and how much better we would all get along.

If it is necessary for us to forsake father, mother, brother, sister, wife, children, houses and lands in order to serve the Lord, and do what He requires at our hands, we should do that. "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." **-(Luke 14:26)**. "So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple." **-(Luke 14:33)**. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not

worthy of me." - **(Matthew 10:37)**. These all teach that we should let our service to the Lord be first; we should not serve the world first, and then serve the Lord afterward, or when we cannot serve the world, but we should let our duty to our Saviour be first and the world second. We should not allow anything of a worldly nature to keep us from serving the Lord. Of course we may sometimes be providentially hindered, by illness or misfortune, so we cannot render such service to the Lord as we would wish; but we should not look for excuses for our failures and try to ease our conscience with the thought that we are providentially hindered, when we could go on in the Lord's service very well in the face of the little obstacles which may be in our way.

Let us all try to serve the Lord first, "seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness;" try to serve the Lord more and the world less. May the Lord help us so to do, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

That Basis of Agreement

THAT BASIS OF AGREEMENT

---June 12, 1906

In our issue of May 15 we gave some extracts from a basis of agreement which we signed with Elders J. V and R. S. Kirkland on April 19th, and also an extract from some of his writings in his paper of May 1st, in which he pointedly and openly violated the agreement. We did not publish the agreement in full because it was not necessary, as it had been broken by one of the makers. We published enough for any fair minded and unprejudiced person to see that it was broken. We also published a copy of our letter of May 9 to Elder J. V Kirkland. We would suggest that every one of our readers now get the issue of May 15 and read that letter again. The following is a copy of Elder Kirkland's reply:

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: My Dear Brother-I was very touch surprised and disheartened at yours of the 9th inst., which I received today. As to Sister Lovelace's article, to which you refer as not being in harmony with our agreement, I will say was arranged for the paper and in the office when we wrote the basis of agreement. I do not think, my dear brother, that you should at all allow this to interfere in our reconciliation. It was not my intention, and is still not my intention, to make references to these troubles.

I have withheld some writings that referred to it that was already set up in type. You remember that you published that article of Elder Vickers (which was one of the most disagreeable pieces, to our feelings, at all) after we had our first talk, and agreed to undertake a

settlement, but as our effort had not been made public I said nothing about it, but felt very much discouraged when I read it.

I have stated in the paper of today (that is already in print) that we have come to an agreement, and asked my contributors not to further agitate those differences, and should any persist in doing so I will hold it out of the paper provided you stand to the agreement you signed with us.

I have asked you in both of my letters to tell me if Brother Oliphant, or any of the rest who stood with you, had signed the agreement, to which you have made no reply. I can't help but think that they have failed to sign it is why you write as you do. You know you promised us faithfully that you would stand to it whether anybody else did or not, and we still expect to stand to it whether you do or not. Now if there is nothing in your way except the reference made to the trouble in Sister Lovelace's piece (which was more in your favor than mine), I know it can all yet be carried out as first agreed to, and if this is all, I know you will not allow that to interfere with this settlement, on which so much depends. I can assure you, and God knows that I signed it in good faith, and intend to strictly adhere to every item in the agreement. We have sent it to the following named brethren (and everyone has signed it), to wit:

Elders E. W. Thomas, J. W. Richardson, P. F. Watkins, Jno. T. Oliphant, M. G. Mitchell, Geo. A. Shoultz, W. L. Murray, Ira Turner, S. L. Pettus, Wm. H. Crouse, A. M. Kirkland, H. E. Pettus, W. A. Pinkstaff, A. J. Willis, W. M. Smith, Wm. E. Williams, B. F. Querry.

Now, Brother Claud, if you are sincere in this agreement, let us still be quiet until we have a thorough understanding of your dissatisfaction. If what you state is all the matter can easily be adjusted. We will not take your name off of the agreement. We would not expect you to take ours off under the same circumstances. We have stated in the paper that we will publish the agreement in full in our next issue, and we want to see or hear from you before then, and have what names have signed yours, if any.

Hoping to hear from you at your earliest convenience, I am yours for peace,

J. V KIRKLAND.

We answered this letter on the 18th, and the following is an exact copy of our reply:

ELDER J. V KIRKLAND: Dear Brother-Yours of the 14th was sent to me at Burns last Monday night, but failed to reach me until Thursday at McEwen.

In my letter to you of the 9th I made no reference whatever to Sister Lovelace's letter, as you are surely aware, if you will only read my

letter again. I referred very plainly to your remarks to her letter. You surely know, my brother, that your remarks to that letter was a positive violation of that agreement. We have never used such language as that in referring to you, or those with you, in this trouble. My father never did use such expressions in referring to you, and I never have; and you certainly should have known that I would not consent to go on in this agreement after your using such expressions, when we had signed that agreement. Your statement that the article was prepared for the paper and was in the office when the agreement was signed, is no reasonable excuse to me for its going before the public. If such language as was used in your remarks had been in an article in our office, and already in type for our issue of April 24th, we would not allowed it to go in the paper, and rather than to have done so, we would have paid five times the cost of having other matter set to take the place of it. We would have had only three days to do this, while it was one week and three days to the date of your paper. There was ample time to have kept that article of yours out of the paper. So this explanation does not at all explain to the satisfaction of one who knows anything about the printing business.

Your reference to our publishing Elder Vickers' article is also without just cause in this case. His article was published before any agreement had been written, and before we knew it would be done. Besides, you were continuing to publish matter referring to those things as though nothing had been said along that line. But I had held back some communications before the agreement was signed. So this does not excuse.

You say, "I have asked you in both of my letters to tell me if Brother Oliphant or any of the rest who stood with you, had signed the agreement, to which you have made no reply. I can't help but think that they have failed to sign it is why you write as you do." Then I suppose you can't help but think I did not tell the truth. I wrote you very plainly why I was writing the contents of my letter of the 9th, but your expression shows you, do not believe it, for you say you "can't help but think" it is something else. This expression is in perfect harmony with what you said in the Herald, that somebody had "no respect for truth, honesty," etc.

My brother, if you think I will continue on under that agreement, and say nothing, as long as you are using expressions like this, let me say, once for all, that you are very much mistaken. When I sent out the copies of the agreement, I asked no one to sign it. I merely asked for an expression from them in regard to it. If no other one had ever agreed to sign it, if you had abided the agreement, I would

have never said any more about the trouble. But the agreement is broken, and I am bound by it no more; and I still have to say I am done with it. I am sorry, but as I view the matter there is no one to blame but yourself. The only terms I know now for a settlement, at least this is my own feeling in the matter, is for you brethren to simply agree to cease advocating the things complained of. This is all I know to say further in regard to the matter. I have tried in all I have said to be kind, but firm, and I know my sainted father never spoke unkindly of you, and I consider you have often reflected upon him, as well as myself and others.

Again, I ask that my name be considered no more with the agreement. I suppose you have seen this week's PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. It shows where I now stand on these matters, as also does this letter. Yours in hope,
C. H. CAYCE.

We also received a letter from Elder R. S. Kirkland dated May 15. The following is an extract from it:

When J. V. came home at noon, and told me the pieces you referred to were set up before our agreement was written, and that he would so state to you, and when I saw how determined he was to stand by our agreement, and the piece he had written for this paper, asking the brethren to write nothing else for publication, concerning the troubles that had existed, I felt some hope again, that this would be satisfactory to you and that we could soon move on together, in accomplishing the blessed purposes that we had in view when you were here.

It seems to us that the statements of these two brethren do not exactly agree. Elder R. S. K. says Elder J. V. told him the article referred to as being a violation of the agreement, which was published in the Herald of May 1, was already set up (already put in type) before the agreement was signed, and that J. V. would so state to me; but J. V. does not so state. Elder J. V. says the article was already prepared for the paper and in the office before the agreement was signed, but this is absolutely no reason for its being published. Notice, too, that Elder J. V. says in this letter: "I have stated in the paper of today (that is already in print) that we have come to an agreement, and asked my contributors not to further agitate those differences, and should any persist in doing so I will hold it out of the paper provided you stand to the agreement you signed with us." Then in the same letter he says: "You know you promised us faithfully that you would stand to it whether anybody else did or not and we still expect to stand to it whether you do or not." It seems to us that one statement means that he is going to stand to the

agreement provided we do, and that the other statement means that he is going to stand to it whether we do or not. Elder R. S. says Elder J. V. was determined to stand to the agreement. So we wonder if he was determined to stand to it when he signed it. If he was determined to stand to it when he signed it, then he must have been determined not to break it; and if he was determined not to break it, we wonder how it was that he did break it. We wonder if he did something he was determined not to do. Or, did he determine to break it and then determine to stand to it, provided we would stand to it, after he had broken it? Or, did he determine to break it and then determine to stand to it, whether we would or not, after he had broken it? We cannot understand this "determination." The following is a copy of our reply to Elder R. S. Kirkland:
ELDER R. S. KIRKLAND:

Dear Brother-Yours of the 15th was received several days ago, and I would have answered sooner, but have been so much behind with my work on account of having been away from home, that I have let your letter wait and answered others older-received before yours was, knowing you would see my letters to Brother J. V., I note you say he told you the article I referred to was already set up, and that he would so state to me; but he does not say that in his letter to me. If it had been, it should have been kept out. I know I would have kept it out of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. But besides the article I referred to, which he wrote, there were others. When any number of parties enter into an agreement, and one of them breaks the agreement, that releases all the others. So I consider that I am out of it. I am sorry, but under the circumstances I cannot conscientiously remain in it. Yours in hope,
C. H. CAYCE

In a letter from Elder J. V. dated May 21 he has the following to say with reference to the language he used in the Herald of May 1st, which we say was a violation of his agreement:

It mentioned no one. I only spoke of the unkind spirit and hard words that I had endured, as indulged in by some, and attributed it to human tradition when backed by jealousy and prejudice, and it was this spirit that I said seems to have no respect for truth, honesty, sincerity, years of faithful service, gray hairs, etc.

In this he admits that he had reference to things indulged in by some. It was, of course, the things indulged in by some who differed from him. He attributed the things they indulged in to human tradition when backed by jealousy and prejudice, and it was this spirit of human tradition, backed by jealousy and prejudice, that "seems to have no respect for truth, honesty, sincerity, years of faithful service,

gray hairs, tears, piety nor learning." Then, some who differed from him were in possession of a spirit of human tradition, backed by jealousy and prejudice, and this spirit they were in possession of seems to have no respect for truth, honesty, sincerity, years of faithful service, gray hairs, tears, piety nor learning." Verily, we did not misconstrue his meaning. There is no way to "explain" it away. Every effort made to "explain" it away only drives our conclusion more plainly to the point.

In this same letter, of May 21, he says we quoted from a Missionary Baptist publication to prove what he claimed as his intention was not as he said. We suppose he has reference to the clipping from the Baptist Flag which we published in our editorial headed "Some Plain Facts," in our issue of Feb. 27, 1906. He surely knows that what we quoted from the Flag was for no such purpose as he says here, but we quoted it in support of our statement of what Elder J. N. Hall told us, that Elders Kirkland had considered the matter of representing in the Missionary Baptist meeting at Texarkana last fall, where they could have a hearing and cooperation in the work of preaching the gospel to the lost. The clipping from the Flag said they were concerned about preaching the gospel to the lost, etc. Elder Kirkland asked in the Herald, after this, why we did not tell what Elder Hall said to us before Elder Hall died. If we had known Elder Hall was going to die at the time he did, we would have told it before. We would be glad to have him for a witness, for we are sure he would not deny a word we quoted from him as his statement to us. He also says that in our statement, "It seems to us that all of our dear brethren everywhere who have been thinking we were too severe on Brother Kirkland, and that he wanted peace and fellowship can surely see now that we have made a fair and earnest effort to settle the trouble, and Brother Kirkland has failed to abide the agreement," that we "as same as acknowledge" our severity on him, but talk as if it was just. We did not "as same as acknowledge" anything of the kind. We acknowledged that some dear brethren had been thinking we were too severe, but we did not acknowledge that they were correct in their thoughts. The language itself implies that we thought they were mistaken in thinking we had been too severe, which is the very opposite of what Elder Kirkland says.

The following is a copy of our reply to Elder Kirkland's letter of May 21:

ELDER J. V KIRKLAND:

Dear Brother-Replying to yours of the 21st, just received, will say I see but little necessity for discussing the matter further. As to you calling us names in the article you published, will say that every reader would judge you to have had reference to those who differed from you on the points involved, and the names of the parties had just as well been called. This is a reasonable view to me. Not only was this language used which I mentioned, but the different points (or some of them) were discussed. I have honestly and candidly given you my opinion and told you my feelings in regard to the matter. I just cannot conscientiously allow my name to continue in connection with the agreement under the circumstances. If you want to continue to charge me with falsehood, etc., I suppose you have the privilege, if not the right. So far as I am concerned I expect to have but little to say about those things, perhaps nothing. I shall refer to them only when I think it is really necessary. I would be glad the matters could all be dropped and settled, yet under the circumstances I do not consider myself bound by that agreement. I have given the reason.

As to who signed it with me will say that I wrote you I asked no one to sign it. I only asked for an expression from them in regard to it. So no one signed it, though I had expressions of willingness from some to accept it (or words of that import) If it would bring peace to our churches. Some did not approve of some of the wording. Now I have told you as plainly as I know how. And I wish you to remember I asked for no signature. For the present I do not deem it necessary to say more.

Yours in hope, C. H. CAYCE.

We received another letter from Elder J. V Kirkland dated May 28 in which he says:

You say: "Not only was this language used which I mention, but the different points were discussed." I was only answering in a kind way her questions. The agreement does not forbid us teaching our views on these points but says: "We only claim the liberty to express our opinion on this subject in kindness to our brethren," etc. Besides I have told you repeatedly that this was written long before we signed the agreement and that I had no intention of agitating these differences. You say: "If you want to continue to charge me with falsehood, I suppose you have the privilege, if not the right." Now, Brother Cayce, you know that I have never charged you with falsehood. Why do you use such language?

Of course Brother Kirkland "was answering in a kind way her questions" when he said a flood of abuse had been heaped upon him for the past eighteen months, and when he used the other language already quoted from him in that article, "No respect for truth,

honesty," etc. If that is kindness shame would blush in the presence of unkindness, we should think.

The expression, "We only claim the liberty to express our opinion on this subject in kindness to our brethren," appears in the agreement only with reference to Elder Kirkland's proposed plan of federal government, but this does not give the privilege of continually advocating it. Besides, what could possibly be the use or benefit of an agreement if the different points embraced therein are to be continually advocated or agitated? The article being written before the agreement was signed is no excuse for its being published. If Brother Kirkland had no intention of agitating the differences when he wrote and published that article, we wonder what he would have said if he had intended to agitate the differences. He says we know he has never charged us with falsehood, but we happen to know he has. His own letter of May 14th, and our reply of the 18th, as copied above, will speak for themselves, and are too plain on this point. If it were necessary we could produce more. So, we will say we used such language simply because it is true.

In this same letter he says further:

If you should sign a note with several parties and one should hurt your feelings, even if it were intentional, would that give you a lawful excuse to take your name off the note? Could you just take it off any way whether the other parties were willing or not? When a man signs a contract with others can he just take his name off because they or one of them hurt his feelings, even if it were intentional?

If we were to sign a note agreeing to pay you a certain amount for a certain consideration, and you were to fail to perform the consideration, that would give us a lawful excuse to refuse to pay the note, and no court of justice would require the payment of it. If a man signs a contract with others, and one of the others breaks the contract, or fails to do as the contract stipulates, then he is released. If we sign a contract with you, and you fail to carry out your part of the contract, then we are released from the obligation, and we are no longer bound by it. If we were to sign a contract with you, and we should fail in a single instance to carry out our part of it, you would have a perfect right to refuse to be bound further by it. Even if we should say we are going to carry out our part of it, this would not binder you being released, after we had failed on our part, and we would have absolutely no right whatever to call in question your withdrawal. So, we consider we signed a contract, or agreement, or covenant, with you. You broke the agreement, or covenant. That makes the whole thing null and void, and makes it appear to us that

the only terms of peace that will reach the case are that you continue to advocate the things which are causing the confusion and distress among our people, and those who do not believe them must say nothing, and utter no protest whatever. This is the way it looks to us. As we stated before, we state again that we signed the agreement in good faith, and would have said no more about the trouble if Brother Kirkland had not broken it; but he did break it, so we are free to do as we see proper, or as we feel the cause to demand. And we would also say, as we have said before, that the only way we can see for a settlement is for those brethren to simply lay those things down and cease to advocate them, etc.

We humbly beg our readers to consider these things, and may the Lord help us to stand with the truth in humbleness, yet with boldness, is our prayer.

C. H. C.

Remarks to J. F. Leonard

REMARKS TO J. F. LEONARD

---June 12, 1906

We think it is as much wrong to advocate an error through the press as in the pulpit. We should contend against false ways through the press as much as from the pulpit. And we should do this both ways. We think Old Baptists do sympathize with and pray for mourners; but they do not need the modern mourners' bench revival machinery invented by the world and used by them. The Bible teaches everything we ought to practice religiously, and it says nothing about the mourners' bench. Neither do we think Old Baptist churches should have organs. Of course if they want them, we cannot prevent them having them. And if they want a Sunday school, or a kissing party, or an ankle show, we cannot prevent that either. But this does not make it right. Because a church wants a thing does not make it right. We do not wish to declare non-fellowship for our brethren who have the organ, but we do not approve of it. May the Lord help us all to lay aside every thing that causes confusion.

C. H. C.

Who Are The Primitive Baptists?

WHO ARE THE PRIMITIVE BAPTISTS?

---June 26, 1906

In the Baptist Banner, a little Softshell sheet, of May 23, 1906, published in Martin is a windy effusion under the above heading. The wonderful (?) display of wisdom (?) and learning (?) is over the

signature of C. H. Bell, a little preacher of the Softshell persuasion, in which he has this to say concerning "these people known among us as the Primitive Baptists:"

They oppose, or once did, (and that is the principle today) an educated ministry and say it is wrong to educate our preachers, when it is a well grounded fact that many of the Primitive preachers were highly educated, Paul especially. These with many other peculiar ideas have made a very wide difference between what are known as Missionary Baptists and these people.

We wonder where the Rev. Parson Bell was educated? Wonder if he graduated in Harvard or Yale? We doubt if he ever even had any schooling in "Whale college." Allow us to suggest, Mr. Bell, that Paul was educated in literary and law affairs before he was called of the Lord to the ministry. After the Lord's call he did not spend a few years attending a man-made theological incubator to learn how to preach, but "immediately conferred not with flesh and blood." If the Lord needs an educated man now, or has a work for an educated man to do in His vineyard, He knows where to find him and is able to call him, as in the case of Saul of Tarsus. "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called." -(I Corinthians 1:26). But this, with many other peculiar ideas Paul had, has made a very wide difference between him and the Softshells. Was Peter an educated man? Was Matthew? Was Mark? Was Luke? Was James? Was John? Oh, the proud, boastful spirit of these Softshells!

But Elder Bell says "Peter caught the spirit of what is called Hardshellism." Then Peter must have been what you now call a "Hardshell." Well, we are in good company. But Elder Bell says Peter was convinced that he was wrong.

If Peter was wrong, then we are wrong. If we are right, then Peter was right. In the Baptist and Reflector of April 28, 1892, Rufus C. Burleson says we "cling to all the doctrines and ordinances as they came from heaven-pure, simple, holy and sublime." He also says we "have never rejected any ordinance or doctrine of the Baptist Church as founded by Christ and the apostles 1892 years ago on the banks of Jordan." We are clinging to all the doctrines and ordinances as they came from heaven, we are right, we have never rejected any ordinance or doctrine of the Baptist Church as founded by Christ and the apostles. The Softshells have done this. Then the Softshells are wrong, and have departed from the simplicity of the gospel. Hence they are not primitive. Mr. Burleson also says, "Scores of our Missionary Baptists are only immersed Methodists in the Baptist Church." Elder J. R. Graves said, in the Tennessee Baptist of Sept. 8,

1860, "Let it be borne in mind then that our Missionary organism is of human origin, and of very recent date, entirely outside and independent of the churches, and not known in the primitive ages of the church." These quotations are from leading men in your own church, and according to their own admissions you are not Primitive Baptists. Your claim sounds very much like, "And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, we will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach." - **(Isaiah 4:1)**.

Elder Bell says we have no gospel only for the sheep. We must still be in the right, for the Saviour told Peter to feed His sheep; but the elder says "it don't make good sheep feed sometimes," he fears. We suppose the reason he thinks it does not make good sheep feed is because he does not like it. This does not prove that it is not good sheep feed, for the Apostle Paul tells us "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

Elder Bell further says, "In the debate between Elders S. F. Cayce, Hard-shell, and I N. Penick, Missionary, Elder Cayce said there was no message for the sinner and when he looked at the figures showing the number now in heathen lands without Christ the Saviour he became indignant and assured if they were ever saved at all it was before the foundation of the world and that our preaching to them would not change their case." To this we would say that Elder S. F. Cayce conducted himself as a Christian gentleman in the debate here with Elder Penick, and treated his opponent with all possible courtesy and fairness, and gave no cause for such misrepresentation of his position as this. We will not say Elder Bell has willfully misrepresented him, but we do most emphatically state that Elder S. F. Cayce did not say that "if they were ever saved at all it was before the foundation of the world." He did argue that they were saved "according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world." He argued that the saved were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world and saved in time according to that choice. But if you are not satisfied with that debate, "trot out" your "big brother" again and we will try him a few rounds. Elder S. F. Cayce has fallen asleep, and his labor is ended in defending the cause of Christ, but while his son lives, by the help of the Lord we are ready to defy this Philistine army. Bring out your Goliath, if you are wanting more.

There is just one more sentence we wish to notice at present in the Elder's article, and that is this: "See the success and blessings of the Missionary Baptists, while the other is growing beautifully less all the while." Does worldly splendor, pomp, vain pride and show, denote

that the Lord is with you, and that the Softshells are the church of Christ? Does wealth and numbers prove that your denomination is the church of Christ? If it does, it will also prove the same thing for the Methodists, or the Catholics, or others. An argument that proves too much is as bad as one that proves nothing. As to the "other growing beautifully less" -this only manifests a spirit of hatred and malice, and shows that the Elder would be glad if they were all dead. But false prophets of his kind have been saying for years- long before he was born-that they would soon all be dead. Are they all dead yet? No, there are enough left yet to put the whole Fullerite army to flight, and it doesn't take long to do it, either. "One shall chase a thousand, and two shall put ten thousand to flight." They are not quite so few yet as you would like. When the last Old Baptist dies, Elder, if you are living, you better be about winding up the last of your little affairs here, for just then the elements are going to melt with fervent heat and time will be no more. He also says we were once about equally divided, but now it is not so. Yes, it has been true all along the line, and is true yet, that the children of the bond woman are more than the children of the free woman. Ishmaelites are more numerous than Israelites.

Now we would suggest to Elder Bell that we have on file some things in his own writing, and that it might do very well for him to cast no more reflections or insinuations about the Primitive Baptists. C. H. C.

Matthew 24

---June 26, 1906

Brother G. B. Thomasson, of Agnes, Texas, has requested our views of **(Matthew 24)**. As he does not call for our views on any special portion of the chapter, we suppose he wishes to know our opinion of the same as a whole. So, we will offer only a few words. In the thirty-fourth verse the Saviour says, "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." All those famines, pestilences, wars, rumors of wars, desolations, earthquakes, and other distresses mentioned-these were all to be fulfilled before the passing away of that generation. So this prophecy could not be of something that is yet in the future. Those things have all been fulfilled. In the fifteenth verse He says. "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place," etc. The holy place was in the temple, and in the destruction of Jerusalem the "abomination of desolation" was seen standing in the holy place. Dead bodies were found there. So, taking it all together, we think this chapter is foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem and the overthrow of the temple. In verse 2 it is said, "There shall not be left here one

stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." This was said with reference to the temple. Then the Saviour tells of some things that were to come to pass before the destruction of the temple, and says these shall all be fulfilled before that generation passes away. For these reasons we think the chapter is foretelling, mainly, of the overthrow of the temple and the destruction of Jerusalem. We offer these thoughts simply as our own views. We are not infallible, and may be wrong; but if what we have given can be any benefit to anyone, we shall have nothing to regret. C. H. C.

THE SPIRITUALITY OF THE GOSPEL

---July 24, 1906

In the Apostolic Herald of May 15, 1906, is a communication signed Albert Oliphant, Forest, Ind., which contains some things we wish to notice. The following is an extract from the letter:

I suppose for a good many years there has been among God's people more than one notion as to the spirituality and effectiveness of His gospel, which is greatly to be lamented. This concerted condition resulted in the formation of two factions, or parties. Each, in their devilish enmity, have wandered into very dangerous extremes. One party believes that the "gospel of Christ is the power of God" and man, addressing only the regenerate, discarding the accountability of the unregenerate, and the preaching of repentance to them; however, they proclaim the inability of the unregenerate with great emphasis (but for what profitable purpose, with consistency, I cannot comprehend), since they believe the unregenerate are not subjects of gospel address; for it is supposed that a minister is preaching the gospel while he is in the pulpit- not merely "lecturing." This disregard and unconcernedness for the religious welfare of the souls of the unregenerate, they plainly see while the minister is in the pulpit, or in their society. Consequently to them, the gospel is destitute of sweetness, the house of God its preciousness, or sacredness; the audience decreases, the church declines for the want of gospel food, and in many places becomes extinct for the want of recruits.

We wish, first, to call attention to the expression, "devilish enmity." We do not desire to offer any comment on these words-we only call attention to them.

Brother Oliphant says, One party believes that the gospel of Christ is the power of God and man, addressing only the regenerate, discarding the accountability of the unregenerate, and the preaching of repentance to them.

We do not understand why Brother Oliphant says this party believes that the gospel is the power of God and man. This must be a supposition of his. But we plead guilty to believing a portion of what he says this party believes, though we do not discard the accountability of the unregenerate. The law demands perfect and perpetual obedience, and the sinner is accountable and under obligation to keep the law; but the sinner is unable to keep it, as he is already under its curse, by reason of sin. The broken law requires of the sinner that which he is now unable to perform. We do maintain that the gospel is to the regenerate, and to them only. We do not believe there is a single command, admonition or exhortation in the gospel to the unregenerate requiring spiritual service of them. What is the gospel? What does the word gospel mean? The gospel is good news. The word gospel means good news or glad tidings.

For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith.

(Romans 1:16-17). Paul was not ashamed of the glad tidings or good news of Christ. Why was he not ashamed of it? Because it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. If one preaches or proclaims the good news or glad tidings of Christ, he is proclaiming the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.

-(I John 5:1). The literal or interlinear translation says, has been begotten of God, or has been born of God. The word which is translated born may be correctly translated either begotten or born. So if one preaches the gospel, proclaims the good news of Christ, he proclaims the power of God to save the person who is born of God. To proclaim the power of God to save the believer through Christ, is to preach the gospel, is to proclaim the good news of Christ. None of this is to the unbeliever. It is to every one that believeth. In the proclamation of the good news of Christ the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith. The righteousness of God is not revealed in the gospel to the character without faith, but revealed from faith to faith. The person who has faith is in possession of the Spirit, for it is a fruit of the Spirit; and if one has the Spirit he is one of the Lord's children. So in the proclamation of the glad tidings of Christ the righteousness of God is revealed to those who are born of God. This text **{(Romans 1:16)}** is one used by Brother Oliphant, and it very plainly contradicts the idea, we think, that the gospel is in any sense addressed to the unregenerate. Remember that the gospel is good

news. What good news have you for the unregenerate? Can you tell him that Jesus died for him? Upon what principle can you tell him this, only upon the principle that He died for all the race? If you tell him that Jesus atoned for him, must it not be upon the principle of a universal atonement? Then what about the doctrine of special atonement? The most glorious, full and complete gospel sermon we have on record is the Saviour's sermon on the mount, as recorded in Matthew, beginning at the first of the fifth chapter, and the Saviour begins that wonderful discourse by presenting a speciality, Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. The good news of that discourse was for those who are poor in spirit; those that mourn; the meek; those who hunger and thirst after righteousness; the merciful; the pure in heart; the peace-makers; those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; those who are reviled, persecuted, and who have all manner of evil said against them falsely for Jesus' sake.

We haven't space to copy all of Brother Oliphant's article from the Herald. We would be glad if we did, so that all our readers could see for themselves every argument made and every Scripture quoted in defense of the positions taken in the extracts we have given above; but the extracts are sufficient to show his positions, we think. We suppose the positions taken are endorsed by the editor, Elder J. V. Kirkland. We know that he endorses some of them. Elder Kirkland agrees with him on the repentance question. In support of the idea that the unregenerate are commanded, in the gospel, to repent, Brother Oliphant quotes a number of passages. He does not make an argument from each one, but merely quotes them. We want to notice a few of them to see if they are to the unregenerate, or if they may be rightly applied to them. First we notice **(Luke 13:3)**, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," which he quoted. Remember that this text is given to show that the unregenerate are commanded to repent. If this is true, then the perishing is eternal, so the conclusion must be that the unregenerate must repent in order to life. But why not let us have the whole thing? "There were present at that season some that told Him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. And Jesus answering said unto them, Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered such things? I tell you, Nay; but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay; but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." -**(Luke 13:1-5)**. It is plain that this language was spoken to the Jews, who were God's people as a

nation. It was spoken to national Israel. National Israel was typical of spiritual Israel. So, instead of the language being now applicable to the unregenerate, it belongs to the Lord's disobedient children. If they live after the flesh they die to the enjoyments that are in the gospel church or kingdom. This argument might be made still further, but this is sufficient to show that the right application of the text is not to the unregenerate.

The next we notice is **(Acts 2:38)**, "Repent and be baptized every one of YOU in the name of Jesus Christ." If the unregenerate are told in this text to repent they are also told to be baptized, for the same persons are commanded to be baptized who are commanded to repent. So, if this position is correct, the Campbelites are right. Brother Oliphant surely will not accept that. A text that proves too much is as bad as one that proves nothing at all. What is true of these two passages is true of every text the brother quoted. Not one of them requires gospel service of the unregenerate.

Now, notice what Brother Oliphant says about the gospel being destitute of sweetness to the unregenerate. We wonder how much sweetness there was for the unregenerate in the gospel Paul preached. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." - (I Corinthians 2:14). Paul was talking about his preaching, the "things we speak," and says the natural man does not receive them. The gospel Paul preached was destitute of sweetness to the unregenerate. How about John's preaching? "They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error." - (I John 4:5,6). If John knew what he was talking about, the man who proposes to preach in such a way as that the unregenerate will hear his preaching-hear with gladness-proposes to be of the world in his preaching. If he proposes to give a gospel sweetness to the unregenerate, the world, he admits in so claiming that his preaching is not of God, but of the world. The world hears those who are of the world in their preaching. John teaches this. The world did not hear or receive John's preaching; there was no sweetness in his preaching for them; but those who knew the Lord heard his preaching; there was sweetness in it to them. We are in good company. We would ether be in company with Paul and John in preaching a gospel that has a sweetness for the Lord's humble poor, than to be in company with the world in preaching another gospel that is received by the world. How much sweetness was there in Stephen's preaching for them? When they

heard what he had to say "they gnashed on him with their teeth," and they stoned him to death. Not much sweetness to them in his preaching. If there was a sweetness in the gospel to the unregenerate, then the gospel would lose its offensiveness to the world and no one would ever be persecuted, stoned, put in prison, put to death, or be punished by the world for preaching it.

But Brother Oliphant says:

The opposite party (at least some of them), seem also to believe that the "gospel of Christ is the power of God" and man, looking to the "watchman," instead of "beyond" the "watchman;" believing in instrumentalities beyond what is reasonable-that it might be possible for it to be the minister's business (or "power") to save souls, "build the house," or "keep the city."

So far as we are acquainted, those who claim to believe in instrumentalities in eternal salvation say they believe it is God who does the saving, that the power to save is with the Lord, but that the Lord uses instruments in salvation. We know they sometimes make arguments and make remarks that would lead one to think they believed the minister has power to save; yet they do not claim to believe this. But we conclude from the reading of what Brother Oliphant has to say that he thinks some go to an extreme in this regard-that the power to save is with the ministry-but that he believes the power to "save souls" is with the Lord, and that He uses instruments in that work. We understand him to mean that he believes the Lord uses the minister as an instrument in the salvation of the sinner. If this is not what Brother Oliphant means, we have misunderstood him. But we haven't space to discuss this point at present.

The following is another extract from Brother Oliphant's letter:

The gospel also makes it the duty of "all nations of men" that "dwell on all the face of the earth" to seek the Lord. **(Acts 17:26)**: "And hath made of one blood (Adam) all nations of men (all human creatures), for to dwell on all the face of the earth; and hath determined the times before appointed (when they should each exist), and the bounds of their habitations" (where they should each exist.) Verse 27: "That they (relative pronoun, which has for its antecedent all nations of men) should (duty) seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us." Verse 28: "For in Him we live, move, and have our being" (existence.)

Here is accountability in its full force, declared by the Lord in His gospel, or counsel. Since all the human specie is commanded to repent, and seek the Lord, it is each and every one's duty; and God

by His gospel requires all duty to be performed; and whatever God requires of His creatures is His "counsel" to them; and He hath commanded His ministry "shun not to declare the whole counsel of God."

He does not quote all of the 28th verse. That verse, in full, and the 29th and 30th verses read, "For in Him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also His offspring. Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device. And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent. Paul is here preaching to a people who are the offspring of God-born of God-a people who have been worshipping God ignorantly, having an altar erected to the unknown God. They are commanded to turn away from their ignorant or idolatrous worship, and all those who are born of God, the offspring of God everywhere, who are engaged in such worship are commanded to repent. There is nothing in this text for the unregenerate. It is to the children of God who are engaging in false worship, and it is the duty of the ministry to admonish all such persons to repent, turn away from it and worship the Lord as directed in His word.

Again we would beg our brethren to lay aside all such teaching and let us labor for the things that make for peace. Oh, that the Lord may sustain us all, and help us to declare all His counsel without fear or favor, yet in humility. May the Lord open our understanding, so that we may all see the truth and help us to earnestly contend for it. Let us be careful to avoid all extremes, and let us be faithful to our Master and to our trust, and the Lord will bless us.

C. H. C.

The Word Made Flesh

THE WORD MADE FLESH

---August 14, 1906

There is a precious sweetness in the thought that the Word was made flesh. We are all poor sinners, having violated God's law in Adam. When Adam sinned, we all sinned in him, for we are only Adam multiplied. Now, that the law of God has been violated, if we ever enter the portals of eternal glory the demands of that broken law must be met. The law must be satisfied. All the debt we owe to divine justice must be paid. Not only so, but there must be righteousness for us. As we have broken the law, we are already guilty; so we can

have no righteousness of our own to plead that is sufficient of thyself. And now, having done all this for us, thou hast arisen from the dead and ascended to glory, there to appear in the presence of God for us, to intercede for thy people according to the Father's will. Oh, blessed Redeemer, thou knowest when we are tempted and when we need thy prayers. Then thou wilt pray or intercede for us when we are in need. Let us cast all our care on Jesus, having the sweet assurance that He careth for us. Dear brethren, hold up your heads, and press onward in the service of our adorable King. He knoweth all your trials and difficulties, and will never leave thee nor forsake thee. Remember us in your prayers. Pray the Lord to direct us aright and to sustain us in all our trials.
C. H. C.

THE PRODIGAL SON

---August 14, 1906

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Sir-Will you please give me your views on the prodigal son? It will be found in **(Luke 15)**. Was he born of the Spirit of God when he left his father or not? Or did he receive a change while he was gone? Please give your views on the above through the paper. I remain
yours truly,
J. F. JOHNSON.
Sardis, Tenn.
OUR ANSWER

As Brother Johnson merely asks if the son was born of God before he left his father, we will not take space to quote all the chapter referring to the matter. It may be found in Luke 15, beginning with **(Luke 15:11)**, "And he said a certain man had two sons." The younger son left his father and took his journey into a far country. If the father represents the heavenly Father, then the younger son was born of God before he left and took his journey. If the elder son was born of the Father, so was the younger son. He was as much a son of the father as the elder son. Both were born of the same father. And the younger son was no more a son of his father when he returned than when he left. He was his father's son when he started on the journey; he was the same son while he was gone, and the same son when he returned. While he was away from his father's home, he was a son, but was away from home, and engaged in swine feeding. We have thought perhaps some of the Lord's sons are now away from home and engaged in the same kind of business. We can only hope they may come to themselves, as this younger son did, and acknowledge their errors and their sins, and come home again, and

let the fatted calf be killed and have rejoicing in the Lord's house, that the sons, who are now dead to the enjoyments of that house, are alive again.

We trust these few thoughts may be some help to you, and that the Lord may bless them to your good, and to the good of all our readers.
C. H. C.

Elder Crouse's Letter

---September 18, 1906

In our issue of Sept. 4, 1906, is a letter from Elder Wm. H. Crouse, of Winchester, Ky., under the caption "A Statement of Facts Important to Our People." Our dear brother, Elder J. K. Stephens, of Bald Knob, Ark., was here in Martin at the time, and stated that he took the responsibility of having the article inserted in that issue without comment, leaving the comment, if any, to us, and that we had not seen the article. We have a few words to offer, and we wish to offer them in the spirit of kindness, but yet we wish to speak plainly. If we had seen the article before it was published we would have written to Elder Crouse privately and offered some remarks; but as the letter has already been published we feel it to be our duty to offer some remarks publicly.

First, Brother Crouse says, "For many months a war has been waged against Elder J. V. Kirkland." We do not, at all, feel that Brother Crouse has correctly stated the case in this expression. We do not accuse him of stating it wrongly on purpose, but do think he makes a wrong charge against us. Instead of a war having been waged against Elder J. V. Kirkland, he has waged a war against the time-honored principles of our fathers, and against the doctrine and practice of the church. While he has done this, some have stood firmly by those principles, and have defended them in the face of the opposition of Elder Kirkland and some others. None of us who have opposed the new measures advocated by him, we feel sure, have done so as opposing Elder Kirkland; but we have desired to be faithful to our King in opposing his departures from the original principles of the church of Christ.

Brother Crouse also says, "but I did feel that he was unjustly opposed and persecuted." Brother Crouse does not say, in so many words, that he does not feel that way about it now, but we are hoping that he now has a different feeling. One is certainly justifiable in opposing a wrong position or false doctrine. Elder Kirkland's position on Federal government is either right or wrong. If it is right, then he was unjustly opposed in his advocating it. If it is wrong, then the opposition was just and he was not unjustly opposed. The same thing

is true regarding his position on the commission, and Elder Crouse says he has "never for one moment favored his ideas of church government or the commission." As to the persecution, we have never thought persecution consisted in telling the truth. So far as we know, every charge made against Elder Kirkland has been sustained. They have not been denied by him, that we know of. So far as the points are concerned that are mentioned in Elder Crouse's letter, and on account of which those brethren have withdrawn from Elder Kirkland's paper, none of them are new. It had already been said in our paper that Elder Kirkland said our people were not justifiable in withdrawing from the Missionary or New School Baptists. Elder J. N. Hall's statement to us, which was published in our issue of Feb. 27, 1906, in our editorial headed "Some Plain Facts," in support of which we copied an editorial from the Baptist Flag, a Missionary Baptist paper published in Fulton, Ky., showed clearly that Elder Kirkland would be willing to fellowship them. Elder Kirkland never denied this. He only insinuated that we were jealous because Elder Hall wanted him to join the New School Baptists. We never thought then, and do not think yet, that this would be a very convincing reason to give that one is jealous of another. The New Schools would be glad to get anyone from the ranks of the Old Baptists at any time. It has also been stated in our columns that Elder Kirkland had said he would be willing to receive the Missionary Baptists on their baptism, provided they would come a church at a time. Not one of these things had ever been denied that we know of, and they all, therefore, stood as confessed. This all being true, these are no new things just brought to light. They are only presented in a little different way, perhaps.

Now, some might say, "If you were aware of these things, then why did you sign that peace agreement with them?" We suppose we can have no better time than now to tell why. In the first place we wish to say plainly that we did not sign that agreement as representing anyone. We simply signed it as an individual, and our signing it could bind no other person. Individually and as an individual, we were willing to sign the agreement, and allow Elder Kirkland to hold the views embraced by him, provided he would not agitate or contend for them. We hoped that as a result of the agreement the questions would be agitated no more, and that thereby a division might be averted. We were willing to sign the agreement with him, and allow him to hold those views, provided he would not agitate them, in order to save a division. On the other hand, we thought that if Elder Kirkland broke the agreement, which he did, it ought to show to fair-minded brethren that he did not want peace on any kind of

reasonable terms. It ought to show that he preferred a division rather than to cease agitating those measures.

Now we wish to call attention to some of the statements Elder Crouse submitted to Elder Kirkland. The second item reads:

While we might not agree with all that our brethren did in separating from the Carey-Fuller party (we are all fallible) yet we hold that they were justified in separating from them and that such issues would be sufficient ground for separation today; viz: that eternal life is conditional, the atonement universal, and that it "rests upon the church to bring the world to Christ."

In Elder Kirkland's letter to Elder Crouse he says, "In the second item I have always thought a division could, and should, have been averted, by prudence and the proper use of the blessed truth, in patience and love. So I do not think it would be exactly honest in me to sign it as you word it." Notice that he says he has always thought this way.

In the "Cause Defended," published in 1898, is a chapter by Elder J. V. Kirkland on "Baptist History-Perpetuity of the Gospel Church." In this chapter, on page 95 of the book, the following language is found with reference to the separation of the Old Baptists from the New School Baptists:

Such gross departures from the original faith and practice of the Baptist Church as those already mentioned, with hundreds of others too tedious to mention, are sufficient ground to justify those who are true Baptists and wish to keep pure the communion and preserve the holy principles and holy church government, delivered to us by Christ and His apostles, which our holy brethren have faithfully contended for against the powers of darkness and given their lives for more than twelve hundred years during the dark ages, in withdrawing from those who have brought in those departures.

If he has always thought "a division could, and should, have been averted," then he has always thought, surely, that there was not sufficient ground to justify a division. The statement submitted by Elder Crouse says our brethren "were justified in separating from them" (the New School Baptists). Elder Kirkland does not think it would be exactly honest in him to sign the statement worded this way, as he has "always thought a division could, and should, have been averted." Of course, if it could, and should, have been averted, then there was not sufficient ground to justify it. If Elder Kirkland thought in 1898 that the departures were sufficient ground to justify our brethren in withdrawing from them, did he always think they were not justified in doing so? If he always thought they were not justified in separating from them, then did he think in 1898 that our

brethren had sufficient ground to justify them in withdrawing from the New Schools? And if he thought in 1898 that the departures of the New Schools were such as to justify our brethren in withdrawing from them, but does not now think they were justified in separating from them, did he always think "a division could, and should, have been averted?" How can it be that he "always thought a division could, and should, have been averted," if he thought in 1898 that our brethren had sufficient ground to justify them in withdrawing from the New Schools? This all looks like a contradiction to us, and we do not see how the statements can be harmonized.

In Elder Kirkland's letter to Elder Crouse he offers no objection to the third item, yet there is a word changed in it, as submitted by Elder Kirkland. That item, as written by Elder Crouse, reads:

We believe the alien sinner to be dead in sin and wholly unable to rescue himself from his condition, and cannot be reached by the gospel, but can only be quickened by the Spirit of God.

As changed by Elder Kirkland it reads:

We believe the alien sinner to be dead in sin and wholly unable to rescue himself from his condition, and cannot be rescued by the gospel, but can only be quickened by the Spirit of God.

Notice that the first says the alien sinner cannot be reached by the gospel; Elder Kirkland used the word "rescued" instead of "reached." The New School Baptists, we think, will admit that the alien sinner cannot be rescued by the gospel, that the Holy Spirit rescues the sinner; but argue that the gospel reaches the sinner, and that the Holy Spirit reaches the sinner through the gospel and rescues him. We would ask why Elder Kirkland changed that word? Does he hold the New School position on this question? We cannot understand why he would use the word "rescued" instead of "reached" unless he does hold with them. We leave the reader to judge.

Again, in his letter to Elder Crouse he says: "I was asked some years ago if a Missionary Baptist church should reform and accept the true doctrine and practice of the Bible as we understand it, could we take them into our fellowship as a church, and I said that I think we could just as our brethren did the Separate Baptists in the Kehukee Association in 1777, and I so stated in my correspondence with Elder J. M. Thompson." Remember, as above stated, it has already been published in our paper that Elder John T. Blanchard heard Elder Kirkland say he would be willing to receive the Missionaries on their baptism, provided they would come a church at a time. Now, he claims this would not be alien baptism. And he would be willing to

receive them just as our brethren did the Separate Baptists in 1777. Hassell's History, page 698, says, concerning the differences that existed between and among the brethren then, that "The most forcible objection of all appeared to be the retention of members who had been baptized in unbelief; and this was admitted on the part of the Regulars to be a wrong; on which account several of their churches sought to correct it, by requiring all such of their members to be baptized." These brethren, in reconciling their differences, adopted seventeen articles of faith found on pages 699 and 700 of Hassell's History. Article 12 reads: "We believe baptism and the Lord's supper are gospel ordinances, both belonging to the converted or true believers; and that persons who were sprinkled or dipped while in unbelief were not regularly baptized according to God's word, and that such ought to be baptized after they are savingly converted into the faith of Christ." Article 16 reads: "We believe that no minister has a right to the administration of the ordinances, only such as are regularly called and come under the imposition of hands by the presbytery." By these articles of faith it is clearly seen that those brethren accepted or received no baptism except that which was administered by one having proper authority, and the baptized person being a proper subject. To conform to this belief the churches then sought to correct the irregularity on this point by requiring all their members to be baptized who had been dipped before they were regenerated. To receive a Missionary Baptist church in the way Elder Kirkland is willing to do would be to receive them without requiring what the brethren required in the Kehukee Association. Besides this, suppose a Campbelite church should reform in doctrine and should accept our position on election, predestination, salvation by grace, and so on, why not accept them on their baptism? They went out from us, just as the Missionaries did, by the invention and introduction of new theories. It would be just as consistent to receive one as the other. The Campbelites party has lost its identity which it once held with the Baptist Church. On page 97 of the "Cause Defended" Elder J. V Kirkland says, concerning the Missionary Baptist cause, that it "had lost its identity with the true Baptist Church." On page 99 he says: "From this it is very evident that the Primitive Baptists are right in their claim to hold the identity of the apostolic church." If we hold the identity of the apostolic church, the Missionaries do not; and any baptism, therefore, administered by them, whether it be a single member or a whole organized body of them, is without gospel identity, and is alien baptism. So, when the whole matter is summed up, we can see no new reason for the steps taken by these brethren. We will also say that so far as we are concerned we think it is just as necessary for those brethren

to renounce Elder Kirkland's position on some other points as on these. In THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of July 18, 1905, is a letter from Elder L. E. Thomas, in which he upholds Elder Kirkland's plan of federal government, or at least it is so understood, and argues that the commission was given to the church. This letter was written to Elder S. F. Cayce, and in it he says, "Hoping you will favor me with an answer soon, either through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST or privately," etc. He was favored with a kind reply by our father, Elder S. F. Cayce. A short time after this, as our readers know, our father passed away, and we are reliably informed that Elder Thomas said, when he heard of it that "it is a God-sent blessing to our cause," etc. On our recent tour in Ohio and Indiana some of the churches served by some of these brethren refused to make appointments for us. This could be for no other reason than that we oppose the positions believed by them. Will they all now renounce those positions also? We are glad Elder Crouse has seen the error of following Elder Kirkland, and we trust he will now continue steadfast, and that the Lord may enable him to be faithful in contending against every false way and to stand firmly for the truth, letting others do as they may. May the Lord direct and sustain us all.

C. H. C.

Acts 26:18,20

---September 25, 1906

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Will you give in the paper your views of **(Acts 26:18,20)**. Please take up each clause in these two verses and give all the explanation necessary. I believe you are able to do this or I would not ask it of you. Yours in gospel bonds, W. A. LAMB.

Kite, Ga.

OUR ANSWER

In compliance with Brother Lamb's request we will try to give some of our thoughts on the Scripture referred to. But we wish to give some of the language in connection with the 18th and 20th verses. This was in Paul's defense before King Agrippa, as recorded in **(Acts 26)**. Beginning with **(Acts 26:15)** we read: "And I said, who art thou, Lord? And He said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto

whom now I send thee." This includes the 17th verse. The 18th, 19th and 20th verses read: "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me. Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision: but shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance." We thus quote at length so that the reader may have the connection. We are of the opinion Brother Lamb wishes our views more especially on the clause, "that they should repent and turn to God," although he asks that we take up each clause in the 18th and 20th Verses. We haven't space to take up each clause and comment at much length on each, but will endeavor to offer a few of such thoughts as we have. Our ideas are worthless unless they are supported by inspiration, so we desire to give a "thus saith the Lord" for our positions, and we desire that our positions be in harmony with the general tenor of the Scriptures. Notice, first, the expression, "For I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness," and also, "delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee." We wish first to call attention to the thought embraced in this language, that God called Paul to the work of the ministry-his calling was from the Saviour, and that he was sent by the Lord. The Lord said He was the sender. Paul conferred not with flesh and blood. He did not wait for a board or church to send him. He did not enquire of the church as to what he must do. He did not ask them whether he would be supported not. He did not say he could not preach and make tents too. He was a tent-maker. He did not say he could not do both. He did not want to ask the church at Jerusalem if they would support him while he was in Damascus and in Judea and among the Gentiles. He began preaching Christ at once, with all his confidence and trust in the Lord that provision would be made for him-that the Lord would be with him and would provide for him. His trust was in the one who sent him. Even so it is this day. If the church sends a man, his trust is in the church, he depends on the church, and he looks to the church for support. If the Lord sends a man, we think he is willing to trust the Lord, and to depend on the Lord's promise to be with him and to feed and clothe him. When the cry came from Macedonia, "Come over and help us," Paul did not refuse to go until they would raise a certain sum of money, as some of our preachers have done in this latter day, but went, by the direction and sending power of God, into Macedonia. If the ministry

of today would follow Paul's example there would be less trouble among the dear people of God.

Paul was sent by the Lord as a witness. "A true witness will testify to the truth without money and without price." If a witness is hired to testify in the courts of our land, his testimony would be thrown out of court. Even if his testimony should be true, it would not be received by the court, if the court is apprised of the fact that he is hired to testify. If a man will not go before a certain court to testify unless he is hired to do so, he may also be hired to stay away, or to go before some other court. So, it seems that some have been hired to leave the Old Baptist court and to testify in some other court.

He was sent as a minister. "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." - **(Ephesians 4:11-14)**. "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." - (I Corinthians 13:28). These Scriptures teach us that the gifts in the ministry are given by the Lord to the church, and are for the benefit of the Lord's people. They are "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

"To open their eyes." It would do no good to open the eyes of one who is blind. To benefit one by opening his eyes, he must first have life and the power of sight. People are sometimes born in nature without the power of sight, because nature and the works of nature are imperfect; but God is perfect and His work is perfect. It is the doing of God, the work of God, by which one is born into the spiritual kingdom. When one is born into that kingdom he is born with the power of sight. He may now be benefited by having his eyes opened to every false way, and to the true teaching of the Scriptures, and to the doctrine of God and the ordinances of the church of Christ.

"And to turn them from darkness to light." If one has his eyes closed, it is apparently dark. The Lord sent Paul to open the eyes of those who had been born of God, and to turn them from darkness to light. He was to open their eyes to the truth in a

doctrinal way, and to the ordinances of the gospel; he was to turn them from the darkness of false worship, and from law worship, to the light of the true gospel worship of God. He was to declare unto them the whole counsel of God, and knowing the terror of the Lord he would persuade men. He would not persuade unregenerate sinners to be born again; it is the work of God that sinners are born again. He would persuade those who have been born again, those who have a sweet hope in Jesus, to turn away from the darkness of law worship and law service to the true light of gospel worship and gospel service. The foolish virgins said, "Give us of your oil, for our lamps are gone out." The light of law service has gone out. "A great wonder appeared in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet." The light of the moon, representing the law, has gone out-it is under feet, and the sun has risen. The true light of gospel service is now shining. Paul was sent of the Lord to turn the children of God from the darkness of the law to the true light of the gospel. No minister who preaches law for gospel can rightly claim to be doing what Paul was sent to do.

"And from the power of Satan unto God." To be turned from false worship to the true service of God is to be turned from the power of Satan unto God. "Take heed unto thyself and to the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." The minister of the gospel, by taking heed unto himself and unto the doctrine, will save himself and those that hear him. He will not save all those who hear the sound of his voice, but those who hear-understand and heed his preaching. "Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." The Lord opened Lydia's heart, that she attended unto the things spoken of Paul. The Lord regenerates, gives the understanding, opens the heart. Then the minister who is sent of the Lord, by taking heed unto himself and unto the doctrine, may save himself and those who hear-may save those who have been regenerated, who have understanding, whose hearts the Lord has opened. He saves himself, first, from false ways, from the power of Satan. "But I keep under my body, lest after I have preached to others I myself should be a castaway. Then he saves those who hear with the same salvation, in the same way that he saves himself-from false ways, from false doctrines, from the doctrines of men and devils-thus turning the Lord's children from the power of Satan unto God.

“That they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.” “He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” -**(John 1:11-13)**. Those who hear, or heed, the preaching of the gospel have already been born of God, and they receive forgiveness of sins in a manifest sense. When Jesus came unto His own, those who received Him had been born of God; those who believed on His name had been born of God. So, those who had been born of God were given power to become sons of God. They were not given power to become the sons of God in regeneration, for they were already born of God. They were given power to become sons manifestly. Paul was sent to preach the gospel, that those who had been born of God might receive forgiveness of sins, or become sons of God, in a manifest sense. It was not that the unregenerate might receive forgiveness of sins, or become children of God, or that they might be born of God. “But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” - (I Corinthians 2:9-14). As no man knoweth the things of a man only by the spirit of man, even so no man knoweth the things of God only by the Spirit of God. No man who is destitute of the spirit of man can know the things of man; even so no man who is destitute of the Spirit of God can know the things of God. Paul's preaching, therefore, could be of no spiritual benefit to those who were destitute of the Spirit of God. He spoke the things of God, but the natural man, the man who did not possess the Spirit of God, did not receive those things. He could not know them, because they are spiritually discerned. Those who were in possession of the Spirit could discern those things, could receive the things he preached; and in taking heed to them they

would show their faith by their works, thereby receiving forgiveness of sins in a declarative way. And they also thereby received "inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in" Jesus. They received the inheritance among them who are in the visible kingdom or organized church of Christ here on earth. "Therefore I endure all things for the elects' sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." **-(II Timothy 2:10)**. Paul was willing to endure all the trials and persecutions that might be heaped upon him by the enemies of the cross of Christ for the sake of God's elect, for the sake of God's little children, that they might "also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus;" that they might walk in obedience to the loving commandments of Jesus, and thereby enjoy the manifestations of His divine presence and have His approving smiles, thereby receiving some sweet assurances that they are indeed the Lord's children.

"But shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God." We have already seen that Paul's preaching was to those who had been born of God, and for their benefit. This being true, it cannot be that Paul shewed to the unregenerate that they "should repent and turn to God;" but he did show that those who were the children of God should repent, turn away from every false way, and turn to God, turn to the true worship and service of the Lord. On the day of Pentecost there were present Jews, devout men, out of every nation, who heard the preaching of Peter, and "they were pricked in their heart" -they were cut in their heart. This is proof that the Lord had already taken away the stony heart out of their flesh and had given them a heart of flesh, a heart susceptible of feeling. They were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." They were the Lord's children; they were devout men; they had been circumcised in heart. Peter told them to repent, to turn away from false ways, to come out from among the world and be separate therefrom. Verse 40 says, "And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation." He did not command the untoward or wicked generation to repent nor to save themselves. Surely Paul and Peter were both sent of the Lord, and their preaching was of the same kind. And surely Peter did not fail to preach according to the commission given him. He surely preached

on this day according to the command of the Lord. Then if Paul was to admonish the untoward or wicked generation or unregenerate sinner to repent, Peter should do the same thing; but he did not do that on this occasion. No command is recorded that he gave to the untoward generation. God's children are commanded or admonished to repent, come out from among that generation, to save themselves from them by coming out and being separate from them.

We might go on and on, giving instance after instance and Scripture after Scripture, but we deem it unnecessary. What is true in the foregoing references, is true in every case that might be referred to. God's word nowhere contradicts itself. It is all a perfect chain of harmony from first to last, and all other Scriptures treating on the same subjects are in perfect accord with these.

We have tried to comply with Brother Lamb's request to such an extent as that he may understand our position and know where we occupy on the points involved. We trust the Lord may bless the remarks to the good of all our readers. Let us all try to contend for the faith that was once delivered to the saints, and pray with, and for each other. Remember us in your prayers.

C. H. C.

OUR COLORED BRETHERN

---October 2, 1906

We see a move on foot among our colored brethren for a National meeting to be held in Huntsville, Ala., in 1907 to organize a National Association. We note that they have a National Moderator, a National Vice Moderator, a National Secretary, a National Financial Secretary, a National Treasurer, a National Statistical Secretary, fourteen National Field Secretaries, National Executive Committee composed of thirteen, a Board of Directors composed of members from sixteen associations, with the Moderator and Clerk of sixteen other associations, a Press Bureau composed of four members, a committee on Sunday School Work composed of seven members, a committee of seven women on National Woman's Work, a committee of two on History of Colored Primitive Baptists and Hymn Book. We would kindly advise our colored brethren to let these things severely alone. Where, in the Bible, do you find any of these secretaries or committees? This whole affair looks very much to us like the new inventions and ponderous machinery of the New School Baptists, and is foreign to the Bible. Our opinion is they will cause trouble among our colored brethren, and we think it would be better to let these

things alone and follow the plain and simple teachings of the Scriptures in all church matters. C. H. C.

Matthew 12:43-44

---October 2. 1906

Brother J. B. Miller, of Shepherd, Ga., has requested us to give our views of **(Matthew 12:43-44)**, which reads, "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished." We do not feel any impression to write at much length upon these words. If we are not mistaken this Scripture has already been explained in our columns perhaps more than once; but we will offer in a very brief way what we think is taught in the parable or illustration used by the Saviour in the language. We would call attention to the fact that the unclean spirit went out of the man. He was not bound nor cast out. This man could be nothing better than a nominal professor. He professed to be good, possibly; but the unclean spirit had only gone out for a season. 'The strong man armed was not bound. The strong man keeps his house and his goods are in peace until a stronger comes upon him. The unclean spirit keeps his house, the sinner, until a stronger comes upon him. The stronger is Jesus. He is stronger than all powers of darkness, and He comes to the poor sinner and binds the strong man, and spoils his armor wherein he trusted. The last state of this man is never worse than the first. The strong man, the unclean spirit, is bound. But when the unclean spirit goes out of his house he is not bound. It is his own house he goes out of. When he returns he finds it empty. If it is empty, it is not occupied by the Spirit of Jesus. The Lord has not taken up His abode there by the operation of His Holy Spirit. The Lord is not there. The Interlinear translation says he finds it unoccupied. So he can be no better than merely a nominal professor. The unclean spirit "taketh with him seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there," so says verse 45. So instead of being better after his outward profession he is worse than before, "and the last state of that man is worse than the first." We have known some nominal professors in our lives who were worse after than they were before-that is, their practice was worse and they were more wicked. The last state was worse than the first. But when the Lord binds the strong man, the last state is never worse than the first. The Lord's work is perfect and will stand. Men may persuade and scare the sinner so that he may for a while profess to be so very

good; but scared religion will not last and is worthless. God knows the hearts of all men, and no outward profession when the heart has not really been changed can deceive the Lord. These few thoughts are offered in love to all our readers. C. H. C.

WHAT DOES HE BELIEVE?

---October 9, 1906

We take the following from the Western Recorder: "Elder R. S. Kirkland, of Fulton, Ky., joined Walnut Street Church in this city on last Sunday morning and preached there Sunday night. He was one of the best known and most highly esteemed ministers of the 'Primitive' Baptists. His study of the Bible convinced him that the commission was given to the church instead of to the apostles as individuals, and hence is of perpetual obligation; and that it is the duty of the church to preach the gospel to all the world. He received a most cordial welcome, and his sermon Sunday night gave great satisfaction. On the advice of friends, including the writer, he engaged in evangelistic work for a number of years, and this he will continue for a time, at least. He is a preacher of unusual force and originality, and he is sound in the faith—a thorough Missionary Baptist. We cordially commend him to our people. We have known of Brother Kirkland for some time. He has been quite a prominent preacher in the ranks of our Primitive Baptist brethren. A number of them, however, objected to his missionary teachings. We are glad to have him join a Missionary Baptist church, where we believe, he belongs. May we ask one or two questions? 1. Does he believe that a person must have repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ in order to be saved, or that a simple feeling of desire to be saved indicates that he is regenerated? 2. Was he received in the Walnut Street church on his Primitive Baptist baptism, or was he rebaptized? The Recorder does not state. We ask these questions for information—Baptist and Reflector, Sept. 27, 1906.

The Reflector is glad, and so are we. We are glad for any to leave us who are not satisfied with the teaching of God's word and the old order of gospel service, as handed down to us through the ages from Christ and the apostles. You are welcome to any others we may have who may be in line with him. We suppose he can tell you whether or not he believes a person must have repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ in order to be saved. We have been informed that he was received in the Walnut Street church on his Primitive Baptist baptism; that they did not "re-baptize" him. Why not take him that way? A. J. Holt, a leading Missionary Baptist of this state, corresponding secretary of the Tennessee Baptist convention,

said, "My reasons for receiving the baptism of the Anti-Missionaries are, they have the same baptism we have. * * * They are a congregation of baptized believers; that is what we call a church." Elder W. P. Throgmorton said in a letter dated Sept. 26, 1893, "I believe that the baptism of our 'Hardsbell' brethren is valid. * * From the time of the division between us and the 'Hardshells' it has been the general custom of our people to receive 'Hard-shell' baptism as valid. * * As to the supposed case (or real case is it?) you mention of the 'Hardshell' preacher who wants to come to the Missionaries.

I would take him on his baptism, and would accept him as a minister on his 'Hardshell' ordination, provided his views as to doctrine and practice accords with those of Missionary Baptists." Of course they took Elder Kirkland on his baptism, and would be glad to take many more the same way, and you are welcome to every one who wants to go. C. H. C.

STARS IN THE CROWN

---October 9, 1906

After a great revival in a town, when the hymns sung in the meeting had sung themselves down into the hearts of the people and were being sung on the streets, a brother was going along singing, "Will there be any stars in my crown?" Across the street another brother sang: "No, not one; no, not one. We fear there may be too much truth in this with many a Baptist. What about it?-Baptist and Reflector, Sept. 27, 1906.

We suppose the Reflector knows whether it is true or not. C. H. C.

OF THE WORLD

---October 9, 1906

The world is coming to the Baptists. Let Baptists rise and take the world.-Baptist and Reflector, Sept. 27, 1906.

"They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them." - (I John 4:5).

C. H. C.

DEBATE AND MEETING AT BUFFALO

---October 16, 1906

We arrived in Doniphan, Mo, on Monday, October 1, on our way to the debate at Buffalo Church, near Bennett, Ripley county, Mo. Elder P. E. Whitwell, of Bennett, and Brother J. J. Seymore, of Doniphan, met us at the train. Mr. Borden, our opponent, boarded the same

train at Naylor, Mo. Brother Whitwell conveyed us to his home that afternoon, and we spent the night there. Tuesday morning we went to the church. The weather was very disagreeable and rainy, so we had a small crowd Tuesday and Wednesday. The crowd increased each day, so that the house was about full on Friday. Elder Borden opened the discussion and continued in the affirmative for two days, he affirming that "The church with which I (E. M. Borden) am identified is apostolic in origin, doctrine and practice." On Wednesday morning we began in the affirmative, we affirming that "The church of which I (C. H. Cayce) am a member, known as Primitive Baptists, is apostolic in origin, doctrine and practice." Mr. Borden represented the Campbellites. He is a pleasant man, and conducted himself in a gentlemanly manner all through the discussion. We had a pleasant discussion, and if there was the least unpleasantness between the disputants we were not aware of it. Of course we think we sustained our position fully, and our brethren all expressed themselves as being perfectly satisfied with the result. They were all exultant and happy. According to our previous arrangement we remained with the church on Saturday and Sunday and had meeting both days. On Sunday a dear sister came to the church and gave a reason of her hope in Christ, and was gladly received by the church. She is to be baptized at the next regular meeting, the fourth Sunday in this month. The meeting was a pleasant and joyful one, and will long be remembered by us. We tried to serve them as an humble pastor some years ago, and they have a warm place in our heart, and we pray the Lord to revive and prosper them. We would kindly and lovingly admonish them to be diligent in the discharge of their every duty and to fill their seats at their meetings, and "forsake not the assembling of themselves together." May the Lord bless every one of them, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

BEGAN TWENTY YEARS AGO

---October 16, 1906

Since the last issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST we looked into the first subscription book kept by our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, when he established, or first began publishing, THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. In turning through its pages we saw the names of several parties who are yet taking the paper; some of them have been subscribers since the first issue, Jan. 1, 1886; others began taking the paper during that year whose names are yet on the list. But many of those whose names are on that book, who subscribed for the paper during the first year of its publication, have passed away and gone to their long

eternal home. Some of them have passed away during the past twelve months. Some of them have seemingly gone off after strange doctrines-some, too, who were dear, good brethren. They have allowed prejudice to lead them astray, it seems. It is now nearly twenty-one years since the first issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST was mailed to its subscribers. The present editor was only a lad of a boy, then, though he entertained a precious hope in the Saviour and loved the Old Baptists and their doctrine and order. In our childhood days the dear brethren often gathered at father's home, and peace and fellowship abounded. It seemed that they all loved each other and loved the cause. They enjoyed each other's company and association. They lived for each other. Oh, how we long for those happy days to be restored in our beloved Zion. What is wrong? Surely there is a wrong somewhere. It seemed to us that the brethren then all had confidence in each other, and a brother's word was as good as his bond. Now, it seems that there is so much distrust and a lack of confidence. Dear brethren, what is the matter? Have some gone too much after the world? And have some gone to an extreme one way and some the other? We believe the true Old Baptists love each other now; but do we show it-do we manifest it as it was in years gone by? "Let us not love in word only, but in deed and truth." Let us all try to prove our love by our works. In those days of old the dear old soldiers of the cross would go to church for miles and miles. They would visit other churches. Let us visit each other more, and associate more with each other, and thereby cultivate our love one for another. Let us try to throw off any spirit of slothfulness and lethargy we may have, and "serve the Lord with reverence and godly fear."

But we did not begin this to write on that line. We thought to mention a few things that passed through our mind as we looked over the pages of that old book. We have also lately been looking over some old copies of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. We find the same doctrine defended in those old papers that we are trying to contend for now. The articles of faith put forth in the prospectus and in the first issue were the same that we publish now, except the eleventh article has been added since the paper started. Although that article has been added since then, yet the sentiment of it was contended for in the paper at the first. All the sentiments of those eleven articles were believed and taught then. Those same principles are good enough for us now.

The Bible teaches them, and we are content with them. We hope, by the grace of God, to continue to contend for them while we live, whether our stay on earth be long or short. We humbly ask all our

readers to pray for us to that end. The "good old way the fathers trod" is good enough for us. They walked in the Bible way, for whatever is Baptist is Scriptural. We would rather have the sweet fellowship of the Lord's humble poor and afflicted people than to have all the applause and praise of men and the pleasures the world affords. We ask for only an humble low place among them, and trust they may graciously grant it unto us while we live. When we have to die and pass away, we desire that they may be gathered around us then. "Mid scenes of confusion and creature complaints, how sweet to my soul is communion with saints." "The friends of my Master most cheer me on life's rugged way." Brethren, watch over us for good, and pray for us.

C. H. C.

TOUR IN OHIO AND INDIANA

---October 16, 1906

We left home on Tuesday, July 31, for a six weeks' tour in Ohio and Indiana. This was our first visit among the brethren in those states. We filled appointments on Aug. 1 and 2 at Dry Ridge, Ky. Elder James J. Gilbert, of Winchester, Ky., is the pastor of this church. At this place we met Elder J. Seldon Steers, who lives in Dry Ridge, and Elder C. P. Beadle, of Indiana. On the 3rd we went to Salem Church, near Walton, Ky. Elder Beadle went with us. At these two places we met a number of dear brethren and sisters, who were kind and good to us. Then we went to Indiana, and attended the White Water Association, held at Second Williams Creek Church, Aug. 10, 11 and 12. This was a pleasant meeting, indeed; the preaching was all a unit, and the brethren all seemed to be of one mind. Love and fellowship abounded. At this association we met Elders E. W. Harlan, John R. Daily, R. W. Thompson, Hiram Dale, F. T. Taylor, C. W. Radcliffe, T. C. Williams and W. A. Chastain.

We also attended the Scioto Association at Mt. Pleasant Church, near Sabina, Ohio, on Aug. 15, 16 and 17. Besides the writer, the following ministers were present: Elders J. C. Reed, J. W. Wyatt, J. W. McClanahan, J. W. Taylor, U. C. Porter, L. V. Hite, W. A. Chastain, Wm. Cory, Wm. Fisher, Walter Yeoman, R. W. Peters, J. W. Hoppes, Ceo. Waddle, L. T. Ruffner, Z. K. Holliday, Thos. Cole and T. C. Williams, and Licentiates D. P. Spitler, Fred Chester and J. R. Smith. This was another pleasant meeting.

Peace and harmony prevailed throughout the entire service.

The next association we attended was the Muskingum, at Jonathan Creek Church, near Gratiot, Ohio, on Aug. 22, 23 and 24. The names of their home ministers are Elders W. H. Fisher, E. Barker, Frank

McGlade, U. C. Porter, O. L. Daily, C. J. Carmichael, W. H. H. Francis, J. J. Vanhorn, and Licentiate J. T. Neel. These were all present, we think. The visiting ministers present were Elders Z. K. Holliday, A. S. Shoemaker, L. V Hite, T. C. Williams, J. W. McClanahan, J. Harvey Daily and the writer.

The next association attended was the Miami, at Mt. Zion Church in Blanchester, Ohio, on Sept. 7, 8 and 9. The ministers of the association are Elders Wm. Cory, J. C. Reed, T. C. Williams and Licentiate Harvey Adams.

These were all present. The visiting ministers present were Elders J. C. Hanover, C. J. Carmichael, M. Silveus, J. W. Hoppes, J. W. Taylor, and the writer.

These were all pleasant meetings. At the Muskingum Association two dear sisters came home to their friends telling what great things the Lord had done for them. Many hearts were made glad. From this (the Muskingum) Association we went to Falls of Licking Church, having appointments there for Saturday and Sunday, Aug. 25, 26. Elder L. T. Ruffner was with us at this church. We had an enjoyable service here. On Sunday Sister Lillie German came to the church and gave a reason of her hope and was gladly received. As our next appointment was at Newark, Ohio, for Monday night it was requested that we have services the next day at this place again and that we also attend to the ordinance of baptism. This we agreed to do. So the unworthy writer had the privilege and pleasure of baptizing the sister on Monday.

We haven't the space to mention all the churches and homes we visited nor all the persons met. We visited a number of churches in different associations and it is with a feeling of gratitude that we say we were heartily received at every place we went. The brethren and sisters were kind to us-taking us into their homes, and conveying us from place to place. They were so much better to us than we feel to deserve. Many of them we never expect to meet again in this world of sorrow, but while we live we shall ever remember their many expressions of fellowship and love and encouragement, and their many acts of kindness. These things all made us feel so little and unworthy and insignificant. We feel so unworthy of the many expressions of fellowship from the dear brethren, both in word and deed. And we humbly ask every one of them to pray the Lord to sustain us and keep us in the right way, and help us to live in such a way as to always retain your love and fellowship. It seems to us this world would have but little for us if we were deprived of your fellowship. The Lord has been good and kind to us, in permitting us to be among those dear brethren and sisters. May heaven's richest

blessings be showered upon every one of them, is our humble prayer. We ask every one of them to take this as a personal letter to them, expressing our thanks and feelings of gratitude for their kindness. We would write many of you personally, but it is impossible for us to write to as many as we would be glad to write to. We shall always be glad to hear from any of you, and when any of you feel disposed to do so, you are requested to write for the columns of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. We want you all, both North and South, to feel that it is your own medium of correspondence. Send us all the news of your good meetings. Help us to make THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST better, more interesting and comforting all the time. Pray the Lord to so lead and direct us that we may conduct the paper to His glory and the comfort of His people and the advancement of His blessed cause. Pray Him that we may do our duty-regardless of what men may say, think, or do-and that we may be possessed of a spirit of true humility.

May the Lord bless every reader, and help us all to fight the good fight of faith a little longer, until the warfare is over and we lay our armor by in death, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

1 Peter 3:18-21

---October 23, 1906

We have been requested by Sister Lizzie Herston, of Killen, Ala., to give our views on **((Pet 3:18) (I Peter 3:18-20))**. Brother D. P. Mason, of Citronelle, Ala., has asked for our views of the 19th verse. We do not offer our views as a standard but will cheerfully offer a few of our thoughts on the passage. It reads: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Christ suffered for sins. He had no sins of His own for which to suffer. He was the just one. Then He must have suffered for the sins of others. Those for whose sins He suffered were unjust-they were sinners. He must have suffered to render satisfaction for sins. **((2:4) (Isaiah 42:4))** says: "He shall not fail." **((3:10) (Isaiah 53:10))** says, "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He hath put Him to grief: when thou shalt make His soul

an offering for sin, He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand." If He suffered to render satisfaction for sin, He accomplished that object, or else He failed. The prophet said He should not fail. Then He surely did render satisfaction for sins. Not only did He suffer to render satisfaction for sins, but it must be true that He suffered to render satisfaction for all the sins of all those for whose sins He did suffer. If Christ suffered for you, it was to render satisfaction for all your sins. This is true concerning every one for whom He suffered. Then if it be true that "He shall not fail," it follows that He did render satisfaction for all the sins of all those for whose sins He suffered.

When He suffered for sins He made an offering for sin. Isaiah says, "When thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed." He made an offering for sin for His seed-or His people. He saw, in His eternal mind and purpose, every one of them. They were all embraced in the offering. He suffered for their sins that He might bring them to God. Their being brought to God was the object to be accomplished by His suffering for their sins. He did not suffer for their sins to bring them back simply to their original condition, Adam occupied in the garden of Eden, nor to give them an opportunity of coming to God, or to make their salvation possible, or to give them a chance to be saved; but He suffered for their sins to bring them to God. If it is true that "He shall not fail," then it must also be true that every one for whose sins He suffered will be brought to God. He suffered for their sins to bring them to God, and the prophet says "He shall not fail," so they will all be brought to God.

Jesus says, "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which He hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." -**(John 6:38-39)**. The Father's will was that He should lose nothing-that every one be brought to God for whose sins He suffered. The prophet says "the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand." If the Lord's pleasure shall prosper in His hand, and the Lord's pleasure is that He should lose nothing and that they all be brought to God, then all those for whose sins He suffered will be brought to God. Not one of them will be lost. Christ was put to death. He died, to this end. He was put to death in the flesh. His body was offered for sins. "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ Once for all." - **(0:10) (Hebrews 10:10)**. But on the third and appointed morning this same body that died and was offered for sins was quickened by the Spirit, and Jesus arose from the dead a mighty conqueror over death and the grave in the behalf of every one for

whose sins His body was offered. If the offering had failed to render satisfaction for the sins of one for whom it was made, He could have never come forth from the grave. But the offering rendered satisfaction, and His body was quickened by the Spirit and He arose from the dead.

By the same Spirit by which His body was quickened He went and preached unto the spirits in prison. This shows very clearly that there is a work upon spirit which is performed by the direct work of the Spirit. "And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father." -**(Ephesians 2:17-18)**. There is a preaching, or a work, which Jesus does by His Spirit, or by the Holy Spirit. This work is what is also called regeneration. Through the work of Jesus, His offering, both Jews and Gentiles have access to the Father by one Spirit in the work of regeneration. The Holy Spirit makes the application of the blood of Christ in the work of regeneration. People were saved, or brought into spiritual relationship with God, in Noah's day by the work of the Spirit, just as they are now, and just as they were in the days of the apostles. He preached unto spirits in prison by the Spirit in Noah's day. "I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." -**((2:6) (Isaiah 42:6-7)**. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning; the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that He might be glorified." -**((61:1) (Isaiah 61:1-3)**. The Saviour, by His Spirit, goes to the poor sinner who is in the prison house of sin, and by that Spirit proclaims liberty to the captive, delivers him from the bondage of sin, applies the blood of Christ in regenerating the sinner, and makes him a tree of righteousness, the planting of the Lord. He is not the planting of the Lord and the preacher, but the planting of the Lord. The whole work that is necessary to his eternal salvation, and that qualifies him to live in heaven, is the work of the three-one God. This was true in Noah's day, and it is true now. They were brought into the benefits of the

atoning blood of Christ in Noah's day by the work of the Spirit; and it is even so now.

Noah and his family, eight souls, were saved in the ark by water. Noah was a righteous man, and was a preacher of righteousness before the flood, before the ark was built. So the salvation in the ark was not the salvation which qualified him to live with God in glory. He was already a righteous man, had already been made righteous. The salvation in the ark was enjoyed after the other work had been done, after he had been made righteous. He was saved from the old world to the new world. He was saved from the wicked generation. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." Baptism is a figure of something, and it is like another figure, and they are a figure of the same thing. Baptism saves in a figure, just as the ark saved in a figure. If the apostle was correct, and baptism is a figure like that of the ark, and saves in the same way, then baptism saves those only who are made righteous before baptism. Some might ask, "How could they be saved by baptism if they are saved, or made righteous, before they are baptized?" They are saved by baptism just as Noah and his family were saved in the ark. They were children of God before the flood came, and were saved in the ark from the old world to the new. So God's people now who are baptized are saved from the world to the church; they arise from baptism to walk in newness of life. There is a blessed salvation to be enjoyed by the child of God—that one who has been born of God, been made righteous, in baptism. In being baptized we say we have been killed to the love of sin and made alive to the love of holiness. When we had the sweet assurance in our hearts that we had indeed been made alive to holiness, and the blessed hope sprang up in our hearts that we had an interest in the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus, a sweet peace filled our souls that the world knows nothing of. So, when we follow the Saviour in baptism there is a sweet peace enjoyed which cannot be realized any other way. This portrays, in the figure, what was done for us and in our hearts in the work of regeneration. It is an outward washing symbolical of the inward cleansing already performed in our hearts by the work of the Holy Spirit. By being baptized the child saves himself from the untoward or crooked generation, as Peter exhorted those on the day of Pentecost who were pricked in their hearts. We are glad to see the Lord's children come to the church, telling "what great things the Lord has done for them," and being baptized and enjoying the salvation which is enjoyed therein.

May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of all our readers, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

SALVATION BEFORE FAITH

---October 30, 1906

ELDER C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-Which is first-salvation or faith? I ask this so you can answer through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, as I want to show it to those who say "faith precedes salvation." I write like I know you see it as I do-that a child must be born first, which is life, and life is salvation, and it is to the living that God gives gifts, and faith, I think, is a gift. If I am wrong and you see differently, I hope you can make it plain to me. May the good Lord help and bless you and yours in all things, is the prayer of a poor, unworthy sister, Rocheport, Mo., R. 2.

MRS. ROBT. ALEXANDER.

OUR REPLY

We most assuredly think you are correct in saying salvation precedes faith. If faith is used in the sense of belief, then it is a mental act, an act of the mind. The unregenerate man is in possession of a carnal mind, and the carnal mind is enmity against God. He is not in possession of a spiritual mind, or the mind of Christ. For one to be in possession of a natural mind, or carnal mind, he must necessarily be in possession of the natural life. Then no act produced in or by the natural or carnal mind can be in order to the receiving of natural life, but proceeds from that life. No stream can possibly rise higher than the fountain head, and no effect can be higher than the source from whence it comes. Then a belief or faith produced in or by the carnal mind can be no higher than the mind, the source from whence it springs. The mind can produce nothing above itself. Then in order that one have true spiritual faith or belief he must first have the spiritual life-he must first possess a spiritual mind.

We learn from (**Galatians 5:22**) that faith is a fruit of the Spirit. Anyone can understand that in nature the vine produces the fruit. The grape is an evidence that the vine existed first. The first grape sprang from the first vine. It is the vine that produces the grape. This is true with reference to every kind of natural fruit. The tree or vine produces the fruit. Hence the tree or vine must necessarily exist first. One must first possess the tree in order to produce the fruit. So one must possess the Spirit in order to produce faith, which is a fruit of the Spirit. If one is in possession of the Spirit he is already a child of God, is already in possession of eternal life, has already been born of God. In (**Romans 8:9**) the apostle says, "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." Every proposition has two

sides to it- an affirmative and a negative. In this proposition the apostle affirms the negative side of the question, and the other side of it must, of necessity, be "if any man have the Spirit of Christ, he is one of His." As it is true that one must have the Spirit in order to produce the fruit of the Spirit, it follows that one must be Christ's in order to have faith. This means that he must be Christ's in the sense of regeneration-in possession of the Spirit of Christ.

(I John 5:1) says, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." This is the King James translation. When we see one who is a true believer in Jesus we know that one is born of God. How do we know it? We know it from the fact that the belief is the fruit and the evidence of the birth. Being the fruit and the evidence of the birth it cannot possibly precede the birth. The Interlinear or literal translation of this passage reads, "Every one that believes that Jesus is the Christ, of God has been begotten." To translate the words so they would read easier in the English we have it this way, "Every one that believes that Jesus is the Christ, has been begotten of God," or "has been born of God." The word is correctly translated "has been born" as well as "has been begotten," for it means the same. Then the one who truly believes in Jesus has been born of God. The birth is first.

(John 1:11-13) says, "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." We are told here that those who believe on Him were born of God. The birth preceded the belief, and their believing was an evidence that they were born of God. Those who believed had been born of God. Eternal life is given first, and faith follows after, and is an evidence of the previous existence of life. These are only a few of the reasons which might be given and evidences that might be produced showing that eternal salvation or eternal life precedes true faith in Jesus, but we deem these to be sufficient. May the Lord bless these remarks to the good of every reader. C. H. C.

Selah and Luke 16:1-9

---October 30, 1906

Will you or someone answer some queries for me?

1. What does the word "Selah" mean that is found in the Psalms so often?
2. **(Luke 16:1-9)**, and most especially the 9th verse.

Your brother in hope,

LOT CORNY.

Dalton, Ga.

OUR REPLY

Selah means a "suspension (of music), a pause."

With reference to the text referred to in **(Luke 16:1-9)** will say we have heard different opinions expressed on this; but it has often been a puzzle to us as to what it really does mean. We have heard it said that the Saviour taught in the language that we should make friends, or be friendly, with the ungodly or unrighteous persons, so that they may receive us into their homes, etc. We may have said sometime ourselves that this might be the meaning of the text, but we do not now think so. From the 1st to the 8th verses in this chapter is recorded the parable of the unjust steward. Get your Bible now and read it, as we haven't space to give here the entire quotation. The 8th verse reads, "And the Lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely, for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." The lord of the steward, the rich man, commended the steward, not for his unjust works, but for being wise. It was the wisdom he displayed that was commended. "The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." How true this is! Instead of acting wisely, as we should, in spiritual or church affairs, we so often act so very foolishly or unwisely. Acting in a wise way is commended, and acting unwisely or in a foolish way is condemned. Let us be wise, not in our own conceits, but in doing what our Lord requires, wise in attending to our religious duties, as well as all the duties devolving upon us.

The 9th verse reads, "And I say unto you, make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." The word mammon here means riches, and the literal or Interlinear translation renders the text, "Make to yourselves friends by the mammon of unrighteousness." We think the true meaning of this language is that we should distribute of our carnal means or riches to those who are destitute and in need of food and raiment, that those who have of this world's goods should bestow their goods to those who are in need.

Verse 10 reads, "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much." Verse 11, "If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon (or riches) who will commit to your trust the true riches?" If one is not faithful to distribute of his carnal things, when he has plenty, and to administer to those who are destitute, how shall it be thought that he will be faithful in other matters? "But

whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth." - (I John 3:17,18). We Old Baptists do love one another. Of course we do; the world admits it; but, dear brethren, do we not sometimes forget to love in deed? Are we not sometimes forgetful of the deed, and allow the word to go for the deed? We are not accusing anyone. Let each of us ask ourselves the question, and all our readers can answer in your own hearts whether this is not sometimes true, but we will acknowledge here that we have been guilty. We acknowledge our shortcomings, not only on this line, but we so often fail to do the right. Lord, help us to serve thee more and better in days to come than we have done before. Dear brethren and sisters, remember us in your prayers. We could write more in connection with the above parable and lesson drawn from it, but we feel this is sufficient for all to see what we understand it to teach. We may be wrong; we are fallible and liable to err, but we freely give our ideas on the subject. May the Lord bless the same to the good of all our readers.
C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 3:14-15

---October 30, 1906

Brother Arthur Davis, of Boaz, Ala., has requested our views on the above mentioned Scripture. Verses 11, 12 and 13 read, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble: every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is." The 14th and 15th verses, on which he requests our views, read, "If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." It seems to us that this language teaches plainly that there is a reward to be enjoyed or had by obeying the Saviour. It does not teach, however, that we receive eternal life by obeying the Lord. Eternal life is the gift of God, as is abundantly taught in the Scriptures, and the Lord imputes righteousness without works. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done; but according to His mercy He saved us." "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling; not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace which was given

us in Christ Jesus before the world began." "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." Many expressions besides these might be given showing that eternal salvation is not obtained by rendering obedience; that the reward of living with God in glory is not obtained by our works. Every poor sinner who is so fortunate as to enjoy heaven, with all that heaven means, will enjoy it for no other reason only for what Christ has done for him. It is all the work of God, from first to last, that will give us to enjoy heaven. But when the Lord has imparted divine life to us, we are then spiritually alive. The Lord then preserves and cares for us in that life, and has promised never to leave nor forsake us. His grace is sufficient, and is always present. We may not always realize the presence of His grace, but it is present and sufficient, whether we always realize it or not. In nature, those who are alive, those who have the natural life, enjoy that life and enjoy the blessings in the life by being diligent and by rendering strict obedience to the laws of nature. So the person who has the divine life enjoys that life and the blessings of that life while here in this world by rendering obedience to the laws of Christ's kingdom. Those who have the divine life are under law to Christ, so the apostle says. Being under law to Christ, they enjoy the Christian life here by obeying Christ. This does not obtain a home in heaven. The Lord gives that to us by His grace. But when the Lord has given us the life that will give us to live with Him in glory, we are then made alive to righteousness, we have the righteous life; and by being diligent in the discharge of our duties which pertain to that life we have a reward of the blessings that pertain to that life while here in this world. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned, and in keeping of them there is great reward." - **(Psalms 19:7-11)**. "But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work) this man shall be blessed in his deed." - **(James 1:25)**. Many passages might be quoted showing that there is a blessed reward to be enjoyed by the child of God when he lives in obedience to the adorable Redeemer.

On the other hand, when we live in disobedience we suffer loss. We lose all the blessed reward which is ours when we obey the Saviour. We lose the blessings of His approving smiles; we lose the blessing of

an easy conscience. When we try to obey our Saviour we have an easy conscience, realizing that we have tried to do what the Lord requires. But when we disobey, we have a guilty conscience which smites us for our wrong doing.

While all these things are abundantly taught in the Scriptures, we think, yet acceptable obedience is rendered from a principle of love. If we try to serve the Lord because we love Him and because we love the right, the Scriptures teach that these blessings will be enjoyed by us. If we propose to serve the Lord simply because the blessings are promised, and not because we love God or right, then the blessings are not promised to us. While all this is true, we think these things are all laid down in the Scriptures for our encouragement, and we think they should be taught in the right way for the comfort and encouragement of the poor tempest-tossed child of God. We think they should be taught as an encouragement to the poor child who is halting between two opinions, and fearing to take up his cross on account of his own weakness and unworthiness. The Lord has promised to never leave nor forsake such; and when those who feel poor and unworthy and insignificant walk in the Lord's commands they enjoy the blessings of the life He has given them-they enjoy the reward promised.

May the Lord help us all to walk in obedience to His commands, help us to build of gold, silver, precious stones, so that our labor may not all be lost or burned up; but that we may have the reward. If we fail to do what He requires of us, then we are building of wood, hay, stubble, and our works will all be burned up and we lose what we have done; we are thus living a life of disobedience. Though we may thus suffer loss, we will not be banished at last from the peaceful presence of God, for "he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." Oh, how good, kind and merciful is our God-though we disobey Him and are so sinful, yet we shall be saved! How faithful we ought to be to do what little He requires of us. May the Lord help us so to do, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

Parable of the Sower

---November 6, 1906

Brother R. F. Deason, of Centerville, Ala., has requested us to give our views of **(Matthew 13:4-8)**, in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. (Verses 3 to 8)read as follows:

And He spake many things unto them in parables, saying, Behold, a sower went forth to sow; and when he sowed, some seeds fell by the wayside, and the fowls came and devoured them up: some fell upon

stony places where they had not much earth: and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth: and when the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away. And some fell among thorns, and the thorns sprung up, and choked them: But other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold.

We do not wish to set our views up as a standard. We know we are poor and fallible and liable to err. We know we make mistakes, and our views will not do for a standard, but we are willing to give our brethren our views on any portion of God's word, when we feel to have any light on its teaching; but if they differ from us we do not propose that our way of looking at it is the standard. On this parable of the sower we do not agree with many of our brethren. They may be right and we wrong. This makes us fearful of expressing our views-not that we are afraid of our brethren, nor afraid of the position we hold. But we trust we realize the great responsibility resting upon us to teach and advocate the truth. Feeling this great responsibility we will give some of our thoughts in regard to this parable, and if any of our readers see the matter differently, we ask them to cast the mantle of charity over us, and remember that we are as liable to make mistakes as other people.

We are aware that many of our brethren hold the position that the hearers denominated as the "wayside," the "stony places," and the "thorns" were all unregenerated, and that the hearers called the "good ground," and these only, were children of God. We know that there is a preparation of heart that is necessary in order that the preaching of the gospel be of spiritual benefit to anyone. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." - (I Corinthians 2:14). Read all (this chapter). It clearly teaches that the natural man, the unregenerate man, cannot be taught spiritual things. The unregenerate man does not receive the teaching of the gospel. "They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." - (I John 4:5,6). This is an infallible rule by which we may know whether a man is of God or of the world in his preaching. If the world receives or endorses his preaching, it is proof positive that he is of the world in his preaching. On the other hand, if God's people receive it, and there is a witness in it to them, it is proof positive that his preaching is of God, that the doctrine taught is the doctrine of God. These, as

well as many other expressions in Holy Writ, teach conclusively that the unregenerate do not receive the preaching of the gospel, that a preparation of heart is necessary in order that one receive the gospel teaching. "He that is of God heareth God's words," says Jesus. If "he that is of God heareth God's words," then one must be of God in order to hear God's words. If one must be of God in order to hear God's words, then his hearing is an evidence that he is already of God. "The Lord opened Lydia's heart, that she attended unto the things spoken of Paul." So, the work of the Spirit in the heart must be done first before one can hear, or understand, or receive the preaching of the gospel. The Saviour, in speaking to unregenerate persons, said, "Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye cannot hear my word." They could not hear His word because they were destitute of the spiritual life. They were not of God. It is true, they did hear the sound of His voice, the natural sound, but they did not hear in the sense of receiving His teaching.

Now, one other point we wish to notice here. If our brethren are right in their view that the wayside hearers, the stony places and the thorns all represent alien or unregenerate persons, and only the good ground represents children of God, it is still true that the preaching of the gospel is not in order to eternal life. With this view of the matter, the sowing of the seed does not prepare the ground. The ground is prepared before the seed is sown. No man sows seed in order to prepare the ground. He always prepares the ground and then sows the seed.

But we do not think these represent three classes of unregenerate and the good ground, and that only, represents the regenerate. This would give us three classes of unregenerate and only one class of children of God. All God's children, according to this view, would be a fruit-bearing class. It is true they all have that faith that God gives, which is called a fruit of the Spirit, but they do not all bear fruit in the sense of this parable, for the fruit bearing here, we think, is in rendering obedience to the Saviour. Notice the Master's explanation of the parable. Verses 18 and 19, "Hear ye therefore the parable of the sower. When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which received seed by the wayside." Many of the Lord's dear children hear the word of the kingdom and do not understand it. They get many precious crumbs, perhaps, from the experimental truths the servant of the Lord proclaims, but when the minister begins to apply these same truths in a doctrinal way they cannot understand it, and the wicked one catcheth away that which was sown in their hearts. Many of God's dear children, too, are not in the way, but are by the way-

hence way side bearers. "These received seed by the way side." Mark the expression, the statement of the Saviour, "they received seed." Then remember Paul says "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." These received seed.

Verses 20, 21, "But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it; yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended." Many of God's people cannot stand persecutions. Many of them are good soldiers and are faithful as long as there is no fighting to do and as long as there are no persecutions to endure, but many of them have turned away from the service of the Lord by and by, when there were persecutions or trials to endure. "And they come unto thee as the people cometh, and they sit before thee as my people, and they hear thy words, but they will not do them: for with their mouth they shew much love, but their heart goeth after their covetousness. And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they do them not." -**(Ezekiel 33:31-32)**. These heard with joy, but did not do. The hearing was all right, but the trouble was in not doing. "For thus saith the Lord to the men of Judah and Jerusalem, Break up your fallow ground, and sow not among thorns." -**(Jeremiah 4:3)**. This was spoken to the men of Judah and Jerusalem, to the Lord's people. This does not apply to the unregenerate. "Today if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation." -**(Hebrews 3:15)**. How careful we should be to not harden our hearts, but to attend strictly to the Lord's ordinances and commandments in time of trials and persecutions, as well as in times of refreshing seasons. These received seed. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God."

Verse 22, "He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful." Have you not known some of the Lord's dear children who would hear the sweet sound of the gospel with joy and gladness, and then allow the cares of this world and their desire for riches choke the word, and they fail to bring forth fruit to the honor and glory of God in rendering obedience to Him? "But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some men coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." -**(I Timothy**

6:9-10). The Lord's dear children often follow after the things of this world instead of seeking first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, as they are commanded to do, and pierce themselves through with many sorrows, and become unfruitful. These received seed, though among thorns. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God."

Verse 23, "But he that receiveth seed into the good ground is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty." These all bore fruit, but some bore more fruit than others. These took heed to the word; they endeavored to follow the Saviour, and in doing so brought forth fruit. "And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge;" "For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." **-(II Peter 1:5,8)**. Beside what the Lord has done for us- after He has given us a sweet hope in Jesus, we should be diligent; and when we are diligent in doing His commandments, which are not grievous, we are not barren or unfruitful. Oh, that we all might be more diligent in the discharge of our every duty.

We have given some of our thoughts in connection with this parable. We haven't space for more at the present. If you do not see it as we do, we ask your kind forbearance. We want no controversy, and trust the Lord may bless these thoughts to the good of some inquiring child of God. C. H. C.

Matthew 8:11-12

---November 13, 1906

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Esteemed Brother-If not asking too much of you I would like very much to have your views on **(Matthew 8:11-12)**. Who are those that shall come from the east and the west? What kind of children are under consideration in the 12th verse? I do not ask these questions to raise a controversy, but I ask them with no other motive than to obtain information. My greatest desire is to understand the teachings of God's Holy Word, and I often ask God in my feeble petitions to give me wisdom and knowledge that I may be enabled to learn more and more of His wonderful ways and goodness toward the children of men.

May God's rich grace and sovereign mercy ever be with you, and may lie enable you by His Spirit to proclaim His everlasting gospel to the glory of His name and the upbuilding of His glorious cause. I am, I humbly trust, your unworthy brother,
CHAS. M. FOSTER

Broughton, Ill.

R. 2.

OUR REPLY

The Scripture referred to by Brother Foster reads as follows: Verse 11, "And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." Verse 12, "But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

We think those who "shall come from the east and west" are children of God among the Gentiles. The benefits of the kingdom in a visible form, separate from other kingdoms, as a visible, organized body, had not then been extended to the Gentiles. They had not then been admitted into the kingdom. Under the law dispensation, or before the gospel dispensation, the kingdom was a natural one, and that kingdom was committed to the Jews. "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." -

(Romans 3:1-2). The services, the ordinances, the divers washings and all the ceremonies were among the Jews. These things were all committed to them. That "many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven," signifies, to our mind, that the privileges and benefits of the service of God will soon no longer be confined to the Jews. The privileges of this service is soon going to be extended to the Gentiles, or to the nations. Isaiah foretells the same, we think. "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." - **(Isaiah 2:2-3)**.

"The law and the prophets were until John: **(Luke 16:16)**. Until John's day the service was law service, which was all confined to the Jews; but now gospel service is required, and the benefits and privileges of it are to be extended to the Gentiles. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob rendered service to the Lord. Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with them in the kingdom-that is, they shall come from the east and west and engage in the service of the Lord.

(Luke 13:29) says, "And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God." The expression, "sit down in the kingdom," does not mean that there is nothing for the child of God to do in the kingdom, for there is much to be engaged in; but it means that there is a sweet rest to be enjoyed by the child of God in the Lord's kingdom in doing the things the Lord commands to be done there. As Abraham and Isaac and Jacob enjoyed the blessings of the Lord in obedience, and as the children of Israel (national Israel) enjoyed the blessings of the promised land (Canaan), so those who come from the east and from the west and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom, the child of God who enters into and goes on in the service of the Lord, enjoys the blessings of the gospel Canaan (the church). As we have seen, this refers to the extending of the privileges of the service of the Lord to the Gentiles, as we understand it; then we think the "children of the kingdom" that "shall be cast out into outer darkness" refers to the Jews, as a nation. They refused to enter into the gospel service; they were enemies to that service. "As concerning the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes." - **(Romans 11:28)**. Because of their unbelief and wickedness they were cast out into outer darkness, and they remain there to this day, so far as gospel service or worship is concerned. **(Luke 13:28)** says, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out." The 29th verse was quoted above. The Jews were, therefore, thrust out, for He was talking to Jews when He used this language. We think the parable of the householder, as recorded in **(Matthew 21:33-43)**, teaches the same lesson. "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

Oh, how thankful we, the Gentiles in nature, should be that the blessings and benefits of the gospel kingdom have been given to us. They were glad in the days of the apostles. "Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, it was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth. And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." -**(Acts 13:46-48)**.

The salvation mentioned here cannot be the receiving of eternal life, for eternal life is not given through the instrumentality of preaching,

but by a direct work of the Holy Spirit. Their judging themselves unworthy of everlasting life does not mean that they did not think they were good enough to have everlasting life, or that they felt to be too unworthy, too unrighteous, or too unholy for the Lord to bestow everlasting life upon them. The grace of God manifested in the bestowal of that life makes the poor sinner feel his unworthiness. It gives him to realize that he is unworthy and that he has no righteousness to plead. It causes him to realize that he is a poor sinner, and to pray like the poor publican, "Lord, be merciful to me, a sinner." But they would not heed the teaching, they refused to enter into the gospel service, thus judging themselves unworthy of everlasting life. We repeat, we should be thankful for the glorious privileges which we enjoy-or rather, which we have vouchsafed to us. Many of us, perhaps, feel sometimes that the service of the Lord is a great burden, and that it is so grievous that we cannot engage in it. Oh, how cold and careless we are sometimes. Let us awake to our duties, and not consider the sweet service as a drudgery, but remember it is a sweet and blessed privilege of which many of the Lord's dear children are deprived. Let us remember that some of the saints have endured severe persecutions for the service of our blessed Lord, and the time may come when some of us may be deprived of the glorious privileges which we now have. Let us show by our works that we appreciate the blessed privileges we have. May the Lord enable us and help us so to do, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

Hebrews 6:4-5,6

---**November 20, 1906**

Brother J. D. Berry, of Horton, Ala., has requested that we give our views of **(Hebrews 6:4-5,6)**, in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. The language is as follows:

For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.

This language is often quoted by those who believe in the possibility of final apostasy in their effort to substantiate that theory. The argument is made that the expression, "if they shall fall away," implies that it is possible for one to so fall away as to be finally lost. Or, that it, at least, implies a possibility that they fall away, and that therefore they may fall; and if they do fall, it must be

a final fall as it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance. Instead, however, of the apostle teaching the possibility of apostasy in this text, he is plainly teaching the very opposite of that theory. To our mind it is one of the strong statements in support of the God-honoring and soul-cheering doctrine of the final preservation of all the saints to glory.

In the first place we wish to notice, briefly, what the idea that he is here teaching the possibility of apostasy would involve. If, for argument's sake, we grant that it is possible for one to fall away, the apostle tells us it is impossible to renew him again unto repentance. The apostle Peter **{(II Peter 1:5-6,7,9-10)}** says, "And beside this," -that is, beside what God has done for you which made you partakers of the divine nature-"giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity." "But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." If Paul is arguing the possibility of final apostasy in **(Hebrews 6:4-6)**, then they fall in that sense when they fail to do the things commanded, or admonished, by Peter. If they fail to add either virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness or charity, then they fall away, and Paul puts up an eternal bar to their ever entering eternal joys by saying it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance. Why would it be impossible to renew them again unto repentance? "Seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame." The Son of God was crucified once for them, and has given them the divine life, they have been made partakers of the divine nature, or partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the heavenly gift and the good word of God and the powers of the world to come; and now, after all this has been done for them, if they fall away the Son of God must be crucified again. If they fall away they cannot be renewed again unto repentance; the death of Christ in their behalf was a failure, and He must now be crucified again and make another effort in their salvation. But the Son of God can never be crucified again; His death was not a failure; so instead of it being possible for them to fall, it is impossible for them to do so. Again, if they fall away after all has been done for them which we see has been done, then the Son of God is put to an open shame. Why and how would He be put to an open shame? If one of them should fall away, it could be said, Here is

one for whom Christ died, shed His blood for him, suffered for him, was buried for him, arose for him, ascended to the Father and interceded for him, made him partaker of the Holy Ghost, gave him to taste of the heavenly gift and the good word of God and the powers of the world to come, and all this has failed to land him safely in glory-he has fallen away at last-and the Son of God, therefore, put to an open shame. But the Son of God will not be put to an open shame. Therefore they cannot fall away. This is just what the apostle is teaching-that they cannot fall away.

The language is in the form of a hypothesis. This is one of the strongest ways of establishing the truthfulness of a proposition. To prove the truthfulness of the proposition the impossible opposite of the original, or true, proposition is supposed, and the result of the supposition argued. This failing, then the proposition reverts back to the original, and the truthfulness of the original thereby established. So, upon this mode of reasoning the proposition supposed is "if they shall fall away." This is the impossible opposite of that which is true; but supposing it is true, the reasoning is that Christ must be crucified again, and that He would be put to an open shame. But Christ cannot be crucified again, and cannot be put to an open shame; and as He cannot be crucified again nor put to an open shame, then the supposition cannot be true that one may fall away, and the original proposition is established.

The apostle uses the same manner of reasoning in **(I Corinthians 15:13-15)**. "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that He raised up Christ: whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not." He goes on with the same manner of reasoning in verses 16, 17 and 18. But what professed Christian will argue that Christ was not raised from the dead? We all believe with all our hearts that Christ was raised from the dead. But Christ was not raised if there is no resurrection of the dead; that is, if our bodies are never to be raised from the dead, then Christ was not raised. In this place the apostle again supposes the impossible opposite of that which is true-he supposes there is no resurrection of the dead, that our bodies will never be raised, then argues the result of that position, which is that Christ is not raised, their preaching was vain, the faith of the saints was vain and the apostles were false witnesses. All these things were true if there is to be no resurrection of our bodies. But is it true that the apostles were false witnesses, the faith of the saints vain, the preaching of the apostles vain, and the body of Christ not raised-are these things

true? No, a thousand times, no. Then if they are not true, the supposition upon which they rest cannot be true, and the truthfulness of the original proposition is established, that there is to be a resurrection of the body. The reasoning here is precisely the same, upon the same hypothesis, as that in **(Hebrews 6:4-6)**.

How could it be true that the apostle is teaching the possibility of final apostasy in verses 4, 5 and 6, when other language in the same chapter is so clearly in opposition to that idea? It cannot be. He begins to argue, as we have seen, by showing the result if any should fall away; all this argument showing conclusively the truthfulness of the proposition he starts out to prove-the certainty of the final salvation of all the saints. Though he argues thus, he says in verse 9, "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak." He is persuaded better things of them than that one of them will ever be finally lost, because the original proposition is true, all God's people are finally saved. Although he would reason upon a hypothesis, though he would thus speak, yet he is persuaded the supposition is not true. Dear child of God, are you not also persuaded of the same thing? Are you not persuaded that the apostle was correct in his reasoning, and that not one of the Lord's little ones shall ever perish?

Now, remember that "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." -**(Galatians 3:29)**. "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." -**(Titus 1:2)**. If they are heirs according to promise, and the promise is eternal life; and God, who made the promise, cannot lie, then not one of them will ever perish.

See what a glorious promise God has made, and confirmed that promise with an oath, as recorded by Paul in **(Hebrews 6:17-20)**: "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth to that within the vail; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." God's counsel is immutable (this is one of the two immutable things), and it was His counsel or design that they should never perish. It being His counsel or design that they should never perish, He promised them eternal life. God's promise is immutable, because it is impossible for God to lie. So His promise is another one of the two immutable things. As

God's promise is immutable, and as He promised them eternal life, not one of them will ever perish. God has not only made the promise, but He has confirmed that promise with an oath. He could swear by no one greater than Himself, because He is greater than all, so He swore by Himself. Then if one of these to whom He has promised eternal life, and confirmed the promise with an oath, should ever perish, then God has not only failed to fulfill His promise, but has also sworn falsely. Oh, horrible thought that men would go so far in their self-righteous esteem and arrogant presumption as to argue a doctrine that would bring our blessed and holy and merciful and loving Benefactor so low! "Oh, shame, where is thy blush?" Our God is faithful and true. His promises are all sure-they are immutable, He will not-He cannot-fail to do what He has sworn to do. He has sworn by His holiness that He will not lie unto David, and David impersonated or represented Jesus in this, and that promise He swore He would not lie about was that His seed or His children should endure forever. Oh, how safe, how secure, how sure is the final salvation and future happiness of all the Lord's little children. They are poor and tempest-tossed and tried pilgrims here, only sojourners, as it were, in a strange land. But cheer up, dear ones, hold up your heads; no weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper. Jesus has conquered the last enemy for you, and even though you pass through the dark scene of death your sleeping dust will one day obey the heavenly voice of King Jesus and come forth again. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory." -**(Colossians 3:4)**. Your blessed, sweet hope is an anchor of the soul and is sure and steadfast. It will never give way; it will sustain you in the hour of death, and on the other side of the dark river that sweet hope will be swallowed up in the reality, for then we "shall see face to face." Our dear father passed away trusting in and resting on this blessed hope. The last discourse we ever heard him deliver was on the subject of this blessed hope. It was sufficient to sustain him in life, and sustained him in his last hours, and it is sufficient for us all.

May heaven's richest blessings be showered upon every one who may read these lines, is our humble prayer. Again we ask all the dear brethren and sisters to remember us at the throne of grace. C. H. C.

A WRONG IMPRESSION

---December 11, 1906

In the Apostolic Herald of Nov. 15, 1906, is an editorial over the signature of J. V. K. which contains just a few things we think justice demands some attention. This editorial is purporting to be a reply to Brother Lockett's letter which was published in our columns in No.

38. The truthfulness of Brother Lockett's positions and arguments are in no way overthrown, and we do not consider a single argument made by Elder Kirkland in reply to be of sufficient force or weight to demand any attention. But his editorial contains some statements which are misleading, and we feel they should be corrected. Concerning the agreement which was signed April 19, 1906, Brother Lockett says, "It was badly broken by Elder Kirkland before the ink, with which it was written, was dry." To this Elder Kirkland says:

Now, this is positively a mistake which I have clearly corrected before; the article which Elder Cayce claimed was in violation of the agreement, was written some two months before the agreement was made, and prepared for the paper and in the office long before we made the agreement. Besides I said nothing against anybody, but spoke of the cruelty of human tradition when backed by prejudice, which no one should have complained of unless he wished to defend human tradition when backed by prejudice.

To this we wish to say again that his explanation does not explain. Because the article referred to was already written and in the office when the agreement was signed is no excuse for the publication of the article. The agreement was signed on April 19th, and the article appeared in his paper of May 1st, which was ample time to have prepared another article to take the place of that one. And again he says, "Besides I said nothing against anybody." Here is what he said; read it and see if he "said nothing against anybody:"

This good, kind, faithful letter from dear Sister Lovelace was a sweet comfort to my wounded heart, and greatly lightened the burden of my weary soul. I feel glad that such true, noble saints, who have known me so long, believe me to be true and faithful to God according to my sincere convictions, notwithstanding all the flood of abuse and hard sayings that have been poured out upon me for the last eighteen months, and the great industry and artful efforts employed to represent me as a vile person, and to thereby destroy the confidence of my brethren in me. I know, if I know anything about honesty and sincerity, I have been honest and sincere in all I have done in my religious life. I have always groaned over my weakness and imperfections, but I have been true to my conviction. Oh! how unfeeling and destructive is human tradition, backed by prejudice and jealousy, when it gains bold in the hearts of the people of God. It seems to have no respect for truth, honesty, sincerity, years of faithful service, gray hairs, tears, piety nor learning. Where such is the case all are frequently sacrificed in order to protect some deformity of human creeds, which will not bear the light of investigation.

You see in this he says "the flood of abuse and hard sayings that have been poured out upon me for the last eighteen months, and the great industry and artful efforts employed to represent me as a vile person, and to thereby destroy the confidence of my brethren in me." Did anybody pour out a flood of abuse and hard sayings against him? Did anybody employ great industry and artful efforts to represent him as a vile person, and thereby endeavor to destroy the confidence of his brethren in him? Elder Kirkland says these things were done. If they were done, did "anybody" do it? If he was not saying anything against anybody, then there did not anybody do these things he said were done. He simply said these things were done, and of course he had reference to them being done by those who had opposed him. Then he speaks of human tradition, prejudice, etc. He could have reference to nothing else only that those who had opposed him had poured out a flood of abuse upon him and had employed great industry and artful efforts to represent him as a vile person, and that in doing this they were actuated by human tradition, backed by prejudice and jealousy, and that in engaging in this, which he says had been done, they had no respect for truth, honesty, sincerity, years of faithful service, gray hairs, tears, piety nor learning. He can no more explain away the meaning of his language in this than he can explain away the existence of the sun.

In the same editorial in Nov. 15th issue, in reply to what Brother Luckett said about his little book called "A Condensed History," he says:

As to the "valuable little book," it was highly commended by some good, able brethren before some decided that I was doing all I was doing for pretentious show and undertook to destroy my influence among our people. Elder S. F. Cayce said of it:

Elder J. V. Kirkland has written and published a very valuable little book, a condensed history of the church, notice of which appears on another page, which we have read very carefully and can cheerfully recommend its perusal to all lovers of truth—all who feel interested in the welfare of Zion—S. F. Cayce, in P. B., July 26, 1904.

Elder Kirkland publishes this statement as though it was all our father ever said about it. Why did he not publish also the statement which appeared over the signature of S. F. Cayce in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of Nov. 8, 1904? Here is the explanation about that endorsement:

When we gave notice of, and recommended, Elder J. V. Kirkland's new book, "A Condensed History of the Church," we had not then read his proposed plan for the "federal government of the churches," but had

read from the beginning up to the chapter on "Church Government," and was so well pleased with what I had read that I wrote said notice, feeling that we would be equally as well pleased with the remainder of the work. But, alas, when I had read the balance of the book, after our notice of same had been published, I felt so disturbed that I turned back and read it again-re-read the chapter on the "Plan Suggested for the Federal Government of Our Churches," and felt so grieved and so "torn up" that my wife saw that I was in trouble about something and asked me to tell her what was the matter, and I finally told her, and stated, too, that I was very sorry indeed that I had "recommended Brother Kirkland's history without offering any objection whatever to his proposed plan for the 'federal government of the churches,' and that I was very much opposed to such a move." This was just before I started on my long tour in Alabama and Mississippi, about the last of July, and I decided that I would write Brother Kirkland in regard to the matter, before condemning the proposition through our paper. So I commenced to write him personally two or three times while on the tour, but would quit and put it off, from time to time, fearing that I might not be able to express myself as I wished, and that I might wound his feelings. So I concluded that I would, therefore, wait until I could see him and talk face to face. But as we have not yet had an opportunity of talking privately with Brother Kirkland-but have written him however-and as we have been informed that the convention-or the brethren composing the meeting-held in St. Louis recommended the inauguration, or adoption, of said proposed plan of "federal government, and as the work has been recommended through our columns, and as our brethren in different parts of the country are anxious to know whether we favor the movement, we feel it to be our indispensable duty to speak out; we feel that the cause absolutely demands it, hence we propose to make our objections known. We wish it distinctly understood, however, that we entertain the very best of feelings toward Brother Kirkland, and that we have no ill feelings whatever toward him or any brother who may have favored the proposed plan of "federal government." Not only so, but we firmly believe that Elder Kirkland's motives, or intentions, are good, and we think, also, that the evils, the factions, the divisions, etc., which he refers to should be remedied. But, as stated to him in a private letter, we do not believe that a "federal government" is the thing needed; and we oppose the idea for the following reasons.

Notice in the foregoing that our father had such confidence in Elder Kirkland that after reading the historical part of the book he felt perfectly free to recommend it, but was so much grieved after

reading the remainder of it. Notice, too, that he says he entertained the very best of feelings for Elder Kirkland and firmly believed that his motives or intentions were good. And now, after our father has passed away, and can no longer speak for himself, will Elder Kirkland or someone else please tell us why the editor of the Apostolic Herald will continue to endeavor to leave such impressions on his readers concerning him? If he could be raised to life here again now and see the things Elder Kirkland has said of him, and the impressions he has endeavored to make concerning him, could he say now that "we firmly believe Elder Kirkland's motives, or intentions, are good?" These things are all so painful to us. It grieves us much to feel called upon to correct such things from the pen of one we have loved and esteemed as a true minister of the gospel of Christ. Not only is it grievous to us on this account, but much more so that Elder Kirkland cannot let the ashes of our dear sainted father rest in peace, after he has worn himself out in the service of the cause Elder Kirkland has professed to love. We had much rather he would endeavor to leave a wrong impression concerning us (and we feel that he has done so several times) than for him to leave a wrong impression concerning our father. It is deplorable that people will resort to such measures.

Oh, that the Lord may give us all grace to enable us to bear all the trials and persecutions of life, and enable us to stand in the right way in humbleness and devotion to His blessed cause. Dear brethren and sisters, will you all please pray the Lord to help us to bear all these sore trials? C. H. C.

John 8:31,47

---December 11, 1906

BROTHER CAYCE: Please give your views on **(John 8:31,47)**. It seems that the same people are under consideration in verse 47 that are in 31. Your unworthy sister in the fear of God. Boydsville, Ark.

VINA CAREY.

REMARKS

If you will notice verses 13 and 14 you will see this language: "The Pharisees therefore said unto Him, Thou bearest record of thyself; thy record is not true. Jesus answered and said unto them, though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true: for I know whence I came, and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go." This conversation, or discourse, of the Saviour to the Pharisees continues unbroken to verse 29, which says, "And He that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please Him." Now, in verses 30, 31 and 32

is a break in the conversation. These verses say, "As He spake these words," -the words in the preceding verses-"many believed on Him. Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on Him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Then in verse 33 the conversation goes back to the Pharisees again, "They answered Him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, ye shall be made free?" The conversation with the Pharisees continues on unbroken to verse 47, and even after. By noticing this break in the discourse of the Saviour we think your difficulty will disappear.

C. H. C.

VARIETY OF BAPTISTS

---December 18, 1906

We have a great variety of people in our denomination. Some are BAPTISTS, some BAPTISTS, some BAPTISTS, some Baptists, some "baptists," some baptists (?), and some - - - Western Recorder, Dec. 13, 1906.

We also had some of the latter class of "baptists (?)" but we think most of them have left us and gone to the Missionaries. C. H. C.

CLOSE OF VOLUME TWENTY-ONE

---December 25, 1906

This issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST closes the twenty-first volume. One more year, with all its changes and shifting scenes, is numbered with the past. During the past twenty-one years many sorrows, trials and difficulties have been encountered and endured by us. Some of us have had to endure bodily afflictions, as well as pass through many dark seasons of doubtful disputations of mind. Temptations have been encountered along life's journey; fightings without and fightings within. Loved ones have been taken away from us, and their places are vacant in our homes and their kind and cheerful voices are heard no more. Day by day we continue to miss their kind words and tender watch-care. Not only have we had all these things to endure during the past twenty-one years, but many of us have passed through some of these sore trials during the last twelve months. Some of our loved ones who were with us one year ago are now numbered with the pale nations of the dead, and their spirits are sweetly resting in the presence of God. Sorrows, trials, troubles, afflictions, sufferings and distresses are all over with them, and they are indeed resting now.

Yet, with all our sorrows and trials, the Lord has been good to us all. Oh, how kindly He has watched over us and preserved our unprofitable lives. His goodness and mercy still endures, and will endure forever. Those of us who are yet spared are monuments of His grace. Realizing the Lord's goodness and long-suffering in His continuing our lives through another year, we should render praise and adoration to Him. We feel to be thankful for His continued blessings, though we know we have been forgetful all along the journey of life.

During the year 1906, and since the death of our dear father on Aug. 27, 1905. the present editor has endeavored to continue to conduct THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST in such a way as to be of comfort and benefit to the Lord's dear children, and to also endeavor to defend the eternal principles of truth-the doctrine of God our Saviour-the time-honored principles loved by our fathers. How well we have succeeded is not for us to say. We are conscious of the fact that we have made mistakes. No one, we are sure, can see and realize our mistakes and short-comings more plainly than we do ourselves. We greatly deplore every mistake we have made, and humbly ask all our readers to cast the mantle of charity over us and remember that we are only human and as much liable to do wrong as other people are. And please remember that we are ready to hear your entreaties and kind admonitions and brotherly pleadings when you see us going in the wrong way doing that which we should not. If we know our heart it is our desire to do right and to contend for the right way.

This volume closes with as large a list of subscribers as we have ever had- perhaps larger. Our subscription list has steadily increased during the past two years, for which we feel thankful. We stated when father died, as well as one year ago, that the office was in debt. We are glad to say that the indebtedness is being gradually cut down, and we hope to have all debts paid in a few more years. While we have been enabled to reduce our indebtedness some during the past year, we admit we would be glad if we could have made a better showing along this line. Taking all things into consideration, we suppose we have no room to complain in regard to these things. We trust we are thankful to the Lord for all His wonderful blessings, and to the dear brethren, sisters and friends who have given us their loyal support, and who have helped us in extending the circulation of the paper. We appreciate your many favors, and pray the Lord to bestow His rich blessings upon you.

We humbly ask all our readers to continue taking the paper. Help us make it better next year. And will you, each one, do all you can to extend the circulation of the paper? Will you do your best to send us

some new subscribers? We trust each one will do all you can in sending new subscribers for the paper during the year 1907. Is the paper a benefit and a comfort to you? If it is, do you not think it would comfort others? And if you think it would comfort others, can you not insist that they take it for a year? You don't know how much this would help us, and we would appreciate it.

Again thanking every one of you for every kindness shown and for every kind word, and again expressing a feeling of gratitude to God for His many blessings, we bid you all farewell for the year 1906, with an earnest desire that we be remembered in your prayers. C. H. C.

1907

INTRODUCTORY TO VOLUME TWENTY-TWO

---January 8, 1907

Another year of the publication of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST has been completed, and we now begin the twenty-second volume. Day by day we realize our weakness and imperfections, and our inability to perform the task of editing the paper as we feel it should be done. We realize our dependence upon the Lord for grace and guidance, and know that without His sustaining grace we must fail. As stated in the close of volume twenty-one, we are aware that we have made mistakes; we are human and liable to err. When we make a mistake we regret it as much as anyone could, and we are always willing to make amends, as much as possible. It seems that we realize our weakness more and more, as the days go by.

We desire to conduct the paper in such a way as to benefit the Lord's humble poor, and so that it may be a benefit to the cause of Christ. If we are not deceived in our own heart, we love the Lord's dear children, and we love the Primitive Baptist Church. We believe that church to be the kingdom our Lord established while He was here on earth. He gave laws, rules and regulations to govern His kingdom, and He is the only King and Lawgiver in the kingdom. We desire to be loyal to Him, and reverence and honor Him as our only King, who is love, mercy and truth. We desire to conduct the paper in such a way as to encourage all our readers to honor and glorify our blessed Master while we all live in this low ground of sorrow. And we desire to reach as many as possible. That is, we desire to try to benefit and comfort as many of the Lord's humble poor as possible. We would be glad to send the paper into the home of every poor, weak, halting lover of the Lord. We are sending the paper to many poor widows and preachers who are destitute and unable to pay for the paper, and

who desire to read it. During the year 1906 some of our dear brethren have contributed some funds to aid in sending the paper to such persons, but we have sent the paper to a great many more. In fact, we have given away on this account nearly \$400 during the year, more than has been contributed by others to aid in sending the paper to the poor.

Some brethren have objected to our printing so many advertisements. Now, we will say that we would be glad if we were able to leave them out of the paper entirely. But all the money we get for the advertisements is used to aid us in sending the paper to poor brethren and sisters who are not able to pay for it. If we leave the advertisements out, then we would be compelled to stop sending the paper to a great many of them. Now, which shall we do? Shall we continue to print the advertisements, and continue to use the money derived therefrom in sending the paper to the poor? Or shall we quit printing the advertisements and stop sending the paper to them, and thereby deprive them of the comfort they receive from the paper? Which shall we do? We have given the matter much thought, and our judgment was that it is best to print the advertisements and use the money as we are using it. If we are wrong, we are open for conviction. How many will say for us to leave the advertisements out? The subscription list is growing some, and our prospects are good so far as the circulation of the paper is concerned. Many good brethren and sisters have taken an interest in procuring new subscribers for us, and we appreciate their kindness to us in doing this, and humbly ask every one of our readers to continue to do all you can in this way for us in the future. Remember that THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST was enlarged last year, and contains each week a great deal more reading matter than it did before, and one dollar a year is an extremely low price for the paper. While the quantity is thereby so much increased, we desire that the quality be kept up to the standard attained in former years. We ask all our readers and correspondents to help us to do this. Write on such things as will have a tendency to bind the brotherhood together in love and fellowship. If you have troubles at home, that can be of only a local nature, do not send them to the editor to publish. The editor always regrets to refuse to publish such things, yet it is not for the best many times for them to go before the public. Write short articles, and send all the good church news you can and help us to make the paper interesting to all lovers of truth. We want you to all feel that THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST is a medium of correspondence for the mutual benefit and comfort of the Lord's dear children all over the land, and help us to put the paper in the home of every Old Baptist in the country.

Asking an interest in the prayers of all our readers, we enter the new year with renewed determination, by the Lord's help, to continue in our weak way to contend for the faith that was once delivered to the saints. C. H. C.

INFORMATION WANTED

---January 8, 1907

Does anybody know of a church of the "Disciples" or Campbellites, commonly called, that will endorse one of their representative men in denying that there is immediate touch or contact of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and salvation? And can anyone tell us of an anti-mission, or Hardshell, church that will endorse a representative man who will deny that the Lord uses means in the regeneration and salvation of sinners? There may be yet some of each kind, but where are they? No, we are not seeking debates, but simply wanting information, and rejoicing at the coming back to the truth from both of these extreme and erroneous points. However we will say that it is possible that we can find a man who will be present and make feeble remarks in case all parties should want a clean discussion of the truth.-Baptist Banner, Dec. 12, 1906.

The above from the Baptist Banner reads to us like Elder Penick is "hankering" for a 'spute. In regard to the Campbellites, we have nothing to say more than that we are sure they have a number of able men among them who will deny the direct or immediate work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration. It seems to us that this is the very thing E. C. L. Denton denied while in debate with Elder Penick not many miles from Martin.

As to the people Elder Penick is pleased to style anti-mission or Hardshell, will say that the Primitive Baptist Church here in Martin endorsed the writer quite a while ago to meet the elder in public discussion. Now, Brother Penick, just come over any day and sign propositions. It is "up to you" now to debate. We will meet you in public discussion on the same propositions you debated with Elder S. F. Cayce, or on the same propositions we debated with your brother, Elder A. Malone, in Macon county, in December, 1905. We are willing to discuss either set of these propositions. Now, brother, come on and sign 'em up, or else just take it all back and say you don't want any debate, you were just "making like." Come over tomorrow and sign them. What say you?
C. H. C.

Romans 5:14

---January 22. 1907

We have been requested to give our views of **(Romans 5:14)**, which reads as follows: "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of Him that was to come." Adam sinned by actual personal transgression of the law God gave him. Those persons who lived and died from Adam to Moses did not transgress by actual personal transgression, as there was no other law given from Adam to Moses, yet death reigned over them. Adam was a figure of Christ-"Him that was to come." Eve, the bride of Adam, "being deceived, was in the transgression." Adam went down under the law where his bride was. So Christ came down under the law where His bride was. He was "made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." Adam had but one bride. So, Christ has but one bride. These are only a few of the thoughts we have had in connection with this text, and which we think it teaches. C. H. C.

Information Wanted

---January 29, 1907

In our issue of January 8, we clipped a little article from the Baptist Banner, in which Elder Penick was making inquiry for a "Hardshell" to deny that the Lord uses means in regeneration. We told the elder that our church here endorsed us quite a while ago to meet him in public discussion, and invited him to come over and sign propositions. It seems that he has taken particular pains not to come-anyway, he did not come. Now we want some information. Does anybody know whether Brother Penick will come over and sign propositions? Can anyone tell us if Brother Penick was really in earnest when he spoke about being present to make remarks, etc.? Or, was he just joking? Is Brother Penick sick?-is that the reason he did not come? We want information on the subject-and we want him to sign propositions now, or "take it back." What are you going to do? C. H. C.

EXPLANATION WANTED

---January 29, 1907

To the Dear Contributors of the Ever Precious PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, a source of imparting much edification to such as have eyes to see, ears to hear and hearts to understand-I am an enquirer after consistency, ask for an explanation that I can see a consistency in. God says **(Ephesians 2:1)**, "You hath God made alive, who were dead in trespasses and sins." Also **(I John 5:12)**, "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son (or Spirit of Christ) hath

not life." I fail to comprehend how or in what sense the dead can perish, unless, as our Arminian friends have it, the alien is not dead, as above stated, but have a little spark of life that may be kindled by gospel fanning. So what I am enquiring after is, can anyone dead perish? and if the dead cannot perish, are we not authorized to say Paul was referring in **(I Corinthians 1:18)** to wayside, stony ground and thorny ground hearers? for we are certainly taught in God's most Holy Word that the way of truth is strait (difficult) and narrow, by reason of which many of God's dear children treat the true gospel as foolishness, for Jesus says that the wayside hearer is so unmindful of his duty in adding to his faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge, etc., that Jesus said Satan caught away that which was sown in his heart. Bear in mind, had he been an alien the gospel would never have gone into his beset. The gospel does not enter the heart of the dead. We understand the Primitives to hold that it is the Spirit first, then they have the life of Christ; and then failing on the practical line they may perish from their enjoyment of their inheritance, and in their actions treat the glorious gospel of the grace of God as though it was foolishness. But Paul says in the chapter, "We preach Christ to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness, but to the called (from death to life) Christ the power and wisdom of God;" but all do not continue in the practical or life of correspondence with God as would be for their good; So what we are enquiring after is, was Paul having reference to alien, dead, sinners when he said, "The preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness;" and if dead sinners can perish, are not the Arminians close to correct when they state he is not so dead as we think, or as Paul, Christ and others said? Now, what your enquiring brother, as I hope, wants and asks is an explanation how the dead can perish, and the living often perish from the practical life and die to the life of correspondence with God. I hope to meet you all in a better world. AN ENQUIRING PILGRIM.

REMARKS

We feel a delicacy in offering a few of our thoughts to the dear brother who wrote the above enquiry, and we beg all to not think it presumption in us to do so. We desire to offer a few thoughts in the spirit of humility, and if any are benefited, to the Lord belongs the glory.

In the first chapter of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians you will observe that some of them claimed to be of Paul, some of Apollos, some of Christ, and so on. After the apostle asks them "Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" he goes on to argue and to show that the preaching of the gospel is not to regenerate or quicken alien sinners into life. "The

preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." The word rendered perish may also be rendered perishing without doing violence to the teaching. They are dead in trespasses and sins, and are perishing in their sins. Being in this condition, the preaching of the cross is foolishness to them. They must be saved from death in sins, from perishing in sins, in order that the preaching of the cross be otherwise than foolishness to them. The apostle goes on to argue this thought through the second chapter, in which he says "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." He is here talking along the same line as in chapter i.-about the unregenerate receiving the preaching, those things he speaks, and uses the same expression (foolishness)-as in first chapter. The alien sinner is dead, or destitute of spiritual life. He is dead to God and godliness. He perishes in receiving the punishment due for his sins.

This is the way we view the matter, and we do not see that there is any inconsistency in the view, or that it allows the Arminian any ground for saying "the sinner is not so dead as you Old Baptists say he is." The alien is simply dead, and being dead he perishes (or decays) in his sins-is everlastingly banished from the peaceful presence of God in eternity. We do, not understand, either, that this in any degree interferes with the truthfulness of the fact that the Lord's children may (and many of them do) perish from the enjoyment of the manifest presence of the Lord here by living in disobedience.

May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of all our readers, and guide us all in the right way, and keep us from harm, and at last receive us unto Himself, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

---February 5, 1907

In the Southern Department will be found an article by Elder Lee Hanks headed "An Explanation," which was called forth by Elder Kirkland demanding a retraction of a statement made by Elder Hanks in this paper some time ago. With reference to that matter we have this to say:

Elder Kirkland was labored with privately by a number of brethren, and he would not agree to cease advocating the measures and theories he advocated. Then some of the churches of the Greenfield-Philesic Association wrote kind and brotherly letters to Fulton Church, begging them to labor with those brethren. All the churches in the association, except one, took action in their conferences and stated in their letters to the union meeting of the Greenfield-Philesic Association, held with the church in Martin on Friday, Saturday and fifth Sunday in July, 1905, that "We favor dropping Fulton Church from our union and association unless they will cease advocating and practicing these things" -the things complained of, and which have been disturbing the peace of the churches since they began to be advocated. The letters sent to Fulton Church were handed to the moderator in conference, but were not read to the church. Thus they refused a hearing to their sister churches. So at the convening of the union meeting the Fulton Church was dropped from the union, they refusing a hearing to their sister churches, and the churches saying in their letters they favored this being done unless they would cease advocating the things then enumerated. The association also took action, dropping Fulton Church from the association, when convened with the church at Little Zion on Friday, Saturday and third Sunday in October, 1905. All the corresponding associations, except one, took action in their bodies, endorsing our act, namely, Big Sandy, Forked Deer, Obion and Predestinarian. The matter stands that way today. There is not a church in the Greenfield-Philesic Association, and we do not believe there is one in the Big Sandy, Forked Deer, Obion or Predestinarian Associations, all in West Tennessee, that would recognize Elder Kirkland or his church as being in order. It is true he has some followers, but the main body of Baptists here consider him as being entirely separated from them.

As it seemed necessary for us to make this statement again, we wish to notice the thought presented in the heading of this article that history is repeating itself. In the days of Gill and Brine there were no disturbances among the Baptists on the question of the commission or missions. Concerning the preaching and teaching of those men and the work of the churches in those days Cramp says in his history, page 499, "And this is certain that those eminent men and all their

followers went far astray from the course marked out by our Lord and His apostles. They were satisfied with stating men's danger, and assuring them that they were on the high road to perdition. But they did not call upon them to 'repent and believe the gospel.' They did not entreat them to be 'reconciled unto God.' They did not 'warn every man and teach every man in all wisdom.' And the churches did not, could not, under their instruction, engage in efforts for the conversion of souls." Here is a period of time before the days of Fuller and Carey that the churches did not engage in mission work- they did not engage in efforts for the conversion or salvation of souls. They recognized the truthfulness of the teaching of Holy Writ that it is the work of God alone to save from sin and all its ruinous consequences. Gill and Brine were eminent men, they were representative men, of the Baptist Church in their day, and they did not call upon the unregenerate to repent and believe the gospel. The churches were having no trouble on the mission question in those days. It is evident that the Baptist ministers and churches of that day did not hold to the idea that the obligation of the commission was resting upon the church, for they were not engaged in mission work.

But this state of peace and quietude did not continue. Andrew Fuller and William Carey rose up among the Baptists and began teaching a theory which had been taught by Rome for centuries-that the church should convert the world to Christ. Their theory resulted in the organization of the first missionary board or society among the Baptists on Oct. 2, 1792, at the home of Beebe Wallis in Kettering, England. It is manifestly true that this was not in harmony with the sentiment of the Baptists as a body, for when Mr. Carey first made mention of the matter, or proposed the move, Dr. Ryland said, "When God gets ready to convert the world He will do it without your help or mine." This is the substance of his expression. B. H. Carroll, Jr., in his work called "The Genesis of American Anti-Missionism," page 25, says, "It is unquestionable that missionary activity in the United States, among all denominations, was, in a sense, a direct growth of William Carey's work. This great Baptist was the founder of missionary activity in two continents and was the father of American, as well as English. missions." This work of Mr. Carroll's has been well received among the New School Baptists. If Mr. Carey was the father of missions among the Baptists, it follows that this mission child, born since 1761, the year Mr. Carey was born, is entirely too young to claim to be the original practice of the Baptists. The Baptist Church is older than the father of this little child-yet those who are followers of this late move claim to be the original Baptists.

Mr. Carroll says on page 58, concerning Adoniram Judson, that "The conversion of this man to Baptist views, and his missionary labors and successes severally, contained the genesis and stimulus of American Baptist Missions." The genesis is the beginning. So Mr. Carroll says here was the beginning of American Baptist Missions. There were American Baptists prior to Mr. Judson's conversion to baptism by immersion (for this is really what he was converted to), yet they were not Missionary Baptists, for Mr. Carroll says this is the genesis of American Baptist missions. Luther Rice was also a great leader in this new mission movement among the Baptists. In a letter to Dr. Bolles, of Salem, Mass., written by Mr. Judson while in Calcutta, he says concerning places where there were openings for missionaries, "At present Amboyna seems to present the most favorable opening. Fifty thousand souls are there perishing without the means of life," etc. The Boston Female Society for missionary purposes was organized in 1800. This appears to be the first female society formed in this country among the Baptists; and Mr. Carroll says, page 34, "After Judson, there were many spinning, weaving, knitting and other feminine societies to promote the mission cause.

After bearing with, though all the while contending against, these departures from primitive practice and teaching, as well as gross departures from the Scriptures and the simplicity of the gospel, a number of brethren met at Black Rock, Maryland, on September 28, 1832, and made formal declaration of non-fellowship against these departures. In their address they say: "We will now call your attention to the subject of missions. Previous to stating our objections to the mission plans, we will meet some of the false charges brought against us relative to this subject, by a simple and unequivocal declaration, that we do regard as of the first importance the command given of Christ, primarily to His apostles, and through them to His ministers in every age, to 'Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, and do feel an earnest desire to be found acting in obedience thereunto, as the providence of God directs our way, and opens a door of utterance for us." This expression from these brethren is unmistakable evidence that the commission was a "bone of contention." They differed from the Missionaries on this point. We have already seen that the mission idea was a new thing, and a departure; and we will state this as a true principle, that the whole mission scheme, as well as a salaried system for the ministry, is based on the idea that the commission was given to the church, and that the obligation of the commission rests on the church. If you remove the idea from the minds of men that the commission is binding on the church, you would have

removed the foundation from under the whole mission theory and the fabric would crumble and fall, having no foundation upon which to stand.

Those brethren at Black Rock did not believe the commission was given to the church, but to the apostles and ministry, for they said so. Fuller, Carey, Judson, Rice and others had invented new schemes and theories, based upon their view that the commission was given to the church and that the church should convert the world to Christ, and introduced those measures into the Baptist Church. These brethren at Black Rock held the original view, that the commission was given primarily to the apostles and through them to the ministry in every age. This was Gill's view. He says:

“Go ye into all the world:” not only into Judea, and through all the cities of it, where they had before been confined; not only into the Roman empire, which is sometimes so called, because a great part of the world was under that government; but into every known and habit' able part of the whole universe, to all the nations of the world under heaven; and it is to be observed, that this command is not enjoined upon every apostle separately, as if each of them was to go into all the world, and travel over every part; but that one was to go one way, and another way; every one had his line, or that part of the world marked out for him, whither he was to steer his course, and where he was to fulfill and finish his ministry: and besides, this commission not only included the apostles, but reaches to all the ministers of the gospel in succeeding ages to the end of the world; and since this, one part of the world which was not known, is now discovered: and the order includes that, as well as the then known parts of the world; and the gospel accordingly has been sent into it.

This shows that Gill held that the commission was to the apostles and ministry and not to the church.

But someone might ask, “Did not the brethren at Black Rock believe that it was the duty of the church to send the ministry?” Yes, they believed it this way, that it was the duty of the church to ordain or set apart to the work those the Lord called. They did not hold that a church in Tennessee or Kentucky should support a man while he was preaching in the “regions beyond,” or in Burmah or China. They held that it was the Scriptural plan for those to contribute their carnal things to aid the minister among whom he labored, and this is the way they give us to understand it was done before the mission scheme was invented. See their address.

Now, in this latter day some others have arisen among the Old School Baptists holding that the commission was given to the church,

among them Todd, Strickland, Hackleman, R. S. and J. V Kirkland, and others. Where will you now find the four first named? Among the New School Baptists.

Mr. Carroll says the Missionaries "pleaded in vain for a spirit of toleration." Their measures were tolerated for years, but forbearance had ceased to be a virtue. Mr. Carroll, page 165, in quoting from Holcombe's History of the Baptists of Alabama, describes a circumstance that is claimed to have occurred in the Flint River Association. He says the Missionaries "most affectionately and earnestly besought their anti brethren to suffer them to do as they felt bound in conscience to do as they would with their own, and not let those things be a bar to Christian fellowship. They intreated, they plead by the mercies of God-by the love of the Saviour, and by the joys of heaven; they wept-tears flowed; they cried to heaven-heaven smiled! But the adamantine hearts of the anti brethren were not touched; they were apparently as hard as the nether mill-stone." Does this not sound very much like some favorite expressions in use so much in this day? Does it not have the appearance that some in this latter day have almost borrowed some expressions that were used in those days in pleading for forbearance? But, did our brethren do right in bearing with those departures no longer? What Old Baptist can afford to say our brethren should have longer borne with all the heresies they had to contend with? For our part, we think that if they made a mistake it was in bearing with those heresies for so many years. The Saviour says "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," and the apostle tells us that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."

Mr. Carroll, page 188, says "the attack always comes from the antis. They forced the fighting and necessitated the division." This we say is to their credit. But the same charge is now made against those who are contending against the idea that the commission was given to the church, that the alien sinner should be admonished to repent and believe the gospel, as well as other theories that are not according to primitive doctrine or the Scriptures.

One instance of the result of continued forbearance with error is shown by the departure of the Hephzibah Association in Georgia, as recorded on pages 182 and 183 of Mr. Carroll's work. In 1832 they were opposed to the new mission schemes, but they continued to bear with and tolerate the teaching of Elder Kilpatrick, which teaching was done privately as well as publicly, until in 1836 the association passed a resolution to "become a component member of the Baptist Convention of the State of Georgia." Verily, the rule given by the

apostle is a good and safe one to follow-" an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject."

After trying the board and society scheme for years, it seems that many of the New School Baptists are becoming aware of the fact that the scheme is a failure, though the cry has so often been made, "Give us money and we will take the world for Christ." Now they are entering into another new scheme, and have organized a kind of national missionary association with J. B. Sellman as secretary and treasurer. This organization was effected, we think, in the latter part of 1905, at Texarkana. We cannot see any material difference between this and their former way; but now if a church or individual wishes to contribute to the mission cause their contribution may be sent to Mr. Sellman, who will keep a record of it and forward it to the missionary in the field. Mr. Sellman was appointed by the association.

In the Apostolic Herald of August 1, 1906, Elder J. V. Kirkland editor, Brother Kirkland mentions the names of Elders H. F. Pettus (who is now with the New School Baptists) and W. L. Murray, and insists that they should spend their time preaching among the destitute and where there are no churches, and that the brethren should arrange as best they can to get up means to pay their expenses while there. He says: "And I wish to kindly ask all of our brethren and churches to lay by a donation to help in their expenses. If any church or individual wishes to make a donation for that purpose, they can send it to the A. H. with their instructions and I will see that it is expended just as they say, and a true record is kept of it for the inspection of all concerned." For our life we cannot see the difference between the position occupied by Mr. Sellman and that which Elder Kirkland proposes to fill in the above statement, except that one was appointed by a kind of national association while the other was not. Verily, history continues to repeat itself.

Yet, amidst all the changing and shifting scenes that are continually going on in the world, the Lord has never left Himself without a witness. In all ages there have been some who were not carried about with every wind of doctrine, and there will be a few of that kind when the Lord comes again. His kingdom continues to stand, notwithstanding the many efforts to reform and reconstruct. Jesus is her King and Lawgiver, her Husband, and will never leave nor forsake. Let us press on, fighting as true soldiers under the banner of Prince Immanuel. Only a few more trials, difficulties, dark seasons and heartaches, and we can lay our armor by. May the Lord sustain us all, and help us to contend earnestly for the faith that was once for all delivered unto the saints. C. H. C.

ENTER INTO REST

---February 12, 1907

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother in Christ, I hope-If it is not asking too much please give me your views of the "rest" spoken of in Hebrews 3 and Hebrews 4. I think it is a rest for the children of God while here in this world, if they have faith and trust in God at all times.

I have great sympathy for you in wanting to defend your dear father, but why not let God right all wrongs? If you can let God fight all your battles you can find a great rest of mind. I know this by experience. I am a lonely widow, and have had many ups and downs in this world. When things go as I think they should not, or not the way I wish they should, I sometimes worry over them a great deal; but when I can carry it to God in prayer and trust fully in Him everything works out so nicely, and then I can see that my way was not the best. I fully believe our dear Saviour when He said: "First seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you." I believe these things mean carnal things, such as are necessary for life. I think if we would enter into that rest we must trust wholly in God for everything, and work every moment of our lives as though we were working for God, and trust wholly to Him for the reward of the same. Oh, how hard this is to do! Do you think there is anyone these days that enters into that rest? I think if Brother Kirkland had trusted in God and prayed to Him to bring all those factions together instead of praying to find a way himself, as he speaks of in his little book, the "Condensed History of the Church," he might have been a great help to Zion. But as it is he seems to be making another faction. Oh, that he would cease from his own works, trust wholly in God, and enter into that rest prepared for the people of God.

Please pardon if I have worried you, and please give some remarks on this rest; I may be wrong.

MARY E. CHAMBERS.

REMARKS

We don't know that we have any special remarks to offer on the subject of that "rest" just now. We judge that if all the Lord's children would cease their many works in endeavoring to "save souls" from an endless hell, and turn their attention toward doing what the Lord commands, they would enter into a sweet "rest." There is a rest enjoyed in laboring to do what the Lord requires; but an awful bondage and weariness in laboring to do those

things God has not commanded. May the Lord help us to do His bidding, and thereby enjoy the sweet rest from other labors. As to defending our father will say we felt that justice demanded that we expose the false impression, which it seemed to us was intended to be made, that our father endorsed certain measures. His life and deportment need no defense; but when effort is made to make it appear that he endorsed that which he did not, we feel called upon to refresh the memory of our readers on those matters.
C. H. C.

QUESTIONS BY A PRESBYTERIAN

---February 19, 1907

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-A Cumberland Presbyterian minister asked me to send you these questions, and for you to answer them through your paper. They are as follows:

1. Have the Primitive Baptists any written creed outside of the Bible?
2. Do you consider man responsible to his Creator for his salvation?
3. Is faith the act of the man, or is it the gift of God? He asked me if I thought you would answer them, and I told him certainly. Yours in hope, D. M. RAULSTON.

Chattanooga, Tenn.

OUR ANSWER

Brother Raulston says the above questions were propounded by a Cumberland Presbyterian minister, but does not give the gentleman's name. We answer:

1st. The Primitive Baptists have no written creed stating all their belief in full outside of the Bible. Our Confessions of Faith are only a written statement or explanation of our belief on some points which we understand the Scriptures to teach. The Bible is our rule of faith and practice.

2nd. Man is not responsible to his Creator for his salvation. Man is responsible for his damnation. By transgression man is lost, and man is responsible for it. If a man jumps into a well he is responsible for being in there, but he is not responsible for not jumping out again.

3rd. Faith is the gift of God. "For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." - **(Romans 12:3)**.

"For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit." - (I Corinthians 12:8,9). Faith is a fruit of the Spirit; **(Galatians 5:22-**

23). Faith is the evidence of things not seen; (**Hebrews 11:1**). Evidence is not the act of a man, so faith is not the act of the man. Since the gentleman has asked questions of us, and "turn about is fair play," we wish to submit a few questions for his consideration.

When Philip baptized the eunuch did they both go down into the water? (**Acts 8:38**).

Was the water in a jug?

How large was the jug?

Did Philip baptize the eunuch?

Did Philip sprinkle or pour the eunuch?

Can the Greek word baptizo be translated pour or sprinkle?

Did not Philip immerse the eunuch?

Did not Paul say "We are buried with Him by baptism?" (**Romans 6:4**).

Can a man please God while in the flesh?

Is not the unregenerate man in the flesh? If the man who is in the flesh cannot please God, and the unregenerate man is in the flesh, what can the unregenerate man do in order to his salvation?

Did not the Cumberland Presbyterian church spring from the Old School Presbyterians?

Is not the Cumberland Presbyterian church too young to be the church of Christ?

If a man has an experience of grace and is a member of a young institution should he not forsake the worldly kingdom and become a member of the kingdom set up by Christ while He was in the world?

We trust our friend will consider the answers to his questions, and also think seriously of the questions we have given, and may the Lord open his heart so he may receive the truth. C. H. C.

FOR WHOM IS THE GOSPEL?

---February 19, 1907

Brother Noah Ellis, of Henderson, Texas, asks, "To whom was the gospel sent-the saved or unsaved, and for what purpose was it sent?" and requests that we answer through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. We receive so many requests for views that we have not space to write at much length on many of them. We will endeavor to give some of our views in compliance with the request made by Brother Ellis.

The gospel is for the benefit of the child of God. The unregenerate have no part in the matter whatever. The natural man, which is an unregenerate man, one who is not in possession of the Spirit of God, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God," says the apostle in (**I**

Corinthians 2:14). In this text he is talking about the things which he preaches-that the natural man does not receive them. The gospel is good news, glad tidings. It is the news of what Christ has done for poor sinners. It is the news of what Jesus has done for those He has saved. There is no news in the gospel for or to the sinner who has not been saved by Christ. So the gospel is to the ones who have been saved with an everlasting salvation by Jesus Christ. The good news of the gospel is to them. Jesus says: "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." - John 8:47. This statement being true, one must be of God in order that he hear God's words. If one must be of God in order that he hear God's words, the gospel cannot be to or for the one who is not of God.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." - **(II Timothy 3:16-17)**. All Scripture is given for the benefit of the man of God- so the apostle teaches in this language. Then the gospel is to the man of God, to the one who has been born of God.

The gospel is for the comfort of God's children. "Comfort ye, comfort ye, say ye to Jerusalem, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins." - **(Isaiah 40:1-2)**. The prophet was to speak for the comfort of the Lord's people, not in order to make people for the Lord. His speaking was to comfort the Lord's people. "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." - (I Timothy 4:16). Timothy was already a child of God, had already been born of God. But by taking heed unto himself and to the doctrine he would save himself and those who heard him. He would save those who heard him from the same things he thereby saved himself from. He would save himself and those who heard him from error and false doctrine by taking heed unto himself and unto the doctrine and continuing therein. So the gospel is to save the Lord's children from false doctrine and from the errors of false and idolatrous worship. May the Lord help us all to take heed unto ourselves and to the doctrine and to continue in the right way, and may we be found walking in the paths of righteousness and contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

WHEN WERE THEY WRITTEN?

---February 26, 1907

Brother R. L. Edwards, of Paragould, Ark., writes:

I want you, or someone that will, to write an article setting forth when the names of God's children were written in the Lamb's book of life. The preacher here tells us they are registered in the book of life when the sinner accepts God as his or her personal Saviour. To all of the ministering brethren, if the good Lord ever directs you this way we will be glad to have you visit us. Pray for me and mine.

It is not necessary to write a lengthy article to show when the names of the redeemed, those who will finally enjoy heaven, were written in the book of life. Any man who says they are written there now, when they accept Christ as their personal Saviour, contradicts the plain statement of God's word. "The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition: and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is." - **(Revelation 17:8)**. This is a plain statement that those whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world shall wonder. This being true, those whose names were written in the book of life from the foundation of the world shall not wonder. No statement could be clearer that the names of some were written in the book of life from the foundation of the world. "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." - **(Revelation 13:8)**. "My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them." - ((9:15) (Psalms 139:15-16). David is here impersonating or representing Christ. God's children, the redeemed, those who will finally enter heaven, are represented as being the body of Christ. The eyes of the Lord saw His substance, His children, when they had not been created; and in His book they were all written when there was none of them. They were, therefore, written in the book of life from the foundation of the world-before they "accept Christ as their personal Saviour." Their names having been written in the book of life, Jesus atoned for their sins on the cross, and they are regenerated in time by the direct work of the Holy Spirit in the heart; and when this work has been done in their hearts they accept Christ as their personal Saviour, the Holy Spirit having witnessed in their hearts that Jesus is their Saviour, which enables them to accept Him as their Saviour. This is

the plain teaching of God's word on these points. Let us continue to contend for them, notwithstanding the false teaching of men. C. H. C.

PARABLE OF THE TARES

---February 26, 1907

We have been requested to give our views on this parable, which is recorded in **(Matthew 13:24-30)**. It reads as follows:

Another parable put He forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also.

So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn.

The Saviour gave some light on this parable, in declaring it unto His disciples, as recorded in verses 36 to 43:

Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and His disciples came unto Him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

Now, it seems to us that this parable has reference somewhat to the end or closing out of the old or law dispensation and the ushering in of the new, or rather to the end of the Jewish age or Jewish world. Jesus says the harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels. The word angel, in Scripture, often means minister. "Unto the angel of the church," as used several times in Revelation,

certainly refers to the minister of the church. So the reapers or angels were the ministers of Christ, sent by Him. They were not sent by the church or by a board, but were sent by Him. They are sent the same way now as they were then-that is, Christ sends His ministers or His angels now.

As the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so it was in the end of the Jewish age or Jewish world. Those wicked Jews were cast out; there was wailing and gnashing of teeth. The Lord's kingdom, or church, came forth from all the darkness of that age, her subjects shining as the sun. Though they suffered persecution and martyrdom, yet loyal subjects were there, and the kingdom of Christ was 'fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.'

These are a few of the thoughts we have had in connection with this parable. We do not know that this is the correct view of it, but it is the way we view it, and we offer these thoughts for our readers, and not as a standard at all. We know there is a difference among brethren on many of the parables, and we do not propose that our views are a standard.

C. H. C.

WHEN WAS CHRIST BORN?

---February 26, 1907

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-What day of the month was Christ born, and what month was He born in? Does the Bible say when He was born? Please answer through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST.

Yours in hope of eternal life,

A. D. MAUBRAY,
Palmerston, Tenn.

W. M. POUNDS.

OUR ANSWER

The Bible does not give the date of the birth of Christ, neither the month nor the day of the month. No living man knows the exact date of His birth. We are supposed to count time from the birth of Christ. That is, it is supposed that time is counted, as we now compute time, from the birth of Christ, but it is conceded generally that He was born at least four years before the period from which our time is counted. Some chronologists place the time of His birth five or six years prior to the period from which our time is counted. The day, nor month, nor year of the birth of Christ is not certainly known. The beginning of His ministry is more definitely known than the date of His birth.

C. H. C.

Matthew 24:19

---February 26, 1907

We have been requested to give our views of **(Matthew 24:19)**, which reads: "And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days." We think this language simply has reference to the literal destruction of Jerusalem, which is being foretold in much, if not all, this entire chapter. In the destruction of Jerusalem, when the city was surrounded by the Roman army, mothers were driven to starvation, and literally ate the flesh of their own offspring who had died of starvation. This prophecy of the Saviour refers to this, and was fulfilled then.

C. H. C.

CAYCE IS WILLING

---March 5, 1907

Has our Brother C. H. Cayce decided to try his hand on the same propositions we discussed with his beloved father? And does he know of any community wanting us to discuss these issues? Just get yourself good and ready, brother, and "the Lord willing," we will be on hand and try to make a few feeble remarks.-I. N. P.-Baptist Banner, Feb. 21, 1907.

It is not a late thing, Brother Penick, that we are willing to discuss those propositions. Yes, we know where the debate is wanted. There are some persons in the town of Martin, Weakley county, Tenn., who are wanting the debate. It is a good place, and the Primitive Baptist meeting house is open for our use. Yes, Martin will do. We will be home (D. V) on Monday, March 18. Come over and let us agree on the time. C. H. C.

INFORMATION WANTED

---March 5, 1907

Under the above caption our Brother C. H. Cayce manifests some anxiety for a debate with us, and seems to think we may be only joking as to our willingness to "make a few feeble remarks" if the Lord so wills that a debate will do good in any community. Find the place, Brother Cayce, where both people want a debate and want us to serve them, and get yourself good and ready, and don't suffer any uneasiness about your brother's willingness to show his faith that the Lord will use His word as a means to convert you from error on this very important issue. The propositions discussed with your beloved father suit me quite well. If these suit you, then the time and place are all that we need. We are very busy, but our Lord would have us be all things to all men that we may, by all means, save some, and

we are certainly willing to endure all things. Something, at least, for the elect's sake, that they may obtain the salvation with eternal glory.

The Lord willing, we will try to accommodate you, brother-I N. Penick, in Baptist Banner, Feb. 21, 1907.

Under the caption of "Information Wanted" in the Banner some time ago Brother Penick seemed very anxious to know if there was a Campbellite that would defend one side of a question and if there was one he called a "Hard-shell" that would deny the Lord uses means in regeneration. He seemed to be so anxious about it, and we like to be accommodating, so we told him, as our readers remember, to come over and sign propositions. As he did not come, we did not know what the trouble was, and so made enquiry. Now, Brother Penick says the propositions he discussed with Elder S. F. Cayce will suit him, so we suppose this part is now agreed on. Brother Penick says for us to find the place where both people want a debate, and that the time and place are all that we need. Well, we think we can name a suitable place. Some time ago some of your brethren in Martin wanted our brethren to get a man to deny a certain proposition in debate. If they did not want a debate this was the wrong kind of request to make. This was in Martin, Brother Penick, and our church house is open for our use. So now all we need to agree on is the time. We will (D. V) be home about March 18. Call on us then and we will see about the time. Don't be uneasy about us being ready. We will try to be on hand to accommodate you. C. H. C.

THE RIGHTEOUS SCARCELY SAVED

---March 12, 1907

We have been requested to give our views of the text recorded in (**I Peter 4:18**), which reads, "And if the righteous scarcely be saved where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" The question has been asked, "Who is the ungodly man?" Perhaps it would be better to read also the 17th verse, which says, "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" Verse 18, "And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"

"The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God." This judgment has to do with the house of God. The alien or unregenerated sinner is not embraced in this language at all. It is the regenerate character that this language embraces. The apostle is talking about the Lord's children. In verse 15 he says, "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil-doer,

or as a busybody in other men's matters. The Lord's children should not live in such a way as to "suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil-doer, or as a busybody in other men's matters." They should not be busybodies; they should each engage in their own calling, doing what the Lord requires of them, and not meddle with the affairs of others. They should not be evil-doers. They should endeavor to do right at all times and under all circumstances. Doing right will not bring confusion and division in the church of God, where the judgment begins. The judgment is in the house of God, and that one who brings trouble in the church by wrong living or by introducing new means and measures, is necessarily judged as an evil-doer, or as a busybody. He cannot escape such judgment-he cannot be saved from it.

"Them that obey not the gospel of God," we think, are the Lord's children who hear the gospel, or understand it, but do not obey it. There are commandments, admonitions and exhortations in the gospel, which are all to the Lord's children, to those who have been born of God; but all the Lord's children do not obey those commandments and admonitions, nor heed the exhortations. Hence the Lord says, "If His children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes." The "end of them that obey not the gospel of God" will be in suffering the chastening rod for their disobedience. "For if we sin willfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know Him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me. I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge His people." - **(0:26) (Hebrews 10:26-30)**. The Lord judges His people, and punishes them for their disobedience. The one who does not according to his Master's will, yet knows His will, shall be beaten with many stripes. When we disobey our blessed Saviour, our punishment is sometimes very sore We render ourselves worthy of sore punishment, indeed, by refusing to obey our blessed Saviour, who has done so much for us.

"If the righteous scarcely be saved." If those who live right, who endeavor to obey our blessed Master, "scarcely be saved" -scarcely escape the chastening of the Lord, scarcely escape sore punishment, "what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" And "if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" The grace of God in the heart teaches us that we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world. If we do not live as His grace teaches us, we live ungodly lives, our lives are not then God-like. We suffer for our wrong doing in consequence.

May the Lord help us to keep His commandments, help us to live godly lives, and to walk in humble obedience to His commandments while here in this world, and save us in heaven by His grace, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Matthew 5:13-16

---**March 19, 1907**

Brother M. C. Grubb, of Osyka, Miss., requests our views of **(Matthew 5:13-16)**, which reads as follows:

Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt has lost his savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

Some of this language is often applied to the unregenerate sinner by the man who is of the world in his preaching, but such application of it is a perversion of God's word. This is found in the Saviour's sermon on the mount, the most full, perfect and complete sermon, doubtless, on record. Verses 1 and 2 of this chapter **{(Matthew 5)}** read, "And seeing the multitudes, He went up into a mountain: and when He was set, His disciples came unto Him: and He opened His mouth, and taught them, saying" -and among other things which He said to them was the language of the text, "Ye are the salt of the earth," etc. It was not said to the multitude; He left the multitude, departed from them, and went up into a mountain. His disciples came unto Him, where He was in the mountain, and the multitude was not there. Then He opened His mouth and taught them, the disciples, who were present with Him, saying unto them, "Ye are the salt of the earth," etc.

There is some sense in which the Lord's church or kingdom is the salt of the earth. It is for their sake that this wicked world is preserved and spared and perpetuated. Salt has a preserving or saving quality. It does not make or produce meat, but it preserves or keeps the meat already made. "Ye are the salt of the earth;" for your sake the earth is preserved. "But if the salt have lost his savour" -if you live in such a way as to lose your influence, and to bring reproach on the cause, then "it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men." If one lives in this way, so as to lose his influence, bringing reproach on the cause, he should be cast out, he should be excluded from the church, and allowed to be trodden under foot of men. He is no benefit to the church when living in that way. He has lost his savor, and is good for nothing.

"Ye are the light of the world." There is a light in the true gospel service and worship of God. During the law dispensation there was a light in law worship and law service; but the law dispensation is ended, and the light of that service is gone out, and those who engage in that kind of service now manifest no light in that service. Gospel worship and gospel service has now begun; and you who worship God this way, under the gospel, are the light of the world. The light is now in gospel service and worship, and not in the law.

"A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid." The church of Christ was established in the top of the mountains, and it cannot be hid. The light of that city will shine throughout all ages while time lasts. The powers of men and devils may all be exerted to hide, cover up, or destroy this city, but it cannot be hid. "It shall stand forever," says Daniel. It is above all other kingdoms. The light of other kingdoms is darkness when compared to the light of this kingdom. All other kingdoms are low, in the valleys, and are completely hid when compared with this kingdom, the city of our God. His church, this city, is high above all others. Let us who are members of this kingdom, who have a home in this beautiful city, not go down into the valleys in the darkness of the worldly kingdoms, but let us put forth all our best efforts in the service of God, doing His will and His commandments in this city which is high above the world, and where the light of gospel service and worship is to be found.

"Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel," etc. In the affairs of nature, men do not light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick. "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord," says the prophet. If our spirit or soul has been lighted up with a flame of eternal life, we have the light and should not put it

under a bushel, but on a candlestick. The candlestick is in the church, and not in the world, you know. How careful we should be as to where we put that light. It would look very foolish in nature, you know, for one to put a lighted candle under a bushel, or under a box. So in grace, we should put the lighted candle on the candlestick, in the church, where it will give light, and not put it under a bushel, or in some place where the gospel worship and service is not found. When our light is put under a bushel, or in the place God has not appointed for His gospel worship and service, it does not give light to those who are in the house or church.

“Let your light so shine before men.” Let your light shine before men like a lighted candle on a candlestick. Do not let your light shine like a lighted candle under a bushel, but on a candlestick. “Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.” By letting our light shine, on the candlestick, in the church, where the Saviour has commanded, we glorify our Father which is in heaven. We thereby give glory to God. We cannot thus glorify God by putting our light elsewhere. We should keep our lamps trimmed, and burning, and always on the candlestick, and thereby glorify our Father which is in heaven. “Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works.” We should let our light shine in such a way that others may see our good works. We should be so devoted to the service of God, and so attentive to His service, as to let that be first. “Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness,” says the Saviour. We should be so attentive to the service in the church that others may see that we love the service of God more and better than we do the world and all that the world contains. Let us give our energies to His service. There is nothing in the world so pleasant or sweet as the service of God. “I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.” The service the Lord requires of us as His children is not unreasonable. We owe all to Him. Let us prove that we love Him, and let us honor Him by doing what little He requires. “Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and I will receive you. Let us, as His children, whose spirits have been lighted up with a flame of eternal life by a direct touch of God's Holy Spirit with our spirit, be separate from the world. The world does not love us. They may try to deceive us, and try to make us believe they love us, but they do not. If they can so tempt us as to draw us away from the true service of God, they will have accomplished all that they desire. They may think well of

us as neighbors and as earthly friends, but they do not love us as pertains to our service, and they are only too glad when they can succeed in drawing us away from it. Let us keep ourselves unspotted from the world. Let us not follow after their inventions. May the Lord help us to deny ourselves of all that the world would place before us to draw us away from His service, and help us to let our light shine out in rendering service to Him and in doing what He requires of us as His children, and enable us to live humbly at the feet of our brethren, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

HAS CHANGED

---March 26, 1907

We clip the following from the Baptist and Reflector of Jan. 31, 1907, and give it to our readers without comment:

A few weeks ago Rev. R. S. Kirkland, of Fulton, Ky., closed a meeting with Rev. D. T. Marlin, at Tennessee Bend, Ill., resulting in thirty-one accessions, seventeen by baptism. Brother Kirkland, after preaching the contrary some years, now seems to be very effective in proclaiming that people can help going to hell.

IS IT ANNOYING?

---March 26, 1907

Rev. Claude H. Cayce, a Primitive Baptist disputant, of Martin, Tenn., is annoying Rev. I. N. Penick, of the Baptist Banner, for a debate. It is pitiful to see the risks some headstrong men will run.-Fleetwood Ball, in Baptist and Reflector, Feb. 28, 1907.

If Brother Penick is annoyed, he should not have begun the "annoying" business. If he had not run the risk in beginning the matter, he would not have been annoyed. He will probably be annoyed more than he is now when we engage in the discussion, which we will do if he will "come to time." C. H. C.

DEBATE WANTED

---March 26, 1907

In the Baptist Flag of March 21 we notice a request from a Missionary Baptist Church, under the above heading, that we and Elder Penick engage in a discussion at their church. If you want a debate in your section, please confer with our brethren there. If they want a debate and think it will do good, and want us to represent them, we are ready to agree on the time. We suppose they have a right to say whether they want a debate or not; and if they do, they have a right to get someone else to represent them.

In accepting Elder Penick's call for one to deny the Lord uses means in regeneration we were acting for ourselves, and our people in Martin want the debate, and one of his brethren here made a challenge. When we get through with the debate here, we will meet him at other places where a debate is wanted. But Martin is first. Come on, Brother Penick.
C. H. C.

THE LAW SATISFIED

---April 9, 1907

We have been requested to state, in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, our views as to what law Christ satisfied for His people. He rendered satisfaction for every sin committed by His people. He became the surety for those the Father gave Him, and He suffered for all their sins; He atoned for every sin each and every one of them commits. All their sins are charged to His account, as He is their surety. Sin is transgression of law. So that as Christ renders satisfaction for all their sins, He satisfies every demand of law against them.
C. H. C.

SOME QUESTIONS

---April 9, 1907

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I was asked to send you some questions for your views on them.
1st. Did Adam's transgression cause eternal condemnation on all the human race?
2nd. Do the children of the devil sin?
3rd. What are the children of God before regeneration?
Yours in hope,
FRANK HARDER.
Linden, Tenn.

OUR ANSWER

In reply to the first question will say that when Adam transgressed God's holy law, the life he lived became poisoned with sin. We are nothing more nor less than Adam multiplied. When we are born into this world we are born with a life that is poisoned with sin; we are in possession of a nature that is sinful, and when we begin to practice anything at all we practice sin. The practice is like the nature it springs from. So that without the work of Christ to remove our guilt and the poison and stain of sin we would be everlastingly banished from the presence of God. "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered

into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." -**(Romans 5:12)**.

To the second question we say yes.

In answer to the third question we reply, natural men and women, children of Adam by ordinary generation. C. H. C.

DEBATE IN MARTIN

---April 9, 1907

We have seen Elder Penick, and the propositions have been signed and the time agreed on for our debate in Martin. The Lord willing the discussion will begin on Tuesday morning, July 9, 1907, in the Primitive Baptist church house. The following are the propositions:

1. The Scriptures teach that all for whom Christ died will be saved in heaven. C. H. Cayce affirms; I N. Penick denies.
2. The Scriptures teach that in the death of Christ sufficient provision was made for the salvation of all the race of Adam. I. N. Penick affirms; C. H. Cayce denies.
3. The Scriptures teach that sinners are regenerated, or born of God, independently of, or without, the gospel as a means. C. H. Cayce affirms; I. N. Penick denies.
4. The Scriptures teach that in regeneration, or the new birth, the Lord uses the gospel as a means. I. N. Penick affirms; C. H. Cayce denies.

One day will be devoted to each proposition. It is hoped that we will have a clean and fair investigation of the propositions, as truth is what we should want. C. H. C.

KEEP A RECORD

---April 9, 1907

A brother has asked us if we think a record should be kept of church conference We think the clerk of the church should make a record of all the business transacted in every church meeting whether the regular moderator is present or not. Not only should a minute of the meeting be made, but a record should be made of everything done. Besides this, we think a record should be made on the church book of all the meetings. If the church meets and has preaching, it is proper that a record be made, the record stating who did the preaching. This will show in after years where the church has stood all along the line, and will be matters of history that may at some time be of invaluable benefit to our brethren in years now in the future. We cannot tell how much benefit some little record like these may be in the future. All records should be full and complete, so that they can be clearly understood by coming generations.

C. H. C.

Romans 8:9-10

---April 16, 1907

Brother J. F. Mitchell, of Iconium, Mo., has requested our views of the above text, which reads as follows: "For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." Some of our brethren may not see this as we do, and if any brother has something better to offer, he is at liberty to present: his views. We shall make only a few remarks.

"For I was alive without the law once." He was alive to sin, he loved sin, but was dead to holiness and righteousness. He was not then dead to sin, but dead to righteousness; dead in sin, but alive to it. To be dead in sin is to be alive to sin. To be dead to sin is to be alive from sin or alive to God. He was alive to sin without the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. He was alive to sin without the "law of the Lord," which is "perfect, converting the soul." - **(Psalms 19:7)**. While in a state of nature, in the flesh, he was married to the law-the Sinai law. He was a Pharisee of the Pharisees. He thought he must do many things contrary to Jesus of Nazareth, which things he also did He consented to the death of the martyr Stephen. He obtained letters of authority from the high priest to bind and cast in prison those he found calling on the name of the Lord, both men and women. Starting on his journey from Jerusalem to Damascus to carry out his mission we hear him breathing out threatenings. But, lo, before he reaches Damascus-"the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." He now became dead to sin. Before this he was dead in sin, but now he is dead to it. The law that is "perfect, converting the soul," has been written on the fleshly tables of the heart by the Spirit of the true and living God, and he is raised up from a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ. He is killed to the love of sin, hence "sin revived;" he sees what a great sinner he has been all his life; he dies to hope in legal righteousness; he dies to sin; he loves sin no more; but now he loves holiness and righteousness. He is now alive unto God, and so should bring forth fruit unto Him. He found the commandment to be unto death, in that he was killed to the love of sin; but the commandment was nevertheless ordained to life, for he is now alive unto God. His cry now is, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Instead of binding the saints and casting them into prison, he now comforts them and suffers trials and hardships for their sake. He endures all things for them. He is

willing to lay aside comforts and pleasures for their sake. He is willing to endure afflictions, to endure hardness as a good soldier. He is willing to be beaten with rods, with stripes, be cast into prison, shipwrecked, tried and condemned by his countrymen, and to be bound and scourged by them. "Neither count I my life as dear unto myself, so I finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus." "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." May the Lord help us all to follow in his footsteps, to be followers of him as he was of Christ, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

Galatians 3, Galatians 6:18

---April 16, 1907

A brother in Mississippi has asked our views of (**Galatians 3:17**) and (**Revelation 20:8**). We have no thoughts regarding the latter that we feel like offering to our readers now, but will give a few words in connection with the former, which reads as follows: "And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." The apostle is teaching in this language and in the context that the inheritance, eternal life, is not received by obedience to law. In verse 16 he says, "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ." The promise to Abraham was an unconditional one, "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;" "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." "Thy seed" is Christ. The blessing of our eternal inheritance is in Christ, and not in our obedience to law. The law given to Moses on Mount Sinai was four hundred and thirty years after the promise to Abraham, "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Yet this did not make the promise of none effect. The promise was an unconditional one, and did not depend upon obedience to the law given on Mount Sinai for fulfillment. This law did not make the promise of none effect. Obedience to the law could not give life. "If there could have been a law given that could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." If a law could have been given that could have given life, then Christ would not have come into this world of sin and sorrow as a sin bearer to suffer and bleed and die for poor sinners, for righteousness would have been by the law. "If righteousness

come by the law, then is Christ dead in vain." All of Christ's suffering and death is in vain, He has accomplished absolutely nothing by it all, if poor sinners could be saved by their own obedience. This teaching of the apostle forever and eternally overthrows every Arminian theory and conditional system of theology-that sinners are saved in heaven by complying with conditions-no matter by whom that theory is invented nor what the conditions are. Sinners are not saved that way. Our eternal salvation is solely by virtue of what the Lord does for us, and not what we do for the Lord nor for ourselves. Then to the Lord alone belongs the praise and the glory. In the heavenly world there will be no discordant sound. No such song will be heard as "Thank you, thank you for the gospel," as some money-hunting theologians have said; but the heavenly strain will be "Not unto us, not unto us, but unto thy name be glory, honor, majesty, might and dominion; for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every tongue and people and nation." God's promise of eternal life is sure to all His children, and "the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are His." May His blessed sweet presence sustain us and enable us to realize that the promise embraces us, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

WOMEN PREACHERS

---April 23, 1907

We have been requested to write an article giving our views as to women preaching. We do not think there should be much necessity for writing an extended article on this subject. The Scriptures are too plain on this point. The most disgusting sight we have ever seen in affairs of religion is a woman occupying the pulpit. Which one of the prophets was a woman? Which one of the apostles was a woman? When did the apostles ordain a woman to preach?

To preach is to teach. The eminent apostle to the Gentiles, Paul, says: "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" -#**ITi 2:12**|. If he did not suffer a woman to teach, then he did not suffer a woman to preach. No one would say he was a woman hater, and was not correct in his teaching on this line. We had just as well reject his teaching on any other subject as on this. In the third chapter of this same letter he says, "If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife," etc. If women as well as men may preach, Paul would have said, "If a man or woman desire the office of bishop." But God does not call women to fill this office-hence "if a man desire the office of bishop." May not a bishop be the wife of one husband? No! not if Paul knew what he

was talking about. A bishop should have only one wife. He should be the husband of one wife. "One that ruleth well his own house." The husband is the head of the family, as Christ is the head of the church. "The same commit thou to faithful men." Why did he not say men and women? It is a flagrant and open violation of God's word for a woman to preach-occupy the place of a teacher in the church. Yet the so-called Christian world seem to care but little what the Bible says or teaches. They are for anything and everything that will tickle the fancy of the world and gain the applause and praise of men. May the Lord deliver His church and kingdom from such heretical and abominable practices.

C. H. C.

Matthew 5:32

---**May 7, 1907**

We have been requested to give our views of **(Matthew 5:32)**, which reads, "But I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." What is true with reference to the husband is also true with reference to the wife. If it is wrong for the wife to put away the husband, it is also wrong for the husband to put away the wife. If the Scriptures allow the wife to put her husband away and marry again, it will also allow the husband to put away his wife and marry another. Now, remember this, that what is admissible in the one is admissible in the other, for "they are no more twain, but one flesh." Then, the question is simply this, Can a man for any cause, expressed in Scripture, put away his wife and marry another, and he not be an adulterer?

In the text quoted above the Saviour tells us that if a man shall put away his wife for any other cause than that of fornication, he causes her to commit adultery. If she has committed fornication, and for this cause be put her away, he does not cause her to commit adultery. If she has been put away for any cause, and then marries another man, the man commits adultery, in marrying one who has been put away.

Now, notice the Saviour's language recorded in **(Matthew 19:9)**, "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." If the wife commits fornication and the husband puts her away on this account, and marries another, he does not commit adultery. If the husband puts his wife away for any other cause except fornication, and marries another, he commits adultery. If the Saviour had said,

"Whosoever shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committeth adultery," then a man would have no Scriptural reason whatever to put away his wife and marry again. But the Saviour gives only one exception to this universal rule, and that one exception is, "except it be for fornication." So that if the wife commits fornication, and the husband puts her away on this account and marries another he is no adulterer. If the wife commits fornication she becomes dead to her husband, and if she thereby becomes dead to him, he may marry again and be no adulterer.

In **(Luke 16:18)** the Saviour says, "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." In this place it is laid down as though it was a universal rule with no exception, but the Saviour expresses the exception, and the only exception, in **(Matthew 19:9)**, as quoted above.

If the husband commits fornication, and the wife puts him away on this account, and then she marries another man, she is no adulteress. Neither is the man an adulterer whom she marries. To try to make it plainer: B. commits fornication; on this account Mrs. B. puts him away; then Mrs. B. marries Mr. C. In this case Mrs. B. is no adulteress, and Mr. C. is no adulterer. This is true, by reason of the fact that Mr. B. is a fornicator, and thereby becomes dead to Mrs. B., and this gives her a Scriptural right to marry again. This is clearly the exception to the rule, as laid down by the Saviour, and none have this right, except for fornication.

The language of the apostle in **(I Corinthians 7:15)** does not contradict the Saviour's teaching. He says, "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace." If the unbelieving husband or wife departs, let them go; you are under no obligation to follow them. But the believing one should not help the unbeliever to go; but if they will depart, let them go. But if they do go, this does not release the marriage bond. It does not give the one left the privilege of marrying another, for the apostle says in verses 10 and 11, "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife." It is plainly taught here that if one departs the other has no right to put them away on this account, but they should remain unmarried-hold themselves in readiness at all times for a reconciliation.

If the wife puts the husband away for any other cause than for fornication and marries another, she becomes an adulteress, and the

man she marries becomes an adulterer, and to continue to live in this state is simply to continue to live in adultery.

The woman who was brought to the Saviour, having been caught in the very act, is no example to resort to as an excuse, in our judgment. She was brought before the Saviour by those who were seeking to entangle and condemn our Lord. This lesson teaches us that the Saviour's mission was not to administer the law, neither was He to sit as a judge to pass sentence on those who violated it. This was not His mission, which is clearly taught in this circumstance. His work was to fulfill the law, to render satisfaction to it.

These are our views on this subject. We do not propose to give them as a standard for our people, but we feel it is a safe position. We trust our brethren everywhere will study the matter carefully and prayerfully. Then may the Lord enable us to go in the right way, knowing no man after the flesh, but to have a true regard for the right, and give us Christian fortitude to walk in that way, and help us to always do that which is well pleasing in His sight. C. H. C.

CHRIST AND BELIAL

---May 14, 1907

A Brother Moore, of Nolen, Miss., requests our views of **(II Corinthians 6:15)**. That verse reads, "And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" We may be wrong about the matter, but we think this language teaches us that the Lord's children should keep themselves out of all the institutions that are partly composed of infidels. Verse 14 says, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?" For a believer to be yoked with an unbeliever is to be unequally yoked. How can we engage with them in worship without being yoked with them? It seems to us that we should not do this. Then follows the language of the 15th verse, as quoted above. "And what concord hath Christ with Belial?" The word "Belial" means a vile, worthless person, reckless of God and man. It seems to us that we should hold ourselves aloof from all such characters. The institutions of the world, which are called benevolent, are largely composed of men who are reckless and who are infidels and who reject Christ. The orthodox Jew rejects Christ. So, also, does the Mohammedan. We do not say they are all bad, but many of them are not good men, many of them are "reckless." The man who denies or rejects Christ is to that extent an infidel. Should we "brother" them, and meet on a common level with them in any kind of religious service or ceremony? It seems to us we should not. To pray a prayer

the orthodox Jew will receive we must not approach the Father in the name of Christ. If we must not pray in the name of Christ, then we must deny Him just to please the one who despises our blessed Lord. Should we do this? We do not think so. Search the prayers and forms of service of the different institutions called benevolent and see how many of them have the name of Christ in them. Some of them have the altar erected to the "beloved. St. John." May we not just as well approach the Father through the mediatorship of the virgin Mary? We think so.

Verse 16 says, "And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." Surely the temple of God hath no agreement with idols. Verses 17 and 18 read, "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." We would humbly beg our brethren, in the language recorded here, to come out from among all those things and be separate from them, and the Lord will receive us. We have no desire to unite with those things or to affiliate with them. The Lord's kingdom is above them all, and we do not wish to go down to them. We would be so glad, and rejoice so much, if all our brethren would come out from all those things. We feel that we love our brethren and the church so well that we would be willing to give those things up for their sake, even if we were affiliating with them and thought there was no harm in our doing so. If our brethren thought it was wrong and thought we should quit it, we believe we love them so well that we would quit for their sake. Jesus is our only Mediator, and He has promised, "If ye ask anything in my name I will do it." We should pray in His name only. We can come to God in no other way. Dear brethren, "Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith." We cannot draw near any other way. The Lord will not recognize any other way. Let us all give our time of service in the Lord's church, and draw near to Him there, and He will bless us. He has not promised to bless us in these other things. If we desire to perform acts of benevolence, let us remember to "Do good to all men, especially to the household of faith." If we would give our time to the church and spend the same means that way that is spent in the other things, would it not be much better, and would not the church then be what some brethren say it lacks? Dear brethren, let us all try it for awhile. Is there one brother who will write us he will try it for a time? May the Lord help us to know and do His will.

C. H. C.

NEW WINE IN OLD BOTTLES

---May 14, 1907

Brother J. H. Malone, of Watertown, Tenn., has requested our views of **((21) (Mark 2:21-22))**, which reads: "No man also seweth a piece of new cloth on an old garment: else the new piece that filled it up taketh away from the old, and the rent is made worse. And no man putteth new wine into old bottles: else the new wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles will be marred: but new wine must be put into new bottles." We think this has reference to the closing out of the old or law dispensation and the setting up of the gospel dispensation. The old or law worship is not to be engaged in now. The gospel service is to be engaged in now. This service is in the gospel kingdom, which Daniel said the God of heaven should set up. The new service is in the new gospel kingdom. This is the way we view the matter. The new or gospel service is not to be engaged in, as under the old or law dispensation, or in the national kingdom; but is to be engaged in the new, the church of Christ. C. H. C.

GOOD REPORT OF THEM WITHOUT

---May 21, 1907

Brother E. D. Clayton, of Smithville, Miss., requests us to say to the brethren in the ministry who are traveling in his section that when they desire to cross Tombigbee River, if they will go to White Springs he will put them across free, as he owns the ferry there. He also requests us to give our views concerning **(I Timothy 3:7)**, the expression, "Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without," and also **(II Timothy 3:12)**, "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." He thinks there is a seeming contradiction. In the language first quoted the apostle is giving the qualifications a man should have before he is set apart or ordained to the office of bishop or elder. If a man does not possess these qualifications as recorded in verses 1 to 7 of this chapter he should not be ordained. Those without are those who are not members of the church. If a man's character is not good his influence will not be good. He should have a good character; his character should be above reproach. If different kinds of evil reports are continually being circulated about him, as to his moral or upright standing, it is a bad omen. "Where there is so much smoke there is apt to be some fire" is an old saying, and often proves true. His life should be such that his neighbors and those who know him will speak

well of him as a man, even though they may despise or hate the doctrine he advocates.

The text referred to in 2nd Timothy does not in any wise contradict this teaching. A man does not have to engage in card playing, whisky drinking, gambling, swearing, or other immoral practices in order that he be of good report of them who are without. If he engages in any of these things the wicked and profane man, even, who is without the church would not speak well of him. The drunkard speaks well of the man who is sober and temperate. The profane man who takes the name of God in vain will speak well of the man who refrains from all such evil practices. The servant of Christ does not have to engage in immoral practices in order to be of good report of them that are without; but if he engages in these things his character will not be good-he will be of evil report of them that are without. The servant of the Lord-even all His children-should live in such a way that no one can have an evil thing to say of his character. His character should be above reproach.

People are not persecuted for doing evil. They may sometimes be punished for it, but never persecuted. Those who live godly lives and contend for the doctrine of God our Saviour are sometimes persecuted because of the doctrine they hold to. Many of them have been persecuted in ages past. Paul was sorely persecuted, but not for unrighteous practices. No one could say aught against his character as a man. It was his doctrine or teaching that they objected to. The same may be said of many of the Lord's servants since his day.

History gives us an account of the burning of some of the followers of the Lord in the year 1022. In those days the Catholic church was united with and supported by state and those who refused to accede to the teachings of Rome were tried and punished by law. In the case referred to those persons "were charged, among other things, with holding that there is no washing away of sins in baptism, that in the Lord's supper the bread and wine are not changed to the body and blood of the Saviour, and that it is unlawful to pray to the saints. These were unpardonable sins. The accused were men of learning and piety, whose unimpeachable characters and holy lives were well known, and by whose benevolence many poor were daily relieved; but they did not believe in baptismal regeneration, transubstantiation, and saint-worship, and therefore they must be burned alive, and burned they were on the very day of their trial." - Cramp's History, page 83. History abounds with other instances like this.

May the Lord help us to live so that no one can truthfully speak evil of our lives, even though we suffer persecution. It is better to suffer for

well doing than for evil. May the Lord sustain us and give us all grace for our day and trial, and enable us to glorify Him, that we may be counted worthy to suffer for His sake.

C. H. C.

TOUR IN INDIANA AND OHIO

---June 18, 1907

We left home on Saturday night, April 6, on our tour in Indiana and Ohio. We went first to Pimento, and then to Crawfordsville, the home of Elder J. H. Oliphant. We saw three willing ones come home to the church at Crawfordsville. We visited the home of Elder John R. Daily in Indianapolis. We visited some of the churches in the White Water Association. Then we visited some of the churches near the home of Elders R. W. and John M. Thompson, including Greenfield, Ind. At Lebanon Church four were received for baptism. Elder John M. Thompson is pastor there, and he remained with them the next day to administer the baptism, and we have heard that another joined on that day.

From this section we visited some of the churches in northern Indiana, near the home of Elders W. L. Lines and Geo. A. Bretz. Then we went into northern Ohio, and filled appointments arranged by Elder A. F. Dove. Then we came into southern Ohio, and visited the church at Middle Run, in Miami Association, which we had promised some time ago to do. This was an annual meeting, embracing the third Sunday in May. During this meeting a Sister Collins came to the church and related a reason of her hope and was received. Then we were at Blanchester on Monday and Tuesday. Sister Bertha Smith united with the church here, and was baptized by the unworthy writer on Tuesday afternoon. After this we visited some other churches in the Scioto Association, and some perhaps in the Muskingum. We were kindly and heartily received. The brethren and sisters were all good to us- far better than we feel to deserve. Their many deeds of kindness will never be forgotten. We wish we could give a more extended account of this tour, but our space forbids it. We met a number of dear and faithful brethren in the ministry, too. May the Lord abundantly bless all the dear ones we met, and those who so kindly cared for and ministered to us, is our humble prayer. We trust they will remember us kindly, and that they will pray the Lord to sustain us.

C. H. C.

WHOM DID JOHN BAPTIZE?

---June 25, 1907

A. O. Jones, of Chattanooga, Tenn., asks, "When John was baptizing in the river of Jordan, was he baptizing sinners?" He was not baptizing unregenerate sinners. He came to make ready a people prepared for the Lord. They were already prepared in heart before he baptized them. When the Pharisees and Sadducees came and demanded baptism at his hands he refused them. He told them to bring forth fruits meet for repentance-that is, they must bring fruits of repentance; they must give some evidence of repentance before he would baptize them. Those he baptized confessed their sins. They realized that they were poor, sinful creatures. That person whose heart is untouched by the Spirit of God, or the sweet influence of the love of God, does not realize the exceeding sinfulness of sin; hence he does not confess his sins, is not sorry for his sins, thinks he is as good as anybody and better than most people, and is not a subject fit for baptism, and John baptized no such characters.

C. H. C.

SALOONS AND CHURCH MEMBERS

---June 25, 1907

Some of our brethren seem to want to know what we think about church members visiting saloons or bar rooms. It does not seem to us that there is room for any discussion on such a point as this. We are positively commanded to abstain from every appearance of evil, and the very mildest thing that can be said of such places is that they have the appearance of evil. Gamblers, drunkards, and wicked, profane men frequent such places; and they are not fit places for church members to go. No brother should go to any place where he would be ashamed for his wife, or mother, or sister to go with him. Any church member who continually visits such places of vice and immorality should be admonished, and if he fails to heed the admonition and continues on in that course, we think he should be excluded from the fellowship of the church. The Arminian world has delighted to call the Old Baptists "whisky jugs" and such like names. We have always denied being guilty, and every church claiming to be an Old Baptist Church should prove that we are not whisky Baptists by excluding any member who engages in such practice. In our country the churches do not tolerate drunkenness. We suppose this is explicit enough for all our readers to understand what we think about such. C. H. C.

LIARS NOT ALL DEAD

---June 27, 1907

A clipping from the Kansas City Star has been sent to us, in which the writer proposes to give an account of the feet-washing service at Hollow Rock Church, in Carroll county, Tenn., the first Sunday in May. We never saw more falsehood crowded into so little space in our life. Concerning the custom of washing each other's feet the writer says, "The younger generation will not perpetuate the custom-which will cease with the passing of 'Parson' Stoker." This is a prophecy like so many other prophecies made by the prophets the devil and his hosts have been sending out all along the ages. It is false. The bloodthirsty murderers of the humble followers of the meek and lowly Nazarene, like this stranger to truth, have been prophesying all along that these old soldiers and their ancient customs would soon die out- all pass away and be no more. People often prophesy what they desire, and if the writer of that article in the Star was not afraid of the law of the land he would not hesitate to destroy the life of every member of the "little flock" at old Hollow Rock Church.

He says, "Hollow Rock is probably the only place in the South where the Primitives have observed the feet-washing rite during the past twenty years. Now the writer of that article knows this is as false as Satan himself. He knows there are other churches-several of them-of the Primitive Baptist faith within twenty miles of Hollow Rock that have practiced this ordinance ever since they were constituted. He knows this is the general and almost universal practice of the Primitive Baptist churches in this section of country. If he does not know these things, we are compelled to admit we did not know there was such lamentable ignorance in West Tennessee. Some of his ilk have said some people would get to heaven on their ignorance. If such a thing is possible, then we are of the humble opinion that scribe will enter the Portals. May the Lord pity such a piece of humanity as the writer of that article, if indeed he is human.

We have not space, nor an inclination to notice all the vile slander from the pen of this son of the lower region, but will simply brand his statement that the men washed the feet of the women and the women washed the feet of the men as a lie of the first water and the blackest hue. The devil himself could not, personally, invent more base, low, mean, vile, black falsehood and put it in smaller compass than the writer of that article has done. Not only do we say this, but the managers of the paper ought to know that such things as are contained in that article are untrue.

The father of lies and his cohorts will continue to speak all manner of evil against the Lord's humble followers falsely. If there is any such place as an eternal hell-and we believe there is-"all liars shall have their part in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone."

We are informed that an article appeared in the Memphis News-Scimitar about like the one in the Kansas City Star. C. H. C.

REMARKS TO J. H. HALL

---July 2, 1907

Your feelings of unworthiness is an evidence that you should offer yourself to the church. The eminent apostle to the Gentiles said, "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." You could not feel to be less than he did. "Whosoever loveth is born of God, and knoweth God, for God is love." If you love the cause of Christ and love the doctrine of God our Saviour, it is an evidence of the work of grace in your heart. If you would deny yourself and take up your cross and go to the church and relate to them a reason of your hope in the Saviour and follow your Lord in baptism, you would find that sweet rest the Saviour has promised those who follow Him.

May you be encouraged to do this is our humble prayer for you.
C. H. C.

CHRIST OUR SURETY

---July 2, 1907

Since Brother Radcliff asked our opinion as to whether Christ is our security, or our surety (see his letter elsewhere in this paper), we will offer a few of our thoughts on the subject. We would say, however, that we understand Christ to be the surety for His people, and have always understood this to be the doctrine of the Primitive Baptists as a denomination.

The very idea of Christ making atonement for His people on the cross is evidence that He was their surety. It is generally understood that if A is security for the payment of a debt owed by B, the creditor will look to B for the payment of the debt just as much as he looks to A. He holds B responsible equally with A. But if A is surety for B, then when the debt is due the creditor makes demand of A for the payment or settlement of the debt. He looks to A for settlement. Thus the Saviour became surety for His people. All their sins were charged to His account. Their sins were not charged to them and to Christ jointly, as partners in the affair, so that demand for payment could be made upon both. "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." -Isaiah 53:6. All their sins, all their iniquities, were laid on Him; they were charged to His account, so that demand was made of Him for payment of the debt which they owed to divine justice. Thus He became their substitute; He was offered in their stead. In that sense

He was their substitute. All their sins being charged to Christ and laid on Him, the law holds no demands against them. The demand was all against Christ, and He met every demand, and paid the debt in full. "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all" -the demand was that he pay it all, and this was upon the principle that He had assumed the debt. If He did assume the debt, it then became His, and was not, therefore, a debt owed by them both. He took upon Himself all their indebtedness, paying what they owed and setting them free therefrom.

In Paul's letter to (Philemon 18) he said, concerning Onesimus, "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account." If it was put on Paul's account, it was not put on an account against Onesimus. Paul became his surety. He did not say, "If Onesimus fails to pay, or is not able to pay it all, I will pay what he lacks," but he said "put it on mine account" -that is, charge it against me; do not charge it against him. Thus Christ became surety for His people. Their sins were all charged to His account.

This blessed truth is a comfort and consolation to us, but time forbids us writing more. Go on, dear brother, proclaiming the truth that Christ is our surety.

C..H.C.

WOMEN HELPERS

---July 2, 1907

Sister M. E. Mynatt, of Charity, Mo., writes us that she read our editorial some time ago concerning women preaching and endorsed the same; but that since reading that article she has read **((3) (Philippians 4:3))**, and asks what part we would place those women in. The text reads, "And I intreat thee also, true yoke fellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellow labourers, whose names are in the book of life." The expression, we suppose, which is referred to is "help those women which laboured with me in the gospel." We would call attention to the fact that people may labor in the gospel, and yet not be preachers. To do what the Lord requires in the gospel, to serve Him in the gospel kingdom, is to labor in the gospel. In **(Romans 16:3)**, Paul says, "Greet Priscilla and Aquila my helpers in Christ Jesus." Aquila was a Jew, born in Pontus, and Priscilla was his wife. {see **((8:2) (Acts 18:2))**} Aquila was not a preacher, but he laboured in the gospel just as his wife, Priscilla, did. Aquila and Priscilla heard Apollos preach, he knowing only the baptism of John. "They took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God

more perfectly." They taught him privately—"they took him unto them." Thus they laboured in the gospel. The apostle tells us, too, in **(Romans 16:4)**, that they "have for my life laid down their own necks." They put their own lives in danger to help him and to save him from dangers. Persecution was great, and they hazarded their own lives to save him from danger. Oh, how comforting and encouraging are such friends and helpers in the gospel! Do the poor servants have such friends and helpers now in the Master's service? Yes, we believe there are some, even now, who would hazard their own lives for the sake of the poor tried minister and the cross of Christ. As poor and unworthy as we are, we have met with some dear saints of God who have manifested so much kindness and tender feeling for us, that we have been led to believe they would willingly endure severe trials for our sake, were it necessary. May the rich blessings of heaven rest upon them, is our humble prayer. Yes, they are helpers in many ways. Words of comfort and encouragement fall from their lips when the poor tried minister is in despair and is feeling as though he had as well "ground arms" and quit the field; but then he is encouraged to fight on a little while longer, realizing that though his efforts appear to him to be weak, yet there are some who appreciate them and who are his friends. No one knows the trials and conflicts of the life of a true minister of Christ only those who have had the experience. Though this is true, yet the true minister, who is faithful and earnestly contends for the faith will have true friends among the humble followers of the blessed Saviour.

C. H. C.

HAVE BEEN BAPTIZED

---July 23, 1907

We understand that the Missionaries have at last baptized Elders R. S. Kirkland and H. E. Pettus, who were at first received on their baptism from our people. We wonder if this will settle the stir among the Soft-shells in regard to what they term alien immersion. We suppose these two men have immersed quite a number since they were received by the Missionaries, and if the baptism they were received on was not good, the Missionary folks now have a good many unbaptized people among them that these parties immersed. We wonder what disposition they will now make of all these? If Elders Kirkland and Pettus did not have gospel baptism, then these people immersed by them are not baptized. Truly, "the legs of the lame are unequal." What will they do?

C. H. C.

LADIES' AID SOCIETY

---July 30, 1907

We see in the Apostolic Herald of July 15, 1907, that a "Primitive Baptist Ladies' Aid Society" has been organized at Boonville, Ind. It appears that the organization was effected January 10, 1907. The names of officers given are as follows:

Viola McNeely, Secretary; Melvina Jones, Vice President; Nancy Powers, Treasurer; Almeda Williams, President. These names, as officers, are signed to a letter in the Herald addressed to Elder J. W. Richardson, in which they ask his advice in the matter. They also say they laid their plans before Elder Jno. T. Oliphant, who is the pastor of the Boonville Church, and that he approved of the same. A letter is published from Elder Richardson in reply, in which he approves of the society. It seems that these letters fell into the hands of Elder W. E. Williams, who sent them to the Herald with his approval.

In the name of our only King and Law-giver, the only Saviour of sinners, who has declared by inspiration that "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," "that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," we would ask, where are we drifting? In the name of our King we ask, is it not time to call a halt?

This society cites (**Romans 16:1**), "I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church," as sufficient authority for a "Ladies' Aid Society." Why, yes, of course! What a pity the poor, ignorant, old foggy Primitive Baptists have never seen until now that this meant that they should have a Ladies' Aid Society! Oh, yes! here it is: "I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church and President of the Ladies' Aid Society!" "Greet Priscilla, who is secretary of the Ladies' Aid!" And so on, and on! Oh, no, that is not in the whole blessed Book! Give us book, chapter and verse, please, where they organized a Ladies' Aid in the days of the apostles. Until this is done, you will please excuse us if we condemn the baby and insist that it is an intrusion to bring the little thing into God's house. We would humbly, yet solemnly, warn our brethren to "touch not, taste not, handle not the unclean thing" -and all the inventions of men in the affairs of religion are unclean. The ancient Waldenses regarded all the inventions of men in the affairs of religion as an unspeakable abomination before God.

Suppose we try a little more new translation to suit the Aid Society. Turn to (**II Corinthians 1:1**), and read and compare with this: "Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the members of the Ladies' Aid Society which is in all Achaia." Compare

(Galatians 1:1-2), with this: "Unto the churches and Ladies' Aid Societies of Galatia." Compare **(Ephesians 1:1)** with this: "To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the Ladies' Aid Societies in Christ Jesus." Compare **(Philippians 1:1)** with this: "To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons, and to the Ladies' Aid Societies, with their presidents, vice presidents, secretaries and treasurers. Compare **(Colossians 1:1-2)** with this: "To the saints and faithful brethren and Ladies' Aid Societies in Christ which are at Colosse." Compare 1st Thess. i. 1 with this: "Unto the church and the Ladies' Aid Society of the Thessalonians." Compare **(Titus 1:5)** with this: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and organize Ladies' Aid Societies, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." It seems to us that a careful examination of the places cited above and a comparison with the above would be sufficient to convince any Old School Baptist who is willing to simply follow the Scriptures that there is no authority for a Ladies' Aid Society, and that it should be let alone. May the Lord help us to follow Him and His teaching and not follow after the world and the inventions of men.

C. H. C.

Matthew 23:37

---August 7, 1907

Sister J. D. Rodgers, of Warrensburg, Mo., has requested us to write our views on the above mentioned text, which reads, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." We have often heard this text used by the Arminian world, though they usually quote it wrong. They often change it to read "How often would I have gathered thee together." And there is another sermon that a few years ago was preached among us, called the hen and chicken sermon, in which the application was, seemingly, somewhat twisted. The old hen was so anxious to gather the chickens under her wings, but the chickens would not-so the sermon ran. The chicken was made to represent the child of God outside the church, and we suppose the hen was to represent the church. The Arminian world applies it to the alien or unregenerate sinner.

It seems to us the language is very plain. The Saviour was talking to Jerusalem, who had killed and stoned the prophets. As a result, her children were scattered and not gathered together. This Jerusalem was God's chosen nation, and they disobeyed the law, and her children were not gathered together.

Verses 38 and 39 read, "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." With national Israel, Jerusalem, this was literally fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem-"Behold, your house is left unto you desolate." National Israel was typical of spiritual Israel; in this language we have a type of the church, so that it may now be rightly applied to the church of Christ, and to her only, when she kills or stones one of the Lord's servants whom He sends unto her. Sometimes they do stone the Lord's ministers-not with literal stones as they formerly did, but they do stone them in different ways, by lightly esteeming them as God's servants and in not caring for them, and in not helping them to bear their burdens. And when a church thus stones one of the Lord's servants they will suffer for the same. Not only so, but their children are not gathered together as they would otherwise be, for the Saviour says "ye would not." Their house is finally left unto them desolate. They suffer for their wrong doing. Sometimes an humble servant of God is stoned, because a church thinks he is not a good enough preacher for them, he is not as able in expounding the doctrine as they want-which appears that they think they are too good for such an insignificant man to preach for them. Sooner or later their house is left unto them desolate. The Lord will not allow them to go unpunished. He will take away the manifestation of His presence, and they shall not see Him henceforth, till they say, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. When they are ready to say. and do say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord," then may they see once more a sweet manifestation of His work and presence.

We offer the above remarks for the consideration of all our readers, and pray the Lord to enable us all to walk in the right way. C. H. C.

ANOTHER ONE GONE HOME

---August 13, 1907

Rev. A. M. Kirkland, of Fulton, Ky., a Hardshell Baptist preacher, has united with the Missionary Baptists, and will continue his ministry with us. He is a brother of Rev. R. S. Kirkland, who some months ago took the same step. -Fleetwood Ball, in Baptist and Reflector, Aug. 1, 1907.

The above is an item of good news to our brethren. It would be so much better for our cause if all who are in line with the Missionaries on the commission and repentance questions, as well as some other points, would go on to the Missionaries where they belong. It does

look to us like the good brethren who are following and clinging to these men, but do not believe what they advocate, ought to be able to see now where they are being led to. If you think the Primitive Baptist Church is the church of Christ and if you do not believe as do the Missionaries on the commission and repentance questions, we admonish you to cease following these brethren and come back to the old church and walk in the "good old way," and you will find rest to your souls, and we may thereby have peace.

Just here we want to give our readers the benefit of a statement from Brother P. A. Walker which we have on file in our possession. The statement is as follows:

This is to certify that on the second Sunday in October, 1905, Elder J. V Kirkland said, in conversation with me, "The time has come when we do not know where the church is." Faxon, Ky.

Signed

P. A. WALFZER.

If he cannot tell where the church is he is as likely to conclude that it is in one place as another. That expression doesn't sound much like an Old Baptist to us. Elder J. V has lately been among the Burnham people in Indiana, and wants his national meeting held at a time next year that the Burnham people can attend. Some of the Burnham people are now doing some missionary work in connection with the anti-board part of the Missionary Baptists. "Straws show which way the wind blows." The leaders of the Lord's people cause them to err. May the Lord help us to forsake men and follow Christ.

C. H. C

WITH OR WITHOUT MEANS

---August 20, 1907

I want someone to answer the following questions:

Was the preaching of the gospel the means of Paul's conversion? Was it the means of Cornelius' conversion, and Zacchaeus, and the thief on the cross, and the lunatic in the tombs?

If the preaching of the gospel is the means of salvation, and the above were saved without hearing the gospel preached-what I want to know is, are some saved by means and some without means? Has God two ways of saving the people-one by the preaching of the gospel and others without it? Someone please inform me.

D. C. WACASER.

Bangor, Ala.

OUR ANSWER

We do not know that Brother Wacaser expects a reply from us to his questions, but we offer a few remarks.

The preaching of the gospel was not the means of the regeneration of Paul, Cornelius, nor any other person. Paul was present when Stephen was stoned, and gave his consent to the wicked performance, for he held the clothes of those who stoned Stephen; but the preaching had no effect on him. John tells why Stephen's preaching had no effect on Paul at that time. Paul was yet in an unregenerate state, he was of the world, only a worldly character. "We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us." -**John 4:6**. Stephen was of God in his preaching, and that character who is not of God does not hear such preaching. They may, and do, hear the vocal sound of the preacher's voice, but they do not hear understandingly, or to profit, while they are not of God. In order to hear understandingly they must first be of God. If they must be of God first, then the preaching is too late to be a means of regeneration or to make them of God.

The case of the infant cannot be reached by means of the gospel. The infant cannot understand the gospel, and the adult is saved the same way the infant is-both are saved one way. The Saviour says, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. -**(0:15) (Mark 10:15)**. The adult receives the kingdom of God the same way the little child does, or he does not receive it at all. The infant does not receive the kingdom of God, or eternal life, through the means of gospel preaching. As both infant and adult are saved the same way, it follows, therefore, that the adult does not receive the kingdom through the means of gospel preaching either.

God does not have two ways of giving life to the dead. "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom He will." -**(John 5:21)**. The Son quickens the dead sinner into divine life, raises him up out of a state of death in sin into a state of life in Christ, the very same way and by the very same divine power that the Father raises the dead. Both are done the same way, and that is one way only. "No man can come to the Father but by me," says Jesus, who had just affirmed that "I am the way, the truth, and the life." If He is the way, and no man cometh unto the Father but by Him, then there is only one way of eternal salvation. Sinners receive eternal life, are regenerated, just one way. The Lord speaks to them, as He did to Saul of Tarsus when he was on his journey from Jerusalem to Damascus, and when He speaks to the dead sinner He imparts life. He regenerates the sinner. "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life," says the Redeemer.

Life is imparted by a direct touch of life; it is not imparted through a means or medium. Hence, sinners are regenerated, born of God, or born from above, or quickened into divine life, by the Spirit of God coming into direct touch with their spirits. When they have thus been made "new creatures" in Christ they are capacitated to hear and understand the gospel, and they never are until then. We are sure that the reason why many of the Lord's children in this country of ours do not believe the gospel, or do not believe the truth, the doctrine of God our Saviour, is because of false teaching. They are blinded and led astray by false and judaizing teachers, men who are teaching for doctrine the commandments of men. There are so many, who manifest that they are willing to teach most anything, if the money flows, freely their way. They "corrupt" the word of God, or handle the word of God deceitfully for the money there is in it-making merchandise of the people, so that many of the Lord's dear children are blinded by them and are spending their money for that which is not bread and their labor for that which satisfieth not. The gospel is for the benefit of the Lord's children, for their comfort, encouragement and instruction. It cannot benefit one who does not receive it, and the natural man does not receive it. So, if it benefits any, it is the Lord's children, those who have been born of God.

May the Lord help us all to contend earnestly for the doctrine of God our Saviour. We should be aggressive, but not progressive. The same old faith and practice of the apostles is good enough. Let us not try to progress and thereby depart from that same old teaching and practice, and thereby be on the retrograde. But let us, by the Lord's help, be aggressive. Let us be ready to contend for the good old way. Let us remember to always face the enemy. The Lord has not given us a covering to protect our back from the enemy of truth. So let us be careful. May the Lord help and sustain us all, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

Jonah 3:10

---August 20,1907

Brother W. R. Moore, of Luxomni, Ga., and Brother J. D. Musick, of Walnut Grove, Ala., have requested our views of **((0) (Jonah 3:10)**, which reads as follows: "And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way, and God repented of the evil, that He had said that He would do unto them; and He did it not."

We would say, first, that the Scriptures do not contradict themselves. If we place a construction upon any portion of Scripture which would make that portion contradict another, it is necessarily true that the

construction is wrong. This being true, it follows that any construction placed upon this text that would contradict any plain statement in the Scriptures would necessarily be wrong.

In **(Malachi 3:6)** the Lord says, "For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." Here we are positively told that the Lord changes not. If the Lord ever changes, then this statement of the Lord Himself is not true. But the statement is true, and the Lord does not change. If He did change, then the sons of Jacob would be consumed. The sons of Jacob are all the heirs of promise. "The Lord's portion is His people; Jacob is the lot of His inheritance." -**(Deuteronomy 32:9)**. Jacob was a representative character, hence the heirs of promise are called the sons of Jacob. Not one of them will ever be consumed, because the Lord does not change.

Not only is it true that the Lord does not change, but He is without variableness or shadow of turning. "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." -(James 1:17). The Lord is without even the shadow of a change. He does not vary. Men may, and do, vary, change and turn, but the Lord does neither. He is the same yesterday, today and forever more. The Lord's dealing in the case of the Ninevites was in perfect harmony with His dealings with His people. Nineveh was in wickedness and rebellion, and were not living as God required under the law. Jonah was sent to preach to them, and his preaching was a proclamation of the result of their wicked rebellion and disobedience. Their disobedience would bring destruction and ruin upon them. This was in perfect harmony with the declaration of the Lord Himself, as recorded in **(8:25) (Ezekiel 18:25-30)**, "Yet ye say, the way of the Lord is not equal. Hear now, O house of Israel; is not my way equal? Are not your ways unequal? When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them, for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die. Again, when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive. Because he considereth, and turneth away from all his transgressions that he hath committed, he shall surely live, he shall not die. Yet saith the house of Israel, the way of the Lord is not equal. O house of Israel, are not my ways equal? Are not your ways unequal? Therefore I will judge you, O house of Israel, every one according to his ways, saith the Lord God. Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions so iniquity shall not be your ruin.

The Lord's way is equal, but their ways were not equal. Nineveh had departed from the Lord's commandments, they were His people in rebellion. A continuation in that wickedness and rebellion would bring death. "For his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." But Nineveh repented in sackcloth and ashes, and "when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness," "and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive," "he shall not die." So Nineveh turned from her wickedness, and the Lord did not inflict the punishment of death or destruction of the city, but spared them, which was according to His promise.

The Lord's people turn away from the right way, and thereby their peace and happiness, in this age, is destroyed. When we all engage in doing what the Lord requires and what He has commanded us as His children to do, we have peace and fellowship abounding. Doing what the Lord requires does not bring strife and confusion among the Lord's people; that is always brought about by something the Lord has not commanded. Our peace is destroyed by doing things the Lord does not command. Let us all try to engage in doing what He requires and nothing more. Let us thereby "strive to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." "Let brotherly love continue." May the Lord help us to be faithful and true to His service, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

KNOW AS WE ARE KNOWN

---August 20, 1907

Brother James H. Mitchell, of Sturgis, Miss., asks if we think we will know each other in heaven. There is a great difference of opinion on this question, and we think much of what is said about it is only speculation. The apostle says "we now see through a glass darkly," or dimly. We only know in part now. Then may we not be safe in saying that no living man on earth today knows just how it will be in heaven, or how we shall know each other there? We are sure that when all the Lord's children reach heaven they will know each other as the redeemed of the Lord. Fleshly ties and affections will be done away. "Henceforth know we no man after the flesh." "I shall know, even as also I am known." We should know no man after the flesh here in the service of God. But we know only in part. After awhile perfect knowledge will be ours, and we will all know each other as the redeemed. We will know Jesus as our elder Brother and Redeemer, and we will know God as our heavenly Father. This will be enough, with heaven so arranged and fixed as to give all the redeemed perfect and eternal happiness and bliss. It will be enough,

and that should satisfy us. It is a place of perfection, and all our imperfections will be left behind and done away. Surely the Lord's mercy is great to prepare such a home for us and then prepare us for such a home. Sometimes we feel a longing desire to pass over the river into that blessed home. Oh, is it for us?

C. H. C.

Isaiah 14:12

---August 27, 1907

Elder W. J. Leonard, of Laurel, Miss., requests our views of **((2) (Isaiah 14:12))**. It reads as follows: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations." The language has direct reference to the falling of Babylon and to the King of Babylon. Verse 4 says, "That thou shalt take up this proverb against the King of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased." The word Lucifer has no reference to Satan, but to Venus, the morning star. Satan is never in Scripture called Lucifer, though it is said that he transforms himself into an angel of light. It refers to a Babylonish King, who shone in all the splendor and glory of false worship, and who was exalted greatly in his heaven, a heaven of outward splendor and happiness and authority, then possessed by him. He weakened the nations "by subduing them, taking cities and towns, plundering the inhabitants of their substance, carrying them captive, or obligating them to a yearly tribute, by which means he weakened them, and kept them under." This, although referring to Babylon of old, and to King Belshazzar, in all probability typifies Romish anti-Christ, for as they weakened the nations, so Romish anti-Christ got the power over many nations of the earth, reigned over the kings, and by various methods and measures drained them of their wealth and riches, and thereby greatly enfeebled them. The one who weakened, or killed, the people was cast down to the earth. Rome has slain thousands of the Lord's children because they would not deny their Redeemer. But Babylon will finally be destroyed, overthrown, cast down.

These thoughts are offered for the consideration of our readers. C. H. C.

REPLY TO M. C. COLE

---September 3, 1907

On another page of this paper will be found a letter from M. C. Cole. He sent a letter containing some questions to the editor of the Sword

and Shield, a Missionary Baptist paper, and it seems that the editor of that paper made no reply to Brother Cole's questions, so he now sends the letter to us with the request that we comment on the same. It seems to us that Brother Cole has already given a Scriptural and logical answer to his own questions, and it is our judgment that he will be disappointed if he expects his positions to be overthrown. We will answer his questions by number as follows:

1. Yes, the sinner in his unregenerate state is totally dead to spiritual things.
2. The gospel was given for the spiritual benefit or comfort of the regenerate, those who are born of God.
3. The commission, as recorded in Matthew and Mark, was given directly to the apostles. The commission was not given to the church.
4. The lost sinner, or the unregenerate sinner, cannot partake of spiritual food. The unregenerate sinner is not in possession of spiritual life. In order that one partake of natural food, he must first be in possession of natural life.

Just so, in order that one partake of spiritual food, he must first be in possession of spiritual life. The gospel food is for the regenerate character, that one who has the spiritual life.

5. There is no difference between spiritual quickening and the giving of spiritual or eternal life. To quicken is to give life, to make alive from the dead.
6. The receiving of eternal life does not depend upon the written or preached word. Sinners are regenerated in all ages the very same way and by the very same power. "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." So says the Saviour. Hence the adult is saved the same way the infant is saved-both are saved the same way. The infant is not saved through the instrumentality of the written or preached word, and neither is the adult.

7. Christ did that which He came into the world to do. The angel said He should save His people from their sins. He came to make reconciliation for their sins, to redeem them from under the curse of the law, and He finished the work. "By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." -(**Hebrews 9:12**). "When He had by Himself purged our sins, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." -(**Hebrews 1:3**). He did not leave this work to another. God does not leave His work to another. If He did not do the work He came to do, and left it for another, as no other is able to do the work, He not only did

not fill His mission, but no one of Adam's race could ever be saved in heaven.

8. The gospel was not given that life might be imparted through the preached word. "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom He will." -**(John 5:21)**. "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth." -**(John 5:28-29)**. The dead will not be raised from the graves through the preached word or proclamation of the gospel; and "as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will." The Son quickens the dead sinner into life the very same way that the dead will be raised from the graves; so it is not done by the preaching of the gospel. The word gospel means good news, and is good news to no others only those who have been quickened into life; hence is for the child of God, and is not for the unregenerate. To find a statement of the object of the gifts in the ministry see **(Ephesians 4:11-12,13)**. They are given for the perfecting of the saints-not to make saints.
9. The natural child, after birth, is a child of its parents by birth.
10. No, Christ did not die that all the human race might be saved. If He had, then all the race would be saved. He died for the Lord's elect. "For the transgression of my people was He stricken." - **((3:8) (Isaiah 53:8)**.

As we understand it, Brother Cole is right on these points. This doctrine does more than give you a chance, Brother Cole, for this plan of salvation is sure. As the natural man does not receive such teaching as this, it follows that you are a child of God. Therefore this makes salvation sure for you. If we had to render obedience in order to be saved in heaven, none of us would ever enter the glory world. Sinners are saved in heaven by grace only. We are sure you are not at home among the Missionary Baptists, and we would admonish you, as one that loves all those who believe and love the doctrine of salvation by grace, to come to the Primitive Baptists, who love and teach this doctrine, and ask for a home with them. We believe it would be a sweet home for you. May the Lord bless and direct you, is our humble prayer. If we can be of any service or help to you, feel perfectly free to write to us.

C. H. C.

IN EAST AND MIDDLE TENNESSEE

---September 10, 1907

We left home on Thursday, August 15, to fill the appointments as published for us. We arrived at Cedar Springs Church, in Marion

county, Term., near Condra Station (Cedar Springs post office), the place of meeting of the Sequatchie Valley Association, at about noon on Friday. At this meeting we met Elders R. O. Raulston, M. A. Hackworth, A. G. Sharp and H. L. Golston, who are members of this association; and Elders J. G. Woodfin and H. F. Agee, of the Elk River; D. H. Cordell and C. H. Dykes, of Collins River. This was a pleasant meeting, and peace and harmony prevailed throughout. Brother B. F. Condra, who is a member of our home church, was with us at this association and at South Pittsburg on Monday night following. His former home was at Cedar Springs Church, and he met many of his relatives and old friends. He returned home on Tuesday. After the association closed we filled appointments at South Pittsburg on Monday and Monday night, Sweetens Cove on Tuesday and Wednesday, Jasper Wednesday night, at the home of Brother Wilson Condra, near Cedar Springs Church, who is afflicted and not able to go to the church, on Thursday, and then at Dunlap on Thursday night. Elder Raulston was with us at all these places except Sweetens Cove, and is yet with us. We are going with him in his buggy from place to place.

On Friday morning we went to the Collins River Association, at Yellow Springs Church, on the mountain. The following ministers were in attendance: Elders C. H. Dykes, D. H. Cordell, Peter Anderson, and T. B. Lankford, of the Collins River; L. F. Evans, of the Round Lick; H. L. Golston and R. O. Raulston, of the Sequatchie Valley. This was another pleasant meeting. The Collins River is the association our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, was attending when he died two years ago. On Sunday night we tried to preach at a meeting house near the home of a Mr. Moffitt, a brother in the flesh to Brother Venus Moffitt, and then spent the night with Mr. Moffitt. He lives at the old home place of his father, who was an Old Baptist minister, and who is lovingly remembered by many in that country.

On Monday we went to Sulphur Springs Church, near Irving College, where our father died. We saw where the stand was erected, a part of which yet remains there, and saw about where he stood just before he fell. We saw the spot where the cot stood upon which he lay when he breathed his last. It was in the public road and under a large poplar tree which stood near. We saw the house where his body lay on Sunday night, and went into the room. No one who has never had the experience can imagine our feelings as we viewed these things for the first time since our dear father passed away. It seemed to us that we could almost feel his presence and hear his voice proclaiming the sweet and glorious truth that "as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the

heavenly," as we stood there beholding the spot where he fell in the service. Oh, that God would enable us to be faithful as he was. And we do pray that heaven's richest blessings may be bountifully bestowed upon the dear brethren and friends who were so kind and attentive to our dear father and to us.

From Sulphur Springs Church we went to Bildad Church, in the bounds of the Round Lick Association, and were there on Wednesday and Wednesday night. At this church we met Elders P. G. Byers and L. P. Potter. Brother Potter came with us to Mt. View Church today-Thursday, Aug. 29, where we had meeting today and tonight. It is now 11:25 p. m. We are at the home of Brother T. R. Vaughan. The brethren are kind and good to us, and we have been kindly received by them at every place we have gone. We are enjoying the company of Brother Raulston, who expects to be with us until the close of the Round Lick Association next Monday, which will be before this paper is printed or mailed. We desire an interest in the prayers of all the brethren, that the Lord may keep us humble and at the feet of our brethren, who are all so good and kind to us.

C. H. C.

REMARKS TO V. P. FERGUSON

---September 10, 1907

We do not know that we fully grasp the meaning of your question. If you mean by "preparing questions and answers," the preparation of Sunday school literature, or such as is used in Sunday schools, will say that our chief objection is to the present avowed object of the Sunday school-that of teaching people to make children of God of them. Another objection is that the Sunday school is of recent origin, and Christ gave all that is necessary in connection with His church and its organization. We think our brethren in the ministry are always ready to answer any question put to them by any enquirer after truth. We would suggest, dear brother, that you take the Bible as the man of your counsel, and "pin your faith to no man's coat sleeve." The Bible is a safe guide, and our opinions are worthless unless they are in harmony with it. May the Lord bless you, and give you the sweet influence of His Holy Spirit, and bless THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST to your comfort and instruction, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

MISSIONS A FAILURE

---November 5, 1907

A remarkable case of apostasy has occurred in the missionary field of the United Brethren. A missionary in Africa took a native baby and reared it, and when he came to this country gave the boy a high school and medical-college education; then the young man was sent back to his own tribe to do missionary work. He married in this country, and took his wife from Dayton, O., with him to his former home. Their four children are now in school in this country, but the man has renounced Christianity, has turned to heathenism, and now, at the age of nearly fifty years, has become chief of his tribe, a devil worshiper, contracted plural marriages, and taken on the habits of a heathen. What is the matter? It seems to us that the mistake was in undertaking to educate a human soul into Christianity. The human appliances were all right. They did the best they could. They kept the man for half a century; but they could not get the heathen out of him, nor fortify him against heathenism when brought into direct contact with it. There is but one way to make Christians. God alone can create the soul anew and make it a new creature in Christ Jesus. God alone can take the heathenism out of the human soul. Let us never forget that man must be born again.-The Methodist (Fulton, Ky)., Oct. 23, 1907.

The above clipping from The Methodist is only another evidence of the truthfulness of the claim made by the Primitive Baptists that the "human appliances" are a failure and do not result in the salvation of sinners. Our position all along has been that "God alone can create the soul anew and make it a new creature in Christ Jesus;" that "God alone can take the heathenism out of the human soul." The editor of The Methodist has admitted our claim on this, and it is next in order to renounce all the ponderous machinery and human appliances of the modern religious world, invented by men in the name of Christianity to make merchandise of the people. The whole missionary scheme to evangelize and Christianize the world is the invention of Rome, and those who are engaging in it are following the footsteps of Rome. We are sure many are doing so unwittingly, and we believe many are honest, but deceived. Such occurrences as the above should have a tendency to open the eyes of some of the Lord's children who are deceived, and on that account fostering and aiding those enterprises. C. H. C.

Genesis 6:1-4

---**November 12, 1907**

Brother H. F. Holley, of Purvis, Miss., has requested our views of **(Genesis 6:1-4)**, which reads as follows: "And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men

that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown."

We think the "daughters of men" represent the institutions or inventions of men. The sons of God, or God's children, married or united with the inventions of men; they engaged in such worship as was invented by men. Long before this Cain made an offering unto the Lord of the fruit of the ground. The offering he made was produced by his own labor, and was the fruit of the ground, from "beneath" and not from "above." Abel "brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof." His offering was of the right kind, it representing the offering which Christ should make, in which there was shedding of blood. But the "sons" of God did not continue to make such offerings as Abel made-they took them wives of the daughters of men. -They united with and joined in the offerings and services that were invented by men. Like many of God's children do now, they were married to or united with and joined in service that God did not accept.

The expression, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man," has no reference whatever to the work of regeneration. There is no reference to regeneration in the whole connection. "Yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." Just one hundred and twenty years from that time the flood came and man was destroyed from off the face of the earth. That the destruction of man is what is referred to is clearly seen by reading the entire chapter. Verse 7 says, "I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth." This was done in just one hundred and twenty years- "yet his 2 days shall be an hundred and twenty years." If the expression, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man," has reference to the work of the Spirit in regeneration, then it would follow that the work of regeneration ceased at the expiration of one hundred and twenty years from that time. But this Was not under consideration, as we have seen.

These are a few of the thoughts we have had in connection with the passage referred to. We have not time or space to go into a more lengthy discussion of the same, but submit these to our readers, trusting they may be blessed of the Lord to the good of some of the Lord's children. C. H. C.

GREENFIELD-PHILESIC ASSOCIATION

---November 19, 1907

Our association, the Greenfield-Philesic, was held with the church at Greenfield, Tenn., on Friday, Saturday and third Sunday in October. There were thirteen ministers in attendance, besides those who were members in this association. Besides the preaching at the stand every day, there was preaching at different places every night. The preaching was all a unit, no one seemed to have a hobby to ride, and there was much rejoicing among the saints. Love and fellowship prevailed throughout the entire meeting.

Brother Latnay Miller, son of Brother L. V Miller, who has lately moved to Martin from Illinois, offered himself for membership on Saturday night after preaching by Elder C. F. Stuckey, of Norris City, Ill., at a schoolhouse about four miles west of Greenfield. He was heartily received into the fellowship of the brethren, and was baptized by the writer on the fourth Sunday in October, our regular meeting here in Martin.

Our association was a very pleasant meeting, and will be long remembered. We feel to thank the Lord for His wonderful mercies, and to press on a few more fleeting months in His delightful service. May His grace sustain us all, and may He give us all the Christian courage and fortitude to press forward all the time in praise and honor to His name, doing what little He requires of us as His children. We often feel discouraged and cast down; but we often feel to take courage from His blessed and enduring and sure promises, and are willing to go on enduring the trials of life. May the Lord help us all so to do, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

QUESTIONS OF ORDER

---November 19, 1907

Dear Editor of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST-Will you for the good of Zion answer the following queries:

No. 1. If a man is an admitted adulterer and comes to the church claiming that God for Christ's sake has forgiven his sins, and the church receives him, would it be gospel order for him to live as he was living before?

No. 2. If a brother involves himself in debt and lets his notes and accounts go unpaid until his creditors lose confidence and offer his notes or accounts for less than one-fifth face value- is it gospel order for the brother to put money into the hands of another and buy in his notes or accounts for less than 20 cents on the dollar?

No. 3. Is it gospel order for one or two churches of an association to charge a sister church with disorder in practice, when they are from twenty to forty miles away and have not visited or investigated her?
M. L. BARRETT. Bonham, Tex.

OUR ANSWER

In reply to No. 1, will say we do not consider it gospel order for a church to retain a brother or sister in her communion who continues to live in adultery. The Scriptures are very clear on this, it seems to us. See (I Corinthians 5).

In answer to No. 2 will say that we certainly consider it, not only contrary to gospel order, but contrary to common honesty for a man to refuse to pay his just debts if he can pay them. A man may be unavoidably involved in debt so that he cannot pay. Or he may be involved so that he cannot pay at a certain time; yet if he endeavors to pay, and if he does pay when he can, we do not think he is to be condemned. Of course he should be careful about going in debt. If one does become involved so that he is unable to pay what he owes, dollar for dollar, and can honorably procure a compromise from his creditors, which is sometimes done, we do not think he should be condemned. We do think, however, that he is doing wrong to pay only a part of the amount he owes, if he could pay all. It has been a distinguishing mark of the Old Baptists that they pay their debts, and we think they should tenaciously live up to that reputation.

Replying to No. 3, will say that in our judgment no one certain rule could apply in all cases. Circumstances could be such that what would be right in one instance would be wrong in another. It is not always absolutely necessary to visit a church in a certain locality to know that the church in that locality is in disorder. If a church is in disorder, and a sister church is aware of it, we do not see that they are necessarily compelled to visit the disorderly church in order to charge them with the disorder. It is right to endeavor to reclaim those who enter into disorderly practice, but we do not think it is always necessary to visit them before they can be charged with the disorder. We know nothing about what gave rise to the above queries, but have tried to give a brief answer to them, according to our humble judgment, as We understand the questions. Let us all try to do right, and do as we would be done by.

C. H. C.

Romans 10:13-15

---November 19, 1907

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother in Christ-Will you please explain **(Romans 10:13-15)**? I ask for information, and I feel that, with the

help of God, you could give us some light on the subject. Yours in much love,

W. B. SCREWS. Aline, Ga.

OUR ANSWER

We are always willing to give what views we may have on any passage of Scripture. If we are not right we want to be. The passage Elder Screws asks our views on is one much relied on by the whole Arminian world to prove that no one can enter heaven without first believing on Christ, or believing the gospel, and that therefore the gospel should be preached for this object-hence, that no one can be saved in heaven where the gospel is not preached. The passage reads: "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!" Verses 16, 17 and 18 read, "But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by word of God. But I say, Have they not heard? Yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world."

The apostle starts out in this chapter by saying, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." This shows us clearly that Israel, or the Lord's people, were under consideration, and not unregenerate or alien sinners. Many of God's people now, the Israel of God, are ignorant of God's righteousness, and are going about to establish their own righteousness. They seem to expect to reach heaven on their own obedience or right doing. They are not submitting themselves to the righteousness of God. They are ignorant of the way of salvation. They have zeal, but not according to knowledge. The zeal is all right, but it is expended in the wrong way. The zeal is of God, but false teachers lead them astray, and they are zealous in the inventions of men, endeavoring to establish their own righteousness, instead of being zealous in what God commands and requires. They have been taught the doctrines and commandments of men by false teachers, hence they are ignorant of God's righteousness. Although this is true, yet they have an experimental

knowledge of the Lord in the pardon and forgiveness of their sins, for the apostle says in verse 8. "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach." The same apostle says, "We preach Christ crucified." The same Christ that is preached by the true minister dwells in the heart of His regenerated people by the Holy Spirit. This being true, there is an agreement or harmony in the experience of the child of God and the gospel, good news, glad tidings proclaimed by the minister of Christ. So when the child of God bears this glad tidings, there is a witness within testifying to the truthfulness of what he hears-hence the comfort and encouragement in hearing the good news. It bears witness with what we have experienced. All this shows clearly that the first work is the inward work of grace the Lord performs in the heart, the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit. That is the first thing requisite to calling on the name of the Lord. If this is not the first thing necessary, then one must call on the name of the Lord from the heart while he yet has a bad heart. If the heart is changed, or made good, in order that he be able to call on the name of the Lord from a good heart, and those who have a good heart are in a saved state, or are children of God, then it is too late for him to call on the name of the Lord in order to become a child of God. That those who have a good heart are children of God is very evident from the Saviour's teaching in **(Matthew 5:8)**, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Then if they do not call on the name of the Lord from a bad heart, the heart must be made good first. If the heart is made good before they call on the name of the Lord, they have the promise before they call that they shall see God. Then their calling on the name of the Lord cannot be in order to their seeing God or entering heaven. But if God's children were calling on the name of the Lord instead of missionary boards, men, and measures invented by them, they would be saved from many of the gins, snares, and pitfalls set by men to delude, deceive and seduce the Lord's children and to draw disciples after them.

Certainly, they will not call on Him in whom they have not believed. Inwardly, or experimentally, deep down in the soul of all the Lord's children, there is a cry which goes out to the Lord, having been taught a lesson experimentally which cannot be taught any other way. But outwardly, or doctrinally, or practically, they do not call on the name of the Lord unless they believe the doctrine of God our Saviour. And to believe the doctrine in its fullness it is necessary that they hear it. Then, "how shall they hear without a preacher?" If the Lord had no use for the preachers He would not call and send them out. Surely, the Lord has a use for His ministers. He commands them to teach; to feed, to comfort His sheep. In order that the minister do

this, the subject to be taught or comforted must first be a living subject.

“And how shall they preach, except they be sent?” The preacher usually preaches the power that sent him. If he is always preaching about money, telling about how many souls are going to hell because they lack money to send the gospel to them, or if the burden of his discourses is money, it is evident money is the moving power or authority for his going. If he preaches the power of man, it is evident he is sent by the authority of man. If the power of God and love and mercy of God is the burden of his discourses, it is evidence that God sent him. Yes, the Lord sends His ministers. They are not to be sent by a board, church, society, men or set of men. “Pray the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth laborers into His harvest.” This is the language of the Saviour as recorded in

((0:2) (Luke 10:2). Why pray the Lord of the harvest, if the men are ready and willing, and can't go, because the people will not give?-the Lord has called, the college has qualified, and the board, or society, or association, or church, can't send because the people are too stingy and covetous! May the Lord deliver us from such a theory! Truly, the harvest is plenteous and the laborers are few. There are many laborers, but oh how few are the true and faithful ones. Dear brethren, do you realize how few they are? Then “pray the Lord of the harvest, that He would send laborers into His harvest.” The Lord does the sending-and how shall one preach the truth if the Lord does not send him? “How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things.” His walk must be in harmony with his preaching. If he preaches the truth, but lives a life not harmonious with his preaching, then his preaching will have no good influence. Did you ever hear one preach in whom you had no confidence because his walk was not right? Did you enjoy the preaching? His preaching was not glad tidings to you. His walk must be upright if his preaching benefits those who know him. Oh, how beautiful should his walk be! How careful the minister of the gospel should be of his walk. If his walk is such as becometh sound doctrine, and the doctrine he preaches is sound, then the hearts of the saints are comforted, edified and built up, and the Lord's little children are united together in love and fellowship, and there are no divisions. Oh, that the Lord would send forth true and faithful and humble laborers into His harvest!

Let us strive, dear brethren, to live humble and devoted to the cause of our Master and devoted to one another, and help one another and

not try to destroy; let us endeavor to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. The Lord will provide. Let us go in obedience to Him, not trusting in men, but in the Lord alone.

C. H. C.

QUESTIONS FROM J. H. KUYKENDALL

---November 26, 1907

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Please answer the following questions in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST:

Is salvation conditional or unconditional?

If unconditional, why did Christ come to call sinners to repentance?

((32) (Luke 5:32)).

If unconditional, can a Gentile be saved?

If unconditional, what will become of the infant that dies and is not one of the elect?

Hillsboro, Texas, R. 8.

J. H. KUYKENDALL.

OUR ANSWER

Eternal salvation is unconditional on the part of the sinner. No one can act in order to life; so if any ever received eternal life, it could not have depended on a condition performed by them. If it is conditional on their part, and no one can act without life, or in order to life, then no one could ever be saved.

If salvation had been conditional there would have been no need of Christ coming to call sinners to repentance. If this repentance is a condition in order to the receiving of eternal life, the life depending on their repenting, they could have performed the condition as easily without Christ coming as with it. So, if this salvation is conditional, the coming of Christ is in vain, and He accomplished nothing by His coming. The text referred to says Christ "came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." It does not say He came to call on them to repent, but to call them to repentance. He calls them to repentance. When He calls the sinner, therefore, He calls him to repentance-the sinner thus called repents. The call precedes the repentance. If God calls the sinner, He calls him out of nature's night into the marvelous light and liberty of the kingdom of His Son. This is done in the call then repentance follows the call. Repentance, then, follows after life has been given, and is not in order to the receiving of life.

Yes, eternal salvation is unconditional, and Gentiles can be saved.

They could not be saved if their salvation depended on conditions to be performed by them.

Eternal salvation is unconditional, but you cannot, nor can any other man, ever prove that an infant dies that is not one of the elect. Your question on this point is based on a mere supposition that an infant dies not being embraced in God's election. And that's the foundation for the whole Arminian fabric-it is based on the sandy foundation of human supposition and the inventions of designing men to make merchandise of the people.

Now suppose we ask a few questions:

Is eternal salvation conditional or is it unconditional, on the part of the one saved?

If it is conditional, what are the conditions?

Does it depend upon obeying the gospel?

If one obeys either law or gospel does he not act?

Can one act without working?

If one cannot act without working, and cannot obey without acting, and his salvation depends upon his obedience, is not salvation by works?

Now will you compare and reconcile your position with that of Paul in **(Ephesians 2:8-10)**, "For by grace are ye saved through faith: and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them;" **(Romans 9:16)**, "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy;" **(II Timothy 1:9)**, "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began;" (Titus 3:5,6), "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."

If eternal salvation is conditional, does it not follow that one must act in order to life?

Can the dead act in order to life?

If the dead cannot act in order to life, and the salvation of the dead sinner depends upon his act, does not his salvation depend upon an impossibility?

If the salvation of the sinner depends upon an impossibility, can he ever be saved? If so, how?

If the sinner is not so dead as Old Baptists say he is, then how dead is he? Is he as dead as Paul says he is? If he is as dead as Paul says

he is, is he not as dead as Old Baptists say he is? How many degrees are there in death?

If eternal salvation is conditional, and depends upon obedience to the gospel, how can anyone be saved who never bears the gospel preached?

How can the heathen be damned for rejecting Christ or the gospel, when he never heard the gospel, therefore had no opportunity of rejecting it?

If the heathen is damned because he does not believe the gospel, when he has never heard it, and you have the means to send the gospel to him (therefore, you have the means of his salvation), yet you do not send it to him, are you not to blame for his damnation? Is God just if He damns the heathen and allows you to enter heaven, when the blame for the damnation of the heathen rests on you?

Would not the wrong party be sent to hell?

Can the infant obey the gospel?

If the infant cannot obey the gospel, and salvation depends upon obedience thereto, can the infant be saved?

If eternal salvation depends upon obedience to the gospel, how could any be saved before the gospel dispensation?

Many more questions along the same line might be asked, but we will just give a little argument, which no Arminian theologian can ever answer. We give it in the form of syllogisms, taking their own position as the second premise in the first syllogism, thereby placing them in a dilemma from which they can never escape.

FIRST SYLLOGISM

1st. Whatever is essential as a condition of salvation is absolute, universal and without exception.

2nd. Obedience to the gospel is a condition of salvation.

3rd. Therefore, obedience to the gospel as a condition of salvation is absolute, universal and without exception.

SECOND SYLLOGISM

1st. Obedience to the gospel as a condition of salvation is absolute, universal and without exception.

2nd. Infants cannot obey the gospel.

3rd. Therefore, the damnation of the infant is absolute, universal and without exception.

This is the inevitable result of every Arminian theory under the sun.

Try it all you please and you can never escape the conclusion. But the second premise is wrong-salvation does not depend on obedience to the gospel, nor on conditions to be performed by the sinner.

May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of our readers, and to the good of all into whose hands this may come; and may He

graciously grant an understanding that His children may see and understand the truth.

C. H. C.

Galatians 5:4

---**November 26, 1907**

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Please give me your views on **(Galatians 5:4)**. In what sense have they fallen from grace? May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon you, is my humble prayer. Your little brother in hope of eternal life,
MURRY FLY.

Paris, Texas.

OUR ANSWER

The text reads, "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Paul was writing to the Galatian brethren, and he recognized them as brethren. This fact is sufficient to show conclusively that they had not "fallen from grace" in the sense that apostasy is taught by the world-they had not lost their eternal life or spiritual relationship with God. These brethren had been deluded by false teachers, and were claiming justification by the law. They did not claim this before they were deluded, but since they had been deluded this was their claim. Now, if you are justified by the deeds of the law "Christ is become of no effect unto you." What Christ has done amounts to nothing if you may be justified by the deeds of the law. In claiming justification by the law you set aside all the work of Christ in your salvation. You once rejoiced in salvation by grace, you claimed salvation through the work of Christ alone. But you have fallen from that-you now claim justification by the deeds of the law. Notice verses 1 to 3 of chapter 3. The third verse says, "Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" In verse 1 of chapter 5 he says, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Many of God's children are entangled with the yoke of bondage and are, seemingly, expecting justification by the deeds of the law instead of resting from law worship and law service in gospel worship and service. Some who once did rest in gospel service have departed from it- they have fallen from grace-and are trusting in their own deeds in obedience to law for justification. Let us "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

C. H. C.

VALID BAPTISM

---November 26, 1907

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Friend-Please answer the following questions through your paper: Suppose I join the church, and the preacher is sincere at the time of my baptism, and afterwards he turns out a public drunkard and swearer-should I fear I had not been baptized by a legal administrator? When I see this I am persuaded to say (or almost) that such was deceived in the beginning, hence all would be false. This is my idea about it. Yours truly,

J. R. FREEMAN

Eufaula, Ala.

OUR ANSWER

We do not think Brother Freeman's conclusion is correct every time. Such a conclusion would be equivalent to saying a minister could not be so overcome by the temptations of Satan as to give way to them through the weakness of the flesh. A child of God-a true minister of the gospel-may yield to temptation and go far from the path of rectitude and right, so far that there may be but little outward evidence that he is a child of God. Indeed, we do not know how far wrong the Lord may sometimes suffer one of His children to wander away in sin and wickedness. We think that if one is called of God (and the best evidence we have that a man is called to preach is that he does preach) and is set apart by the church to administer the ordinances, so long as he is in order, baptism administered by him to a proper subject in water is gospel baptism. We do not think that what the minister may do after the baptism is administered could in any way affect the validity of the baptism. If it could, then it is very doubtful if there is one living today who has valid baptism; for if the wrong doing of the minister would invalidate the baptism administered before the wrong was committed, the wrong would also invalidate all the other official acts which he may have performed. This would result in no one having gospel baptism or valid ordination. If an officer does a wrong for which he is impeached and deposed from office, that does not affect the acts performed by him while in office before; they are all just as valid as though he had not done the wrong. These things are worthy of careful thought.

C. H. C.

PRIMITIVE

---December 3, 1907

A few days ago a copy of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, published at Martin, Tenn., fell into our hands. While it had a great deal to say about experimental religion, there was an air of self-appropriation

about it that was very noticeable to us. But it is more particularly the "Primitive" that we wish to say some things about.

The word primitive means "original," and of course they claim to be the original, or first Baptists. But is their claim valid? or can it be sustained? There is no doubt but what the church which Jesus Christ instituted was a Baptist church, but was it identical with the faith and practice of the so-called Primitive church of today? We are willing to admit that their faith in part is in accordance with Scriptural teaching, yet in practice they are in many things far from it. If the first Baptist churches had held in full to the same faith and practice as held to by them today, there would long since ceased to have been any Baptist churches in the world.

Their systems have the seeds of death in them, and they would long since have perished, had it not been for the Missionaries. As much as they decry us their own existence depends upon the Missionaries. They have appropriated to themselves the wrong name. Their real name is Anti-Missionary. To prove that they are not the original Baptists, they deny the commission of our Saviour, when He said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." It is true some of them claim that the commission was fulfilled by the apostles, and is no longer in force upon the churches. The promise of the Saviour to be with them "unto the end of the world," proves this to be erroneous.

The commission was given unto the churches, and the church will exist unto the end of time, and hence "to preach the gospel to every creature" is a part of her mission in the world. Again, our Saviour says, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you into the world."

Christ's mission into the world was to preach His own everlasting gospel, and He says this is the church's mission also.

No people who deny the commission can be Primitive Baptists, and it is wrong for us to call them that. It always makes us feel sad to hear our people call them by that name, for we virtually thereby admit that we are not Scriptural Baptists. James says faith without works is dead, being alone, and this is verified in them-Mississippi Baptist (Newton, Miss.), July 3, 1907.

The above clipping from the Mississippi Baptist, a Missionary Baptist paper published at Newton, Miss., was sent to us by one of our brethren.

Of course there "was an air of self-appropriation about it." Of course it is an "air of self-appropriation" for one to tell what the Lord has

done for him. David says, "Come and hear, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what He hath done for my soul." -**(6) (Psalms 66:16)**. To such people as the editor of the Mississippi Baptist, to tell what the Lord has done for one's soul is an "air of self-appropriation." It is very noticeable to him to read a paper that declares what the Lord hath done for poor sinners. He is not accustomed to reading such. But if the writers for THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST had been telling of wonderful things they and others were doing for the Lord, it would not have been so noticeable to this editor of the Missionary Baptist persuasion. He is accustomed to reading and writing along that line. When he reads things that are so unusual to him, and which he so seldom sees, of course he notices it.

He says, "of course they claim to be the original, or first, Baptists." Of course we do. But we claim nothing more than what is ours and belongs to us. All well informed people belonging to other orders know we are the original Baptists; and honest well-informed men among the Missionary Baptists have admitted it. You know that the first missionary society among the Baptists was formed in 1792, by Fuller, Carey, and some of their fellow laborers. Those were new societies and new inventions introduced among the Baptists. They were unknown in the apostolic age and for centuries after among the Baptists. You know this to be true, and that your people-the Missionary Baptists-are following after and practicing those new things that were introduced by those men among the Baptists. Hence your people have departed from the original faith and practice of the Baptist Church. You know this is true; hence you must also know you cannot be the original Baptists.

He further says, "they would long since have perished, had it not been for the Missionaries." Yes, it was prophesied before you were born, perhaps, that these despised Old Baptists would soon all be dead. But they would live on if there were no missionaries of the modern sort. They lived until 1792 without any of the modern missionary soul-saving machinery now in use by the Missionary or New School Baptists; and they will continue to live, notwithstanding your deceptive efforts to make people believe you are the original order of Baptists, and your bloodthirsty desire, born of a corrupt heart, for their death. The system of salvation taught by the Primitive Baptists is the only system sufficient to reach the case of poor sinners. They can be saved in heaven no other way than by grace through the all-sufficient work of Christ, and that is the system they teach. Indeed, it is the seed of death to the blasphemous heresies taught by the Roman sprout, who call themselves Missionary

Baptists. But to the heaven-born soul who understands the truth, the system taught by the Primitive Baptists is joy and peace. Your charge that the Primitive Baptists deny the commission of our Saviour is false. We do not deny it. But "He said unto them," the eleven, "Go ye into all the world," etc. He did not say to the whole church "go," but to the eleven. "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you." Jesus came into the world by the authority of the Father, and these were to go by the authority of Christ. But your preachers go by the authority of the boards and other societies. None of the so-called soul-saving work you are engaged in is authorized by the Son of God, and you are not going by His authority. Your society is no more the church of Christ than is Rome. Your modern men-made machinery is borrowed from Rome, and your doctrine is largely borrowed from her, and you are more like the mother of harlots than the chaste bride of Christ. May the Lord have mercy on His poor deluded little children who are deluded by you and entangled with the yoke of bondage put upon them by those who "teach for hire" and "divine for money.

If your people are so sure you are the original Baptists, why doesn't your brother come to time for a discussion we were to have with him on this question in Mississippi? We have been waiting two years for him to set the time, but it seems that he is "clean gone." You, seemingly, want to be called by our name to take away your reproach, but you can't even have the name.

Poor fellows!

C. H. C.

FOOTBALL AND MISSIONS

---December 3, 1907

Saturday 40,000 people paid \$68,000 to see Yale and Harvard play football. And to think that all that money would have kept thirty missionaries in China for a year -Nashville (Tenn.) American, Nov. 26, 1907.

Yes, and the poor Chinese dying and going to hell every day because the missionaries don't go! Just think how many poor Chinamen will go to hell because these "Christian" people spent this money to see a football game, instead of using it to send the gospel to them! And these same "Christian" people tell us, too, that the heathen are going to hell for the want of the gospel!

In the minutes of the Tennessee Baptist Convention of 1906 we are told that this people contributed for state missions (Tennessee) for the year, \$16,582.63, and that they had 2,986 conversions. Each convert, therefore, cost them \$5.55 12 each. At this rate, the

\$68,000 spent for the football game would have saved 12,241 souls in Tennessee! Is it not horrible that 12,241 people in our own state of Tennessee are to suffer the torments and vengeance of eternal fire because the people who profess to be engaged in the soul-saving business spent this money to satisfy their own fleshly desires and pleasure? Does it not look like the wrong party is sent to hell? Lord, deliver us from such blasphemous and damnable heresy. C. H. C.

SOME DIE IN DISOBEDIENCE

---December 10, 1907

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: `Dear Brother in the Lord-Will you kindly give me, through the columns of your paper, I- your views on **(Romans 10:17)**?

Will the Lord suffer one of His children, one of the elect, to wander off into sin and die in that condition? Have we such a case on record? I know that the Lord saves His people with an everlasting salvation, that there is no final falling away, or falling from grace, as some term it.

There are some Campbelites here who claim that if a child of God wanders off in sin and dies in that condition, he will be lost. I know that nothing can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ, but the point I want to know is, Will the Lord suffer one of His children to die in disobedience-in Babylon. Your views on the subject will be greatly appreciated. Yours in an humble hope,

CHARLES W. LYENS.

Holt Ave., Macon, Ga.

OUR ANSWER

In our issue of Nov. 19 we gave our views on **(Romans 10:13-15)**, and in the article we quoted also the 17th verse, which reads, "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." The faith referred to in this text is, we think, the historical, or rather, the doctrinal faith produced by hearing the gospel or doctrine of Christ preached or proclaimed in its purity and simplicity. But that does not produce hearing. "The word" that "is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart," produces or gives the hearing. Unless the hearing has been given by the Word of God, the character does not hear the preaching understandingly-hence no faith. We offer the above in connection with our editorial in Nov. 19th issue.

We think some of the Lord's children have died in sin or disobedience. See **(Hebrews 3:7-19)**. Turn to your Bible now and read the entire chapter. Verse 17 says, "But with whom was He grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the

wilderness?" These were God's chosen people-national Israel-and they were a type of God's spiritual Israel. They died in rebellion in the wilderness. We think many of God's children are in other orders-in Babylon-and many of them pass away from this world without ever having united with the true church or visible organized kingdom which Christ set up here in the world. Hence many of the Lord's children die while in Babylon. The command is to come out of Babylon, but we think many of God's people do not obey this command. Many who have an experience of grace do not believe the doctrine advocated by the Primitive Baptists, which is the doctrine of the Bible, the doctrine of God our Saviour, and live and die with membership in the different societies called churches. We think they die in Babylon, but they will be, and are, as happy in heaven as others of the redeemed. Their home or happiness in the glory world does not depend upon them having membership in any church here, but alone upon the finished work of Christ. While this is true, yet there is a sweet rest and comfort enjoyed and realized by those who believe the truth and have membership in the church of Christ, which is not felt or realized by any others. The Saviour instituted this church or kingdom here as a home and resting place for His children while they are in this world, and no one can enjoy the rest in that home unless they have membership there, or unless they are living in the home.

May the Lord help us all to live as becometh His children; and may we show by our life that we appreciate the precious home our Saviour has prepared for us here in His church. Let us be satisfied with it and with what He has put in it.

C. H. C.

CLOSE OF VOLUME TWENTY-TWO

---December 24, 1907

The twenty-second volume of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST closes with this issue. Another year, with all its joys and sorrows, is gone. Oh, how swiftly time is passing! Twenty-two years ago the first issue of this paper was sent out by our beloved and sainted father, who continued as editor until his death, Aug. 27, 1905. Many changes have been wrought since the first issue of this paper was sent out to its readers. Many of those who were then living and enjoying the sweet fellowship and company of the saints on earth have crossed over the river. They are now resting from all their labors. Not only is this true, but even during the past year many changes have taken place. Loved ones, and dear and faithful friends, have fallen. We have seen them cross over the river one by one, and we sometimes

wonder who will be the next to pass over. Many of us have endured sore afflictions, sad bereavements, heartaches, and deep sorrows. We look around us and miss the presence of loved ones and listen in vain for the welcome sound of their voices. No, we cannot hear them now—they are hushed in death. Then we wonder if we may not also soon pass over the river and meet our loved ones who have gone on before and join with them in perfect and everlasting praises to our blessed Saviour. We are sure it will not be long until we, too, shall come to our journey's end and shall step off the stage of action. Through all our sorrows, afflictions and bereavements the Lord has been good to us. His grace has been sufficient in all our sorrows. It has seemed sometimes that the waves of trouble and billows of distress would surely overwhelm us; but the sustaining and preserving grace of the Lord has been sufficient, so that we continue to the present. His ever gracious presence and all-sufficient power and grace has preserved us through the sorrows and trials of another year, and we feel to be under renewed obligations to adore and praise His blessed name. Surely His mercies endure forever. His blessings are innumerable, and are showered upon us all every day and every hour.

We are well aware that we have made many mistakes during the past year. We humbly trust all our readers will throw the mantle of charity over our, many imperfections, and help us overcome them. It is our sincere desire to conduct the paper in such a way that it may be for the comfort and consolation of the Lord's humble poor. We desire that it be a medium of friendly and Christian correspondence, and a welcome visitor every week to the homes of its readers. We know there has been some writing on disputed points and on things that are causing trouble in our beloved Zion. It is almost impossible to keep all these things out of the paper, but we trust the brethren will help us to keep them out of this paper by not writing concerning these things. There are local troubles, and these should all be settled at home. Do not write to the paper about them. Tell of your hopes and fears, and tell the dealings of the Lord with you. And if you have an exercise of mind on some Scripture write your views. Make your letters short as you can, so as to express your views as briefly as possible. But, above all, write on such things as will have a tendency to unite the dear children of God in love and fellowship. Let us all try to do more good and less harm next year than the past.

We have received many words of encouragement from the dear brethren and sisters during the past year. This has been a wonderful help to us. We have often felt like giving up in despair, but the comforting words from the dear saints of God have encouraged us to press onward in the battles of life. We appreciate these things more

than we can tell, and we humbly pray the Lord's richest blessings may rest upon every one of you, and that His presence may be continually manifested to you.

During the past year several names have been added to our editorial staff. It is a source of consolation and encouragement to us to have such able and faithful soldiers of the cross associated with us as corresponding editors as those dear brethren whose names appear on the editorial staff. We trust they will do more writing for the paper than they have been doing.

Asking an interest in the fervent prayers of all our readers, that the Lord may sustain us and keep us in the right way, through all the journey of life, we bid you farewell for the year 1907. C. H. C.

1908

Introduction to Volume Twenty-Three

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME TWENTY-THREE

---January 7, 1908

With this issue we begin the publication of the twenty-third volume of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Twenty-two years have passed away since the first Issue was sent out. To us these twenty-two years have passed quickly. It seems to us that it has been only a very short while since our sainted father sent out that first issue of the paper. Though the time seems to have been so short, yet many changes have been wrought. Some who were then comparatively young in the service of the Master are now looked upon as the old veterans in the warfare, while many of them have been called away from this world of sorrow to their long eternal home. Most of those who were old in the service then have crossed over the river of death and their warfare is ended. Many of the dear saints who read the first issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST are numbered with the pale nations of the dead, and but few who were subscribers then are subscribers now—that is, comparatively few. They are few as compared to the number who are now subscribers for the paper. But while so many changes have taken place there are some things that have not changed. Principles are eternal and never change. The doctrine of God our Saviour has not changed. It will always be the same. Men may change, and invent new theories and new practices, but the doctrine of God never changes. God made man upright, and man sought out many inventions. Every doctrine and theory of salvation taught in the

world today, except the doctrine of God, is an invention of man, and there are many of these inventions.

It is our desire that THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST be published in defense of the doctrine of God our Saviour. Our humble desire is to heed the admonition given in (**Jeremiah 6:16**), "Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein." If all would do this, the promise is "and ye shall find rest for your souls." It is our desire to be found faithful to our heavenly Master and faithful to His cause. Our humble prayer is that we may be so guided and directed of the Lord and influenced by His Holy Spirit in the publication of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST that it may be a blessing to the cause and not a curse.

We realize that the blessings of the Lord have been wonderfully bestowed upon us, if we are not deceived. Although we have had sore trials during I the past year, yet the Lord has wonderfully blessed us. He has blessed us both temporally and spiritually. We have been blessed with food and raiment, and have not had to suffer want. Besides the many temporal blessings that have been bestowed upon us, we have had the pleasure of enjoying many sweet meetings with the Lord's children, and have been blessed of the Lord to enjoy their sweet association and fellowship. Perhaps there are many of them whose faces we shall never see again in this world, but we separated from them with the blessed hope of meeting again where separations never come.

As we stated in the close of volume twenty-two, THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST has a larger circulation now than ever before. Many of the dear brethren, sisters and friends have taken a great interest in procuring subscribers for the paper and in helping us to extend the circulation. We appreciate all this more than we can tell, and humbly pray the Lord to abundantly bless you all. We humbly trust each of you will continue to do all you possibly can in this way during the present year. It is not simply for our benefit that we make this request. We trust our desire is for the good of the cause of Christ. Simply making money is not our object in the publication of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. If we are not altogether deceived in our own heart, our first object and aim is for the good of the cause and to try to comfort and encourage the Lord's dear children. This being our sincere desire, we want, with all our heart, to continue to publish the paper every week and to give all the reading matter it is possible to give, and at as low a price as possible.

Now, again we wish to say that we do not want to publish anything more about troubles and confusions among the brethren. Brethren, please do not send articles of that kind to us. We want you to write

for the paper, but we think enough has been said for the present about organs, secret societies, federal government, etc. Tell something about your hopes and fears-how the Lord has led you along and preserved you by His grace. Tell of your good meetings. Send us all the good church news you can. Help us to make the paper more interesting than ever before. Write about the good things of the kingdom, so that everyone will eagerly look for the coming of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST and be glad to read it. We do not mean by what we say here that we do not want to be faithful to the cause, but simply that we think enough has been said about those things for the present time. It is our desire to be found faithful and ready to contend against every false way, and to warn our dear brethren against any measure that is not in harmony with the teaching of Holy Writ; and to humbly and lovingly plead with them to walk in the good old ways of our beloved Zion, doing what our only King and Law-Giver has commanded, and leaving undone everything He has not commanded.

We greatly realize our weakness and insufficiency for the task that apparently lies before us for the year 1908. We realize the great responsibility resting upon us. We have before us now a letter dated October 23, 1906, from a dear and precious brother, J. D. Huffman, who crossed over the river soon after that letter was written. In this letter he said, "Now our God has said He would never leave Himself without a witness. Dear brother, He has raised you up and qualified you to defend His cause and feed His sheep. Dear brother, the responsibility is great on you...May the God of all grace ever be with you and give you wisdom and understanding to teach His people aright in all things that pertain to His glory." We surely feel that great responsibility, and humbly ask all our dear brethren, sisters and friends to pray for us as this dear and precious brother assured us he did. Will you pray earnestly that the Lord may guide and direct us in wisdom's ways, that what we do or say may be for the comfort and encouragement of His dear children and to the honor and glory of His own name? If we could only know beyond doubt that our feeble efforts were of some benefit to the Lord's dear children we feel that we could be content. Again, dear brethren, pray for us.

C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 8:8-13

---January 7, 1908

Brother S. T. Johnson, of Greenfield, Tenn., has requested us to give our views on the above Scripture through our columns. We have more requests of this kind than we can possibly comply with, it

seems, so that we will be compelled to offer only a few thoughts in answer to requests of this kind. The apostle in this chapter is writing about the eating of meat offered unto idols. It was a custom of those who worshipped idols made of stone or wood, graven images, to offer meats unto them as sacrifices. Those who worshipped the idols would eat this meat with reverence to the idol. The Christian, or child of God whose trust was in Christ, knew that these idols were false gods, and that the eating of the meat, therefore, amounted to nothing. The brother who knew this, being strong in the faith and doctrine of Christ, could eat this meat with no reverence whatever to the idol. But some weak brother, who was not so well established in the doctrine of Christ, seeing the strong brother eating the meat, and not knowing but what he was eating in reverence and fear of the god to which it was offered, might be thereby emboldened to also eat-but in reverence to the idol; eat it as offered to an idol. Thus the weak brother may be led astray, led to think he should engage in that as a service to the idol, and thereby become an offender. For the strong brother to engage in such a thing, whereby he may lead a weak brother astray, is a sin against the brethren. See verse 12. Simply eating the meat, as such, is not a sin; but to eat it as a sacrifice to an idol, or with reverence to the idol, is a sin. Hence, though the thing the strong brother may engage in, may, of itself, be no harm, yet if it is liable to cause a weak brother to go astray, it is wrong for the strong brother to engage in it. In doing so he sins against the brethren and against Christ. This being true the apostle says, in verse 13, "Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." Lest he make his brother to offend, he would refrain from doing that which of itself was no harm-no wrong in it. Yet, for the sake of his brethren he would not do it. Oh, that we all might be possessed of such a spirit.

C. H. C.

Sin Unto Death and First Resurrection

SIN UNTO DEATH AND FIRST RESURRECTION

---January 21, 1908

The sin unto death in **(I John 5:16)** is not final apostasy. The Saviour says in **(John 10:28)**, "They shall never perish;" and Paul teaches in **(Romans 8)** that there is nothing that can separate one of God's children from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Though this is true, yet a child of God may so live after the flesh as to die to the enjoyment of the salvation of the Lord and die

to the fellowship of the church. This is what John is teaching, we think. It is not what is spoken of as sin against the Holy Ghost. As to the two resurrections mentioned in **(Revelation 20)**, or the first resurrection and second death, will say there is a difference of opinion among brethren on that question, and we do not desire to express a positive view regarding it, for we do not deem it of sufficient importance to have controversy on it. Some hold that the teaching of the passage is that the saints will be resurrected first and that Christ will reign over them on earth for a thousand years, and at the expiration of the thousand years the wicked will be raised. Others hold that the first resurrection is the raising up of the sinner from a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ. It is certain that the work of regeneration is spoken of as a resurrection in more than one place.

In the latter part of the chapter it is evident that those whose names are written in the book of life are not judged out of those things written in the books according to their works. Those who are judged out of those things written in the books are those whose names are not written in the book of life, and they are all cast into the lake of fire, and not one of those whose names are written in the book of life are cast into the lake of fire. C. H. C.

The Prodigal Son

THE PRODIGAL SON

---January 21, 1908

Elder J. W. Parker, of Quill, Ga., has requested our views on the parables in Luke 15, especially the parable of the two sons, beginning at **(Luke 15:11)**.

The first is the parable of the lost sheep, and reads as follows: "What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the finery and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth his friends and neighbors, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance. Just as there is joy in the home of the shepherd when he finds the sheep that was lost, so is there joy in heaven when the sinner repents. The word heaven does not always refer to the place of ultimate bliss and glory. Paul speaks of the third heaven; and if there is a third, there is also a first and second. The church is sometimes spoken of as a heaven, we

think. And the term "sinner" does not always refer to the unregenerate-not by any means. See **((8) (James 4:8)** and **((9) (James 5:19-20)**. Children of God are here called sinners, as is the case in many other places. We think there is joy in the church when one of the Lord's children repents who has been in disobedience and sin. We think the parable teaches this. "Likewise, there is joy." We think the next parable, recorded in verses 8 to 10, teaches the same lesson.

As to the parable of the two sons, will say they were both sons. The elder was no more a son than the younger; but the latter said to his father, "Father, give me the portion of goods that falleth to me." Then the father divided his living unto them unto the sons. The younger son gathered all together and took his journey into a far country-not into a fair country, but a far country. Every time one of the Lord's sons, or children, takes a journey away from the home the Lord has prepared for them here in this world, which is the church of God, and the true service of God, he goes to a far country; but he does not go to a fair country. The younger son spent all he had, wasted his substance with riotous living, and there arose a mighty famine in that land. That far country-far away from the sweet service of God, is a land of famine to a child of God who has realized the sweet pleasures of gospel service and the fellowship of the saints in the church of Christ. Then he went and joined himself to a citizen of that country He did not join himself to a citizen of the land of Canaan-the land of joy and delight, but to a citizen of the far country. He did not join himself there to the service of God. Yet he was a son, just as he was before he took the journey to that country. The husks that the swine did eat was no food to him. Swine food and sheep food is very different. "But no man gave unto him." In the Lord's economy, the gospel, he says, "Freely ye have received; freely give." But not so in the land far away from the service of God not so among the swine-feeders. But when he was pinched with famine he said, "How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger." So many of the Lord's children do this. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labor for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness." -**((5:1) (Isaiah 55:1-2)**. This is spoken to Israel-not to unregenerate persons. The son says, "I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father. I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and

am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants." He is ready now to make full confession of all his wrongs, and is content and willing to have a very low place in the home. He does not ask now for a high place; he has been brought low. Oh, how proud he was before! But how humble now! He was a proud son before, lifted up with vanity. But "pride goeth before a fall, and a haughty spirit before destruction." But what joy when the wanderer returns and confesses all his sins! True, sometimes there are some who are jealous, as was the elder son; still it is true that there is joy over the return of the wanderer.

Afflictions, though they seem severe,
In mercy oft are sent;
They stopped the prodigal's career,
And caused him to repent.
Although he no relenting felt,
Till he had spent his store;
His stubborn heart began to melt,
When famine pinched him sore.
What have I gained by sin, he said,

But hunger, shame and fear?
My father's house abounds with bread
While I am starving here.
I'll go and tell him all I've done,
And fall before his face;
Unworthy to be called his son,
I'll seek a servant's place.
His father saw him coming back;
He saw, and ran and smiled,
And threw his arms around the neck
Of his repenting child.

David says, "Before I was afflicted I went astray." **((67) (Psalms 119:67))**. How prone we are to go astray, but afflictions serve to bring us back. Some of the most humble and devoted Christians we have ever seen were sorely afflicted. Afflictions will cause us to realize our own weakness, and then we are brought low before the throne of grace, acknowledging our sins and wickedness, and pleading for an humble place in the service of God.

The prodigal son has no reference whatever to unregenerate characters. There is nothing in the whole parable about regeneration or unregenerate characters.

C. H. C.

Is Our Faith Wrong?

IS OUR FAITH WRONG?

---January 28, 1908

We have before us a minute of the seventy-ninth annual session of the Conecuh River Primitive Baptist Association, held in 1906, which contains the Articles of Faith of the association. Elder C. W. Hardin was moderator. Elder J. E. W. Henderson, who is well known among our people, especially in the South, as a sound and able minister of the gospel, and who has been many years engaged in the warfare; is a member of this association. The second item in their Articles of Faith reads: "We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the revealed word of God and the only rule of faith and practice."

We also have before us a minute of the seventy-ninth annual session of the Echeconnee Association, held in 1907. Elder S. T. Bentley was moderator. The second item in their Articles of Faith reads: "We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice."

We also have before us a minute of the sixty-ninth annual session of the Harmony Primitive Baptist Association, of Georgia, held in 1907. Deacon B. F. Markett was moderator and Elder R. H. Jennings clerk. The second item of their Articles of Faith reads: "We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice."

We also have a minute of the Upatoie Association, of Georgia, held in 1907. Elder J. M. Murray was moderator. The second item in their Articles of Faith reads: "We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice."

We might go on and on quoting from the Articles of Faith of different associations in different sections of the country; but these are sufficient. They are all practically the same. Now, if language means anything, the teaching of this article of faith is that the Scriptures teach all that we should believe or practice religiously. If the Scriptures are the only rule of faith and practice, then it follows that the Scriptures teach everything we ought to practice. If there is one single thing a church should practice, or may rightly practice, that the Scriptures are silent upon, then the Scriptures do not furnish a sufficient rule, and are not the only rule.

This article of faith, or tenet, is not new among the Baptists. In the London Confession of Faith, put forth in 1689, we find this language, Chapter 1, Section 1: "The Holy Scriptures are the only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule of all saving knowledge, faith and

obedience," etc. The same chapter, section 6, says: "The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down or necessarily contained in the Holy Scriptures; unto which nothing is any time to be added, whether by new revelation of the Spirit or traditions of men. Nevertheless we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the word, and that there are some circumstances. concerning the worship of God and government of the church common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the word, which are always to be observed." The same chapter, section 7, says: "All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned but the unlearned, in a due use of ordinary means, may attain to a sufficient understanding of them."

In this language quoted from the London Confession the same idea is taught as is embraced in the second item of the Articles of Faith of the different associations quoted above. Please notice carefully section 6, "The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down or necessarily contained in the Holy Scriptures." Notice, also, carefully section 1, "The Holy Scriptures are the only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule of all saving knowledge, faith, and obedience." If the Scriptures are an "infallible rule of all saving knowledge, faith, and obedience," it follows that every thing to be practiced in obedience is contained therein. Every thing commanded therein is to be observed, and nothing is to be observed which is not commanded, if the Scriptures are an infallible and certain rule.

Monsieur de Vignaux, who was forty years pastor of one of the churches of the Waldenses, and died at the age of eighty years, wrote a treatise concerning their life, manners and religion. He gave a summary of their doctrinal principles, for the sake of which they were persecuted, such as "that the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to our salvation, and that we are called to believe only what they teach, without any regard to the authority of man-that nothing else ought to be received by us except what God hath commanded." See Jones' History, page 294. This was long before the London Confession was framed-a hundred years or more. These people expressly held that "nothing else ought to be received by us

except what God hath commanded." In the year 1120 they put forth a Confession of Faith, the tenth article of which reads, "Moreover, we have ever regarded all the inventions of men (in the affairs of religion) as an unspeakable abomination before God," etc. The eleventh article reads, "We hold in abhorrence all human inventions, as proceeding from Anti-Christ, which produce distress, and are prejudicial to the liberty of the mind." These people held that all the inventions of men in the affairs of religion-that is, everything not commanded in the Holy Scriptures-were an unspeakable abomination before God; and that they proceeded from Anti-Christ and produced distress.

On January 1st, 1886, Elder S. F. Cayce sent out the first issue of this paper, THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Since that time this paper has been published and sent out in the interest of the Primitive Baptist cause and in defense of their faith. The Articles of Faith appear elsewhere in the paper, and have been inserted in our columns from time to time since the first issue. The second item says: "That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are a revelation from God, written by inspiration, and that they are the standard of faith, and the only rule divinely authorized for Christian practice, teaching, as they do, all that we ought to believe, know, or practice religiously." When the first issue of this paper was sent out twenty-two years ago, with the express avowal that this was one article it would defend, no Old School, or Primitive Baptist objected to it. It was received by them then. If there is one now who will not receive it he is not like they were twenty-two years ago; he is not like those were who framed and adopted the Articles of Faith of the Conecuh River, Echeconnee, Harmony and Upatoie Associations; he is not like those who framed and adopted the London Confession of Faith; he is not like the ancient Waldenses. If these people were all Baptists of the Primitive or first order, then the man who will not or does not accept the teaching of that article is not a Baptist of the Primitive order.

Now, we believe that whatever is Baptist is Scriptural. If whatever is Baptist is not Scriptural, then the Baptist Church is not Scriptural and is not the church of Christ. If whatever is Baptist is Scriptural, then the Baptist Church is Scriptural and is the church of Christ. That which is Baptist is that which has been set forth as a belief, doctrine, or tenet, of that people. We have seen that it has been declared by them all along the line that the Scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith and practice: that what the Scriptures teach or command should be practiced, and that all things not commanded or taught therein are the inventions of men and should be avoided. This has been taught by them all along the ages; it is therefore Baptist. Then

if it be true that whatever is Baptist is Scriptural, it follows that this teaching of theirs is Scriptural.

We would ask in all candor and earnestness, and in love, who will dare deny that whatever is Baptist is Scriptural, and at the same time claim to be a Primitive Baptist? For one to deny that proposition or statement is simply to admit that the one making the denial is either not a Bible Baptist or that the Baptists have not been Biblical all along the ages.

Is it true that they have been wrong all these years in holding to this point? Our answer would be, most emphatically, No. But some say, if that is correct, then why do you have associations, hymn books, meeting houses, moderators, clerks and church record books? Well, now, that's easy to answer. We are commanded to meet often together, to forsake not the assembling of ourselves together. An association is nothing more nor less than a meeting together for, worship and mutual edification. We are commanded to sing; "Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." -**(Ephesians 5:19)**. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." -**((6) (Colossians 3:16)**. In these places we are commanded to sing psalms, hymns and spiritual songs. To do this it is necessary now, as it was then, that they be either written or printed, that the songs or hymns be collected together-hence a hymn book. Did you know a part of the Holy Scriptures might, with propriety, be called a hymn book? The Psalms of David were written in metre-hence hymns, a book of hymns. Yet some have discovered so much "light" that they have found that those who have a book of hymns (a hymn book) are practicing something that is unscriptural and for which they have no precedent. But meeting houses- what about them? **((3) (Mark 3:13-19)**: "And He goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto Him whom He would: and they came unto Him. And He ordained twelve, that they should be with Him," etc.; then the names of the twelve are given, and verse 19 says, "And they went into an house." Then it is Scriptural, is it not, to "go into an house?" Numbers of times we read of the Saviour entering into the synagogue to teach and to preach. A synagogue is a meeting house. Too many instances are mentioned of meeting together and worship being conducted in houses for any well-informed person to try to "make a play" or such as that.

"Let all things be done decently and in order." -(I Corinthians 14:40). If all things are to be done decently and in order, it is necessary that one be appointed to preserve order-hence a

moderator, and a clerk to do what writing is to be done. Does it not look as though a Baptist is "hard pressed" who will resort to such as this to justify himself in unscriptural teaching?

Again, we ask, Is it true that they have been wrong all these years in holding to this point? Again we answer, emphatically, No. The Holy Scriptures themselves pointedly declare the correctness of this principle, which has been so tenaciously held to by the humble followers of the Lord from the beginning of the gospel dispensation, on down through the dark ages of bloody persecution and death to the present time. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." -**(II Timothy 3:16-17)**. If there is one thing a man ought to practice religiously which the Scriptures say nothing about, then the Scriptures do not thoroughly furnish him unto all good works. No man under heaven is able to make it appear that there is one single thing we should practice religiously, or as a religious service, about which the Bible is silent, and let this statement of the apostle remain true. The Scriptures are given that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works-not simply some good works, but all good works. Then all the works taught in the Scriptures are good works; and all the good works are taught therein. Then the works not taught, or commanded, or required, by the Scriptures are not good works they are not acceptable to God as religious service. If one does all that the Bible requires of him, he would be perfect in the sense of that text. He would not have reached a state of sinless perfection, for that is not under consideration, and no man can do that in this life; but the Scriptures are given "that the man of God may be perfect," that he may be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Then if he should do all the good works the Scriptures require of him, and one more good work that the Scriptures say nothing about, then he would be more than perfect, A would he not? If not, why not? If he would not, in that case, be more than perfect, then he would not be perfect in the sense of the text when he has done all that the Scriptures require of him. If that declaration of the apostle be true, and it is true, it follows that it is just as much a violation and a transgression of the teaching of the Scriptures to practice anything in the name of Christianity, or as a religious service, that the Bible says nothing about, as it is to leave undone anything that it expressly commands. This is an unalterable truth, and no man can gainsay it. No sort of "begging the question" or trying to mystify will change this truth.

Teaching or practicing those things which the Scriptures authorize or command does not cause strife and confusion, or distress, in the church of God. It is the teaching or practicing of things the Scriptures are silent upon that brings distress, sorrow, strife and confusion in the church. When people decide to reform the church and "start right up-to-date;" or when they decide that the Baptists have been wrong along the line, and start out to carry them back to "primitive" doctrine and practice-in either or both such cases, they usually bring trouble and distress in the church.

If the things the Scriptures are silent upon "are matters of privilege, and are to be used, or not used, as circumstances require," why not have an "ankle show," or a "cake-walk," or an "ice cream festival," or an Epworth League, or a Baptist Young People's Union, or Christian Endeavor Society, or "a living curiosity show," or any or all the many different inventions of men practiced "as circumstances require" in the name of religion and Christianity?

Oh, that the Lord would grant unto all His ministers a spirit of humility and devotion to His blessed cause, that they might love peace and harmony upon gospel principles too well to advocate or practice or teach anything not required by the Holy Scriptures. May we all contend earnestly, in love and humility, for those things, and those only, that make for peace, and thus be bound together in love and fellowship. Our heart bleeds when we see distress and sorrow in our beloved Zion. We humbly ask of our dear brethren and sisters to pray the Lord to sustain and uphold us, that we may never depart from the right way.

C. H. C.

What Do They Think?

WHAT DO THEY THINK?

---February 18, 1908

In the Apostolic Herald of Feb. 1, Elder J. V Kirkland asks us a question concerning the basis of agreement which was written in April, 1906-the question being if we still endorse a certain part of it, etc. We reply that if you had been as good as your word and had kept the agreement we would have abided by it. You know this, and there is no necessity of your making further show of pretended humility and sounding the false and misleading cry of persecution. But of course Elder J. V Kirkland never says anything that is wrong! Oh, he is so good, and so gentle, and so kind, and meek, and humble, and loving, and tender, and forgiving, and so filled with the Holy Spirit-he must be inspired and proof against mistakes and wrongs! And, oh, he

is so sincere-and no one who differs from him can possibly be sincere; they are all blasphemers, and hypocrites, and persecutors, and liars, and have no respect for piety, gray hairs, nor learning; they are all a set of ignoramuses and fools! Oh, yes, of course. Why, he says, "Any sincere person would enjoy reading the Apostolic Herald." Now, if you don't enjoy reading that paper, and clap your hands for joy every time you read a column of it, and become so overjoyed that you are lost in heavenly wonder and amazement when you read a page of the editorials-you are, of course, insincere, a simpleton and a fool! Oh, Lord, do please deliver us!

Will Elder J. V Kirkland now please tell us about Elder R. S. Kirkland, Elder A. M. Kirkland and Elder H. E. Pettus? How do they stand now on the "Basis of Agreement?" What did you say, Elder?

And, say, Elder Kirkland, was not Dr. Eaton disappointed that you did not go with your brother R. S. to Louisville to join the Missionaries with him? Oh, you don't know? Oh, no, of course you don't know anything about it, and Dr. Eaton is dead now and can't tell us! But, wait, Elder K., Sam can tell, and it seems that some who are in a position to know do tell some things. And now, tell us, Elder K., why was Dr. Eaton disappointed in your not going, if there was no understanding that you would join with Sam? Can you answer these things truthfully-or will you deny them as you have other facts?

And now, one more question-are you not uniting your forces with the faction of Pence, Burnam & Co.? At least, are you not making an effort to do so? And do you not ask all to meet with you in a meeting at Marion, Ky., next June who are opposed to the money basis of representation in the modern missionary boards? And does not this invitation embrace and include the anti-board faction of the Missionary Baptist Church? And is it not your desire and aim to finally unite with them if you can?

Now, answer like a man-no dodging or denying.

C. H. C.

Questions from W. M. Cross

QUESTIONS FROM W. M. CROSS

---February 18, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-By chance I came in possession of a copy of your paper of July 2, 1907, partly mutilated by handling, in which I find what is purported to be your "Abstract of Principles;" but as before stated, partly mutilated. Having been a Baptist minister for thirty years, and anxious to know the truth, I wish to ask you a few questions for information. My grandfather, William Cross, a

predestinarian and preacher of some note in that order, taught that Christ died only for the elect but exhorted all to repent, and I never could understand properly his position.

QUESTIONS

1. Do you teach that God, from eternity, ordained that Adam should eat the forbidden fruit, together with the motives and circumstances by which he (Adam) was coerced to violate the law?
2. Do you teach that Christ died only for such as will be saved?
3. Do you make a distinction between the death of Christ and the atonement? If so, what distinction?
4. Do you teach a universal, or a restricted, atonement?
5. Do you teach the doctrine of eternal justification?
6. Upon what is man's responsibility predicated?
7. Are the elect children, children before they repent in Christ?

8. Do you teach that God through Christ made no provisions for those that will be lost? These are questions in which I feel a deep interest. Will you please publish them in your paper, together with your answer, or write me giving the information desired?

I belong to the Pulaski County Association, and judging from a discussion of the subject of election the other day at Somerset, Ky., there are no two of our preaching brethren agreed on it, some taking one view and some taking another. It is only the truth that will do us all good and stand the consuming fires of the last day.

WILLIAM M. CROSS. Burnside, Ky.

OUR ANSWER

We are always willing to give any information we can to an honest enquirer after truth, and as Elder Cross says the truth is what he desires we will try to answer his questions, though we do not expect to argue our position at great length. We would suggest to him first that it may be possible that he did not exactly understand the position his grandfather occupied on some points.

In answer to your first question will say that we do not teach that God ordained from all eternity that Adam should eat the forbidden fruit in the same sense that He ordained the salvation of sinners. We do not think God's predestination bears the same attitude to sin as it does to holiness. God permits, or suffers, or allows sin and wickedness, but does not approve or sanction it; but does punish, overrule or restrain sin and wickedness. God's purpose is to punish sin. We do not teach that Adam was coerced to violate the law, but that he did so freely and willingly. "After God had created all other creatures, He created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, rendering them fit unto that life to God for which they were created, being made after the image of God, in righteousness,

knowledge, and true holiness, having the law of God written in their hearts, and power to fulfill it, and yet under a possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will, which was subject to change." -London Confession of Faith, Chapter 4, Section 2.

"Although God created man upright and perfect and gave him a righteous law which had been unto life had he kept it, and threatened death upon the breach thereof; yet he did not long abide in this honor. Satan, using the subtlety of the serpent to seduce Eve, then by her seducing Adam, who without any compulsion did willfully transgress the law of their creation and the command given unto them in eating the forbidden fruit, which God was pleased, according to His wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to His own glory." -London Confession of Faith, Chapter 6, Section 1.

In answer to question 2 will say, yes, we teach that Christ died for all those who will finally be saved, or for the elect, and for those only. To the third question will say, no, we make no particular distinction between the death of Christ and the atonement. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." When Christ died, or shed His blood, He satisfied the law; made reconciliation, satisfaction, atonement for sin.

To the fourth question will say we teach a special atonement-that Christ died for those the Father gave Him. "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory some men and angels are predestinated or foreordained to eternal life, through Jesus Christ, to the praise of His glorious grace; others being left to act in their sin to their just condemnation, to the praise of His glorious justice." - London Confession, Chapter 3, Section 3.

"These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." -London Confession, Chapter 3, Section 4.

"The Lord Jesus, by His perfect obedience and sacrifice of Himself, which He through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of God, procured reconciliation, and purchased an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto Him." -London Confession, Chapter 8, Section 5.

We do not know that we fully understand your fifth question. If you mean to ask if the justification procured by Christ is eternal, will

endure throughout all future ages, and that none who are justified by Christ can ever be condemned, we answer yes. But if you mean to ask if these characters were always justified, or always in a justified state, we answer no. They were involved in sin, as all Adam's race. But in eternity God made choice of a certain number whom He gave to His Son, and purposed or predestinated their justification-so that they were justified in the mind and purpose of God. Then when Christ died for them they were justified in the eye of the law, satisfaction having been rendered to the law for them. Then in regeneration the work of Christ in the atonement and in His death is applied to them, purifying their hearts or souls-that justification being actually applied to them. "Although the price of redemption was not actually paid by Christ till after His incarnation, yet the virtue, efficacy, and benefit thereof was communicated to the elect in all ages successively, from the beginning of the world, in and by those promises, types, and sacrifices wherein He was revealed and signified to be the seed of the woman which should bruise the serpent's head; and the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, being the same yesterday, and today, and forever." -London Confession, Chapter 8, Section 6. In answer to your sixth question will say man is responsible for his violation of God's law. By his violation he is condemned, and he alone is responsible for it. He has fallen into a pit of condemnation, and is responsible for being in the pit. The only way he can ever be taken out of the pit is by the work of God, which is purely a stoop of mercy. In answer to your seventh question will say that regeneration precedes belief in Christ as one's personal Saviour. See **(John 1:11-13)**, "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

Your eighth question is answered in the answer to the second. We have tried to be explicit and plain, and trust you, and others, may gather some light from this as to what we teach. C. H. C.

PRIMITIVE AGAIN

---February 25, 1908

We are in receipt of a leaf from the Mississippi Baptist, published at Newton, Miss., of Jan. 8, 1908, on which appears an editorial under the above heading. It is an attempt at a reply to our editorial in our issue of Dec. 3, 1907, in which we replied to an article from this same paper headed "Primitive." The editor is now begging the question, and saying that some things we said were unworthy the

pen of a Christian writer, etc. Yes, of course; that's all very nice of you-Of course it was nice of you to say concerning the contents of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST that "while it had a great deal to say about experimental religion, there was an air of self-appropriation about it that was very noticeable to us." And now, the aforesaid editor would try to "wheedle" out by saying he had reference to the name! Shame on such! Your language had it about the religion and not about the name. And it was so "awfully nice" for you to say the other things you said. It was so nice in you to say we deny the commission! But suppose you tell us what board sent Paul to Rome? By the authority of what board was he being sent when he was shipwrecked and escaped on the island of Melita? (See **(7:1) (Acts 27)** and **(8:1) (Acts 28:1)**) What board sent Peter to the house of Cornelius? Give us book, chapter and verse for your Sunday school, B. Y. P. U., and various other societies you have? You are not Bible Baptists unless you have Scripture authority for these things-and this you do not have. Will you please tell us where and when the first missionary board was formed among the Baptists? Did we tint tell the truth about it being in 1792? Can you show one before that date? If you could we suppose you would have done so. Unless you can show it, it follows that you are not the old order of Baptists-hence not primitive.

Did you not say in a certain sermon that Peter was a "Hardshell" until he was converted? If he was a "Hardshell" until he was converted, then he was at first what we are now. Then our sort of Baptists existed before your sort, by your own admission. Verily, the "legs of the lame are unequal."

No, your people are not the original order of Baptists, and it is a vain effort to assert it.

C. H. C.

Elder Mayo

ELDER MAYO

---March 10, 1908

On Sunday night, Feb. 23, Elder G. T. Mayo, who lives in our town, united with the Missionary Baptist church here. Elder Mayo's name has been on the editorial staff of Elder Kirkland's paper, the Apostolic Herald. It seems that Elder Kirkland's corresponding editors are leaving him one by one.

Elder Mayo first united with the Primitive Baptists; and was with them for several years. Some years ago he left us and united with the Missionary Baptists, and we think the day was set for his baptism by

them; the day and hour arrived, but Elder Mayo changed his mind and sent them word he would not be there. Then he came back to the Primitive Baptists, and remained with them for a time. Again he united with the Missionary Baptists. This time they baptized and ordained him, and he preached for them about a year-possibly not quite so long, or perhaps a little more, we do not remember the exact length of time. Then again he came back to the Primitive Baptists, making full confession. He said he had found that the Old Baptists could get along without him, but he could not get along without them. But now he has gone back to the Missionaries again. Perhaps he has now learned that he can get along without the Old Baptists. Whether he can do this or not, they will continue to move along in the even tenor of their way. We like Elder Mayo as a man, and trust he may sometime become satisfied and contented religiously.
C. H. C.

Instrumental Music

INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC

---April 7, 1908

We clip the following from the Gospel Advocate, a Campbellite paper published in Nashville, Tenn. We think this little piece is so true and logical that we desire to give it to our readers. It was written by Mr. David Lipscomb, the editor of the Gospel Advocate. The use of organs has caused divisions among the Campbellites, and Mr. Lipscomb gives truthfully their tendency. C. H. C.
THE CLIPPING

I think it is wrong to use an instrument in connection with worshipping God "in psalms and hymns and tunes and spiritual songs" anywhere at any time. The wrong is more emphasized from the tendency to substitute an entertainment of instrumental music for the service of God in song, making melody in the heart unto the Lord. Teaching singing with a musical instrument is on a par with using a crutch to teach a child to walk. When he is taught to hobble along on a crutch he does not know how to walk. If he ever learns to walk it must be done after he lays aside the crutch. When a person is taught to carry the tune along with an instrument, he does not know how to sing. The instrument, instead of teaching him to sing, hides the deficiencies of his singing and becomes a substitute for singing. A person that has to teach singing with an instrument cannot sing himself and cannot teach singing. He is like the man with a crutch teaching walking or dancing. The universal cry for girls to learn instrumental music is a hurtful and expensive fad. It is hurtful in

different ways. The girls learn to thrum the piano; the boys do not learn music at all. The trouble is, neither men nor women, as a rule, can sing. Before the rage for instrumental music became so general, much of the time of the young people when they met together was spent in singing; and all sung. Now nobody sings. The study of instrumental music is expensive, both of money and time, with no return in nine cases out of ten. There is no probability that nine out of ten of those who take music lessons will become sufficiently proficient in the practice to interest themselves or others. I once knew an excellent music teacher that gave lessons for a number of years in one of our best educated county towns. She left the town, and after some years returned on a visit, and concluded she would look up her old music pupils. She found about eighty, as I remember, that had taken lessons from her, and out of this number only two ever pretended to play. She said that she felt that her time had been greatly spent in vain, and the time of these girls and the money of their parents had been wasted. If parents would study these questions for themselves, and not be carried away with a fad of the young people, we would have better singing and better Christians generally.

Kind Words

KIND WORDS

---April 14, 1908

THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, of Martin, Tenn., came in last week in its new dress, which adds to the appearance of the paper in many respects. They have put in up-to-date machinery of different kinds. We congratulate our young brother, Elder C. H. Cayce, in his efforts and success in giving his readers a neatly printed and a sound Old Baptist paper. May the Lord continue to bless him in his efforts to serve Him and to follow in the noble examples of his lamented father, who spent his life in the service of God and like Daniel, kept his face toward Jerusalem. So many of our young ministers have fallen by the wayside of late years that when we see one who is content to walk in the good old way in which our fathers trod, our hearts go out in praise to God in their behalf, and our prayer to God is that these young men may have an abundance of grace to enable them to bear hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ.-W, in Baptist Trumpet.

REMARKS

We feel to appreciate these kind words from Brother Webb so much. We feel our own unworthiness and insufficiency for the task of editing and conducting THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. and also our inability to

preach the gospel of the grace of God. Oh, how unworthy we feel to occupy the sacred desk to endeavor to speak in God's name. And what great responsibility rests upon us as editor of an Old Baptist paper! How needful it is that we be careful that what is advocated and contended for in the paper be according to sound doctrine and in harmony with God's word. We realize our dependence upon the Lord that He would guide us by the influence of His Holy Spirit and sustain us by His grace, that we stay in the right way.

If we are not deceived in our poor heart, the cause of our Master, and the comfort and benefit of His people, and the glory of His name, is our first aim -we feel that these are first and above all else with us. We desire to "know no man after the flesh." Our humble desire is to know the right course to pursue, regardless of men or their opinions. What we desire is that which is right in the sight of God, and we believe God approves of His children asking "for the old paths" and walking therein, for He has commanded it. We are satisfied with the old way-the old paths are good enough. Men have sought out many inventions, but they have never improved upon God's way. By the Lord's help we desire to continue to defend the Lord's way and to expose the inventions of men, no matter where found-even though they be introduced among the Old Baptists. We humbly ask all our brethren and sisters, who love the good old ways of Zion to remember us in your prayers, that the Lord would direct and sustain us. And we humbly ask all to stand by us in the publication of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. The brethren and sisters have done this, and we appreciate it. We believe they will patronize and support the paper that stands by the true principles of the doctrine of grace. Hence we have had no fears but what the paper would be sustained if we were pursuing the right course; and if we do not stay in the "good old way" it ought not to be sustained.

Our dear Brother Webb has spent many years in the service of our Master and such expressions of approval and encouragement from old soldiers of the cross like him are a great comfort to us. We desire to continue in the same old way. "it was good enough for our fathers," and it is good enough for us. We desire to live and die having an humble place among the dear Old Baptists and in their hearts. Brethren, pray the Lord to grant it. C. H. C.

John 3:16-17; Hebrews 2:9; Romans 9:15-25

---April 21, 1908

Brother J. L. Harder, of McKenzie, Tenn., has requested our views of the above passages. We have not space or time now to write at great length on these, but will state our views briefly.

(John 3:16-17) reads: "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved." This text tells us plainly that God gave His Son for the believer. He did not give His Son for the unbeliever. If God did not give His Son for the unbeliever, then Christ did not die for all the race, unless all the race are believers. To argue that the term "world" in this text embraces all Adam's race, is to make the text contradict itself. As the text does not contradict itself, it follows that the term "world" does not embrace all Adam's race, It necessarily follows, therefore, that it refers to the believers-the world of believers. Again, to make the term "world" embrace all Adam's race would be a positive contradiction of **(Romans 9:13)**, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." This tells us positively that God hated Esau. Then if Esau was a part of Adam's race, He did not love all the race. Now, notice **(John 3:18-19)**, "He that believeth on Him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil." The Saviour here tells us plainly that the condemnation is that men loved darkness rather than light. The condemnation does not rest in their unbelief, but in the fact that "light is come into the world, and they loved darkness rather than light." This is where the condemnation rests.

(Hebrews 2:9) reads, "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man." (Verses 10, 11 and 12)read, "For it became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. And again, I will put my trust in Him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me." The word "man" in the ninth verse in the King James' translation is not in the original Greek. In translating any passage, if a word is lacking and needs to be supplied, a word should be supplied

that will agree with the context. This is a universal and invariable rule. In verse ten these characters are called "many sons," and in verse eleven they are called "brethren," in verse twelve they are called "brethren," and "the church;" in verse thirteen they are called "children," and in verse fourteen they are called "children." These are all the same characters, or persons, that are referred to in the ninth verse as "every man." Hence He tasted death for "every son" (many sons), for every one of His "brethren," for "the church," for every one of His "children." He died for these, and these only.

Our opinion is that Brother Harder wished the foregoing passages harmonized with **(Romans 9:15-25)**. There is a seeming contradiction to some in these, but there is no contradiction, and the seeming contradiction vanishes when the foregoing passages are rightly applied. In **(Romans 9:21)** the apostle says, "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump, to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour?" This refers to the case of the prophet going down to the house of the potter and seeing the potter at work. A vessel was marred in the hands of the potter. Then he took clay of the same lump and made another vessel as seemed good to the potter to make it. In the beginning, or in the morning of creation, God made the man. The vessel was marred in the hands of his Creator by sin. Now, God takes clay of the same lump (for all are alike by nature) and makes vessels unto honor, as seems good to Him to make them. He does not make a vessel unto honor provided the clay becomes willing, but as it pleases Him. He does not save one man and not another because the one man is better clay than the other, but He saves as it pleases Him. Verse sixteen says, "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." Salvation is of God, and He shows mercy in saving. It is His work to save. "It is not of Him that willeth." Our will is not consulted as to whether they will be saved, yet He makes them willing by the regenerating power of His Holy Spirit. They are shown the awful depravity and corruption of their own hearts, are given a new and higher order of life, and then they begin to hate and to abhor sin and to love righteousness and holiness; and their will is now sweetly inclined to that which is holy and righteous. These few thoughts are submitted in love for truth, and we trust they will be blessed to your good. C. H. C.

Acts 22:16

((2:16) (Acts 22:16)

---April 21, 1908

We have been requested to give our views of **((2:16) (Acts 22:16))**. It reads, "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." This language was spoken by Ananias to Saul. Ananias was one of the Lord's ministers, and dwelt in Damascus. Saul had left Jerusalem with letters of authority to bind and cast in prison all who were calling on the name of the Lord, or all the followers of Christ. As he journeyed and came nigh unto Damascus, at about noon, a great light from heaven suddenly shined round about him. Saul fell unto the ground and heard a voice saying unto him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Saul answered, "Who art thou, Lord?" "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." -John 6:63. When Jesus speaks life is imparted, and the dead are brought to life, and answer, always. The divine life was imparted to Saul when the Lord spoke to him, and he was awakened to his true condition in nature. Here was something he had never realized before, hence he cried out, "Who art thou, Lord?" The Lord answered, "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest. Then Saul enquired, "What shall I do, Lord?" Saul now has a will and a desire to follow and serve the Lord. He has a new will and new desires. Will and desire spring from life. He now has a new life from which springs the new will and new desire to serve the Lord. This being true, it is too late for him to be baptized in order to his regeneration. The work of regeneration has already been completed in his case. The inward washing, or inward cleansing, we see, was done for him before he reached Damascus. He is now a praying character. The Lord was also working with Ananias, for He appeared to him and told him to go to Saul. Ananias was afraid, but the Lord told him that he was a chosen vessel, and "behold, he prayeth." Ananias was afraid no longer, when he had the evidence that the Lord had appeared to him and that he was a praying character. He then went to Saul and called him "Brother Saul." He told him that the Lord, even Jesus, that had appeared to him while he was on his way to Damascus had sent him to him, and then used the language of the text, "Why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." This washing away of sins is, therefore, an outward washing, representing or showing forth the inward washing or cleansing that had been performed in his heart before he reached Damascus. It is a showing of one's faith by his works. It declares outwardly the work of grace that has already been performed by the Lord in the heart. These are our views, to some extent, expressed in a brief way on the text.

C. H. C.

Romans 7:24-25

---April 28, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I want your views on (**Romans 7:24-25**), as I do not understand its meaning.

I have heard several different men talk about it. Please answer through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. I would be glad for any brother to write and let me know what he has to say.

Pray for me.

JESSE L. HARRIS

Atkins, Ark., R. 2.

OUR REPLY

We will try to give a few of our thoughts on this text. But it would be well to read the (twenty-third verse)also. The three verses (23, 24, 25) read as follows: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

In the twenty-third verse the apostle presents the thought that there is a warfare going on in his life. There is a warfare going on in the heart and life of every child of grace. In regeneration the old or sinful nature was not taken away. He still has the nature that is poisoned with sin. But in regeneration he received another nature; he was made partaker of the divine nature. So he now has two natures, and they are contrary to each other. They are no more alike than midday is like midnight, than bitter is like sweet, than light is like darkness, than good is like bad. These two natures being possessed by the one man, there is a warfare going on in his heart and life all the time-or nearly so. The old nature is called the flesh in many places; it is also called the old man. The new or divine nature is called the

new man, the spirit, the inner man. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. (**Galatians 5:17**). Here one is called the flesh and the other the Spirit, and they lust against each other. That man who does not find this warfare in his members is not a child of God. Oh, how bitter the conflict! It is a warfare enduring for life. There is no discharge from it while we continue to live in this unfriendly world. But blessed

thought, this world is the Christian's battle ground. He receives an honorable discharge from the warfare and goes to a blessed home prepared for him when he lays his armor by in death. Sweet rest awaits him there. Oh, how he longs to be free from sin! yet he daily finds himself brought into captivity by it. No wonder then he often cries out in his daily life and experience, O wretched man that I am! No wonder he would ask, Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? Or, Who shall deliver me from the body of death? This is a question so often asked by the heaven-born soul. He realizes that the arm of flesh is too short and that the power of man is too weak to deliver a poor sinner like he realizes himself to be. He knows he is not redeemed with corruptible things, such as silver and gold. He realizes that all the gold of Ophir, and the silver of Peru, and the cattle of a thousand hills, all together, are insufficient to buy a home in heaven for a poor sinner like him. He knows that father and mother, brothers, sisters, friends, preachers, churches, societies, are all unable to deliver a poor sinner like him. Then who shall deliver me from the body of this death? In the very depths of his soul he is enabled to exclaim, with joy and thanksgiving, as did the apostle, I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. The Lord can, does and will deliver. Blessed be His holy name. Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that He will yet deliver us. **-(II Corinthians 1:10)**. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin. With the mind, or divine nature, the new man, he serves the law of God; but with the flesh, or the old, sinful nature, he serves the law of sin. That sinful nature will continue with us as long as we remain here; but after a few more toils, pains, dark and cloudy days, after a few more storms, a few more battles, and the warfare will be over. We shall lay our armor by. The Lord alone, through Jesus Christ, will finally give us the victory. He will deliver all His children. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. (I Corinthians 15:57). May it be yours, dear reader, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Eleventh Article of Faith

ELEVENTH ARTICLE OF FAITH

---April 28, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-For the benefit of a friend of mine who is a subscriber to your paper, I desire you, through the columns of your paper, to give an explanation of the eleventh article of the Abstract of Principles (the clause, "are all under law to Christ"). The word "law" is the objection.

Your unworthy brother,
O. P. POORE
Robards, Ky., R. 2.
OUR REPLY

The eleventh article of our Abstract of Principles, as published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST nearly every week, reads as follows: "That the children of God (those already born again) are all under law to Christ, and that it is obligatory upon them to obey this law; that in doing so they enjoy the blessings promised; but in disobedience thereto they suffer the penalty thereof, while here in this world." Brother Poore says the word "law" in this article of our faith is the objection. Well, we suppose if the Bible says this is true, Brother Poole's friend will accept it. The Bible is our standard of faith, and we are willing for this article to be tried by the Standard. "To the law and to the testimony." Let us go there and see if we can find anything like a statement that somebody who has been born again is under law to Christ. Turn to (**I Corinthians 9:20-21**), and you will find this language: "And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ), that I might gain them that are without law."

Here the apostle says plainly, "being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ." These are nearly the same words as are contained in the article of our faith. If the brother objects to the article of faith saying we are under law to Christ, we suppose he would object to the apostle saying the same thing. The apostle did say, "being under the law to Christ," and we are sure the brother cannot object to that. If he cannot object to that, then he can no longer object to the article of faith.

"For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." -(**Romans 8:2**). This being true, he is delivered from the law of sin and death, and is under law to Christ. This law proclaims freedom and liberty, while the law of sin and death proclaims bondage and death. To obey the law we are under to Christ is a loving and willing service; and the one who does this is "blessed in his deed." -(**James 1:25**). "If ye love me, keep my commandments." -(**John 14:15**). "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." -(**John 13:17**). "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring

forever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold; yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned: and in keeping of them there is great reward." -**(Psalms 19:7-11)**. "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest." -**(Hebrews 8:10-11)**. This is the new covenant, and it is the claim of the Old Baptists that we are not worshipping under the old covenant. Then if we are now under the new covenant, God does write His laws in the hearts of His people; and if He does this, we are under obligation to observe those laws. To do so is not a slavish service, but a loving service. May the Lord help us to render that service, is our prayer.

Much more Scriptural testimony could be given, but we deem this to be sufficient. C. H. C.

Acts 8:16-17

(Acts 8:16-17)

---April 28, 1908

Brother W. M. Moore, of Bellefontaine, Miss., requests our views of **(Acts 8:16-17)**, and asks if they received the Holy Ghost before baptism. Brother Moore says he heard a man who claimed to be holy in body and spirit preach some time ago on this text, and that he said those people were regenerated but had not received the Holy Ghost. He says the preacher also used **((9:2) (Acts 19:2))** to prove his position.

The text in **(Acts 8:16-17)** reads, "For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." It is an immutable law in nature that everything partakes of the nature of that from which it springs. God gave this immutable law in creation. The same law holds good in grace. The work of regeneration is one in which the person regenerated is made a partaker of the Holy Spirit, or of the divine nature, in which he receives the Holy Spirit. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." - **(Titus 3:5-6)**

This shows clearly that there is a work of the Holy Spirit performed in the work of regeneration. The apostle emphatically declares, in **(Romans 8:9)**, that "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." If the man who has been regenerated is not in possession of the Spirit of Christ, or the Holy Spirit, then he is not a child of God; and if a regenerated man is not a child of God, then whose child is he? People sometimes talk about Old Baptists being ignorant; but it is very evident that all the ignorance is not in the Old Baptist Church, not by any means. Old Baptists are not so ignorant as to say that a regenerated man is not in possession of the Holy Spirit, and therefore not a child of God.

Those persons upon whom Peter and John laid their hands after they had been baptized were children of God already; and the Holy Ghost was poured out upon them in a miraculous way by the laying on of the hands of the apostles. The same is true of those characters spoken of in the nineteenth chapter upon whom Paul laid his hands. The sixth verse of that chapter says, "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." The Holy Ghost coming on them in this way was such as enabled them to speak with tongues and to prophesy. Any man who claims to have such a gift of the Holy Ghost now should be able to demonstrate the fact by speaking with tongues, and be able to tell the future for as long as one day, if no longer. The Holy Ghost fell on Cornelius before baptism. See **((0:44) (Acts 10:44-48)**. Cornelius was regenerated-born of God-accepted with Him-before Peter went down to his house. He was one that feared God, and the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. He worked righteousness, "and ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of Him." -John. His prayers were heard and "the effectual prayer of a righteous man availeth much." -James. And Peter said, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him." -**((0:34) (Acts 10:34-35)**. Then after this the Holy Ghost fell on Cornelius and his household in such a miraculous way as that they of the circumcision, or Jews, were astonished, for they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. But we have seen that Cornelius was in possession of the Holy Spirit by being regenerated before this.

"Try the spirits," is an admonition John gives; and we should do so with diligence and care. C. H. C.

Backed Down

BACKED DOWN

---May 19, 1908

A big Missionary Baptist "divine" of Chattanooga, Tenn., made a great challenge for a debate with our people some time ago. Brother D. M. Raulston, who lives in Chattanooga, accepted his challenge and wrote us asking if we would meet the Missionary champion. We replied that we would if our brethren desired us to do so. But, lo, the boastful gentleman's voice has suddenly become so impaired that he cannot debate, and they have failed to get another man! Poor fellows! A toad sometimes "swells" to wonderful proportions, and sometimes suddenly shrinks to small size. The Primitive Baptists are such an insignificant set in the estimation of some of them, and they can boast wonderfully of what they would do to these Old Baptists if they could only have the opportunity-but when the opportunity is presented, it is astonishing to think about how their voices have become impaired. If some people would strain their voices less in their boasting, perhaps they would be in better condition to do what they boasted they would do. Some folks might do more and talk less.
C. H. C.

Sin Unto Death

SIN UNTO DEATH

---May 19, 1908

Brother Joel T. Hawkins, of Arp, Texas, asks us if the death mentioned in **(I John 5:16)** is the same death as that mentioned in **((20) (James 5:20); (I John 5:16-17)** reads. "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and He shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it. All unrighteousness is sin: and there is a sin not unto death." **((9) (James 5:19-20)** reads, "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins." Yes, we think it is the same death, it is a death to the enjoyment of the fellowship of the church and to an enjoyment of the manifest presence of the Lord. It does not refer to eternal death, or to everlasting banishment from the presence of God in eternity. One might act in such a way that he should not be retained in the church, that his exclusion would be absolutely necessary-sin unto death-and there be no other way but to exclude the member: On the other hand, one might do very wrong, and yet the nature of the

wrong, or sin, he such that he may be reclaimed from the sin and he retained, and thus a soul saved from death
C. H. C.

2 Peter 2:2

(II Peter 2:2)

---May 19, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: I want your views on **(II Peter 2:2)** and oblige,
WASH HINSON.
REMARKS

The text reads, "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." There were false prophets among the people during the prophetic dispensation. So, in the gospel dispensation there are false teachers among us. Some of the false prophets were Israelites, of God's chosen people as a nation. So, some false teachers, some who are God's children, teach false doctrine, and deny the Lord that bought them. "There shall be false teachers among you. They will rise up in the church and will "draw away disciples after them." They deny the Lord that bought them in the false doctrines they teach. They bring upon themselves swift destruction. Sooner or later they are cut off from the fellowship and communion of the true followers of our Lord and Master. They are cut off from the church, and lose the fellowship and love the brethren once had for them. They are cast out, as the unprofitable servant. They are thus destroyed, and they bring it all upon themselves. They have no one to blame but themselves, for they "bring upon themselves swift destruction" by their false teaching. This truth uttered by the apostle has been abundantly exemplified during the past few years, and we fear there are others. Lord, help us all to contend for the right way, that we may never lose the fellowship and love of our brethren. C. H. C.

The Slothful Servant

THE SLOTHFUL SERVANT

---May 19, 1908

Sister J. S. Swicord, of Climax, Ga., requests us to give our views concerning the servant who hid his Lord's talent in the earth. The parable is recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew. This servant received one talent; he received according to his ability, but

instead of improving the talent he hid it in the earth. He said that his lord was a hard task-master. If we say that we cannot do what the Lord requires of us in His service, we say that He is a hard task-master, that He requires more of us than He gives us the ability to perform. But the Lord is not a hard task-master. He gives His children the ability to do what He requires them to do in rendering gospel service to Him. The unprofitable servant, who hides his talent instead of doing as the Lord requires, is cast into outer darkness. Oh, how dense that darkness is! Many of the Lord's children have realized to their sorrow how dreadful the darkness is. When we disobey our loving Saviour's commands, we are soon groping our way in the darkness. "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." How bitterly we weep then! It is so much better to use our ability and our endeavors to improve the talent our Lord has given us, and endeavor to do what He lovingly commands us as His children to do, than to hide the talent, refuse to keep His commandments, and say by our disobedience that our blessed Saviour is a hard task-master. We are commanded to let our light so shine-let it shine as a lighted candle on a candle-stick-that it may give light to all that are in the house-let our light so shine before men that others may see our good works. Others do not see our good works when we disobey our Lord. We are not then letting our light shine. The light is thus hid by our disobedience. Our talent is not put to use. Let us all try to do what our Saviour requires of us. Peace and fellowship would then reign in our beloved Zion, and the approving smiles of our adorable Redeemer would be ours to enjoy. We would then be letting brotherly love continue. May the Lord help us to do so, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Women Preachers

WOMEN PREACHERS

---May 19, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-We as Primitive Baptists, believing we are the church of God, believe a woman is out of her place to attempt to preach the gospel, as some are trying to do, for it is said in the word of God, (**I Corinthians 14:34-35**), "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak (that is, to preach); but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak (to preach) in the church."

Can we find a woman in the Primitive Baptist Church, if they are true Baptists, trying to preach?

When the twelve apostles were called why didn't Christ say, "You go, John, Mary, Susan, James," and so on, until the twelve were named? I am giving you what I think about this. It is not much, on account of me being no Bible scholar. One Sunday I was at an Arminian's for dinner and this subject came to our minds. I directed her to **(I Corinthians 14:34-35)**, and she directed me to **((2) (Philippians 4:2)**, "I beseech Euodias, and beseech Syntyche, that they be of the same mind in the Lord." These were two women who were church workers at Philippi. Being no Bible scholar, I could not give an answer to her proof. Will you please compare through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST **(I Corinthians 14:34-35)** with **((2) (Philippians 4:2)** as soon as you can? Your brother,
Wadesville, Ind., R. 20.
LESTER E. RECORDS.
REMARKS

We know of no Primitive Baptist woman posing as a preacher. It makes no difference what the Arminian world may say, nor how much they may endeavor to make it appear that **((2) (Philippians 4:2)** justifies a woman preaching, it still remains true that it is positively forbidden in God's word. The place referred to in Corinthians not only forbids it, but **(I Timothy 2:11-12)** also positively forbids it. The apostle there says, "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." The apostle here plainly says, "I suffer not a woman to teach." The church that does suffer it now is not like the apostle, and therefore is not the church of God. These women mentioned in **((2) (Philippians 4:2)** were not preachers. There is not even the shadow of an intimation that they were. Preaching is not the only kind of church work there is to do. The third verse of the same chapter says, "And I entreat thee also, true yoke-fellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellow-laborers, whose names are in the book of life." These women helped the apostle in bearing his burdens, and encouraged him on his way. So do many of the sisters now help the poor ministers along the way; they speak words of encouragement to them and in different ways help them in their ministry, yet they themselves do not pose as preachers. In **(Romans 16:3-4,5-6)**, the apostle says, "Greet Priscilla and Aquila my helpers in Christ Jesus: who have for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles. Likewise greet the church that is in their house. Salute my well-beloved Epaenetus, who is of the first fruits of Achaia unto

Christ. Greet Mary, who bestowed much labour on us. This shows how some of the sisters helped the apostle-but no intimation that they were preachers. There is absolutely no Scripture authority for a woman to preach; there is no precept nor example for such a thing. There is no authority for it, either express or; implied. We can see only one reason for a woman posing as a preacher, and that is she wants a name, or excitement, or wants to act "smart." The Lord in His personal ministry, never sent out a woman to preach-not one. Neither does the Lord send them now. C. H. C.

John 3:5

(John 3:5)

---May 26, 1908

Elder T. M. Hood, of Dickson, Tenn., requests our views of **(John 3:5)** and asks why the water is spoken of first. The text reads, "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Bear in mind that the subject the Saviour had under consideration was the new birth, in the third verse He says, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." It may also be correctly rendered, "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." The Saviour, then, was talking about being born again, or being born from above. The word "and" in the fifth verse may be correctly rendered "even" -thus, "Except a man be born of water, even Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Again in the seventh verse He said, "Ye must be born again" - or born from above. In the sixth verse the expression, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," does not mean that one who is born of flesh is nothing more than a lump of flesh, for the man is a being composed of soul, body and spirit. Neither can the expression, "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," be taken in an abstract sense. The Saviour teaches in these expressions the great truth that everything partakes of the nature of that from which it springs. Thus in being born of an earthly parentage one partakes of the nature of that parentage, and in being born of the Spirit one partakes of the divine nature. In this birth of the Spirit there is a washing or cleansing of the soul. In that sense the Saviour here uses the word "water," as denoting a washing or cleansing. **(Titus 3:5)** says, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Here it is called a washing. Water signifies the same. "Born of water and of the Spirit," and "washing of

regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." It is the work of the Holy Ghost or Spirit of God to renew the sinner, and this is done by regeneration, in which there is a washing. "That He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." - (**Ephesians 5:26**). Here the work of regeneration, that work which prepares us in soul for heaven, is called "washing of water by the word." This is not the natural water, which is filthy at best. Take a powerful magnifying glass and look at a drop of clear water through it and you will see a living, working mass. But this water, or washing of regeneration, is a cleansing work.

The water does not refer to baptism, for if it did baptism would, sure enough, precede regeneration; and baptism would be the turning point upon which the eternal destiny of the sinner is hinged. Neither does it refer to the natural birth, for two good reasons. If it refers to that, it would also follow that the natural birth must precede the spiritual birth in all cases, but John the Baptist was born of the Spirit before his natural birth into the World. Besides, the text says, "Except a man be born of water." A man is one who has already been born of the flesh. Hence the Saviour was talking of those who had been born of the flesh, and if the water referred to the birth of the flesh, then the man must again be born of the flesh then of the Spirit in order to enter into the kingdom of God. C. H. C.

Hebrews 2:2-3

---May 26, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother in the Lord, as I hope-We are strangers in the flesh, but if I am what I profess and hope to be, we are not only acquainted but kin in the spirit. I have been taking your valuable paper, THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, since March, 1907, and am well pleased with it. It sets forth the doctrine of the Bible, or what I understand as the doctrine. As I have read some of your views on questions asked you to my satisfaction, I would be pleased to have your views on (**Hebrews 2:2-3**), "For if the word. spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him." What salvation is under consideration, and what is it we will not escape if we neglect the salvation? Some say we cannot neglect a thing we are not in possession of, and then say the salvation spoken of is common or time salvation, which I understand to be our reward in obedience, which we are not in possession of until we obey. This view seems

inconsistent to me. Please answer through the paper, or privately, if you think worthy of answer.

May the God of all grace bless you and uphold you in your good work, is my prayer. Remember me and mine, if not asking too much.

Your brother, I hope,

D. M. STILL

Dickson, Tenn.

OUR REPLY

The opposite of salvation is condemnation. The question, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" is a stronger way of saying, "If we neglect that salvation, we cannot escape the opposite of the salvation." If the salvation here spoken of is eternal salvation, then it necessarily follows that our escaping eternal condemnation depends largely upon our not neglecting our eternal salvation. Eternal condemnation is the opposite of eternal salvation. A farmer may neglect his crop. If he does neglect it, he will have no crop—he will not reap a harvest. He must sow the seed, and not neglect to cultivate, if he reaps a harvest. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." If the farmer sows wheat, he will not reap corn from that sowing. After he sows the wheat, it is necessary that he cultivate the crop in order that he reap a bountiful harvest. "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip." "If ye sow to the flesh, ye shall of the flesh reap corruption." If the farmer sows bad seed he will not reap a good harvest, If he sows burrs he will not reap wheat. "Beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity." **-(II Peter 1:5-6,7).**

To sow as we should and to cultivate properly in the Christian life requires diligence. It is necessary to give earnest heed. If we neglect, then we are not giving earnest heed and are not diligent. If we are not giving earnest heed and are not diligent, then we "let them slip" - we are neglecting the salvation, and cannot escape the condemnation, which is the opposite of the salvation.

Our escaping eternal condemnation does not, in any sense, depend upon what we do or fail to do. This depends altogether upon the mercy and grace of God, and what Christ has done for us. "Not according to our works, but according to His mercy He saved us," says the apostle. "Not of works, lest any man should boast," he says again. When he said this, he was talking about that work which will give us to live with God in glory. "But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus." **-(I Corinthians 1:30).** It is the work of God that one, is in

Christ. He escapes eternal condemnation by the work of God- what God does for him-only and alone. It is the work of God only and alone by which one escapes eternal condemnation.

If the man who has natural life is slothful and neglectful of the duties of that life, he fails to enjoy the blessings of the life. He is not saved from the curses, or the opposite of those blessings. He cannot escape the opposite. So, the child of God, that one who is in Christ and who has the life of Christ implanted in his soul, who neglects the duties of that life, cannot escape the condemnation-cannot escape a guilty conscience. If he does not take heed, does not give diligence in that life, he is not saved from the pitfalls and snares set for him by Satan. It is necessary that he take heed and give diligence in doing what the Saviour requires in order that he escape those things and be saved from them. It is necessary that he give diligence and take heed, in order that he escape false doctrine and false practice. May the Lord help us to take heed, to be diligent in the discharge of our duty, that we may thereby save ourselves from the untoward generation, that we may be saved from the inventions of men and from their false doctrines and practices, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

Wonderful Historian

WONDERFUL HISTORIAN

---June 2, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Esteemed Sir-The enclosed clipping was taken from the Weekly Commercial Appeal, of Memphis. If you have the time, I would be glad that you would put the illustrious ancient historian and perambulating encyclopedia, that turns out made to order answers for every conceivable question, for the column in the Commercial Appeal, right as to date. With best wishes, I am yours very truly,

J. W. DELK

Coffeetown, Miss.

R. I

THE CLIPPING

Q.-Where, when and by whom were these religious denominations founded: 1. Presbyterian; 2. Methodist; 3. Missionary Baptist; 4. Primitive or Hardshell Baptist. READER.

A-1. John Calvin, 1509-1564, is called the father of Presbyterianism. His great work was done during his exile at Geneva. John Knox (1507-1572) was the leader in establishing Presbyterianism in Scotland, and the first presbytery was organized in England in 1572.

2. Methodism grew out of the movement led in England by John Wesley (1703-1781,) and the first organization was in 1739. The government of the church took practically its present form in 1743. Thomas Coke organized the church in America in 1784. 3 and 4. The name Baptist was first given in 1644 to an organization of English Separatists. The England Baptist Missionary Society was organized in 1792 under the leadership of William Carey. The "Hard-shell," or Primitive, or Anti-Mission body was organized about 1835 in the United States. They claim to be the original Baptists, while all others have departed from the correct principles and practices.

REMARKS

We shall not notice all of the above statements of this wonderful historian. We will simply say that the people known now as Primitive Baptists, called "Hardshells" by the enemies of truth, can trace their identity by history through the centuries to the days of the apostles by their doctrine and teaching. It makes no difference what they were called in different places and at different times, they were the same people.

The above historian (?) admits that the England Baptist Missionary Society was organized in 1792. That is true, and it was the first missionary society organized among the Baptists. This is admitted by all informed persons, be they Baptists or anything else. After that, the mission question was introduced in this country and societies begin to be organized here. The first one in this country was organized several years after 1792. For years the churches groaned and labored under these departures, until finally in 1832 a convention met at Black Rock, Md., and formally declared against the new measures and departures from the old order and simplicity of the gospel. The separation was final in about 1840. Thus the Missionary Baptist denomination came into existence. The admission that the Baptists existed prior to 1792, and that the mission system began in their ranks that year, which system the Missionaries now have, is an admission that they are the new order, and they have been adding new theories and inventions all along since their birth at such a rapid rate that their "daddy" (Andrew Fuller) would not know his "baby" if he could be brought back to earth now.

C. H. C.

Pray For Laborers

PRAY FOR LABORERS

---June 9, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Our little band of brethren and sisters met last first Saturday, but as we have no pastor we had no preaching. We sorrowfully turned our faces homeward, thinking all along the way, "Have we done our duty?" Tell us, Brother Cayce, should we have sung some songs and then all prayed for the Lord to send laborers, for the harvest is great, or was that command to the minister alone?

Will not some brother send us an appointment? We are few, but I believe all are faithful, but my own imperfect self.

Brother Cayce, may the good Lord sustain you and give you of His wisdom from on high to proclaim the merits and the power of a never-dying Saviour to save the vilest sinner without the help of man. Dear brethren and sisters, please pray for me and my dear family. Your sister in hope of a better, brighter, world,

S. A. CARRUTH

Tupelo, Miss.

R. 3.

REMARKS

We think it would be right for the church to hold conference whether a preacher is present or not. We think one great trouble and cause of so much coldness among the brethren is that they depend too much on the preacher. It appears sometimes that the preacher is depended on to do all the singing, praying and preaching; and sometimes it looks as though the preacher is depended on to do all the hearing too. Yes, it would have been right if you had engaged in singing some hymns in praise to the Lord. The Lord is worshipped in song as well as preaching, and sometimes that is a very sweet part of the service. And if you felt your need of a laborer in the Lord's vineyard, why should you not bow in humble prayer to the Lord of the harvest and pray Him to send laborers into the harvest? It seems to us that those who feel and realize the need of true gospel laborers could very consistently pray the Lord to send them. The Lord gives ministers to the church. See **(Ephesians 4:8-13)**. As the ministry (laborers in the vineyard) are gifts of the Lord to the church, why should they not pray to the Lord for them? Yes, pray the Lord of the harvest to send laborers into that part of His vineyard, as well as into other places.

C. H. C.

Information Wanted

INFORMATION WANTED

---August 4, 1908

Is salvation by grace or of works? My Bible teaches me that salvation is by grace and not of works. **(Ephesians 2:8-9)**. But I notice that many of our preachers teach salvation by grace and works, especially during the protracted meetings. They will preach salvation by grace and practice salvation by works. They will preach salvation by grace in the pulpit and then come down and introduce works and make all kinds of propositions to sinners and get all they can to take the anxious seats, as they call them. (Where is the Scriptural authority for it? Book, chapter and verse, please.) Then they will turn to the Christians and begin to make propositions something like these: "If any of you have children or a friend back in the congregation, go to them; and if any of you have a son or a daughter at these anxious seats, come and bow by them." Next, "Let all the Christians come to the altar and bow with these anxious ones; get as close to them as you can." Just as if the Lord could not or would not save the people by themselves or without a lot of help. Now will some preacher or preachers that follow these practices tell me where I can find a Scriptural authority for such practices? I can't find it. Please give me book, chapter and verse, if it is in the Bible. If not, why practice something that the Lord never taught us? Is it for the purpose of creating an excitement in order to get people into the church to count numbers? Is there not great danger of creating an excitement and through animal magnetism or mesmerism, cause people to be deceived and cause souls to go to hell? I think many of our preachers ought to get back to the Bible and quit preaching after Rome and her grand-daughters-C. S. Gregory, Ratiiff, Miss., in Baptist Flag, July 23, 1903.

REMARKS

If you will examine the twenty-third chapter of Revelation carefully perhaps you will find the authority for such practices as you mention, as well as many other things engaged in by the Missionary Baptists. If you do not find the authority there for the practice you mention, you will not find it in the Bible.

Here is another point our friend Gregory may consider: The preacher will often tell the sinners that Christ is standing there at the altar ready, willing and anxious to save them; and that all that is necessary for them to be saved is for them to come to the altar and give themselves to the Lord. Then when the sinners come to the altar to give themselves to the Lord, the preacher will kneel in prayer and beg the Lord to "come now and save these poor penitent sinners." Now the question: Was the Lord there when the preacher said He was? If so, did He leave when the sinners came? If He was there at the first, then left, was He ready, willing and anxious to save

them? If He was, did He change His notion, and leave when the sinners went there? If He did not leave, why does the preacher pray for Him to come? Why do they preach one way, and pray another? Why do they preach, sometimes, that salvation is by grace, and then tell the sinners they will go to hell unless they do thus and so? Do not some men judge for reward, teach for hire, and divine for money? See **(Micah 3:11)**. Do not some people teach that they could take the world for Christ if they had money enough? Does not this make the eternal destiny of men and women depend upon money and the liberality of the people? Does your home in heaven depend upon this, or does it depend upon the mercy and grace of God? Can your home in heaven depend upon the mercy and grace of God, and the home of another in heaven depend upon something else? Is God dependent upon money and the liberality of the people to save His people? Is not the world and all its fullness His? If He was hungry, would He tell you? Does not God do His will? Is it not God's work to save? Then, will He not save all that it is His will to save? If not, why not? These questions are only a few of the many that often arise in our mind. We give them to our readers and trust they may ponder them in their hearts. Oh, that the Lord's people might see the truth and be blessed with the holy boldness to contend for the same, and to come out from among the false religionists of the day.
C. H. C.

Converts for Nine Dollars

CONVERTS FOR NINE DOLLARS

---August 18, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Here is a clipping from today's Memphis Commercial. This is the first time I ever saw anything like it in newspaper print, however I've heard of such at divers times and it just made my poor heart throb at the idea of such. I read it to a friend of mine who was sitting near by, and he just remarked: "It's the first time I ever heard that it cost money to bring men to Christ," and stated he did not believe in such and that from all appearances, he said, it looked like the way religious services are being conducted is a money machine. He is not a member of any church. Make a note of the clipping some time if you deem it proper.
With much love,
E. A. GULLEDGE.
THE CLIPPING

Oklahoma City, Okla., May 23-Converts to the Baptist faith are won in Oklahoma at a cost of but \$9 each, a record in economy

surpassing that of any other state or territory, according to a statement made at today's session of the Northern Baptist Convention by Rev. C. J. Stalcup, representing the Home Mission Society of Oklahoma. Dr. Stalcup recounted the history of the mission work in Oklahoma, beginning with the Christian crusade in 1865, and said it had been continued up to the present time without interruption and with very gratifying results.

REMARKS

According to the minutes of the Tennessee Baptist State Convention for 1905 and the Baptist and Reflector, converts in Oklahoma cost four dollars more than they did in Tennessee that year. They would do more good by spending their money where it costs less to save a soul. We wonder if they will sing in heaven, "Thank the Missionaries and the liberal people for spending money to save our souls." Such perversions of God's word is common in these days. It seems that the people love to be humbugged.

C. H. C.

Predestinarian Baptist

PREDESTINARIAN BAPTIST

---September 8, 1908

We have before us Vol. 1, No. 1, of a paper called "Predestinarian Baptist," published by Elders C. M. Weaver and W. I. Camel. Elder Weaver is connected with a disorderly faction in Illinois, and was a leading figure in a division in the Bethel Association in that state a few years ago. Elder Camel was born and reared in West Tennessee, and we have known him for years. He was a leader in an unholy and sad division in our churches some years ago. The Baptists in our country nearly all know him, and he has no standing among our people. Neither of these men would be received by or in any of our churches. We note some of the principles they propose to stand for and teach in their paper, which have always been a source of strife, confusion, discord and division in every place and at every time they have been taught and advocated among them. We also note some of their inconsistencies. We feel it to be our indispensable duty to call the attention of our brethren to these things, and to raise a note of warning and cry of approaching danger to the brethren in sections where these things are likely to be introduced and bring more trouble into our beloved Zion.

This paper (the Predestinarian Baptist) proposes to advocate the doctrine of the absolute and unconditional predestination of all things that come to pass, the annihilation of the wicked, and that an

experience of grace is the only thing necessary to obtain and retain membership in the church of Christ.

In an article copied from the "Advocate of Truth," and endorsed by Elder Weaver, this statement is found: "Now with these facts confronting us, witnessed by inspiration, we should not wonder that the Lord said to Daniel, 'The wicked shall do wickedly.' This is an expression of the decree of God. In this chapter and the one preceding it, the word shall, in speaking of the future acts of His creatures, is used as directed by Jehovah more than 150 times, and he prefaces the whole of it by saying, 'and now will I shew you the truth.' There is no uncertainty attending these shalls; and linguists tell us that 'will' used with the first person or 'shall' with the second or third person expresses determination." According to this statement, every time God says "you shall" or "they shall" or "thou shalt," it expresses God's determination-that God has determined it to be that way. If that be true, then some of God's determination fails. The Lord said to Adam, "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it." -(**Genesis 2:17**). If the term, "thou shalt," or "you shall," expresses God's determination, as that article says, then God determined that Adam should not eat of that tree; but he did eat, and therefore God's determination was a failure. The Lord has also said. "Thou shalt not kill. Neither shalt thou commit adultery. Neither shalt thou steal. Neither shalt thou bear false witness against thy neighbor." -(**Deuteronomy 5:17-20**). According to the statement of the paper referred to above, God determined that these people should not kill, nor commit adultery, nor steal, nor bear false witness. Yet some do these things; hence, according to that position, God's determination or predestination is a failure.

Now, the truth of the matter is that the statement made in the paper is not correct. The word shall is sometimes used in making a statement of a fact, and sometimes in giving a command. In (**Genesis 2:17**) and in (**Deuteronomy 5:17-20**) it is used as a command. These were commands given by the Lord. In the statement, "the wicked shall do wickedly," is no expression whatever of God's determination or predestination. It is simply a true statement of a fact. Upon this principle the Scriptures harmonize. The predestination of God does not bear the same relation to sin and wickedness as it does to righteousness and holiness, and when no distinction is made in one's preaching or teaching on this line, trouble and confusion always follows.

If their position regarding the annihilation of the wicked be true, then the Baptists have been wrong all along the line. Our articles of faith are wrong, and the whole denomination, as a body, is wrong. This is

the first and only paper we know of among us that in its first issue comes out squarely against our articles of faith, and openly repudiates an article which is accepted by nearly all who claim to be Old School Baptists. It is true that some have held this view as their private opinion, which has been allowed, and no quarrel raised. But in every case where it has been advocated, it has caused division. Many churches in Kansas were torn to pieces by the introduction and teaching of that doctrine among them. If that position be true, our whole denomination would have to be reformed and reconstructed. This cannot be done. They may be divided and their peace and union destroyed by the introduction of new measures and heresies, but they cannot be reconstructed. The Saviour said, in **(Matthew 25:46)**, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." The same word which is translated eternal with reference to the life of the righteous is the word used in the original with reference to the punishment of the wicked. "These shall go away into aionion punishment: but the righteous into aionion life." If the life of the righteous is eternal, then the punishment of the wicked is eternal. If the punishment of the wicked ceases, then the life of the righteous will cease, for one is as lasting as the other. If their other contention be true, that an experience of grace is all that can be required of one in order that membership be had and one be retained in the church of Christ, then the church has no right to discipline her members. The position is in direct opposition to the very idea of discipline. If one has an experience, according to their position, no matter how badly he might conduct himself, the church would have no right to exclude him from their fellowship. When Elder Camel lived in our country and helped to divide our churches, we thought then that the doctrine he advocated was a cloak for wrong doing, and this looks to us as though it is the same thing.

The doctrine of grace presents no such things as this. The doctrine of the Bible teaches that we should live as becometh children of God, and that we should not have fellowship for those who do not. Such teaching as they have put forth in the first issue of their paper can only cause strife and division in every place where it obtains a footing, and it is the indispensable duty of the brethren everywhere to let the teachers of such things alone. It grieves us to feel the necessity of raising a warning cry against these things, but we feel that it is our duty, which it is if we are what we profess to be. Dear brethren, we beseech you, in the name of Christ, and for the sake of the peace, and union, and fellowship of the churches, to take warning. C. H. C.

2 Corinthians 4:3

(II Corinthians 4:3)

---September 8, 1908

We have been requested to give our views on **(II Corinthians 4:3)**, which reads, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost." The next verse reads, "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." We think the apostle has reference to the children of God whose minds are blinded by the god or gods of this world. The good news of Christ is hid to them. They do not believe the gospel. They have an experimental knowledge of the Lord; but their minds are so blinded by false teachers and their teaching that the gospel in its purity and sweetness is hid to them. The Saviour says in **(Matthew 13:15)**, "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." It is God's people whose heart waxes gross, and whose ears become dull of hearing, and who close their eyes to the truth. The heart of the unregenerate is desperately wicked, and does not become gross. He has no spiritual ears nor eyes to become dull or to close. The heart of a child of God may become gross, his ears dull of hearing, and his eyes closed. When he is in this condition the gospel of Christ, the glad tidings, is hid to him, and he is lost to its sweetness. When one is in this condition he is not converted from his errors, or from the ways of the world, and the light of the glad tidings does not shine unto him. It is hid to him, and he is lost in the darkness of the world, false theory, false religion, false doctrine, false practice, doubt and despair. Yet, notwithstanding his losing so much while journeying here as a pilgrim, he shall not be utterly cast down nor destroyed, for the Lord upholdeth him with His hand, and will at last take the poor wanderer home to Himself, where sorrows and troubles and afflictions will be no more.

C. H. C.

Revelation 22:18-19

---September 8, 1908

We have been requested to give our views on **(Revelation 22:19)**. Verses 18 and 19 read, "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this

book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." The book of life referred to in verse 19 may be the same as the tree of life referred to in verse 2 of the same chapter, and also in verse 14. The city, or holy city, is referred to in verse 14. The holy city is the church. The tree of life may be Christ in His manifest presence to His children in the church. Their part in the church is to have sweet delight in the realization and manifestation of His presence. They feed upon His promises, and sit with Him. But when they "take away from the words of the book of this prophecy," their part is taken away, and they have not the enjoyment of the presence of Jesus nor the comfort and sweetness of His presence to feed them. They have no place in the church or holy city. They do not sit with Jesus in His kingdom or church. The plagues are added and the joys and comforts of the Christian life are taken away.

C. H. C.

2 Peter 2:22

(II Peter 2:22)

---September 8, 1908

We have been requested to give our views on this text, which reads, "But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned unto his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." Peter says it happened unto some people according to the proverb, which he says is a true one. A dog will turn to his vomit and again eat that which he vomited up. A sow may be washed forty times, yet will wallow in the mud at every opportunity. Their natures are not changed. They have only the one nature, so with the unregenerate. They may make great professions and much outward show of cleanliness, but when convenient opportunity presents itself, and they think they may not be found out or caught in their wickedness, they will wallow in the filth again and will again eat the sins that they have professed to hate. It is their nature, for the nature has not been changed, and they have no holy nature. God's people are sheep. A sheep will not wallow in the filth and mire. C. H. C.

1 Peter 2:13

---September 8, 1908

We have been requested to give our views on this text, which reads, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake:

whether it be to the king, as supreme;" verse 14, "or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by Him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well." This teaches us that God's people should be a law-abiding people; that we should be subject to kings and governors, and obey their laws, commandments and ordinances in all things and in all matters not contrary to the commands of our God. We should obey the laws of our country in all respects where conscience is not interfered with.
C. H. C.

Romans 8:1

---October 6, 1908

We do not think Paul's expression in Romans, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," has reference to obedience, or that the Lord's people are not condemned because they walk after the Spirit. We believe it is true that there is a sense in which the children of God are condemned when they disobey, but we do not think this text is treating upon that subject. The apostle continues the expression, and tells why there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."
This is why they are not condemned. We offer this in kindness. C. H. C.

IS IT TRUE?-SOMETHING NEW

---October 20, 1908

I am told that the long agitated question among Missionaries as to whether the boards control the churches or the churches control the boards a year ago at New Albany, Miss., assumed a new shape. E. L. Wesson, former editor of The Expositor and Journal, of Memphis, which paper was sold to J. B. Cranfill, the leading editor of the Board party, who at that time was editor of the Baptist Tribune, to which Elder E. L. Wesson became field editor, and afterwards pastor. While pastor at New Albany this same F. L. Wesson, endorsed by all the leading board people, ordered a former member of New Albany Baptist Church to sit down. The member of the church turned to the church and said, "I appeal to the church." These five words and no more. The episode is too long to record. The Lowreys, of Blue Mountain College, I N. Penick, and the Baptist Flag endorse and honor F. L. Wesson. The question I want to ask THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST to answer is, Is that the private opinion of these great men, or will they publicly say what they have privately done, namely, "No

man has the right to say to a Baptist church, 'I appeal to the church?'" Or, in other words, Is the authority in the preacher or in the church?

F. L. Wesson is counted authority, and his associates stand high, too. An open debate might be healthy, too, as lawyers are not informed and differ about the legal phase of the case.

This was done in regular conference under a regular motion. A SUBSCRIBER.

REMARKS

We do not know what these men will say publicly, but we do know what the practice of the Missionary Baptist Church is. The boards control the churches, and the preachers are the bosses. It is true also that they have usually claimed that the church controls. but their practice has not been that way. Read the constitution of the Southern Baptist Convention for evidence that the churches do not control.

C. H. C.

NO MISREPRESENTATION

---October 20, 1908

Elder C. M. Weaver says in the Predestinarian Baptist of October 1: "Now before you undertake to injure us and the Predestinarian Baptist, I think it would be more becoming of you and would look much more like the right spirit for you to first take up our articles of faith and prove them untrue by the Bible, and show that we are not occupying primitive grounds. Will you do this, or will you continue to misrepresent us and poison the minds of the brethren against us?" In this you charge us with misrepresenting you. We deny the charge and demand the proof.

It is not necessary to take up one's articles of faith and prove them untrue in order to prove that he does not teach the truth, for some people sometimes teach things that are not in harmony with their articles of faith. We did refer to statements you made and some you endorsed, and if those statements were not your teaching then there is nothing in language.

But Elder Weaver teaches that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated from all eternity all things that come to pass. He now accuses us of misrepresenting him. If we did as he accuses us. and if his teaching is true, then God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated from all eternity that we should misrepresent him. Then why complain at us? Are you not complaining at God's predestination?

He says that it would be more becoming of us to do another way than the way he says we did. Then we suppose it would have been more becoming of us if we had done differently to the way God predestinated we should do. If God predestinated that we should do the way we did, then we suppose He predestinated that we should not do some other way. So Elder Weaver thinks it would have been becoming of us to do what God predestinated we should not do. He seems to think it was unbecoming of us because we were carrying out God's predestination.

Elder Weaver indirectly accuses us of believing the Missionary Baptist doctrine, which he knows is untrue. He knows that the Missionary Baptists teach that the receiving of eternal life is conditional on the part of the alien sinner, and he also knows that we do not teach this. Hence his charge is without foundation, and he certainly knows it. Elder Weaver also intimates that he would like to have a debate. Have you a man that your brethren will endorse as an honorable man and able to set forth your doctrine and defend it? And will he affirm that "The Scriptures teach that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated from all eternity all things whatsoever cometh to pass, both good and bad?" If you have the man and he will affirm that proposition, and you want a debate, we are sure you can be accommodated.

C. H. C.

FAIRCHILD PEACE PROPOSITION

---October 27, 1908

Some time ago we received a copy of a "Peace Proposition," by Elder J. W. Fairchild, editor of the Footprints of the Flock. Several brethren have asked us what we think of it, so we feel called upon to express our opinion of it publicly. We would have done so before this time, but we have been so far behind with our work that we could find little time to write.

We will now say plainly that we do not endorse the move, and do not endorse some of the points brought out in the proposition, besides the proposition does not appear to us to be in harmony with itself. Not only is this true, but Elder Fairchild has been a leader in advocating the things that caused the division among us on predestination and common or time salvation. In 1905 Elder Fairchild made a trip to Texas and went among those who denounce our brethren as "Bildads," "Arminians," etc. The following is a sample of what Elder Fairchild himself said of our brethren in Texas: There was one addition to the church at this association, and another one baptized who had joined some time before. The one who joined

was L. E. Skinner. Brother Skinner had been a Missionary Baptist preacher, but becoming convinced that the Old School Baptists are the church of God, he sought a home among them. Not understanding the difference between the true and so-called Baptists in Texas, he joined the "Bar Baptists," or Webb faction, but soon found that they are more bitter enemies to the truth and its advocates than the Missionaries themselves.

This is a short extract from what Elder Fairchild said of our Texas brethren, and as we stand with them in doctrine, so far as we know, we feel that it includes us. Here he calls the true and faithful advocates of truth in Texas a faction, and "more bitter enemies to the truth and its advocates than the Missionary Baptists." We do not understand why Elder Fairchild would want fellowship with us while he considers us such bitter enemies to the truth. Does he want fellowship with the Missionaries too? If not, why not-seeing he asks us to fellowship him, while he considers us more bitter enemies to the truth than the Missionaries.

In another place in this paper is an article written by Elder Fairchild in 1896 and a reply written by Elder Lemuel Potter. We copy them from the Church Advocate of June, 1896. We think Elder Fairchild should retract a little before asking the brethren to fellowship him with his teaching.

When Elder Fairchild asks us to fellowship him and his teaching, with those who stand with him, and who advocate the same doctrine he has been advocating, we are asked to fellowship such teaching as the following: In the Bethel church trial in the Circuit Court of Graves county, Ky., Elder R. H. Boaz' deposition was taken in February, 1897. This question was put to Elder Boaz: "You will please state whether or not you believe that man has the power to will or to do sinful acts unless God purposed and predestinated that he should do those sinful acts?" His reply was: "I answer again that the purpose or predestination of God, according to our belief on the subject, has nothing to do with the shaping of man's will; but that man has not the power to will or to do anything that thwarts God's purpose or predestination.

I ANSWER THAT MAN HAS NOT THE POWER TO WILL OR TO DO A SINFUL ACT UNLESS GOD PREDESTINATED AND WILLED THAT HE SHOULD DO IT. For I believe that God purposed or decreed all things whatsoever cometh to pass." (The emphasis is ours.) When it comes to this, we must beg to be excused. If we must believe this in order to be a Primitive Baptist, we confess we are not one.

In Elder Fairchild's article concerning his trip in Texas, from which the above extract is quoted, he says they have been persecuted and

falsely accused. In his peace proposition he says, "We unconditionalists (a great many of us at least) have learned that we were mistaken concerning the views of our conditional brethren: that they do not hold that God's regenerated people have the ability to obey independent of the Spirit, and by obedience merit blessings." In all candor we would ask why has anyone ever understood us to teach that God's people had the ability to obey independent of the Spirit? Elder Fairchild and those who have stood with him have charged us with believing and teaching this, but we have always denied it, and have always argued that it is THROUGH THE SPIRIT that they are able to obey.

He also says in his peace proposition that the bars of fellowship were set up by those who believe in limited predestination and conditional time salvation. This may be true so far as he knows; but if so, his knowledge is limited.

In our country we begged and plead and labored for peace; we begged that these things not be made a test of fellowship nor made a hobby of, but our pleadings were all in vain. It was said that we were heretics and should be rejected. If we were heretics then, we are heretics now, for we stand now just where we did then.

We would like to know if Elder Fairchild believes as Elder Boaz stated his belief in his deposition quoted from above? We do not believe what Elder Boaz said he believed, and beg to be excused when we are asked to fellowship it. Elder Fairchild says in his peace proposition that "so long as real differences exist between us there will be confusion, and peace will never be brought about by crying, "Peace, peace, where there is no peace." If he believes as Elder Boaz, then there is a real difference existing between us, and Elder Fairchild says "so long as real differences exist between us there will be confusion." Then, why not let us alone and let us have peace? Do you want to be among us again in order to have more confusion? As sore as the doctrine is preached among us again that caused the confusion before, it would cause the same thing again. The churches in our country are in peace, and they do not want that doctrine preached among them.

Elder Fairchild further says in his peace proposition, "But there can be no acceptable service rendered to God only that which is the fruit of the Spirit; therefore their obedience depends not on their own volition, but upon the Spirit of God. We 'work out our own salvation with fear and trembling.' We do the work; but the reason we work out our salvation is because 'God works in us, both to will and to do of His good pleasure.'" If the child of God has no volition in rendering obedience, then there is no obedience rendered. The windmill turns,

but it does not do so voluntarily. It does not obey. The service which God accepts is a willing service, rendered from a principle of love. "If his offering be a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord." -**(Leviticus 1:3)**. This was for the children of Israel. True, the offerings and sacrifices made under the law represented the offering which Christ should make for the sins of His people, yet it is necessary for us to make a sacrifice now in order that we render true and acceptable service to the Lord. As the sacrifices made then must be made willingly, so must they be thus made now. If they are made grudgingly they are not acceptable before the Lord. He requires a willing service. Hence there must be some volition. It is also true, however, that volition, or will, springs from life. A will for natural things springs from the natural life; so a will for holiness and righteousness springs from the divine life which God implants within the soul by the direct work of His Spirit. When this is done we are required to render this willing service.

Again, Elder Fairchild says in his proposition, "And should any do what Christ commands, hoping thereby to obtain a reward, they would be the servants of self, seeking their own welfare and not the glory of God. All such service is selfish, and can never be well pleasing in the sight of God." David says, "The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.

More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned, and in keeping of them there is great reward." - **(Psalms 19:8-11)**. If there is no sense in which we should render service to the Lord in hope of reward, why would David use this language? The reader will please turn and read **((8) (Proverbs 11:18); ((21) (25:21-22); ((0:41) (Matthew 10:41-42); (I Corinthians 3:8); ((23) (Colossians 3:23-25); (Hebrews 11:6)**. The Saviour says, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." - **(Matthew 11:28-30)**. The reward or rest is what the weary and heavy laden is longing for, and in this text he is expressly told by the Saviour to take His yoke and he shall find that reward of rest which he is longing for.

We wonder if Elder Fairchild was not laboring under a heavy burden before he went before the church and related what he hoped the Lord had done for him? And we wonder if he did not go to the church hoping to find relief there? If so, was he not hoping for a reward or rest in doing this? And we wonder if the Lord was pleased with this act of his? Again, we wonder if he did not begin preaching hoping to find rest-hoping for a reward? We wonder if he would continue preaching if he was as well satisfied when he is not thus engaged? Then, does he not continue preaching in the hope of continually finding that rest-hoping to continually receive the reward? Unless he can receive our views, then there is a difference existing between us. These things are what Elders Boaz, Perkins & Co., have continually called Arminianism in this country. There are certainly a great many commandments, admonitions and exhortations in the Scriptures. The Arminians have always applied them to the alien or unregenerate sinner. The Old Baptists have always said they belong to the child of God. Instead, therefore, of being Arminianism, it is what we have always used to defeat them and to overthrow their positions and arguments. We stand on the same old platform, and have no other place to go, neither do we desire any. May the Lord help us all to stand in that way, and help us to watch as well as pray.
C. H. C.

NO FELLOWSHIP

---October 27, 1908

The Predestinarian Baptist of Oct. 1, 1908, has an editorial over the signature of W., which we presume to be Elder C. M. Weaver, which says: "We never met Elder Fairchild, but have known of him for several years; and have always known him to be a Baptist of the old sort and one that would stick." He put out a declaration of his faith on predestination and time salvation some time ago and requested all who could stand with him to notify him. I have read his declaration of principles and find them to be just what I believe and teach, and I take this method of saying to him, I join you heart and hand on the doctrine of unlimited predestination and salvation unconditional and all of grace. * * * I am ready to walk with any of God's children in the truth, but I cannot and will not walk a single day on this earth with 'conditional time salvation,' the doctrine of chance, or any other that seeks to rob God of His glory. I want to walk with him who walks with God." Now, Elder Fairchild, there you have it, precisely! Do any of the "unconditionalists" declare non-fellowship? What do you say now? And does not Elder Weaver's statement have in it that those brethren who believe what they call "conditional time salvation" also

believe in a chance system, and a system that seeks to rob God of His glory? Is not this enough?

C. H. C.

INFANT SALVATION

---November 17, 1908

In this issue of this paper is a letter from Brother James A Leake, in which he requests our views on infant salvation. He says the Arminians argue that the Primitive Baptists preach infant damnation. This old story has been told on the Primitive Baptists until it has become stale and gray-headed. No honest well informed person makes such a charge against the Primitive Baptists. The person who does it is either willfully ignorant or maliciously falsifies.

In **(0:15) (Mark 10:15)** the Saviour says, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." This teaches us that the adult is saved the very same way that a little child is saved. Some may say that it teaches that we (adults) must become just like a little child in order that we be saved. Very good; if it teaches that, then it follows that when we become as a little child, there is nothing that will prevent our salvation. If there is nothing that will prevent our salvation when we are just like a little child, then there is nothing that will prevent the salvation of the little child. The little child is perfectly helpless and dependent. So are we. The little child is saved because of the blessing which Jesus bestows. We are saved the same way.

C. H. C.

Genesis 3:22-24

---November 17, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother in the Lord-Will you kindly give me your views on **(Genesis 3:22)** through the columns of your paper?

DANIEL MILLER.

Louisville, Miss., R. 5.

REMARKS

(Genesis 3:22-24) reads, "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So He drove out the man; and He placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the

tree of life." In verse 5 the tempter had said, "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Notice, "ye shall be as gods," not as God, but as false gods, which are plural, more than one. The Lord is God of gods, Lord of lords, and King of kings. Now, since man has violated the law, he knows evil. He knew the good before, but now he knows both good and evil-hence "is become as one of us" -not as I am, but as one of us. Then the Lord God sent him forth from the garden to till the ground, "lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever." Then the Lord placed the Cherubims and flaming sword to keep the way of the tree of life. These have never been removed, and to this day they keep the way of the tree of life, so that man cannot put forth his hand and take of that tree and eat and live forever. Hence the sinner cannot be saved by his own effort.

C. H. C.

A DOUBLE MINDED MAN

---November 24, 1908

Start Brother Daniel Revs, Capital Hill, Okla., requests our views on **(James 1:8)**, "A double minded man is unstable in all his ways." A double minded man is one who is wavering; he is always changing; he is unstable; undecided. He is not settled in his mind. He tries one position a short time, then another. He may stay with the Old Baptists a while, then go to another church or denomination; but he doesn't stay long-he soon comes back. But he is not fully decided; he soon goes again to the other denomination. Still, he is not settled. He may soon come back again; and so, on and on. He is unstable, unsettled in his mind as to who is right or as to where he belongs. This is a double minded man.

C. H. C.

THE SOUL AFTER DEATH

---November 24, 1908

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: I would like to have your views about the soul after the death of the body. Is it a living substance with knowledge of what is going on in this world?

J. C. HARRIS

Franklin, Ky.

REMARKS

The soul is a living entity which exists after the death of the body. Moses died, and the Lord buried him. His body was buried; but on the mount of transfiguration the Saviour talked with Moses and Elias in

the presence of Peter, James and John. This being true, the soul of Moses was a living entity.

The Saviour told the disciples not to fear those who could do no more than to kill the body, but to fear Him that is able to destroy BOTH soul and body in hell. In Revelation we are told that John saw the souls of them under the altar of God who were beheaded for the testimony of the Lord. They were crying, "How long, oh, how long," etc. This being true, the soul must be a living entity which exists after the death of the body. We do not know how much they know, and we would, therefore, rather not express any opinion on that point. Some brethren hold that they do know all that is going on here, while others think that they do not. Perhaps much of that is only speculation. There is enough clearly revealed, and what is not revealed is beyond us. We can only speculate on that, and our speculation will not do others any good. C. H. C.

Deuteronomy 6:6-7

---**November 24, 1903**

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Please give your views on **(Deuteronomy 6:6-7)**, "And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou heat down, and when thou risest up."

Pray for me, as I feel I need your prayers. Your unworthy brother,
L. O. CARR.

R. 2, Butler Springs, Ala.

REMARKS

These words which the Lord commanded were the commandments, the statutes and the judgments which the Lord commanded that Israel might do them. See verses 1 to 5. These people should continue to teach the law to their children, not to make them their children, but because they were theirs. The law was to be taught them because they were Israelites. So, there is a teaching now, not to make people children of God. The Lord teaches the experimental lesson Himself. Then there is a gospel teaching for His children, and His ministers are required to teach this gospel lesson to God's people, and not to the unregenerate. C. H. C.

THE SCAPEGOAT

---**November 24, 1908**

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I would like for you to give your views on what the scapegoat represents, and who he represents, if not asking too much of you. May God bless you all, is my prayer.

Yours in love,

ARTHUR GREENHILL

Daily, Ala.

REMARKS

In the offering in which there was a scapegoat, two goats were used. See **(Leviticus 16)**. Both these goats represented the work of Christ in His atonement and sacrifice for sin. One of the goats was slain. So was Christ slain. The priest laid his hands on the head of the scapegoat and confessed the sins of Israel on the head of that goat, then the goat was carried away by a fit man into the land of forgetfulness. Our sins were laid on Christ; see **((3:6) (Isaiah 53:6)**. He bore our sins in His own body on the tree; see **(I Peter 2:24)**. He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself; see **(Hebrews 9:26)**. The scapegoat, therefore, represented the work of Christ in carrying our sins away into the land of forgetfulness, where they will be remembered against us no more. Our sins are, therefore, atoned for, satisfaction is made for them; and they are also all borne away, in the work of Christ. C. H. C.

CLOSE OF VOLUME TWENTY-THREE

---December 22, 1908

The twenty-third volume of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST closes with this issue. It has now been published continuously for twenty-three years, without any suspension-hence it has not been "revived." The first issue of the paper was sent out the first of January, 1886, by our dear lamented father, Elder S. F. Cayce, and has never been suspended and then "revived." The writer has been connected with the paper nearly all the time since September 1st, 1886, in one capacity or another. Since the death of our dear father in August, 1905, we have been trying in our weakness to fill the place of editor. We were aware that it was a hard place to fill, but never realized the extent of it until the burden fell upon our shoulders. We have labored arduously and incessantly since that time, feeling that the responsibility is so great and there is so much to do that we have no time to lose. We do not dare claim, for a moment, that we have made no mistakes, for we realize keenly that we have made many of them. We are sure we know this as well as our readers do. We do not claim perfection for ourselves nor for others, yet our own mistakes give us more trouble than the mistakes other people make. It is our desire to profit by the mistakes we have made in the past, and to try

to avoid the same mistakes in the future. But we are forgetful and short-sighted creatures, and sometimes make the same mistake more than once. We trust all our readers, especially the dear brethren and sisters, will throw the mantle of charity over all our imperfections, and pardon every mistake we have made, and bear with us in our weakness.

We are well aware of the fact that THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST is not being conducted to suit some people. Because we have condemned the practices of some they say we publish "wrangling" articles. Of course with some people everything is "wrangling" unless it coincides perfectly with some new-fangled notion of their own. If we were to open our columns to the defense and advocacy of those new measures and new practices, then it would not be "wrangling" in their estimation. We have been censured because we have allowed our columns to be used in condemning the new measures introduced by some among our people in different sections of the country. But THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST is being published in defense of Primitive Baptist principles and practice, and it is an obligation we feel resting upon us to condemn every wrong and false way, even though that way be introduced among our own people. One editor has even gone so far as to threaten in a private letter to us to take his "fighting gloves" off and "go at it" in earnest. "None of these things move us. We feel that we have endeavored to discharge our duty along this line, and if God has required this at our hands, the anathemas of men concern us very little. Young, ambitious men may continue to start their little "journals," and dictate to others how they should conduct an Old Baptist paper, and publish many "Don'ts" for their older brethren who are wearing themselves out in the service, but by the Lord's help we shall endeavor to continue to publish The PRIMITIVE BAPTIST in defense of the time honored principles of our fathers, and in defense of our dear precious old brethren who have stood in the heat of the battles and have borne the burdens of the day. God bless our dear, precious old brethren. They have been a comfort and consolation to us, and they are yet. We have been trying in our weakness to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ for about eighteen years (it has been, we think, about eighteen years since we made the first effort), and the dear old fathers in Israel have been kind and good to us, and have so kindly "nursed" us during these years. We love those of them who are yet spared to us, and the memory of those who have already crossed over the river is cherished by us. We trust the Lord may so keep us that we may never speak unkindly of them. We have, amidst all the conflicts and censures, been much comforted and encouraged by the many words and letters of commendation

from dear brethren and sisters in different portions of the country. We receive many letters of commendation from the North, South, East and West. This has been a great comfort and encouragement to us. At times we have felt to be greatly discouraged, but perhaps the mail would bring a letter of commendation, containing words of cheer, from some dear brother or sister, perhaps in a distant place, which would revive our drooping spirit and help us to take courage to "fight on" a little while longer. Were it not for the many expressions we receive from the dear brethren and sisters endorsing the principles contended for in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, and telling how they have been comforted and encouraged by reading its columns, we feel that we would have given up in despair. We cannot tell how much your kind words and sweet letters have benefited us.

Whether THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST has been conducted to the glory of God or not, we must leave our brethren and sisters to judge. We can only say that it has been our humble desire to conduct the paper in such a way as to comfort and benefit the Lord's dear tempest-tossed children, and to the glory of God, and to contend for the ancient order of the gospel and for the order of God's house.

Now, we kindly bid our readers farewell for the year 1908. Before another issue of the paper is sent out, this year will be a thing of the past. It has brought its sorrows, trials and conflicts, as well as its joys and pleasures. May our dear Saviour manifest His sweet presence to our every reader, and may His grace sustain you in all your trials and conflicts, is our humble prayer. We beg our dear readers to please remember us in all your petitions at a throne of grace. Pray the Lord to strengthen us for the trials of the coming year, that we may be enabled to conduct THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST in such a way as to be well pleasing to our adorable Lord.

C. H. C.

1909

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME TWENTY-FOUR

---**January 5, 1909**

With this issue we begin the publication of the twenty-fourth volume of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. The old year, with its joys and sorrows, is numbered with the past, and the new year of 1909 has been ushered in. We know not what this year has in store for us. We cannot see into the future. Yet we are sure, if we may judge the future by the past, that there will be difficulties to surmount and trials

to endure. There is "a thorn for every rose," and a sorrow for every joy. Day is always succeeded by the night. Hence we are aware that all will not be pleasure. There will be battles for some of us to fight. We should fight the good fight of faith, as valiant soldiers of the cross. We should put on the whole armor of God. The Lord has given His little children sufficient weapons for use in the warfare. He has prepared for them "for an helmet the hope of salvation, the breastplate of righteousness, the shield of faith, the sword of the Spirit," and "their feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace." A helmet is a headdress, something to be worn on the head. The blessed hope the Lord has given keeps us from giving up in despair.

The breastplate protects the breast. The righteousness our blessed Lord has wrought out for His little children protects them from the destructive darts or arrows of the wicked one.

A shield is worn on the arm, and is to be held between the wearer and the enemy to ward off the thrusts of the enemy. The Lord has prepared for His little children the shield of faith. Then He has given them a sword to use in the other hand. There is something for both hands to do. There is enough to keep our minds engaged. Our affections also should be set on things above, not on things on the earth.

The feet also have something to do. We should walk right. The feet are shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace. Oh, how careful we should be.

The Lord has been so kind, merciful and good to us, that we feel to be under renewed obligations to serve and to try to honor Him. Our humble desire is to try to honor Him both in speaking and writing. We desire to "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints" both in preaching and in writing. Of course we believe the Primitive Baptist doctrine to be the doctrine of God our Saviour, and our humble desire is to continue to contend for and defend that doctrine. So far as the doctrine and the principles are concerned which we have contended for in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST we have no apology to offer, and we expect, by the help of the Lord, to continue to contend for and to maintain those same principles during this year, if the Lord should spare our life. Those principles are dearer and more precious to us year by year, and month by month, week by week, and day by day. We are willing to live by them and we hope to be willing to die by them. They are good enough to live by, and they are good enough to die by.

-----*

Just here we wish to ask all to please stop sending us articles for publication concerning your local church troubles. Such things are neither comforting nor interesting to the household of faith. Our enemies may be glad to hear of such things, but we want to publish such things as will have a tendency to make the brotherhood feel glad. So please do not write about your church troubles, but if you have a good meeting, and if there are some additions to your church, write a short letter about that. It will be good news, and all the brethren will be glad to read it.

Now, we ask all to continue taking the paper, and to send us all the new subscribers you possibly can. We appreciate every effort that has been made by the brethren and sisters in this way, and only trust they will continue to help us in this respect. But more than this, we desire an interest in your prayers that the Lord may enable us to conduct the paper in such a way as to be a benefit to His people, and not bring reproach upon His cause, and that His name may be honored and glorified, and that we may be sustained by Him in our labors to that end. C. H. C.

OUR TRIP WEST

---January 12, 1909

We left home on Tuesday night, October 20th, starting on our trip in Oklahoma, Texas and Arkansas. We were gone just nine weeks, arriving home on Tuesday night, December 22nd, finding all as well as usual. We traveled between 2,000 and 3,000 miles, and filled appointments in the three states.

We met many dear brethren and sisters who formerly lived in Tennessee and Mississippi and whom we knew in years gone by, besides meeting many we had never before met. We enjoyed many pleasant seasons, were present at many good meetings, and met many dear brethren in the ministry whose faces we had not seen until we met them on this trip. We found the brethren to be generally united on the fundamental principles of the gospel, satisfied with the plain and simple worship of the gospel, and content with the order of God's house. They love the truth, and want to hear it proclaimed in its purity and simplicity.

There were some additions to the churches at some places. Two were baptized at Bald Knob, Ark. The churches generally seemed to be alive and prosperous, though at a few places it appeared that zeal was lacking to some extent. However, it was a busy time in many places, and no doubt this was the cause of the seeming lack of zeal sometimes.

We enjoyed the trip very much. The brethren received us kindly, and made us feel welcome and at home among them. We shall always remember them and cannot forget their many deeds of kindness shown to us.

We would be glad to give a more extended account of the trip, but time and space forbids it now. We hope to have the privilege of visiting them again some time, if the Lord wills, and hope to be remembered by them in their prayers.

C. H. C.

OUR TRIP IN AUGUST

---January 12, 1909

We have had so much work on our hands that we did not take the time to write anything about this trip. We left home on July 31st, and filled appointments in the bounds of the Fountain Creek Association, closing at Lynnville on Tuesday after the second Sunday in August. At County Line Church, on the second Sunday, we tried to preach the funeral of Elder J. M. Johnson and his mother and brother, which has already been mentioned by others in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. From Lynnville we went to Knoxville, Tenn., and attended the Powell's Valley Association. It was a season of refreshing. Love and fellowship seemed to abound. The preaching was all a unit.

From there we went to Byesville, Ohio, and attended the Muskingum Association. This is the home of our dear old brother, Elder C. J. Carmichael. The ministers present were Walter Cash, C. P. Beadle, A. S. Shoemaker, J. C. Hanover, I C. Williams, L. V Hite, J. R. Wilson, U. G. Porter, W. M. Shoemaker, Frank McGlade, Thos. Cole, C. J. Carmichael,---Neal, and another brother, from Pennsylvania, whose name we have forgotten. The meeting was pleasant indeed. This was our first time to meet Elder Cash, but we trust it may not be the last. We had the pleasure of his company for several days, as he went with us to some other places.

We had the pleasure of again visiting Falls of Licking, Hebron and Newark, then to Greenfield Ind. We were later arriving there than they expected, but we had a pleasant little meeting there. The same afternoon we went on to Indianapolis. We had the sweet pleasure of again associating with our dear brother, Elder John R. Daily, in his home and church, and also met Elder E. E. Lundy, of North Carolina, whom we learned to love.

Then we filled appointments at Salem, Abners Creek, Palestine, Danville, Friendship, Roachdale and Crawfordsville, in the order named. At Danville we met Elder E. D. Thomas, who is pastor of the

church. We had the pleasure of meeting Elder L. T. Buchanan for the first time, and again being at the home of Elder J. H. Oliphant. From Crawfordsville we went to the Muddy River Association, which was held near Eldorado, Ill. We do not call to mind the names of all the ministers present, so will not try to give their names. The preaching was in power and in the spirit of the Master. After this meeting closed we went to Cottonwood, Norris City, Carmi, and Crossville and enjoyed some sweet meetings at these places. Then we attended the Skillet Fork Association at the "old" church near Crossville, on Friday, Saturday and second Sunday in September. This was a very pleasant meeting. We are not sure that we remember the names of all the ministers present, so will not try to mention them. But we enjoyed the meeting generally, and shall not soon forget it. From this meeting we returned home. We shall not forget the many acts of kindness bestowed upon us at the many places we went. We are no more than a little servant in the Master's cause, and feel to deserve so little of the many acts of kindness bestowed upon us. C. H. C.

ACCUSATION ANSWERED

---January 12, 1909

C. H. Cayce, the Hardshell editor, accuses me of being insincere because I believe that God's decrees do not conflict with man's freedom. If I am insincere because I believe this, the greatest Baptists of all ages of the world would have been insincere. No Baptist ever thought of teaching that God's sovereignty conflicts in any sense with human instrumentality and responsibility until the Hardshells began preaching it in the nineteenth century. Mr. Cayce had better accuse the Apostle Peter of being insincere; for Peter certainly teaches this very thing in [Acts 2:23](#). "The legs of the lame are unequal." -W. A. Gaugh, Jackson, Tenn., in Baptist Builder, Oct. 28, 1908.

We made no such accusation as the above. Mr. Gaugh was once a member of the Primitive Baptist Church. While among us, at one time, he argued that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated everything that comes to pass, both good, bad and indifferent, and that there were no such things as conditions in the Bible. He argued, not only that the receiving of eternal life is unconditional upon the part of the sinner, but that the blessings bestowed upon, and the happiness of, the child of God in this life are also unconditional-just as much so as the receiving of eternal life. We asked him if he ever had any arguments with Arminians-Missionary Baptists, Methodists and others-and he replied in the affirmative. We

then quoted a few passages of Holy Writ and asked him, "What do you do with such passages as these when you are in a dispute with an Arminian and he quotes them in order to prove his position, that eternal life is conditional?" Mr. Gaugh replied, "I acknowledge that when I get into an argument with them I have to take your position."

Now, this is the charge we made, and we reaffirm it, that Mr. Gaugh admitted that he would take a position which he did not believe, and argue it, just to gain a point or to gain a victory. We have no patience with such handling the word of God deceitfully-and we gave him to understand as much at the time. It seems to us that an honest man should be honest in handling the word of God.

C. H. C.

FEET WASHING NOT A TEST

---January 19, 1909

The following is an extract from some remarks; the other part of the article is not reproduced because it cannot be of any special interest now:

The Primitive Baptists of the United States, as a body, have not made feet washing a test of fellowship. As a body, they have contended that it is taught and should be practiced; but as a rule it has not been made a test of fellowship. If every shade of difference, and every different custom, and every different view are made tests of fellowship, the Primitive Baptists would, at this time, in the United States, be divided into more factions than there are states in the Union. C. H. C.

WHO IS RIGHT?

---January 19, 1909

The brethren have at last gotten Brother Cayce aroused enough to join in with them in charging that boards boss, or control, churches. Many times over has this charge been disproven since the Hardshell split off, and still it is made.-Baptist Builder, Oct. 28, 1908.

Very well, some of your own people claim to prove that the conventions and boards do control the churches. It is just like "Katy did; Katy didn't" among you. Now whom shall we believe? The boards and conventions among your people manage and control their missionary operations as they please, and the churches have no "say so" in it. It is simply "submit or get out." If it is not that way, show us.

C. H. C.

NO NON-FELLOWSHIP

---January 26, 1909

We wish to inform you of an expression of sentiment that carried unanimously by rising vote, at our last church session, viz., "That we move out of the way all unscriptural bars to Christian fellowship." This very expression carries with it the idea that such bars did exist and as you can readily see it is sweeping and far reaching. We have not yet determined just what it shall embrace. We guess the re-baptizing will in a measure cease.-Jas. Ragan, in Apostolic Herald, Dec. 1, 1908.

REMARKS

The above clipping from the Apostolic Herald refers to a resolution in a Burnamite church. Elder Kirkland, editor of the Herald, is now affiliated with the Burnam people. You see they have not yet determined just what the resolution shall embrace, although it says that they are "going to move out of the way all unscriptural bars to Christian fellowship." Of course if they have any unscriptural bars up they ought to move them out of the way. But we suppose they mean that they are going to move all bars to Christian fellowship out of the way, and that they are going to fellowship anything in the name of Christianity, whether it is Scriptural or not. We also judge that they are deciding to receive members without administering baptism to them. We have no objection to their decision, for they cannot administer gospel baptism, for they lack the proper authority; but the Primitive Baptists will continue to move on in the even tenor of the way commanded of the Lord in receiving none into their communion who are unsound in the faith, and rejecting those who introduce among them the inventions of men, and will continue to baptize those who are received into their communion, no matter if the so-called liberal parties do call us narrow minded. C. H. C.

AWAY FROM HOME

---January 26, 1909

We left home on Monday morning, January 11, for Chattanooga, Tenn., to engage in a discussion with Mr. F. B. Srygley, who represented the Campbelites. The discussion was held in the Cumberland Presbyterian meeting house, and continued from Monday night to Saturday night inclusive. A large crowd was in attendance each night, considering the fact that the weather was disagreeable some of the time. The discussion passed off very pleasantly, and we left the brethren all rejoicing.

On Sunday morning we left Chattanooga for Griffin, Ga., arriving there at about 1:30, where we met Elder Lee Hanks. Had meeting there that night and Sister Hamilton came forward and related a reason of her hope in the Saviour and was received as a candidate for baptism, which is to be attended to at their next regular meeting. From Griffin we went to Emmaus church, near Thomaston, Ga. Then to Mt. Carmel on Tuesday and at Roberta on Tuesday night. Elder S. T. Bentley was with us at Mt. Carmel, his home church, and at Roberta. We had very pleasant meetings at these places.

We left Roberta this morning and came to Macon. We are now with Elders Lee Hanks and J. A. Monsees, at the home of Elder Hanks in Macon.

This is Wednesday, January 20.

C. H. C.

STILL IN GEORGIA

---February 9, 1909

In our last issue appeared a short editorial in which we stated that we were at the home of Elder Lee Hanks at the time we were doing the writing. That was on Wednesday, January 20. We had meeting that night at Bethlehem Church in Macon.

On Tuesday we visited Cool Spring Church, near Danville, Ga., Elder Hanks going with us. At this church we had the pleasure of meeting Elder W. W. Howell, and enjoyed a pleasant meeting with his church and people.

On Friday we were at Mt. Zion Church, near Norristown, Ga. Elder John M. Thompson was with us here, and we once more enjoyed the sweet privilege of hearing him preach an able discourse in defense of the time-honored principles loved by the Primitive Baptists. It was a great pleasure to have the privilege of being with Brother Thompson again, although we were with him so short a time. We also had the pleasure of meeting Elders Mooring and H. Meeks at this church. Elder Hanks was also with us here. He went from here with Elder Thompson to his next appointments.

On Saturday and Sunday we were at Hebron Church, near Garfield, Ga. For the first time we had the pleasure of meeting Elders Lonnie Holloway, of Graymont, Ga., and W. M. Bullard, of Phoenix City, Ala. We enjoyed hearing Elder Bullard preach both days. He earnestly contends for the ancient landmarks "which our fathers have set," and wants none of them removed. We also had the pleasure of again meeting Elder S. M. Anderson, who has been the faithful pastor of this church for about thirty-one years, if we are not mistaken in regard to the length of the time.

On Monday we went to Old Canoochee Church, about two or three miles from Graymont, Ga., where we had a pleasant meeting indeed. Sister Pauline Kingery came forward, when the opportunity was given by Elder S. M. Anderson at the request of the brethren, and related a reason of her hope in the Saviour and was joyfully received, and is to be baptized at their next meeting. Besides Elder Anderson, Elders Lonnie Holloway and Herschel Hill were also present. This was our first time to meet Elder Hill.

At night we tried to preach in Garfield at the Missionary Baptist meeting house. We had the pleasure of meeting Elder H. Temples at this place. We met him when in Georgia three years ago, but did not have the pleasure of being in his company for more than a few moments.

On Tuesday (today-January 26) we were at Upper Mill Creek Church, Elder Temples coming with Us from Garfield this morning. We had the pleasure of meeting Elder A. J. Brown today at this church. The service was pleasant, and we enjoyed meeting the brethren and sisters here once more. We are now at the home of Brother J. N. Akin to spend the night.

Since coming to Georgia we learn that Elder S. L. Pettus, formerly of Fulton, Ky., now of Missouri is in this section visiting the progressive churches who have departed from the ancient simplicity of the gospel worship by the introduction of organs, and some other measures which our people are not accustomed to. Our readers will remember that an article was published in our columns a short time ago from Elder Ira Turner concerning Elder Pettus having returned to the Primitive Baptists from the Missionaries.

We find our brethren where we have been to be plain Old Baptists satisfied with the soul-cheering doctrine of grace, and satisfied with the plain, simple worship authorized by our blessed Saviour in the gospel kingdom. They have heartily and kindly received us, and have been much better to us than we feel to deserve. They have heartily endorsed our public efforts in trying to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation, and trying to contend for the plain, simple worship of the Lord's house. We feel to thank the Lord and to take courage to press on in the service of our heavenly King. We humbly ask all the brethren, sisters and friends to pray the Lord to enable us to fight the good fight of faith until we reach the journey's end. May heaven's rich blessings be showered upon every one of you, is our prayer. C. H. C.

NOW IN FLORIDA

---February 9, 1909

In our last report we stated that we were then (January 26) at the home of Brother J. N. Akin, near Statesboro, Ga. From his home we were conveyed by his son to Lott's Creek Church, in the Lott's Creek Association, on Wednesday morning. A goodly number had gathered at the church, and had about decided we were not coming, as we were late, caused by a shaft being broken, and we had to walk nearly a mile to borrow another buggy to finish the journey. We had a pleasant meeting. The brethren and sisters heartily endorsed our feeble effort in speaking to them of the goodness and mercy of God. On Thursday we were at Deloach Church, where we had the pleasure of again meeting Elder W. H. Wilkinson, whom we met while in Georgia three years ago. The congregation was not large, owing to a misunderstanding, brought about by a change in the appointment—so some thought. But we had a very pleasant meeting here any way. On Friday morning we were conveyed to Ash Branch. We were glad to again meet Elder J. H. Smith at this church. We also met him three years ago. A good sized congregation was present, and we enjoyed a pleasant season with these dear brethren and sisters once more. On Saturday morning we boarded a train at Pembroke for Claxton, where we were met by a Mr. Lynn, who is a staunch Baptist friend, and conveyed by him to Little Flock Church to attend a general meeting appointed to be held there. The weather had suddenly turned severely cold, so that only a few met at the church that day, yet the meeting was a pleasant one. Here we met Elders F. M. Donaldson, D. L. Calloway, M. L. Riner and Wm. Beasley, and Brother Bowen, who has been liberated to exercise his gift. We had another pleasant meeting at night at the home of Brother Lynn, who is eighty four years old. On Sunday the weather was so cold and disagreeable that the brethren decided to not try to go to the church. So we had no service that day, but that night we were at the home of Brother A. W. Odom with Elder F. M. Donaldson, and a few brethren and sisters came in, so we had services and enjoyed a pleasant little season with them.

On Monday Elder Donaldson conveyed us to Anderson Church, an appointment having been sent on there for us on Saturday. The congregation was good, considering the short notice and the inclemency of the weather, and we had a good meeting. Brother Bowen, mentioned above, and Elders Galloway and Riner were again with us, besides Elder Donaldson.

After meeting we were conveyed to the home of Brother J. R. Calloway, and after dinner he conveyed us to Manassas where we boarded the train for Savannah, Ga., arriving there at about 8:45 last night. This morning (Tuesday, Feb. 2) at 2:50 we left Savannah on

the Seaboard Air Line Railroad for Dade City, Fla., where we begin (the Lord willing) filling the appointments made for us in Florida. At this writing we are on the train, near Ocala- just now going into the town at 1:30.

We trust the brethren and sisters will remember us in their prayers.
C. H. C.

Hebrews 7:1-4

---February 23, 1909

We have been requested to give our views of **(Hebrews 7:1-4)**. The passage refers to Melchisedec, who was king of Salem and priest of the most high God. He met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him, and Abraham gave to him a tenth part of the spoils. See **(Genesis 14)**.

Melchisedec was a man; see **(Hebrews 7:4)**, "Now consider how great this man was." As a man he was not without father or mother; but as a priest he was "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually." A priest after the order of Aaron, under the Levitical priesthood, was not without father or mother. The priestly office in that priesthood went from father to son, hence not without father, and not without descent. In the priestly office of Melchisedec there were none before him and none after; hence without descent. Thus it differed from the Levitical priesthood. Christ was made a high priest after the order of Melchisedec, {see **(Hebrews 6:20)**} and not after the order of the Levitical priesthood. In the priestly office in which Christ officiated, there were none before Him and none since-it was "without father, without mother, without descent," just like that of Melchisedec. C. H. C.

2 Peter 2:18-21

---February 23, 1909

Some time ago we were requested to give our views of **(II Peter 2:22)**, which we did, though briefly. It seems that some of the brethren think our views are wrong, which is their privilege. But some have asked for our views of verses 18 to 21, wanting us to harmonize these with our opinion of verse 22. If you will read verse 17 you will find these characters described. It says, "These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever." True, verse 20 says, "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein,

and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning." But verse 22 says, "it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." This shows that their profession was only an outward one, that there was no inward change, no change of nature; hence only a washed sow, and not a sheep. Therefore gone back to her wallowing in the mire. C. H. C.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

---February 23, 1909

ELDER C. H CAYCE: Dear Brother-Will you kindly give me your views on the passage of Scripture relative to Christ after the crucifixion preaching to the spirits in prison. I know there are several theories advanced, but they cannot, all be correct, and I ask for information.

Also the text where Paul teaches that the Lord, by His Spirit, hath shined in our hearts. That is evidently an inspiration. But is it an intellectual inspiration, or simply a moral inspiration? Would not divine intellectual inspiration necessitate absolute accuracy in the views and opinions of the Lord's children? If a moral inspiration, would it not only affect the heart or affections, leaving the mind to be instructed by reading or hearing the truth? And would this not account for some of the Lord's children going off into error-their mistake being of the mind, or intellect, and not of the heart? Does the doctrine of election and predestination according to Calvinism differ from the doctrine as held by Old Baptists? Yours in an humble hope, CHARLES W. LYENS.

Halt Ave., Macon, Ga.

REMARKS

1. (I Peter 3:19) speaks of the Lord preaching to spirits in prison. Verses 18, 19 and 20 read, "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." The preaching to spirits in prison mentioned here was in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing. This is very clear evidence, it seems to us, that sinners were saved in Noah's day just like they are saved now. They were regenerated then by the work of the Spirit, and they are regenerated that way now. The Lord has never had but one way of regenerating sinners.

2. We suppose the text referred to here is **(II Corinthians 4:6)**, which says, "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is light, or liberty, and whatsoever doth make manifest is light. When God shines in the heart by the power of the Holy Spirit, the sinfulness of that heart is made manifest to the person. It is thus revealed to him by the Spirit of God that he is a sinner in the sight of God. The heart is made right, or made good, by the work of the Holy Spirit; yet they may be taught wrong doctrines, and thus be right in heart and wrong in the head.

3. Calvin was the founder of the Presbyterian church. The old Westminster Confession of Faith, a Presbyterian production, set forth the doctrine of unconditional reprobation as well as unconditional election. The old London Confession, which was largely copied from the Westminster Confession, set forth the doctrine of unconditional election but not unconditional reprobation. Baptists have been charged with holding unconditional reprobation, but have ever denied it.

C. H. C.

CONDUCT OF DEACONS

---February 23, 1908

We have been asked the following: "I want your views on the deaconshow they should act when not in church. Do you think it is right for them to go to ice cream parties, or to play parties, or box suppers, or any of those worldly pleasures? You may answer through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST."

If you will turn to **(Acts 6:1-6)** you will find the first deacons set apart in the church by the apostles-`seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom." In **(I Timothy 3:8-10)** we find that "Likewise must the deacons be grave, not doubletongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless." It seems to us that these expressions are plain enough. No church member should be found engaging in the things mentioned, much less a deacon. Those things are worldly pleasures and inventions of men, many of them often being conducted in the name of Christianity and to "raise money for the Lord," and no meek and humble follower of the Master should have anything to do with such things. They are an abomination in the sight of God.

C. H. C.

Zechariah 4:14

---February 23, 1909

Brother N. J. Yeager, of Centerville, Ala., has requested our views on Zechariah 4 and especially verse 14. He asks "who are those two anointed ones?" The 14th verse reads, "Then said he, These are the two anointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth." We have thought the two anointed ones in this text refers to the same as the two witnesses in **(Revelation 11:3)**. Read the entire chapter and compare with **(Zechariah 4)**. You will see that the two witnesses are going to be killed, and their dead bodies shall lie in the street for three days and a half. We think these two are the church and the ministry. They have suffered persecutions and death for the truth's sake, and we understand they are to again pass through sore persecutions for the sake of truth. This persecution will last for three and one-half years. They will be put to death as in days gone by for the faith. We know that many of our brethren differ from us as to what these two witnesses are, but the brother requested our views, and we have tried to give them briefly, and not for the purpose of calling out a controversy on the subject. C. H. C.

Matthew 19:8, and Romans 13:1-8

---February 23, 1909

Brother J. M. Ayres, of Dossville, Miss., has requested our views of the above cited passages. **(Matthew 19:8)**, reads, "He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives but from the beginning it was not so." Brother Ayres says, "When was the beginning, and what beginning?" The beginning of the marriage ordinance. In the morning of creation the Lord made a helpmeet for the man, and said, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." There was then given no privilege of putting the wife away.

The place referred to in Romans we think teaches that wholesome laws are not to be dreaded by those who are children of God and walking in His service. Such laws are given for the control and restraint of the wicked, and it is our duty to be subject to and obedient to those laws, so long as matters of conscience in the worship of God are not interfered with. So long as a law allows us to worship God as we understand His word teaches, we should be obedient to the law. We should be law-abiding citizens. And we are

glad to say that so far as our knowledge extends the Primitive Baptists as a body of people are law-abiding. C. H. C.

STILL IN FLORIDA

---March 9, 1909

Our last report was written on Tuesday, Feb. 2, while on the train going to Dade City. We arrived in Dade City and had meeting there that night in the Methodist meeting house. Elder M. L. Gilbert, who lives here, met us at the train. We had the pleasure of meeting Elder W. D. Lee, of Loves, Miss., who was here visiting his son. We were personally acquainted with him, having been with him a number of times in Mississippi. We also unexpectedly met Elder J. H. Fisher here.

On Wednesday afternoon we went to Tampa, and were met at the train by our cousin, Mrs. Marian Clement, and her husband, Victor Clement, and went to their home. We had the sweet pleasure of meeting our dear aunt here, Sister Mattie Mills, whom we had not seen for twenty-four years; also had the pleasure of meeting our cousin, Oscar, Aunt Mattie's son, and spending some time with them while in Tampa. We spent the time with them Thursday and Friday. On Saturday and Sunday we were at meeting at the church in Tampa. This was the regular meeting time, and Elder Gilbert, who is pastor, was present with us. The meeting was pleasant, and we enjoyed being there.

We had meeting at Port Tampa City on Monday night, and at St. Petersburg on Tuesday night. At the latter place we met Elder W. W. Williams, of Georgia, and Elder Voorheis, of New Jersey. We were glad to meet these brethren. We also met a Brother Bozeman, of Georgia, Brother and Sister J. C. Calvin, of Calvin, Illinois, whom we had met before.

On Wednesday morning, the 10th, we went to Largo to meet the appointment at Lone Pilgrim. Elder J. D. McMullen was at the depot to board the train going south; and he told us the appointment was not known, that no word had been received concerning it. So we returned to Tampa, and had meeting in the city again on Thursday night.

On Friday morning we went to Sidney, on the "Seaboard" train, and had meeting at Salem. Elders Fisher and J. Ellis Blanton were present. Then went to the home of Elder E. J. Devane in Plant City, and had meeting in the Methodist meeting house that night, and had the pleasure of meeting Elder Devane for the first time.

Saturday morning we went to Wauchula, accompanied by Elders Devane and Blanton, where we had meeting Saturday and Sunday, which was a pleasant meeting. From here we were conveyed by

Brother L. D. Doke to his home, where we spent Sunday night; then he conveyed us to Paynes Creek, where we had meeting on Monday; then to Bowling Green, where we had meeting that night. Spent the night with Brother A. C. Beauchamp.

On Tuesday we were met in Bowling Green by Brother Wingate, who conveyed us to his home, where we spent the night; then to Corinth on Wednesday. At this place we met Elders D. Wilkinson, M. Lightsey and J. M. Brewer. We also met Brother J. J. Altman again at this place, who exercises in public. We met him first at Wauchula. He conveyed us to his home, where we had meeting again that night. Then on Thursday he conveyed us to Fort Meade, where we spent the night with a Brother Wingate. On Friday morning Brother Altman conveyed us on to Elim, where we had meeting that day. Elder Brewer was also with us here.

From Elim Brother B. B. Dossey conveyed us to his home, where we spent the night; then on Saturday morning conveyed us to Mt. Olive, where we had meeting Saturday and Sunday. Here we had the pleasure of meeting Elder J. H. Kirkland and spending Saturday night at his home. We had a very pleasant meeting here.

Elder Devane conveyed us to his home in Plant City. On Tuesday Brother Devane went with us to Mt. Enon, near Plant City, where we had a pleasant meeting, then returned to Brother Devane's home.

On Wednesday morning we left Plant City for Orlando, and met our appointment at Orange Church, in the suburbs of Orlando, and enjoyed a very pleasant meeting with this church. We were met at this church by Brother E. U. Cauthen, who conveyed us to Winter Garden, where we had meeting in a Missionary Baptist house. Our appointment for this place was first made for Thursday night, but was changed to Wednesday night on account of some other conflicting appointments.

At this writing, on Thursday, Feb. 25, we are at the home of Brother Cauthen, in Winter Garden. C. H. C.

REPLY TO T. H. COTTON - FEET WASHING

---March 9, 1909

We will try to give what information we can on the subject of feet washing, as requested by T. H. Cotton, in a letter from him in another column of this paper.

First, we call attention to the fact that the feast of the passover began on the fourteenth day of the month and ended on the twenty-first day of the month, thus continuing for seven days. See **(Exodus 12)**. Now read **(Matthew 26:1-16)**; **(Mark 14:1-11)** and **((Mark 2:1) (Luke 22:1-6)**, and you will find that before the feast of the

passover began, Judas had covenanted with the chief priests and captains to betray Jesus into their hands. Now, let us read **(Luke 22:1-6)**, which says:

Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover. And the chief priests and scribes sought how they might kill Him; for they feared the people. Then entered Satan into Judas surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve. And he went his way, and communed with the chief priests and captains, how he might betray Him unto them. And they were glad, and covenanted to give him money. And he promised, and sought opportunity to betray Him unto them in the absence of the multitude.

Now read **(John 13:1)**:

Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end.

Now read **(Matthew 26:17-25)** and **((2) (Mark 14:12-21)** and you will see how that Jesus told the disciples to make ready the passover, and also the conversation which took place while they were eating the passover concerning His betrayal. It is clear and easy to understand that Matthew and Mark agree on this. Mark says:

And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, His disciples said unto Him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover? And He sendeth forth two of His disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water; follow him. And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guestchamber where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? And he will show you a large upper room furnished and prepared: there make ready for us. And His disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as He had said unto them: and they made ready the passover. And in the evening He cometh with the twelve. And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me. And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto Him, one by one, Is it I? and another said, Is it I? And He answered and said unto them, It is one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish. The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of Him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born.

Instead of proceeding with the conversation which took place during the eating of the passover supper, as Matthew and Mark did, John breaks off from the conversation and in verses 2 to 17 relates the

circumstance of the feet washing. Then in verse 18 he goes back to the conversation which was engaged in during the eating of the passover supper. Verses 18 to 32 read as follows:

I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me. Now I tell you before it come, That when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am He. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me. When Jesus had thus said, He was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. Then the disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom He spake. Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of His disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him, that he should ask who it should be of whom He spake. He then lying on Jesus' breast saith unto Him, Lord, who is it? Jesus answered, He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when He had dipped the sop, He gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. And after the sop Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus unto him, That thou doest, do quickly. Now no man at the table knew for what intent He spake this unto him. For some of them thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of against the feast; or, that he should give something to the poor. He then having received the sop went immediately out: and it was night. Therefore, when he was gone out, Jesus said, Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him. If God be glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him.

This shows very clearly to be the same conversation as recorded by Matthew and Mark, and which took place while eating the passover supper. It was while eating that supper that the conversation took place as to who should betray the Saviour, and while eating that, supper Jesus gave the sop to Judas, then Judas went immediately out. Hence Judas left them while they were eating the passover supper. Now go again to **(Matthew 26:28-29)**, and **((22) (Mark 14:22-25))** and you will find the record of the institution of the communion supper, which was done at the close of the eating of the passover supper. And remember that this was the first day of the feast of the passover. Mark says:

And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: this is my body. And He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them: and they all drank of it. And He said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will drink

no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

Now let us read (**John 13:2-17**), and we will find John's account of what transpired concerning the feet washing after the supper was ended:

And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot Simon's son, to betray Him; Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands and that He was come from God, and went to God: He riseth from supper, and laid aside His garments; and took a towel, and girded Himself. After that He poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded. Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter saith unto Him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter. Peter saith unto Him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith unto Him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all. For He knew who should betray Him; therefore said He, Ye are not all clean. So after He had washed their feet, and had taken His garments, and was sat down again, He said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well: for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.

It is truly clear that Jesus has said, "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet," and we should do so for this reason. No matter if it does seem to us to be an empty rite, the Saviour said we ought to do it, and that is a good reason why we should. To say that it was an old Jewish custom, and therefore not required under the gospel, is to impeach the Apostle Peter with ignorance of the customs of his own people, for the Saviour said, "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter." Peter did know the old Jewish customs, hence this was not done as an old Jewish custom. In washing their feet Jesus said He had given them an example, that they should do as He had done to them. An example is something to follow. If the Saviour was immersed in baptism, we cannot follow Him in baptism unless we are also immersed. If He was immersed in baptism, and if His baptism is an example for us to follow, then we cannot follow the

example unless we are immersed. Even so, we cannot follow His example in feet washing unless we wash each other's feet. Doing something else is not following the example.

Washing the saints' feet is put down in the catalog of good works by the Apostle Paul in **(I Timothy 5:9-10)**. It is clearly mentioned here as a good work. Then if we fail to do it, it is evident that we fail to do one good work the Lord has said we ought to do.

If the Saviour had commanded us to practice something symbolizing our honesty, it would be right for us to do it. In **(Matthew 6:16-17)** the Saviour is not teaching us that we should not show our humility. Beginning with the (first verse of the chapter), He teaches us that we should not do the things mentioned to be seen of men. We should not engage in any service to be seen of men. If that is the object we have in view, then the service becomes an empty form, and is not acceptable service. If we are not to show humility, then we should not perform any act that might be prompted by a spirit of humility. Instead of humility being something we should not show, it is something that we should show. If all the brotherhood would show and manifest toward each other more of the spirit of humility, we are of the humble opinion there would be less trouble among us. Washing each other's feet is an act of humility; Christ performed it as an example, and we should follow the example. We say, in washing each other's feet, that we have a desire to live at the feet of our brethren, and that we esteem our brethren and prefer them before ourselves. We profess this when we wash their feet; and then we should live the profession.

Mr. Cotten's argument that a church cannot be held in fellowship because they do not practice feet washing, if it be a part of the communion, would require a non-fellowship for every church, almost, in existence-upon that parity of reasoning. The church at Corinth had some wrongs among them; nearly all the seven churches of Asia had wrongs among them; the Galatians had wrongs among them. Yet they were not non-fellowshipped as churches. We would not argue, however, for the encouragement of wrongs; but the idea we wish to present is that a church may be a church of Christ, and fellowshipped as such, and yet have some wrongs existing among them. If a church that does wrong cannot be fellowshipped, then few of them could be fellowshipped, for there are very few that do no wrong. As a rule the Primitive Baptists do not make feet washing a test of fellowship, although it is in many of their confessions of faith. There are some other points in the confessions of faith which could be named, also, that some individual members have not believed, and yet they retained membership and fellowship in the church. We think a

fundamental point of doctrine, or an underlying principle of doctrine, should be made a test of fellowship. So should any practice which is a departure from the fundamental principles of the gospel be made a test of fellowship.

We do not want a controversy opened up in our columns on the question of feet washing, and neither do we expect to permit it; but as Mr. Cotten insisted by private letter that we publish his letter and make some reply to it, we have decided to do so, merely to give him the benefit of some of our views of the matter. We do not give our views as standard. The Bible is the standard that Baptists propose to go by. Let us take that as the "man of our counsel" and be governed by it, and let us try to do what it says do. May the Lord help us all so to do. C. H. C.

THE VERY ELECT

---April 27, 1909

Brother D. A. Hollind, of Horton, Ala., asks us, "Who was under consideration, and who was the very elect?" The very elect are mentioned in (**Matthew 24:24**). The Saviour says, "For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." The Lord will not suffer all His children to be deceived by the false and judizing teachers who are in the world. He has promised to never leave Himself without a witness. If all His people were deceived and led into false doctrines and practices, then He would be without a witness. We think those faithful ones who continue to contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints, and who are not deceived or led astray by false teachers, are called the very elect.

C. H. C.

THE GREAT INVESTMENT

---May 4, 1909

I have just read Dr. Willingham's plan for raising \$50,000 by dividing 10,000 shares at \$5 each among the states. I believe it to be a very happy suggestion and a practical method. It will be easy for many to take shares in the King's business and ever after have the real joy of knowing that one investment which we have made cannot fail. When we have ceased from labor, this investment will be bearing compound interest until the end of time.

Today is a momentous moment in the kingdom of God. The world is waiting for the gospel of love, and Light and Life. "How shall they hear without a preacher? How shall they preach except they be sent?" Many of our best young men and women are waiting to be sent; a debt means they cannot go. Let us take shares in the King's business and save our Foreign Mission Board from the calamity of a great debt.-J. L. White, Greensboro, N. C., in Baptist Standard, April 22, 1909.

What next! What promoters of schemes! The very idea of issuing 10,000 shares of stock in the King's business, at \$5 per share! We wonder if that is par value. Are you going to sell such "valuable" stock at par? Is the price down in the market so that it will not bring a premium? Something must be wrong with the concern if the stock is worth no more than par and buyers hard to find even at that price, for to find a buyer you have to find one who is ignorant concerning the promoters. Wonder what has become of the oil stock? Can't find any more buyers, so have to try another scheme? Poor foreign mission board! What a pity the King's business is so poorly financed the whole thing is always bankrupt and a miserable failure. There is one thing they never fail in, and that is to make merchandise of the people. But, say, what is the whole amount of capital stock of this concern, anyhow? What rate per cent interest does the concern pay at present? And what assurance have we that the concern cannot fail? It has always been in debt, and has been a beggar ever since its birth, and has always been supported by the charities of a people who were led to believe souls were going to hell for want of their hard-earned dollars. We consider it a bad investment, and may God have mercy on the poor ignorant dupes who are gulled into such nefarious schemes.

C. H. C.

ORDERLY BAPTISM

---May 18, 1909

We have been asked the following: **A** is a Baptist preacher in full fellowship, but he becomes disorderly by receiving Missionary baptism into his church. The true church withdraws from him, and while he is considered in disorder he baptizes **B**. Now **B** desires to be in full fellowship with the true church. Can **B** be received into fellowship without being re-baptized?

If **A** was excluded from the church he had no right or authority to administer baptism for the church. It was most assuredly out of order to receive Missionary baptism. It would be just as good order to receive an immersion as orderly gospel baptism administered by any

other people as that administered by the Missionary Baptists. Then, if **A** was withdrawn from after he did this and immersed **B** while thus out of order, then **B** is not baptized. If **A** stood excluded when he immersed **B**, it was not orderly gospel baptism. Hence **B** was not baptized-he was immersed. It seems to us that if **B** desires to be in full fellowship with orderly Baptists, the thing to do is to be baptized by one who is authorized by an orderly church to administer the ordinance, and who is in order when he administers it. C. H. C.

HOW MANY ARE THERE?

---May 25, 1909

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-There is a Methodist preacher in our town that made the assertion the other eve that we were about 100 years old and that there is not as many now as there was then. If you have or can get them I want the statistics of the Primitive Baptist Church. I have seen it in your paper about two months ago from Brother Newman's pen. I want you to also give me the number of preachers that we have. I want to show the little fellow that he not only told one, but two. Please let me hear from you at once, and oblige. Your brother,
J. P. DARR.
REMARKS

According to the United States Census of 1890 there were in the United States, at that time, 3,107 Primitive Baptist churches with 116,271 members. We do not know how many preachers there were. We have no later statistics at hand. According to the Baptist Almanac of 1844 there were then 1,622 Primitive Baptist churches with 61,162 members. Perhaps you can get later statistics from the Census Bureau at Washington, D. C. You cannot get the exact figures, because some of the brethren refuse to give the Census Bureau the desired information.

Your Methodist preacher knows nothing about church history. There are Primitive Baptist churches in Tennessee more than 100 years old that have never changed in doctrine or practice. C. H. C.

VIEWS GIVEN

---June 1, 1909

(Luke 19:10)

"For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." This simply teaches that those characters Jesus came to save were lost. He came to seek and to save lost characters. It does not necessarily follow that He came to save all that were lost.

(Romans 6:23)

“For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” In this text condemnation and salvation are placed in contradistinction to each other. Wages is what one gets for what he does. Sin is the transgression of the law. When a man dies he does not necessarily pay a penalty for what he does. Death is the penalty he receives. Death is a separation. Hence, on account of men's sins they are separated eternally from the presence of God. This is prevented only by the intervention of mercy-grace. So, the apostle continues, “but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Eternal life is God's gift. He does not give it on account of what we have done, or may do, or can do; but He gives it through what Christ has done-” through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

((9:1) (Acts 19:1-8)

We have been asked, “Were they baptized the second time in water, or were they baptized the second time with the Holy Ghost?” The expression referred to in this question is in verse 5, which says, “When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.” This has no reference whatever to a baptism of the Holy Spirit, for that followed the laying on of hands by Paul. See verse 6. It is a question in the mind of many as to whether they were “baptized the second time.” John Gill held the view that they were not. His rendering of it is that they were baptized when they heard John's preaching. In other words, verse 4 begins by saying, “Then said Paul.” Gill's idea is that Paul then said all that is contained in verses 4 and 5, and that when Paul had said this he laid his hands upon them and the Holy Ghost came upon them. If this be the correct view of the text, it follows that baptism administered by John was valid gospel baptism. While we believe the baptism administered by John was valid baptism, yet we have been inclined to a different view of this text. We have thought that these people were not baptized by John, but in John's name. We think they were baptized by Apollos, who was baptized by John. Read ((8:24) (verses 24 to 28 of chapter 18). He was a true believer that Jesus was the Christ, but had, himself, been baptized by John; and knowing nothing of any other baptism, was administering baptism upon the authority of John instead of upon the authority of Christ. But Aquila and Priscilla expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly. Then Paul came along and found these disciples who had been baptized upon the authority of John's baptism, who, when they heard what Paul had to say in verse 5, were then baptized in the name of the Lord, or upon His authority.

(Romans 2:6-7,8)

We think this is a description of the characters who will enter eternal joys on the one hand, and a description of the characters who enter into wrath on the other hand. The Saviour says in **((0) (Matthew 7:20)**, "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." We know that those who seek the good things mentioned in **(Romans 2:7)** have been made good by the Spirit and power of God, because their fruits are good. And those who have thus been made good will enter into eternal joys.

(Mark 7:28-29)

We have been asked the question, "What was the condition of the daughter before the mother besought Christ, that He would cast forth the devil out of her—saved or unsaved?" We do not think that the text necessarily teaches whether her condition was saved or unsaved. She was possessed of a devil, or demon, which is a person whose volition or will is dethroned, or controlled by an evil spirit. The mental faculties were unbalanced. Hence, the daughter was possessed of a plague. This plague, or disease, was cured by the Saviour.

((9) (Jonah 3:9-10)

This does not prove, or indicate, that God is fallible or changeable. The Lord says, in **(Malachi 3:6)**, "For I am the Lord, I change not." James says that with Him "is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Yet Job says "God repented of the evil, that He had said that He would do unto them; and He did it not." His way of dealing was to bless them in obedience. Or when they did right, they enjoyed His blessings; and when they did wrong they were punished. Read **(Jeremiah 18:8-9,10)**, and you will find that the Lord said that this was what He would do.

AID TO THE MINISTRY

We have been requested to write on this subject, the party making the request referring us to **(I Corinthians 9:13-14); ((0:7) (Luke 10:7)**, and **((0:10) (Matthew 10:10)**. In **((0:1) (Matthew 10)** is recorded the sending out of the twelve, and in **((0:1) (Luke 10)** is recorded the sending out of the seventy. We have expressed our opinion regarding this question through our columns heretofore, and will only make a few brief remarks now. In **(I Corinthians 9)** the apostle is certainly teaching the idea that the temporal necessities of the ministry should be looked after. In verse 11 he says, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" In verse 9 he refers to the law, which says, "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." In verse 10 he lets us know that this was written for our sakes. The ox

should do the eating where he was doing the treading. It was not God's way that the ox do the treading in China and do the eating in the United States. He was to eat right where he did the treading. Verse 11 shows that the eating was of carnal things. Then in verse 13 he refers to the law again, calling attention to the fact that a part of the things offered in the temple and on the altar were reserved for those who waited at the altar. In verse 14 he says, "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." Some have argued that this living consists of spiritual food, which the apostle refers to here; but this cannot be true, for the reason that in verse 15 he says, "But I have used none of these things: neither have I written these things, that it should be so done unto me. We think the language to the twelve and to the seventy contains the idea that they were to go, trusting the Lord that they would be cared for and sustained. The Lord's promise is better than promises of men. The man who will not go until a support is promised him shows his lack of faith in the Lord's promise. The Lord has put it into the hearts of His people to care for us, for we know they have been kind and good to us. They have been good to minister to our necessities, and we hope to never bring reproach on the cause they love. Brethren, pray the Lord to sustain us, that we may be kept in the right way. C. H. C.

RICH MAN AND LAZARUS

---June 8, 1909

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Will you or some of the readers please give me your views on this Scripture:

"Moreover the dogs came and licked his sores." - **(Luke 16:21)**.

Were those dogs literal, or is it only figurative? And does this rich man represent man's works? This Scripture is on my mind and I have no light on it.

May the dear Lord bless you, dear Brother Cayce, in publishing THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Your brother in great affliction,

C. H. WELLS

Newtonville, Miss.

REMARKS

The Scripture referred to is the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. We think the parable primarily refers to the Jews and Gentiles. The rich man represented the Jews and Lazarus represented the Gentiles. The Jews were scattered, and are yet in a scattered condition. They are now being tormented. They had their good things under the law dispensation. But now, under the gospel dispensation, the Jews are

being tormented and the Gentiles are enjoying the privileges of the gospel. C. H. C.

MILL CREEK THEN AND NOW

---June 15, 1909

We notice that Kirkland, Burnam, Pence & Co., are to hold their great "General" or "National" meeting at Mill Creek, near Maury City, Crockett county, Tenn., this year. This calls to our mind the fact that Mill Creek Church was among the first churches, if not the first one, to enter protest in conference against some of the measures advocated by Elder Kirkland. The following is their protest:

Whereas, There has been a new departure from the faith and doctrine and practice of Primitive Baptists, as taught in the Bible, said departure being recommended by the St. Louis convention, to-wit, That the St. Louis convention recommend the adoption of, 1st, a Federal government for the churches as per plan laid down in Elder J. V Kirkland's book, or "Condensed History of the Church;" 2nd, That the commission was given to the church as a whole, and not to the ministry alone. 3rd, That there be a publishing house established, and that all Primitive Baptist papers as now published should suspend or be bought by said publishing house or company, and that there be but one Primitive Baptist periodical, and it be sent out from said publishing house or company; therefore,
Be it resolved, by the church at Mill Creek, Crockett county, Tenn., that we solemnly protest against the action of the St. Louis convention; and

Be it further resolved, that we send a copy of this protest to THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST and Baptist Trumpet for publication and ask all Primitive Baptist papers to copy.

Done and signed by order of the church while in conference on Saturday before the third Sunday in November, 1904.

ELDER L. H. STUCKEY, Moderator.

G. W. EDWARDS, Church Clerk.

That protest speaks for itself as to where that church stood in November, 1904. After this the church restored Elder H. W. Thomas, who had been excluded by the recommendation of a council. Elder J. V Kirkland was in the council and wrote the advice of the council. Their advice was that unless Mill Creek exclude Elder Thomas they should be dropped from the association. He was accordingly excluded. Then after the foregoing protest was passed they restored Elder Thomas without satisfaction being made, or even attempted. So in 1905 the association dropped Mill Creek Church, which was in harmony with the advice of the council, Elder Kirkland being one of

the number. But now Mill Creek and Elders Kirkland and Thomas seem to be all in line. We wonder if that protest is yet on their book, and we wonder if Elder Kirkland now goes back on the advice given in the council? Truly, "The legs of the lame are unequal." C. H. C. At the time of the publication of this book Mill Creek Church is in line with the orderly Baptists.

Matthew 5:32

---July 20, 1909

We have been requested to give our views of **(Matthew 5:32)**, which reads, "But I say unto you, that Whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." What is true with reference to the husband is also true with reference to the wife. If it is wrong for the wife to put away the husband, it is also wrong for the husband to put away the wife. If the Scriptures allow the wife to put her husband away and marry again, they will also allow the husband to put away his wife and marry another. Now, remember this, that what is admissible in the one is admissible in the other, for "they are no more twain, but one flesh." Then, the question is simply this, Can a man for any cause, expressed in Scripture, put away his wife and marry another, and he not be an adulterer?

In the text quoted above the Saviour tells us that if a man shall put away his wife for any other cause than that of fornication, he causes her to commit adultery. If she has committed fornication, and for this cause he puts her away, he does not cause her to commit adultery. If she has been put away for any cause, and then marries another man, the man commits adultery, in marrying one who has been put away. Now, notice the Saviour's language recorded in **(Matthew 19:9)**, "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." If the wife commits fornication and the husband puts her away on this account, and marries another, he does not commit adultery. If the husband puts his wife away for any other cause except fornication, and marries another, he commits adultery. If the Saviour had said, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, cornmiteth adultery," then a man would have no Scriptural reason whatever to put away his wife and marry again. But the Saviour gives only one exception to this universal rule, and that one exception is, "except it be for fornication." So if the wife commits fornication, and

the husband puts her away on this account and marries another he is no adulterer. If the wife commits fornication she becomes dead to her husband, and as she thereby becomes dead to him, he may marry again and he no adulterer.

In **(Luke 16:18)** the Saviour says, "Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." In this place it is laid down as though it was a universal rule with no exception, but the Saviour expresses the exception, and the only exception, in **(Matthew 19:8)**, as quoted above.

If the husband commits fornication, and the wife puts him away, on this account, and then she marries another man, she is no adulteress. Neither the man an adulterer whom she marries. To try to make it plainer: B commits fornication; on this account Mrs. B puts him away; then Mrs. B marries Mr. C. In this case Mrs. B is no adulteress, and Mr. C is no adulterer. This is true, by reason of the fact that Mr. B is a fornicator, and thereby becomes dead to Mrs. B, and this gives her a Scriptural right to marry again. This is clearly the exception to the rule, as laid down by the Saviour, and none have this right, except for fornication.

The language of the apostle in 1st Corinthians vii. 15, does not contradict the Saviour's teaching. He says, "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace." If the unbelieving husband or wife departs, let them go; you are under no obligation to follow them. But the believing one should not help the unbeliever to go; but if they will depart, let them go. But if they do go, this does not release the marriage bond. It does not give the one left the privilege of marrying another, for the apostle says in verses 10 and 11, "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife." It is plainly taught here that if one departs the other has no right to put them away on this account, but they should remain unmarried-hold themselves in readiness at all times for a reconciliation.

If the wife puts the husband away for any other cause than for fornication and marries another, she becomes an adulteress, and the man she marries becomes an adulterer, and to continue to live in this state is simply to continue to live in adultery.

The woman who was brought to the Saviour, having been caught in the very act, is no example to resort to as an excuse, in our judgment. She was brought before the Saviour by those who were

seeking to entangle and condemn our Lord. This lesson teaches us that the Saviour's mission was not to administer the law, neither was He to sit as judge to pass sentence on those who violated it. This was not His mission, which is clearly taught in this circumstance. His work was to fulfill the law, to render satisfaction to it.

These are our views on this subject. We do not propose to give them as a standard for our people, but we feel it is a safe position. We trust our brethren everywhere will study the matter carefully and prayerfully. Then may the Lord enable us to go in the right way, knowing no man after the flesh, but to have a true regard for the right, and give us Christian fortitude to walk in that way, and help us to always do that which is well-pleasing in His sight.

C. H. C.

REMARKS TO ELDER A. B. WHATLY ON ORGANS

---July 20, 1909

We agree with Elder Whatly, if we understand him, on every point except the organ question. We agree with him in being opposed to the use of it, but we cannot understand how he can oppose making it a test of fellowship, and at the same time admit that the old temple with all its service is destroyed. The very fact that the organ, or instrumental music, was used in the temple worship, and that the temple and all its worship has been destroyed, is proof enough that it should not be tolerated or fellowshiped in gospel worship and service. If it is right to admit this into gospel service and to not non-fellowship it, then it would also necessarily be right to admit any and all of the temple worship into the gospel church. Why not have the high priests to make offerings of beasts and birds year by year? We can just as consistently admit this into the gospel church as any other part of the temple service. All the temple worship and service has been abolished and destroyed, and no part of it can be admitted into the gospel church without denying the work of our blessed Redeemer and Law Giver.

We do think the brethren who have them should be willing to dispense with them for the sake of peace. Is it possible that they desire to be entangled with a "yoke of bondage," and prefer law worship and service rather than the fellowship of their brethren? For our part we prefer the plain simple gospel worship as given by our loving Master, and the fellowship of His humble followers, rather than have any of the law or temple worship with all its pomp and noise and splendor. The plain simple gospel worship suits us. May the Lord help us all to be content therewith. C. H. C.

Got His Papers

GOT HIS PAPERS

---July 27, 1909

New York, July 8.-The Rev. George Ashmore Fitch, one of three graduates of Union Theological Seminary, who in a recent examination denied the virgin birth of Christ, the historical identity of Adam and Eve, the raising of Lazarus from the dead and the resurrection of the body of the Saviour, was nevertheless ordained last night by the New York Presbytery by a vote of 10 to 7. He will sail this week for China to take up missionary work in Shanghai.

The Rev. Dr. Daniel Seelye Gregory, managing editor of the Standard dictionary and educator of note, spoke for the opposition.

"Tonight," he said, "it was a case of the Bible against the man. One or the other had to be thrown out, and the Presbytery of New York threw out the Bible as the infallible guide of faith and practice."

REMARKS

The above clipping only shows very plainly the tendency of modern theology. The denial of those things referred to is but a flat denial of the divinity of Christ, and virtually a denial of the existence of God. To what are the people drifting! And all this, too, under the cloak of professed Christianity. It seems to us that the dark clouds are gathering thick and fast. An awful storm seems to be approaching. Oh, Lord, shelter and deliver thy poor little tempest-tossed and tried children. May the Lord look in pity and restrain the on-coming storm, if it can be His will, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

In The Days of Noah

IN THE DAYS OF NOAH

---August 10, 1909

Dear Brother Cayce, we would be glad to hear you on some words like this, "As it was in the days of Noe so shall it be at the coming of the Son of man."

DANIEL H. WIUON

Coolridge, Ga.

REMARKS

We suppose the Scripture referred to is **(Matthew 24:37)**, which reads, "But as the days Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." The same thing is spoken of in **(Luke 17:26)**. The following verses tell how the people were doing in Noah's day, until

he entered the ark and the flood came. The coming of the Son of man refers to His coming in the gospel kingdom after His resurrection, when the old law worship and service has been fully closed out, and the light of gospel service and worship has been fully set up; and the destruction of Jerusalem is also referred to, as may be seen in the connection. It was a time of much wickedness in Noah's day, when he entered the ark-so was it a time of much wickedness when Jerusalem was destroyed, the old law worship and service done away, and the light of gospel worship and service fully ushered in. C. H. C.

Titus 3

---August 17, 1909

ELDER. C. H. CAYCE: Dear brother-I will kindly ask you to give me information on **(Titus 3:3-4,5)**. And you will oblige me by giving me Scripture where all things are predestinated. Yours fraternally,
Atlanta, Ark.

J. F. MILLS.

REMARKS

(Titus 3:3), reads, "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another." This describes the condition of these characters in nature without the work of Christ in salvation. This is the true condition of all in nature. Verses 4, 5, 6 and 7, read, "But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." This is a clear and positive statement that they are not saved by works of righteousness which they do. Their salvation from the deplorable state described in verse 3 was wholly the work of God, and was simply and purely of His mercy. This was, and is, all bestowed upon the sinner through what Christ has done for him. He is regenerated, born again, born from above, by the power of the Holy Ghost-not because of the righteous works of the sinner, for it is altogether through what Christ has done for him. Hence, the sinner is justified by grace. This justification makes him an heir of God, and is according to the hope of eternal life. The true hope of eternal life is based solely on what the Lord has done for poor sinners, and not on what he expects to do or has done. **(I Corinthians 6:11)** expresses

the same idea: "And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." The washing, cleansing, and regenerating of the sinner is the work of the Spirit of God. God does that for the sinner which qualifies him to live in and enjoy heaven, and this is all of grace.

There is no Scripture which says all things are predestinated. The very best any can do who believe that doctrine is to infer that it is true, for there is no place in Scripture which says so. **(Jeremiah 7:31)** says, "And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart." This was one thing that God certainly did not predestinate.

C. H. C.

In Indiana

IN INDIANA

---August 31, 1909

We left home at 4 p. m. on Wednesday, August 11, to attend the White Water Association at Village Creek Church, near Connersville, Ind. We arrived at Connersville at about 11 o'clock on Thursday and were conveyed to the home of Elder E. W. Harlan. This was the one hundredth anniversary of this association. There was a division in the association about the year 1845, which was brought about by a misunderstanding more than by real difference, so that there have been two parties going by the name of the White Water Association since that time. The two bodies discovered that they were really one people, and so have been in correspondence for a number of years. At this session they all met as one body, the White Water Association. The following ministers were present: Elders R. W. and John M. Thompson, Greenfield, Ind.; J. R. Wilson, John R. and J. Harvey Daily, Indianapolis, Ind.; Lawrence Ragan, Danville, Ind.; C. W. Radcliff, Mount Vernon, Ind.; E. W. Harlan, Connersville, Ind.; N. L. Ford, Fowlerton, Ind.; T. C. Williams, Magrew, Ohio; C. F. Stucky, Norris City, Ill.; J. T. Stewart, Beans Creek, Tenn.; Joseph Taylor, North Manchester, Ind.; W. N. Tharp, Liberty, Ind.; A. F. Dove, Van Buren, Ohio; D. W. Owens, Hersman, Ill.; Joseph Ford, Seneca, Kan.; C. H. Cayce, Martin, Tenn., and Licentiate L. W. Johnson, Mathews, Ind. It was a pleasant meeting indeed. Brotherly love and the spirit of humility seemed to reign throughout the entire meeting.

On Monday, the 16th, we went to Williams Creek and filled appointments at 2 p. m. and at night, and enjoyed the meeting at both services.

On Tuesday we went to Rushville and filled an appointment at night. The privileges of the church were extended, when Sister Dora Todd came forward and was joyfully received. She is to be baptized by the worthy pastor, Elder John R. Daily, at the time of the next regular meeting, Saturday and Sunday, August 21, 22.

On Wednesday we went to Indianapolis, where we had meeting at 11 o'clock and at night. Elder Harvey Daily was with us at the night service, and Elder J. R. Wilson was with us both day and night. Elder J. R. Daily was away, filling appointments in Ohio. The two services were both very pleasant, and we enjoyed being with the brethren here again.

Today (Thursday) at 11:30 we left Indianapolis. We are now on our way to St. Louis, Mo., where we change cars to go to Rogers, Ark., to attend an association and to fill other appointments which have been arranged. We humbly ask the dear brethren and sisters to pray the Lord to sustain us. C. H. C.

SPIRITS IN PRISON

---August 31, 1909

Brother Cayce:-I see that my article has come to the light, but it appears from your remarks that it was with some degree of reluctance that you gave it space. You will notice that I did not require you to endorse it. I hope it was not expected that I should do such a thing before you publish it. Now, as you have said you did not see it as I did, many of your readers, as well as myself, want you to tell us how you do see it. If I am wrong I want to be right, and if you are wrong you ought to be set right; and all honesty, justice, fairness and brotherly-kindness demand that you give your readers something better. If I am wrong and my position is assuming, you ought to lift me out of the ditch, or said nothing about it, and let me continue therein, but it is up to you to give a better exegesis of it. I am open to conviction and honestly desire the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Will you publish these few lines and give us your views on the subject? Yours in hope of eternal life,

D. Hoppers

Jackson, Tenn.

OUR REPLY

We will say, first, that whether Brother Hopper expected it or not, it is generally expected and understood that the editor endorses what he publishes in his paper, unless he states that he does not. This

being true, a large majority of our readers would have thought that we agreed with Brother Hopper if we had said nothing. While we thought, and yet think, Brother Hopper's views on the subject were not correct, yet we did not think the matter of sufficient importance to call for more than what we said. But as Brother Hopper, in the above letter, calls us out on the question, and seems to think justice, etc., demands that we give our views, we will endeavor to do so. Just here, however, we wish to call attention to the fact that here is a way in which controversy very frequently begins. Of course, if the editor gives space for an article containing views which he does not agree with, he could not consistently refuse space for a reply by someone expressing the view which he does agree with. Then the first brother thinks he should be allowed the privilege of a reply-so there it goes. Sometimes there is hardly any end to it. There is too much controversy among our people already, and we want none on this question, especially so, as we think we are agreed with Brother Hopper in doctrine. If we are not mistaken the question between us is simply as to what this text teaches. We believe that sinners are regenerated now by the operation and power of the Holy Spirit, just as they were in Noah's day. We are sure Brother Hopper believes the same thing. We think the text teaches this truth, while Brother Hopper thinks it teaches something else. As we understand the matter, that is the difference between us.

Now, let us have the text-(I Peter 3:18-21): For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Christ suffered for sins; but He was the just one, and therefore had no sins of His own for which to suffer. He suffered for the sins of others, and those for whose sins He suffered were unjust. As they were unjust, they were justly condemned, and He was not under obligation to them to suffer for their sins. In suffering for their sins He was put to death in the flesh. He laid down His life for them. But He was quickened by the Spirit. On the third day He was made alive from the dead; His body was raised from the grave by the power of the Spirit, the third person in the adorable Trinity. Hence He was quickened by the Spirit, by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison.

He preached unto the spirits in prison by the same Spirit by which He was quickened or raised from the grave. This preaching was done while the ark was a preparing-not after the ark was prepared. The apostle refers to preaching done by the Spirit while the ark was a preparing, not to preaching done to those in the ark after it was prepared. Preaching is teaching, and there is a lesson the Lord teaches by the Spirit. See **((4:13) (Isaiah 54:13); (John 6:45)**. The grace of God in the heart in the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration teaches something. See **(Titus 2:11-12)**. In nature, or in an unregenerate state, all are alike; all are, in that state, by nature, children of wrath or children of disobedience. See **(Ephesians 2:1-5)**. While in this condition they are in the prison house of sin, yet they are willing prisoners, for they are in love with sin, and remain so until the Lord performs His work in their hearts or spirits by His Spirit, thus preaching to the spirits in prison and proclaiming liberty to them. Thus, the Lord preached to the spirits in prison in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing. Regeneration, or proclaiming liberty to the captive of sin, the opening of the prison to them that were bound, was therefore the work of the Lord by the Holy Spirit in Noah's day, while the ark was a preparing, just as it was in the days of the apostles, and as it is yet. Sinners were regenerated by the work of the Spirit in the days of Noah, just as they are now. The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that He might be glorified. **((61:1) (Isaiah 61:1-3)**. In this we are taught that the Saviour was anointed to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound. He does this by the Spirit-by the same Spirit by which He was quickened. This work was done that way in Noah's day, and in the apostle's day, and it is done that way yet. Again, **((2:6) (Isaiah 42:6-7)**: I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out. It was that way in the days of Noah, and it is that way yet.

These characters were sometime disobedient. The same thought is expressed in **(Ephesians 2:1-2,3)**. It is also clearly expressed in **(Ephesians 5:8)**, "For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light." They were "sometimes darkness," were "sometimes disobedient." They were this way, or in this condition, until brought out of the prison of sin by the same Spirit by which Christ was raised from the dead.

If these thoughts are not in harmony with God's word we would not have our readers accept them, but they appear to us to be in harmony with the teaching of the Scriptures, and we give them to Brother Hopper and our readers praying the Lord to bless them to your good. C. H. C.

In Missouri

IN MISSOURI

---September 28, 1909

In the close of our last report we stated that we were on our way to Rogers, Ark., to attend an association near that place. We arrived at Rogers at 6:52 on Friday morning, August 20, and were met at the train by Brother A. Verhine, who lived in our country several years ago, but who now lives near Rogers. He conveyed us to his home, then to the Sugar Creek Association, which was held on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, August 20, 21, and 22.

There were about fourteen ministers in attendance. We failed to get their names. The services were pleasant and seemed to be enjoyed by nearly all who were present, but there was some discord in the business of the association. It appeared that there was complaint by some of the churches about the doctrine Elder Fairchild had been advocating. On Friday there was some discussion of the differences, when it was decided that there was more of a misunderstanding than real difference. Elder Fairchild agreed not to officiate with the unlimited predestinarian Baptists where that doctrine has caused division. We trust the matter is settled, but time will develop the matter as to whether it was only a smoothing over and hiding of real differences or not.

On Monday after the association we visited Cousin Sallie Little, the widow of Elder N. W. Little, who formerly lived in Clinton, Ky. We spent Monday night at the home of Sister Kieser, who formerly lived near Cayce, Ky. Sister Luetta Hawkins, of San Antonio, Texas, sister of Sister Kieser, was there on a visit. We knew them in our childhood days. On Tuesday we went to Eureka Springs to visit our mother's

sister, Mrs. R. B. Ray, whom we had not seen for several years, and remained with her until Wednesday afternoon at 5:15, when we took train for Springfield, Mo., changing cars at Seligman. Elders W. J. Taylor and W. A. Barham were on the train when we got on at Seligman. We arrived at Springfield at nearly midnight, and went to the home of Brother F. M. Morris, where we were kindly cared for. Next morning (Thursday), in company with Elders Taylor and Barham, we left Springfield for Newburg, Mo., where we were met by Brother I T. Mathis and conveyed to his home, about fourteen miles. Elder Taylor preached that night at Brother Mathis' home. On Friday we were conveyed to the place of the association (the Little Piney), where we tried to preach that night. The association convened next day, and continued through Saturday, Sunday and Monday. The following elders were in attendance: C. C. Agee, Northview, Mo.; W. J. Taylor, Garfield, Ark.; W. A. Barham, Watalula, Ark.; C. M. Harris, Putnam, Okla.; J. T. Jenkins, Relfe, Mo., and the writer. This was a good and pleasant meeting indeed. On Monday the following nine sisters came to the church, asking for a home with them: Aggie L. Mathis, Ella Jenkins, Jennie Cowan, Carrie Chit, Jennie Hamilton, Ann Evans, Katie Melton, Jennie Melton and Lorette Steele. This meeting will long be remembered.

On Monday afternoon, in company with Elder W. J. Taylor, we were conveyed to the home of Dr. S. F. Arthur, in Lecom, where we spent the night. On Tuesday we were conveyed to Lake Springs Church, where we had services on Tuesday, Tuesday night, Wednesday and Wednesday night.

The meeting was a very pleasant one. Elder Taylor being with us, did part of the preaching.

On Thursday morning we were conveyed by Brother J. D. Bradford to Rolla, where we boarded the train for Springfield. Spent the night again with Brother Morris. On Friday morning we went to Bolivar, Mo., and were conveyed to Harmony Church to attend the Ozark Association. We tried to preach at the association ground that night. The association convened on Saturday and continued through Sunday and Monday. The following elders were in attendance: W. J. and J. G. Taylor, of Garfield, Ark.; W.

T. Branson, Houstonia, Mo.; T. H. Jenkins, Relfe, Mo.; C. M. Harris, Putnam, Oklahoma; C. C. Agee, Northview, Mo.; L. A. Green and J. H. White, Louisburg, Mo.; R. A. Wiseman, Fairgrove, Mo.; L. C. Mills, Longlane, Mo.; J. A. Ford, Buffalo, Mo.; D. E. Smith, Duncan, Mo.; W. M. Biddie, Not, Mo., and the writer. On Monday Sister Oma Breshears asked for a home in the church and was gladly received. The meeting was sweet and pleasant and will be long remembered.

On Tuesday and Wednesday we tried to preach at Louisburg. Elders White, Green, Ford and Hodges were with us here. On Wednesday Brother L. H. Rice was gladly received into the church and was baptized that afternoon by Elder Green.

On Thursday we tried to preach at New Hope Church, Elder Green being with us there. The meeting was a very pleasant one.

On Friday we had two pleasant services at Pisgah Church, and on Saturday a pleasant meeting at New Bethel Church, and at night in Niangua, although we were very nearly worn out on account of so much travel and trying to preach twice every day. In Niangua we met Elder S. F. Stone.

On Sunday morning we went to Springfield, where we enjoyed a very pleasant meeting at 11 o'clock a. m., and at 3 p. m. A Brother Edwards was received into the fellowship of the church by relation.

On Monday we went to Fellowship Church, near Northview, and tried to preach on Monday and Tuesday. Elder Green preached on Monday night. Elders Green and Wiseman were both with us here on Tuesday.

On Wednesday and Thursday we tried to preach at Ozark Church. Elders Agee and Ford were with us here. At this church the brethren camped on the ground and had two services in the day on Wednesday and had services also at night. It was a pleasant meeting, and will be long remembered by us.

The tour has been a pleasant one to us. The brethren have kindly received us and have been good to us-much better than we feel to deserve. We feel to be but a poor unprofitable servant, if a servant at all. Space forbids us mentioning the names of all whose homes we visited and who were so kind to convey us from place to place, but we feel to appreciate their many acts of kindness shown to us.

At this writing (Friday, Sept. 17), we are at the home of Elder C. C. Agee, near Northview, Mo. We expect to start in a few minutes with him and Sister Agee for Billings to attend the Center Creek Association.

Again we ask an interest in the prayers of all our brethren and sisters, that the Lord may bless our labors to the comfort of His dear children, although our labors be weak and feeble.

C. H. C.

Sad Conditions

SAD CONDITIONS

---October 5, 1909

Miss ANNIE WALL: Dear Sister, Cherishing a Precious Hope in Christ-Your kind favor of some time past received and read with pleasure. I trust you will pardon me for not answering sooner; the delay was unavoidable, as I try to serve four churches, all at a distance, except my home church, and I farm on a small scale to support my family. My sister, I wish to encourage you, as I gather from your letter you have a faithful mind, and I trust your practical life will ever be in harmony with the profession you have made, and that you may be like Mary who chose that good part which should never be taken from her, which was to sit at the feet of Him whom she loved.

I greatly fear there are many uniting with the old church today who do not realize what a solemn thing it is to publicly profess Christ, and what it requires to be a follower of the meek and lowly Lamb of God, who do not first sit down and count the cost to see whether they have sufficient to finish after they have laid the foundation. See **((28) (Luke 14:28-29)**. Ah, indeed, I greatly fear many of us today still remember that country from whence we came out. **(Hebrews 11:15)**.

My dear sister, these are perilous times. Our adversary, the devil, seems to have universal sway over mankind. My sister, you rightfully state you believe God has all power, etc., and then say, "I wonder why things are as they are?" This is a question which none but God alone can answer; He has nowhere told us that we could prevent our surroundings, or prevent perilous times from coming, but told us plainly they were coming.

Therefore He cautioned His people to beware, take heed, lest at any time their hearts be overly charged with surfeiting, and drunkenness and cares of this life and that day came on you unawares (unexpected). **(Luke 21:34)**, "Take heed, lest at any time This is one of the times the above language is applicable, but it is too late to take warning after His people have been overcome with the cares, riches, and pleasures of this life. **(Luke 8:14)**. The caress riches and pleasures of this life are the thorns, and I have no idea the thorns ever were at numerous as they are today. The world never witnessed as prosperous times as we are now. passing through, therefore, His people have waxed fat and kicked, and lightly esteemed the rock of their salvation.-**(Deuteronomy 32:15)**. The Bible account of God's people, they never withstand the temptations produced by prosperity. Prosperity produces a state of ease in Zion, and woe to them that are at ease in Zion. **((Amos 6:1) (Amos 6:1)**. Poverty is a blessing to people. He says, "Blessed be ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God." -**(Luke 6:20)**.

Oh, but say some, the above means to be poor in spirit. But when are they poor in spirit In prosperity, or in adversity? Nay, but in adversity. When the Spirit directed John to writs to the angel of the church in Smyrna, she was in tribulation and poverty, but rich.

(Revelation 2:9) Rich, because the kingdom of God was hers, and was all she had. He admonished her to be faithful unto death, and He would give her a crown of life. She was highly honored, but ah, how unlike the church at Laodicea who said she was rich, and increased with goods, etc. Instead of a crown of life being promised her for her faithfulness, He threatens to spew her out of His mouth (equivalent to casting her out of His sight) for her unfaithfulness, and I haven't a doubt but that we are now in the Laodicean state of the church, which is Paul's last days of perilous times, and is the end of the two witnesses' testimony in sackcloth, which is the church and God's ministry.

This is an age of ease in which the old man is seeking for, and is now enjoying, a good time; while the new, or inner man, is bowed down with sighs and groans unutterable. An age of idleness, and idleness breeds crime, which is now on the increase, and that too of the blackest hue. An age when darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people, etc. **((60:2) (Isaiah 60:2)**. I heartily agree with you, my sister, that God has called ministers in this age of the world, as in the primitive age of the church, and that His people are inspired by the same Spirit, or power, to hear and receive the gospel that they are to preach it. If not, then He has neither ministry nor church. But, my sister, have we, both minister and laity, given diligence to make our calling and election sure? **(II Peter 1:10)**. He says if ye do these things ye shall never fall. I don't think it can be successfully denied that both minister and laity have fallen or left their first love. Of course, God's love, like Himself, never changes. He loved His people before the world began, yea, even His people of today. Our love may, and has grown cold toward Him, but His love never grows cold toward His people. He says, if any man love the world, or even the things of the world, the love of the Father is not in him. See **(I John 2:15-16)**. He does not say the grace of God is not in him.

The sequel of the whole matter is, His people cannot love both God and the world. Either we will hate the one and love the other, or else we will hold to the one and despise the other. "You cannot serve (love) both God and mammon." -**(Matthew 6:24)**.

My dear sister, you urge the necessity of asking and seeking, which is our Master's instruction, and I would not discourage you in urging this great lesson, but remember, my sister, that James says, "We ask

and receive not, because we ask amiss, that we may consume it upon our lusts (pleasures)." -**(3) (James 4:3)**. Our lusts (pleasures) are the channel through which wars and fightings entered our once happy home, and it seems to me that Achan has brought that goodly Babylonish garment and silver, and that golden wedge, into our camps, which has divided us, and thrown all Israel into confusion. Covetousness is the channel through which the above things entered the camps of Israel.

My dear young sister, covetousness -a desire for the good things of this life-is the channel through which we have been led away from the simplicity of the gospel, from the old paths, wherein is that good way, and we are now in a far country, where we have wasted our substance in riotous living. We are in the enemies' land among thieves, near Jerico, where we have been stripped of our raiment (peculiarities) and are in a deathly state, and nothing but the Spirit of life from the Lord will ever revive us, which will surely be sooner or later, for John saw His people revived after they had lain in the streets of the great city three days and a half. They, of course, were spiritually dead and stripped of their raiment.

Peter, looking through prophecy, saw all these things and said, "We, according to promise look for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." -**(II Peter 3:13)**. And John says he saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away and there was no more sea. **(Revelation 21:1)**. This was after the man of sin was bound, and the sudden destruction of that great city Babylon, the mistress of the world. **((0) (Revelation 18:20-21)**.

This occurred between the time that John saw the Spirit of life from the Lord enter into them and they stood upon their feet, and their coming up out of great tribulation, **{(Revelation 2:11)}** and the time that he saw all things made new; therefore, he says, "And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials," etc., "and he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain (the mountain of God's holiness; **((8:1) (Psalms 48:1)**) and shewed me that great city," etc. This great city is the bride, the Lamb's wife, after she had come up out of great tribulation (not out of graves, but out of great tribulation), and had washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. I know **(Revelation 21)** is looked upon by many as giving a description of the church in her glorified state in eternity, after the resurrection of these vile bodies, but then he says, "And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it (the church), and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it." -24th verse. The nations of the

earth which are saved, are the nations healed, for after she had come up out of great tribulation (out of the streets of the great city where she had been overcome, and trodden under foot so long) she bore twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month, and the leaves of the tree (her leaves) were for the healing (saving) of the nations {**(Revelation 22:2)**} and they shall walk in her light. Ezekiel bears testimony to the same time and things. See **(Revelation 17)**; also **(Isaiah 35)** bears testimony to the same great event. He begins by saying, "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose," etc. Then closed by saying, "And the ransomed (redeemed) of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." The above Scriptures have never been fulfilled, but will be, and I believe everything is preparatory to, and is ready for that great day.

My sister, I have been more lengthy than I intended when I began this letter, but if you are wearied I hope you will pardon me. I know I have but poorly expressed myself, but believe my position true. I will close, and may God's richest blessings be with you, and may you ever adorn your profession, and be a bright light in our Father's kingdom, is the prayer of yours, I hope, in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ.
H. W. NEWTON.

Oak Grove, Mo.
REMARKS

By request we give space to the letter from Elder H. W. Newton in another place in this paper, but we must ask Brother Newton to please excuse us from accepting all he has said concerning the Primitive Baptists. We have never met Brother Newton, yet we love him, and we do not differ from him for the sake of difference, but because our experience and association among the Old Baptists teach us that he is wrong. We do not know how it is in Brother Newton's immediate vicinity, right at his home-brethren there may have all forsaken the right way, they may all be seeking after the inventions of men they may all be seeking after the things of the world and not after godliness their ears may be stopped, their eyes closed, and they may be "rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing;" they may all be worldly minded, instead of spiritually minded-we say they may be this way where Brother Newton lives-but this is by no means universal among our people. It is true that there may be some errors among us in some localities, but this has always

been true, and it is no worse now than it has been heretofore-and we are sure it is not as bad as it has been at times in the past. The Primitive Baptists, as a body, are a people who want to do right. They desire to know and practice the truth, and we are going to give them credit for it. We do not mean that we are going to give them the glory or honor-no. We feel to give the glory and honor to God that He preserves and keeps true and faithful witnesses for truth, and that there are many yet who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. We are well aware of the fact that many, very many, of the Lord's dear children are blinded by the false teachers of this world, and are seeking after earthly riches and pleasures. Yet the Lord has reserved a remnant who are witnesses for truth and are walking in the good old ways our fathers trod. That remnant is composed of the great body of the Primitive or Old School Baptists. This is true, so far as the United States is concerned. Please let us say, not boastingly, but meekly, that we have been among the Old Baptists to a small extent, at least, in about fourteen states, and we must say that as a body of people they are, as a rule, poor in worldly goods, yet willing to divide their few small possessions to relieve the sick, clothe the naked, feed the hungry and to care for their poor faithful servants in the ministry. They love the Lord and His sweet service more than they do the world and all its glories. As a rule they are a God-loving, God-honoring, God-fearing, meek, humble, quiet, peaceable, faithful and true people. They love the humble and simple service of the Lord, and they have proven to us that they do-and they are continually proving it to us. We love them more and more on this account, and do not see how we could get along in this old world without them; and we beg that they allow us to have only a very low place with them while the Lord spares us to live on earth. We do not say anything with an intention of wounding any person on earth, but because we think Brother Newton is wrong, if we understand him, and we just loved our precious brethren too well not to say so. We love dear Brother Newton, too, and humbly trust he will not be offended at us.

Again we ask an interest in the prayers of the dear brethren and sisters.

C. H. C.

God The First Cause

GOD THE FIRST CAUSE

---October 26, 1909

This world is governed by the law of cause and effect-not one thing is left to blind chance.

There is not only a cause for every effect, but there is a cause for every cause except the First Cause. The First Cause is an uncaused cause—all the reasons of its existence are in itself.

First Cause is another name for God. God is the first cause of all causes.—F. in Footprints of the Flock for September, 1909.

The above from the pen of Elder J. W. Fairchild, in his paper of September, 1909, savors of “rottenness” to us. We said before that we did not endorse his so-called peace proposition, or peace appeal, and we are not yet sorry we said it. We now say that the above is a strange doctrine to us—not strange in the sense that we never heard it before, but strange in the sense that it doesn't read just right to us. According to the logic of it God did not cause Adam to violate the law, but the devil caused Adam to do so. And Elder Fairchild says God is the first cause of all causes. Then God caused the devil to cause Adam to violate the law. Adam would not have violated the law if the devil had not caused him to do so; and the devil would not have caused Adam to violate the law if God had not caused him to do that. There can be no effect without a cause. Then Adam could not have violated the Law if the devil had not caused him to do so, and the devil could not have caused Adam to violate the law if God had not caused him to do so. If this does not make God the author and first cause of sin, we confess we do not know the meaning of the words. There is no use caviling over the matter; it simply makes God the first cause and the author of all sin. We freely say we do not believe any such teaching, and must be excused. It is not Bible doctrine, and we stand just where we have been standing regarding it. We do not believe the churches in that country will endorse such teaching. If Elder Fairchild wants recognition among our people, he should make a “clean surrender” of the doctrine of the absolute and unconditional predestination of all things, and quit publishing that doctrine in his paper. If he will not do this, there is no need to plead for peace. Advocating that doctrine causes trouble and strife, and there is no use to plead for peace and advocate the doctrine at the same time. If a man is in earnest in pleading for peace, the way to prove, or show it is to quit advocating the things that cause trouble. That doctrine caused trouble among our churches in this country, and we do not want a man among us who advocates it. This is plain, but it behooves us to be plain. C. H. C.

Missions and Methods

MISSIONS AND METHODS

---November 9, 1909

We have received and read a copy of "Missions and Mission Methods," a book of 287 pages. recently published by Elder J. H. Millburn, of Union City, Tenn. Elder Milburn is an anti-board Missionary Baptist. In this book he takes the position that the commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, was given to the church, and that the obligation of it now rests upon the churches, and not upon boards, societies or other inventions of men. Although we think he is wrong in his position regarding the commission, we agree with him that these boards and societies are simply inventions of men, and deny the authority of Christ. On page 238 he says:

"Baptists got along without any such Episcopal machinery for over seventeen hundred years; we can get along without it now; my brother, will you try to be loyal to Christ, and let such institutions of men alone?" This is precisely what our people thought and believed at the time of the division when Gary, Fuller and others introduced those things into the Baptist family. The Baptists got along without those things seventeen hundred years, and we are still getting along without them.

On page 12 he says: "God has always had faithful witnesses; He has now and will have until He shall come again. God has never had less, at any time, than 'a remnant according to the election of grace.' At this time, however, God has a mighty host, but alas, many of them are asleep in regard to the perilous times which are upon them. The conflict is on; multitudes have taken a firm stand 'on the Lord's side' against innovations and the inventions of men in religious matters," etc. The Primitive Baptists took that firm stand all along the line. We remained on that platform when those things (inventions). were introduced into the Baptist family by Fuller & Co. Your people left the "Lord's side" when they went into these things that gave rise to the division.

On page 65 he says: "It is only when men go beyond God's revealed will and teach and practice that which is not required that divisions and strife come among the children of God." This being true, it follows that those men who introduced these inventions and methods of which Elder Milburn complains were the cause of the division in the Baptist family. It must, therefore, necessarily be true that the Missionary Baptists are the seceding party, and are not the original Baptists. Those things are not in God's revealed will. The parties who introduced, taught and advocated those things went "beyond God's revealed will," and, therefore, departed from the original principles, and so are not the original Baptist church. The Missionary Baptist church is, therefore, a new sect, and is not the church of Christ.

On page 107 he says: "Honestly, reader, what do you think of those editors and authors (?) who persistently assert that those who refuse to adopt Conventionism have 'split off,' but will never tell what they have 'split off' from? There were no Baptist Conventions, nor Convention Baptists, nor churches cooperating with organizations of similar character or kind, for over 1,700 years. We ask again: In the name of right and justice, what is it those churches refusing to cooperate with Conventions have 'split off' from?" This is a question we would like to have answered, too. It is a question the Missionary Baptists have failed to answer for years. If the churches that refuse to cooperate with Conventions have not "split off," then the Primitive Baptists have not "split off," but the Missionaries have; for the Primitive Baptists have, all along, refused to cooperate with their machinery, while the Missionaries have cooperated with those things, and those things caused the division.

Elder Milburn brings some very serious charges against the boards, and shows very clearly and plainly that they are unscriptural and that it is very wrong to cooperate with them, or to aid them in their work. We would be glad to give more extracts from the book, but space forbids. As stated above, we think he is wrong in the position that the commission was given to the church. Neither do we endorse all the doctrinal sentiment he has advanced, but we do heartily endorse the sentiment that the boards and societies they have are the inventions of men and are unscriptural. The book contains much valuable information. The price is one dollar. If you want a copy, send a dollar to Elder J. H. Milburn, Union City, Tenn., and he will send you one. C. H. C.

Organs in Churches

ORGANS IN CHURCHES

---November 16, 1909

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: My Dear Brother-Our church at Cordele does not, nor never has used an organ in its song service, and there is not a member that desires that we use one; however, there are some churches in Georgia that do use the organ.

Will you answer briefly the following question? Should we exclude from our fellowship a church which uses an organ in its song service, but does not urge its use upon others, and is otherwise sound and orderly?

Thanking you in advance for an early reply, I am, yours in hope,

THOS J. MCARTHUR

Cordele, Ga.

OUR REPLY

The above may have been intended as a private request; it may have been sent with the expectation of a reply by private letter, but as we have no secrets in the matter, we decided to publish the request with our reply.

If a church in our association (the Greenfield) should introduce an organ into her service, the sister churches would at once labor with her to get her to remove it. If she failed to do so, she would certainly be dropped from our union. This is what we would do. But your question has in it, "should they do so?" We most emphatically, yet kindly, say yes. Law worship and law service has been closed out, and has no place in the gospel church. We could as consistently admit into our churches and fellowship the whole brood of Arminian law worship, service and practice, as we could admit the organ part of it. As for our part we want none of it.

C. H. C.

Not Surprised

NOT SURPRISED

---November 23, 1909

We are not at all surprised that Brother C. H. Cayce should endorse Brother Milburn's argument against our regular missionary organizations. The Hardshells made these same fights against our Lord's work seventy-five years ago and the results have been fully demonstrated.- Baptist Builder, Nov. 17, 1909.

Elder Penick need not be surprised when we endorse the truth at any time. But if Elder Penick should ever endorse the truth it would surprise us very much. It is a very easy matter to say "so-and-so has done so-and-so" - much easier than to answer arguments or fair questions. Will you pray tell us what the "Hardshells," as you call us, split off from in opposing your societies, boards and conventions-when none of those things existed among the Baptists prior to 1792? Your mission system is unauthorized by the word of God, and is foreign to truth. C. H. C.

Questions

QUESTIONS

---November 23, 1909

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I want to ask you to give me your views on the Scripture where Christ said, "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to

prepare a place for you." Did He mean the church here in this world, or in heaven?

We are divided into four factions here. Don't you believe it would be best not to join any church? I believe we can serve God as well out of the church as we can in it.

There are a number of Primitive Baptists here who do not belong to the church. I take THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. I read the paper and then mail them to parties in North Carolina and Tennessee. It doesn't cost but little to send them. I sent four to a Missionary preacher who is an organ advocate. The organ is an idol. I am ninety-one years old-a poor old sinner.

Remember me in your prayers. Please answer the above.

D. C. WACASER

Garden City, Ala.

REMARKS

The Scripture referred to is recorded in **(John 14:2)**. Brethren differ on this text, and we suppose will continue to do so. In some way there was a kingdom prepared for the Lord's people from the foundation of the world. "Inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." In another respect the death, burial, resurrection, ascension and intercession of Christ is necessary in this preparation and the reception of them into the place prepared for them. We think it is also true that the Lord makes or prepares a place for us here, and makes it our duty to fill that place. We believe our sainted father, Elder S. F. Cayce, filled his place.

To the next question, we would answer no. We do not think it best not to join any church. We think the Lord's people, who believe the truth, should join the Old Baptist Church, which we think is the church of Christ. If one can serve God as well out of the church as he can in it, then why did Christ establish His church? One cannot do some things the Lord has commanded His children to do without becoming a member of His church. Hence, he cannot serve God as well out of the church as he can in it, and therefore it is best to join the church. C. H. C.

Sinners and Ungodly

SINNERS AND UNGODLY

---November 23, 1909

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother in hope of eternal life-I want you to give me your views on the ungodly- who is he? It says, "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" Yours for truth,

D. T. TOWNER

Oneonta, Ala.

REMARKS

The text cited above is in **(I Peter 4:18)**. Verse 17 says, "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" This shows clearly that the righteous referred to in verse 18 are those who obey the gospel, and that the saving is that which is enjoyed by those who do obey. Hence the ungodly and the sinner are those who do not obey the gospel.

C. H. C.

Questions From W. C. Moore

QUESTIONS FROM W. C. MOORE

---November 30, 1909

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Sir-Permit me to ask you a few questions in regard to the death of the Lord Jesus Christ and the salvation of the poor lost sinners, and answer them through the columns of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, if you feel disposed to do so. I am not a subscriber for your valuable paper, but I am a reader of your lovely, Christian-like paper, THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Hence, I write to ask the following questions:

1. If God so loved His people as to give His Son to die for them, why did He not have the same love to give His Son to die for all?
2. If the death of Jesus Christ was based upon the principle of mercy, why was it not based upon the principle of mercy for all?
3. If Christ unconditionally atoned our actions, sins, why did He not also unconditionally atone the sins of the back-sliding Israel?
4. Does the Holy Spirit ever give any commands or warnings to sinners, in order to flee from the wrath to come? If not, why not?
5. What purpose did God have in creating the goats?

I would be glad for you or any writer of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST to answer the above questions through the columns of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Now, I did not ask the above questions to bring a reproach upon your cause or its readers. I have always heard it preached in the Bible, general atonement, free agency, general calling, etc. So my motive in writing to you is to know the truth.

Will you or any writer to THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST favor me with a reply? Trusting you will favor me with this reply, I am, Yours very truly,

W. C. MOORE

Bellefontaine, Miss.

REMARKS

In answer to Question 1 we refer to **(Romans 9:11-13)**: "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." This plainly tells us that God hated Esau. Then God did not love Esau. In verse 11 it is explained, "That the purpose of God according to election might stand." If any man can tell why God did not love Esau, he will tell why God did not love all the race. In Verse 14 the apostle anticipates and answers the objection that some make, that God is unrighteous if He loves a part of the race and does not love all the race. He says, "What shall we say then? is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid." Have we any right to reply against God, and ask why He does not love all the race, and bestow spiritual blessings upon all of them? Certainly not. Read verse 20 in the same chapter.

In answer to question 2 we will say: If the death of Christ was based upon a principle of mercy, then He had a right to die for a part of the race without dying for others. If He did not have this sovereign right, then His death was not mercy, but an obligation which He was under to sinners. If He was under obligation to them to die for them, and if they are saved through what He accomplished in His death, then their salvation is not a matter of mercy, but a matter of obligation-something the Lord was under obligation to them to do for them. If the salvation of the sinner is not of God's mercy, then the Bible is a farce, and the whole thing is a delusion, a snare and a myth. Sinners are saved by mercy-grace-through what Christ accomplished in His death. Therefore, His death was an act of mercy. As it was an act of mercy, He had a sovereign right to die for a part of the race, without dying for others.

Replying to question 3 we will say we suppose "actual" sins is meant by "actions" sins. We did not correct the word, because we did not know certainly that this was what was meant; but we will take it for granted in our answer. Christ did actually atone for all the actual sins of all His people, or else He did not do so. There could be no such thing as conditional atonement. Christ either made atonement, or else He did not make atonement. If He made atonement, then it is already done, and cannot now be conditional upon the part of the sinner. The sinner is the offending party; God is the offended. A mediator steps in between the offended and the offending parties. If the mediator makes atonement, or reconciliation, that atonement or

reconciliation does not depend upon the offending party. Christ was the mediator, and He made atonement, or reconciliation, for the offense of those who were represented by Him in His offering. If He did not make atonement, or reconciliation, then His work as a mediator was a failure and God (the offended party) is still unreconciled. Then, if God becomes reconciled because of anything the sinner does, let it be whatever it may, then the work of Christ was a failure, and the sinner is not saved because of what Christ did for him, but because of what he does himself. Backsliding Israel were chastised for their sins, but chastisement is not atonement. To be made at one with God, the guilt of the sinner must be removed, and chastisement does not remove the guilt. The Lord's people are chastised now for their disobedience, but that does not atone. Christ made atonement for them. Christ did atone for the sins of His spiritual Israel among national Israel. "They are not all Israel, which are of Israel." The Jews were God's chosen people as a nation. Some of them were God's people spiritually. Christ made atonement for all the sins of His people spiritually-those embraced in the covenant of grace.

To question 4 we say unregenerate sinners are nowhere in God's word commanded to flee from the wrath to come. In nature the sinner is condemned already. Judgment has already been pronounced. He is guilty, and already condemned. To warn him to flee would be to tell him to run from justice-and if he could, and should, flee, he would only be an escaped convict. He cannot enter heaven an escaped convict. The great Judge of the Universe cannot be thus deceived. Then why should he be warned to flee? It would be the very height of folly.

To question 5 we say: "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He giveth to all life and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." -(**Acts 17:24-25,26**). This tells why God made all men-"for to dwell on all the face of the earth." God did not make them sinners. Man was not a sinner as God made him. He made himself a sinner. Man transgressed the law of his creator, and thus became the offending party. The penalty for the offense was death. Hence, there must be the intervention of another party, or all are forever lost. Here Christ intervenes as mediator for His people and makes atonement, reconciliation, satisfaction for their sins. The others are not injured by

the work of Christ, but are left where they are placed by reason of sin-transgression. C. H. C.

Remarks to J. C. Biggs

REMARKS TO J. C. BIGGS

---December 7, 1909

We are not sure that we understand Brother Biggs on every point. The children of God, we understand, belonged to Christ by gift before atonement was made by Him for them. When He died for them, then they were His also by redemption or purchase. In regeneration they are made His by vital relationship; they are God's people then by birth-a vital relationship or kinship then existing. In this (regeneration) they receive the spirit of adoption; and they are adopted when this mortal body is resurrected and received into the heavenly family.

God overrules, restrains and punishes sin and wickedness. He is in no sense the approver of it.

C. H. C.

First Cause Again

FIRST CAUSE AGAIN

---December 7, 1909

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I can't understand your article in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of October 26. Do you believe God put Adam in the garden to keep the law forever? If so, why did Christ stand as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world? I understand you to think that the devil was the cause of Adam's transgression, and God didn't intend it. Now I don't believe that God is the author of sin, no more than you do; but, my dear brother, I believe good was accomplished and not evil. What was more evil than the crucifixion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and Christ Himself said to one, "you have no power against me except it be given you from above;" and He also said "for this hour was I born, and for this cause came I into the world." But it took a devil to betray Him; and I believe God's purpose was carried out in Adam as it was in Christ. And, now, my dear brother, I want you to show me where I am wrong. I have not written this for publication; I only want you to show me where my mistake is. You can answer me through the paper or by private letter. I hate to ask this of you, but if I am wrong I want to be right. Dear brother, pray for me, that God may give me grace to bear me through this world of sin and sorrow. Your sister, I hope, saved by grace, if saved at all,

MRS. GEORGIA TOWNSEND
R. 1
Center, Miss.

OUR REPLY

In reply to your question, "Do you believe God put Adam in the garden to keep the law forever?" will say we believe just precisely what God's word says about it. "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it." -

(Genesis 2:15). If God put the man in the garden to violate His law, the Bible does not say so. We believe what the Bible says. If you believe what the Bible says, then you cannot believe God put the man in the garden to violate the law. No one can possibly believe both propositions, for they are diametrically opposed to each other. The Bible does not say Christ stood as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world. The text used in support of that thought is **(Revelation 13:8)**, which says, "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." The writing of the names in the book of life was from the foundation of the world. That book of life was the "book of life of the Lamb slain." The names were written from the foundation of the world. **(Revelation 17:8)** shows this to be true. It says, "And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world." A literal translation as given in the Interlinear New Testament, of **(Revelation 13:8)**, is, "And shall do homage to it, all who dwell on the earth of whom have not been written the names from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb slain." To transpose the words, so as to have easy flowing English, we have it thus: "And all shall do homage to it, who dwell on the earth, the names of whom have not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb slain." The very expression, "Christ stood as a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" is contradictory within itself. if He stood, He was not slain. A lamb that is slain does not stand-it is cut down. Christ was cut down-Pie was slain for our sins, but He was raised again.

God did not predestinate that Adam should violate the law. God is the author of His predestination. You would surely admit this. Then, if God is the author of His predestination, and He predestinated that Adam should violate His law, then He is the author of the violation of that law. No man under heaven can escape that conclusion. One had just as well say the moon is blue mud and then try to argue that it is not, as to say God predestinated that Adam should sin, and then try

to argue that God is not the author of sin. God did predestinate the salvation of His people, and He is the author of their salvation. He is the author of His predestination, if good, and not evil, was accomplished in Adam's transgression, then there is no such thing as evil. The heathenish and idolatrous infidel saying, that "Whatever is, is right," would then be true. Oh, horror of horrors! The idea that good, and not evil, is accomplished in all the crime, murder, theft, robbery, rape, wife-killing, mothers slaying their offspring-and all other crimes that are being committed all over the country! Lord, deliver us from such black, blasphemous, heathenish infidelity! To Pilate Jesus said, in **(John 19:11)**, "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." The Jews had sought to take the life of the Saviour from the time of His advent into the world; but they could not take it. They did not take it, either. Christ laid down His life. See **(John 10:17-18)**, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." In **(7) (John 18:37)** Jesus said, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice."

If God's purpose was carried out in Adam, or if God predestinated that Adam should violate the law, then Adam did God's will when he violated the law, or else God predestinated that Adam should not do His will. If God's will was for Adam to violate the law, and He had predestinated that he do so, then God told him to do that which it was not His will for him to do. God told him not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. If God had predestinated that he should eat of the fruit of that tree, then He told him not to do the thing that He had predestinated he should do. The penalty for the violation of that law was death. If God willed and predestinated that he should violate the law, then the man is punished with death for doing God's will and what God predestinated that he should do. **(I Corinthians 10:5)**, "But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness." If God predestinated that they should do as they did, then God was not well pleased with His own predestination. If God's predestination is according to His will, then God was not well pleased with His own will in this instance, if He predestinated that they should do as they did. God did not predestinate that they should do as they did, for God is pleased with His predestination; but He was not pleased with them.

We fail to see where there is any grace in a system that puts the man in a state of sin by the predestination of God. If God predestinated that all should be sinners and then predestinated that some should be saved from sin, then God predestinated to save some from His own predestination. We fail to see where there is any room for grace in that kind of theory. It destroys every principle of grace. It would be as much damnation by grace as salvation by grace. Man sinned willfully, and by his own act brought condemnation and death. It was by man's disobedience, and not by the predestination of God. Hence, God's predestination has never damned anyone. But God did predestinate to save His chosen people from sin, and according to that predestination He saves them. His predestination to save them was grace- mercy alone. Hence they are saved by grace. We love the doctrine of grace. Poor rebel sinners are saved by grace. Without grace we are forever lost. But we do not love the doctrine that God absolutely predestinated everything that comes to pass, and that God is the cause of our sins and wickedness. If that doctrine be true, then God has absolutely predestinated that we should not believe it, and we are glad He did not leave that out.
C. H. C.

Questions

QUESTIONS

---December 14, 1909

(II Corinthians 12)

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Please give your views of **(II Corinthians 12)**. Does Paul have reference to himself or someone else in regard to the third heaven? Yours, saved by grace, if saved at all,

R. F. HORNER
Lane, Tenn.

Paul has reference to a vision or revelation which he had. In that revelation or vision he was caught up to the third heaven and "heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." That is, he heard words which are not possible for a man to utter.

C. H. C.

WHEN BORN OF THE SPIRIT

When a man is quickened into life is he born of the Spirit?

Yes, a man is born of the Spirit when he is quickened into divine life. There are a number of figures used in the Scriptures to represent the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration. The same work is called begotten, born, quickened, translated, resurrection, and also other

figures. They are all used to represent the same thing. The idea conveyed by all of them is that the sinner is passive in receiving the new or higher order of life. C. H. C.

Psalms 14

(Psalms 14)

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I want a little light on **(Psalms 14)**. Did "the fool" use all the expressions in that chapter, or is it David's language? A religious sect in this country claims a man must live clear of sin, both soul and body; and if you refer them to **(Romans 3:10)** they refer to Psalm 14 and ask if we believe what the fool says.

B. A. CADDELL

R. 2

Centerville, Ala.

No, the fool did not use all the language recorded in the fourteenth Psalm.

Those who would say so are either grossly ignorant, or else they willfully misrepresent the matter. Who would be so grossly ignorant as to say the fool said, "Oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion! when the Lord bringeth back the captivity of His people, Jacob shall rejoice, and Israel shall be glad." Here is another expression "the fool" did not make use of: "For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." This expression was used by the wise man, Solomon, in **(Ecclesiastes 7:20)**. The man who will try to find one Scripture to contradict another plain statement in God's word does not believe the Bible, any way. He is an infidel. C. H. C.

ELECTION AND ATONEMENT

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Please answer the following questions in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST and send a copy to me: Does election precede faith, or is election the cause of faith? How does the atonement apply to infants and insane persons?

Fraternally,

ELDER J. H. SIMMONS

R. 3

Hamilton, Ala.

Yes, the election precedes faith. "According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will." **-(Ephesians 1:4-5)**. The apostle here says they were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. It must have been before they had faith, then.

The atonement applies to infants and insane persons just as it applies to others. The Holy Spirit makes the application. The idea that persons must perform conditions in order to receive the benefit of the atonement would exclude all infants and insane persons. Infants, idiots, insane persons and intelligent adults are all saved just alike-in the very same way. C. H. C.

Resisting The Holy Ghost

RESISTING THE HOLY GHOST

Can an alien sinner resist the Holy Ghost? Answer through your paper.

M. J. BOOTHS

Somerville, Tenn.

The operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of the alien sinner is life-giving. The alien sinner is dead-in a state of death. It is unreasonable, illogical, unscientific and unscriptural to talk about the dead resisting life-giving power. They do not resist the life-giving work of the Holy Spirit.

C. H. C.

Ephesians 4:17-19

(Ephesians 4:17-19).

I would be glad to have your views on **(Ephesians 4:17-19)**.

R. A. FORD

Oakland, Miss.

This is an exhortation or admonition to the Gentile church at Ephesus to walk not as other Gentiles walk. The Lord's children should not walk as unregenerate sinners walk. Their walk and conversation should be different. They should walk in the ordinances of the Lord's house and talk of His goodness and mercy. They should "speak to each other in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs." They should meet often together, and pray with and for each other. They should watch over each other for good. They should be mutual burden-bearers, helping each other, bearing each other's burdens. They should manifest, or prove, their love for each other.

Let us not walk as other Gentiles walk. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 24

CLOSE OF VOLUME 24

---December 28, 1909

With this issue another volume of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST is closed. Another year, with its trials, sorrows, disappointments, heartaches, bereavements and conflicts, as well as joys and pleasures, is gone. Many of our friends and loved ones have crossed over the river who

were with us one year ago. We have had our sorrows and heartaches, as well as seasons of rejoicing. Most of us have been blessed with refreshing seasons, though they may have been mixed with sorrows. We have sometimes felt to realize that the Lord was with us, and that His grace was sufficient. How precious His promises have been to us. We have made mistakes. Sometimes we feel that perhaps our whole life has been made up of mistakes. It seems that we realize, more and more, our weaknesses and proneness to err, as the days and years go by. An editor's place is a hard place to fill. Experience only will teach one what it is. If there is one single thing in the whole country that is wrong or irregular, somebody is almost sure to write the editor about it and demand space to give the whole thing a "general round up." If space is refused, then the editor is "taking sides" and "recognizes the disorder," etc. Then the editor must be "drilled" in a long, tedious and continued private correspondence. He must be reprimanded or censured for putting his judgment against the judgment of the writer and perhaps others. And often because something is not published he gets an order to "stop my paper." Sometimes a letter for the paper is brought to a close with the statement, "This is submitted to your better judgment; do with it as you think best;" but if it does not appear in the paper promptly, the editor gets a letter asking why. Thus matters go on, "day in and day out." There is no rest. It is a continual thing, on and on. The editor may, sometimes, after he has retired, late at night, too tired and worn-out to sleep, build a little air-castle. He may, while thus awake, dream that in a few more weeks, or months, or years, he will reach the place where he will have a little rest and ease. But, behold, his air-castle is "knocked into smithereens" in a short time, and he finds himself still confronted with problems as hard to solve as any that were ever presented to him. Brethren, if you think "it's easy," just try it. We promise you now that we will not envy you.

Notwithstanding all the trials and conflicts we do not feel like giving up. We desire to press on. If we know our heart our greatest desire on earth is to comfort and benefit the Lord's humble poor. We love the church our blessed Redeemer established on earth. The Old Baptists are our people, and we love them and want an humble home with them while the Lord spares our life.

I love thy church, oh God;
Her walls before thee stand;
Dear as the apple of thine eye,
And graven on thy hand.
For her my tears shall fall,
For her my prayers ascend,

For her my toils and cares be given
Till toils and cares shall end.

As to the doctrine and principles we have endeavored to sustain in the columns of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, we have no apologies to offer. As stated already, we have made mistakes. We are free to confess this; but we believe the principles we have contended for are eternal, and we are content to continue holding to them. Our desire has been to earnestly and faithfully contend for the faith that was once for all delivered unto the saints, and to comfort and benefit the Lord's dear children. As to how well we have succeeded, we are willing for our brethren and sisters to judge. We have received many letters of commendation and precious words of encouragement from many of them. These things have given us renewed energy, and have strengthened us to press on in the service.

We have believed the Old Baptists would uphold and sustain one who proves himself true to the cause they love, and that is so dear to their hearts. We have believed they would support a paper that is true to their principles. We have also believed they would withhold support from a paper that was not true to those principles. We have seen some papers prove to be failures because they were not true to them. Our confidence in our brethren remains unshaken. The true and loyal support that has been given THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST has been better and more than we feel to be worthy of, yet we appreciate it more than we can express, and our efforts will be to still improve the paper in every way possible. We desire to give our readers all the reading matter possible as cheaply as we possibly can. THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST IS not published simply as a money making enterprise. We are continually studying methods and ways to reduce expenses, so as to publish the paper at as low a price as possible. We humbly trust our brethren will continue to give us their support, and that they will do all they can to continue to extend the circulation of the paper. If every subscriber would send us one new one it would double our list. How many will send us a list of new subscribers during January, 1910? You have already done much, and we greatly appreciate it, and trust you will continue to do all you can. But above all this, we want an interest in your prayers. We feel to need your prayers. Will you pray earnestly to the Lord to uphold, sustain, direct and keep us in the right way? We are so poor and weak and prone to go astray, that without His divine aid and assistance we would fall and utterly perish.

C. H. C.

1910

Introductory to Volume 25

INTRODUCTORY TO VOLUME 25

---January 11, 1910

With this issue we begin the twenty-fifth volume of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Twenty-four years ago the first issue was sent out. Many trials and hardships have been endured during these twenty-four years. Our dear sainted father, Elder S. F. Cayce, established the paper and was its editor until his death in August, 1905. Since his death we have tried, with our limited ability, to uphold and contend for the same principles that he loved so well and died contending for. We have not done so because father did, but because we love those principles. We earnestly believe them to be the principles of God's eternal truth. We know that some have objected, and some have tried to persuade, and some have tried to brow-beat, and thus cause us to turn from these principles. But we feel now that we could never forsake them. They are dearer to us than all else on this earth. What a miserable coward we would be to leave, forsake and turn away from those principles. We trust we may never forsake or turn away from them. By the help of the Lord we expect to continue to conduct THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST in defense of those principles-the same principles that have been defended in its columns for the twenty-four years it has been published.

The first issue of the paper was twelve pages the same size as the pages are now. It was a monthly paper then. After that it was changed to eight pages, twice a month. It was published that way for a year or two. Then it was published four times a month, the pages still being the size they are this week. It continued this way for a few years, and then the pages were made a little larger-an odd size. After another short time, we then sent the paper out every week except Christmas week, thus giving fifty-one papers each year instead of forty-eight. We have continued to send out fifty-one or fifty-two issues every year since then. But in May, 1906, the paper was again enlarged, making it eight pages with five columns to each page. Now we have enlarged it again, going back to the four column size, but sixteen pages. Now you see the paper is twice as large as it was a few years ago, and almost twice as large as it was four years ago, and the price only 25 cents more. Yet a few brethren have insinuated that our object is to make merchandise of the gospel. They may think

so, but we are sure they would not if they could take our place for awhile. Everything the farmer has to sell, and everything we have to buy, has increased very much in price during the past few years, and we have to buy everything we use. Yet we have studied, planned and worked laboriously in every way we could imagine to reduce our expenses or to keep them down, to try to continue to publish the paper without increasing the price. Blank paper is much higher than it used to be and labor costs us much more. The only reason we have been able to continue the paper as large as we have and at the price has been by plans and ways of saving labor expense. Now, our present change in size of the paper makes it about one-third larger, but the increased cost to us is not quite that much, hence we raise the price only one-fourth, or 25 cents a year more than it was before. Doubtless many of our readers will remember that the price one time was \$1.25 a year, and that at that time the paper was just one-half as large as it is now. But we wish to say, and we are glad it is so, that we do not think we have received more than a half-dozen complaints regarding the change.

Some complain now and then about the advertisements in the paper. But we do not know of a single one but was willing to withdraw that when we tell them we are trying to use all we get that way in sending the paper to poor destitute widows and preachers who want the paper and are not able to pay for it. If we leave the advertisements out we could not send the paper to them because we are simply not able financially to do so. We think it best-more God-like-to continue to publish the advertisements and send them the paper. Brethren, just think a moment. Shall we, in your interest, take the advertisements out of the paper and stop sending it to those poor destitute children of God who love the glad tidings as well as you do? Or, shall we, in their interest, continue to publish the advertisements to enable us to send the paper to them? Would brotherly love say deprive them of the pleasure of reading the paper? We are sure that when you consider the matter in this light you would say go on as we have been.

We feel to enter the new year with renewed energy and renewed determination to press on in the Master's service. The Lord has been so good and kind and merciful to us that we feel under obligation to render service to Him. His dear children have been much better to us than we feel to deserve, and our earnest desire is to comfort and benefit them. We want to conduct the paper for their benefit and in defense of the cause of Christ. Dear brethren and sisters, this is your paper-it is your medium of correspondence for mutual comfort and encouragement. But it is not for the, object of publishing local

disturbances and differences abroad. We have been trying to get the brethren to quit sending such things to us. We dislike to flatly refuse to publish such things. But we now say you need not send them to us. We are going to do our very best to keep them out of the paper. Please do not write to us about such things. We want you to write about such things as may have a tendency to unite the brethren and sisters in love and fellowship on the true principles of the doctrine of God our Saviour. Write us about your good meetings. Send us all the good church news you can. Please do not neglect this. If you have any good news send it to us at once.

Now, dear brethren and sisters, will you pray for us? Will you pray the Lord to direct, uphold and sustain us, and enable us to conduct the paper to the comfort and benefit of His people and to the glory of His name? And will you continue to help us all you can? We are poor weak creatures, and need your help.

May this year be one of joy and happiness to all our readers, is our humble prayer.

C. H. C.

In Alabama

IN ALABAMA

---January 18, 1910

We left home on Saturday morning, December 25, for McKenzie, Ala., to debate with a Mormon, Mr. F. M. Slover. Arrived in McKenzie on Sunday evening at 5:47. The debate began on Monday morning, December 27, and continued four days. For two days Mr. Slover affirmed that "The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints is in harmony with the church of Christ described in the New Testament in faith, organization, doctrine and practice." Then for two days we affirmed that "The Baptist Church, of which I (C. H. Cayce) am a member, is in harmony with the church of Christ described in the New Testament in faith, organization, doctrine and practice." It was a victory for truth. A synopsis of the debate will be written later and published in our columns or in a pamphlet. Some brethren have requested us to put it in pamphlet form.

On Saturday and Sunday, January 1 and 2, we filled appointments at South, and had a very pleasant meeting both days. We met Elder Wiggins and Elder Thomas there, whom we had not met before. Elders Little and Kimbro were also with us, but we had met them at McKenzie during the debate. Elder Gatlin was our moderator in the debate. Elder Bolton was also in attendance.

We are now at the home of Brother Grantham, near Red Level, Ala., and near New Home Church, where we have an appointment for today. We humbly pray the Lord to bless our weak efforts to the comfort and benefit of His dear people.

C. H. C.

Who Will Debate For The Primitive Baptists?

WHO WILL DEBATE FOR THE PRIMITIVE BAPTISTS?

---February 15, 1910

C. H. Cayce has been the champion for them in these parts since the death of his father. I have met him twice on the proposition, "All for whom Christ died will be saved in heaven," and on the operation of the Holy Spirit independent of the word of God. My affirmatives were: "Baptism a condition of pardon to the alien;" "It is possible for a child of God to so apostatize as to be finally lost." He has been asked to meet me again near Rutherford, Tenn. He says now there is only one question he will meet any of us on-that is we must affirm that "the Scriptures teach that faith, repentance, confession, and baptism in water are necessary conditions to be performed by the dead alien sinner in order to spiritual or eternal life." We have always affirmed that baptism, preceded by other conditions, is a condition of pardon of past sins, and that we must continue to live a godly life here as a Christian; that God has promised all who will do this eternal life. Mr. Cayce claims to have met a brother in Texas on this proposition. I wrote to the brother about it. His reply was that he did it because he could not get a fair proposition. He defined the proposition to suit him, and debated it. As to my part, I am willing for the Baptists to state what they believe in their proposition. They should allow us the same liberty. I am sure that Cayce has raised this false issue to keep out of debate. He has enough on the fair proposition. If not, he can show it by answering the call of his brethren near Rutherford, Tenn., to debate with some Christian preacher. He has his name to four propositions. He has debated them twice-Old Bethel, near Dukedom, Tenn., and Maury City, Tenn. I wonder if it took him this long to find that they were unfair?-A. O. Colley, in Gospel Advocate (Nashville, Tenn.), Feb. 10, 1910.

The foregoing "splutter" from Mr. Colley does not relieve him from the dilemma he has deliberately placed himself in. A brief statement of a few facts would perhaps be in order just now. We met Mr. Colley in debate on four propositions (the atonement, design of baptism, operation of the Spirit and the possibility of apostasy) at Bethel, Graves county, Ky., and then again at Maury City, Tenn., last March.

Mr. Colley, during this last debate, kept trying to get away from the propositions, and to bring into the discussion the plan of salvation. He had also said that Cayce would not debate with him on the plan of salvation. So during that discussion in Maury City we asked Mr. Colley to sign the following propositions:

1. The Scriptures teach that spiritual or eternal life is given to dead (alien) sinners without conditions on their part.-C. H. Cayce affirms.
2. The Scriptures teach that faith, repentance, confession and baptism in water are necessary conditions to be performed by dead (alien) sinners in order to spiritual or eternal life.-C. H. Cayce denies.

Mr. Colley refused to sign the propositions. Some time ago we received a letter asking if we would meet Mr. Colley in another discussion near Rutherford, Tenn. We replied that if Mr. Colley was ready to sign those propositions we were ready to meet him. The propositions were sent to Mr. Colley by those concerned in that vicinity. Some time ago we met Mr. Colley on the street in our town and asked him if he had heard from the matter. He replied that he had, but had sent other propositions back. Note that he did this instead of coming directly to us. We asked him if he would sign the propositions. He refused, and proposed that we select a man, and he select one, then the two select another and that if the three decided that the propositions were fair he would sign them. We immediately accepted his proposition and selected a man who is a member of another church. Mr. Colley objected to the selection. We then selected another, who is a member of another order, and insisted that Mr. Colley select his man. This he refused and failed to do. Thus, he simply utterly failed to do what he proposed to do. Now, is he not a pretty looking piece of humanity to come into print and ask the impertinent and silly question, "Who will debate for the Primitive Baptists?" Such trickery and sham and "make-like" "bluffs" as this might make blushes rise on the face of some of the ministers of darkness, but we presume not so with such Campbelites as Mr. Colley.

On January 24 we received a letter from Mr. Colley regarding the discussion. If Mr. Colley wants another debate with us he can retract what he said-that "Cayce will not meet him on the plan of salvation" - or he can sign the propositions submitted. The first proposition is what we teach, and we propose to affirm it in debate. The second proposition is what the Campbelites teach all over this country, and every man with a thimbleful of brains who knows anything about the Campbelites knows it is their doctrine. As they teach it, they should not be ashamed to affirm it in debate. Mr. Colley said they do not

believe it as it is stated in the proposition. Then we proposed that he state it in the proposition as he does believe it. This he refused to do.

Now, Mr. Colley, will you affirm for the Campbellites the doctrine you teach? It is evident to all who know the facts that if you refuse to sign these propositions, then your statement that Cayce would not meet you on the plan of salvation was a false statement. Put up or shut up. C. H. C.

That Court Decision

THAT COURT DECISION

---February 22, 1910

In our issue of December 9, 1909, we published the decision of the court in the trial for the church property at Luray, Va., between our people and the Burnamites. Our neighbor, the Baptist Builder, a Softshell sheet, published in Martin, Tenn., takes occasion to make some remarks concerning the same, and tries to draw the conclusion that the Softshell brood is the original Baptist family. The remarks were by the Rev. W. B. Clifton, the office editor of the Softshell sheet. He quotes the following from the decision of the court:

Upon the whole case, I am fully persuaded of the correctness of these propositions, to wit: That the Mt. Carmel Church of Old School Baptists of 1849 was a church or congregation of that denomination which originated as a distinct sect or denomination among the Baptists in the early thirties out of an organized opposition to the doctrines and beliefs of their former coreligionists on the subject of "means" and Sunday schools, missionary and other practices heretofore referred to, etc.

Then Mr. Clifton makes the following remarks:

There is no reason to suppose that the court was prejudiced in favor of Missionary Baptists, or that this judgment was based on anything else than the evidence introduced in the trial. Yet, it is plainly declared that the so-called "Old School" Baptist denomination ORIGINATED as a DISTINCT SECT or denomination IN THE EARLY THIRTIES. This judgment is according to truth, as all know who have made an impartial investigation of the subject. The sect or denomination calling itself "Old School" or "Primitive" Baptists is less than one hundred years old, and is distinguished by certain tenets and tests of fellowship that were unknown in the Baptist denomination prior to the division in the early thirties.

The foregoing appeared in the Baptist Builder of January 15, 1910. Any fair minded and unprejudiced person can readily see that the

conclusion drawn by Elder Clifton is far-fetched, and does not necessarily follow at all. Prior to 1792 there were no mission boards or mission societies among the Baptists. Those things were introduced by Fuller and Carey. They were the leaders in the new progressive movements. Elder Clifton knows those things were new among the Baptists and any honest man who knows it will confess it. The Baptists bore with these new measures until the early thirties, when the division finally came. Then as the Burnam party introduced the new measures which caused the division at Luray, Va., and they were, therefore, not the original Baptist Church; so the Softshells (Missionaries) introduced the new measures which caused the division in the early thirties, and they are, therefore, not the original Baptists. Any honest sensible man should be able to see and understand this.

C. H. C.

John Calvin

JOHN CALVIN

---March 15, 1910

John Calvin was a leader in the Reformation of the sixteenth century. He was the founder of the Presbyterian church. He was never connected with the Baptists. His teaching agreed with the Baptist teaching on many points. He taught the doctrine of election and predestination of the saints, and the effectual work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration. These principles had been taught in the ages before Calvin. He was not the author of them. They have been called Calvinism because he figured so prominently in teaching them in the Reformation. But few Presbyterians now hold to all the main principles advocated by Calvin.

C. H. C.

Baptists in America

BAPTISTS IN AMERICA

---March 15, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-For the benefit of some of the young Baptists state in your paper who was the first Baptist in America. Your brother in hope,

JOEL R. MOTSINGER

Pekin, Ind.

REMARKS

Dr. John Clark was the founder of the first Baptist Church in America. It was founded in 1638. Roger Williams founded his church in 1639,

at Providence, Rhode Island. The church founded by Dr. Clark was at Newport, Rhode Island. C. H. C.

Predestination

PREDESTINATION

---March 15, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-As I see several articles headed with the word "Predestination," would you please give your views on what is the proper meaning of the word, and what idea we should have in view when we use the word "predestination?" I would like to see an article from you or some of the brethren on the proper definition of the word. Yours unworthily, ELDER CHARLES WEST.
Helenwood, Tenn.

REMARKS

Webster tells us that the word predestinate is from two Latin words which mean before and determine. Pre means before, and destinate means to determine. Hence, predestinate means to determine beforehand. It is to predetermine or foreordain; to appoint or ordain beforehand by an unchangeable purpose or decree.

The word in the Greek from which our English word predestinate is translated is prohorizo. It means to mark out or bound, to appoint, decree, specify, declare, determine, limit or ordain prior to or in front of, or before. In other words, it means to appoint or decree or determine beforehand.

We fail to find any place in the Bible where the word predestinate is used except with reference to the salvation of the Lord's people and their deliverance from ruin. C. H. C.

Dram Drinking

DRAM DRINKING

---March 15, 1910

We have been requested to write on the subject of dram drinking and card playing. We are sorry to know that any Old Baptist has given occasion for such a request to even be made. It seems to us that it is not necessary for very much to be said on such a subject as this. It is a shame and a disgrace to the cause we profess to love for any member of the church to engage in card-playing and drinking. It should not be tolerated by the church. Such practice should not be engaged in by any professed moral man, much less a member of the church of Christ. The candlestick will surely be removed from any church whose members continue to engage in such immoral and unbecoming conduct. Permit us to say, with kindness, yet in all

earnestness and candor, that we have no patience with it. We are commanded to abstain from every appearance of evil, and engaging in such practices is anything else but abstaining from the appearance of evil. Our little church here in Martin would not tolerate it. Some may say that our little church here is no criterion. True. she is no criterion, and does not claim to be; but God's word is a criterion, and we should try to follow it. To be a good Christian, or to live a good Christian life, is more than to simply live morally. In other words, Christianity is more than morality. The members of the church should not set examples before others that would have a tendency to lead to immorality. How does it look for a church member and a worldly man to sit down to a table and play a game of cards together-even if it is only for past-time? The worldly man is given reasonable ground to say: "There is a church member-an Old Baptist, at that-doing the same way I do. I am as good as he is." Such things bring a reproach on the cause.

Reader, if you have ever engaged in such things, and if you love the cause, then let us plead with you to cease such practices for the sake of the cause you love. May the Lord help us all to "walk worthy of the vocation where with we are called."

C. H. C.

Predestination Again

PREDESTINATION AGAIN

---March 15, 1910

The following letter from Brother W. H. Nosier was received some time ago, and we thought it was intended as a private letter, but we saw a request on the back of it to return it if not published. We wrote a letter in reply to the brother, but have decided to publish both.

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother in Christ-I have been a member of the Primitive Baptist Church now for only about a year, having come from the Missionaries, and have been a subscriber for your paper about the same length of time, and had begun to like it fine. I also read with interest your debate with Penick. Today I received your proposition of paying for the PRIMITIVE in advance and getting the paper at one dollar a year, and was just about to send you two dollars to apply on same when I read your editorial in answer to Sister Georgia Townsend's letter, as published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of December 7. which caused a halt in my intention.

I just thought if you are going to publish a paper and light on the ideas and doctrines of brethren, as you have done in this editorial, I just simply did not want the paper. It seems to me that an editor who

takes such an active part on such mooted questions as the absolute predestination of all things that come to pass or conditional time salvation, etc., etc., is entirely out of his place. At least, that is the way it looks to me.

Do you know that there are as good, honest, brethren who believe, honestly, in the absolute predestination of all things as there are in the church anywhere? As for myself, I have remained neutral so far with regard to the subject, but from the facts I have gathered from the teachings of God's word I have about come to the conclusion that if God works all things after the counsel of His own will, then man has no will in the matter. And He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth. Not only that, but He has a purpose in all He does. Then you break out with oh, horror of horrors at what you are pleased to term "the heathenish and infidel saying, whatever is, is right," as if our Bible does not say "The God of all the earth will do right." Of course there is a whole lot about what God does and why He does it that we do not understand, but is that an excuse for us saying that God does not work all things (and not only some things) after the counsel of His own will? I trow not. You yourself must admit that God did predestinate some of the most wicked things that ever come to pass on this earth-witness Pharaoh. "For this cause I have raised thee up;" and Joseph, "As for you, ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good to bring to pass as it is this day, to save much people alive;" and then the most atrocious crime ever committed in this world, crucifying of the Son of God. Will you dare say that was not predestinated? "Father, if it be possible let this cup pass, yet not my will but thine be done." No, Brother Cayce, I don't fault you for what you believe on this great question; no, nor any other brother; but I do think you ought not write such strong editorials and take such strong sides against what brethren honestly believe. I do wish brethren could bear with one another and be charitable, for we are all fallible and liable to err. May God be with the dear brethren every where, is my prayer. W. H. NOSLER.

OUR REPLY

W. H. NOSLER: Dear Brother-Please pardon the long delay in writing you since we received yours of Dec. 15th. We have been away from home part of the time, and have been so busy with other matters that we have answered very few letters.

If you do not take THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST because we speak out plainly on what we deem fundamental points of doctrine, we will have to lose your name from the list. We would not shun what we believe to be the truth if it costs every subscriber on the list. The truth is

what we want, paper or no paper. A man who will not speak out is not faithful to his trust. We are aware that there are some good honest brethren who believe in the predestination of all things that come to pass-good and evil alike-and so much the worse. If no good brethren were deceived by it we would not be so much concerned about the matter. But as this is the case we feel the responsibility resting upon us to speak out against it.

God works all things, that He does work, after the counsel of His own will. If you will read (**Jeremiah 7:31**) and (**Jeremiah 5**) and (**Jeremiah 32:35**) you will find one thing God did not predestinate. It is true God always does His will, but we do not. God always does right, but men don't do right in committing murder, theft, rape, robbery and other crimes.

You say you think we should not write such strong editorials and take such strong sides against what brethren honestly believe. According to that, if a brother honestly imbibes the rankest principles of Arminianism or Catholicism, we should not take a strong stand against it because the brother honestly believes it. Every mouth must be stopped from speaking against false doctrine, on that principle, and every pen laid aside and no writing be done against any false way. If it is right to oppose a false way at all, it is right to oppose it strongly.

But why do you say we should not take a strong stand? Do you not tell us that God works everything? Then God worked this, and we had nothing whatever to do with it, for you say man has no will in the matter. Why not make your complaint to God? You say He works it all. According to your position, God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated from all eternity that we should write every word we did write, and we could not possibly have done otherwise.

By the help of the Lord we expect to speak and write against every false way, as we understand it to be our duty, while the Lord spares our natural life. And may He lead all His children out of every false way, is our humble prayer.

C.H.C.

High and Low Seats

HIGH AND LOW SEATS

---April 5, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I have some close friends who believe there will be high and low seats in heaven. For instance: they say Paul, the apostle, will have a higher position than a common preacher, and I suppose a common preacher will have a higher

position than a "hayseed" church member. I do not think this kind of doctrine sounds right. Please give your views on it, for the benefit of myself and others. Your brother, I hope, L. J. HEWATT
Lawrenceville, Ga.
REMARKS

If sinners were saved in heaven because of what they do, or because of their good works, it might be true that one would have a higher place or a more exalted position in heaven than others. But sinners are not saved in heaven because of their righteousness, or because of their good works. They are saved in heaven because of what Christ has done for them, and He did no more for one saved person than for another. What He did for one of His children He did for each one of them. If what Christ did for one secures a high place in heaven for him, what He did for another will do the same for him also. Hence, as sinners are saved in heaven because of what Christ has done, and not because of what they do, it follows that as Christ did no more for one of the saved than He did for another, all of the saved will be on an equality, or on a common level.

Paul said **{(II Timothy 4:8)}** a crown of righteousness was laid up for him. He also tells us that this same crown was not only laid up for him, but it was also laid up for all who love the appearing of the Saviour. This being true, they will all wear the same crown. One will be no higher than another with respect to the crown they wear.

All the Lord's children will have the same inheritance; **{(I Peter 1:3-5)}** as they all have the same inheritance, and each one has all the inheritance, then there is no difference here. All are on an equality and on an equal footing, so far as the inheritance is concerned. This being true, it cannot be true that one will have a higher place or a more exalted position than another.

In **(Romans 8:17)** we are told that the children of God are joint-heirs with Christ. Everyone knows that a joint-heir is an equal heir. Then as they are all joint-heirs with Christ, they will all, each and every one of them, share heaven and all that it is and all that it means equally with Christ. If one has a higher place than another, then they are not joint-heirs, are not equal heirs. But they are equal heirs, and therefore one will not have a higher place than another. If one should have a higher place than another, why could there not be jealousy arising? Why could not one be jealous of another and envious of another who might be occupying a higher place than himself? This would destroy the very idea of heaven, and there would be no heaven at all.

It appears to us that this idea of a high and low seat in heaven is very much akin to an exalted opinion of self. Usually those who hold to such an idea have such an exalted opinion of self that they expect to occupy a very high place, and if we are to judge by expressions they sometimes use, they expect to look down with contempt upon those who occupy a lower place. It is pharisaical in the extreme. It is contrary to sound reason, contrary to the teaching of God's word; and the idea of doing much for the Lord in order to enter heaven gave birth to it. May the Lord deliver His little children from every false way, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Gives It Up

GIVES IT UP

---April 5, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Esteemed Brother in Christ-Will you allow me a little space in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST for a short rejoinder to your remarks on my article of December 15?

I did not in that article intend to defend absolute predestination, only to quote a few Scriptures and present a few arguments which were rather hard for me to get around under any other theory.

You rather got the best of me on my main Scripture by saying "Yes, God does work all things (that He does work) after the counsel of His own will," and then by giving me some passages where, manifestly, He does not work. And I guess you are right when you say, "If it is right to oppose a false way at all it is right to oppose it strongly."

But you completely "shut off my wind" (so to speak) when you said, "But why do you say we should not take a strong stand? Do you not tell us that God works everything? Then God worked this and we had nothing at all to do with it, for you say man has no will in the matter. Why not make your complaint to God?" It won't do, Brother Cayce; I see it won't do. Brother Cayce, you have written me a good, gentlemanly, Christian letter, and such letters I claim will do more good than it is possible for any other kind to do. It looks like imposition, anyway, for such a "clodhopper" as I am to light onto a man of your standing, who perhaps has forgotten more about the Bible than I ever knew. Brother Cayce, I have reconsidered matters, for I don't want to do without the good old PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, so I send you herewith \$2. Mark my subscription ahead and send me the Youth's Guardian Friend. I guess it will reach you by April 1. And believe me ever your brother in Christ, although a very weak one, if one at all,

W. H. NOSLER

Eugene, Ore.

REMARKS

We are glad to see you, dear brother, confess that the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things won't do. We are glad you have seen the error of it.

No, dear brother, we are not your superior. We are only a poor, weak servant, if indeed we are a true servant of the Lord at all. We feel to be dependent upon the Lord for strength and for wisdom. We realize, too, that we are so ignorant in comparison with what there is to know. There is so much to learn that we sometimes feel we have learned very little. May the Lord help us all to see the right and to reject every false way, and may He give us faithful, humble men to contend earnestly for the truth, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

1 Samuel 19:9

---April 5, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-My father, C. T. Clayton, requests that you give your views of (**I Samuel 19:9**), about the evil spirit from the Lord. N. C. CLAYTON

Galloway, Ga.

REMARKS

The Lord sent the evil spirit upon Saul. The Lord did not make the spirit evil-or make the spirit wicked-but sent the evil spirit upon him. Chapter fifteen shows that Saul "rejected the word of the Lord," disobeyed the commandment of the Lord and that the Lord therefore rejected Saul from being king. The Lord no longer blessed him with His presence, but sent an evil spirit upon him. This was a punishment for his sin, a punishment for his rebellion. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 16:2

---April 12, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Will you please give your views on is: (**I Corinthians 16:2**), "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come."

Our Brother Missionary talked on that subject last Sunday, but I cannot agree with him. I want more light on the subject. Hoping to hear from you through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, Yours in hope,

J. T. NOLEN

Sulligent, Ala.

REMARKS

We don't know what the "Brother Missionary" said, neither do we know what Brother Nolen thinks about the text. It has reference to the care of the poor saints at Jerusalem. Verses 1 to 3 read as follows: "Now, concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order for the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come. And when I come, whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem."

There is nothing in this about "paying the preacher," or laying by something to "give to the preacher." While it is true that the Scriptures teach that the minister should be cared for and his temporal necessities supplied, by voluntary contribution, yet this text has nothing whatever to do with that question. It teaches that we should "lay by in store" for the necessities of the poor. The day is not necessarily so important as that we lay by in store. The business of the deacon is to receive and disburse these funds. The members of the church should "lay by in store," as God has prospered them, by placing their contributions in the hands of the deacons. Then the deacons should see that the necessities of the poor and destitute are supplied out of the funds thus placed in their hands. It is not right to wait until it is reported to the church that a certain one is in need before a contribution is made. The sufferer may have to suffer on for weeks before the necessary and could be supplied, if it must always be reported to the church before the contribution is made. On the other hand, if the contribution is made, as "God has prospered" us, and is in the hands of the deacons, as it should be, then the poor sufferer may be relieved at once.

Again, if no contribution is made until the sufferer is reported to the church, we would not usually give "as God has prospered" us, but possibly as that individual sufferer immediately needs. Thus we would be doing some good to the needy one, but still we would not fully carry out the command. We should "lay by in store, as God has prospered" us. Thus the deacons of the church would have funds on hand to relieve the sufferings of the poor and destitute when such are brought to their notice. We should not be careless or indifferent upon such important matters. We should endeavor to be zealous and careful about such matters. We should not become neglectful of these things because of the fact that so many try to "twist" the Scriptures to make them support their fanatical foreign notions. C. H. C.

What Adam Lost

WHAT ADAM LOST

---April 12, 1910

Dear Brother-Please give your views on what Adam lost in the fall, or by sin, and what he was restored to by Christ-that is, in this life. Did the death of Christ place man back in the state that Adam was in Eden, or any part? If so, what?

I ask this as I think it will be worth something to some of the brethren.

Your brother in hope of eternal life,

W. P. HANCOCK

Eldorado, Ill.

REMARKS

Before Adam transgressed the law he was a good natural man. He did not have the God-life, or spiritual life. He was in possession of an upright natural life. He was without sin-good. When he violated the law he lost his moral uprightness. He lost his moral standing. From then to now Adam, in nature, has had absolutely no moral or upright standing with God. He lost it in the fall. What Christ did was not done for Adam, or rather for the whole race of Adam, but for those chosen out of the race of Adam. Hence, Adam, as Adam, was not restored to anything in Christ. The Lord's chosen, Christ's bride (those who were given to Him for His bride) are restored in Christ, not simply to what they lost in Adam, but to more. They "receive double." They are given eternal life through Christ. If they were only restored to the original state they would not reach heaven. Hence the Lord's people receive more in and through Christ than was lost in and through Adam. C. H. C.

John Exiled

JOHN EXILED

---April 19, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Sir-I would like to have your explanation on John being exiled on the isle of Patmos-whether we have Scriptural authority that he was exiled or not. Please explain through the paper. A Baptist friend,

MRS. S. J. PRIDDY.

REMARKS

John was certainly banished to the isle of Patmos. In **(Revelation 1:9)** he says, "I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." This is Scriptural authority as to why

John was there. It was because of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ. History testifies of this fact.

C. H. C.

What Is Changed?

---April 19, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Is it the fleshly heart or mind of man that is changed in regeneration? The Bible says, "I will put my laws in their mind, and write them in their heart."

Also, what is meant in the Saviour's language to Nicodemus, concerning being born of water and of the Spirit? What does the water mean?

DICK PEARCE

Norris City, Ill.

REMARKS

It is not the lump of flesh called the heart that is changed in regeneration. The heart, in Scripture, usually means the seat of affection. In regeneration the sinner receives a new life, a new nature, and from this new life and new nature spring new desires and new affections. Hence it is called a "change of heart." He is said to have a new heart, for he has a new seat of affections. He is also said to "have the mind of Christ."

The term water in **(John 3:5)**, in the Saviour's language to Nicodemus, we think, refers to the washing, or cleansing, or purifying work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration. We know many of our brethren do not hold this view, but it is their privilege to differ from us. We are not a "standard" by any means. Still, that is our view. It is the same as the "washing of regeneration" in **(Titus 3:5)**.

C. H. C.

Acts 2; Acts 28:31 AND Ephesians 2:10

---April 26, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Please give your views on **((39) (Acts 2:39)**. Explain who the call is to. Also give your views on **(Ephesians 2:10)**. Yours in hope of eternal life,

D. H. SANDERS

R. 1

Bold Springs, Tenn.

REMARKS

The call referred to in **((39) (Acts 2:39)** is the calling of the Holy Spirit. It is by the power of the Holy Spirit. It is a holy calling; **(II**

Timothy 1:9). God does the calling; **(I Corinthians 1:9).** God calls all the heirs of promise, and those who are called are children of the promise; **(Galatians 3:29); (4:28).** The promise was made before the world began; **(Titus 1:2).** The Lord confirmed the promise with an oath; **(Hebrews 6:13-17).**

(Ephesians 2:10) teaches us that the children of God are the workmanship of God-not the workmanship of God and company, but of God. It shows that a creative power is necessary to put one in Christ-"created in Christ." Putting one in Christ, then, is a creative work, requires creative power. They are "created in Christ Jesus UNTO good works." In order that one walk in, or perform, the good works of the gospel, he must first be created in Christ unto good works. This being true, no one performs the good works in order to be in Christ, but he must be in Christ in order to perform the good works. And those who have thus been created in Christ should walk in the good works which God has commanded. The Lord has ordained, or prepared, the good works, and those who are in Christ, the Lord's children, should perform them. C. H. C.

Luke 15:8

---April 26, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I would like for you to give your views on **((8) (Luke 15:8)**, as I have heard so much said about it of late. Your sister in Christ, I hope, MRS. J. D. ROGERS. Warrensburg, Mo.

REMARKS

((8) (Luke 15:8) reads, "Either what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and seek diligently till she find it?" Verses 9 and 10 read, "And when she hath found it, she calleth her friends and her neighbors together, saying, Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which I had lost. Likewise I say unto you, There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." This is one of the parables which was spoken by the Saviour. A parable is something which does, or may, occur in nature, and which is used to teach a lesson. A moral is drawn from the parable, which is used as an illustration. The lesson drawn from this parable is that there is "rejoicing in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." It is illustrated by the rejoicing when a woman has found the piece of money which she had lost. Just as there is such rejoicing at the finding of the money which was lost, so there is rejoicing when the transgressor (sinner) repents, or turns from his wrong course. Angels often refer to ministers or messengers. The rejoicing is in the

church, here, when one repents who has gone away from the true worship and service. If one becomes careless and unconcerned, it grieves the brotherhood. Then when he repents-turns away from his carelessness and indifference-and is again found to be diligent and prompt in the service and worship of God, there is much rejoicing. All are glad, and feel to rejoice. If we have been careless and indifferent, let us try to quit it and try to be diligent in the discharge of our every duty. We will then feel better ourselves and will make others feel better too.

C. H. C.

A Wrong Impression

---May 3, 1910

It has been our impression, because of early associations, that the Hardshells did not believe in providing for the preachers. We are learning, however, and glad to do so. Elder C. H. Cayce, editor of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, says in the course of some remarks, "It is true that the Scriptures teach that the minister should be cared for and his temporal necessities supplied by voluntary contributions." -W. I. Elledge in Baptist Flag, April 21, 1910.

There are, perhaps, many things you have not yet learned. The people you are pleased to call "Hardshells" have always held that it is right and Scriptural to minister to the temporal necessities of their ministers, but they have always opposed a salaried system, mission boards, societies, conventions, and such other like things that have been engaged in by nearly, if not quite, all Missionary Baptists since the mission system was introduced by Fuller and Carey, until recent years. If people would give more attention to what the Primitive Baptists do really teach, instead of giving attention to what their enemies say about them, many would learn that their real teaching is very different from what their enemies say it is. C. H. C.

He Will Not Debate – Who Will?

---May 3, 1910

Since Hon. Thos. E. Watson began exposing the modern missionary system in the Jeffersonian (weekly) and the Watson's Magazine (monthly) which are published by him at Thomson, Ga., Rev. Len C. Broughton, of Atlanta, a Missionary Baptist preacher, challenged Mr. Watson for a public discussion on the foreign mission question. Mr. Watson declined to debate with Dr. Broughton, and said he would discuss the question with Mr. Bryan. After this some of our brethren in Macon, Ga., asked us if we would discuss the mission question with Dr. Broughton in Macon. We replied in the affirmative. The brethren

requested us to write Dr. Broughton. The following is a copy of our letter to him:

MARTIN, TENN., March 15, 1910.
DR. LEN BROUGHTON
Atlanta, Ga.

Dear Brother-I have been requested by my brethren in Macon, Ga., to represent them in a proposed discussion with you at that place on the foreign mission question. I submit the enclosed proposition for your consideration and signature, if you accept. If the proposition suits you, please return one copy to me with your signature. I suggest that there be two sessions each day, of two hours each, for not less than three days. I prefer four days on this proposition. Please let me hear from you at once regarding the matter. Suggest a time that will suit you. Fraternaly, C. H. CAYCE.

The following is a copy of the proposition we submitted:

Missions, as taught and practiced by the Missionary Baptists, are authorized by the word of God.---affirms. C. H. Cayce denies.

The following is a copy of Dr. Broughton's reply:

ATLANTA, GA.

March 21st -10.

MR. C. H. CAYCE, Martin, Tenn.

My Dear Brother-Yours of the 15th to hand, and I beg to say that I have no time to be given to such discussion. My time is far too valuable and can be spent in other ways far more to the glory of God.

With best wishes, I am, Fraternaly yours,

LEN G. BROUGHTON.

In reply to this we wrote Dr. Broughton as follows:

MARTIN, TENN., March 23, 1910.

Rev. LEN C. BROUGHTON

Atlanta, Ga.

Dear Brother-Yours of the 21st to hand. It is rather peculiar that you have no time to be given to a discussion of the mission question, seeing you challenged Mr. Watson to discuss the mission question with you. Is time more limited now than then? and has your time become so much more valuable? Is your time too valuable for you to devote a few hours of it in defending what you believe to be authorized by the word of God? Or, do you believe the word of God authorizes mission practices as engaged in by your people?

As Mr. Watson declined to meet you when you challenged him, my brethren desired that I meet you in Macon. I agreed to do so, and again call on you as a faithful man to your trust to meet me on the

issue and defend your position. Please let me hear from you again regarding the matter. Yours fraternally,
C. H. CAYCE.

To this letter we have had no reply from the Rev. Dr. Broughton. We think any one's time might be spent far more to the glory of God than by engaging in advocating the mission system advocated by the Missionary Baptists. God's word does not authorize any such practices as they are engaging in. Their boards, conventions, and such things are unknown to the word of God. God's word does not authorize many things they engage in under pretense of Christianizing the world.

But as Dr. Broughton's time has become so limited and so valuable, perhaps the Missionaries can furnish a representative man from among them to discuss the question with us in Macon, Ga. Can they do so? Will they do so? Put out your man, or else abandon your unscriptural practices. C. H. C.

Matthew 24:19-22

---May 10, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-One of our Old Baptist sisters has requested me to ask you to give your views on **(Matthew 24:19-22)**, through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Your sister in hope of eternal life,

MARY SHUSTER
McLeansboro, Ill.
REMARKS

The Saviour, in this chapter, is foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem, and telling of the tribulations and trials that ate to be endured before and at that time. In verse 34 He says, "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." In verse 19 He says, "And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days." This was literally fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem. The city and its inhabitants were surrounded by the Roman army and the people literally starved to death. Mothers actually devoured the flesh of their own sucking children. Such tribulation had never been on earth up to that time, and never since. See verse 21. "Pray that your flight be not in the winter." -Verse 20. Why pray that it be not in the winter? In verse 16 He had told them to flee into the mountains when certain things came to pass-for that time of great tribulation and the final destruction of Jerusalem would then be near at hand. He had told them to flee into the mountains-hence pray that your flight be not in winter. It was all literally fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem. C. H. C.

2 Corinthians 12:2-5

---May 17, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I want your views on (**II Corinthians 12:2-5**). Your unworthy brother,

J. T. COOK

Light, Ark.

REMARKS

The apostle in the language referred to was speaking of a revelation which he received from the Lord. In verse 1 he says, "I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord." In that revelation he heard words that were impossible for him to utter. The apostle would not glory of himself, but would glory of the one from whom the revelation came. He would glory in the Lord. He continues to speak of the "abundance of the revelations" in the following verses. The language, then, we think, refers to a revelation to him from the Lord, in which he saw a vision and heard words he could not utter. C. H. C.

Jeremiah 23:19-20

---May 24, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-Please give through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST your views on (**Jeremiah 23:19-20**). and oblige, your unworthy brother,

JOE HACKWORTH

Talbert, Texas.

REMARKS

The passage referred to reads, "Behold, a whirlwind of the Lord is gone forth in fury, even a grievous whirlwind: it shall fall grievously upon the head of the wicked. The anger of the Lord shall not return, until He have executed, and until He have performed the thoughts of His heart: in the latter days ye shall consider it perfectly." A careful reading of the entire chapter will show that the prophets had been prophesying falsely; Israel had been living in rebellion. They had failed to keep the commandments of the Lord. The Lord's anger was kindled against them, and He was going to punish them for their wrong doing. "If ye sow to the wind ye shall reap the whirlwind." They had been sowing to the wind. The reaping time had now come, and they were to reap the whirlwind. "For whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." They were reaping the reward of their false prophesying and wrong living. These were Israelites, and the same is true of God's people in this age. They reap what they sow. C. H. C.

Record It

---May 24, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I want some advice. If I commit a misdemeanor and become my own accuser, and make acknowledgment before gospel dealings are begun, would it be right to record it, or not? And if the acknowledgment is received would it be necessary to record what I did or not? Brother Cayce, please give your advice through the paper. Your brother,

E. W. BLANKINSHIP

R. 2

Goldville, Ala.

REMARKS

We think everything done by the church, or pertaining to church business, should be recorded. The record should be full and complete. Under the circumstance related above, it would certainly be to your interest, as well as to the interest of the church, that the whole thing be recorded. If it is not recorded, and should ever be brought up in any way in the future, there would be nothing to prove that you had made satisfaction. This would not be to your best interest, nor to the interest of the church. If the whole thing is recorded in full, and it should ever be brought up or mentioned in the future, you could show and the church could show that the matter had been mentioned by you in the church, and that satisfaction had been given for that specific act, whatever it might be. Hence, we think it should be fully recorded. Everything done in and by the church should be fully and correctly recorded.

C. H. C.

Debate on Missions

---May 31, 1910

Well, well, our door neighbor, Brother C. H. Cayce, seemed anxious to deny in debate that missions as taught and practiced by regular Missionary Baptists is Scriptural. He is calling for a man to affirm this, and the Builder will find a man to defend God's word and work on missions; and now will Brother Cayce affirm that missions as taught and practiced by the so-called Primitive Baptists is Scriptural? Everybody knows that Bible Baptists believed, taught and practiced missions, and the Builder will find a man to defend missions as taught and practiced by Missionary Baptists; and we will see if Brother Cayce will defend the doctrine and practice of his people on missions-Baptist Builder, Martin, Tenn., May 11, 1910.

Yes, we will meet any man who is respectable, that the Missionary Baptists of Macon, Ga., will recognize as a representative man of the order. It is the practice of the Missionary Baptists that has been called in question. Our teaching and practice concerning missions are not the things that have been under discussion. It is your teaching and practice. It is "up to you" or your people to defend the same. If your people in Macon will recognize you as a representative man, and we suppose they will, and you will accept the proposition submitted, we will have the debate. We insist that the Missionaries put up the very best man they have. Elder Penick, do you speak for your brethren in Macon? If you do, send us a copy of the proposition with your signature, and suggest a time. C. H. C.

James 5:20; Mark 9:43; Luke 11:30

---May 31, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I ask you for information on the passages of Scripture: **((20) (James 5:20)**-that does not mean to save a sinner from hell, does it? **((9:43) (Mark 9:43); (Luke 11:30)**. I am very much interested in these Scriptures.

I have your and I. N. Penick's debate, and am satisfied Penick is on the wrong side. A brother in Christ,

BOWRY CARTER

Quincy, Miss.

REMARKS

No, **((20) (James 5:20)** does not mean to save a soul from an eternal hell. In verse nineteen James says, "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him." The erring brother is the one to be converted and saved. Saved from what? From error, of course, for if he errs from the truth he would be in error. This is what he is to be saved from-from death in error.

In **((9:43) (Mark 9:43)** the Saviour is giving instruction in discipline in the church. No matter how important the place a member of the church may occupy, if he acts in a disorderly manner he should be dealt with. It is better to lose the important member than for the whole church to suffer, and the candlestick to be finally removed. We are too apt to be ready to deal with a member who acts disorderly if he does not occupy what is deemed an important place or position in the church, and at the same time pass unnoticed a crime of equal or greater magnitude if committed by the member holding the important position. The church should be as strict with the latter as with the former. If any difference is made, the member occupying the important position should be held to account more quickly than the other.

(Luke 11:30) teaches that "as Jonah was a sign unto the Ninevites," he was a sign in the fact that he was "in the belly of the whale" for three days and nights. So was the Son of man three days and nights in the earth. As Jonah was vomited up by the fish after three days, so the earth gave up the body of Christ after three days. Compare this text with **(Matthew 12:38-39,40)**.

C. H. C.

A Challenge

---June 7, 1910

We noticed a few days ago that Elder Sykes, of Texas, proposed to discuss the absolute predestination of all things, thus throwing down the gauntlet. We have been asked several times if we would debate with an advocate of this doctrine. We have always replied in the affirmative, but they never furnished the man. WE ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE thrown down by Elder Sykes. But for fear this is not sufficient to get them to discuss the differences, we make the following challenge:

We challenge those who hold to the doctrine that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated all things that come to pass to furnish a representative man from among them to discuss the following propositions with us:

1. The Scriptures teach that God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate all things that come to pass, good, bad and indifferent.

.....affirms.

C. H. CAYCE, denies.

2. The Scriptures teach that much of the happiness of God's children while here on earth is conditional, and depends much upon the way they live.

C. H. CAYCE, affirms.denies.

The discussion to be held at a place where it may be called for and at a time to be agreed on by the disputants. The challenge also embraces this: Competent stenographers are to be employed to take the speeches as delivered, and the whole discussion to be published in book form. Not less than two days to be devoted to each proposition. The speaker on each side to have a moderator, and a third to be chosen by them to act as president moderator. The speakers to be governed by the rules in Hedge's Logic, with an additional rule, "No new matter to be introduced in the final negative on a proposition." We challenge them to furnish the man.

C. H. CAYCE

Watertown Debate

---June 7, 1910

Oakley made a great fight in a fair and orderly manner.
He certainly sustained his propositions and routed Paine on his.
.....Paine seems to take pride in being a mud slinger.

We had a few Missionary Baptists present and they were orderly. The Hardshells had the crowd and their deportment as well as their speaker's was disorderly. I was Brother Oakley's moderator.-

S. N. Fitzpatrick

Lebanon, Tenn.,

in Baptist Builder of May 25, 1910.

REMARKS

We are a little surprised at such a statement as the above from Rev. Fitzpatrick. We were present the first day of the discussion and acted as moderator for Brother Paine. It is a well known fact by those present that Rev. Oakley began the mud-slinging, and that it seemed almost, if not quite, impossible for him to observe the rules.

Rev. Fitzpatrick, you know that just after Elders Paine and Oakley had each made one speech in the afternoon on Tuesday (the first day) you arose and requested the speakers and the audience to observe the rules. You also know that Elder Paine made the next speech and that he observed the rules strictly. You also know that in Mr. Oakley's next speech he violated no less than three rules. You gave your assent to this at the time, and so did the president moderator. You also know that it was understood between us that if the speakers violated the rules again after your request that they observe them, that I should then reprove them. You know furthermore that we arose and showed three rules that Mr. Oakley had just violated, and that we required an apology. You also know we stated that if we could remain at the debate, and should act as moderator during the remainder of the time, that Mr. Oakley would observe the rules or else the reins would be removed from Elder Paine. You know these are facts. And you know, also, that on the train that afternoon between Watertown and Lebanon you admitted the justness of our claim and contention.

Now, don't you know that the people know that the Rev. Oakley was the mud-slinger, and not Elder Paine? And don't you know that the people know that Rev. Oakley did not conduct himself in an orderly manner? And don't you know that people will know it if you don't tell the truth about the matter? And don't you know that they will lose confidence in you if you tell things that are not true? And don't you

think you should tell the truth about it anyhow? And don't you think it would be in order now for you to apologize? You represented it correctly when you said there were few Missionary Baptists present, for there were but few of them present on the first day, and what was true of that day we are informed was true of every day, and Rev. Fitzpatrick admits it. Their small attendance, notwithstanding their boasted numbers in that community, shows how little they esteem the Rev. Oakley or the platform he proposed to occupy. Evidently one or both are lightly esteemed by them there.

C. H. C.

Baptism

---June 7, 1910

In another column in this paper will be found a letter from J. J. Carroll, a Missionary brother, who requests us to write on the subject of baptism. He states that he is dissatisfied with the Missionary Baptists, and would like to live with the Primitive Baptists but does not feel the weight of baptism.

We wrote an article on the subject of baptism, giving some reasons why we do not receive or accept the baptism of other people, which was published in our issue of January 16, 1906. If Brother Carroll will procure a copy of that issue of the paper he can read some of our reasons. But we will offer one or two here.

He quotes from Paul. **{(Ephesians 4:5)}** "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." The preceding verse says, "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling." Brother Carroll confesses that he is not satisfied with the Missionaries. This being true, he must see something wrong with their faith (doctrine). Then if the doctrine is wrong, the baptism must necessarily also be wrong. The baptism administered by any people cannot possibly be any better than their doctrine. When Brother Carroll was baptized by a Missionary Baptist preacher he was baptized into the faith of that people. The act of baptism administered by them declared that he was a Missionary Baptist in faith. If he is now a Primitive Baptist in faith, the only way to declare it is to be baptized by one authorized to administer baptism for them.

If the Missionary Baptist church is the church of Christ, then the Primitive Baptists have no right to administer baptism for them, for we are not authorized by them to do so. They do not ordain our preachers. On the other hand, if the Primitive Baptist Church is the church of Christ, then the Missionary Baptist church is not; and if they are not the church of Christ, then they have no right to administer baptism for the Primitive Baptists. No one has a right, or a

Scriptural authority, to administer baptism, unless he is ordained, or set apart, by authority of the church of Christ to administer the rite. We do not believe the Missionary Baptist church is the church of Christ; hence we do not deem their immersions to be valid baptisms, and do not accept them.

The Roman Catholics were the first to depart from the faith and split off from the true church. Is baptism, as administered by them valid? No. Then, if the Missionaries have departed from the original principles or faith of the church, and split off from the church, neither is baptism as administered by them valid. From this standpoint (if the Primitive Baptist Church is the true church of Christ), baptism administered by a Missionary Baptist is no better than that administered by a Roman Catholic.

However, we would say that the fact the Missionaries do not practice footwashing is not the only reason, by any means, that they are not the church of Christ. They are wrong in doctrine and are following Rome in practice. Their mission schemes are largely patterned after Rome, and they are fast drifting toward the old mother. Their mission schemes and practices are borrowed from Rome-and borrowed articles usually are returned some time. We would be glad if the Lord's people among them could have their eyes opened to the truth concerning these things, and then have the Christian courage to come out from among them. C. H. C.

Debate on Missions

---June 21, 1910

About as expected, our neighbor, Brother C. H. Cayce, was only joking when he made such sweeping challenges to discuss the mission issue between Baptists and Anti-Missionaries. He tries to dodge out on the plea that their teachings and practices on missions are not in question. Well, well-I. N. Penick

in Baptist Builder, June 8, 1910.

Yes, about as expected when Elder Penick said the Builder would furnish the man to defend the practices of the Softshells on the mission question-you won't do it. What's the matter, neighbor-won't your brethren in Macon recognize you as a representative man? Or, did you intend to make people believe you would defend your practice when you have no intention of doing so? Come on, now, and sign the proposition, or else come out like a man and confess that you cannot or will not meet the issue. If you will not meet the issue by debating that, you are the dodger. Will the Missionaries furnish the man?

C. H. C.

Ministerial Aid

---June 28, 1910

In announcing a list of appointments for one of his brethren, the editor of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST urges the people to "see after his welfare in a godly way." The meaning of this is not exactly clear; but it probably includes a reference to the financial side of the business. It is a mistake to suppose, as some appear to do, that Anti-Missionary preachers are clothed and fed in a miraculous way. In this respect they are dependent upon the contributions of the people, just as the preachers of other denominations are. The only difference is, that other denominations are open and frank about it, while the Anti-missionaries do their paying in a sly sort of way. As Elder Lee Hanks said in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of February 19, 1892, they will take the preacher "off in some secret place and give him ten cents as though they were committing some crime and wanted to conceal it." There is an inconsistency in this of which religious people ought to be ashamed.-

W. B. Clifton, in Baptist Builder, June 15, 1910.

None that we know of, except some ignorant superstitious Softshell Baptists, suppose that Primitive Baptist preachers are clothed and fed in a miraculous way. They go preaching where they feel that the Lord directs; and they do this trusting in the Lord, that He will put it into the hearts of the hearers to minister of their carnal things. They go without the promise of money or support by men. This the Softshells will not do. The Softshells do not trust the Lord. The Lord promised to be with those He sends out to preach. The Softshells will not risk the promise of God. They must have a promise of a support from men before they will go. They must have men to go the Lord's security before they will do the preaching. This is good evidence that they are not sent by the Lord. If they were sent of the Lord, they would be willing to trust Him. They would rather trust the promise of men than the promise of the Lord,. They look to the party by whom they are sent for support, and for a promise of support. They have no confidence in their god. Well, we don't blame them much, for they claim that their god can't save people that he wants to save, because people are too covetous to give their means to send the gospel. Their poor little god is no better than Diana of the Ephesians. They have to tell the people that sinners are going to hell by the thousands every day for want of the gospel, in order to get them to give of their hard-earned dollars. That's the way many of these Softshell humbugs get their support. If the angels and demons of the bottomless pit were capable of blushing, they would blush at the hypocrisy and

humbuggery of this Softshell brood. "There is a generation that curseth their father, and doth not bless their mother. There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet is not washed from their filthiness. There is a generation, O how lofty their eyes! and their eyelids are lifted up. There is a generation whose teeth are as swords, and their jaw teeth as knives, to devour the poor from off the earth, and the needy from among men. The horseleach hath two daughters, crying, Give, give. There are three things that are never satisfied, yea, four things say not, It is enough: The grave, and the barren womb; the earth that is not filled with water; and the fire that saith not, It is enough." -**(0:11) (Proverbs 30:11-16)**. These Softshell beggars (horseleach daughter) never get enough. It is always GIVE, GIVE. Poor fellow! May God have mercy on your poor soul.

C. H. C.

Debate on Missions

---July 19, 1910

Brother Cayce wanted to appear brave and confident, but it is clear to all that he don't intend to even promise to try to defend the doctrine and practice of his people on missions. Will S. A. Paine or anybody else defend the Hardshell brethren on these points? We will find a man to represent the Baptists. Let Cayce hush and somebody else talk who is willing to show his faith by his works-Baptist Builder.

REMARKS

The above clipping is from the pen of Elder I. N. Penick in the Baptist Builder of June 29, 1910. It is very evident that Elder Penick will not defend the teaching and practice of his people on the mission question. Have they a representative man among them who will affirm that "Missions as taught and practiced by the Missionary Baptists are authorized by the word of God?" If you have the man put him up, or else quit your teaching and practice on the mission business.

C. H. C.

Twin Brothers

---July 26, 1910

Our "little" Softshell neighbor, the Rev. I. N. Penick, D. D., says in the Baptist Builder of July 20, 1910, that the "Hardshells" and Campbelites are twin brothers. We would rather be a twin brother than to be an illegitimate Softshell profligate, whose birth is the result of a meeting behind a straw stack.

C. H. C.

The Heathen Question

---July 26, 1910

In the Baptist Builder of July 19, Elder Clifton, office editor of the Softshell sheet, makes reply to what we said in answer to him a few weeks ago. He says "the giving is all right as long as it goes into the pocket of the covetous anti-missionary tourist, but all wrong when used to declare among the heathen the unsearchable riches of Christ!" In Scripture there is no such thing found as a single minister being supported by the mother church at Jerusalem while preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ among the heathen, or Gentiles. This new-fangled mission business is the innovation of men, gotten up under pretense of preaching the gospel among the heathen to save them from hell, for gain. Where is the Scripture for buying little negroes in Africa? Yet the plea is sent out among enlightened people of our land for contributions to buy little negroes all over Africa-asking for money to "redeem" "little Doras!" This, too, under the pretext that money is needed to send the gospel! But, oh, give us money in send the gospel to the poor heathen! And your poor, half-starved missionaries in China must have at least two or three servants or they will not be noticed! All this, and more, done with money begged from the people to save the poor heathen. Yes, in heathendom they must be supplied with free schools, free doctors, free hospitals, free medicines, free dentists to fill their rotten teeth with gold-leaf. That's he way these Softshell beggars use the money in preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ among the heathen while people are starving and perishing for want of food at our own doors. Do they stop at this? No. Young ladies of this country are "gulled" into teaching the heathen Chinese to their ruin. Look at the Elsie Seigle case; and such occurrences have taken place more than once. It was no rare exception. One of their preachers said, "We knew it." Yet they continue to invent every scheme they can to get the ungodly gain. May the Lord pity them.

If our readers want to learn more truth concerning this black, dirty, wicked, mission business, send 25 cents to us for a copy of "Foreign Missions Exposed," by Hon. Ths. E. Watson. of Thomson, Ga. He shows the thing up, and gives their own statements.

When are you Softshells going to name your representative man to debate the mission question with us in Macon, Ga.? C. H. C.

That Challenge

---August 2, 1910

In reply to the challenge which we published in our issue of June 7, the following article appeared in the Advocate of Truth of July 1, 1910:

The above appeared in "The Primitive Baptist" of June 7th. I have obtained the consent of the editor of the Advocate of Truth to give it space in his paper, and I ask Elder Cayce, if he is willing for his readers to know that he has either willfully or ignorantly misrepresented the facts in the case, to give this, my answer, a place in his paper. It will be readily seen that Elder Cayce willfully, knowingly and purposely makes the impression that I have made a challenge on the subject of the absolute predestination of all things; and he puts in capital letters, "WE ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE thrown down by Elder Sykes." Now the truth is, I have either made such a challenge or I have not. Elder Cayce either saw such a challenge from me, or he did not. If I made such a challenge it certainly can be produced. If Elder Cayce saw such a challenge from me he can certainly produce it. If he did not see such a challenge from me, he has willfully, knowingly, purposely and with evil intentions misrepresented the matter, in which case he is unworthy of notice by any honorable debater, and is not fit to represent any religious order which has any regard for truth and honesty. It would be unjust and unfair, however, to charge this upon him without giving him a chance to make good the proof of his statement. It may be that in order to provoke controversy some unscrupulous person has forged my name to such a challenge and had it published, and that Elder Cayce saw it and supposed that I was the author of it, and was therefore justifiable in making the above statement. We ask therefore that the reader withhold judgment on the matter until Elder Cayce can have time to produce the document on which his statement was based. In the A. of T. of May, in writing up my recent tour through the east, in speaking of my visit in the Flint River Association, I said, "While I was in the bounds of this association, Elder B. Towry sent me a written challenge to discuss the doctrine of predestination with him. He did not come out to hear me preach, although the meeting was near his house, but sent the challenge by his son. I accepted the challenge and asked his son to go after him and bring him down so we could begin at once. But he replied that his father wanted a little time, and he did not go after him. I could not linger there and wait for him to get ready, so the debate did not come off; I promised the brethren, however, that I would come back some time next fall and hold the discussion if he did not back down."

It cannot be that this was what Elder Cayce saw, for it states that Elder Towry challenged me, and that I accepted the challenge. If this is what he saw and presents as a challenge from me when he says, "WE ACCEPT THE CHALLENGE thrown down by Elder Sykes," then he has purposely, knowingly and willfully deceived his readers and made them believe that I had put out a challenge when he knew it was not true. If this is the case, then I would not under any consideration meet him in discussion, for a man who would not scruple to make such a misrepresentation of the truth in order to deceive the people before he goes into a discussion, would not scruple to handle the word of God deceitfully, nor to resort to any unfair means to make a false impression. If Elder Cayce can produce such a challenge from me as he has sought to make the people believe I have made, then I am willing, if it suits Elder Towry and his brethren, for him to take Elder Towry's place in the discussion now pending, which is to begin on Tuesday after the first Sunday in October at Pleasant Grove Church, some 7 or 8 miles southwest of Fayetteville, Tenn. I have a duplicate of the proposition written by Elder Towry and sent to me, which reads as follows: "The Scriptures teach that God did predestinate all things whatsoever come to pass, both good and evil."

I had nothing whatever to do with the framing of this proposition; but when it was presented to me in the form of a challenge for me to affirm, I wrote at the bottom of it, "Accepted by J. C. Sykes," and handed it back. I received what Elder Towry says is a duplicate of the one I signed, a few days ago. The one who discusses the subject with me will do so on that side of the house.

If Elder Cayce can produce such a challenge from me, or with my name to it, as he has sought to make the people believe he saw, and thus exonerate himself from any suspicion that he willfully misled the people in the above article, then I am willing for him to take Elder Towry's place in the discussion of this proposition, at the time and place above mentioned, provided that he and his people do not think that Elder Towry is a representative preacher of their order. If they think he is a representative man then there can be no reason assigned for replacing him with another, only that the other fellow might gain some notoriety by it.

Or if Elder Cayce cannot produce the challenge he claims to have seen from me, and his people do not think that Elder Towry is qualified to represent them, and will move him out of the way and put an honest, clean, upright man, one who will treat his opponent with the courtesy and kindness due an honest disputant, then I am willing, yea, urge they do so.

I am not preparing nor expecting to discuss at the time above mentioned, a proposition on Conditional Time Salvation, because it is the legitimate offspring of limited predestination, and must stand or fall with the doctrine. Hence to discuss it as a separate proposition, is to sidetrack from the main issue, which will require all that time or expediency will allow in one discussion. The agreement in this discussion is, that I am to have all the time I want to present my proof on this proposition.

Now I wish to say a few words about this proposition and the one presented by Elder Cayce on the same subject, and every one I have yet seen presented on that subject by that side. I have never yet seen one presented by them that does not manifest either ignorance on the part of the framer, or an unholy and unrighteous desire to get the advantage in its wording, so as to enable them to appeal to the prejudice instead of the judgment of the people. This is clearly seen in the one which I have agreed to discuss. You will note that it says, "The Scriptures teach that God did predestinate all things whatsoever come to pass, both good and bad." Why is this "both good and bad" affixed to the proposition? Is it because the writer thereof did not know that the expression, "all things whatsoever come to pass," fully states the matter as we believe it? Did he know that this last was only a repetition of the sentiment contained in the first part? If he did not, then he is indeed ignorant; if he did know it, then he put it there because he thought it would give him some advantage which a true grammatical statement would not. The proposition as stated by Elder Cayce goes still farther. It adds after "all things that come to pass," "good, bad and indifferent." I can't believe that ignorance is the cause of his putting this last part to it. If so, he is not qualified to represent his people. But if he knows that all the prefixes and affixes which he can add to it does not cover any more ground than "all things that come to pass," and that nothing can come to pass that is not covered by this statement, then why did he add this affix? He has here not only violated the use of good language and good sense, but he has introduced a class of things which are neither good nor bad-indifferent things, as though there were some things toward which God is indifferent, and which He does not regard as good or bad. John says, "All unrighteousness is sin." Then as all righteous things are good, and all sinful things are bad, we find no place for his indifferent things. This only shows his eagerness to so frame our doctrine as to give him some undue advantage. I wonder if Elder Cayce will say that he has heard our people advocate the idea that God has decreed more than all things whatsoever come to pass? If not, why supplement that statement with "good, bad and

indifferent?" I wonder if he will say that he has heard us argue that God has decreed over and above all things whatsoever come to pass a lot of things that will never come to pass, some of which are neither good nor bad? If not, then why this supplement? No fair-minded man wants anything in a proposition for discussion more than a clear and concise statement of the point to be discussed, and he is willing to strip it of all superfluous words and phrases which add nothing to the sentiment contained in said proposition. I have accepted a proposition with one of those superfluous prize poles attached to the latter end of it, but if the man who meets me on that proposition undertakes to use it to prize up the prejudice of the people, I will show him up in his proper light. All I want, and all any honest man could want, is a fair, open, honest and candid investigation of this subject upon its real merits, without any play upon or appeal to the prejudice or passions of the people.

If the limited Baptists are not satisfied with the man who challenged me and have a man whom they are willing to trust, who is willing to discuss this question upon its merits in the manner above stated, let them tell Elder Towry to stand aside, and have their man on the ground at the time and place above stated. Let them now speak or forever hold their peace.

J. C. SIKES.

REMARKS

In reply to the above will say that we received a letter from a brother whose name we do not remember, which was a reply to some things Elder Sikes had preached in Alabama. It was written for publication in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, We did not give it space because we do not wish a continued controversy on the question through the paper. We are sorry that the article was not preserved. We understood from the tenor of the article that Elder Sikes had made some kind of challenge in his preaching. But as Elder Sikes says he never made a challenge, we will say that we either misunderstood the brother who wrote the article or else he misunderstood Elder Sikes. We do not wish to misrepresent any one, and beg Elder Sikes' pardon. If he was misrepresented, it was not done intentionally.

As to the objection raised by Elder Sikes to the proposition, or the words, "good, bad and indifferent," will say that Elder Sikes knows very well that the words "all things" are often used in the Scriptures and elsewhere in a restricted sense. If the proposition, therefore, should say that "God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate all things that come to pass," there would be room for a quibble by applying it in a restricted sense; but with the added words, "good, bad and indifferent," there is no room

for quibbling on that point. Those words added simply make the expression, "all things that come to pass," unrestricted. Elder Sikes certainly knows why we put the proposition that way. The elder says that in adding these words we violated the use of good language and good sense. We deny that we violated the use of good language. The words refer to "things," and make the proposition embrace all good things, all bad things and all things that may not be classed as good or bad. If something comes to pass that the man who affirms the proposition cannot say is good, or bad, then the proposition says it is embraced in the "all things" which God predestinated. It is not, therefore, a violation of good language. It may be a violation of good sense, in the estimation of Elder Sikes. He may think no one who would oppose his position has good sense. But we will not comment on that matter now.

Elder Sikes says: "I am not preparing nor expecting to discuss at the time above mentioned, a proposition on conditional time salvation, because it is the legitimate offspring of limited predestination, and must stand or fall with that doctrine. Hence to discuss it as a separate proposition, is to side-track from the main issue, which will require all the time expediency will allow in one discussion. The agreement in this discussion is, that I am to have all the time I want to present my proof on this proposition." Our challenge has nothing whatever to do with the discussion with Brother Towry. We don't care how much time is used in that discussion, and we don't care how many nor how few propositions are discussed at that time. Our challenge said nothing about that time. The time is to be agreed on by the disputants, according to the challenge. We do not care whether he discusses the question of "conditional time salvation" with Brother Towry or not. And it makes no difference whether "conditional time salvation" is the legitimate offspring of limited predestination or not. Our brethren who have held to what some call "conditional time salvation," have been called Arminians, Bildads, Half-Baptists and many other such names, and we want an investigation of the matter. We want a clean, honest, fair investigation of the two propositions submitted. That is all we want. If the Bible teaches that God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate all things that come to pass, good, bad and indifferent, we want to know it. And, if the Bible does not teach that much of the happiness of God's children while here on earth is conditional, and depends much upon the way they live, we want to know it. Hence, we repeat the challenge.

THE CHALLENGE REPEATED.

We challenge those who bold to the doctrine that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated all things that come to pass to furnish a representative man from among them to discuss the following propositions with us:

1. The Scriptures teach that God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate all things that come to pass, good, bad and indifferent. -affirms; C. H. Cayce denies.
2. The Scriptures teach that much of the happiness of God's children while here on earth is conditional, and depends much upon the way they live. C. H. Cayce affirms;---denies.

The discussion to be held at a place where it may be called for and at a time to be agreed on by the disputants. The challenge also embraces this:

Competent stenographers are to be employed to take the speeches as delivered, and the whole discussion to be published in book form. Not less than two days to be devoted to each proposition. The speaker on each side to have a moderator, and a third to be chosen by them to act as president moderator. The speakers to be governed by the rules in Hedge's Logic, with an additional rule, "No new matter to be introduced in the final negative on a proposition." We challenge them to furnish the man. C. H. C.

The Footprints

---August 2, 1910

Elder J. W. Fairchild has resumed the publication of the Footprints of the Flock. He claims he has labored hard for peace, but his writings show that he was saying some hard things about some brethren who differed from him. In the May, 1910, number of his paper, among other things, he says: "There is no hope for peace between the high-minded bosses in the Baptist ranks, and the humble followers of the lowly Jesus. The only hope for peace now is for the Lord's flock to be delivered from the selfish leaders. We have done all we know to pacify these lords over God's heritage, but all to no avail."

Who are the "high-minded bosses" in the Baptist ranks? Of course, if Elder Fairchild is the one to answer the question, the bosses are those who faithfully oppose some position he has been advocating. Who are the "humble followers" of the meek and lowly Jesus? if Elder Fairchild is to answer, of course it would be "Elder Fairchild and those who advocate the doctrine of the absolute and unconditional predestination of all things that come to pass.

It is evident to us, from his writings, that these are the humble followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. He classes those who oppose his teaching as selfish leaders. It is clear that he uses strong terms

and ugly epithets in referring to those who have the courage to oppose his views. Hence, if one has the courage and manliness and Christian fortitude to oppose something advocated by Elder Fairchild, he is a high-minded boss and a selfish leader. Hence, it appears that Elder Fairchild must be allowed to be the leader—he must be allowed to advocate what he pleases, even to the destruction of the peace of the churches—and no one must object under penalty of bringing down the anathemas of Elder Fairchild upon his head.

He further says: “Our labors with these elders who are bent on dividing the Lord's people over predestination and time salvation are at an end; and hereafter our efforts shall be to save the flock from their tyranny.” In this he accuses those who oppose the absolute predestination of all things of being bent on dividing the Lord's people. The truth of the matter is that the preaching and advocating of that doctrine is what causes the division. If it was not advocated there would be no need to oppose it, and then there would be no division. It is true, therefore, that advocating that doctrine is what causes the division. Elder Fairchild was bent on advocating it; hence he is the man bent on division, for he knows it causes division. But from his standpoint it is tyranny for one to oppose that doctrine; but it is not tyranny for him to continue to advocate it when he knows it causes division.

Again, he says: “Were it not for the preachers who have the spirit of bossism, there would be no trouble among us.” What preachers among us have the spirit of bossism, unless it is those who continue to advocate the doctrine of absolute and unconditional predestination of all things that come to pass, and that God caused the devil to cause Adam to sin, and who stigmatize those who oppose that doctrine? If that spirit is not the spirit of bossism we confess we are dull of comprehension.

Again, he says: “Shall a few bigoted bosses destroy the peace of Zion?” We hope not. We hope the churches will withdraw from every “bigoted boss” who continues to advocate this doctrine, when he knows it causes distress and confusion.

Merely as a matter of information to our readers we copy the following from Elder J. B. Hardy, Jr., which was in the Footprints for May, 1910: “I have studied the matter carefully and am ready to say the Footprints must not, will not die. Publish it, and make the world know you are publishing it. Father is here and says tell you to publish the Footprints and say some thing in it too. I am willing to reply to Bogard if you think, best, and will, but I prefer to be after some so-called Primitive Baptists. My spirit is stirred within me, and they must come to the scratch or shut up. They must let up on you or include

me in the fight. I will not be left out." We will offer no comment on this statement now. We give it simply as a matter of information to our readers.

May the Lord help us all to humbly and faithfully contend against every false way, and to contend earnestly for the faith that was once delivered unto the saints.

C. H. C.

That Debate on Missions

---August 9, 1910

Notice the following clear cut proposition:

"1. Missions as taught and practiced by the Missionary Baptists are authorized by the word of God."

"2. Missions as taught and practiced by the so-called Old School Baptists are authorized by the word of God."

For some time Brother C. H. Cayce has displayed some anxiety to discuss this first proposition, but under no consideration will he agree to defend the doctrines and practice of his people. If any of his brethren will try it let them deny this first, and affirm the second proposition and the Builder will furnish a man to look after the truth. If none of them will try to defend their anti-mission doctrines and practices they ought to say so frankly and hush. What say you brethren?-Baptist Builder, July 27.

REMARKS

It is evident that the Builder man does not intend to meet the issue. Instead of doing that, he tries to confuse the minds of the people, and throw dust in the air, to draw their minds away from the issue. It is the teaching and practice of the Missionary Baptists on the mission question that has been assailed and called in question. It was the assaults made on that doctrine and practice that caused your brother, Rev. Broughton, to make a challenge to Thos. E. Watson to debate. Our brethren then called on us to know if we would debate the question. We replied in the affirmative. Rev. Broughton failed to come to time. The Builder then took it up; but also fails to meet the issue. Why not come up squarely, like a man, and discuss the proposition or shut up?

However, if you wish us to affirm a proposition, we will affirm this: "The church of which I (C. H. Cayce) am a member, known as Old School or Primitive Baptists, is Scriptural in doctrine and practice."

We will affirm this. Will you deny it? And will you affirm that "Missions as taught and practiced by the Missionary Baptists are authorized by the word of God?"

Remember that you must furnish a man that your people in Macon, Ga., will recognize as a representative man. Will you do that? And will you meet the issue? We still wait to see. C. H. C.

Challenge

---August 9, 1910

I notice that C. H. Cayce, editor of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, published at Martin, Tenn., has challenged the Old School Baptists to debate the subjects of predestination and conditionalism in which he proposes to deny what he, in the early part of his ministry professed to believe, and to affirm what he then denied.

If Elder Cayce and those now associated with him will put up any honorable representative man among them, who has the endorsement of his people and will sign propositions on these subjects, which express fairly and honestly the issue between us, they shall be accommodated. Elder Cayce proposes that stenographers be employed to write the debate and that it be published. To this I will say Predestinarian Baptist ministers do not wish to lord it over God's heritage, but we are willing to leave this matter entirely with the brethren to do just as they please about having the debate published.

Now if they want a fair and honorable discussion, let them bring out their man. W. I. C.

The above appeared in the Predestinarian Baptist of August 1, 1910. Elder W. I. Carnell is one of the editors, and we presume he is the author, as it is signed W. I. C.

As to his statement that we propose to deny what we, in the early part of our ministry, professed to believe, and to affirm what we then denied, we have only to say that we shall make no reply to this now. It will receive due notice at the proper time.

We made the challenge for your people to furnish a representative man from among them to meet us in discussion on the propositions as they appeared in the challenge. Do you accept those propositions? The first one is what you teach. Will you affirm it in debate? Do you believe the second proposition? Will you deny it in debate? And will your people say, by act of a church, that you are a representative man? Do you want our people to endorse us for the debate? We have not asked them to do so, and we don't know whether they will or not; but we have been called on by them in different states to represent them in discussions. We made the challenge for your people to furnish a man to meet us. It was made on our own responsibility. But do you want one or more of our churches to endorse us for the debate? Will your people furnish a representative man if our people

endorse us? It was included in the challenge that stenographers be employed to take the debate down, and that it be published.

The propositions upon which we made the challenge are fair and embrace points of difference. Why did you not put the propositions in your paper? Did you want to misrepresent us? Did you wish to keep the true issue from your readers? Now, we want a fair and honorable discussion of those propositions. If we are wrong, we want to be right. We want the truth. WILL YOU MEET THE ISSUE, provided your people will say you are a representative man? And WILL THEY SAY THAT? Will your people furnish a man? We await an answer. How long will we have to wait? Our man is out and ready to agree on a time when you people furnish the man and he signs the propositions upon which the challenge was made.

C. H. C.

Missions Again

---August 16, 1910

“In the Scripture there is no such thing found as a single minister being supported by the mother church at Jerusalem while preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ among the heathen, or Gentiles.” -C. H. Cayce, PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, July 26.

Isn't that “cute?” He might also have said there is no record of the mother church at Jerusalem taking up a collection to pay for printing the associational minutes! The Scriptures show however, that the Jerusalem church was composed of poor people who were to some extent dependent upon the generosity of their Gentile brethren. But besides that, Paul tells us, in **(Galatians 2:9)** that “James, and Cephas, and John, they who reputed to be pillars” in the church, gave “to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision.” It appears, then, that there was an understanding and a division of the vast mission field between the mother church and the other churches, the former undertaking the mission to the Jews, and the latter that to the Gentiles. The intimation that the Jerusalem church was opposed to the missions to the Gentiles is therefore, false: for its leading members distinctly fellowshipped two men who had been set apart for this work. And we are prepared to show from the word of God that other churches helped to support Paul “while preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ among the heathen, or Gentiles.” Will Eld. Cayce dispute it?

We have felt quite sure for some time that Elder Cayce, of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, has been waiting for an opportunity to spout off the contents of Tom Watson's slanderous pamphlet against foreign missions. And so, in his issue of July 26, instead of attempting to defend the inconsistent practices of his own people, he favors us with a tame rehash of Watson, which, however, only exposes the bad animus and the logical weakness of the Anti-Missionary position. The first thing that we call attention to is that Elder Cayce makes no distinction whatever: he seems to charge that all the men who go out as foreign missionaries are base mercenaries, and that ALL the females are prostitutes! This is as vile a slander as ever emanated from the pit of perdition, and Elder Cayce knows it, and knowing it he retails it for the cash there is in it!

Now, that an occasional base character should appear among the missionary forces is to be expected; but this no more discredits the foreign missionary work as a whole than the appearance of such characters among the churches of all denominations at home discredits Christianity as a whole. As a matter of fact the argument has n more real weight against foreign missions than an argument based on the treason of Judas, the covetousness of Simon Magus and the dissimulation of Peter at Antioch has against Christianity. Even the man blind enough to swallow Hardshellism ought to see this. But we are willing to bring the matter to a concrete test. There are several men and women now on foreign fields who were born and reared right here in West Tennessee: will Elder Cayce affirm and undertake to show that these people are of the character and guilty of the practices he refers to? Will he affirm and undertake to prove that the Baptist churches in West Tennessee, for example, endorse men and women known to be of bad character, and approve of such methods and such practices as those he mentions? If he cannot prove these things why does he make statements that imply that all the foreign missionaries, both men and women, are base and unworthy of decent respect? But finally in regard to foreign mission work in general, who is to be believed, men like Elder Cayce, who deal out course slanders for the money there is in it, or men like William J. Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt and former vice President Fairbanks, who saw with their own eyes, and could have no motive in misrepresenting the facts?

The above appeared in the Baptist Builder of August 3 in Elder W. B. Clifton's department. Now, why doesn't the Rev, gentleman tell where we got authority for what we said? And why doesn't he publish what we said, so his readers can judge for themselves as to whether his statements are true or false? It simply won't do to give the facts

out to his readers. If the people knew the facts concerning this mission business, the high-salaried secretaries and chairmen of boards, beggars and solicitors in the field, the high-salaried missionaries, doctors, dentists and teachers would have to look for another job. It just won't do to let the people know the facts. If they knew the facts, they would not go down in their pockets so freely and hand over so many of their hard-earned dollars for the Rev. clergy. The elder's conclusion, that there was an understanding and a division of the vast mission field between the mother church and the other churches, is not proven by his quotation. **{(Galatians 2:9)}** But suppose the quotation did prove his statement, would that sustain their practices? Does it authorize the existence of the Southern Baptist Convention, their state conventions, home and foreign boards, with their secretaries, chairmen and treasurers? Who divides the "vast mission field" for the Missionary Baptists who go to the field? Do the churches divide the field, or does the board do the dividing? Those who know anything at all about the matter know that the board assigns to the missionary his field of labor, that therefore, the board does the dividing. But the quotation does not sustain the contention of the elder. The first verse of that chapter **{(Galatians 2)}** says, "Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also."

This shows that Paul had been preaching among the Gentiles for a number of years already. His field of labor had already been assigned him. The field of labor was assigned him by the Master when He appeared to him and called him to the work; see **((2:21) (Acts 22:21); ((7) (26:17))**. Not only is this true, but the apostle says, **(Galatians 1:15-21)**, "But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace, to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not." The apostle did not confer with the church at Jerusalem, nor with a board, as to where he should go preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ, or where his field of labor should be. He did not wait to see whether or not he would get a salary or a support from a board or from a church at Jerusalem. Evidently he was not a missionary of the modern sort. The elder says he is prepared to show from the word of God that other churches helped to support Paul while preaching the

unsearchable riches of Christ among the Gentiles. But can he show that Paul, or any other minister, was supported by the mother church at Jerusalem while preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ among the Gentiles? Our statement was that there is no such thing as this found in Scripture. If it was there, we suppose the Rev, would have produced it.

While the apostle was at Thessalonica the brethren at Philippi sent gifts unto him. Philippi was about forty miles from Thessalonica. Does that look like foreign missions? While he was in Corinth the brethren from Macedonia contributed to his necessities. These contributions were not sent from a distance of more than two hundred miles, for Philippi, in Macedonia, was not more than two hundred miles from Corinth, and Thessalonica was nearer. There is nothing in any of these that favors missions as now practiced by these modern Softshell Missionaries.

Instead of the mother church at Jerusalem sending out and supporting missionaries in the foreign field, contributions were made by the Gentile churches and sent to Jerusalem for the help of the poor saints there. But, now these modern Missionaries must have contributions sent to the foreign from the home field to supply free schools, free doctors, free nurses, free dentists, free gold leaf, free medicines (and the Lord only knows how much more) for the heathen. They reverse the order in the contribution arrangement. We did not intimate that the church at Jerusalem opposed the Apostle Paul's going among the Gentiles, and Elder Clifton knows it. But we say that the church at Jerusalem did not support the apostle, nor contribute to his necessities, while he was preaching among the Gentiles, neither did God require it. Elder Clifton also knows this is a fact. All the Softshell modern Missionaries in the United States cannot overthrow this position.

Now, the Rev. Softshell gentleman shows his anger and utter inability to meet our position. He charges that he has felt quite sure for some time that we were waiting impatiently for an opportunity to spout off the contents of Tom Watson's slanderous pamphlet against foreign missions. He FELT IT! We have had the same opportunity all the time that we have now. This flatterer has been making remarks about us and our brethren in his dirty way for quite awhile. For some time we paid no attention to his thrusts, until he "swelled up" so large we decided to give the Rev, gentleman a few facts. As to what he says about Tom Watson's pamphlet, will only say that he misrepresents Tom Watson. Mr. Watson is not opposed to missions, and says so on the first page of the first chapter in the pamphlet. But if the pamphlet is slanderous, why don't you Softshell pop-guns make him pay for the

slander? Why don't you refute the things therein contained? Why doesn't your Mr. Bryan, whose word you say the people should take, meet Mr. Watson in debate on the question? Mr. Bryan dare not discuss the question with Mr. Watson. But this Softshell windbag says we deal out course slander for the money there is in it. In the name of decency and honesty, whom have we slandered? We only told a little of what Rev. Paul Wakefield said, and he is a missionary advocate. If the language is a slander, then Dr. Wakefield is the guilty party and not C. H. Cayce. Are we a vile slanderer because we tell what their own people say who believe in and advocate foreign missions, and whose stomachs begin to ache right now when they get on the foreign mission question, but whose heart is, seemingly, as hard as flint when they are appealed to concerning the poor starving white people right here at their own doors? Slanderous, indeed! Just at this time we have before us a copy of the Woman's Missionary Advocate of August, 1910. On pages 63 to 67 is a letter from Miss Emma Lester, on the foreign field. The letter is headed, "One Day Out From Shanghai." In this letter, on page 65 of the pamphlet, appears this language: "The Filipinos are Catholic, and one cannot help but admire the work and tremble at the influx of Western wickedness that is coming in faster than Western goodness. It is so in all of these Eastern lands. One ship brings the missionaries and countless barrels of whiskey. We sit at table with an American woman who is on her way to bring back girls for her evil business. They say the name 'American girl' in the East means a bad woman. There you are! A woman missionary on the foreign field said it! Are a vile slanderer because we tell what she said? Western wickedness is coming in faster than Western goodness! It is so in all these Eastern lands!

Pray tell us, then, how they are to be converted in the present generation? If the Western importations make them worse, pray tell us how long it will require for the West to "take them for Christ?" Imagine, too, how much influence these missionary women will have in converting these heathen and "taking the world for Christ," when "the name 'American girl' in the East means a bad woman?" It seems to us that, to any reasonable person, it would be clear that before they can have much influence in the East they must correct matters at home.

On page 471 of Pearson's Magazine for April, 1910, the editor of the magazine says:

During the past year the foreign mission movement in the United States has grown astonishingly. Foreign missions seem to be based on business instead of Christianity. Great state conventions have

been held in various states, and the Laymen's Missionary Movement inaugurated a national campaign in October last year, which still continues. It is to conclude in May with a National Missionary Congress in Chicago. Already the pledged contributions indicate that more American money will go into foreign missions this year than ever came in any one year from our country. Perhaps this is due to the movement's "business" appeal. It may be good business to Christianize foreign heathens, but it does seem that it might be better business to relieve certain heathenish conditions right at home in this day of bread-lines and the vast human-stunted under-growth of the United States. During the year 1909 several great charities for home purposes were forced to discontinue or curtail their activities because of lack of money. During the same year the gifts of the United States for foreign missions increased \$600,000 over the previous year, while the gifts of Great Britain decreased \$96,000 and the gifts of other Christian countries decreased \$120,000. Is this because Americans are better, or is it because they are more foolish? This magazine asked Mr. Barry to answer that question. He has spent four of the last six years traveling in the far East and South America. He has seen the missionaries and their work. His story follows-Editor.

This was written as a kind of introduction to an article headed "Business vs. Christianity," by Richard Barry. It cannot be charged that the statements of the editor of Pearson's Magazine or Richard Barry are the product of narrow-minded prejudice against foreign missions. These men could have no more motive to misrepresent the facts than Wm. J. Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt or former Vice-President Fairbanks, and Mr. Barry has spent as much time in the East and in South America among the foreign missionaries and the heathens as any of the other three gentlemen, and perhaps all three together. We must consider Mr. Barry a good witness. We give the following extracts from Mr. Barry's article:

These are two appeals:

The first is from the Federation of Churches and Christian Organizations in New York City. A page of statistics is submitted. These figures conjure of some appalling facts. They show that in a 122 blocks in lower Manhattan there are a quarter million people who were born abroad. These people are so densely packed together that there is an average of 750 of them each acre of ground. They represent eleven different nationalities, four different world religions and upward of twenty different sects of those religions. For one minute consider the problems presented on that little handful of earth, inside our very doors, in the bosom of our national family.

Sanitation! Congestion! Homelessness! Housing! Industrial welfare!
Religious education! Political education! Secular education!

The second appeal is from the Laymen's Missionary movement. It presents figures so vast that the mind recoils, stunned. It is almost as difficult a mental problem as to look into the heavens, with a text book on astronomy in one hand, and attempt to estimate the number of stars. However, let us seize the fringe of the statement as it sweeps by, comet-like, on its course, and attempt to estimate it. There are in the world, the appeal says, a billion people who are not Christians. A thousand millions! About twelve times the population of the United States! About four thousand times as many foreigners as live in the lower part of Manhattan! Of course, this is outside of the fifty millions of people who live in the United States who are not Christians. or who do not at least belong to any Christian organization.

Now the appeal is that we shall evangelize that billion of people within the present generation. They want to carry the gospel to that thousand million within thirty-five years. At present there are 13,350 missionaries in the field. They want 40,000. Last year this country spent ten millions on foreign missions. This year the new movement asks for fifty millions.

They want one man and one woman for each fifty thousand of that foreign population, and \$2,000 for each of them to spend. There, in a concrete sentence, I believe I have stated what is meant when these organizers say they want to evangelize the world. A man and his wife with \$2,000 a year, for every fifty thousand non-Christians will turn the trick.

To which appeal shall we listen?

To the foreign appeal, of course. Are we not an imaginative, emotional, extravagant people? Who can beat the American in driving a bargain? And who can beat the American in foolishly spending the money he makes from a bargain? No nation has greater resources from which to draw, and no nation spends those resources more recklessly. It is for good and sufficient reasons that the United States and Canada lead the world in contributions to foreign missions. But let us consider the matter critically, without prejudice. The new missionary movement is called a business men's movement, and the new appeal is being made to business men for business reasons. Therefore, let us look at it in a business like way.

First a quotation from "Men and Missions" the weekly bulletin of the new movement: "I never saw a more representative gathering of the men of New York," said Richard Barry, war correspondent, magazine writer and staff correspondent of "Pearson's Magazine," in speaking

of the mass meeting in the Hippodrome on Sunday afternoon. "I never saw a more representative audience of men of substance or standing at any meeting, political, religious, or commercial. I was surprised. I had no idea a missionary meeting could draw men that way."

We call special attention just here to the fact that the promoters of the missionary movement quote Mr. Barry, who is the author of the article from which these extracts are taken. Mr. Barry continues:

This quotation is correct, so far as it goes, but "Men and Missions" did not record all that was said before that meeting opened. There were present 5,300 "key" men, the leaders of the churches of Greater New York, and before the exercises began I asked an officer of the convention if he would permit me to step to the platform and ask the assemblage this question: "Wilt every man in the audience who has in his pocket an unsigned contract with Oriental or African merchants please rise?" I offered to wager that at least half the audience, thus taken off guard, and perhaps thinking I might be an agent for such merchants, would rise. The officer would not permit me to put the question, but he laughed. I believe he thought I was joking.

* * * * *

The Japanese are a courteous people. They listen respectfully, and with a much more open mind than we listen in this country, to the teachings of any foreign people. European, Chinese, Indian, Korean, American missionaries are all welcomed. The Japanese listens soberly absorbs and says nothing.

The Japanese are also a practical people. They gratefully accept rice, meat, school buildings, education, knowledge and kind words from all benevolent foreigners, especially from Americans. But they are not Christians and never will be. After sixty years of valiant effort the Christian religion has less hold on Japan than the Buddhist religion has on the United States.

* * * * *

Another speaker for the new movement, Dr. A. J. Brown, a missionary, says, "In Korea I traveled in a car made in Delaware, drawn by a locomotive from Philadelphia over Pittsburg rails, fastened by New York spikes to Oregon ties. I sat down to a meal that included Chicago beef, Pittsburg pickles and Minnesota flour. We could afford to support all the missionaries in Korea for the large and growing trade they have developed with this country."

Another "business" appeal! The missionaries built your trade up; therefore build up the missionaries. The missionaries developed the trade with Korea!

* * * * *

The real attitude of the new movement is this-and I am but saying plainly what its speakers say inferentially: Let us carry beef and flour and railroad ties and pig-iron to the heathen (deducting, of course, therefrom a good American profit from the transaction), and his soul will somehow take care of itself. We will carry a little side line of tracts for his soul, but we in our enlightened wisdom, are not so sure that our soul ideas are so much better than his. We will give him the benefit of the doubt on that point, and let him have his choice. On one thing, however, he shall not have any choice-that is, on Business. Our business is infinitely superior to his, and it is our sacred duty to send it to him. Beef and iron, flour and railroad ties, pickles and pork, candy and kerosene-these the heathen must have, even if he rejects the soul tracts.

The placing of those soul tracts, the side line, is to be a mathematical calculation, a placing of Christianity by the rural free delivery route, as it were

However, as good business men, we see the advantage of an approved name of good standing, a name that we can advertise. So we take the name of Christ, the methods of Mohammed and our own weapon, not the sword, but the dollar. Out of this holy trinity of name, ways and means we will evangelize the world-and in jig quick time!

* * * * *

It was stated in one of the conventions in February, as an argument that would induce double contributions, that it took one dollar to carry another dollar to the heathen or foreign lands. In other words, only fifty cents of every dollar contributed here for foreign missions ever is spent directly on the mission fields.

A statement that came to me several days ago, nearer the source of actual experience, is one, however, that I prefer to use. It was made to me by an American missionary while we were traveling together down the Yank Tse Kiang. He had just come from a five years' service in interior China, and he said that for every dollar he spent among the Chinese in his district, for their own good, it cost the Foreign Missionary Board \$10.75.

In other words, about one dollar in twelve actually gets to the heathen...And how is that one dollar in twelve spent?

Two classes of men go to foreign missions-the great and the petty, and the great are vastly in the minority. The ordinary, everyday, well-rounded, normal man seldom goes. There have been some missionaries who have been great men, though most of that caliber are dead.

Most of the missionaries of today are of a far different type. I do not speak from hearsay, but from observation. I have traveled in nearly every "heathen" country. I have seen these men at their work. I have watched them go to and fro. And I have attended more than one missionary convention here. At the conventions here the only subject I have heard discussed (off the platform, when men usually get to talking about what really interests them) has been-how can we get our pay raised? Where there is a weakly minister, one so over-emotional or so spineless that he could be palmed off only on the heathen, he is the one that goes into the foreign fields.

Lucky man! A man who never would find in this country a congregation that could pay him more than \$1,000 a year goes to China, Japan, India or Africa with an allowance of from \$1,200 to \$1,800 a year. And not only is the allowance larger on paper, but he gets it

When the lucky missionary arrives in the foreign field he discovers that, instead of getting only a fifth or half more than he might have had at home, that amount of money really means four or five times as much as it would in this country.

How many ministers of the gospel in the United States have six or seven personal servants, their own carriage and a country place in a delightful climate to which they may retire at rigorous seasons of the year? It is not the exception, but the rule for every American missionary in the Orient to have at least that much

What the missionary today needs is a good endowment, substantial buildings, plenty of rice money, a retinue of servants and the ever-hovering presence of a fleet of battleships.

It is next to impossible to get any man in public life to say publicly anything against foreign missions. In fact, most politicians publicly endorse them. They know the tenacity of religious beliefs.

Recently I have been trying to get some Christian ministers to declare themselves on this subject. Several times I have found ministers of high standing who did not believe in foreign missions, even where their church, as a church, did. In the past few days I have talked with two metropolitan preachers of renown who, when I expressed the views here written, eagerly assented to the justice of the ground taken.

However, when I asked these ministers if I might quote them as being opposed to foreign missions, I was quickly placed under a promise not to reveal their names. Outside of the Unitarian and Universalist faiths, I doubt if a Christian minister could be found in

the whole United States who would register himself as opposed to foreign missions.

Consider the poor whites of the South, cursed with the inertia of arrested hope! Consider the bread lines of Chicago and New York! Consider the destitute babies, the sapless millionaires! Consider the Western deserts and their prayers for water! Consider this vast, stunted human undergrowth of our own continent, foiled, groping, crying aloud! And if nothing but converting some one to Christianity will really salve your conscience, why, there are 50,000,000 heathen tight here within your own boundaries. The Orient and Africa are really absurdly far, impossibly distant. Looking at it even in a business way, I am not so sure it is good "business."

This mania of saving worlds belongs to the middle ages.....It is bad business. It is windy sentimentalism.

For the saving of the world let us trust the Maker of the world.

We have given these lengthy extracts from Mr. Barry's article in Pearson's Magazine for April, 1910, because he is a good witness and has written plainly. We prefer to give statements from their own people, and from those of whom it cannot be said, "They are blinded by prejudice." The statements above need no comment. Mr. Barry is well acquainted with the foreign mission business; but he is not acquainted with the Primitive Baptists, for they have not made themselves prominent advocating such measures. They have always been opposed to the modern mission system, and have always borne such abuse as Elder Clifton's article contains, on account of it.

Elder Clifton says we "seem to charge that ALL the men who go out as foreign missionaries are base mercenaries, and ALL the females are prostitutes." Elder Clifton knows we made no such charge. We gave missionary authority for all we said. But as Elder Clifton accuses us of base slander, we will simply refer to a few more statements made by advocates of missions, Rev. Asa Blackburn said to a reporter of the New York World:

If the "World" would employ its great facilities for gathering news to obtaining a list of the mission girls ruined by Chinese whom they were teaching it would perform a service for which all the churches would be supremely grateful. There have been enough cases of that kind to fill an entire page in the paper. That list would be read everywhere as an awful object lesson in depravity. I believe its publication would so shock the country as to correct the evil which it would aim. Nothing short of some such exposure will stop it. The people need to be horrified. I shall be in sympathy with any measure, however shocking, to save young women from a continuance of this infamy, and with what feeble force I have I will speak for it.

Miss Helen Clark, a director of a mission, said:

For seventeen years I have urged the folly of white women endeavoring to Christianize Chinamen. All about me I have seen the ruin and wrecked homes. Case after case that parallels Elsie Siegel's, with the exception of its tragic termination. But even so, death is better than some things. I have believed from the very beginning that it was impossible for white women to properly influence Chinese men.

Dr. Paul Wakefield, of Springfield, Ill., concerning the Elsie Siegel case, said:

There are more women missionaries degraded by Chinese men than there are Chinese converted. We missionaries have known this for a long time, and were not surprised when we heard of Miss Siegel's death.

A Mrs. Manry, who lives in Crawfordsville, Ind., in giving a report of Dr. Wakefield's lecture to a reporter of another paper, used these words:

Those American missionaries who know the character of the Chinese men and who know that they cannot be converted to Christianity by American or any other women, were not surprised to learn of the murder of Miss Elsie Siegel, the missionary in Chinatown, New York. Of course the murder was a most atrocious one, but it is to be hoped that it will teach American women a lesson. No woman missionary can Christianize a Chinese man. For centuries and centuries, the men of China have had such a low estimate of women that they now can hardly respect them.

On page 88 of *Foreign Missions Exposed*, Thomas E. Watson says: The Elsie Siegel case, like the lightning flash in the dark, revealed the whole world of mission work among the heathen in the home field. How is it abroad? Are the Orientals in the East different from the Orientals who come West? Is a Chinaman in New York or San Francisco any worse than a Chinaman in China? Do these Chinese "converts" ever use the religious cloak to do wrong in China? You do not know. A lightning flash may come some day which will cause "we missionaries" to let that cat out of the bag also.

Then in a footnote on same page. Mr. Watson adds:

It has come! Dr. August Bach, a mission worker of twelve years' experience in China, has denounced the prevailing methods and has declared that there are Elsie Siegel cases in China.

On pages 113 and 114. of Mr. Watson's book on foreign missions we find the following language:

In October last Rev. F. D. Kellogg and wife set out from this country for the Foochow Mission, China. Commenting upon this, an American Chinaman, named Charlie Good, said:

“It is a very foolish idea to send white men and pretty American girls to China. My people, and especially those in the Foochow district, are very desperate. They care nothing for your religion. Ah, yes, we like the pretty American girls. If you should send only men you would soon see a great change.”

Read that statement again, and consider it well. Then remember that Dr. Bach declared that there were Elsie Siegel cases in the Chinese field.

But they keep the facts covered up-and our sisters go blindly into a work which is fraught with perils of which they are entirely ignorant-perils which may lead them to a fate worse than death.

We clip the following statement from the Nashville American, Nashville, Tenn., of August 7, 1909:

At Crawfordsville, Ind., a few evenings since, Rev. Paul Wakefield made a talk in which he said: “There are more women missionaries degraded by Chinese men than there are Chinese converted.”

Startling as this declaration sounds, it is tame when compared with the subsequent statement, “We missionaries have known this for a long time,” etc. Commenting thereupon, Tom Watson expresses the sentiment of every normal mind: “I think that is the most infamous statement that a minister of the gospel ever made.” And he adds: “The missionaries who kept that awful secret are not much better than the Chinamen who ruined the girls.” Instead of being any better, they are worse; for while the tiger is not to be blamed for regaling himself with the mutton, there is absolutely no excuse for the soft-head who sends the lamb to domesticate the tiger.

Now we suppose the Rev. Clifton will say again that we deal in coarse slander for the money there is in it. Who gets the salary? Why, sir, these missionaries. They are the ones who are out for the money there is in it.

Notwithstanding the fact some of them have known for a long time that there were more women missionaries ruined by the Chinese than there were Chinese converts, yet they kept the matter secret. Why did they keep it a secret? There can be but one reason-for the money, the fat salary they get. We do not say they are all corrupt-we made no such intimation-but it is a rotten and corrupt affair, and our desire is that the good people who have been deceived may have their eyes opened to the true situation and to the truth.

Now, Mr. Clifton, howl some more if you want to. Your howling hurts no one.

Are those Softshells going to furnish a representative man to discuss the mission question with us in Macon, Ga.? C. H. C.

Luke 13:6-9

---August 30, 1910

Brother G. W. Hewett, of Brown, Ark., requested our views on this text a good while ago. The reader may turn and read, beginning with the first verse of the chapter. Those characters upon which the tower in Siloam fell are referred to. Then the Saviour tells those people present that those people were not sinners above all who dwelt in Jerusalem, and that except they repent they would likewise perish, just as did those upon whom the tower fell. Then in verse six the Saviour begins by putting forth a parable unto them, showing that the Jewish nation should be cut down. To them had been committed the oracles of God, but they were not bringing forth fruit. They were disobedient and rebellious. Hence they were to be cut down; the gospel privileges were to be given to the Gentiles. So, now, when a church continually lives in disobedience and rebellion, and fails to bring forth fruit, the candlestick is removed and planted in another place. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 9:7-15

---August 30, 1910

Some time ago Brother C. W. Estes, of Falkner, Miss., requested our view of **(1 Corinthians 9:7-15)**. The reader will please turn to same and read it. The apostle was teaching the duty of the church to minister of their carnal things to those who ministered spiritual things unto them. In verse 9 the apostle says: "For it is written in the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." The idea expressed is that the ox should do the eating where he does the treading. It is not God's plan for him to do his treading in China and his eating in the United States. If the treading is done in China, the eating should be done there also. He should be ministered unto by those where the treading is done.

It is evident that the apostle has reference to the fact that carnal things should be ministered unto the servant by those unto whom he has ministered spiritual things, from the language of verse 11, which says: "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" It is true that the apostle did not use these things, neither did he write these things in order that they should minister unto him. This is true with every true servant of the Lord. He does not ask that he be ministered unto. He does not say

“no pay no preach.” He will do his duty (or should do so) to the best of his ability whether the brethren minister unto him or not, it is his duty to go as the Lord directs, and unto the field of labor the Lord directs, and then it is the duty of those unto whom he ministers spiritual things to minister unto him of their carnal things. All this should be done willingly, as a service of love on both sides. When so done it is blessed of the Lord. On the other hand, He does not approve nor recognize the hireling system. C. H. C.

Elder Sikes Did Challenge

---September 6, 1910

Our readers will remember that in our issue of August 2 we copied a letter from Elder J. C. Sikes, of Texas, from the Advocate of Truth, in which he denied having made any challenge, and accused us of misrepresenting him, and in which he used some very unbecoming expressions. When our issue of August 2 was printed we did not have proof of our statement at hand. The following letters show that Elder Sikes said he had not only made a challenge, but that the challenge was of five years standing. So, while in Alabama Elder Sikes said he DID CHALLENGE; since he returned home he says he NEVER MADE ANY CHALLENGE. Since he has accused us of falsifying we must meekly ask, Did Elder Sikes tell the truth both times? The following letters show who has falsified and who has misrepresented the facts in the case. Please read them carefully, and then remember the propositions and terms upon which we challenge them to furnish a representative man to meet us.

C. H. C.

ONE STATEMENT

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-I see in this week's issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST that Elder Sikes is hunting a loophole to escape meeting you in debate.

It is surprising that men claiming to be Primitive Baptists would make such broad assertions as Elder Sikes did while here in Alabama and then try to dodge or get out of it on a plea that he made no such challenge, and if he did, you ought to be able to produce it. This proves that he sees he is in a hole and is trying to get out by claiming that you should produce the challenge with his name to it.

Now, elder, how does that sound to a thinking man? As to what you told Brother Jack Berry when you were here in the early part of the year, that you had a standing challenge of five years for any of our side to meet you, and not a one of them would meet you in a discussion, Brother Berry talked to me about your challenge and asked me if we did not have a man that would meet you. At that time

I did not favor the debate, as the Baptists Elder Sikes affiliated with and preached for while here were in gross disorder, and they themselves admitted it. Yet they claimed that the wrong act must stand, and while they are still pursuing the very course that they themselves admitted was wrong, Elder Sikes came from Texas to preach for and encourage them in their course. Up to that time they denied believing the doctrine of absolute predestination of all things, but since Elder Sikes visited them they openly affirm the doctrine. Now, is it not strange that Elder Sikes would boast about his challenge of five years' standing and none of our folks would meet him (all afraid of him, of course), and now censure Brother Cayce as misrepresenting him for saying that he (Elder Sikes) had made a challenge while here in Alabama, and that he (Elder Cayce) therefore is not qualified to meet an honest disputant. Let us look to the honesty of the people he affiliated with while here for a moment. Another brother and myself were appointed as a committee to visit a church for her wrong and unscriptural course, and who also had a charge against her pastor for unfaithfulness. When the charge was told them their pastor said we were doing him a wrong, that we should have come to him with our complaint privately. We told him if he would point out our wrong and show us one precept or example in the New Testament where we were commanded to go to a brother privately for a public offense, we would yield the point and ask forgiveness for our wrong. Instead of trying to point out our wrongs he said that our course was a mob law and he was opposed to mob laws and wanted to put them down. Kind reader, how does this sound for Primitive Baptists? Another church confessed that she had done wrong and asked us to forgive her, when in fact she did not belong to the union at the time the wrong, as she called it, was committed. Now, dear reader, stop for a moment and think of a Primitive Baptist church asking for forgiveness for something that was done before she was in existence, and yet Elder Sikes came and preached for and held up such a course for a few churches that had been labored with and dropped by the Flint River Association. After all this inconsistency he says, "If Elder Cayce cannot show his challenge with his name to it he is not fit to meet an honest disputant." Oh, shame, where is thy blush? O consistency, where art thou? By their fruits ye shall know them.

If anyone doubts this statement Brother Berry's post office is Huntsville, Ala. Brother Berry is a member of one of the churches that was dropped or excluded by Flint River Association, and I suppose Elder Sikes thought he could brag a little and it would not

reach us. Brother Berry is still a member of that church, but he is an honest upright Christian gentleman.

We had hoped they would see and repent of their wrong, but it seems they have been turned to their idols, and there is no repenting spirit about them. So we are now in favor of the discussion. Yours in bonds of love,

B. B. LAWLER

Gurley, Ala.

ANOTHER STATEMENT

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-In reply to your letter of the third, I will say that while I was in company with Elder Sikes last winter I asked him if God purposed that Adam should transgress, and he said he did. After asking him a number of other questions I asked him if he debated, or would debate the subject. He said that he had had out a standing advertised challenge for five years, which no one had accepted. Unworthily,

E. J. BERRY

R. 2

Huntsville, Ala.

ANOTHER STATEMENT

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-After reading your paper, THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, I see that Elder J. C. Sikes, in his reply to your challenge on the subject of the predestination of all things, misrepresents things in regard to the debate now pending between him and my father, Elder B. L. Towry. Elder Sikes says when I presented the proposition he signed it and asked me to go bring father down so we could begin at once. I did not present the proposition until after preaching. He signed it and passed it back and said that he did not have time to debate it now, but would be back sometime soon, though he did not say when. Before services I stated to Elder Jessie Towry, one of their order, that father had received a challenge the day before from Elder Bikes wanting to debate the question of absolute predestination of all things with him while he was here. I asked Jessie to tell him that father was ready to begin the discussion any time after the next day. But if Elder Sikes' time was pressing him so he could not stay he would begin the next day, but I thought it ought to be circulated better. Elder Sikes said he did not have the time to debate it now, but would be glad if father would come over and be with him that day at Pleasant Grove schoolhouse, also that night at a brother's house about two and one-half miles away. This was about fifteen or twenty minutes before services began, and anyone knows that it would have been impossible to have had a fair debate in that length of time, when only one side was there

to judge it, and but very few of them. I told Jessie Towry we would not do that. Jessie Towry said that Elder J. C. Sikes said he had out a world-wide challenge on the subject of predestination and no one would meet him.

Elder Cayce, my desire is not confusion, but that all who are interested may know the facts of it. I have witnesses that will testify to what I have written.

Yours in hope,

A. N. TOWRY

R. 4

Fayetteville, Tenn.

Keys of the Kingdom

---September 20, 1910

We think the keys of the kingdom (or church) were delivered to Peter, and he used them to unlock the door and open the kingdom to the Gentiles when he went to the house of Cornelius and preached the gospel there. We do not think the door of the church is ever closed, or has been since it was opened to the Gentiles. It is always open to God's little children who give a reason of their hope in Jesus and ask for a home there. C. H. C.

Foreign Missions Again

---September 27, 1910

In the Baptist Builder of August 24 Elder Clifton says he may have yielded occasionally to pay Elder Cayce back in his own coin, having reference to his ugly epithets which he has been hurling at us for some time. He knows this is another falsehood, for he knows that he began this mud-slinging and that we paid no attention to it for quite a while.

In the issue of August 31 and September he also says something about our last editorial in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST on the foreign mission question. He does not answer nor refute a statement from a single witness. He says he does not know why we quoted the statement from the Woman's Missionary Advocate. Well, we are not responsible for his ignorance nor for his false statements. We showed clearly why we quoted it, and he made no reply to it.

Now, parson, you may howl all you want to. It amuses us. C. H. C.

Our Challenge

---October 4, 1910

In THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of May 31 and June 7, 1910. we challenged those who believe that God absolutely and unconditionally

predestinated all things that come to pass to furnish a representative man to meet us in debate. We stated that Elder J. C. Sikes had laid down the gauntlet. In the Advocate of Truth of July 1, 1910, he denied that he had made any challenge. In THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of September 6, 1910, we produced the proof. From the statements published in that issue we quote the following:

After asking him a number of other questions, I asked him if he debated, or would debate the subject. He said that he had had out a standing advertised challenge for five years, which no one had accepted.

E. J. Berry

R. 2

Huntsville, Ala.

Jessie Towry said that Elder J. C. Sikes said he had out a world-wide challenge on the subject of predestination and no one would meet him.

A. N. Towry

R. 4

Fayetteville, Tenn.

This shows clearly that Elder Sikes said he had made a challenge. He had either made it, or else he had not done so. If he had made it, then he did not tell the truth when he denied it. If he had not made it, then he did not tell the truth when he said he had. But, let us not be severe in our judgment. Perhaps the elder can explain the matter. In the Predestinarian Baptist of August 1, 1910, Elder W. I. Camel says:

Now, if they want a fair and honorable discussion, let them bring out their man.

We again say that we are ready to agree on the time when the propositions are signed by a representative man. It seems that they do not want to meet the issue squarely. If they do not furnish the man we will conclude that the whole fraternity are religious cowards. Put up your man or shut your mouths about us and what we teach. We repeat our challenge.

THE CHALLENGE.

We challenge those who hold to the doctrine that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated all things that come to pass to furnish a representative man from among them to discuss the following propositions with us:

1. The Scriptures teach that God did from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate all things that come to pass, good, bad and indifferent _____ affirms. C. H. Cayce denies.

2. The Scriptures teach that much of the happiness of God's children while here on earth is conditional, and depends much upon the way they live. C. H. Cayce affirms _____ denies.

The discussion to be held at a place where it may be called for and at a time to be agreed on by the disputants. The challenge also embraces this:

Competent stenographers are to be employed to take the speeches as delivered, and the whole discussion to be published in book form. Not less than two days to be devoted to each proposition. The speaker on each side to have a moderator, and a third to be chosen by them to act as president moderator. The speakers to be governed by the rules in Hedge's Logic, with an additional rule, "No new matter to be introduced in the final negative on a proposition." We challenge them to furnish the man. C. H. CAYCE.

Gifts in the Ministry

---October 4, 1910

By request of Brother Leonard in his letter on another page in this paper we will try to write a few words on the above subject.

The parable of the supper as recorded in **(Matthew 22:1-10)** and ((6) (Luke 14:16-24), shows that the Lord sends His servants out into the "highways and hedges." He sends His ministers out as hunters and as fishers, to hunt and to fish for His children. He does not send them out to make children for Him, but to find those He has made.

There are many of the Lord's children who have never heard an Old Baptist sermon delivered. They know nothing about what Old Baptists preach. Perhaps they have heard much said by our enemies about our teaching, but our enemies misrepresent us. They cannot have a very strong desire to hear Old Baptist preaching unless they have some idea of what Old Baptists teach. The very best way in the world to let them know what Old Baptists teach is to go into the neighborhoods where they are and preach the gospel to them, as the Lord opens the way. This has been the practice of our fathers in the ages past. Churches are usually established by some minister, or ministers, going into a neighborhood and preaching, where there is no Old Baptist Church. This is the way the churches were established in the New Testament times. The ministers went into different localities, as they were directed by the Spirit and preached the gospel, and churches were established. This has been the gospel rule and practice all along the line. It is still the practice of the Primitive Baptists. The Fuller and Carey plan, as practiced by the New School Baptists, is for a board, or society to assign the minister his field of labor and send him out. The Bible plan is that the Lord sends them

out and assigns them their field of labor, and they go trusting the Lord for guidance and for support.

Indeed, all are not pastors. "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." - (Ephesians 4:11). An evangelist is what some would now call a traveling preacher. There are some good preachers, able preachers, who are not good pastors. These are all different gifts in the ministry. The pastor is not above the evangelist, and the evangelist is not above the pastor. They are on an equality, though having different gifts in the same office. If one is satisfied laboring as a pastor, and he feels that his labors as a pastor are blessed of the Lord, and he feels to be abiding in his calling when thus laboring, then he should labor in that way. He should abide in his calling. "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them."—(2) (Acts 13:2). Saul, called Paul, was the apostle to the Gentiles, but Barnabas was not an apostle. He was a minister of the gospel, called by the Lord (the Holy Ghost). It does not appear that he labored much as a pastor, but that he labored as an evangelist, or traveling preacher. The Lord called him to that work, and he was ordained just like any other called minister.

If you feel an impression of mind to go into destitute places to preach the gospel, you should do so. We often think the destitute places are too much neglected. The Lord calls and impresses His ministers where to go. He assigns the field of labor, and they should endeavor to follow their impressions and labor where the Lord directs.

Much more could be said along this line, but time forbids us writing more now. May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of our readers, is our prayer, and enable us all to follow the direction of His Spirit. C. H. C.

Educate The Japs

---October 25, 1910

The little girl she wanted us to help educate, as we did Mrs. Maynard's sweet Bible woman, now doing good work among her own people, is provided for. Last month, Dr. Willingham received \$26.00 for her, and now read this letter from West Virginia:

"Enclosed please find \$10.00 to help educate the little Japanese girl Mrs. Medling told us of."—E. M. Heck.

Just see there, Mrs. Medling, what good your letter did! You need not give the \$10.00 you offered, and if you choose, you can put your gift in the chapel. There are always so many things only the people on the ground see the need of. You have only to draw on Dr.

Willingham now for \$36.00 to be used for the little Japanese maiden! Isn't that grand? Thank you, Mrs. Heck, a thousand times! You have often helped us before, and doubtless will again. God bless you.

The above appeared in the "Young South" department of the Baptist and Reflector of October 20, 1910, over the signature of Laura Dayton Eakin, Chattanooga, Tenn. For the education of the little Jap just draw on Dr. Willingham for \$36.00. The Rev. Dr. received \$26.00 for her last month. Now here comes a donor with ten dollars more for the little Jap. Oh, how they can howl for a little Jap, who so much needs an education in Japan! What authority is given for this? "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," is the authority that they give. It is strange to us that people cannot see that our Lord's command embraced no such things as this. But if you want to raise the sympathy of a crowd of Pharisees, just raise a cry in behalf of the Japs in Japan, the Chinks in China, the negro in Africa, and so on. But present to them the claims of the poor suffering children in our own home land, who are destitute of food and raiment and without educational opportunities, and you get nothing. The work bears on its face the marks of Pharisaical hypocrisy.

In the Baptist and Reflector of the same date we see a report of the Tennessee Baptist Convention. In the report on "Foreign Missions" we find this statement:

The report on the great denominational enterprise was submitted by Dr. O. M. Savage, of Jackson, father of Mrs. R. P. Mahon, a missionary in Mexico. The report says: "We have mission workers in South, Central and North China; in Africa, in Italy, in Brazil, in North and South Mexico, in Japan, and in Argentina. In China we have 145 missionaries, bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh; in Africa, 12, in Italy, 6, in Brazil, 44, in Mexico, 35, in Japan, 16. in Argentina, 14. These 275 leaders, with their companies of native workers, constitute an army, which must in the main receive its supplies from the home land, these Southern States. Our board has already appointed two new missionaries in this convention. Perhaps in China advancement is most marked of all our foreign fields. Africa shows hardly less advancement than China. Our Foreign Missions are operating such auxiliaries as theological seminaries, girls' boarding schools, publishing houses, homes for blind girls, orphanages, hospitals, dispensaries, Bible institutes, Bible classes, colportage, Christian literature depots."

What a pity our Lord did not say, "Go ye into all the world and operate theological seminaries, girls' boarding schools, publishing houses, homes for blind girls, orphanages, hospitals, dispensaries,

Bible institutes, Bible classes, colportage, Christian literature depots," and so on. What are these hospitals and dispensaries? The hospitals are places where the sick Chinks, Japs, negroes, and so on, may have free medical attention, free nurses and free board. Oh, how their stomachs ache for the poor sick Chinamen in China, Japanese in Japan, negroes in Africa, while the poor whites in our own boasted land of Bibles and Christianity are allowed to suffer and die for want of attention—not only in their little rooms in the crowded cities, but without shelter!

What are the dispensaries? They are drug stores handling free medicines for the Chinks, Japs, negroes, and so on, in the far-off lands. But the poor suffering white creatures in our own home land may die and go to the bad place, so far as these missionary fanatics are concerned. No, sir; no free school books, free medicines, free hospitals, free doctors, free dentists, free gold leaf to fill teeth, free schools, nor free clothing or shelter for the poor crippled destitute white people in our own home land! Yet, in all their bowling for money for such objects, they are sailing under the pretense of preaching the gospel to a lost world! May the Lord pity their followers who blindly follow on without investigating for themselves, thinking they are helping to carry out the Lord's command. C. H. C.

My Impressions

---November 8, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother, if you will allow one as unworthy as I am to call you brother—I have just finished reading your debate with Penick, and I was induced, as I believe, from on high, to send you my best respects and praise for the work's sake. I thank the giver of all good and perfect gifts for taking men out from among the world and placing them on the walls of Zion, who are able to defend the glorious gospel that I love so well, as you are. I cannot begin to tell you how much good it did me to see how easy it was for you to answer his questions and prove the doctrine of salvation by grace and grace alone.

Well, Brother Cayce, I have a question I want to ask you. First, I will say, if my poor heart deceives me not, that still voice you spoke about in your debate spoke peace to my troubled soul several years ago. Then I had a strong desire to join the church and did join at New Hope, in Hamilton county, Ill. After I was baptized I thought my trouble was over, but since then that same still small voice has told me there is something else for me to do. Now, Brother Cayce, that

has caused me to neglect my duty as a Christian and by that I have failed to enjoy a Christian's life. I have had brothers tell me that it was my duty to preach, and that is the way that small voice seemed to impress it on my mind. There is where my trouble comes from. I do not see how I can preach. In the first place I always felt too unworthy for such a call, and in the next place, it never did seem to me like I had understanding enough of the Scriptures to proclaim God's glorious gospel in a way that would be of any benefit to God's little children, and, then, I am so poor in this world's goods that it seems like it takes all of my time supporting my family. There have been times I had a strong desire to get up and tell the brethren how I felt about this matter, but something seemed to say to me, "You aren't fit to do that, and you would bring reproach on the good Old Baptist Church if you were to undertake such a work." And then it seemed to say, "Your brethren would not listen to you anyway.

Now, when you were here that was the first time I ever saw you, and when I shook hands with you it seemed to me if I were just as good as you I could go ahead and discharge what I think is my duty.

You remember when you started up in the stand you asked if there were any of us that exercised in public. You did not know how badly I wanted to take a part with you, but that same something seemed to say, "You will insult your brethren if you do," so I just remained where I was. When you prayed I thought that was the best prayer I ever heard, and I think so yet. You remember you took your text from ((4:9) (Isaiah 54:9), which reads, "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee." I thought while you were preaching that if the Spirit of God did not have anything to do with that sermon I was badly fooled, and, when I got your debate and read it I knew that you could not defend the gospel that way if you were not instructed from on high.

So that is the reason I thought I would ask you if I have experienced a call to the ministry. I ask the prayers of all God's little children.

A. T. WEATHERFORD.

Mt. Vernon, Ill.

REMARKS

We would humbly admonish you, dear brother, to endeavor to walk in obedience to your dear Saviour, as you feel impressed. If the Lord requires a work at your hands, no matter how weak you may feel, no one else can do that work for you. The apostle tells us that "Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the

flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called," etc. He also tells us something of his own feelings: "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ."

Dear brother, we are just a poor sinner. We humbly hope we are a saved sinner—saved alone by the grace of God. We are no better by nature than others. "I myself also am a man." We are very imperfect, and humbly beg our dear brethren to bear with us and allow us to have an humble place with them while we live on earth. We love them, and we love the doctrine and principles that are so dear to them, and we feel that we are willing to bear all the reproaches of this world in defending those principles, and we want to live and die with the people who love and advocate them. C. H. C.

AUTHORITY TO ORDAIN

---November 15, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother in Christ—I have been thinking of joining the old Primitive Baptist Church. I have been trying to preach the gospel of Christ for twenty-five years. I was ordained by Missionary Baptists. Now, the brethren don't want me unless I would let them ordain me again. Now, tell me why they want to do this. Did not our authority as ordained ministers come from the same fountain, the old German and Scotch and English Baptists? Is not my authority just as good as the Primitive? I don't believe in the mission system, only as it is laid down in the word of God. Please give me your views on the question. Yours in Christ,

D. C. BISHOP
Randle, Wash.

REMARKS

Some years ago the Baptists were one family. New doctrines and new practices were introduced among them, which (new doctrines and practices) finally caused division. We judge that as Brother Bishop expresses a desire to join the Primitive Baptists, he thinks they are holding to the original doctrine and practice of the Baptists. It is a historical fact that the Missionaries do have the new doctrines and practices among them that caused the division in the Baptist family. It is, therefore, true that they have departed from the original Baptist doctrine and practice. If the fact that they were once with us gives them the authority to administer the ordinances, it would also give the Roman Catholics the same authority. They split off from the Baptists in about the third century. But the fact that the Baptists and Catholics were once together does not prove that the Catholics have a gospel right to administer the ordinances. They have no such right,

because they have departed from the true doctrine and practice of Christ and the apostles. For the same reason the Missionary Baptists have no gospel right to administer the ordinances.

If your authority, Brother Bishop, which was given you by the people you are now with, is as good as the Primitive, there can be no good reason why you should leave them and join the Primitives. They have no gospel authority to administer the ordinances because they have departed from the original practice of the gospel.

The ordinances can be administered by those, only, who are authorized by the church to administer them. The Missionary Baptists are not authorized to administer the ordinances for the Primitive Baptists. If the Primitive Baptist Church is the church of Christ, then Missionary Baptists have no authority to administer the ordinances for the church of Christ. An ordinance is not valid unless it is administered by the proper authority. Hence an ordinance of the gospel is not valid when administered by the Missionary Baptists. We have written on this question before, and haven't time to write at more length on it now. But these reasons, if there were no more, are sufficient. May the Lord bless these thoughts to the benefit of our readers, is our prayer.

C. H. C.

1 Corinthianbs 6:9-11

(I Corinthians 6:9-11)

---November 15, 1910

W. F. Haley, of Eastman, Miss., requests our views of this text. The apostle shows that certain characters shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Then he tells the Corinthians that they were once in the same condition of these characters. "Such were some of you." But the Lord had cleansed them by His Spirit and had brought them out of their former condition. It was not done because of their good works, because they had not been doing good works. But since the Lord has washed them and cleansed them by His Spirit they are capacitated to do good works. C. H. C.

Ezekiel 16:24-55

((24) (Ezekiel 16:24-55)

---November 22, 1910

Brother T. W. Osborne, of Blackford, Va., requests our views on this Scripture. Israel had been guilty of lewdness, and the chastening rod of the Lord was to fall heavily upon them on account of their wrong doing. He was going to punish them for their wickedness, yet He would not forget His promise or covenant. The Lord's people of this day commit the same abominations by uniting and affiliating with the institutions of men. The Lord will punish them for it, but He will not

forsake them in the end. He will not forget nor forsake His promise or covenant. C. H. C.

Some Questions

SOME QUESTIONS

---November 22, 1910

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Dear Brother-There are about one thousand and one questions I would like to ask on points of Scripture for my own satisfaction, not for controversy, but that I may learn the truth, and believing you competent to enlighten me on these hard points, I will trouble you with a few of the said questions.

1. Is there proof in the Bible that man was created an immortal being? If so, why does Paul say that this mortal shall put on immortality? Webster says the soul is immortal-it will never die, and it seems to be the popular belief that man is immortal; then if we already have immortality, why does Paul say that we will put it on at the resurrection?
2. What is meant by the meek inheriting the earth?
3. What is meant by the second coming of Christ? Do you understand that He will come in person in the like manner in which He left, in a bodily shape, or do the Scriptures mean that He comes only in Spirit?
4. What do you understand is meant by the 1000 years that Satan is to be bound, or so-called millennial?

Please answer as much in detail as space will permit, and oblige, one of the unlearned, H. D. LEONARD. Albertville, Ala.

OUR ANSWER

We are not a standard, and do not wish the brethren to consider us as such. We haven't time nor space to go into detail in answering the foregoing questions. But we will give a brief answer by number.

First. The Scriptures teach that man was made in the likeness and in the image of God. God is represented as having a body, head, ears, nose, mouth, hands, arms, feet, and so on. Man, in this respect, is in the likeness of God. There are three persons in the God-head-the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Hence God is one composed of three. So man is one composed of three-the soul, body and spirit. Thus man is in the image of God. The body is mortal; it decays and returns to dust at death. It was the body Paul was talking about when he said this mortal must put on immortality. He was not talking about the spirit or the soul. The word immortal has more than one meaning. One meaning is, always living and never dying. Another is, always existing. The soul or spirit never ceases to exist. It may be always

dying, yet never dead, or never ceasing to exist. The soul or spirit of the child of God is always living and never dying.

2. Those persons who manifest the spirit of meekness shall inherit blessings here on earth.
3. The Saviour comes now in the person of the Holy Spirit, but the promise of God is that He is coming again in person. He is coming to gather His children home. He is coming just as He went away. The statement of the angel was that He should come again in like manner as ye see Him go away. The same Jesus who was here and suffered for our sins and who died, was buried, rose again and ascended to His Father, will come again.
4. The so-called millennial reign of Christ, as taught by the Russellites or Millennial dawn people, is a religious humbug. It is an invention of man. Jesse Cox, in his "Exposition of the Revelation," we think, gives a good exposition of this matter.

C. H. C.

Wheat and Tares

WHEAT AND TARES

---December 6, 1910

Brother H. E. Rouw, of Holdenville, Okla., requests our views of the parable of the wheat and the tares. We will give only a brief reply. The parable refers to the closing out of the law dispensation and the ushering in of the gospel dispensation. The wheat was gathered together in the gospel kingdom in gospel worship and service. The tares were not admitted in the gospel worship and service. The law service and worship was then done away. It was destroyed.

C. H. C.

Remarks to C. B. Owen

REMARKS TO C. B. OWEN

---December 13, 1910

Dear brother, you cannot excuse yourself for your failure to obey the Lord with the idea that the right time has not come. God always does His work at the right time, hence Jesus was born into the world at the right time; but we do not always do our work at the right time. If it is your duty to unite with the church, but the right time has not come for you to do so, why would the Lord chastise you for not doing so? "Now is the accepted time," says the apostle. The right time to do our duty is now. C. H. C.

END OF VOLUME ONE

1911

SELECTED EDITORIALS FROM THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST

Beginning with 1911

By Elder C. H. Cayce

Volume 2

Originally Printed 1936

Reprinted 2007 PBHC San Antonio, Texas

TO

My Beloved and Sainted Mother who cared for me when I could not care for myself, and who dearly loved her poor boy, and to My Sainted Father who fell in the pulpit proclaiming the precious principles of truth which are dear to my poor heart this Volume is Lovingly Dedicated

PREFACE

There does not seem to the writer to be much necessity for a preface to this volume. We have received a great many words of commendation and approval of the first volume of our editorial writings, not only as to the workmanship of the book, but more especially of the contents. We appreciate all this, and it has encouraged us to begin the publication of this second volume earlier than we had anticipated. If we know our poor heart our desire in the publication of these volumes is, first, the glory of God, and, second, the instruction, comfort, consolation and benefit of His humble poor, and for the benefit of the generations yet unborn. We desire that the things contained in these volumes may be preserved for the benefit and instruction of the generations following-so that they may know where we occupied, and what the principles were that our people stood for.

May the good Lord graciously grant to bless the same to the end designed, if it can be according to His holy will, and may His blessings rest upon the reader, is our humble prayer.

The Author Thornton, Ark., April 2, 1936.

Introduction to Volume 26

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME XXVI

---**January 10, 1911**

In the providence of God our life has been spared, and we are permitted to begin the publication of the twenty-sixth volume of The Primitive Baptist. The paper has stood through the battles and conflicts of twenty-five years-a quarter of a century. Many sore trials, sad disappointments and bereavements have been endured during these years. Yet the Lord's mercy has been extended to us all along the journey. Our sainted father (Elder S. F. Cayce), who was the founder of this paper, was its editor, as most (if not all) of our readers know, until his death in August, 1905. Since then we have been trying to conduct the paper along the same lines that were followed by him. The paper has never changed in sentiment, and we expect, if the Lord spares our life through another year, to continue to advocate the same principles of truth that we have in the past. Those principles are loved and cherished by the Primitive Baptists, and have been dear to the hearts of the Lord's humble followers in ages past. They are dear to us now, and we do not yet feel like giving them up.

We trust the dear brethren in different portions of the country will continue to rally to our support, and help to sustain the paper in contending and fighting for those eternal principles of truth.

We receive many requests for views on different portions of Scripture. We cannot possibly comply with all requests we receive of this kind. But it is a rather frequent occurrence for someone to ask our views on some point upon which we have already written. It is seldom we feel that these are of sufficient importance to be published again. We trust that those who make requests of this kind will not be offended if we do fail to comply. Sometimes we delay writing because we feel to have no special light on the matter, and sometimes we delay because of lack of time. Sometimes there are other reasons which we feel are good. But we have no intention of slighting anyone, and we trust no one will feel that way.

We again say that we trust our brethren, sisters and friends will continue to help us all they can in extending the circulation of The Primitive Baptist. All your efforts are much appreciated. And pray the Lord to direct us in wisdom's way and sustain us by His grace, that the paper may be conducted in a way that will be to His glory and to the comfort and benefit of His humble poor on earth. C. H. C.

Tour in Alabama

TOUR IN ALABAMA

---January 10, 1911

We left home on Monday afternoon, October 24, and arrived at Guntersville, Ala., Tuesday night. Brother Bodine met us at the train and conveyed us to his home. Our first appointment was at Brown's Creek on Wednesday. Elder J. T. Stewart met us there and accompanied us to all the appointments in this association (the Mount Zion). We filled appointments at the following named churches in that association: Brown's Creek, Shiloh, Rocky Mount, Little Vine, Salem, Siloam, Mount Moriah, Zion Hill, Clear Creek and New Hope. In the Mud Creek Association we filled appointments at the following named churches: Standing Rock, Woodville and Clear Creek. In the Flint River Association we filled appointments at Flint River, Hurricane, Briar Fork and Pleasant Grove churches. We failed to make a memorandum, so we cannot give the places where we spent nights, those we met, etc. We had the sweet pleasure and privilege of meeting several brethren in the ministry, some of them being with us a number of days. The meetings were pleasant and sweet to us. The service at New Hope was especially pleasant, and will be long remembered. Some of the Lord's dear children came home to the church there, while others showed a longing desire to do so.

We learned that many years ago (perhaps in the early seventies) some Missionaries were received into this association on their baptism, but in the year 1878 (if we remember the date correctly) it was all put out from among them, and they set themselves in order. We do not think we were ever among a more devoted and orderly body of Baptists in our life than these people are. They are faithful and jealous in the service of the Master, and we felt a warm affection for them.

They were all kind and good to us at each place. We shall ever remember them, and pray the Lord's blessings may rest upon them.

The churches named in the Flint River Association have lately passed through a severe trial in contention with those who advocate the absolute and unconditional predestination of all things that come to pass; but the war is practically over, and they are enjoying peace now. That doctrine always causes trouble among the churches where it is advocated.

We enjoyed the sweet association and company with the brethren during the whole trip, and would be glad to mention all whom we met, but cannot do so. They are all held in sweet remembrance, and we pray the Lord's blessings may rest upon them,

and trust the Lord may permit many of us, at least, to meet again on earth; but if we meet no more on earth we have a sweet hope of meeting them in a better world where separations never come. C. H. C.

DEADLY PARALLEL

---January 10, 1911

It seems that our neighbor, Elder I N. Penick, editor of the Baptist Builder, sometimes forgets the positions he has formerly occupied on some points, or else he does not always occupy the same position. Who can read the, following and then tell what Elder Penick believes? Just read the parallel. Comment is unnecessary. C. H. C. And we are fully committed to the theory that Christ's life of obedience and His shameful death satisfied fully and forever all the claims of justice against us, so that the Father's love may flow freely to all the blood bought heirs of grace.

I N. Penick, in Baptist Builder, January 4, 1911.

The Scriptures teach that all for whom Christ died will be saved in heaven.-I N. Penick denied in the Cayce Penick debate. The Scriptures teach that in the death of Christ sufficient provision was made for the salvation of all the race of Adam.-I N. Penick affirmed in the Cayce Penick debate.

Information Wanted

---January 17, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-Are the Regular Baptists in line and fellowship with the Primitive Baptists? Is it order for a Primitive Baptist Church to receive a member on the face of a letter from the Regular Baptist Church? Brother Cayce, please answer the above questions either by private letter or through The Primitive Baptist. Yours in hope, R. B. Langford, Washington, Okla.

OUR ANSWER

If, by the term Regular Baptist, you mean the people we know as Burnamites, or Penceites, or Bradleyites, it is not good order to receive them on a letter. We would as readily receive a Methodist, or a Campbellite, or a Presbyterian, or a Missionary Baptist, or a Catholic, by letter, or on a letter, as to receive a follower of Burnam, Pence & Co. that way. They are not Primitive or Old School Baptists. A letter is good only from a body of the same faith and order. C. H. C.

Luke 17:17

---January 24, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-

When your dear father stayed all night with us when he was in Texas, I gave him a text to write on in our paper. He either forgot it or had no time. We would love for you to write on it. The passage is **((7) (Luke 17:17))**. When I go to our next meeting I will carry several of my papers and give them to some of the members of Shiloh Church and try to get you some subscribers. I don't see how any Old Baptist can do without The Primitive Baptist. We are both old and it is a great comfort to us. Give my regards to your mother. We trust you will be spared long to our people, for we need you. How we feel the loss of Brother S. A. Paine! Oh, how we, as well as his little family and aged parents, shall miss him here in Texas, May God in His love and tender care be a father to them. Please excuse this scattered letter

and remember us at a throne of God's rich grace. A sister, I trust, Mart Gollihar. R. 2, Whitney, Texas.

OUR REMARKS

((7) (Luke 17:17) reads, "And Jesus answering said, Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine?" There were ten lepers who cried out to the Saviour, begging for mercy. He told them to go and shew themselves unto the priests. As they went they were cleansed. One of them turned back, glorified God, fell down on his face and gave thanks and praise to the Saviour for it. Even so it is today. Many of God's children, many who are cleansed, are not giving glory to God nor thanks to the Saviour. Only a few do this. C. H. C.

He Can Get It

---February 7, 1911

We have been informed that there is a certain Softshell Missionary Baptist evangelist who "jumped on" a discourse we delivered while in the Mount Zion Association in Alabama in November, and that he said he would like to get hold of us. We will inform the gentleman that if he is a representative man among his people he can have the pleasure of getting all the hold he wants. We are ready to discuss any or all of the same propositions we discussed with Elder I N. Penick, or any other points of difference. We have repeatedly called on the Missionary Baptists to furnish a representative man to affirm this proposition: "Missions as taught and practiced by the Missionary Baptists is authorized by the word of God." If the gentleman wants an opportunity to give us a "cleaning up," let him come to time on this proposition, and he can have all the time he wants. C. H. C.

Luke 16:19-31

---February 7, 1911

Brother Daniel Gwaltney, of Gossett, Ill., requests our views on (Luke 16:19-31). It is the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Brother Gwaltney asks, "Was the rich man a son of God? Was he a son by birth? Why did he call him father? And why did he (Abraham) call him son? Was that a literal hell under consideration?"

There is nothing said in this passage about the rich man being a son of God. It was Abraham that he addressed as father. He was a literal descendant of Abraham, for he was a Jew. There is no evidence that he was a child of God at all, only in the sense that he was a Jew, and the Jews were God's chosen people as a nation. But "they are not all Israel that are of Israel." The "children of the promise are counted for the seed." The rich man represented the Jews and Lazarus represented the Gentiles.

In The Primitive Baptist of June 8, 1909, we wrote a few words on this same parable. In that paper we said: "We think the parable primarily refers to the Jews and Gentiles. The rich man represented the Jews and Lazarus represented the Gentiles. The Jews were scattered, and are yet in a scattered condition. They are now being tormented. They had their good things under the law dispensation. But now, under the gospel dispensation, the Gentiles are enjoying the privileges of the gospel." We hold the same view of the matter now that we did then.

Brother Gwaltney says a preacher quoted the passage to prove that a son of God was lost. If the text proves what the preacher quoted it to prove, and the preacher preaches the truth, then there was a man in hell believing the truth. The preacher referred to advocates the idea that people are prevented from going to hell by preaching to them. The rich man advocated or believed the same thing, for he

desired Abraham to send Lazarus to warn his five brethren to prevent them going to that place of torment. Abraham did not believe that doctrine, for he said, "neither will they believe, though one arose from the dead." If all people who believe the doctrine that preacher advocates go to the same place, then they will all go to hell, if the place the rich man was in was what the preacher contends it was. If those who believe the truth do not go to hell, as that preacher teaches, then that preacher does not preach the truth, for the rich man in hell believed the doctrine that preacher teaches.

The whole Arminian system is out of joint and is too short at both ends. C. H. C.

Secret Orders

---February 14, 1911

We admit that it may seem inconsistent for brethren to refuse to fellowship members of their home church affiliating with secret orders and at the same time fellowship churches that allow such affiliation by their members. But sometimes some things are borne with that are not approved of or fellowshipped. The wrong, in the first place, was in those churches ever allowing their members to affiliate with secret institutions. The practice of affiliating with those things is wrong, and no man can defend it by the word of God, If it cannot be defended by the word of God it is wrong, and the churches that tolerate it are doing wrong.

The Lord commanded Peter to call no man common that He had cleansed, but the Lord has not cleansed the institutions of the world. Some people who have been cleansed by Him may unite and affiliate with those institutions, but when they do so they are not obeying or serving the Lord. They should serve the Lord only.

The Lord has but one church or kingdom on earth. If that kingdom is the Old Baptist Church (and we believe it is), then all other so called churches are only worldly institutions, no matter how much they may claim to be the church of Christ. Claiming to be the church of Christ does not make it so. The Masonic fraternity might claim to be the church of Christ, but that would not make it so. All those secret institutions are worldly institutions, and so are all so-called churches (even if they do claim to be the church of Christ), hence they are on a parity. One is as good as another, from that standpoint.

It seems to us that brethren should refrain from affiliating with those institutions, because it wounds the feelings of their brethren for them to do so. It has always seemed to us that those brethren should be as careful of the feelings of their brethren as those should be who are opposed to those things. It has always been contrary to the rules of the church, and it has seemed to us that a brother should regard the feelings of his brethren, and what has always been the rules of the church, and stay out of those things.

We do wish our brethren would lay these things down and have nothing to do with them. We are clear of it in our country, and we expect to remain that way. It has always resulted in trouble when churches allowed such things, and always will result that way, sooner or later. We may have troubles in other matters, but we hope to escape trouble on that by staying clear of it. May the Lord help us to serve and honor Him, is our prayer. C. H. C.

The Soul of Man

---February 14, 1911

That man has a soul which will exist as a living entity after the death of the body has always been a distinctive doctrine of the Baptists. They, as a people, have

always taught this doctrine. All who claim to be Baptists must admit that whatever is Baptist is Scriptural, or else they must admit that Baptists have not been Scriptural. If the Baptists are and have been Scriptural, then whatever is Baptist is Scriptural. So, if the Baptists have been Scriptural in their teaching, it is a Scriptural truth that man has a soul which exists as a living entity after the death of the body. A denial of this, and the doctrine that man will be utterly annihilated and have no conscious existence after death is a heathen doctrine.

The unregenerate possess a soul, but the soul is not called the inner man. Man is a complex being composed of soul, body and spirit. It takes all three to constitute a complete man. Man is one composed of three, just as God is one composed of three.

Regeneration is a spiritual work, and is the work of God's Spirit upon the spirit or soul of man; yet it is said by the Saviour, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." The man (sinner of Adam's race) is born again, or regenerated, by the work of the Holy Spirit upon his soul or spirit. In regeneration he receives a new life, a new principle, and from this new life springs new desires and new aspirations. The new life is a holy life, and therefore the new desires and aspirations springing from it are holy. In regeneration he receives a new nature, which is a divine nature. Hence he is "made partaker of the divine nature."

The old, or sinful, nature which he had before, has not been taken away. He still has that nature. Hence he now possesses two natures. He is now a man, composed of soul, body and spirit, in possession of two natures. This is why there is a warfare within. There is a warfare now between the old, sinful, nature, and the new, divine, nature. The old, sinful, nature and inclinations constitute the old man, the outer man. The new, divine, nature and inclinations constitute the new man, the inner man. We are commanded to crucify the old man. We should crucify, overcome, put down, the old principle, the old, sinful nature and inclinations.

We are commanded to put on the new man. We should put on, follow, and obey the new nature, the new desires and aspirations, the new man. We are commanded to put off the old man with his deeds. We should put off the old, sinful desires, inclinations, the old man, and follow after the new desires, aspirations, inclinations, the new man. It seems to us that these things are all plainly taught in the Scriptures, and that there is no good reason for anyone to deny them.

In this connection we will copy the following from the pen of Elder Hassell in the Gospel Messenger for February, 1911. C. H. C.

Q. Will the everlasting punishment of the wicked be annihilation or endless conscious torment?

A. Annihilation, of the utter extinction of conscious existence, is the doctrine of the heathen atheistic Buddhists; it is a sign and a cause of the most corrupt times. As proved by the context and by other Scriptures, destruction in the Scriptures never means annihilation. The Almighty never made anything for nothing; such an idea impeaches His omniscience and His unchangeably. Nonexistence, instead of being everlasting punishment, is an end of all punishment.

The Son of God never endured the infinite horrors of Gethsemane, Golgotha and Calvary to save sinners from unconscious nothingness. To every reverent, intelligent and candid believer in the Scriptures the following passages demonstrate, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the conscious, everlasting suffering of the wicked: **((Dan 12:2) (Daniel 12:2); ((0:28) (Matthew 10:28); ((9) (13:49); (25:36); (5:28); (Romans 2:6,16); ((Th 1:7) (II Thessalonians 1:7-8,9;) (Revelation 14:11); (19:20); (20:10); (21:8); (22:11)).** Satan, transforming himself into an angel of light, perverts these and other plain Scriptures into fables and nothingness. {**(Genesis 1:4-5); (II Corinthians**

11:3,14-15); (II Timothy 4:3-4); (Revelation 12:9)} The false doctrine of annihilationism was first broached, among professed Christians, in the fourth century, by Arnobius, of Africa, a superficial rhetorician; but it has found many followers, in the last two or three deteriorating centuries, among Materialists, Pantheists, Universalists, infidels and Arminians.

Life is not existence (for things without life exist); but life is a condition of existence; and so death (the opposite of life) is not nonexistence. Adam died (in trespasses and sins) in the day when he ate the forbidden fruit. **{(Genesis 2:17)}** but he still existed as a natural though sinful man. And so the Ephesians, who were "dead in trespasses and sins", had **{(Ephesians 2:5)}** a natural sinful existence, in which they walked in worldliness and disobedience, **{(Ephesians 2:2)}** until God quickened them, or gave them spiritual and divine life. The cutting off, or consuming, or perishing, or destruction of the wicked on earth **{((0) (Psalms 37:20,34,36,38); (Malachi 4:1,3)}** is their judicial, righteous, violent consignment to death, from which they "will come forth unto the resurrection of damnation". **{(John 5:29); (Matthew 25:41,46)}** Punishment is pain, physical or mental, and consciousness is essential to pain; therefore everlasting punishment is everlasting conscious pain-everlasting "contempt," **{((Dan 12:2) (Daniel 12:2)}** "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," **{(Romans 2:8-9)}** "everlasting fire," **{(Matthew 25:41)}** "where there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth." **{(Matthew 13:41-42)}** It seems enmity to God and cruelty to sinners to endeavor to soften these awful truths into annihilation or nothingness. Our English word punishment is derived from a Latin and Greek word meaning pain or suffering; and the Greek word rendered punishment in **(Matthew 25:46)** "(these shall go away into everlasting punishment)" means chastisement, and is in **(I John 4:18)** rendered torment. Christ saves His people from the everlasting torment deserved by their sins.-S. H.

Remarks to C. A. Clemons

---February 14, 1911

How would we know what our brethren have believed and taught in all ages since the days of the apostles were it not for their writings-the books which have been handed down to us? Old Rome burned the writings of our fathers, and burned our fathers, too. The same thing may be done again.

It is true that much is printed that should not be; but our people should read good literature. Their children will read something, and they should provide good literature for them to read.

Nearly all the trouble in the church springs from the pulpit. The preachers cause it. Then the papers tell us about it, and keep us posted. No doubt, however, too much is published about the troubles. More should be published about the good things, and less about the bad things. C. H. C.

Wheat and Tares

---February 21, 1911

On another page of this paper appears a letter from Brother John G. Rousseau, of Paint Rock, Ala., in which he takes issue with us concerning the wheat and the tares. We gave a short statement of our views on this in our issue of December 6, 1910. We do not propose to set up our views as standard, but we certainly think Brother Rousseau is wrong in his application of the subject.

It is a fact that most, if not all, the parables the Saviour used had primary reference to the closing out of the law dispensation, or the Jewish age, and the ushering in of the gospel dispensation, or gospel age. The original meaning of the term "end of the world," as used in the parables in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew, is the "end of the age;" the end of the dispensation. The word "world" in the original has no reference to this material universe. For this very reason Brother Rousseau's position cannot possibly be correct.

The passages quoted by Brother Rousseau showing that grievous wolves shall enter the church, and so on, does not, at all, disprove our statement that the parable has reference to the closing out of that Jewish age or dispensation.

An angel is a messenger. The Lord's angels were His apostles and ministers, and by their ministry and preaching they gathered the good out from among the bad. The good were gathered together in bundles into gospel worship and service.

If Brother Rousseau makes the proper application of the parable, it would be wrong to ever exclude anyone from the church, no matter what crime he might commit, for we understand his application to be that the tares are in the church, and must not be rooted up, or taken out, for fear of rooting up the wheat; and if this be a correct application it would destroy all church discipline. Not only so, but the Saviour does not say the field is the church, but the field is the world.

Other reasons might be given along this line, but we think these are sufficient. We trust Brother Rousseau and all our readers may consider these thoughts, and remember that we do not propose to be a standard, and that we are well aware of the fact that we make mistakes and are not always right. C. H. C.

Romans 5:18

---February 21, 1911

Brother O. G. Perkins, of Ratcliff, Ark., requests our views of **(Romans 5:18)**, which reads, "Therefore as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."

In the text the apostle shows that we were brought into a state of condemnation by the offense of one man. By his own disobedience, transgression, offense, Adam brought condemnation upon himself and his posterity. We are all only Adam multiplied, and we must, therefore, be in the same condition he placed himself.

Just as judgment came upon us to condemnation by the offense of one man, so by the righteousness of one we are justified. In the next verse the apostle declares that, "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." How many were made sinners by one man's disobedience? There can be but one reasonable answer given to this question, and that is, all who were represented by him-and that must be all his race, for he was the federal head and representative of the race.

On the other hand, who are made righteous by the obedience of one? What is true regarding the other question must also be true regarding this-only one reasonable answer can be given, and that is, all who were represented by Him. Christ was the one who rendered the obedience. Hence, all that Christ represented will be made righteous by His obedience. These are sinners of Adam's race made righteous by the obedience of Christ. Any other theory denies the work of Christ in atonement, and denies grace in the salvation of sinners. C. H. C.

Luke 5:4,7 AND John 21:11

---February 21, 1911

Elder D. M. McMillin, of High Point, N.C., requests our views of **((4) (Luke 5:4,7)and (John 21:11)**. The reader will please turn to the passages and read them, beginning with the first verse of the chapter.

In (Luke 5) the Saviour makes use of a fisherman and the draught of fishes to illustrate a part of the work for the ministry. Notice the latter clause of ((0) (Luke 5:10), "From henceforth thou shalt catch men."

In (John 21) the Saviour shows His power to protect, care for and feed His servants. The disciples had forsaken the service of the Lord and returned to their former worldly occupation of fishing. The Saviour shows them here that He is able to feed them, and that they need have no fear but what they will be provided for in all their necessities. We should not turn away from the service of God on account of a fear that we will suffer temporally. The Lord will provide food for us and will care for us. C. H. C.

Hulsey – Cayce Debate

---February 28, 1911

In another place in this paper is a clipping from the Doctrinal Interpreter concerning the discussion between us and the Rev. J. W. Hulsey, of Waldron, Ark., which was held at Dayton, Ark., Dec. 20 and 21, with some comments by Elder Moses Barton, of Abbott, who was present during the whole discussion.

In said clipping the Rev. L. A. Robertson says, "Hulsey could not drive him, while he was in the affirmative, to tell how infants are saved." The Rev. Mr. Robertson either knows this is not true, or else he was so bewildered, like his brother, the Rev. Hulsey, that he did not know what we did say. We do not like to charge the gentleman with dishonesty-so we will just charge it to his ignorance. He did not know when a plain answer was given to a question.

Again, the Rev. gentleman says, "Cayce is the ablest debater on earth in the Hardshell ranks, but he could not stand before the matchless logic of Hulsey." Shades of Aristotle, Demosthenes, Cicero, Paul and John! The wonderful logic of Hulsey, indeed! Oh, it was wonderful! Here is a sample of it, according to the report of the Rev. Parson Robertson himself: The Rev. Hulsey affirmed that "The Scriptures teach that in regeneration, or the new birth, the Lord uses the gospel (written or preached word) as a means." His first argument was that Christ died for all. Now the logic is, Christ died for all; therefore, the Lord uses the gospel as a means in regeneration! That is the logic of the whole fifteen arguments given by the Rev. Parson Robertson. The reader may take it and apply it himself and see how wonderful it is. Why, God bless your soul, who could stand before such wonderful logic as that? Is it not a shame that those Softshells, tadpoles, would select a man with such logical powers as displayed by Parson Hulsey that would not allow the opponent even a ghost of a show? Wonderful indeed!

But the Rev. Robertson shows his ignorance again in saying, "Cayce is the ablest debater on earth in the Hardshell ranks." He shows his ignorance or illbreeding in calling us Hardshells- but in doing so he admits that he is a Softshell. We think he must be of the tadpole variety of Softshells. Why would he say that Cayce is the ablest debater in the Hardshell ranks? For sympathy, and to palliate their hurting and smarting under a sense of their defeat. That can be the only reason. It is a plain case of "pleading the baby act," just as Hulsey did more than once during the discussion. But the book will show for itself when it is published. As stated by Brother Barton, the price will be about fifty cents. Elder J. B. Little, Abbott, Ark., is

taking orders for it. We will say that orders may also be sent to us. Do not send us any money for them, but write and say how many copies you will take when they are published. Please do this at once. C.H.C.

Note,-The stenographer claimed he lost his notes, so the above debate was never published.

Authority Again

---March 7, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce:
Dear Brother

Some time ago I asked you a few questions concerning the authority of the regular Baptists, known as the Missionary Baptists. You say in your answer to me that they have no right or authority as ordained ministers. Now, my dear brother, please tell me in your paper, or by letter, was Dr. Carey, who is well known in church history, also Judson, Rice, Dr. Clark, Dr. Ward, and many others who came across the mighty deep-were all these brethren without any authority? Now, you say that baptism is not valid when administered by the Missionary Baptists. Now, my dear brother, tell me, when did they lose their authority? Tell me when the Primitive Baptists got their authority? I am in a rut between the two Baptist bodies on the mission question, and it is your duty to show me where to go, or which way to step, to get out. May the Lord bless you, my dear brother. Your brother in love, D. C. Bishop. Randle, Wash.

REMARKS In our issue of November 15, 1910, we answered Brother Bishop regarding the authority of the Missionary Baptists to administer baptism. He now sends the above, which is practically a repetition of the former question, for it simply resolves itself into the same thing.

Brother Bishop's contention amounts to simply this: That as the Missionary Baptists and Primitive Baptists were once together, and therefore started at the same time, or sprang from the same place, the authority of the Missionary Baptists must be as good as the authority of the Primitive Baptists. This is the whole matter summed up in a nutshell, as to his contention. It is the sum of the contention of many others on the same point. Now let us candidly examine the matter. If that position is correct, it will do no one an injury to know it.

In our examination let us remember distinctly that names have nothing whatever to do with it. A spade would not be changed by calling it a hoe or a plow or a horse. It is principles that count, and not names. Bear this fact in mind.

Now, let us proceed. In 1811 Alexander Campbell united with the Baptists. He soon began advocating his new doctrines. In 1827 the Baptists withdrew fellowship from him and his followers. Campbell was once with the Baptists and was, for a while, a strong advocate of their doctrine. While with them he began advocating other doctrines. Some others among the Baptists imbibed his teachings. Then they were withdrawn from or excluded, by those who held the original Baptist views. Now, the question is, Do the followers of Campbell-those who now advocate the doctrines that he introduced among the Baptists have a Scriptural right or authority to administer baptism? There was a division in the Baptist ranks. Do both sides (the Baptist side and the Campbellite side) have a Scriptural right to administer baptism? We are sure Brother Bishop would say no. Then we would ask, why not? The Campbellites were once with the Baptists, and if the fact that Missionaries were once with us proves that they have a gospel right, or authority, to administer baptism, it will prove that the Campbellites have the same right. But the followers of Mr. Campbell do not have that right, for the plain and simple reason that Mr.

Campbell and his followers departed from original Baptist teaching. This, of course, is true, if the original Baptist teaching is Scriptural, and we presume Brother Bishop would say it is Scriptural. Then, if the Campbellites do not have Scriptural authority to administer baptism because they have departed from Scriptural teaching, neither do the Missionaries have the Scriptural authority to administer baptism if they departed from Scriptural teaching.

Again. The Catholics separated from the Baptists about the third century, as stated in our issue of November 15, 1910. They were once with the Baptists. Do they have a gospel right to administer baptism because they were once with us? No. Why not? Because they departed from Scriptural teaching and practice. Hence they have no Scriptural authority to administer baptism. If this is true concerning the Roman Catholics, it is just as true concerning the Missionaries, if they have departed from Scriptural teaching and practice.

Now, Brother Bishop admits that they have departed from Scriptural teaching and practice on the mission question. He certainly admits that the Old Baptists are right in speaking of joining them-or else he has contemplated joining a people whose doctrine he does not believe, and we do not suppose this to be the case.

Brother Bishop asks about Carey, Judson, Rice and Clark. Dr. John Clark was the founder of the first Baptist church in America in 1638. That is, he organized this church. This was long before the days of Fuller, Carey, Rice and Judson. About the year 1790 Fuller and Carey began to introduce the new doctrine and practice on missions. The Baptist Encyclopedia, by William Cathcart, in the sketch of William Carey, says:

He issued a pamphlet entitled "An Inquiry into the Obligation of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathen." This publication made a deep impression upon Mr. Carey's friends, and it had an extensive influence in turning their minds and hearts to the idolaters of distant lands. Mr. Carey became pastor of the church in Leicester in 1789, and there he labored with untiring faithfulness among his flock, and formed plans with unquenchable zeal for the salvation of the heathen. From this church he went forth to India to give God's Word to its vast population.

At the meeting of his association, which was held at Nottingham, May 30, 1792, he preached on **((4:2) (Isaiah 54:2-3))**, announcing the two memorable divisions of his discourse: "Expect great things from God; attempt great things for God." The sermon stirred up the hearts of his hearers as they had never been before; every one felt the guilt of keeping the gospel from perishing myriads, and the need of making an effort to win His ignorant enemies to their Master. At Kettering, the church of Andrew Fuller, the Baptist Missionary Society was organized Oct. 2, 1792. The society was formally instituted in the house of the widow of Deacon Beeby Wallis. The little parlor which witnessed the birth of this society was the most honored room in the British Islands, or in any part of Christendom; in it was formed the first society of modern times for spreading the gospel among the heathen, the parent of all the great modern PROTESTANT MISSIONARY SOCIETIES IN EXISTENCE.

The emphasis in the above is ours. Notice, please, that this society is the parent of all the modern Protestant societies in existence. Then it is not Baptist. Were the Baptists wrong all along the line from the parent church at Jerusalem down to Oct. 2, 1792? NO. The church was organized on right principles without these things, and were right in not having them in all those years, notwithstanding the fact W. F. Bainbridge says, in his book, "Around the World Tour of Christian Missions," page 80:

And when we observe, notwithstanding the wonderful spread of Christianity during the subsequent two centuries, what lamentable weaknesses were manifested all along in the conflicts with heresies and with the world, and finally, that in the fourth century, the church suffered almost an entire eclipse by the world, we are tempted to look for explanation somewhat in the very methods of that early church. Would it not have been better for Paul and the other early founders to have arranged contributions from the churches sufficient, not only for the poor, but to enable their ministry and missionaries to give their undivided attention to the more thorough instruction and more potent leadership of their people? Do not forget that this learned Missionary charges error here to the eminent and inspired Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles. What blasphemy!

In a circular letter of the Philadelphia Association of 1806, after this association had imbibed the teachings of Fuller, Carey, Judson, Rice, Marshman, Ward & Co., on the mission question, in which circular letter is set forth what gave rise to the birth of modern missions, we find this statement: "It is, however, a very remarkable circumstance, that in modern missions Papal Rome has led the way."

Rome led the way-Christ and the apostles did not. These men, in introducing these things among the Baptists, were not following our Lord, but were following Papal Rome. This is their own admission and statement. It is not a charge gotten up by some narrow-minded prejudiced enemy. They have said so themselves. Then, since they are following Rome, and not our Lord, pray tell us by what authority they can administer an ordinance of our Lord's house?

Fuller, Carey, Judson, Rice, Marshman and Ward were some of the leaders in this modern movement, in following Rome. These things were borne with, although contended against by many, for years. During those years the faithful soldiers who stood firmly for the apostolic practice and original order of things, groaned under the great burden. Finally forbearance had long ceased to be a virtue, and a painful separation was the result.

Now, the question is, which is the seceding party? Every fair-minded, candid, honest, person, in the light of these indisputable facts, must say the Missionary Baptist party is the seceding party. They have departed from original Baptist principles, and have no more right even to the name Baptist than a Mormon, a Brahmin or a Buddhist.

With these facts before you, Brother Bishop, it seems to us that there is but one thing you could consistently do, and that is leave these followers of Rome, with all their men made institutions, societies, mission machinery, so called baptism, ordination and all, and unite with the old order of Baptists who are contending earnestly and faithfully for the order of our Lord's house, and who are willing to bear all the reproaches and anathemas of a proud and vain world for His own dear sake. May the Lord help you to decide aright. C. H. C.

Acts 13:48

---March 21, 1911

James T. Morgan, of Buford, Ga., asks us, regarding **(Acts 13:48)**, "Who were they that were ordained unto eternal life, and when?" The text reads, "And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." The word ordain means to prepare or to appoint. The word from which ordained is translated, means to arrange in an orderly manner; assign or dispose; addict; appoint; determine; ordain; set. The text, therefore, must necessarily teach that those who believed were already

ordained or appointed to eternal life. As they were appointed to eternal life, the question would arise, "who appointed, or ordained, them to eternal life?" The apostle answers this in **(Ephesians 1:4-5)**, "According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in Jove: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will." Here it is plainly stated that they were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, which means before the ages of time began. God made choice of them, and predestinated, appointed, ordained, before the ages of time began, that they should have eternal life. Acts cording to that predestination, appointment, ordination, God gives them eternal life here in time. Then they are capacitated to believe, and when they hear the good news, glad tidings, or gospel of Christ, and believe, it proves, manifests the fact, shows that they are ordained to eternal life. Although this doctrine has been despised by the world, and those who teach it are called by hard names now, just as the apostles and prophets were, yet it is God's eternal truth and will stand amidst the wreck and crash of worlds, and is a comforting and soul cheering doctrine to the child of God when rightly understood. In the sovereign choice and purpose of God, and what He does in bringing about His own determination, rests our hope of heaven and immortal glory beyond this world of sorrow and tears. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 15:22

---March 28, 1911

Brother J. C. Davidson, of Shannon, Miss., requests us to give our views of **(I Corinthians 15:22)**, which reads, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." In this chapter the apostle is treating upon the subject of the resurrection of the bodies of the Lord's people. This fact should be remembered and kept in mind in considering the verse mentioned. It is the Lord's people that he is talking about. They all die in Adam. They die every day, and their bodies are consigned to the tomb. They will all be made alive in Christ. Their bodies will be raised again. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." Christ was the first fruits. When He comes again the bodies of all His saints will be raised- "afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." He was talking here about the Lord's people, and no others. C. H. C.

Plagiarism

---March 28, 1911

Plagiarism is to steal another's writings. Our attention has been called to some articles that have appeared in our columns-one of them not long since-that appeared as original articles from those whose names were signed to them, when they were really copied. We had not noticed the fact until our attention was called to it. It is all right to copy the writings of others when proper credit is given, but it is wrong to copy the writings of others and send out as our own productions. We hope this will not occur again. "A hint to the wise is sufficient." C. H. C.

2 Corinthians 7:10

---April 11, 1911

Brother W. G. Thompson, Montague, Texas, requests our views of ((0) (II Corinthians 7:10), which reads, "A godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death." A godly sorrow cannot come from an ungodly source. A godly sorrow, then, must proceed from a godly heart-a heart that has been made right. Godly sorrow works repentance. To repent is to turn from. To repent of wickedness is to be, first, sorry for it and then to turn from it, with a sincere effort and desire to live right. When you see one who is thus exercised, you see one whose heart has been made right, and his repentance is unto, or with reference to, his salvation. "The sorrow of the world worketh death." One may be sorry his meanness has been found out-he may be sorry that he is discovered-and yet not be sorry that he committed the crime. His sorrow does not come from a good heart, for he would do the same crime again, if he thought he would not be discovered and punished for it. C. H. C.

John 1:9

---April 11, 1911

Brother H. M. Williams, Indian Trail, N. C, requests our views of (**John 1:9**), which reads, "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." The true Light refers to Jesus. Verse four says, "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men." He gives life in giving light. The word "world" in Scripture does not always refer to this material universe, nor to all the race of mankind. The ungodly world is spoken of. Hence, the term "world" sometimes embraces the ungodly only. "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed."-(Luke 2:1). Here the word "world" embraces the Roman Empire. It evidently does not embrace all the race of mankind. This is enough to show that the term does not always refer to the whole race of Adam. So He does not give light to every man that comes into the material universe, but to every one who comes into the spiritual world, or spiritual realm. "My kingdom is not of this world," says Jesus. Then it must be of another world. It is a spiritual kingdom, and pertains to the spiritual realm. Jesus lights every one that "cometh into" this spiritual world or realm. C. H. C.

Can't Help It

---April 18, 1911

We frequently hear brethren speak of the enormous sums of money contributed to the cause of popular religion. It seems to be easy for men to be true to a false cause and to sacrifice unto idols. Is it possible that the worshipers of idols love their gods more than we love our God?-Predestinarian Baptist, April 1, 1911.

The paper from which the above clipping is taken teaches that God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate all things that come to pass, both good and bad. If the worldly religion is what the editor refers to as popular religion, and his doctrine is the truth, then God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that enormous sums of money should be contributed to worldly religion. If the worldly, or popular, religion is what the elder refers to as a false cause, and the elder's doctrine is the truth, then God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that enormous sums of money should be contributed to a false cause. It seems to us that it would be easy for one to do a certain way, if God has, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that he should do that way and no other way. According to the elder's doctrine, they could not

sacrifice unto idols, nor even will to do so, unless God willed and predestinated that they should do so.

We would conclude that if God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate that "the worshipers of idols" should "love their gods more than we love our God," it is possible for them to do so, or else God has absolutely and unconditionally predestinated something that is impossible. According to the elder's doctrine, if he does not love God more than the worshipers of idols love their gods, it must be because God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that he should not. Does one who advocates such a doctrine really and truly love God at all? C. H. C.

What Is The Reason?

---April 25, 1911

"But when thou doest alms let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth."- (Matthew 6:3). This text is sometimes quoted to prove that secrecy should be maintained in contributing to the support of the ministry, as if that was giving alms. Alms are given to feed the poor, and Jesus here instructed His disciples not to publish or boast of their deeds of charity. But in supporting the cause of truth I can see no reason that one should object to his left hand knowing what his right hand does, except it is because his right hand don't do anything or does so little that he is ashamed of it. C.

The above is from the Predestinarian Baptist of April 1, 1911. We suppose it is from the pen of Elder W. I. Carnell, as it is signed "C."

According to Elder Carnell's doctrine, that God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate all things whatsoever cometh to pass, if one does not do anything, it must be because God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that he should not. Elder R. H. Boas swore on the witness stand that "man has not the power to will or to do a sinful act unless God predestinated and willed that he should do it." When Elder Carnell was on the witness stand, in the Bethel (Ky.) Church suit, the following question was put to him, which appears in his deposition: "You mean that He (God) designed, or purposed, the individual, or such an individual should commit the individual sinful acts or conduct?" His answer was: "I believe that He did purpose that as well as all things else." Hence, according to the elder's doctrine, if a man's right hand "don't do anything," it must be because God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that he should not do anything. And if his right hand does only a little, it must be because God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that he should do only a little. Then, after all, the elder feigns that he does not know why "one should object to his left hand knowing what his right hand does, except it be because his right hand don't do anything or does so little that he is ashamed of it."

It seems to us that the matter is very easily explained, according to the elder's doctrine; for, according to his doctrine, if one objects to his left hand knowing what his right hand does, it must be because God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate that he should object; and he could do no other way, because God must have absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that he should do no other way than to object. So, also, if he is ashamed, it must be because God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate that he should be ashamed.

According to the elder's doctrine, God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated, from all eternity, that the right hand of some should do nothing, and that the right hand of others should do just a little, and likewise predestinated that they should

object to letting their left hand know what their right hand does, and that they should be ashamed for the left hand to know what their right hand does. And He also likewise predestinated that Elder Carnell should insinuate that their right hand should do more, when He has absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that they should do just what they do and no more. And He also likewise predestinated that we should not believe such doctrine, and that we should object to it. And He also likewise predestinated that the elder should call us Bildads, Arminians and other nicknames, because we do not believe and teach what God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated we should not believe and teach.
Oh, good Lord, do deliver us! C. H. C.

Baptist Missionary Centennial

---April 25, 1911

On June 13, 1813, Adoniram and Ann Hasseltine Judson landed in Rangoon, Burma, and began the enterprise of American Baptist Foreign Missions. There was no general Baptist missionary society in the United States at that time, and in response to their appeal the support of Mr. and Mrs. Judson was assumed by a Massachusetts Baptist Missionary society. In response to a call issued by this society and others, on May 18, 1814, there was formed in Philadelphia "The General Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions." This long title was soon abbreviated in common use to "The Triennial Convention," as it then met only once in three years. Now the centennial of the birth of American Baptist Missions is to be celebrated. In 1913 the celebration is to be in Burma, and as many American Baptists as possible are invited to attend. The centennial of the formation of the missionary society will be held in America. The Watchman says:

"It ought to be the greatest gathering of Baptists ever held on this continent or in the world, greater than the great meetings of the Baptist World Alliance in Philadelphia next June." A special Judson Centennial Commission has been appointed by the Board of Managers of the Foreign Mission Society, which met for organization in Rochester, N. Y., on March 16. The Watchman, from which we take the above facts, adds: "Before the beginning of their foreign missions, the Baptists of the United States were weak, scattered and had little communication with each other. It was the organization of their Foreign Mission society which brought them together, gave them a common purpose; taught them their power, and laid the foundation for the great united and powerful body they are today. This centennial celebration is, therefore, not only a missionary celebration, but commemorates the beginning of a new era of life and growth of American Baptists."

We clip the above from the Baptist and Reflector, Nashville, Tenn., of March 23, 1911. It contains some information concerning the mission business. The centennial of the birth of American Baptist missions is to be celebrated in 1913. Adoniram Judson and his wife were the first to go to the foreign field as missionaries from America. This was in 1813. That was the time of the birth of American missions. Foreign missions was a new thing then among the Baptists of America. The Softshells have the baby yet. They still engage in this, and adopt most every new measure that comes along. They marry every girl that they meet, when they can. They are the new sort of Baptists. The name is all they want, and they have no right to that. They are truly Fullerites, just as much as the followers of Campbell are Campbellites.

According to a statement in the above clipping the Softshells are not bound together by the ties of Christian love and fellowship. They are bound together by the ties of their foreign mission societies. They admit the truth in this. If their men made mission societies were dispensed with, and their ponderous money propelled mission machinery brought to a stop for a short time, the whole fraternity would go to pieces in a "jiffy." It is not bound together nor kept up by the divine influence of God's love and the Holy Spirit, but by the enthusiasm and energy of men who are looking for soft jobs at a fat salary. Covetousness -the love of money-is the root of the whole humbug machine. C. H. C.

A Right Step

---April 25, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-I have been requested by the few members of the South College Street Primitive Baptist Church, at Nashville, Tenn., who have affiliated themselves with secret orders, to write you for publication that, for the sake of peace and fellowship with the brethren everywhere, they have agreed to lay them down and will affiliate with them no more. Your little brother in hope, W. E. Waddell. 1014 Lischey Ave, Nashville, Tenn.

Brother Cayce, we are expecting you to be with us this coming Sunday, the 16th; please don't disappoint us, as we need the service of all such preachers as you are. We all love you and want you to come amongst us. Pray for us when it goes well with you. W. E. W.

REMARKS We are glad to know of the agreement of these brethren, that they will lay down their secret orders and affiliate with them no more. This has been a complaint of brethren for years against this church, and those who heard that some of her members affiliated with secret orders did not approve of it. We trust these good brethren will, from now on, be clear of this.

We filled our appointments there on the 16th, and have promised to be with them again, the Lord willing, the fifth Sunday in this month and the second Sunday in May. C. H. C.

Christian Churches Plan Joining Forces Unity Foundation Embraces Protestant, Greek and Catholic Bodies

---May 2, 1911

The following was published in the Republic, St. Louis, Mo., last July, under the above heading. We give it space for our readers, without comment. It clearly shows an effort for the uniting of Catholicism and Protestantism. The doctrines which the Protestants have borrowed from Rome will be returned some day. It will be a dreadful time for Old Baptists then. C. H. C.

New York, July 20. - Articles of incorporation have been filed in the County Clerk's office for a religious organization to be composed of all Christian churches, including Protestant denominations, the Roman Catholic and Greek churches. It is incorporated under the name, "A Christian Unity Foundation," and it will aim to do for Christianity what the Carnegie and Sage Foundations do for education. A lay member has offered \$10,000 to pay initial expenses. All of the leaders in the movement are men prominent in the Protestant Episcopal Church. The incorporators are twelve clergymen and twelve laymen.

They represent both high and low churches. Six of the clergy are bishops. According to the incorporation the purpose of this foundation is:

"To promote Christian unity at home and throughout the world. To this end to gather and disseminate accurate information relative to the faith and works of Christian bodies; to set forth the great danger of our unhappy divisions and the waste of spiritual energy due thereto; to devise and suggest practical methods of cooperation, substituting comity for rivalry in the propagation of the common faith; to bring together all who are laboring in the same field, and this in the belief that full knowledge of one another will emphasize our mutual membership in the one body of Christ and our common agreement in the essentials of faith."

"That finally, by the operation of the Spirit of God, the various Christian bodies may be knit together in more evident unity in the essentials of faith and practice and in one organized body. So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another."

Most of the movers in this cause live in or near this city. The laymen represent the army, the navy, lawyers and business men.

The foundation is considered significant in the religious world, coming just at the close of the World Missionary Convention in Edinburgh, Scotland, when 1,200 delegates from every part of the world met to discuss unity in foreign mission work. It is also considered significant that it is the Episcopal Church in America that has promoted the organization, inasmuch as this was the only large denomination that refused to join the Federal Council of the Church of Christ in America formed a few years ago.

Missionaries Not Wanted Chinaman Writes Book Against Their Activities - Says They Harm His People

---May 2, 1911

We copy the following dispatch from London from the Tennessean and American (Nashville, Tenn.). Comment is unnecessary. C. H. C. London, April 22.-The "heathen Chinese," educated, civilised and equipped with a sound knowledge of modern civilisation, is appealing to the Christian countries to withdraw their "Bibliolatrous missionaries" from the Celestial kingdom. Mr. Lin ShaoYang, in a book just published entitled "A Chinese Appeal to Christendom Concerning Christian Missions," protests against, the "absurd, contemptible and demoralizing medley that forms the stock in trade of missionaries," and urges that China be left to work out her own salvation, as far as religion is concerned, without western interference.

His method of argument is mainly a bland astonishment and questioning. Dealing with the present condition of Christianity in Europe, he observes:

"What we wonder at is that your missionary zeal should not only remain unabated, but should actually show signs of increasing activity during an epoch which is obviously one of religious unrest throughout all Christian lands, and in which historical research and scientific methods of criticism have caused the gravest doubts to be thrown on the truth of some of the fundamental propositions of Christian faith."

"Do the missionaries propose to convert the Chinese and then wait for the Chinese to reconvert the west?"

"It is because I am firmly convinced that some of the teachings and methods of very many foreign missionaries are seriously defective

themselves, harmful to the people of China and disastrous to the causes of truth, civilisation and international harmony, that I have obliged myself to undertake the difficult and cheerless task of issuing this appeal to the people of the Christian west."

Mr. Lin ShaoYang put a series of questions to the western people. Are those who are not earnest, professing Christians, he asks, worse than their more ardent neighbors in England? Can it be the people of China, half the population of the world, are really doomed to everlasting damnation, as the missionary's creed, as he understands it, postulates? Cannot the missionaries understand that Christianity must be presented to the Chinese in a form "that will bear the closest scrutiny?" How are the catch words of the missionaries, he asks, superior to those of Buddhism and Shintoism and Mohammedanism? The Christianity of the missionaries, he asserts, is crude and out of date. Why is it not expounded in its most modern and intellectual form? "If I pay a visit to a modern observatory shall I be told that the sun goes round the earth because, forsooth, the astronomer's ancestors believed it?"

"What will the unlettered Christian missionary do with a Chinese who has read Hume, or Spencer, or McTaggart, or Bradley, or Nietzsche, and Der Antichrist and is prepared to discuss them with him? It cannot be too strongly emphasised that the Chinese do not want Europe's cast off theology, and if you insist upon thrusting it upon them it is not unlikely that there will some day be a terrible reaction, resulting in the definite expulsion from China of all western religion."

Foe to Freedom

---May 9, 1911

"The Foe to Freedom" is the title of a book written by S. P. Mothershead, Jr., of House Springs, Mo. The author is a Missionary Baptist, and the book was published by the Baptist Flag, Fulton, Ky., and contains eighty nine pages. It has nine chapters, the subjects of which are as follows: "Origin, Development and Doctrines of Romanism;" "Cardinal Doctrines of Rome;" "Early Persecutions of Christians by Rome;" "Persecutions in Piedmont in the 17th Century;" "Romanism in American Politics;" "Roman Catholics and the Indians;" "Roman Catholics and the Public Schools;" "Some Official Transactions;" "The Present Outlook." It is a splendid work, and we wish every Baptist and every Protestant in the United States could procure and read a copy of it. By all means, get a copy for yourself, read it carefully, study it prayerfully; then lend it to others to read who will not, or cannot, get one for themselves.

It is high time we were waking from our lethargy and slumber, if we would have our religious freedom preserved. The freedom purchased for us by the blood of our fathers is fast slipping away from us, and at the present rate things are going, in a few more years we must bow to the mandates of the priest or pope, or suffer the fate of millions of martyrs of the past. May the Lord, in mercy, help us to arouse to the danger and help us to escape the torture!

The price of the little book written by Elder Mothershead is only 25 cents. Send that amount to the Baptist Flag, Fulton, Ky., and get one. Or, send more money and get more of the books and get them circulated. If you prefer, you can send the money to us, and we will have the book sent to you. We offer to do this for your convenience only, because we desire the work to be circulated. We would get

nothing whatever out of it, no matter how many you might order. We have a copy, and have just finished reading it, and can say that the author merely hints at the crimes that have been committed by Rome in the past; and what they have done in the past they will do again if they can.

A sister who was reared a Catholic told us that it is a fact that if a Catholic is working for you and the priest or pope gives orders to this Catholic to put you and your family "out of the way," that the Catholic is bound under oath to obey the order. We are asleep! Let us awake! C. H. C.

How Can They Help It?

---May 9, 1911

In traveling among the churches I notice that in every church there are a few brethren bearing the burdens and trying to maintain public worship. These brethren have a right to expect and to demand that every member of the church shall assist them in this work according to their several ability.-Predestinarian Baptist, April 18, 1911.

According to the doctrine advocated by the paper from which the above clipping is taken, God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate that some should not help to bear the burdens or try to maintain public worship; for the paper advocates the doctrine that God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate all things that come to pass, both good and bad. Now the writer of the above (the editor, we suppose) says the brethren who bear the burdens have a right to expect and to demand that every member shall assist in bearing the burdens. Then they have a right to expect them to do differently from the way God has absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that they should do. We do not know how one could expect a man to do differently from the way God has absolutely and unconditionally predestinated he should do, unless we should expect him to thwart God's predestination. And we must confess that we do not know how we could expect that, especially since Elder Boaz swore that "man has not the power to will or to do anything that thwarts God's purpose or predestination." According to this statement man cannot even will to do anything that would thwart God's predestination; and every man's will, then, is just as God predestinated it should be, and it could not, nor cannot, be any way only the way it is. Yet the Predestinarian Baptist tells us we have a right to expect and to demand that it be different.

But the editor says they "have a right to expect and to demand that every member of the church shall assist them in this work according to their several ability." And since, according to their sworn testimony, man cannot even will to do anything that thwarts God's predestination, then they cannot do nor will to do more than they do. Hence, they are all doing as much as they can, for they cannot do differently from the way God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated they should do. Every one, then, does assist according to his ability.

We wonder what the editor of the Predestinarian Baptist is complaining about, anyhow. Does he complain just because God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated, from all eternity, that he should complain, and he just has it to do to carry out God's predestination?

Truly, "the legs of the lame," etc. C. H. C.

Origins of the Denominations

---May 23, 1911

Baptists, A. D. 31, by Jesus Christ. Catholics separated from the Baptists in A. D. 251 and gradually drifted into the present form. The first Universal Bishop or Pope was Boniface III, who was made such by Emperor Phocas, A. D. 606. Lutherans, A. D. 1530, by Martin Luther. Presbyterians, A. D. 1535, by John Calvin. Episcopalians, A. D. 1540, by King Henry VIII Congregationalists, A. D. 1605, by John Robinson. Methodists, A. D. 1729, by John Wesley. Freewill Baptists, A. D. 1780, by Benj. Randall. Campbellites, A. D. 1827, by Alexander Campbell. Quakers, A. D. 1648, by Geo. Fox. Dunkards (Brethren), A. D. 1708, by Alexander Mack. Mormons, A. D. 1830, by Joseph Smith. Hardshell Baptists, A. D. 1832, by Daniel Parker. Seventh Day Adventists, A. D. 1843, by Wm. Miller. Pentecostal Church of the Najarene, A. D. 1895, by P. F. Breese. Conventionite Baptists is a church now forming and no doubt in a few years will be a full fledged denomination. It is headed in that direction and in the course of nature it will soon come to pass. Already the Conventionites are practically out of fellowship with the main body of Baptists. How long it will take to develop into a new denomination remains to be seen.

The above from the Arkansas Baptist of May 17, 1911, we suppose is a fair sample of the way Bogard states facts. He says the "Hardshell Baptists" originated in 1832 by Daniel Parker. We suppose he refers to the people we stand identified with, as such men as Bogard call them "Hardshells." He knows his statement is false. Again, he says, "Conventionite Baptists is a church now forming." This he knows to be a false statement. He knows that the first mission board among Baptists was formed in 1792, in Kettering, England. The English Baptist Home Mission Society was formed in 1797; the Baptist Irish Society in 1814; the American Baptist Publication Society in 1824; American Baptist Home Missionary Society in 1832; the American Baptist Missionary Union, formerly the Baptist General Convention, in 1814. He knows that the introduction of these things among the Baptists caused the division which formally began in 1832, which was final after several years in the 40's in some sections.

The Southern Baptist Convention was formed in 1845. The Convention and Board missions being introduced among the Baptists, with their doctrines, caused the division then, and Bogard knows it. Hence the Conventionite Baptists is a church already formed, and originated in the days of Fuller, Carey, Judson, Rice, Marshman and Ward. Bogard slanders his convention brethren when he says they are now forming a church. But he contends that the boards and conventions are new and unscriptural. As we refused to accept them when they were introduced among the Baptists, we are, therefore, the old order of Baptists. Bogard and his folks are trying to form a new church, by seceding from the Boardites and Conventionites, for they are splitting off from the people who had their origin with those things.

Our people have never opposed a minister preaching at any place where his lot was cast. Our contention has ever been that the Lord assigns the man his field of labor, and we have ever held the sentiment expressed by Hon. Thos. E. Watson, that "the field should support the missionary," or the man who does the preaching, and that it is unreasonable and unscriptural that he be supported by the United States while laboring in a foreign field.

It is plainly evident that Bogard "twists" in order to maintain his contention, and then he fails. C. H. C.

False Reports

---May 30, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-It is being told in this country that you challenged Elder Sikes for a debate and Elder Sikes accepted the challenge and then you backed out and got Brother Thompson to take your place, and Brother Thompson debated three days and Elder Sikes got Brother Thompson so befuddled that Brother Thompson would not meet Elder Sikes the fourth day, and that Brother Thompson's own moderator took sides with Elder Sikes. It is also being told that The Primitive Baptist is not as sound as it was in your father's lifetime; that your father was an Absolute Predestinarian, and that your father did not believe that the happiness of the people of God while on this earth was in any way conditional. I have been taking The Primitive Baptist ten years and I know that you are contending for the same doctrine that your father did. I have heard your father preach five times and heard him in debate four days, and I was with him nearly all the time he was in this country, and he asked me in the presence of Elder J. J. Massie while in this country on a preaching tour who strewed this "Absolute" seed in this country.

Now, Brother Cayce, I know that these things are not so, but some people do not, and it seems to me that a good thing to do is to republish some of your father's editorials on predestination. Your brother, C. C. Cunningham. Wiggins, Miss.

REMARKS

Elder Sikes did not accept our challenge. It stands yet as we made it, and has not been accepted by anyone. The debate Elder Thompson had with Elder Sikes resulted from a proposition Elder Sikes signed to meet Elder Towry. We never had a thing on earth to do with that discussion or in getting it up. Elder Thompson took Elder Towry's place. Elder Sikes did not get Elder Thompson befuddled. Elder Sikes accused Elder Thompson of charging consequences, which Elder Thompson and his moderator, Elder J. T. Stewart, denied. Hence the discussion was declared off. Elder Thompson's moderator didn't take sides with Elder Sikes.

As to the soundness of The Primitive Baptist, will say that the paper speaks for itself. No article was ever published from the pen of Elder S. F. Cayce in this paper that we would not willingly publish again. The man who says Elder S. F. Cayce advocated the doctrine of the absolute and unconditional predestination of all things in The Primitive Baptist either ignorantly or wilfully falsifies.

As to whether he believed that the happiness of God's people in this world is in any way conditional, will say that he wrote the eleventh item of the Abstract of Principles which this paper is published in defense of. The articles have never been changed since his death. They appear in this paper from time to time. That's an answer to that false statement.

We may republish some of his writings later on. C. H. C.

Questions

---May 30, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce:
Dear Brother

For a long time I have wanted to ask some questions; seeing your answer to Brother D. C. Bishop, I feel that I might now venture, I am sincere and ask for information. Did Christ or the apostles ever organize an association such as Baptists now have? If they did not, then is not the organization of men? Have not most all the divisions of the church come out of the association? Did Alexander Campbell ever endorse the London Confession of Faith? Some years ago I wanted a

copy of the London Confession of Faith. I enquired of Primitive Baptists where I could get it; none seemed to know. At last I found them advertised by a Missionary Baptist publishing house. I sent and got one. Then I attended a debate between J. M. Bandy, of Aurora, Mo., a Missionary Baptist minister, and a Campbellite preacher. Bandy stuck to the old London Confession and made a noble defense, and on Sunday he preached a discourse on predestination and election in which he proved that salvation was by grace alone. Does not religious history tell us that for 300 or more years the church at every meeting or most every meeting took the communion? Do any of them do so now? Some wash feet at the communion; others do not. Which is the true church? I believe you condemn Sunday schools. So do I condemn the way that the teaching is done. How are we to raise our children up in the fear of the Lord, without teaching them the Scriptures? Paul said that Timotby had known She Scriptures from his youth. Was he taught the Scriptures or was it a divine gift at birth? In conclusion, I will say that I believe that Christian parents should teach their children to read the New Testament, at least, and hold family prayer at night before retiring, and the father should return thanks at each meal, and every church ought to have meeting, either preaching or prayer meeting, every Sunday. Who would think of keeping a flock of sheep and only visiting them once a month and feeding them? Please answer in The Primitive Baptist. W. S. Gross. Winslow, Ark.

OUR REPLY

Neither Christ nor the apostles ever organised an association as a separate body or organisation from the church, that we have ever been able to find any account of. It is Scriptural for churches to meet together for mutual worship and the service of God, for their mutual edification. This may be called an association, for churches are thus associated together for worship. An association as a higher court, or as a separate organization from the church, we deem to be unauthorised by the Scriptures.

Most all divisions and troubles in the church are brought about by the preachers. Preachers are at the bottom of nearly every division. Troubles are often taken to the associations, where they have no business. They should always be settled at home, in the churches.

Alexander Campbell was once a strong defender and advocate of the doctrine of predestination and the sovereign choice and election of grace. He said the church, or kingdom, was with the Baptists.

We now have the London Confession of Faith in press, and will soon have them ready for sale in pamphlet form.

It is a fact that Missionary Baptists will get on the Old Baptist platform when debating with Campbellites. If they believe the doctrine they contend for when debating with Campbellites, then why do they, and how can they, debate with us? And if eternal salvation is wholly and altogether of grace, and the Missionary Baptists believe it, then why do they tell us that the alien sinner must hear and believe the gospel in order to his salvation? Why do they tell us the heathen are dying and going to an endless hell by the multiplied thousands every day for want of the preached gospel? Why do they have their ponderous mission machinery for the salvation of the world, if salvation is wholly of grace, and if they believe it is? We know of no authentic history which says the church observed the communion supper at most every meeting. History may say so, but we have not seen it, that we remember of now.

We think, as we have often stated, that washing the saints feet is enumerated in the catalog of good works, and the Saviour says, "Ye ought to wash one another's feet." A child of God, or a church, may neglect to do their duty, and still be a church.

People are not commanded to raise their children up in the fear of God. The Lord's children are commanded to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, not the fear of the Lord. They are not commanded to send them to Sunday school for others to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, but they are commanded to thus bring them up themselves. The object of the Sunday school is to prevent people going to hell, by training them up to make Christians of them. Their home in heaven does not depend upon the training men give. It is right for parents to teach their children to read the Scriptures, but the Scriptures are not taught in the modern Sunday school. The doctrines and commandments of men are taught there. They teach false doctrines. If you want your child taught false doctrine, send it to a Sunday school, and you will surely accomplish that end. You cannot teach your child, or any other child, the spiritual import of the doctrine of grace, and you cannot teach them to love that doctrine; neither can you teach them the sweetness of it, unless the Lord has already regenerated their hearts by His Holy Spirit; but you can teach them to read the Scriptures, and thus teach them in the letter of the truth.

We think family worship has, perhaps, been much neglected by some. We have known father many times in our childhood days to call the family together around the fireside at night, and then read some portion of God's word, then bow in humble prayer at a throne of grace. Those times are remembered by us now with a feeling of gladness. We do not think the Bible says how often a church should meet, but we are commanded to meet often together. We think they should meet as often as they very well can. C. H. C.

Mark 3:14,19

---May 30, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I wish to ask you to give your views on **((4) (Mark 3:14,19))**. The question I am bothered on is in what sense Judas Iscariot was ordained. Your brother in hope, O. L. Weatherpord. McLeansboro, Ill.

REMARKS

((4) (Mark 3:14) reads, "And He ordained twelve, that they should be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach." The nineteenth verse reads, "And Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed Him: and they went into an house." The Saviour ordained twelve, and Judas Iscariot, the traitor, was one of the twelve. The ordination here mentioned was not unto eternal life, but unto the ministry, "that He might send them forth to preach." Judas obtained part of the ministry. See **((7) (Acts 1:17))**. "Then He called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases. And He sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick."-(Luke 9:1-2). Here it is said He sent the twelve to preach the kingdom of God, and Judas was one of the twelve. He must have been ordained to preach. He was not ordained to eternal life. He was not a child of God, in our humble judgment, for he was a traitor, a devil. The fact that he was ordained to preach does not prove that he was a child of God. This is our humble opinion. C. H. C.

1 Timothy 3:12

---June 6, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I would like to have your views on (I Timothy 3:12) through our paper, The Primitive Baptist. Your brother in Christ, R. S. Matheny. Idalia, Mo.
REMARKS

The apostle is giving the qualifications of a deacon in the place the brother refers to. In (I Timothy 3:8) he says, "Likewise must the deacons be grave," etc. (I Timothy 3:12) says, "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well." Under no consideration should a man be ordained to the office of deacon who has two living wives. He should be the husband of one wife, only. He should be one who rules his own children-not as a tyrant, but as a loving father. He should be one who rules his own house. The man is the head of the family, according to God's appointment and arrangement, and he should fill that position in his family if he is ordained to the office of deacon. C. H. C.

Matthew 18:14

---June 11, 1911

Brother Jas. H. Moore, of Blountsville, Ala., requests our views on **(Matthew 18:14)**, which reads, "Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish." In (Matthew 18:12-13) the Saviour uses an illustration-a man having a hundred sheep, and one goes astray, he leaves the ninety nine and goes in search of the one that has gone astray. It is not the will of the shepherd that the sheep perish, although it has wandered away-gone astray. He goes in search of the stray sheep and finds it and brings it to the fold. Just as it is not the will of the shepherd that this sheep should perish which has gone astray, even so it is not the will of the heavenly Father that one of His little ones perish. If the shepherd will go in search of the stray sheep, will not our loving heavenly Father also find His little ones and bring them into His fold? Will He not keep them from perishing? He preserves and keeps them, and they are "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." This is a sweet and soul cheering doctrine to us in our sorrows and distresses here. C. H. C.

2 Peter 3:9

---June 13, 1911

Brother Jas. H. Moore, of Blountsville, Ala., requests our views on this text, which reads, "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Our views were given on this text in our debate with Elder I N. Penick, but we suppose Brother Moore has not read that. Some men count the Lord being slack concerning His promise. Note that it is promise, not promises. God's promise is eternal life; see **(Titus 1:2); (I John 2:25)**. If God is not slack concerning His promise, and the promise is eternal life, then He will give eternal life to every one embraced in the promise. He is "longsuffering to usward." Who are the usward? Those characters to whom He has made the promise. "Not willing that any should perish." Not willing that any of whom should perish? Not willing that any of the "us," to whom He made the promise, should perish. Then, as God is not willing that any of them should perish, and His promise is to give them eternal life, He will bestow that life upon them, and not one of them will ever perish.

"Not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."
God's will is that all these characters, to whom He promised eternal life,

should come to repentance. Those who repent are led to do so by the Spirit of God. See

(Romans 2:4). It must necessarily, therefore, be true that every one embraced in the promise of God, every one to whom He has promised eternal life, will come to repentance, for they will all be led thereto by the Spirit of God. C. H. C.

. It must necessarily, therefore, be true that every one embraced in the promise of God, every one to whom He has promised eternal life, will come to repentance, for they will all be led thereto by the Spirit of God. C. H. C.

Feet Washing

---June 20, 1911

Brother W. H. McClain, of McKenzie, Ala., requests us to write a few words on this. We will just answer his query without quoting his language. The Saviour says in **(John 13:14)**, "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet." That is, each of you should wash the feet of another. In our country it is customary for one brother to wash the feet of another, and then that brother wash his feet. That is to say, A will wash B's feet, then B will wash A's feet. We never saw what some call "ring washing"- that is, A wash B's feet, then B wash C's feet, then C wash D's feet, and so on, around. We never saw it practiced that way. However, we cannot say that it would make any material difference, but we never saw it. C. H. C.

That Challenge

---June 20, 1911

We are in receipt of a little leaflet published and sent out by C. H. Cayce setting out a proposition which he seems to want to debate with some one. We do not know why he sent us a copy of it unless it was to remind us that he is still alive and out of a job. We will say for Elder Cayce's encouragement that we have no objections to him debating his propositions if he can get some one to meet him who has nothing to gain or lose but like himself just wants to "scrap." The Primitive Baptists have never been in the habit of hunting up debates and when we engage in one it will be in defense of what we believe and not what some one else says we believe. Elder Cayce does not debate the differences between the Predestinarian Baptists and the Conditionalists; Bro. Carnell of Illinois tried him on that and he became conspicuously silent. Elder Sikes asked him to get in the ring in Tennessee and he would not even talk about it. He cannot make any one, who has been keeping up with him, believe that he would debate the real issues between us with an Old School Baptist at all. Of course there must be something to counteract the effects of the terrible Waterloo which their cause met in Tennessee when Elder Sikes turned such a fusillade of truth loose on it that their champion, Elder Thompson, acknowledged that he was overwhelmed with the Scriptures. When Elder Cayce failed to respond to Brother Sikes invitation to take the place of the man they pulled down at Taft, Tenn., we conclude that he either failed to get his own consent or the consent of his own brethren to do so and in that case we think there is no justifiable ground for giving him further consideration.-H. P.

OUR REPLY

The above is from the Advocate of Truth, June 1, 1911, published by Elder J. R. Hardy, Silverton, Texas. We sent him a copy of our challenge, which was published in The Primitive Baptist some time ago.

No, we are not out of a job, but we admit that we would be pleased to have an easy job, and we have thought it would be an easy job to debate with one of Elder Hardy's kind. Elder Capnell, of Illinois, has not tried us. That statement is untrue. If any representative man among you will accept our challenge, you will sure get a debate. As to Elder Sikes asking us to "get in the ring" in Tennessee, Elders Sikes and Hardy both know that the discussion in Tennessee was the affair of another party -and not ours. We are not going to meddle with the affairs of others. Elder Sikes refused, any way, to discuss the second proposition in our challenge. Elder Sikes had no right or authority to ask us to take another man's place in that discussion. Besides, the proposition was not signed by us, and the time was all set without our knowledge. We were informed of the time just a few days before the discussion was to begin. There is justifiable ground for your people meeting the challenge, or showing good reasons why they should not. WE CHALLENGE THE WHOLE FRATERNITY TO FURNISH THE MAN to meet us on the propositions submitted. They are plain, fair, clear cut propositions. You are a set of religious cowards if you fail to meet the issue. C. H. C.

Adultery

---June 20, 1911

Brother W. H. McClain, of McKensie, Ala., requests our views on this question: A woman has two husbands. The first quits her. She lives with the other and gets along all right. Now, the question is, Is it right for the church to take her? Our answer is, No. Our views have been given several times on this question. We know that some churches do sometimes retain members, who are thus living in adultery, but it is positively a violation of God's law, and no church can violate God's law and escape the penalty. Trouble and confusion will result sooner or later. C. H. C.

Romans 7:1-3

---July 4, 1911

We are in receipt of a letter which states that three churches in Texas want our views on **(Romans 7:1-2,3)**, asking what kind of life is under consideration. The letter also states that "a woman and her husband separated; he went off and married, and she married also. Now the question is, can they hold her in fellowship and be in order?"

In reply we would say that the text referred to plainly refers to the law concerning a man and wife. Under the law of God a woman is bound to her husband as long as they live. But if the husband dies, then the woman may marry another man, and she is no adulteress on this account. The law of God allows every man to have one wife, and every woman to have one husband. If the man leaves his wife and marries or joins himself to another woman, then he is dead to his wife. He is a fornicator or adulterer, and she should put him away, for it is wrong for her to live with an adulterer. He is dead to her. It is our humble opinion that if a man leaves his wife and goes with another woman, she has a Bible right to marry again, and may be retained in the church, for her former husband has become dead to her. Suppose her husband is an adulterer, should she continue living with him? Certainly not, for in doing so she would be equally guilty. Then she should be commended for not living with him. He is not a husband, truly, any more. She has no husband in the true sense. There is no law which would deprive her of the privilege of a husband. Hence, there is no law that would deprive her of the privilege of marrying again. There is only one Bible reason why one should put away a husband or wife

and marry again, and that reason is adultery. We have repeatedly expressed our opinion on this question. C. H. C.

Jonah 3; Jonah 4:11

---July 4, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-If it is not asking too much of you, will you give your views on **((0) (Jonah 3:10))**? After He had commanded Jonah to go to Nineveh and preach to the people and told them after forty days the city would be overthrown, and God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way, and God repented of the evil that He had said He would do unto them, and He did it not. I haven't any light on this Scripture-that is, how God repents. I understand that they were a chosen people of God, and Jonah's preaching accomplished just what God intended to accomplish, and He knew that they would repent. I don't understand God to repent as a penitent repents on account of sin. Please explain, and oblige a poor, weak, sinful brother, if a brother at all. Yours in hope of a better world, C. C. Smith., Rawles Springs, Miss.

REMARKS

We do not understand that God repents as a man repents. In **(Malachi 3:6)** the Lord says, "I change not." In another place it is said that the Lord "is not man, that He should repent." The people of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah. They turned away from their wickedness, and lived as God had commanded and required. As they did this, the Lord did not visit them with chastisement and destruction. This was according to His law and promise, as is clearly shown in ((8:25) (Ezekiel 18:25-28): "Yet ye say, The way of the Lord is not equal. Hear now, O house of Israel; Is not my way equal? are not your ways unequal? When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die. Again, when the wicked man turneth from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive. Because he considereth and turneth away from all his transgressions that he hath committed, he shall surely live, he shall not die." The Lord's dealing with Nineveh was in perfect harmony with this law and promise which He had made. He did not repent, or change, as man repents, but was faithful to fulfill His promise and maintain His law. C. H. C.

Wheat and Tares Again

---August 8, 1911

To make the separation of the wheat and tares to mean the final wind up of time, at the resurrection, is to make the resurrection of all and separation of the sheep from the goats, a work done through instrumentality. We would as soon believe and teach that God regenerates sinners through the instrumentality of ministers (angels) as to teach that He will resurrect them and separate them from the goats that way at the final wind up of all time.

Now, brethren, no matter how much you quibble, nor how much you quarrel about the matter, our statement remains true, whether you believe it or not, that the word world in the expression, "so shall it be in the end of the world," is translated from a word which means age, and never was used to denote mankind, neither part nor all the race. Now, this is a fact, and all your grumbling at our position will not change this fact. We have now said our say on the matter, and there is no use of all this continual stirring of a difference over a parable. C. H. C.

A Suggestion

---September 5, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother

May I not ask you if it would not be better for our paper and the cause generally to leave off so much of that private correspondence and dreamy articles and long obituaries, and in place of that use more editorials? It seems to me that there might be some improvement along this line. Sometimes we see articles commencing about this way: "My dear Brother Cayce, by your permission I wish to say to your many readers that for a long time I have had a desire to write to the many readers of your much loved paper, The Primitive Baptist. I know that if this desire is not of the Lord, then no good can be accomplished, neither can we be blessed in His name. But if this desire is of the Lord," etc., etc. Now, if all this was left off there would be more room for editorials and short articles from the brethren and sisters. I would be glad to see some improvement along this line.

REMARKS

The above was written to us recently as a private letter. We take the liberty of publishing same, leaving off the name of the writer. It contains some good suggestions. There is too much said along the line the writer speaks of-"by your permission," "if the Lord will direct my pen," etc. There is no use taking up space to say all these things. Many, very many, writers say, "you may publish this if you think it worthy, but if not, just cast it into the waste basket and all will be right with me." We usually leave such expressions out when we publish the articles, for they take up unnecessary space. Besides, we wonder if it is not sometimes said when it is not really meant; for sometimes if an article is not published very soon we receive a letter from the writer wanting to know why, etc., etc. And sometimes one will write, "Please stop my paper," if an article is not published soon. (Would you think it?) Sometimes some will even talk of starting a paper himself because of some reason like that.

We have thought that too many private letters are sent for publication in the paper. It is all right to publish private letters when they are real good, or contain matter of general interest; but when they are of no special interest to any more than the immediate family of the one who receives them, it is not right to consume space for their publication. It takes space for just a few which belongs to all the readers. We have some private letters on hand now that were sent us with the request to publish which we do not have space for. We cannot publish all that is written especially for the paper, much less all that is sent us.

Another thing we would mention just now is that it must be understood that the editor of a paper is responsible for what is advocated or taught in the paper. Parties often write asking our views on some passage of Scripture. If we give our views and someone happens to differ from us, they may then write a long article calling our position in question. Then we must publish the article, or else someone will charge us with being arbitrary, or think we want to impose our views as standard, when the party writing the article has not been called on, at all, perhaps, to give his views. But if he has, and such views do not agree with the views of the editor, who is responsible for what is taught in the paper, and if the article is published without comment from the editor, and someone who is not a regular reader of the paper and does not know the views of the editor reads the article he has a right to think the editor endorses it.

The writer's saying he will be responsible for the contents of the article can make no difference, for the reader of the article cannot know that the editor does not agree with the writer unless the editor says so. Then if the editor publishes the article it is his duty to say he does not see it that way, so that it may be known that the same is not his own opinion. Whenever a paper proposes to be an "open forum" it simply proposes that its columns are open for continual controversy, or else the editor proposes to have no views of his own for which he will stand- perhaps both, for correspondents may be in a continual controversy even if the editor says nothing. We hope our readers can understand this, and understand what we mean. We do not propose, at all, that the views of the editor of The Primitive Baptist should be accepted as a standard, but the paper should continually reflect the views held by the editor. He will be judged and measured by what is published in the paper. Now, we do want to make an Old Baptist paper of it, and we propose that Old Baptist doctrine shall be set forth and defended in its columns, as much as is in our power to have it so. For this reason we are under no obligation whatever to publish articles from others that set forth a doctrine in opposition. Some may say that this is cowardly; but if one thinks we are afraid to defend the doctrine we hold to, he has only to try us to see whether we will meet representative men to defend our principles.

But now let us all try to make some improvements. We appreciate the suggestions made by the writer of the above letter and give space for it in the paper and have said our "little say" for the consideration of all our readers.

There is one more thing we want to mention, which is this: We are requested to write a great many private letters. We would like to do this when requested, but we feel sure that it would not be expected of us to do much writing of that kind if all could know the arduous duties resting upon us. We cannot enumerate them, but will say that we need your help and sympathy. Can we be assured that we have this? Many letters of sympathy and appreciation are received, and they all encourage us much to press on in the service. Will you all pray the Lord to direct us in the right way, and to sustain us and enable us to walk therein? C. H. C.

Concerning Organs

---September 12, 1911

We have thought for some time that the brethren in some places were rather slow or slack concerning matters of this kind -in receiving into their midst those who hold to and engage in new measures that destroy the peace and fellowship of the churches where introduced. We desire peace and fellowship to abound in our churches, but peace cannot be had where such practices are continued. The churches in our section will not receive among them those who tolerate the use of instrumental music in the churches. Organs were introduced into worship by Papal Rome, and the church which adopts that practice simply follows Rome instead of Christ and the apostles, and churches here do not, and will not, fellowship it. We would especially call attention here to this expression which Elder Thompson uses: "We think it a duty to firmly oppose this departure-to tolerate it by mixing with those that favor it is no better than to practice it. We cannot believe that brethren oppose it seriously while they associate with those who practice it." This statement is just as true concerning any other departure or wrong practice as it is concerning this.

May the Lord direct us all in the right way, and enable us to walk therein. C. H. C.

Made It Plain

---September 12, 1911

Dear Brother-I have just finished reading the debate between you and Brother Penick. You put the strongest argument that I have ever had the pleasure of reading on that subject. I think any fair minded man would acknowledge the same. If Christ died for all the race of Adam, it looks as though they would all be saved. I think you make it clear to any unprejudiced mind. Brother Cayce, I have differed from several of the Baptist brethren on **(Romans 6:22-23)**, "The gift of God is eternal life." I hold that Paul had reference in that to the death of all the race of Adam. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law-not the Adamic transgression. That is the way that I understand it. If I am wrong, tell me my mistake, and I will be very thankful to be set right. I believe that everybody that Christ died for will be saved in heaven. Your brother in Christ, D.C. Bishop. Randle, Wash.

REMARKS

(Romans 6:23) says, "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Sin is the transgression of the law, and that is what we do. Death is what we get for it. We are Adam multiplied. Hence, Adam's sin is our sin. Death passed upon all men. **(Romans 5:12)**. Without the intervention of mercy we are all lost. So far as the law is concerned there is no deliverance. The law condemns every violator, and we are all violators. But mercy interposes through what Jesus Christ has done, and thereby deliverance is brought to every one for whom Christ died. Hence, "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." This is damnation by works and salvation by grace. Eternal life is God's gift-God gives it. Christ redeemed from under the curse of the law every one for whom He paid the redemption price, and through what He has done God gives them eternal life. C. H. C.

The New Birth

---September 19, 1911

Brother J. A. Cobb, of Bond, Ala., asks us this question: "When does the new birth take place? Is it at the time one is quickened, or is it when one is delivered from the burden of sin and guilt?" Different figures are used in Scripture representing the work of regeneration. Although different figures are used, they all represent one thing, and that one thing is becoming in possession of eternal life, or the impartation of that life. Becoming in possession of eternal life is represented in Scripture as a birth, as a resurrection, as a creation, as a translation, as a deliverance, etc. All these different figures represent the same thing. To quicken is to make alive from the dead. It is to raise up out of a state of death into a state of life. It is a resurrection. See (Ephesians 2:1-6). This is an instantaneous work. This is done by the Lord speaking to them, and when He speaks to them He imparts the divine life. See **(John 5:25)**.

The lesson taught in all these figures is that the sinner is passive in receiving eternal life. We cannot very well get more out of a figure than is intended to be taught in it. The very fact that a child cries is unmistakable proof that a living child has been born. So when one begins to mourn on account of sin and to cry unto the Lord, begging for mercy, it is positive proof that he has been born of God. Then one may ask, "Why does he mourn if he has been born of God?" We answer, Because he does not know he has been born of God. When the fact is made known to him that Jesus is his Saviour and that he has been born of God, then he rejoices. The fact is one thing, and the knowledge of the fact is another thing.

Our brethren all agree that the sinner is passive in receiving eternal life, and that it is by the sovereign will and work of Almighty God. This is the fundamental point,

and we are all agreed on it. We should not, therefore, cavil over the minor matters.
C. H. C.

Adultery Again

---September 19, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-As I am a reader of your valuable paper, I wish to call your attention to a reply you made in The Primitive Baptist of June 20, 1911, to a question asked by Brother W. H. McClain, of McKenzie, Ala., and your reply in The Primitive Baptist of July 4, 1911, to the three churches in Texas. I heartily endorse your views in this last reply. There seems to be a conflict in the two replies. I do not say there is, but I would be glad for you to give an explanation for the satisfaction of myself and others. May the Lord bless you in your work, and keep you from all harm, is the prayer of your unworthy brother, B. J. Hornsby. Tallassee, Ala.

OUR REPLY

In our issue of June 20, 1911, the proposition was put before us this way: "A woman has two husbands. The first quits her. She lives with the other, and gets along all right. Now, the question is, Is it right for the church to take her? Our answer is, No."

If we understand the matter the woman married husband No. 1. Then he quit her because they did not get along. Then she married No. 2. She did not quit husband No. 1, but he quit her. There is no intimation that husband No. 1 went with another woman, but she married another man-husband No. 2. In such case she is an adulteress, and the church should not receive her or retain her in fellowship. But if husband No. 1 left her and married another woman, or went with another woman, then he is an adulterer and she should not live with him. He is dead to her, and she has a right to marry No. 2, and in that case she may be retained by the church. Adultery or fornication is the only reason our Lord gives or allows for a husband or wife being put away. We think you can now understand that our remarks in our issues of June 20 and July 4 are in perfect harmony, and that there is no conflict. In the Comforter for August, 1911, George D. Godard puts a question to us this way: "A lady member of the Primitive Baptist Church marries a man; he becomes hopelessly insane and is removed to the sanitarium; she asks and receives a divorce from said husband. Now, should she marry again, would it be Scripturally proper for her to be retained by the church? This question is asked not as a matter of criticism but that the answer may be considered." We unhesitatingly answer that she should not be retained by the church.

If our readers will again examine our editorial in the issue of July 4 they will see that our position is this: A man and woman marry. Then the man, whom we will call husband No. 1, not only deserts the wife but marries, or goes with, another woman. In doing so he becomes an adulterer. Our Lord positively teaches that adultery is a reason for which the marriage union may be dissolved, and it is the only reason the Scriptures give for doing so while the parties live. Now, as husband No. 1 has thus acted-gone into adultery, thereby scripturally dissolving the marriage union, and as the marriage union is dissolved, he is dead to the wife, and she is therefore loosed from the law of her husband. This being true, she has a perfect Scriptural right to marry husband No. 2, and if she has a Scriptural right to do this, then the church should retain her.

We trust we may now be understood. We have often expressed our view of this matter. At least, we have done so several times. Now, we state again that the only Scriptural right one has for putting away a husband or wife and marrying again is

adultery, or fornication. If a man has a Scriptural right to put away his wife for fornication, or adultery, then he has a Scriptural right to marry again. For if he puts her away by Scriptural right, then he has no wife, and there is no law which forbids him having a wife; hence he has a Scriptural right to marry.

Since writing the above we find among our letters a question from Elder N. V Parker, of Walnut, Miss!, as follows: "Can the Baptists legally and orderly set apart and ordain to the work of the ministry a man whose wife has been excluded for fornication, and he still living with her and the church still holding the charge against her?" We will say that we would not want to help ordain a man who continues to live with a woman who is a fornicator. If the woman is guilty, and the man knows it, yet continues to live with her, we think he becomes party to the crime, or an adulterer, and we would not want to ordain one we thought to be living in adultery. This is sufficient for our readers to know what we think about the matter. But we will just put this question, and each reader can answer to himself: What would you think of a man who would continue living with a woman as his wife when he knew she was too intimate with some other man or men? Would he be any better than the woman? C. H. C.

Birth and Adoption

---September 19, 1911

Brother G. M. Birdwell, of Dunlap, Tenn., asks us to explain the difference between being begotten or born and adoption.

There are but two ways by which one can become a legal heir to an estate, or be brought into a family. One way is by birth and the other is by adoption. No one adopts his own child, for the child is already his by birth. This is true in nature. For one to adopt a child, he must take a child out of another family and receive it into his own family as his own child. Adoption, therefore, is the transferring of one from one family into another.

In the work of regeneration, or the new birth, the sinner receives the divine nature. He is born into the heavenly family, and is made akin to God. This is a work of the Holy Spirit upon the spirit, or soul, of the sinner. As stated, in this work the sinner is born into the heavenly family, so that when the body dies the spirit, or soul, goes to a place of rest in the presence of God. The body, being mortal, decays and goes back to dust. But it shall not remain that way. In the last great day the body will be raised again and adopted into the heavenly family. In **(Romans 8:23)** the Apostle Paul says, "And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, the redemption of our body." This seems to be very plain to us that the adoption is the redemption of the body. The body will be changed and received into the heavenly family. This is complete deliverance or salvation of the whole man -salvation of the sinner of Adam's race-the whole man, soul, body and spirit, finally saved. C. H. C.

Revelation 12:1-8

---September 19, 1911

Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-Please give me some light on (Revelation 12:1-8), particularly on the following:

1. The woman spoken of in (Revelation 12:1).
2. The child referred to in (Revelation 12:2).
3. The red dragon in (Revelation 12:3).

4. Does the heaven spoken of in (Revelation 12:7) have reference to the everlasting heaven, the home God has prepared for His children?
5. Was there never a devil until this war in heaven? People here claim that the devil was an angel in heaven until he rebelled against God and caused this war, then God cast this angel out and now it is the devil. Your sister, I hope, An Inquirer.

OUR REMARKS

Our opinion we are willing to give in a few words, as follows: 1. The woman spoken of in (Revelation 12:1), is the church. The heaven spoken of in that verse is the Jewish heaven or Jewish kingdom.

2. The child referred to in (Revelation 12:2) was Christ.

3. The red dragon, in (Revelation 12:3), was King Herod.

4 and 5. The heaven in (Revelation 12:7) does not refer to the place of the final happiness of the Lord's people. There is no discord, trouble or war in that place. If it referred to the place of ultimate bliss and glory, and there was a war in that place and some cast out of it, God's people would not be safe when they finally reach that place. Angels are messengers. The church is sometimes referred to as a heaven or "heavenly places."

There was war in the church and the dragon's angels were cast out with him. This was true in the establishment of Roman Catholicism. This is all figurative language and refers to the church and things that occur here, and not in ultimate glory. C. H. C.

The Commission

---October 31, 1911

On another page in this paper the following questions are asked us by J. S. Garrett, of Denton, Ark.:

1. To whom was the commission given?
2. If given to the apostles alone, and expired as they expired, where do we get authority to baptize?

It is not necessary to answer at length. We simply call attention to ((4) (Mark 16:14-15): "Afterward He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen Him after He was risen. And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," It stands out clearly that the antecedent of the pronouns them and ye must be the eleven. He said to the eleven, "Go ye." ((20) (Mark 16:20) says, "And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them."

In (I Corinthians 11:2) the apostle says, "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you." This shows that the ordinances were delivered to the church. Baptism is an ordinance; the ordinances were delivered to the church. Hence baptism is administered by the authority of the church.

The eleven were sent out by the personal call or command of the Saviour, the second person in the adorable Trinity. The ministers are called and sent out now by the Holy Spirit, the third person in the adorable Trinity.

We deem this to be a sufficient reply to these questions. We would now admonish the brother to go home to a people who contend for the truth as it is in Jesus. C. H. C.

Do You Mean It?

---November 21, 1911

At this distance it appears that the Taylor Cayce debate to be held at Salem Church, near Murray, Ky., beginning December 12, promises to be a right lively discussion of some very vital issues. Brother Cayce seems to think that he is fully able to do some Baptist preacher a job, but every time he happens to get hold of the wrong man. He has but little room to feel disappointed, for it has certainly become quite common with him to see his doctrine covered up by the truth of God's word.-Baptist Builder.

The above clipping is from the Baptist Builder, of which our neighbor, Elder I N. Penick, is editor. Hence, we ask, do you mean it? He says we happen to get hold of the wrong man every time. Well, yes, those who have read the Cayce Penick debate generally think Elder Penick was the wrong man, for he utterly failed to meet the arguments. What did he say about the following argument, which appears on page 197 of that debate:

First. "Whatever is essential as a gospel condition to salvation must be absolute, universal, indispensable and without "exception."-J. H. Grimes, in Baptist Standard of April 25, 1907.

Second. "The condition of salvation is faith in Christ."-J. A. Scarboro in "Geology," page 32. Third. Therefore, faith in Christ as an essential to salvation is absolute, universal, indispensable and without exception.

If faith in Christ, according to their own logic, their own argument, is an absolute essential to salvation and is universal and without exception, as the infant is unable to exercise faith in Christ, it absolutely, universally and without exception excludes the infants and leaves them out of salvation. You cannot reach the case of the infant with your plan of salvation.

We repeat the question: What did he say in reply to this? NOT ONE WORD.

The same argument is made again on page 344 as follows:

First. Whatever is essential as a gospel condition to salvation must be absolute, universal, indispensable, and without exception.-J. H. Grimes in Baptist Standard, April 25, 1907.

Second. The condition of salvation is faith in Christ.-J. A. Scarboro, in "Geology," page 32.

Third. Therefore faith in Christ as an essential to salvation is absolute, universal, indispensable, and without exception.

What is the conclusion? That no one can be saved unless he first has faith in Christ. And the brother has used the word faith all through this discussion in the sense of belief. Therefore, no one can be saved unless he believes in the Lord Jesus Christ. Then I offer this as another syllogism:

First. Faith in Christ (and I suppose you accept it, as you have said nothing about it) as an essential to salvation, is absolute, universal, indispensable, and without exception. You accept this as the conclusion in the first syllogism, because you have not replied to it. You have not undertaken to overthrow or disprove the premises.

Second. The infant is unable to exercise faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Third. Therefore, the condemnation of the infant is absolute, universal, and without exception, and not one of them can ever enter the portals of eternal glory.

Did Elder Penick ever make any reply to these arguments? NOT ONE WORD. Yes, we got hold of the wrong man, indeed, to reply to arguments! This is not the only thing he failed to meet, but is a sample of many.

Again, if Elder Penick thinks it is such an easy going thing to overthrow our positions why would he not affirm in discussion with us the same proposition Elder Taylor is to affirm-that "Missions as taught and practiced by the Missionary Baptists are authorized by the word of God?" Elder Penick utterly failed to meet us on this proposition, although we insisted that he do so.

Again: If a debate with us always proves such a victory for your cause, why will you not take some hand in having some of those debates published?

You refused to help publish the Cayce Penick debate, or to take a lot of the books. Now, we will make you this proposition on that debate: If you will take 2,000 copies of them we will get out another edition on good book paper, bound in paper covers, so they can be sold cheap, and will get them out in good style, and will furnish you the 2,000 copies for 28 cents each, which is absolutely less than cost. Now, why not take 2,000 of them and dispose of them and thereby show the fallacy of Cayce's position? We guarantee Elder Penick ignores this proposition.

Again: We are making arrangements to have the discussion with Elder Taylor on the mission question taken down and published in pamphlet form. Elder Taylor refuses to take any of them, for reasons which he assigns to us. Through courtesy to him we do not publish his reasons. But we will make this proposition to Elder Penick, or the Builder: We will publish or print an additional 2,000 copies for you for 15 cents each, which is away below actual cost, if you will take them. Now, what do you say? If Elder Cayce's position is so fallacious, here is a splendid opportunity for you to show to the people the great good in your missionary enterprises and that your teaching is authorized by the word of God. We guarantee Elder Penick does not accept this proposition. Come across, neighbor. C. H. C. Note:-The debate with Elder Taylor was not published because the stenographers, after the first half day, said they could not get all that the speakers said, and Elder Taylor would not agree to correct the manuscript of his speeches. C. H. C.

Nashville, Tennessee

---November 21, 1911

The South College Street Primitive Baptist Church, Nashville, Tenn., was received into the Cumberland Association in September. We have been told that the association was an enjoyable meeting. This church has passed a resolution declaring non-fellowship for all men made institutions. They are plain old fashioned Old Baptists, and want none of the newfangled progressive measures that are being introduced in some sections. Neither do they want the doctrine that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated all things that come to pass.

We have agreed to meet F. B. Srygley there in debate in December. The discussion will begin December 25, at night, and will continue each night during the week, closing Saturday night, December 30. The brethren in Nashville desire a good attendance of brethren from other places. C. H. C.

Question of Order

---November 21, 1911

Suppose a person holding a letter from an orderly Baptist Church should unite with the Methodists as a temporary expedient, still holding her letter, with a view of uniting with a Baptist Church when possible, would it be orderly for another Baptist Church to receive such a person upon her recanting or acknowledging her error?-or would such a person have to make acknowledgment to the church that granted the letter in order to be restored to fellowship?

ANSWER

A regular church letter of dismissal reads: "Brother" or "Sister A. is a member with us in good standing and full fellowship, and is hereby dismissed from us when joined to another church of the same faith and order." It is evident, then, that if a sister obtains a letter of dismissal from an orderly church and unites with the Methodists while holding said letter, she is amenable to the church which granted the letter; for she is not dismissed from them by the letter until joined to another church of the same faith and order. The proper place, then, for her to go in order to obtain fellowship among Old Baptists is to the church where she got the letter. She should go to them and make amends for her wrongs. C. H. C.

Questions

---November 21, 1911

We have been requested to answer the following questions through The Primitive Baptist:

1. Do private members of the church have a right to debate Bible subjects with other people publicly?
2. Should members of the church engage in musical entertainments?

To question one, we would say that any member has a right to contend for the truth in any honorable way-publicly or privately. We debated Bible subjects publicly before we had membership in the church, and we feel that we did right.

In answer to question two will say that it is, at least, a question as to whether members of the church should engage in musical entertainments. The object of the entertainment and the kind of entertainment would also have something to do with the matter. Some things are lawful, but not expedient. We think it seldom expedient for members of the church to engage in such things. C. H. C.

The Organ

---November 28, 1911

In another column in this paper is an article from Elder J. H. Oliphant on the organ. We heartily endorse all Elder Oliphant says. The organ is an innovation among our people, and innovations cause distress. The man who introduces and advocates the new measure or innovation is the man who causes the distress. This is universally true. There is no denying this fact. There are some left who are not willing to adopt the measures of old Rome, and we believe there will still be some when we are called away. The church is to stand forever, as our blessed Lord has instituted it. The candlestick may be removed from one locality to another; but the Lord will reserve some witnesses somewhere who will not now the knee to the image of Baal.

Affiliation with secret orders among our people is as much an innovation as the organ. And it is just as bad a practice or worse. All innovations among our people should be put down. Let us all stand together on the ancient order of God's house. We need each other, and should be willing to lay down all innovations and live together in sweet peace and fellowship. C. H. C.

Note.-As the article by Elder Oliphant, referred to above, so plainly expresses our views of the matters mentioned in the article, and as the subject is one that should concern our people all along the line, we have decided to insert his article in this book. Elder Oliphant was an able and highly esteemed minister. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

"If when he seeth the sword come upon the land, he blow the trumpet and warn the people, then whosoever heareth the sound of the trumpet and taketh not warning...his blood shall be upon his own head."

I do not want to be an extreme alarmist, but if this progressive spirit should prevail among us so that our people should use the organ in time of service, I think serious injury will be the result. From my heart I oppose it as a serious and dangerous innovation. It is a compromise with the world, a being "conformed to this world." It is turning from the "fountain of living waters," and hewing out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water. I realise my imperfection, but I regard it as an awful state of things among Primitive Baptists when there is a spirit of tolerance or forbearance for this innovation. A Primitive Baptist Church with an organ preacher in its pulpit is a self-contradiction. It is not primitive to have organs in church, but it is primitive not to have organs, especially for our people. An organ preacher will produce an organ party; and in fact when a church wants an organ preacher it proves there is an organ party there, even before the preacher gets there. When Baptists look with favor on the organ as a help in the worship, it indicates that they are tired of the "old ruts," and are ready to contrive some way to relieve our people of their unpopularity. "Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set." To move the corner stone so as to make your field bigger is a sin. Our fathers understood that the organ was not included in the ancient survey.

Should we now remove it so as to take it in? or, in God's name, should Baptists be silent and quiet while it is being done? "Remove not the old landmark, and enter not into the fields of the fatherless." Who ever heard of a contention among our people till the last year or two that the ancient deeds and "the faith once delivered to the saints" included the organ? It is new and recent that such a claim was set up. Where is the spirit of Hume, of Potter, of E. D. Thomas, and of Lampton? How was it that they failed to see the organ included in the old landmarks? It was not included in them, and the desire to set back the corner stone is of men. "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded." Here is the line, and who is at liberty to go beyond this line? Or who can in good conscience be satisfied and silent while others are removing and obliterating this line? Let us quit ourselves like men and be faithful to Him that called us to the ministry. "Some remove the landmarks; they violently take away the flocks and feed thereof." In this mad effort to favor the organ the flocks are taken away and driven away, and the feed too. The milk of the word and the milk of His service is taken away, and instead thereof is carnal, flesh pleasing and world pleasing music, not included in the ancient landmarks. It is new and not ancient, and those who press it know that it will divide and scatter the flock. They know this and yet they press it, or meekly and tamely be still while others remove the corner stone.

The prophet said, "His watchmen are blind-they are all dumb dogs; they cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber." "Yea, they are greedy dogs that can never have enough." If the dog is silent, the intruder is satisfied with the dog, I am sure. Is it a little thing to divide churches? We are told to "mark them that cause division." Who is causing it in this case? Let us mark them if they love a carnal music better than they love the peace of God's house. To "mark" them, as here required, is to attribute to them the strife, the distress and the heartaches that go with division. They are responsible for it. The organ in church is Catholic in origin, and copied by the other churches. It wields its influence over the light-minded especially. It has been worn out by the fashionable churches, and their most

intelligent ones are sick and disgusted with it, and now Primitive Baptists are talking for it. I said "Primitive Baptists." I had better not have said this. True Primitive Baptists are satisfied without it, and weep to see this restless, world pleasing spirit in our midst.

The prophet drew a sad picture when he said, "Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves. Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? The diseased have ye not strengthened; neither have ye healed that which was sick; neither have ye bound up that which was broken, nor brought again that which was driven away...But with force and cruelty have ye ruled them."

Who could think that the organ could be urged on our people without causing division? It has divided others; the Campbellites are divided all over the country on account of it; yet with absolute certainty that division will result elders press it, and others urge that we quietly let it alone; let it grow, and grow; we don't want it ourselves, but are willing not to meddle with it.

I do not believe that Primitive Baptists will do this; they will oppose it, reject it and keep it out of their pulpits. If they do tamely submit, and go along with it, I will feel that I have never known the dear Old Baptists. I have lived with them, labored with them, and suffered with them over forty two years; and I do not believe they will tolerate this departure, or act the part of "dumb dogs that cannot bark." My time is near its close, and I desire to be true the inch of time I am yet to stay here. I have been with our people in their trials, and where they were forced to speak out. I want still to stand with them and oppose this last innovation with firmness, unyielding, and yet in kindness. Brethren, let us be kind, and speak the truth in love. Let us be ready to make peace, "easy to be entreated;" but let us humbly and patiently speak out on this subject and encourage our tried elders that we are in the right in this matter, and God will bless us in our earnest efforts to preserve the truth in the world. Our dear children will love us all the better to see us stand up for the time honored principles of our fathers. The World can see when Primitive Baptists yield up their principles and turn their backs on the practice of our fathers; they can see it, and our children can see it. Let us keep this world pleasing thing out of our pulpits, and pray for dear, faithful and tried elders, that the Lord may bless them, and bless their labors and churches.

It is sweet at times to think that a few more stormy winters and we shall enter our eternal home; all our tears shall be dried, and we shall sweetly rest from our labors. Affectionately, J.H.O.

Elder J. V. Kirkland

---December 5, 1911

The following article is copied from the Baptist Flag, of November 30, 1911, published in Fulton, Ky. Comment is unnecessary. All our readers may now know where he has landed. It is only a pity that he did not go to the Missionaries several years ago. It will be observed that he was received by them on his baptism from our people. C. H. C.

ELDER J. V. KIRKLAND

We have read two or three notices that Elder J. V. Kirkland, Fulton, Ky., had joined the Missionary church. It was good news to us, for we regard Kirkland as a good and strong man. We met him third Sunday, and he told us he had only gone to another Baptist church by letter, was all. We asked him if Fayetteville Baptist church accepted him on his baptism and ordination. He answered in the affirmative. Well, now, has he joined us or have we joined him, which? One peculiar tenet of Baptists is that churches of Jesus are the only custodians of the law and

ordinances. If granted, then what church of Jesus baptised and ordained Elder J. V. Kirkland? Brother Kirkland would have done this some years ago in this section of the country if such an opportunity had been open. A prominent preacher felt of this editor on that subject, as we were members of the same association, but we did anything else but encourage that kind of accessions. If men are not willing to enter at the same door with us, we are not ready to extend the hand of fellowship. There is not a Hardshell church in my knowledge that would receive Brother Kirkland back into its fellowship on a letter of recommendation from Fayetteville Baptist church. Hardshell churches are as strict as Baptist churches on claiming the exclusive right to churches of Jesus Christ. One thing is true, if Hardshell churches are churches of Jesus Christ, then Missionary churches are not, and vice versa, for they are unlike in faith and practice, as well as origin. Jesus Christ is not the originator of both kinds of churches. Morally and religiously Kirkland is all right, but the Flag can't accept his church, from which he came as a church of Jesus Christ, without unchurching itself, and we are sure Brother K. is too good a man to ask it. Our advice to Brother Kirkland, without being asked for it, is to go to the church at Fayetteville, Tennessee, and tell them plainly that you want the paraphernalia, or suit of a regular Missionary Baptist, and to stop any further quibbling that you demanded baptism and ordination at their hands, that you can be one in deed as well as in truth.

Close of Volume Twenty-Six

---December 26, 1911

This issue closes another volume of The Primitive Baptist. One more year has gone forever. Another milepost in our pilgrimage has been reached. Just at this time we do not feel sorry that another year's toils are done. We have passed through some sore trials during the year now closing. Our hearts have been made to bleed, and we have been bowed down in sorrow and distress. Many times we have felt to be "cast down, but not destroyed." We have felt to be much discouraged sometimes for different reasons. Our family has been visited again by the grim reaper, death, besides many of our dear and precious friends have also been called away. We miss them all. Besides the sorrows of this kind some brethren have been offended at our views on some points. Not long since we received notice from a brother that he and some others were going to quit taking the paper because they did not agree with us concerning the parable of the ten virgins, the parable of the tares, and the question of adultery. This seems to us to be rather exacting. We wonder if those brethren feel that they are infallible and cannot be mistaken? We have not thought of setting ourselves up as a standard to which all others must come. We allowed several others free expression of their opinion on the parable of the tares, and do not think less of a single brother who differed from us on it. This was their privilege. And just here we will say that in **(Matthew 13:39-40)**, the word which is translated world is *aionos*. Liddell and Scott, the highest and best known authority on the Greek language, define the word as follows: "Lasting for an age, perpetual, everlasting, eternal." This being true it must be that the Saviour referred to the end of the age. Now, this is our view; yet no one is required by us to accept it. We do not fall out with any brother who may see the matter differently. But we are willing for anyone to take the above to any Greek scholar, and if he will say we are wrong, and show it, we are ready to give up the opinion. But we are not ready to give up our view unless the meaning of the word can be shown to be different. Notwithstanding this, we are willing to accord every brother the privilege of differing from us concerning it, for

no vital matter is involved. We feel the same way concerning the parable of the ten virgins. We do not believe any one man fully and rightly understands all the parables. Shall we make a correct understanding of every portion of Scripture a test of fellowship? If so, who is to be the standard? Who understands it all? Who has the correct view of every passage? Who can afford to say he knows his view is correct and that he understands every passage? If we are not willing to allow one to differ from us on any matter of this kind, do we not say that we are the standard, and that all others must come up to the mark we have made and set? On the question of adultery, some say we are too severe, while others say we are too lax, or too loose, and not severe or strong enough. So, now what are we to do? If we are wrong, we are sure both the other sides cannot be right-for they differ also. Can we do better than "stand between," and grant them the privilege of differing from us? We are sorry, indeed, if our dear brethren are going to be offended at us because of our honest convictions. We trust the brethren who have written us as they have concerning these things will think of these matters, and that they will be willing to bear with us in our own imperfections and weaknesses, and not feel like casting us off because we have not seen everything just as they have. We have no disposition whatever to agitate any question that causes strife and confusion in our beloved Zion, and will not do so when we know it.

We know we have made mistakes. We make them every day. We regret them more than anyone else can. We are sorry for every mistake we have ever made. We desire more than we can tell to be free from them and to make them no more. We humbly trust the dear brethren and sisters will still look over our mistakes and short comings. They have been kind and good to us in the past. They have been far better to us than we feel to deserve. We are drawn closer and closer to them by their many words and deeds of kindness as the days, weeks, months and years go by. They are dearer to us, with the cause they are identified with, than all the world. We would rather give up all this world than the love and fellowship of the Old Baptists. We feel that we are glad to wear out in their service, if it may be God's holy will. The past year has been another one of toil, and many times have we toiled until a very late hour at night; but we do not regret even one moment of the time spent in that way. We delight in the service of the Master, and we delight in trying to serve His precious jewels, too.

Again, we humbly beg the dear brethren and sisters to pardon our mistakes of the past, to look over our imperfections, and to accept the gratitude and thanks of our poor heart for every word and act of kindness shown to us in the past; and, above all, to please remember us in your petitions when at a throne of God's rich, free and reigning grace. Now, for the year 1911, we bid you farewell, praying the Lord's blessings may rest upon every one of you. C. H. C.

1912

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME TWENTY-SEVEN

---January 9, 1912

With this issue we begin volume twenty seven of The Primitive Baptist. We feel to enter the new year with renewed hope and courage to fight on in the warfare for truth. The great fundamental principles of truth are dearer to us as the years go by. We are more and more confirmed in the belief that salvation from sin is by grace and alone of the Lord. We still feel a desire to faithfully contend for the same

principles we have been contending for, but our desire is to do this in humility and love. If we know our hearts we love these eternal principles of truth, and we love the Lord's dear children. We love those who believe and advocate the doctrine of grace. We also believe that many of God's little children are deluded, blinded and led astray from the truth by false teachers and leaders. We love those who are thus led astray, and desire that they be taught the truth, and thereby led out of the delusion they are in. We sympathize with them-we do not hate them. We desire to earnestly, yet lovingly, contend for the truth and endeavor to show them the right way, as we see it.

We are still satisfied to be simply a plain old-fashioned Old Baptist. We want none of the new inventions of the day. The works of men are all imperfect. The ways of men are wrong. God's work is perfect, and His way is the right way. His way is good enough. We cannot improve upon God's way. No man can make a perfect way any better. To add to or to take from is to mix imperfection with it. Let us not try to do that. Let us ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein. In doing this we will find rest. Sweet peace, union and fellowship will then abound. Let us try to seek for the things that make for peace, and the things wherewith one may edify another. Let us not strive about words to no profit. Let us not make a brother an offender for a word. Let us humbly walk in obedience to our blessed heavenly Master, who has done so much for us. Let us not look for faults in our brethren. If we do, we will be sure to find them, for we are all imperfect creatures. Let us remember that "charity thinketh no evil."

Let us try to throw the mantle of charity, over each other, and watch over each other for good and not for evil. Let us all remember, when we see a brother do wrong, that we might under similar circumstances do even worse than he has done, and thus let us endeavor to convert the brother from the error of his way. Let us bear with each other, remembering that we need to be borne with, as we also have faults. Let us all strive during this year to help each other, and not to destroy or pull down. Let us try to pull together, as a company of horses in Pharaoh's chariot, with an eye single to the comfort and benefit of each other, the advancement of the cause and the kingdom of Christ and the glory of God.

We feel that our physical strength is giving way to some extent, at least. But we do not feel like we want to quit the field while we stay on earth. We feel that we are willing to wear out in the service of the Lord and in the service of His dear people. We feel that we do not count our life dear to ourself, so we finish our course with joy, and the ministry which we have received of the Lord Jesus.

We need your help, dear brethren. Oh, will you still remember us in your prayers? Will you earnestly and fervently pray the Lord to sustain and direct us in the right way? The encouragement we have received in the past has been more help to us than we are able to tell. We still need the help and encouragement of the Lord's dear children, and we need the sweet influence and direction of the Holy Spirit, and we need the Lord's sustaining grace. By the Lord's help and the help of the dear brethren we desire to conduct The Primitive Baptist in such a way that it may be a benefit to the Lord's dear children. Please write us about your good meetings. The brethren all want to get good news of that kind. If you have troubles and confusions in your churches, do not write us about that, but settle them at home. The brethren do not want to hear about the confusion, and it does no good to publish such things. Our enemies rejoice when they see and hear of confusion in our ranks. Let us settle such things at home. It is never necessary to publish such matters unless it is something which concerns the brotherhood in general. Almost all our troubles can be, and should be, settled at home. Let us remember these things.

May our loving Saviour shower down His rich blessings upon every one of you, is our humble prayer. Again we ask you to pray the Lord to direct and sustain us. C. H. C.

Adam's Death

---January 16, 1912

On another page of this paper will be found a letter from J. T. Matthews, in which he asks what state Adam was in before he transgressed God's law, and if he was anything more than a natural man, and was the death a spiritual death, or was he in possession of the Spirit.

When God made the man He made him a natural man-a complete man, composed of soul, body and spirit. It takes the three (soul, body and spirit) to constitute a complete man. The man was not a fit subject for heaven, for if he had been God would have placed him there. God made no mistake, and placed the man in the garden of Eden, where he was capacitated to live and enjoy the blessings of his Creator so long as he obeyed His law. The man was morally good and upright as he came from the plastic hand of his Creator.

In his transgression he lost that moral uprightness-he was separated from it. Death is a separation. He lost all moral standing with God. He did not lose a heavenly life, for he never had it to lose. As before stated, he was not capacitated for heaven; and he stood as much in need of a higher order of life before the transgression in order that he be prepared to live in and enjoy heaven, as we need it today. But we not only need the higher order of life in order that we live in heaven, but we also need atonement, or reconciliation, or satisfaction for our sins. Hence, as we see it, Adam was simply a natural man, composed of soul, body and spirit, with good moral standing before God before the transgression. In the transgression he lost all this moral standing, became corrupted, poisoned and contaminated with sin.

We do not give this as standard, but simply our view of the matter. C. H. C

1 Corinthians 7:15

---January 16, 1912

Mrs. T. S. Murrie, of Willing, Okla., asks our views on this passage, and asks if it gives a right to get a divorce and marry again. We have repeatedly stated in our columns that there is only one Scriptural right to put away a husband or wife, and that is for adultery or fornication. This is our opinion of the matter, and is as plain as we know how to say it. The text above referred to does not, nor cannot, contradict the Saviour's teaching, which is that no one has a right to put away a husband or wife for any other reason than that of adultery or fornication. To try to justify one in doing so by this text is simply to try to justify one in doing what the Saviour positively teaches they have no right to do.

If the unbelieving wife departs the husband is not bound to live with her. That is all (I Corinthians 7:15) teaches. But he is bound to keep himself in a position to be reconciled to her. See verse II He has no right to put her away for this reason.

We trust our position may be understood now. We do not propose that our views are infallible, but we are willing to give them when necessary, or when called on. C. H. C.

More Proof

---February 13, 1912

Next Sunday the new \$65,000 church at Woodlawn, Ala., will be occupied for the first time by the congregation of 850. Dr. W. M. Anderson is the pastor who has made this achievement possible. The above is clipped from a column in the Baptist and Reflector, of February 1, 1912, headed, "Among the Brethren, by Fleetwood Ball." Now, here are these Softshells spending \$65,000 for a fine meeting house when a plain cheaper one would do as well, and the heathen going to hell by the thousands every day for want of the gospel-so they tell us. They say it costs just the small pittance of ten cents to evangelize a heathen. At their own "market price" the money spent for this house would have saved 650,000 souls if it had been put in the foreign mission channel. Will a just God send all those heathens to hell on this account and then save the proud builders of that fine house? We doubt it very much, even if their doctrine is true. C. H. C.

Who Are Asleep?

---February 13, 1912

From the Baptist Builder of January 17, 1912, we clip the following, which appeared in that paper under the heading of "Penick's Points:" We can easily see how our Hardshell brethren have gone to sleep on missions, since their leaders like Bro. C. H. Cayce are teaching them that they are no more responsible than infants and idiots.

This Softshell frog or tadpole thinks that the people he stigmatizes as Hardshells are asleep, but he will not agree to take a lot of the books (Cayce-Penick debate) and try to dispose of them so that the teaching of the two may be read and compared by his people.

But the following statement from the Baptist and Reflector shows who are asleep: The following is a condensed statement of the work accomplished by Texas Baptists during the past year:

Home Missions.....	49,035.07
Foreign Missions.....	61,976.04
State Missions.	124,413.18
Value of church lots secured by the missionaries.....	25,112.50
Value of church houses built in connection with labors of the missionaries	77,714.21
Ministers' Relief Fund.....	3,389.25
Miscellaneous objects.....	1,503.46

Grand total.....
\$343,143.71

This was certainly a tremendous work.

The above shows what these Softshells did in Texas during the past year. They contributed for all purposes the grand, magnificent sum of \$343,143.71. For missions, including home, foreign and state missions, they contributed the magnificent sum of \$235,424.29! Now, is this not wonderful? According to the special reports of the Bureau of the Census there were 392, 184 Softshell Baptists in Texas in 1906, and if we are to credit the reports the Softshells send out concerning their increases, there must have been many more of them in Texas last year than in 1906. But we will grant that they did, at least, hold their own. Then 392,184 Softshells in Texas gave for all missions last year the wonderful sum of \$235,424.29! This is a small fraction more than 60 cents each! "WHAT A TREMENDOUS WORK" Notwithstanding the smallness of the work done, these Softshells teach the people that the heathen are going to an eternal hell every day

for want of the gospel! Such teaching does not "jingle" very well with such "tremendous" giving. Are they asleep? Or, do they believe what they preach? It is hard for us to think they believe what they preach. The object of such preaching is simply to get the people to contribute their hard earned dollars so corresponding secretaries, editorial secretaries, clerks and preachers can get good fat salaries. That's the meat in the coconut. C. H. C.

A Pleasure Trip

---February 20, 1912

Because of having been on his field such a short time Pastor Dodd has decided to postpone his trip abroad until March, 1913. At this time if God wills, the editor hopes to join him in a three months tour through Southern Europe, the Holy Land and Northern Africa.-News and Truths, Jan. 26, 1912.

The above clipping from the News and Truths, of January 26, 1912, gives us the information that Elder H. B. Taylor, of Murray, Ky., expects to make a three months tour in the East sightseeing. He will be accompanied by another Missionary or Softshell preacher. This trip will cost not less than three hundred dollars for each man, and more probably it will cost each one six hundred dollars. These men teach that the heathen cannot be saved without the gospel, and the heathen cannot have the gospel unless the people here contribute of their means to send it to them. They are great workers for the foreign mission cause in connection with the boards, conventions, and all the paraphernalia of all the Softshell fraternity.

J. H. Tucker, of Asheville, N. C, said in the Biblical Recorder that it costs ten cents to evangelize a heathen. See the Baptist and Reflector, of November 11, 1909. At ten cents each, six hundred dollars (the very lowest estimate we can make of the cost of this trip for these two men) would save six thousand heathen. Think of it! Six thousand heathen will suffer in eternal hell because these men use the money for a pleasure trip instead of putting the money in the missionary channel. Good Lord! will these six thousand heathen go to hell on this account? Would not the wrong party be sent there? C. H. C.

Luke 10:30-37

---February 20, 1912

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I would like to have your views on **((0:30) (Luke 10:30-37))**. What do you understand is meant by "going down from Jerusalem to Jericho?" "the oil?" "the wine?" "the beast?" "the inn?" "the two pence?" Dear Brother, I know yours is a hard place to fill; therefore we should be very careful not to wound the feelings of one of God's little ones. Remember me when at a throne of grace. Your unworthy brother in bonds, G. W. Wardell. West Salem, Ill.

REMARKS

We are willing to try to give our views for our dear brethren when called on if we have any settled views regarding the subject upon which our views are requested. In this instance the Saviour uses the circumstance of a certain man going "down from Jerusalem to Jericho" to illustrate or to teach who our neighbor is. The young man with whom the Saviour was conversing asked the question, "Who is my neighbor?" Then the Saviour uses the circumstance to show who the neighbor is. The priest nor the Levite, who came by, were not the neighbor. The Samaritan, who helped the man in distress, was the neighbor. This is the lesson intended to be taught in this parable, or in the circumstance the Saviour referred to. When we get

the lesson taught or brought out in a parable or illustration of this kind, we have then obtained what is contained therein, and to try to get more from it is to try to get more than is intended. We have not seen the parable yet that we are able to make everything in it represent something.

We have often heard brethren preach who would take up some parable and "spiritualize" the whole thing-make everything in it represent something, and when they were through we could not tell, for our life, whether it was that way or not. Much of it is speculation. But regarding this parable, will say that we are not able to make "Jerusalem," "Jerico," "the oil," "the wine," "the beast," "the inn" and "the two pence" all represent something. The whole parable-the circumstance as a whole, not each part of it separately-teaches who the neighbor is.

In some places the church may be represented as Jerusalem. For one who is a member of the church to go into worldly institutions is to go down, as the man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho. It is a "down hill" road all the way from the church to the institutions of the world.

We trust these few thoughts may be blessed to the good of some of our readers. C. H. C.

The Nashville Debate

---March 5, 1912

The discussion between us and Mr. F. B. Srygley, which was held in Nashville, Tenn., beginning on Monday night, December 26, was taken down by a stenographer for the McQuiddy Printing Company, in Nashville, representing Mr. Srygley's side of the question. The agreement was that we might correct the manuscript of our speeches and approve the same before the book is published. We have already received and corrected the manuscript of several of our speeches, and returned them. So the work will be begun at once, if it is not already begun. We agreed to take a number of the books. The questions discussed were:

1. God gives eternal life to an alien sinner without a condition upon his (the sinner's) part, and the Scriptures so teach. C. H. Cayce affirmed and F. B. Srygley denied.
2. Faith, repentance and (water) baptism are conditions of pardon (or salvation) to an alien sinner, and the Scriptures so teach. F. B. Srygley affirmed and C. H. Cayce denied. Three nights were devoted to each proposition-two hours each night.

Mr. Srygley is considered one of the strongest debaters these people (Campbellites) have in this state. Our father met him three times in public discussion, and this was our second conflict with him. If you want to see the Campbellite claims put up as strongly as it is possible for them to be put up by one of their men in this part of the country, you want this book. If their teaching could be sustained, Mr. Srygley could do it. We hope many of our brethren will send us their orders now. Will you please see how many of them you can sell for us? We will appreciate anything you may do in this line. The price of the book will be only one dollar, and it will be printed in good clear type and well bound in cloth. It will be worth having in your homes, for your children to read.

We would appreciate it very much for all who can do so to send their orders now, and if you can do so, send the money, so we can have that much to help us to pay for them when they are ready for us. Will you please do what you can? Can you not sell as many as six or a dozen for us? Please let us hear from you at once. We want to be able to form an idea as to how many of them we will be able to dispose of. C. H. C.

Acts 8:33

---March 5, 1912

Elder C. H. Cayce:
Dear Brother

The Primitive Baptist is a great satisfaction to me. May you and the many other dear brethren continue in your great work, and be upheld and guided by our heavenly Master to comfort and instruct the Lord's dear people. I feasted on your good sermons while with us last fall. Hope to see you again in this life. The winter has been so severe that Brother Morris has not preached for us since last October. We are getting hungry to hear preaching. I am very unworthy of the crumbs, much less a bountiful meal, as is so often sent me. Please remember me when you pray. I am so very weak. I do wish I could live and act as becomes a child of God, but it seems that I cannot. I am always falling down, and am a beggar at Jesus feet. Please give your views on **(Acts 8:33)** through the paper. I will greatly appreciate same. Your unworthy sister in hope of eternal life, Mrs. W. M. Frost.

REMARKS **(Acts 8:33)** is a quotation from the prophecy of Isaiah. When Philip approached the chariot in which the eunuch was riding, he found the eunuch was reading the fifty third chapter of Isaiah. In this chapter the prophet was foretelling the work of Christ, His mock trial in the court, His death, and what He should accomplish by it.

"In His humiliation." The trial in that mock court was humiliating. The crown of thorns which He wore was humiliating. The purple robe which He wore was humiliating. The death He died was humiliating, being crucified between two thieves. He was forsaken by all His friends. He fought the battle all alone. No one was with Him to comfort and cheer Him. "Of the people there was none to help." He bowed His head and gave up the ghost. Now He is dead. "Who shall declare His generation? for His life is taken from the earth." The hope of those who had been with Him is now dead. How can His people live, now that Christ is dead? But, behold, on the third morning He rises again. He was not raised a dead man, but a living Christ. He fought the battle alone, and gained the victory over all His enemies, and over the enemies of His dear children -His generation.

He gained the victory over sin, over death and over the grave. He is alive now forever more. The victory which He has gained is given to His loved ones. "But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." He gives them perfect, complete and full victory-a wonderful and glorious victory. May that victory be yours, dear sister, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Elder Waters With Us

---March 5, 1912

Elder C. H. Waters, of Pindell, Md., was with us on the third Sunday in January and Saturday before. He preached on Saturday afternoon, Sunday and Sunday night. On Monday he went to Sandy Branch. The appointments at Bethel and Rock Spring were called in, on account of the extremely cold weather and bad roads. So Brother Waters returned to Martin from Sandy Branch, and preached for us again on Tuesday, Tuesday night and Wednesday. Then he went to Greenfield. His preaching here was both comforting and instructive, and was much enjoyed by our people. He was heartily received among us, and we trust he may have a mind to come again.

We were sorry that the weather was so cold and disagreeable-so bad that it was impossible for many to get out.

We should have made mention of this sooner, but it was purely an oversight. We trust it will not be taken as showing lack of appreciation of Elder Waters' visit. May the Lord bless the dear brother, and sustain him in all his efforts to serve the Master and His people, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Feel Thankful

---March 19, 1912

Dear Brother Cayce

Much has taken place since I have seen you, or heard you preach; but I want to tell you that I have not forgotten the many times I have listened to you proclaim the sweet old story of salvation by grace. Though it has been so long, it seems I can almost hear your voice while standing in old Harmony Church, your words flowing almost without an effort. It seems that you are led in other directions; but if ever your mind leads you to come to Harmony, we want you to come. The door is standing open, with an ever welcome invitation to you. We have such a dear good pastor, Elder Story. He is kind to all, faithful, and very interesting. We also have another precious young gift, Brother Scott, for which we try to feel thankful. The brethren and sisters are in good health, so far as I know, I have got through the winter so far very well, considering the weather and my age. I am now in my seventy eighth year, and have not had a cold this winter. Of course, I am never clear of some aches and pains; but my general health is good, for which I try in my weakness to thank our heavenly Father, that has been so kind and merciful to me, a poor old sinner who has never, it seems, done any thing that is worth His attention. But still in looking over my long and varied life, I see that His mercies have at all times been thrown around me, and now in my old age I am surrounded with manifestations of His love, and protected by His strong and everlasting arm. I hope this will find you and yours well. Yours as ever in love, W. F. Fuqua. R. 2, Farmington, Ky.

REMARKS

The above letter from this precious old brother was much comfort and encouragement to us. We appreciate so much such words from a dear old father in Israel.

Dear brother, we often think of you, and all the precious brethren and sisters of Harmony Church. That old church is dear to our heart. You do not know how anxious we are to visit you again, but it seems that duty elsewhere prevents. We are hoping the way may be opened for us to visit you this year. We feel to thank the Lord for the dear gift of Brother Story, who serves you as pastor, and also for the younger gifts He is blessing you with. Do not forget, dear brother, that these gifts should be nursed and encouraged. They have many things to discourage them. We believe, though, that you all realize this. May the Lord bless, sustain and keep you all, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Repentance

---March 26, 1912

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother

I want your views on repentance. Has God called on the world or the church, or both, to repent? "And they repented at the preaching of Jonas." Please answer, and oblige. J. W. Harwell, Enville, Tenn.

REMARKS

Gospel repentance is required of gospel subjects. God's people under the law often went away from the service which He required under the law. When they did so, they were required to repent. Hence "they repented at the preaching of Jonas." Those upon whom the tower in Siloam fell did not repent, hence they were destroyed-they perished. Under the law God's people enjoyed temporal blessings in obeying the law. They disobeyed the law and suffered temporal punishment. Under the gospel God's people are commanded to repent, or turn away from false worship or false service. They imbibe false notions and engage in wrong practices often. They are commanded to turn away from all such, and to render the service which God requires in the gospel.

The foregoing is our opinion expressed in few words, as to the repentance required in the gospel. There is also another way in which we may speak of repentance, thus: if a man (or woman) is guilty of immoral practice, such as drunkenness, cursing, swearing, card playing, or other such practices, he should repent-turn away from such practice and live a moral and sober, honest and upright life. Every man can do this, and the moral law requires it. C. H. C.

Here's A Mixture

---April 16, 1912

"Because strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."-(4) (Matthew 7:14). "I am the door. If any man enter in by me, he shall be saved."-(John 10:9). "I am the way, the truth, and the life." "And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The Way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fool's, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there but the redeemed shall walk there."-(0) (Isaiah 35:10). All the above quotations point to the selfsame thing. That Jesus is that "STRAIT GATE," is evident. "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."- Acts. STRAIT means difficult, and "STRAIT GATE" means that it is difficult to enter in at. It is so difficult that Jesus said, "With men it is impossible." There are but few that enter in at the "Strait Gate." "Wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat."-(3) (Matthew 7:13). In this the Saviour gave a comparison. Many in our day boast of the broadness of their platform; and as the Saviour describes it, it is easy to get into, and not difficult to keep in it. Now as to the "STRAIT GATE," there are few that find it, says Christ. The same idea is supported by Paul in Romans, when he said, "Even so now at this present time there is a remnant according to the election of grace." When Isaiah spoke of the high way of holiness he meant Jesus, for He is the way to the Father, and this is God's way of holiness, for it is by Jesus, and of Him, and through Him we are to reach the Father. It is plainly shown by Isaiah who shall walk in the "Highway of holiness." It is the redeemed of the Lord. They are not holy in and of themselves; their holiness is of Christ, for His righteousness is imputed to them. The redeemed shall walk in the righteousness of Christ. No man will ever be saved any other way only

through the righteousness of Christ. The obedience and righteousness of Christ is the good works ordained for the redeemed to walk in, "THE REDEEMED SHALL WALK THERE." Grace reigns through the righteousness of Jesus Christ unto eternal life. No man ever has, ever can, or ever will walk there only as the Lord leads him, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God." Isaiah said the redeemed SHALL WALK THERE. It is hard for men's minds to be led to anything else but a legal base, hence the whole religious world who teach conditions for salvation repudiates Jesus Christ. "Strait is the gate and narrow is the way, and few there be that find it." P.

The above is from the Gospel News, published by Elder J. M. Perkins, of Mayfield, Ky., and is signed P., which stands for Perkins, we suppose. However, in this instance it could very easily stand for Presumption or Presumed, for it contains much that is presumed.

Note, that there are four paragraphs, according to his division, appearing at the head of his article. Then he says, "All the above quotations point to the selfsame thing." If the elder had given all of the first quotation his readers could have readily seen that his statement is unqualifiedly wrong, or else the gentleman must take the position that people are required by the Saviour to enter into Him. Further on he quotes a part of **((3) (Matthew 7:13))**, but even there he religiously passes the first clause of that verse. The Saviour said: "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Why did the Saviour admonish to enter in at the strait gate? He assigns the reason-"for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction."

In **(Luke 13:24)** the Saviour mentions the strait gate again. He says: "Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able." According to Elder Perkins, the Saviour here commanded somebody to strive to enter into Him. Has Elder Perkins turned Campbellite? His statement and contention that the strait gate and narrow way refers to Christ and the way to eternal life is the Campbellite position precisely. Now, who is the Arminian
The statement that "the obedience and righteousness of Christ is the good works ordained for the redeemed to walk in," is such a glaring misstatement of the fact in the case that we are bound to believe the elder knows better. The good works the Lord has ordained, or prepared, for His children to walk in are the things which He has commanded them to do, and not the things which Christ came to do. He fulfilled the law. Do God's children do that? No! Christ did that for them.
Elder Perkins repudiates Jesus Christ, for he repudiates His teachings. May the Lord pity the man who will resort to such subterfuges to "bolster up" a false theory. C. H. C.

Hebrew Alphabet

---April 16, 1912

I have often wished to know what the terms Aleph, Beth, Gimel, etc., mean in (Psalms 119). Can you explain it briefly? May the Lord strengthen you and help you to give us as good a paper for 1912 as you did in 1911, is the sincere desire of yours in love, John V Martin. Box 5, Carl Junction, Mo.

REMARKS The words you refer to are the names of the letters composing the Hebrew alphabet. That alphabet was composed of twenty two letters, and those are the letters. C. H. C.

Questions

---April 23, 1912

Elder C. H. Cayce:
Dear Brother

I want to ask a few questions about some things that have been on my mind. I am sure the Old Baptists are the only people who preach a full gospel as I understand it, and I am sure also that if Christ has a visible church or kingdom on earth, it is the regular Old Baptists. The forerunner of our blessed Saviour was a Baptist and his mission was from heaven. He made ready a people prepared for the Lord, and I am not able to find anything in the Bible that gives the least hint that any of John's subjects were ever refused to be included in the churches of Christ that were organized from the day of Pentecost. If I am wrong in this, please tell me where and how I am mistaken. I understand also from history that the Greek church was made up largely of the people who were baptized by John the Baptist on a profession of faith, that they believed in Jesus the King of saints. Give me your views on this. Also, my dear brother, in **(I John 2:19)**, what do you understand from that? Was it the Antichrist church that went out from the Baptists in the third century? That is what I understand John meant when he used the words "went out from us." I understand that the first Protestant church was the Catholic church that went off from the standard that Christ and His apostles set up. If I am wrong, I should be glad to be set right as the Word of God directs. From church history I understand that there were only two so-called churches for fourteen hundred years, and these were the Baptists and Catholics. Please help me to straighten this out. I understand that the Baptists were never a Protestant people. My dear brother in Christ, please correct any mistakes and answer through The Primitive Baptist. Yours in hope, D. C. Bishop. Randle, Wash.

REMARKS

The Saviour organized His church of material which John made ready by baptizing. The Lord had prepared them, and John made them ready. A church is composed of baptized believers. The Saviour organized His church of believers who were baptized by John. John was sent of God for this express purpose. There can be no reason, then, why those who were baptized by John should not be taken into the church.

Those who "went out from us," as John says, refers to those who depart from the truth. The Catholics did that in about the third century. That was the first "split off" from the church.

The Catholic church was never known as Protestant. The name Protestant was given those who protested against the corruptions of Rome at the time of the Reformation. Baptists were never what is really called Protestants, as they always were a separate people. The Catholics originated about the third century. The Baptists remained separate from them. These two bodies of people were the only "Christian" orders or churches until the Reformation. C. H. C.

Not Consistent

---April 30, 1912

While reading Wesley's Sermons the other day Pastor M. E. Miller, of Marion, ran across this statement on page 273 of Vol. 2, in his sermon on "The New Birth" and copied it and sent to us. Note it. "A man may possibly be born of water and yet not

be born of the Spirit. There may sometimes be the outward sign, where there is not the inward grace. I do not speak with regard to infants; it is certain our church supposes that all who are baptised in their infancy are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this supposition." That was Methodism in its beginning-baptismal regeneration straight for babies. But they have learned better than that in late years. So last year at Asheville in their Quadrennial Conference they reversed Wesley and their former teaching of baptismal regeneration and now say that babies are born into this world "heirs of eternal life and subjects of saving grace of the Holy Spirit." Was the old fashioned Methodism of Wesley's day right or is modern revamped Methodism right? One thing is sure, both can't be right, and a church that as completely reverses itself as Methodism has done one of its cardinal doctrines can't be in any sense a church of Christ. As a matter of fact Wesley was nearer right than modern Methodists. He was right in teaching that children are born in sin but wrong in saying that baptism regenerated them; while the whole ritual of modern Methodism is wholly wrong. Babies are born into this world children of wrath and not heirs of eternal life; and infant baptism is a relic of the dark ages gotten from heathenism by the Catholics and handed down by them through the Episcopalians to the Methodists. -H. B. Taylor, in News and Truths, October 27, 1911.

It seems that in October, 1911, Elder Taylor knew that infants were not saved by water baptism, and that they were not born pure and holy or without sin. But in our debate near Lynn Grove, Ky., in December, 1911, he said emphatically that he did not know how infants are saved. If he did not know how they are saved, how did he know they are not saved by water baptism? How can a man conscientiously or consistently say anything about what other people teach on a subject, when he admits his own ignorance concerning it? C. H. C.

Galatians 5:17 AND Romans 6:12

---April 30, 1912

"For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would."-(Galatians 5:17). "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lust thereof."-(Romans 6:12). Brother Cayce, these two passages of Scripture seem to be a "tangled hank" for me. I wish you would unravel the hank for me through The Primitive Baptist. The first seems to be a positive declaration-"so that ye cannot do," etc. The second, as an admonition, seems to contradict the first by giving the saints power, or representing them as having the ability to obey-"let not sin reign," etc. Yours in hope of eternal life, Jake Owens. Speedwell, Tenn.

REMARKS

We do not think the two expressions referred to by Brother Owens are contradictory. In **(Romans 6:12)** the apostle admonishes the brethren to not let sin reign-do not follow the sinful inclinations and desires.

The expression in **(Galatians 5:17)** shows that the child of God is a complex being-he is in possession of two natures.

The flesh is the Adamic nature, which is a sinful nature. The Spirit is the divine nature, which he received in regeneration. When one is born of the earthly or natural parentage he partakes of the nature of that parentage, which is a sinful nature-the flesh or fleshly nature. Then when one is born of God he is born of the heavenly parentage, and partakes of the nature of that parentage; and that nature

is divine. These two natures are contrary to each other. They are not alike. From this the warfare springs up. The child of God possesses these two natures-and these natures are engaged in continual warfare. The child of God has a desire to live a holy and sinless life. He desires to be entirely free from sin.

This desire springs from the divine nature which he received in regeneration. But he cannot attain to that state of perfection while he stays here, because he still has the same old sinful nature which he had before. He should, however, not follow the inclinations and leadings of that sinful nature by engaging in things that are sinful and wrong, but should follow the inclinations and desires of the divine nature which he now possesses. In **(Galatians 5:16)** the apostle says, "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh."

This expression just precedes the one Brother Owens calls attention to. Certainly the apostle would not admonish the Galatian brethren to do this, and then in the next breath tell them that they could not do so. It is the duty of the child of God to walk in the Spirit, and thereby not to fulfill the lust of the flesh; but he need not expect to do this without a warfare. It will be a continual warfare, and he must fight on in order to continually do what the apostle admonishes here. He would like to walk in the Spirit without having to engage in a warfare, but he cannot do that. We trust these thoughts may be some help to you. C. H. C.

Two-Seedism

---April 30, 1912

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-

We would be glad to have you give your views directly on Paul's commission as spoken of by himself in **(Acts 26:18)**. Also, can you explain to us what "Two Seedism" is, through the columns of The Primitive Baptist? Mrs. Lila Lockhart. Tennessee Ridge, Tenn.

REMARKS

We gave our views on the Scripture above referred to in The Primitive Baptist of September 25, 1906.

The doctrine of eternal Two Seedism is that in the work which we call regeneration, an eternal child, or eternal spirit, comes down from God out of heaven and takes up its abode in the Adam man, and remains in the Adam man until the man dies; then that eternal child goes back to God where it came from, and the Adam man goes to the grave and remains there forever. Thus the Adam man is not a subject of salvation. It is also taught that there are two families in the flesh-that Cain was a child of the devil by ordinary generation, and that Seth was a child of God by ordinary generation-that there are two families existing in the flesh-the family of God and the family of the devil, and that these two families have continued to exist all along from then until now. This is their teaching, although we have not learned how the devil got his family across the flood.

These are some of the teachings of the Two Seed system, which we think are enough to show that the system is false. C. H. C.

Answered Prayer

---May 7, 1912

In connection with the distribution of tracts, which we have been trying to do the last few months, we got permission from Joshua Gravett to have 10,000 copies of an article by him on "Salvation by Grace" printed. We suggested to one or two

brethren that they could invest some of God's money no better way than that, but somehow the idea did not strike them. James' statement came to mind just then: "Ye have not because ye ask not." So we began to ask God for the money to get out the tracts. Last Monday morning we got a letter from California telling us, if we could use \$50 or \$60 in "our Lord's cause" to draw on the writer. Query: How far can God send money in answer to prayer for His own work? Somebody good in mathematics might answer.-H. B. Taylor, in News and Truths, April 19, 1912. Since the Softshells say that they could take the world for Christ if they had money enough, it appears to us that if they could only get Elder Taylor to pray for it, it would be forthcoming. Since Elder Taylor teaches that the heathen cannot be saved without the gospel, and the gospel cannot be sent for lack of funds, does it not look like Elder Taylor would pray for the funds to be sent? Does he pray for the funds for this object- to send the gospel in order to convert the world to Christ? It seems that if he has, the Lord has not answered the prayer. But he says the Lord sends the funds for the carrying on and accomplishing of His work. Then if Elder Taylor has prayed for the funds for the object mentioned, it must not be the Lord's work, as the funds have not been sent. C. H. C.

Is This The Doctrine of Primitive Baptists?

---May 7, 1912

(From Messenger of Peace.)

Elder W. I. Carnell, editor of the Predestinarian Baptist, late by published at Eldorado, III, but in future to be published at Lebanon, Ohio, gives a statement of his belief in a recent issue of his paper which shows most clearly that he is not a Primitive Baptist, allowing the great body of the church to set forth her own faith. Of course Elder Carnell claims to be an "Old Line" Baptist, but anyone who is at all interested can find out what Old School or Primitive Baptists believe on the points for which he so particularly stands. It is not our purpose in this article to try to disprove Elder Carnell's positions, nor to try to prove the positions of Primitive Baptists to be correct; but to call attention to the fact that whether Primitive Baptists are right or wrong, Elder Carnell is not in line with them. He differs from Primitive Baptists on what man is. He claims that he has no indestructible spirit or soul, and if not resurrected as a child of God, will be utterly annihilated. He says of man's creation: "We maintain that God formed man (not part of him) of the dust of the ground, and that, instead of breathing a living soul into the man, he breathed into him the breath of life and he (the man) became a living soul." The London Confession of Faith says that man was created with "reasonable and immortal souls," (1689) and this idea has been reaffirmed in the United States up to the present time. If there is any history of Primitive Baptists that represents them as taking the position of Elder Carnell, we have failed to read it or see it cited. If there is a church in the United States that states this idea in its articles of faith we have not heard of it. Elder Carnell contends that when men and women die, the entire person, of whatever it consists, dies, and is consigned to the grave until the resurrection. He says: "We contend that men and women die, and that hour their thoughts perish; they cease to live until the great resurrection at the last day, when they shall be raised from the dead." He makes no distinction in the death of believers and unbelievers, until the resurrection, when those who are children of God shall be raised to life, and the lost resurrected to be annihilated, their

existence wholly blotted out. It would appear from his position in regard to the children of God while in death, that he stands with some of the Campbellites and other orders who claim that men do not receive eternal life until the resurrection, that they only have a promise of it in this life, for if they are given eternal life in regeneration, as Primitive Baptists contend, then how could eternal life die and lie in the grave? If those who die and are buried have no life in any sense until the last day, the day of the "great resurrection," the disciples were deceived when they thought they heard Moses and Elias talking with Jesus about the death He should accomplish at Jerusalem, for according to the Scriptures Moses was dead. Who is there now living in Missouri and Illinois who remembers to have heard Elders Goodson, Priest, Branstetter, Dark, Van Meter, Potter and numbers of others in their day preach that the entire man, regenerate as well as unregenerate, lies in the grave dead until the resurrection? Were these soldiers of the cross Primitive Baptists? and did they understand what Primitive Baptists had always held on those points? The London Confession of Faith says: "The bodies of men after death return to dust **{(Genesis 2:19); ((36) (Acts 13:36)}** and see corruption; but their souls, which neither die nor sleep, having an immortal subsistence, immediately **{(((7) (Ecclesiastes 12:7)}** return to God who gave them; the souls of the righteous then being made perfect in holiness, are received into paradise, where they are with Christ, and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to **{((Jude 1:7) (Jude 1:7); (II Peter 2:6,9); (Luke 16:23-24)}** the judgment of the great day." Elder Carnell contends that the wicked shall be annihilated and that there is no such thing as everlasting, conscious punishment. Primitive Baptists who have access to the articles of faith of the church of their membership can easily convince themselves that this is not the doctrine of the church they united with, as most of the articles read: "We believe the punishment of the wicked is everlasting, and the joys of the righteous are eternal." Whether the Old School Baptists are right or wrong it is easy to find that this doctrine of annihilation has not been, and is not now, the faith of the church. If the doctrine of heathen Buddhism (annihilation) is true, the Old Baptist Church is now, and has been wrong for centuries. Elder Carnell is not in harmony with the church on this doctrine, and he knows that he is not, and it is a matter of such importance that it has been mentioned as one of the articles of faith continuously. Elder Carnell may contend, in fact does contend, that he is right, and therefore contends that the Old School Baptists are and have been wrong, and have been blinded by tradition, which he says has entered the columns of "some of our periodicals and confuses the mind of many good brethren." Where did they get this "tradition?" The Primitive Baptist Church through her literature and ministry has been teaching ever since the church was instituted the everlasting, conscious punishment of the wicked, which argues that man in his creation is indestructible and lives forever; and has stood stoutly against the "soul-sleeping," or "no-soul" theory, that the entire being of men and women, and especially of the saints, goes into the grave and lies there until the resurrection. Either the church or Elder Carnell is teaching something the Bible does not warrant, and in fact which amounts to heresy, doctrinally. If the church is right, Elder Carnell should not be allowed to introduce his heresy in the church and publish it to the world as Primitive Baptist doctrine, and let the matter go unrebuked. Old School Baptists should inform themselves, if they are not informed, as to what is and has been the belief of the church, and then if they find themselves not in harmony with these beliefs, just leave the church; and either start a church of their own, or try to find one that some other man has started (for there are many of them), and not disturb the Old Baptist Church and throw it into confusion with new "isms." Elder Carnell admits that he is not in harmony with the majority of the church, but he says he

feels confident that he is right. We are not discussing the correctness of his views in this article, but we do say most emphatically that upon his contention that man has no indestructible soul; that when men and women die, both regenerate and unregenerate, all there is of them goes to the grave in death; and that the wicked shall be annihilated, and there is no conscious, everlasting punishment after death; that upon these things he is not a Primitive or Old School Baptist, and has no right to be posing as one, and when Old School Baptists encourage the sowing of these things they are preparing the way for a revision of our old articles of faith which will make trouble and division in the future. But some may think that these are just his private, personal opinions, and that no one has a right to object to his holding them. We are not objecting to his holding them, but to his publishing them under the name of Primitive Baptist. The Means Baptists came in among us years ago, claiming to be genuine "Old Line" Baptists, and many thought the variation so slight that it amounted to little, but it was a departure and led to division. The Kirklands brought in their ideas and claimed to be genuine Primitive Baptists, and they were such able preachers and good men that it seemed harsh to speak against them. But see the havoc in some places that a little leaven worked. Now comes Elder Carnell with his no soul-just animal man, no eternal life for the saved until the resurrection, and annihilation of the wicked, and claims to be an Old School Baptist. He is an able preacher, but what if he were an angel, would that make these ideas harmonize with the accepted doctrine of the Primitive Baptists? These ideas are not new in the world, but they are new among Primitive Baptists, and it means a departure for Primitive Baptists to suffer them to be taught by one professing to be a Primitive Baptist, thus endeavoring to remove the ancient landmarks planted by the fathers when the churches were first gathered here. Elder Carnell says, "In our earnest contention for what we feel sure is the truth, we do not mean to offend, nonfellowship or unChristianize any who may differ with us; but when we feel sure that a brother is wrong in any matter of faith or practice, our duty toward him as a brother is to labor to convince and reclaim him from that wrong." Certainly; that is the very spirit that has been shown by all who have led off from the Primitive Baptist faith, they do not want any nonfellowship lines, they still want the privilege of teaching and "reclaiming" as many as possible. They are "decidedly opposed to setting up bars of fellowship against our brethren because of differences on minor points." That is just the position others have taken when they knew that if the strict line of the doctrine of the church was to be drawn it would leave them on the wrong side of it. Elder Carnell may call the ideas that have been held so many centuries by our people "tradition," but we are well content to abide in the "old ruts;" we can get along very well without any new ideas, especially such as are so radically different from the doctrine that has marked the church for so many centuries. We dislike very much to occupy the place of spokesman in such matters, but we love the church better than the persons of men, and it pains us to think of having our churches torn and disrupted by men who love their own ideas better than they do the peace of Zion. It was not a pleasant thing for Paul to speak of those who should rise up and speak perverse things to draw away disciples after them, and yet by the space of three years he ceased not to warn every one night and day, with tears ((0:28) (Acts 20:28-31)). If any of our brethren have not the means and opportunity of getting information as to what has been the position of the Primitive Baptists upon these points, we would recommend them to write the editors of the oldest and most widely accepted papers of our denomination, as well as to well known writers who are considered sound in the faith by our people, not that these brethren are a standard for Baptists, or set themselves up to be, but their work, study and opportunity gives them an understanding of the history and the faith of our people. We give below, for the benefit of those who wish to do so,

the names and addresses of a few brethren who are well known: Elder Sylvester Hassell, editor of the Gospel Messenger, Williamston, N.C Elder R. W. Thompson, editor of the Primitive Monitor, Greenfield, Ind. Elder F. A. Chick, editor of the Signs of the Times, Hopewell, N.J. Elder C. H. Cayce, editor of The Primitive Baptist, Martin, Tenn. Elder J. G. Webb, editor of the Baptist Trumpet, Tioga, Texas. Elder J. H. Oliphant, Crawfordsville, Indiana. Elder S. H. Durand, Southampton, Pa. These are but a few. There are many others competent to give information as to what has been the faith of the Old School Baptists. We have not asked permission of these brethren to refer to them, but know from their standing that they are in position to know if Elder Carnell is in harmony with the church.

REMARKS

We copy the above from the pen of Elder Walter Cash in the Messenger of Peace of April 15, 1912. Elder Carnell is not advocating Primitive Baptist doctrine, and has not done so for years. He had departed from that before he left this country a number of years ago. He would not be received nor recognized by any of our churches in this country. C. H. C.

A Dream

--- May 7, 1912

Dr. John B. Devins told of a man who dreamed that he constructed a ladder from earth toward Heaven, and whenever he did a good deed his ladder went up two feet; when he did an unusually good deed his ladder went higher; when he gave away large sums of money to the poor he went still higher. After awhile it went out of sight, and as the years rolled on he expected at his death to step off that ladder into Heaven. But in his dream he heard a voice thunder from the skies: "He that climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." Down the man came, ladder and all; and he awoke. He realized then his mistake and sought salvation in the only way-faith in the atoning work of Jesus Christ.-Baptist and Reflector. Now, that won't do, for the Missionary Baptists do not believe in dreams. C. H. C.

Takes Exception

---May 14, 1912

Editor Primitive Baptist:

Dear Sir-

I see in your paper of Feb. 20, 1912, an editorial in reference to H. B. Taylor's anticipated trip to the Holy Land. You go then into an investigation of how many souls could be saved by the proper use of the money he is to use on this, as you term it, "pleasure trip," and wind up with the climax (I suppose) that the wrong party would go to hell, or with the question, "Would not the wrong party be sent there?" Now, elder, what did you say that for? Was it to prejudice the minds of the people against the truth? You know that the Bible nowhere teaches that an individual will be damned if he fails to send money to have the gospel preached to every creature, but it does say **{((6) (Mark 16:16))}** that he that believeth not shall be damned; also **(John 3:36)**, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." The prophet bade the people look and be healed-did not say, "I will not be healed if I don't tell you to look." Of course, the opposite was, "Don't look, and die." Christ uses this time salvation to illustrate eternal salvation, "Should not perish, but have eternal life." Again **{((30) (Acts 16:30-31))}** the jailer said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?"

And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Now there is nothing here that intimates that Paul and Silas would not have been saved if they had not taught this man the word of the Lord and told him to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, but we know it does that the jailer would not. You will say, this is time salvation. Perhaps, but faith is the medium through which we are saved from hell, as seen in (John 3:14-16), (**Galatians 3:26**): "For ye are all the children of God through faith in Christ Jesus," and not by sending the gospel to every creature, as Jesus commanded. Works are what save men in time and not faith. {see (**James 2:25**)} Again, (**I John 5:13**), "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." You may say faith is a fruit of salvation. Let's see, (**Ephesians 2:8**): "By grace are ye (or have been-R. V) saved through faith and that (referring to faith) not of yourselves; it is the gift of God," This is eternal life, for the next verse says: "Not of works, lest any man should boast." Also, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." You will say faith is the fruit of the Spirit, and quote (**Galatians 5:22**), but in Revised Version it is translated faithfulness. Now please answer this from a Biblical standpoint. Sarcasm, ridicule, and playing to prejudices of people is no answer. B. M. Nelson. Springville, Miss.

OUR REPLY

Friend Nelson labors rather hard to prove that one must hear and believe in order to be saved eternally, but makes no effort at all to prove our contention untrue—that if the heathen are sent to hell for not believing the gospel when they have never heard it, and they have not heard it because of the failure of those who have the gospel, then the wrong party is sent to hell. Perhaps the gentleman can tell us upon what principle of justice God will send the heathen to hell for not believing the gospel when they never had the opportunity of believing it. And perhaps the gentleman can tell us upon what principle of justice God will damn the heathen on this account, and at the same time save the man who has the gospel, believes the heathen are going to hell without it, and has the means to send it to them; but instead of using his means that way, spends the money going on a pleasure trip! Perhaps the gentleman can tell us upon what principle God will save Elder Taylor, or any other man, when he uses from three to six hundred dollars taking a pleasure trip, and at the same time eternally damn from three thousand to six thousand souls in hell, who might have been saved by the proper use of the money the man uses to take said pleasure trip. Now, if the gentleman can explain this, we are ready to hear it. An explanation is in order. We have been trying to get some of their strong preachers and debaters to explain this. They have all failed, up to the present time, to make any attempt to do so. But perhaps the above gentleman can come to the relief of his brethren now and remove the difficulty for them.

Every argument, or semblance of argument, the gentleman produces has been smashed with the hammer of God's Word time and again. Is it necessary to smash the same thing once more?

But since the gentleman asks, "What did you say that for?" we will say, because it smashes into smithereens the plea made by the Softshells that the heathen are going to hell on account of a lack of means to send them the gospel. It had effect enough to make Mr. Nelson squeal. But we will try our statement by the Word and see how it compares.

In (**Ezekiel 33:6**), we have this language: "But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come, and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand." These Softshells claim that they see

the sword, for they say the heathen are going to hell without the gospel. But they are using the money to take pleasure trips instead of using it to warn the heathen. The heathen will perish in their iniquity, but God will require their blood at the hand of the watchman. Therefore the watchman will be eternally damned with the heathen. Now, there you are! The whole "push" will go to hell together, if your doctrine is the truth.

It is not necessary to examine each passage the gentleman refers to, for the simple reason that the above proves his contention to be untrue. But will refer to his statement concerning **(Galatians 5:2)**. The Revised Version does translate the word faithfulness instead of faith; but is that final proof? Hardly. The Greek word is *pistis*. Strong's definition of the word is faith. Thayer's definition is, "Faith; conviction of the truth of any thing, belief," etc. The eighth edition of Liddell & Scott's Greek Lexicon, the highest and best known authority on the Greek language, defines the word, "In Theology, faith, belief, as opposed to sign and knowledge." The Interlinear translation renders the word as faith. Your Revised Version is wrong.

But the gentleman, by his contention, denies that faith is a fruit of the Spirit of God. If it is not of the Spirit of God, it is of the devil. So he would have the sinner saved through something which is of the devil!

In **(John 5:24)** the Saviour says: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." We wonder if the gentleman will take his own witness now? The Revised Version says, "He that heareth my word, and believeth Him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life." The believer has passed out of death into life.

This is a strict literal translation of the language: "He that hears my word, and believes Him who sent me, has life eternal, and into judgment comes not, but has passed out of death into life." The one who believes (in the present tense) is one who has passed (in the perfect tense) out of death into life.

In **(I John 5:1)** we are told, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." The word here translated is born is *gegennatai*, and may be translated begotten or born; but this word is in the perfect tense and the passive voice. As it is in the passive voice the person is passive in being born again, or in this birth. As it is in the perfect tense, it denotes a work that had already been completed. The following is, therefore, a literal translation of this text: "Everyone that believes that Jesus is the Christ, has been born of God." The believer, then, has already been born of God.

All the Softshells in the Universe cannot harmonize these passages with their theory. Their theory is wrong. They reverse every principle of logic and true science, and every principle of nature. They seem to think there would never be any more lightning if it did not thunder first! C. H. C.

Galatians 4:4-5

---May 14, 1912

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-

I think the brethren who have a love for the cause should take The Primitive Baptist, and should be prompt to pay their dues. Brother Cayce, I would be glad for you to give your views on **(Galatians 4:4-5)**, "God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." Some brethren differ from me as to what law was under consideration-the Mosaic law, or

the law of sin and condemnation. May God bless you, both temporally and spiritually. Your brother in hope of a better world, H. M. Sanders. Bold Spring, Tenn.

REMARKS

The law referred to could not very well have been the law given by Moses on Mount Sinai, for that law was given to the Jews. The Gentiles were never required to keep the ordinances contained in that law. That law, with all the ordinances connected with it, was given to the Jews. It is true that the moral requirements contained in it, such as "thou shalt not steal," "thou shalt not commit adultery," and "thou shalt not kill," were binding on the Gentiles; but this law was not given to them. But the Lord had a people among the Gentiles, and they were under the curse of some law. They were under the curse of the same law that the Jews were under.

All were under curse just alike. The Sinai law did not curse all alike. Caleb and Joshua observed the law and thereby entered the promised land. Many fell in the wilderness, failed to enter the promised land, because they failed to observe the requirements of the same law which Caleb and Joshua kept. Caleb and Joshua needed a Redeemer just as much as the others did, but they did not need one to redeem them from under the law given by Moses, for they observed that law themselves.

Many of God's people were never under the law of Moses. None of those who lived and died before Moses were under that law. But they were under the curse of the same law that all others of God's people were under. The curse of the law they were under was death. The penalty of the law which they were under was death. The sentence was death. They must be redeemed from death in order that they be saved in heaven. Jesus came down to where they were-under the law that condemned to death-and suffered the penalty of that law for them. He went into death and arose from the dead. Thereby He redeemed them. They were under the law before. But He went down to where they were and paid the price of their redemption. He met all the demands that were against them. He therefore redeemed all His people from the curse of the law of sin and death. C. H. C.

Denies It

---June 4, 1912

Elder H. B. Taylor, of Murray, Ky., in the News and Truths of May 10, 1912, denies saying in our debate at Lynn Grove last December that he did not know how infants are saved. The statement we made in the discussion-"It depends upon where you are as to what you say"-is evidently proven true again in this. Elder Taylor said, more than once, in that discussion, "I do not know," in answer to the oft repeated question, "How are infants saved?" It looks better for a man to say the same thing every time, or else acknowledge that he was wrong one time. C. H. C.

Debate in Arkansas

---June 11, 1912

We have agreed to meet Elder Allen Hill Autrey, Missionary Baptist, in a four days debate at or near Board Camp, Ark., to begin on Tuesday, July 16, at 10 o'clock a. m. Four propositions are to be discussed, which are as follows:

1. The Scriptures teach that the death of Christ made the salvation of all men possible. A. H. Autrey affirms; C. H. Cayce denies.

2. The Scriptures teach that all for whom Christ died will be saved in heaven. C. H. Cayce affirms; A. H. Autrey denies.
3. The Scriptures teach that eternal life is offered to dead (alien) sinners upon conditions with which they can comply. A. H. Autrey affirms; C. H. Cayce denies.
4. The eternal salvation of an alien sinner is unconditional. C. H. Cayce affirms;
- 5 H. Autrey denies.

Those desiring to attend the discussion, and who go on the railroad, should reach Mena on Monday, July 15. If you intend going, write to J. W. Ringgold, Nunley, Ark, C. H. C.

Reply to Elder J. B. Hardy

---June 25, 1912

In another column in this paper will be found an article over the signature of Elder J. B. Hardy, of Croft, Kansas, which we copy from the Spiritual Law Counsel, published in Roanoke, Va. The article appears under the caption, "Elder Kilby's Request Answered." We feel that the cause demands that we publish this article, so that our readers may know for themselves where Elder Hardy stands, as we have been asked several times what his position is. We also feel that we would not be faithful if we do not notice some of the things he has said in the article.

We first call attention to the fact that he does not fairly state Elder Kilby's questions. He says that the questions properly, boiled down would mean just this: "Do the children of God obtain the new covenant blessings upon condition of obeying the New Testament commands?" Elder Kilby's question does not say whether the blessings are new covenant blessings or not. But Elder Hardy's statement of the question is equivalent to stating it this way: "Do the children of God obtain any new covenant blessings upon condition of obeying the New Testament commands?" Elder Hardy then proceeds to argue that the child of God does not receive any new covenant blessing upon condition of obeying the New Testament commands.

It is a fact, and must be admitted, that blessings of some kind are received by some kind of characters on condition of obeying the New Testament commands, or else no kind of blessings are received by any kind of character on such condition.

If any kind of blessings are received by any kind of characters on condition of obeying the New Testament commands, those characters who receive such blessings on such conditions are either unregenerate characters or else they are children of God.

But the unregenerate do not receive such blessings on such conditions, because the New Testament commands are not given to them, but are given to God's children. Elder Hardy says: "But one may say the disobedient fail to receive, to which we answer: If the children of God fail to receive the new covenant blessings by disobeying the New Testament commands, this obedience to the New Testament commands would be the measure of God's blessings to them; and none would ever receive a new covenant blessing from God until he obeyed, for obedience must precede the blessing. This is Simon pure Arminianism, and contradicts not only the Bible, but also every Christian's experience." Now, we must say that Elder Hardy knows this is not Arminianism.

He knows that the Arminian position is that the unregenerate sinner receives eternal life on condition of obeying the gospel or New Testament commands. If it is Arminianism to say that the receiving or enjoying of spiritual blessings by the child

of God depends upon his obedience, then Elder Hardy proposed to affirm an Arminian proposition, for he once proposed to affirm the following, and authorized his name to be signed to it to affirm it: "The Scriptures teach, and it has been the teaching of the church in all ages since its establishment by Christ, that the enjoyment of spiritual blessings depends largely upon the obedience of His (God's) children." If spiritual blessings are new covenant blessings then Elder Hardy proposed to affirm what he says in the article from the Spiritual Law Counsel is Simon pure Arminianism.

Not only so, but if he is correct in his statement now, then the teaching of the church, according to what he proposed to affirm, has all along been Simon pure Arminianism. We wonder if Elder Hardy would now deny the proposition which he once proposed to affirm?

Elder Hardy further says: "But no child of God ever failed to receive any new covenant benefit by disobeying the New Testament commands. They are not suspended upon such contingencies, nor does God barter them off for such service." If Elder Hardy proposed to affirm the truth when he proposed to affirm the foregoing proposition, and if spiritual blessings are new covenant blessings, then some new covenant blessings are suspended upon condition of obedience upon the part of the child of God.

Again: If the enjoyment of spiritual blessings is a new covenant benefit, and depends largely upon the obedience of the child of God, and no child of God ever failed to receive any new covenant benefit on account of disobedience, then no child of God ever did disobey!

Again, Elder Hardy says: "One cannot properly lose what he never possessed." Evidently Elder Hardy is wrong, or else Webster is wrong. Webster's International Dictionary, published by G. & C. Merriam, is standard authority on the English language, and it says: "Lose-Not to employ or enjoy; to employ ineffectually; to throw away; to waste; squander; to let slip; as, to lose a day; to lose the benefits of instruction." To illustrate this, we will say that Bill Lowstep lost the benefits of instruction. Why and how has he lost this? By not obtaining the instruction. He never had the instruction; hence he never had the benefits of it, and, thus, he lost it. He, therefore, lost something he never possessed.

But Webster says, further, "To fail to obtain or enjoy; to fail to gain or win; as, to lose a prize or a stake; to lose a game, a law suit; hence, to fail to catch with the mind or senses; to miss; as, I lost a part of what he said." Here Webster emphatically says that to lose is "to fail to obtain." If one fails to obtain something, he loses that something which he never did possess. He never did possess it, because he failed to obtain it. If one fails to gain, or win, a prize, he loses the prize. He therefore loses something which he never possessed.

Now, here is a New Testament command or requirement: "Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain."-(I Corinthians 9:24). Here they are required to run so as to obtain the prize- run in such a way as to obtain it. The obtaining the prize depends upon them running, and upon the way they run. By failing to run, they fail to obtain the prize. To fail to obtain the prize is to lose the prize. Hence, the child of God who fails to "so run" loses the prize by failing to obtain it.

Again: If Bill Lowstep fails to hear a part of what Elder Hardy says, he fails to get a part of what he says. Bill Lowstep, according to good authority, would say, "I lost a part of what Elder Hardy said." He lost it, because he never got it.

National Israel were God's chosen people as a nation. They were a typical people, and represented spiritual Israel in the gospel day. The land of Canaan belonged to national Israel. It was theirs by gift and by birth. It belonged to them, and it was

theirs while they were in Egypt and while they were in the wilderness. That Canaan was a typical land which possessed many blessings-it was a land "flowing with milk and honey." It typified the gospel church in this dispensation. There are spiritual blessings in the gospel Canaan, just as there was milk and honey in the old Canaan. The children of Israel entered into the land of Canaan, which was theirs by the gift of God and by birth, and enjoyed the milk and honey (the blessings) in the land by obeying the commandments of the Lord. So, in like manner, the church belongs to God's children now-it is theirs by gift and by birth, and they enter into it and enjoy the blessings therein by obeying the New Testament commands. They cannot get into the church without obeying some New Testament command. If they do not lose any blessing by failing to obey, then there is no blessing in the church of Christ, or else they all obey. But there is a blessing in the church, as every child of God can witness who has become a member of it; and some of God's people do not obey. Therefore, some of God's people lose something-and it is a sweet, heavenly blessing, too-by not obeying the New Testament commands. If there is no blessing in the church for the children of God, the Lord could have had no object in view in establishing His church on earth for them. As the Lord certainly did have an object in view in establishing His church for them, it must be true that there are blessings in the church for them.

Again: As the Lord's church, or kingdom, is a spiritual kingdom, and as there are blessings in this kingdom for His children, it must be true that those blessings are spiritual. As there are spiritual blessings in the church for the Lord's children, and some of them fail to unite with that church-fail to cross over into the gospel Canaan-they lose the spiritual blessings which are in that kingdom. All those of God's children who do "cross over" into this gospel Canaan gain spiritual blessings that are in that kingdom by obeying New Testament commands, and thus "crossing over."

Again: Webster says that to lose is "to prevent from gaining or obtaining." God's children who fail to obey the New Testament commands, fail to unite with the church of Christ, fail to follow the Saviour, are prevented from gaining or obtaining the spiritual blessings which are in the church. Therefore they lose something by not obeying the New Testament commands, or by disobedience. Not only do they lose something, but they lose something which they never possessed.

Again: As to the statement that if this position be true, "this obedience to the New Testament commands would be the measure of God's blessings to them," will say that obedience to New Testament commands is the measure of SOME of God's blessings to them. Our Lord says: "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be."-(Revelation 22:12). He was not talking about unregenerate sinners in this expression, but God's children. The reward is according to their work. Their work is the measure of God's blessing. The obedient child receives more and brighter manifestations of His love.

The obedient child, therefore, gains this and the disobedient child loses it. The eminent Apostle Paul, in **(Romans 2:6)**, says God "will render to every man according to his deeds." His deeds shall be the measure of God's blessings that are meted out to him. There are many spiritual blessings which are measured to the Lord's children 'according to their obedience or disobedience. We know God's word teaches this, and we have realized it to be true by experience, if not deceived.

Again, Elder Hardy says: "This is not the principle upon which acceptable new covenant service is rendered, but is a twin to the Arminian theory of serving God for fear of hell," etc. We will say that if Elder Hardy is a true gospel minister (and we do not intimate that he is not), he would never preach another sermon if he could be satisfied without doing so. Then, why does he leave his home and travel

far away, preaching? If he is a true gospel preacher it is because he cannot rest without doing so. He must go trying to find rest. "Then I said, I will not make mention of Him, nor speak any more in His name. But His word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay." -**(0:9) (Jeremiah 20:9)**. Jeremiah was weary with forbearing, and had to go to find rest. The rest was what he felt that he must have, and he had to go to find it. This is true with every minister of the gospel of Christ. If a man is just as easy without engaging in the preaching of the gospel as he is in engaging in it, he has no business preaching, for he is not a minister of Christ.

While all this is true, it is also true that love for God, for Christ and for the cause of Christ prompts all true and acceptable service. "For the love of Christ constraineth us," says the apostle, in (II Corinthians 5:14). That love in the heart of God's children constrains them, leads, directs, influences them to seek for the sweet rest that is found in the service of the Lord. Elder Hardy says they should obey to edify the church. It seems to us that if the church is edified by the obedience of the Lord's children, then something is gained by it, and when they fail to obey, something is lost by their disobedience.

Elder Hardy says that in such obedience they purify their souls unto the true love of the brethren. It seems to us that if this is true, they gain something by obedience. Having one's soul purified unto the true love of the brethren is evidently a blessing of either a temporal or a spiritual nature. It certainly will not be claimed that this is simply a natural blessing belonging alike to regenerate and unregenerate. Then it must be a spiritual blessing, and may be enjoyed by the Lord's obedient children. This is gained by them, then, by this obedience, and they lose it by disobedience. Something is, therefore, gained by the obedience of the child of God, and he loses something by disobedience.

Elder Hardy says that in such obedience "they abound in fruits of righteousness; their evidences are increased; their hope is assured; the love of God is perfected in them; and they are made to joy and rejoice." It seems to us that if all this is true the child of God gains much by obedience and loses much by disobedience. These things are all certainly worth more to the child of God than all this world-the value of them can hardly be measured. He gains all this by obedience; but if he fails to obey he fails to enjoy or obtain these things, and thereby loses them. It is better to obey.

True, the child of God feels his unworthiness to have a place with the Lord's people in the service of God. The fact that one feels unworthy is evidence of a gracious state. But while that is true, he often wonders, and inquires, "Will I be any better off if I try to perform this duty? If I try to do this which I feel should be done, will I still feel condemned; and feel that I am not doing right? Will I feel any better at all if I try to do what I often feel is required of me? I feel so weak and imperfect that I fear I cannot render the service-but will I feel any better if I try?" Such questions arise in the minds and hearts of the Lord's children, if we know anything about the matter, and we have a Scriptural example of an inquiry of that nature, and the question is answered. Some of the Lord's children-His disciples-said, "Behold, we have forsaken all and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?"-(Matthew 19:27). In reply the Saviour refers directly to the apostles in (Matthew 19:28); then in (Matthew 19:29) he says, "And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life." This refers to God's children only. It has no reference to alien sinners. By forsaking all these things and following the Saviour-obeying the New Testament commands-they receive what is worth a hundred times more than all they forsake, and they

receive or inherit eternal life in the same sense that Paul admonished Timothy to "lay hold on eternal life."-(I Timothy 6:12).

In (II Peter 1:2-3), the apostle says, "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, according as His divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him that hath called us to glory and virtue." The next verse says: "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust." This clearly shows that those things which are necessary to prepare and qualify the Lord's children for heaven were and are given by the divine power of God through Jesus Christ. But the apostle adds, in the next verse, "And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue," etc. This shows that virtue may be gained by the child of God. If he obeys the New Testament command, he will add virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and charity. These things will thereby be gained. In verse 10 the apostle says, "For if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." Something is to be gained by the child of God who does these things. Grace was given in Christ sufficient for their eternal salvation-sufficient to bring salvation. The grace of God brings deliverance-brings salvation **{(Titus 2:11-12)}** and teaches those to whom it brings salvation that they "should live soberly, righteously and godly;" but some of them fail to live that way. In (II Corinthians 6:1), Paul says, "We, then, as workers together with Him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain." If they fail to do what the grace of God teaches them they should do, they receive the grace of God in vain in that sense.

"Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."- **(Hebrews 4:16)**. The apostle here admonishes the Lord's children to come to the throne of grace that they may find grace to help in time of need. There must be some sense, then, in which God's little children find grace to help in time of need by coming to the throne of grace. They gain this by doing what they are here admonished to do, and by failing to do this they lose what they would otherwise gain.

It is our humble desire to admonish and encourage the Lord's poor tempest tossed children to come to the throne of grace, that they may find grace to help in every time of need; and it is our desire to beseech them that they receive not the grace of God in vain.

Let us not be afraid of the truth. Let us not be afraid to teach or advocate the truth. The truth will not hurt the Lord's children. This will not divide or alienate them. The preacher who advocates things that are not true causes trouble and distress. Lord, help us to earnestly contend for the faith that was once delivered to the saints-the doctrine of God our Saviour. C. H. C.

Luke 21:31-35

---July 9, 1912

Sister V V Hankins, of Sulligent, Ala., requests our views of (Luke 21:31-35). The Saviour had been foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem, and some things that would transpire before hand. He gives the disciples to understand that just as they know summer is nigh when the trees shoot forth, so they may know that the destruction of Jerusalem is nigh when the things come to pass which He had just

foretold. All those things were to be fulfilled before that generation passed away. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 15:29

---July 9, 1912

Brother J. B. Lee, of Crestview, Tenn., has asked for our views on (I Corinthians 15:29), which reads, "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" (I Corinthians 15:30), "And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?"

In this chapter the apostle is treating upon the resurrection of the bodies of the saints. That is the main subject he considers in the entire chapter. In discussing that question he refers to baptism, in the language of the text referred to. As the doctrine of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints is true, then baptism representing this, it must be that it is performed by immersion or burial.

As baptism was administered that way, we say in the act of baptism that we believe in the doctrine of the resurrection. If there is to be no resurrection, then why should we baptize? Why bury the persons in water and raise them out again in baptism, if the doctrine of the resurrection is not true? If one is true or right, so is the other. If one is wrong, so is the other. C. H. C.

The Cayce-Srygley Discussion by E. G. S.

---July 9, 1912

We have read this discussion, which has just been issued by the McQuiddy Printing Company, in a very neat volume of nearly three hundred and forty pages. They discussed two propositions. Cayce is a predestinarian Baptist, and Srygley is simply a Christian. Cayce affirmed the following proposition: "God gives eternal life to an alien sinner without a condition on his (the sinner's) part, and the Scriptures so teach." For three nights Cayce affirmed this, while Srygley denied. Cayce attempted to sustain this proposition by the Scriptures. He explained the words "eternal life" to mean "that life that prepares and qualifies sinners of Adam's race to live with God in heaven," thus claiming the sinner receives eternal life while still in mortal life, as well as after death.

In his very first effort to sustain this proposition he began to misapply the word of God. The first passage he quoted to prove his proposition was **(Romans 8:8-9)**. In this passage Paul was not talking about alien sinners, but talking to church members that were walking after the flesh instead of walking after the Spirit in its teaching to the Lord's people, and not talking to alien sinners at all. With him, the alien sinner was the nonelect, who could not in any sense please God, could not obey Him. With him, the elect only can please God by obeying Him. These points he tried to maintain to the close, misapplying Scriptures all the way through the discussion of his proposition. Brother Srygley showed up his misapplications of the Scriptures, thus setting aside his arguments and showing his entire failure to sustain his position by any properly applied Scripture. The first proposition ended, they debated for three nights the following proposition, Srygley affirming: "Faith, repentance, and water baptism are conditions of pardon or salvation to an alien sinner, and the Scriptures so teach." In the discussion of this proposition there was a very great change in the character of the debate. Brother Srygley very plainly and forcibly presented the word of God in its proper division and application, and put forward the Scriptures that sustain his proposition in a manner that baffled the skill of Brother Cayce to meet and overturn. Anyone that will read this discussion

without prejudice will see what a difference there is between an effort to sustain human theory about the plan of salvation and the plain teaching of the word of God on the subject.

The man that undertakes to sustain human theories about the teaching of the Bible has a heavy job on his hands. He has to scrap up passages out of their connection and without regard to their proper connection, and thus often makes one passage contradict another. Such errors and blunders are easily upset by one who understands the Book. Anyone that wants to see the power of truth thrown against mere theory will be deeply interested in reading this book. Price, one dollar. The foregoing from the pen of E. G. Sewell appeared in the Gospel Advocate, Nashville, Tenn., of July 4.

Brother Sewell says that in **(Romans 8:8-9)**, the apostle was not talking about alien sinners, but to church members. Yes, the apostle was talking TO church members, but he told them that those who are in the flesh (alien sinners) cannot please God, and gave the church members to understand that they can please God. Our position was that the alien sinner is the unregenerate sinner-the one who is yet in an unsaved state. Our points were sustained, not only by the Scriptures and arguments which Mr. Srygley tried to refute and failed, but by many which he never even pretended to notice.

On the second proposition we answered every argument Mr. Srygley made, showed how he could not harmonize his construction of some passages with other plain statements of Holy Writ. Besides this, we introduced many negative arguments and proof texts which Mr. Srygley did not even pretend to notice.

Mr. Srygley is considered by them as among the ablest debaters in the state. They esteem him as one of their strongest men. We conclude that if their position could be maintained Mr. Srygley could maintain it. Get the book and read it carefully and see who failed. They have not yet told us what became of Aunt Fannie Corbett, and we suppose they do not yet know.

Yes, Mr. Srygley had a heavy job on his hands. He could not meet the arguments-not because of his weakness, but because he was not on the side of truth.

Send us your order for one of the books. The price is only one dollar. If you can sell any of them for us, and thereby get people to investigate, we would appreciate it.
C. H. C.

Questions On The Organ

---July 9, 1912

Dear Brother Cayce: I would be glad to have your views on a matter of importance just now, in some places, on the organ question. It is urged that we should not make this a bar to fellowship, but that we should labor with those that practice it, to reclaim them from this error. Were the organ churches in Georgia labored with before they were dropped from fellowship? If we are decided to fellowship it, would it be consistent to labor to get our brethren to drop a matter that we have fellowship for? Have our people usually had fellowship for it in the past? Would it be new among us to treat it with fellowship? Can we expect the fellowship of both parties in the Georgia trouble? It seems right to patiently labor with brethren in error in doctrine or practice, and not hastily drop them. But if we are resolved to fellowship the thing we labor to remove, what would be left to labor about? What do brethren mean that talk of not wanting the organ, and of laboring with others to reclaim them from it, and yet of having fellowship for it? Do you suppose they are honestly opposed to the use of the organ in church themselves? It sounds catchy to talk of patience and gentleness and of laboring with erring ones to reclaim them

from error, but to add that we must not declare non-fellowship for it, puts one at a loss to know what they mean by "laboring." Could you give us a little light? Do you know what they are aiming at? I feel that some explanation is due our people from your pen.

OUR REPLY

Brother A. requests us to answer the foregoing specifically. We have tried to be plain heretofore concerning these matters, and Brother A. understands our position, but there may be others who do not. We thought we were plain enough in our remarks concerning the peace proposition which was proposed some time ago. But we are willing to express ourselves again on the matter. We will answer the questions as they appear above.

It is our understanding that the organ churches in Georgia were labored with. So our answer to that question is, yes. If we have fellowship for a thing, we cannot see the consistency in laboring to get brethren to drop it. Why should we want a thing dropped that we have fellowship for? No; our people have not had fellowship for the use of organs in the past. It is a Roman Catholic invention, and unknown in the church of God. This answers the next question, but we will add that it is a new thing in the church, and to fellowship it is to depart from the original principles and practice of the church.

No, we cannot expect the fellowship of both parties in the Georgia trouble, neither can we have it. If we are resolved to fellowship a thing, then there is no room for labor to be bestowed. We cannot consistently labor to remove a thing and at the same time say we fellowship it. The next question is one that no man on earth can answer. When a man says he has fellowship for the organ, he says, by that, that he will not labor to remove it. When he says he wants it removed and that he will labor to that end, he says, by that, that he does not fellowship it. Now, when a man says both, if you can tell what he really does mean, you are wiser than a Solomon.

Now, you ask if we suppose they are honestly opposed to the use of the organ in church themselves. Well, we do not know -but if they are honest in that-if they are honest in saying they are opposed to the use of it, then they are not honest in saying they fellowship it. On the other hand, if they are honest in saying they fellowship it, then they are not honestly opposed to it. Hence, we do not know which they are honest in; but our supposition is that they are not honestly opposed to it, and are honestly in favor of it, and are willing to fellowship it.

Next, we are asked, "Do you know what they are aiming at?" Well, we may not know what they are aiming at, but we have an idea. Our judgment is that they are aiming to carry their point, and have the organ introduced into as many churches as possible, and to tie the hands of as many as they can so that no one can raise an objection to their modern Babylonish practices. This is the way it seems to us. We would humbly warn our brethren to be very careful how they say they are willing to fellowship this invention of Rome. As for us, we have no fellowship for it. We believe we voice the sentiment of our churches in this country when we say that they have no fellowship for organs in churches, and want no man to come among them who does fellowship the practice. C. H. C.

Carnell Inconsistencies

---July 16, 1912

Those who desire to be at church will make an effort to go, and those who do not desire to be there should not be so deceitful as to say they desire it. -
Predestinarian Baptist.

Some do not desire to go to church, yet say they do desire it, according to Elder Carnell. As they do not desire it, and as God has absolutely and unconditionally predestinated everything that comes to pass, according to Elder Carnell, then God has unconditionally predestinated that they should not desire it. He has also unconditionally predestinated that they should say that they do desire it. Then, according to Elder Carnell, they should not do what God has unconditionally predestinated that they should do. If God has unconditionally predestinated that they should do what they do, then He must have unconditionally predestinated that they should not do some other way.

Then, according to Elder Carnell, they should do what God has unconditionally predestinated that they should not do. Oh, consistency!

If a man is so disposed, it is quite easy to denounce a doctrine as heresy, misrepresent and rail against it and those who advocate it. I have known some railers ever since I began preaching.-Predestinarian Baptist.

"If a man is so disposed," according to Elder Carnell's doctrine, it must be because God unconditionally predestinated that he should be that way. He could not even try to be any other way, because God unconditionally predestinated that he should not try to be any other way, according to Elder Carnell's doctrine. Yes, we suppose it is easy for a man to do what God has unconditionally predestinated that he should do. We imagine it would be a rather hard job for a man to do what God has unconditionally predestinated that he should not do. If Elder Carnell's doctrine be true, it is hard for us to see how one could misrepresent it, for no matter what one says or does, God has unconditionally predestinated that he should say and do that very thing.

Don't worry because a brother advocates something you don't believe, if it is not Bible doctrine you can disprove it. And if it is Bible doctrine it's all right anyway.-Predestinarian Baptist.

"Don't worry!" Bless our souls, how can one help worrying, since God has unconditionally predestinated that he should worry, according to Elder Carnell's doctrine! If a brother advocates something you do not believe, God has unconditionally predestinated that you should worry about it, and has also unconditionally predestinated that Elder Carnell should then tell you not to worry! "If it is not Bible doctrine, you can disprove it." No, he cannot disprove it, either, for God has unconditionally predestinated it; it is all right, whether it is Bible doctrine or not. Oh, consistency

Don't neglect to pay your subscription. We have to pay the cash every month for the printing. Anyone who desires to read the paper can surely spare the small sum of one dollar a year to pay expense of publishing.-Predestinarian Baptist. According to Elder Carnell's doctrine, God has unconditionally predestinated that some should not pay him their subscription. Then God has also unconditionally predestinated that Elder Carnell should complain about it. But perhaps God has also unconditionally predestinated that Elder Carnell should have the cash to pay for his printing every month, so we suppose his bill will be paid, whether his subscribers pay him or not! We cannot understand, however, how one can have a dollar to spare to pay for Elder Carnell's paper, especially when God has unconditionally predestinated that he should not have it.

"If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone." Don't pout and slight and ignore him as if he were an enemy without telling him the reason why.-Predestinarian Baptist.

How can one "go and tell him his fault" since God has unconditionally predestinated that they should not do so, according to Elder Carnell's doctrine? How can one tell "him the reason why," since God has predestinated that he should not, according to Elder Carnell's doctrine? But here we find the elder again telling people to do what God has unconditionally predestinated that they should not do. Oh, consistency! consistency!

We often hear people speak of their dead friends being in heaven. How could a dead man enjoy heaven if he were there? The dead are not in heaven, they are in the grave; everything in heaven is alive.-Predestinarian Baptist.

We suppose a dead man could enjoy heaven, whether he is there or not, if God unconditionally predestinated that he should! But the elder says "the dead are not in heaven, they are in the grave." Well, Moses died and God buried him, but Christ talked with him on the mount of transfiguration, and the disciples recognized him as Moses and as being very much alive.

If he was not alive, Christ was an impostor. On the other hand, if Moses did not die and was not buried by the Lord, then the Scriptures are untrue; and if the Scriptures are untrue, Christ is an impostor. So the elder is in a dilemma. According to the elder's doctrine, Moses was not alive, but was dead; but God unconditionally predestinated that Peter, James and John should believe that he was alive-or that they should believe a lie. Therefore, according to the elder's doctrine, Christ was an impostor. More consistency

If the members of a church do not feel able to contribute enough to enable their pastor to attend their meetings, they should ask other interested persons to help them. Outsiders are apt to think that if the church needs their assistance they would be courteous enough to ask it, and they have a right to think so.-

Predestinarian Baptist.

We would suppose they will ask outsiders to help if God has unconditionally predestinated that they should ask. But how can they ask, if God has unconditionally predestinated that they should not ask? According to Elder Carnell's doctrine, the church may need the assistance of outsiders, but God has unconditionally predestinated that they should not be courteous enough to ask it. Then the outsiders have a right to think that the church does not need their assistance, although they do need it; God has unconditionally predestinated that they should need it, and has predestinated that they should not be courteous enough to ask for it, and then predestinated that the outsider should think they do not! Oh, what consistency

The Predestinarian Baptist is a plain dealer, it keeps nothing back in the dark. No one can complain that we evade the issue or that he cannot locate us on any Bible subject; we state our positions in plain English, so if we are in the wrong and anyone desires to convert us from the error of our way, and thus save a soul from death and hide a multitude of sins, he will know just where to find us and where to take hold to help us out and we will be very grateful to anyone who will lend a helping hand in that direction, but when a man undertakes to condemn us without a trial, convict us without evidence and to slander us by misrepresentations and false accusations then he may expect a fight to the finish.-Predestinarian Baptist. Now, isn't that wonderful? Doesn't that paralyze you? How in the name of heaven can one convert another, when they are like machines in the hand of God? And how in the name of common sense can one save a soul from death, when all salvation is by grace and is unconditional and God does it all?

The elder's theory is contrary to God's word. It is a conglomerated mess of ridiculous absurdities from start to finish, and many men who advocate it have but

little regard for truth, and Elder Carnell is one of the many. Will he put us to the test on that? C. H. C.

Expect to Attend

---July 30, 1912

We expect, the Lord willing, to be at the Daily Throgmorton debate, near Whittington, Ill., on August 13, 14, 15, 16. We will arrive at Whittington at 7:25 on Monday afternoon. After the debate closes we will go to Newark, Ohio, arriving there at 10 o'clock on Saturday morning on the Pennsylvania Lines, and will be with the church there on Saturday and Sunday, the regular meeting time. Some brother will please meet us at the train Saturday morning.

Then we will go to Falls of Licking Church, on Monday. Then we desire to attend the Muskingum Association which meets with the church at Goshen, near Spratt Station, on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. C. H. C.

Luke 9:13

---July 30, 1912

Brother C. C. Gooch, of Selmer, Tenn., requests our views of **(Luke 11:13)**, which reads, "If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?" The Saviour was talking to His disciples. He was not talking to unregenerate sinners, trying to get them to ask for the Holy Spirit. As He was talking to His disciples, those who were already children of God, He was, therefore, talking to people who were already in possession of the Holy Spirit in the sense of regeneration. God's children may, therefore, approach the throne of grace and ask the Father for the manifest presence of the Holy Spirit to lead, guide, direct and influence them in the right way, and to sustain them in sorrows and distresses. C. H. C.

Missionary Statistics

---September 17, 1912

Some Missionary statistics for the state of Missouri are given in the Baptist Builder of September 11, 1912. We are told that in Missouri there are 182,784 Baptists, members of the American Baptist associations. The total amount contributed to the cause, for all purposes, including church expenses, Sunday school expenses, district missions, state missions, home missions, foreign missions, education and miscellaneous was \$1,020,547.18. This was an amount equal to \$5.58 for each member.

This seems to us to be a very small sum for a people to give who are so much given to boasting of what they are doing for the Lord. We are sure the average Old Baptist does more than that for the cause, notwithstanding the fact that they are called stingy and covetous by these boasters. But let us examine their giving a little further. For district, state, home and foreign missions they gave \$133,435.09. This is an average of 73 cents for each member; Now, is not that wonderful giving! Poor fellows! They boast of their great wealth and give the magnificent sum of seventy three cents each for missions. The people, these folks say, are dying and going to hell by the thousands every day for the want of the gospel, and these wealthy folks

give the stupendous sum of seventy three cents each to send the gospel to save those thousands!

These Missouri folks gave \$36,966.99 for foreign missions. That was the enormous amount given by 182,784 Missionary Baptists in Missouri to send the gospel to the heathen. This was less than twenty one cents each-a small fraction above twenty cents each-given for this purpose. The Missionary Baptists tell us it costs just ten cents to evangelise a heathen- see the Baptist and Reflector of November 11, 1909. Think of it! The price of the eternal salvation of a heathen is only ten cents, and yet these wealthy boasters, gloating in their shame, give only a small fraction over twenty cents each for the salvation of these poor souls! May the Lord pity them. Evidently they are as blind as bats. C. H. C.

Daily Throgmorton Debate

---September 17, 1912

The Daily Throgmorton debate was held at Ewing, Ill., August 13-16, according to announcement. We had the pleasure of attending it. It was our intention to write a short synopsis of the debate, but we have not had the time to do so-besides, it is to be published in book form. People can get the book and read it, which will be better than to read a short synopsis.

Elder Daily opened the discussion with a speech of one hour affirming that "The Scriptures teach that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved." Before Elder Daily was through that speech we said it would never be answered, and it has not been, to this good hour. The arguments presented by Elder Daily were logical, and were absolutely unanswerable.

On the 15th and 16th Elder Throgmorton affirmed that "The Scriptures teach that God employs the preaching of the gospel as a means in the regeneration of sinners." In Elder Daily's first negative speech he answered all of Elder Throgmorton's arguments and introduced some negative arguments against the proposition. Elder Throgmorton fell behind in his next speech and was never able to catch up.

The discussion was conducted upon a high plane, both men exhibiting Christian and gentlemanly deportment, except one thing in which we think Elder Throgmorton forgot himself; at that time he pretended to mimic Old Baptists by using a "singsong" tone. We think, however, he was rather sorry of that. No unpleasantness was manifested at any time. Our people were well pleased with the defense made by Elder Daily and many of them were present.

We notice that Elder Throgmorton has charged in his paper since the debate that Elder Daily copied some questions from our pamphlet (Hot Shot) which he used in the discussion. We thank Elder Throgmorton for his compliment paid to us-that we are the author of the questions that were so much trouble to him, and that disturbed him so much that he had to try to fix matters up in his paper a little better than he did in the discussion. Elder Daily was fully equal to the occasion. He had the truth, and truth cannot be overthrown. C. H. C.

We Got It Next

---September 17, 1912

We clip the following slush from The Primitive Baptist, of Martin, Tenn. Its spirit which shows so prominently between the lines as well as in the lines is enough to condemn it in the eyes and minds of all sensible people: "Permit me to say that right here in Jackson the churches, about twelve in all, have such theatrical doings,

costly and expensive things, that hundreds of people never go to church; there is a little basket stuck under their noses for collections for the church, Sunday school, home or foreign missions, or paying the pastor, and trained singers, or educating young preachers for the promulgation of their damnable heresy.

Men here who are paying rent and living from hand to mouth are assessed, and must pay up, or be excluded from their church. It is simply bleeding the poor to death; and these same preachers who are supported by the poor, would hardly recognize them on the highways or in their homes as human beings. Their own children are being trained in the high school for social life, are made doctors, lawyers or preachers, or singers, and the children of the poor, whose contributions have helped them to reach the height of their ambition, can go to hell, so far as they are concerned, if the money does not come! Preachers here have refused to go out five miles in the country to preach a funeral unless the family of the dead would give him five dollars (Is this pure religion?-Jas. i. 27). If things go on at the same rate for the next twenty years as for the past ten years, we will be taxed to pay the expenses of these false churches and preachers. The whole thing is fast going to Rome, their mother and headquarters. The principle is the same, although it assumes a different name, and all profess to be guided by the Holy Ghost." And we found it in the Illinois Baptist, June, and we judge, from what the Illinois editor has to say about Elder Cayce's article that he (the Illinois editor) does not believe that Editor Cayce has told the truth, and by virtue of the fact we take it for granted that the Illinois editor does not believe such things to be right, as Editor Cayce charges against Baptists in his article.

However, our Illinois editor only met these charges by the process of belittlement, without any proof. We are sorry to say that some of the charges that are brought against Baptists, by Editor Cayce, a Hardshell and a gentleman so far as we know, is true, and we acknowledge the corn and the Illinois editor had just as well get in the hole with us. For instance, Editor Cayce charges that the churches in Jackson have "theatrical doings." We don't know about the churches in Jackson, but "de fiddle and de bow," the horn, whistle and other things of a similar class have played an active part at Laurel, Bay Springs, Meridian and other places that we could mention. It does look a good deal like theatrical doings to us, and it makes us feel about the same way.

We guess that Editor Cayce charges, too, that such extravagance is practiced in the churches of Jackson that hundreds of people never go to church at all. We have heard poor people, lots of them, thus talk about our rich aristocratic churches, and we knew of more than one church splitting on account of this very thing-at least that's the way we got it. We guess that Claud did not miss the truth far. Those baskets are stuck under the nose tolerably regular also, and it's humiliating, too, when one is penniless. We have never used them and never expect to.

We think it much better to wait for offerings to be made when a definite object, that demands our support, can be brought before the people. Folks want to know, and ought to know, exactly what they are giving their money for. Let the baskets stay at home. When there is a collection to be taken, let the pastor or deacon get up and tell the people the object then gather a hat. That will do.

As to Editor Cayce's thrust at Baptist people for doing mission work and his thrust at Baptist pastors for trying to make something out of their families, we have got the commission, **(Matthew 28:19-20)**. If the Hardshells had it, they would give it back to us; but would the Illinois editor be willing to receive into his church a member from Editor Cayce's church, if Editor Cayce had baptised him, without giving him another dose? Eh? Will wait for a mild answer and proceed to note more of Editor Cayce's charges against Baptists. He charges that men who are poor in

Jackson are assessed and must pay up or be excluded. Well, we are satisfied that this is not in accord with our faith and practice, but we have a typewritten letter on file right now, from officials of a Baptist (?) church that agrees with Editor Cayce's charge.

Dr. R. C. Johnston, M. P. Mush, Sr., all just as good Baptists as ever lived, would be compelled to say that Editor Cayce told the truth on this point, if they were called upon to witness, and they are not all. Laurel, Miss., is their home. "Sic em," Cayce. But once more. We wonder if the Illinois editor never did hear of a preacher charging for going five miles to conduct a funeral service? If we hadn't we'd be very careful about talking about Editor Cayce's ignorance. We are glad to say that these charges as introduced by Editor Cayce, some of which are true, is the very thing that made Hardshells, and Conventionism is responsible for it. Let Baptists go along and do mission work and other work as they once did, then Hardshells will perish.

REMARKS

We clip the above from the Southern Department of the Baptist Flag, of September 5, 1912. Elder C. A. Gilbert is editor of that department. It appears that the Illinois Baptist charges us with saying certain things in our papers, and then denies them. We never made the charges complained of, but think they were made (or some of them were) by some brother whose letter was published in our columns.

But Elder Gilbert virtually admits every one of them, and then charges that the Conventionites are responsible for the division in the Baptist family. His charge being true, the Missionaries are not the original Baptists, and we are. If you brethren among the Missionaries would get right on points of doctrine while you are fighting this board business, and then come back to the Old Baptists, you would then be in the Old original Baptist Church. C. H. C.

Challenge Accepted

---September 24, 1912

As many of our brethren are aware, Elder C. H. Cayce, editor Primitive Baptist, Martin, Tenn., has developed strong symptoms of late that he is spoiling for a public discussion with some one of our brethren on the questions of God's decree and what is known among us as conditional time salvation. He assumed the authority to state for us our position on predestination, and has sent abroad printed copies of same, with his challenge to our people to furnish a man to meet him. Following is the proposition Elder Cayce has submitted on God's decree, for us to affirm: "The Scriptures teach that God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate all things that come to pass, good, bad and indifferent." So confident did the elder seem to feel that none of our brethren would accept this cut-and-dried proposition that he waxed bold to brand us in advance of our refusal as a set of "religious cowards." Immediately upon receiving his challenge-which was mailed to my address-I accepted and signed his proposition on conditional salvation and in my letter advising him of the fact, I submitted as the proposition I would affirm, the following: "That God hath from all eternity, freely and unchangeably decreed all things whatsoever come to pass, is Primitive Baptist teaching, and the same is Scripturally and logically true." The elder refused to meet me on this proposition. He will not deny that the predestination of all things is the teaching of Primitive Baptists; and because I told him the reason why, he proceeded to uncork the vials of his wrath and to pour out their contents upon those whom he brands as a "dirty crowd" of "religious cowards." I would advise Elder Cayce, that, inasmuch as we would affirm the predestination of all things whatsoever come to pass, his qualifying terms, "good," "bad," and "indifferent" are

superfluous and unnecessary. But he insisted that we must accept the proposition just as he had stated it, or else stand before the world branded by him as a religious coward. Seeing that he was going to crawl out through his conveniently arranged loophole, I accepted both of his propositions just as he had worded them, and have named Benton, Ill., as the place for holding the discussion. It is now up to Elder Cayce. If he does not back down upon his own propositions he will have to meet us. I am now awaiting his decision and will serve notice of same through the Predestinarian Baptist. C. M. Weaver.

REMARKS

The above is from the Predestinarian Baptist of August 1, 1912. It seems to us that Elder Weaver assumes quite a good deal for himself. He states, himself, that we challenged his people to furnish a representative man to meet us. We suppose Elder Weaver considers himself a representative man. Are we to judge that he is the whole crowd, and that he is going to furnish himself? The challenge was not made to him, but to his people. We wonder if they have selected him to represent them? If so, when did they do so? Which one of his churches made the selection?

The elder says we proceeded to uncork the vials of our wrath, etc. Well, it would be hard to find a name for the dirty, filthy letter he had written to us beforehand. No, we have not poured out any wrath upon these folks, but we said a few things to this man which were true, and he knows it. Those people have continually misrepresented us and our people, and have often been corrected in some of their statements concerning us. Still they have persistently repeated their misrepresentations. We have been forced thereby to conclude that the misrepresentations made by many of them were wilful and malicious. They would never agree to meet our people in a public discussion of the differences. They put out a challenge themselves in this section once, and then backed down. But they did not cease their misrepresentations of us. Hence we put out our challenge for them to furnish a representative man to meet us.

Because of the way they had been doing we felt to be justifiable in saying that unless they met the challenge in every particular they are religious cowards. We see no reason why we should retract as yet. Elder Weaver refuses to have any thing to do with employing a stenographer and publishing the discussion. That was a part of the challenge.

We are under no obligation to meet him until that part of the challenge is agreed to and he furnishes some evidence that his people consider him a representative man. Our challenge also stated that the discussion should be at a place where it may be called for. Elder Weaver names Benton, Ill. Who has called for it at Benton? If the elder manifests such a disposition in debate as he did even in the beginning of his correspondence with us, it will not show him up to a very good advantage to a thinking people.

We shall see what we shall see. C. H. C.

Matthew 12:43-44

---November 19, 1912

The article in this issue on the above text was copied from The Primitive Baptist of October 2, 1906, and appears in Volume I, page 114. It is not necessary to put the same article in this volume. C. H. C.

The Jews Chosen

---November 19, 1912

We have been asked this question: "Do you understand that the Jews as an entire nation are chosen people of God, and will all be saved?" The Jews, as a nation, were the chosen people of God. He made choice of the Jews as a nation. They were His people, as a nation. But He did not make choice of the entire nation to eternal life. "They are not all Israel which are of Israel."-(Romans 9:6). All of Abraham's seed were not children of God-see

Romans 9:7

---December 10, 1912

On another page in this paper are two letters from E. O. Wiles, of New Zealand. Those letters show that we have had some correspondence with him concerning a visit to that country. For some time we have had a mind to visit New Zealand and Australia, and perhaps other places, to try to speak to some of the Lord's children there concerning His goodness and mercy. We have felt that if the Lord is in the matter the way will be opened somehow. We have also felt sure that if the Lord is in the matter that we would be provided for without us having to organize a society and have someone pledged to "hold the rope" while we go, as Carey and Fuller did. If we have the assurance that the Lord is in the matter, we will not be afraid to start on the journey,

Concerning the term "Missionary," as explained to Brother Wiles in a private letter, we also say here that this term was adopted by the Missionary Baptists after the division among the Baptists in this country, which occurred from 1832 to 1845. Those who took the name "Missionary Baptists" adopted the views of Fuller and Carey on the atonement and gospel preaching as instrumental in regeneration, free will, free agency, etc. Our people seemed to accept the idea that this title suited them, understanding it to signify that they adopted the modern mission machinery and inventions of men. The terms "Old School" and "Primitive" were then applied to our people, signifying that our people held to the original Baptist teaching. If our people had called the "Missionaries" Fullerites they would have been known by that name today, just as Campbell's followers are known by the name of Campbellites. The command recorded in (Matthew 28:19), "Go ye therefore, and teach (disciple) all nations," was given by the Saviour to the eleven. "The eleven" is the antecedent of the pronoun "ye." It is now the office work of the Holy Spirit, the third person in the Trinity, to call and send out the gospel ministry. The Holy Spirit also assigns them their field of labor.

The ordinances were delivered by the apostles unto the church (see (I Corinthians 11:2)), and they are administered by the authority of the church, and by those whom the Holy Spirit has called, and who are authorized by the church to administer them.

We are glad for Brother Wiles to write for our columns. Many of our people enjoy his letters. C. H. C.

1 Peter 3:21

---December 10, 1912

"The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." We have in these words a clear statement of the meaning and design of baptism. It is stated to be a

figure of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, and its design is, not to purify either the body from outward defilement or the conscience from sin, but that a good conscience may thus give answer outwardly to the work of God wrought in the heart. A good conscience is one which has been cleansed through faith by the application of the blood of Christ, which alone can purify from all sin. We have in this text, first, a refutation and condemnation of the perversion which nearly all professing Christendom has made of the ordinance of baptism, in the sense that by baptism all souls are regenerated and made fit to be heirs of glory. When vital godliness dies out of any people there straightway comes in formality and ritualism of various sorts, and salvation comes to be no longer ascribed to the death and resurrection of Christ for justification, and the new birth of the Spirit is ignored, and salvation and regeneration are held forth as the result of baptism or of other forms and ceremonies. This is true of Romanists, Episcopalians, Campbellites, and is also largely true of Presbyterians and Methodists. Campbellites teach that baptism is essential to final salvation, as an act of obedience, and the other named teach that baptism is essential to salvation, not merely as an act of obedience to God, but because in baptism the soul is regenerated, without which regeneration no soul can live eternally with God. It was the declaration of a Romanist preacher centuries ago that the wailing cry of the souls of unbaptized infants is heard throughout the regions of darkness forever. Such souls, it is asserted, are not in hell, neither can they enter heaven and dwell in the presence of God, therefore they roam, without rest or peace, forever in the regions of darkness. All who believe in infant baptism feel that they must have this ordinance attended to before their children die, else the children will lack something in that other world to which had they been baptized they would have attained. One many years ago said to us that she had lost one child by death which had not been baptized, and she then made a vow that no other child of hers should die without baptism. In reply to the question, "Why, do you think that your child is lost?" she said, "No, but it lacked something in that world which baptism would have secured it." We could but say to her, "If your child is suffering through your neglect, instead of your suffering for it, where is the justice?" Because Baptists have always insisted upon baptism as it is taught in the word of God, and have condemned sprinkling or pouring as superstitions of men, and because they have never received such sprinkling and pouring as baptism when members of other professed bodies of Christians have come to them, it has been for centuries charged against them by haters of truth, and believed by foolish and ignorant men, that they believe that baptism is essential to salvation. It has not mattered that they believe and have always taught the contrary, viz., that salvation is essential to baptism. Evil minded men continue to urge this charge against them, and foolish men believe it. If indeed we do not believe that baptism must be received in order to the justification of the soul and to an entrance into the world of glory, unless Baptists do not possess ordinary human sympathy with their fellowmen, we certainly should be found urging with all solemnity and persistence upon all men the necessity of being baptized, and did we believe this there would never be any question asked of any one who came to us asking baptism; we should only be too much filled with rejoicing that another had come asking for that which would save the soul. It is not we, as Old School Baptists, who believe and teach that one must be baptized if he would be saved, but those who practice sprinkling of infants and Campbellites, who practice immersion. Old School Baptists could not

believe and teach salvation by ordinances of any kind, because they do believe and teach with all their hearts that salvation is alone through the atonement upon Calvary. They believe that it is the work of Christ for us that saves, and in which we are to trust and not our work. Baptism by immersion and emersion (into and from the watery grave) is essential to walking obediently in the commandments of the Lord, just as to follow all other commandments which He has given His people is essential to obedience. But obedience to the commandments of the Lord does not justify the sinner, nor secure his abode in heaven; this is secured to him alone by the finished obedience of the blessed Lord. There is no more salvation in baptism than there is in any other act of obedience which we may gladly render in token of our love to Him who loved us and died for us. We have not written here of all this with any expectation of silencing the charges of ignorant men to which we have referred, but that our readers who, it may be, have been disturbed by these false assertions, may have somewhat to reply when they hear such things said. In the text the apostle uses the expression, "The like figure, whereunto even baptism." Baptism here is assented by the apostle to be just such a figure of salvation as was the water of the flood, by which he declares that Noah and his family were saved. The waters of the flood, then, were a figure of salvation; baptism is also a figure of salvation. Let us note that the apostle here did not say that Noah was saved from the water of the flood, but by the water. The ark into which he was shut, saved him and all with him from destruction by the flood, but here the assertion is that there was a salvation by the water itself. What was that salvation? It appears to us that it could have been but one thing, vis., that by the flood Noah and his family were separated forever from the wicked antediluvian world, or saved from it. The same flood that saved Noah from the former wicked world, at which he vexed himself and against which he preached while preparing the ark, was the destruction of the world of wicked, men. Noah was by the flood forever separated from all his former life; so also were the people said to be "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," when they passed over dry shod through the water standing as walls of brass on either side and under the cloud that hovered over them. True, the word "baptism" always signifies dipping or immersion and emersion, but here the reference of the apostle is not so much to the form of baptism as to the separating work wrought at the Red Sea, by which all Israel were forever separated from Egypt and their former life there, and were shut up to the leadership of Moses. "Separated from Egypt and separated to Moses." So Noah was by the water of the flood separated to the new world that appeared after the flood. All this was a figure of that salvation which God works for His people through the finished work of Christ by His death and resurrection. They are in like manner (not figure, but in reality) separated to the Lord and from their former death in sin and ungodliness. Now baptism is here declared to be just such a figure of this salvation in Christ as was the water of the flood. As the antediluvian world became dead to Noah by the flood, and he to it, so through Christ believers have become dead to their former life, and hope, and bondage', and have been raised up to newness of life, and now live in a new world, with new hopes and desires and blessings, and by the water of baptism they declare this work to have been wrought in them. As Noah was saved by the work of God wrought in him, separating him from the ungodly world in spirit and feeling before the flood came, so are believers separated from their former life and love by the work of the Spirit in their heart before they

receive baptism. Indeed, had not this work been wrought in the heart of Noah before the time of the flood, salvation by the water of the flood could not have been his, The water of the flood would not have wrought this righteous principle in him, and he would have been after the flood living the life of wickedness that all the world had been doing before. So also if righteousness has not been wrought in the heart of men before baptism there has been no real separation from others, and the water of baptism is to them but a solemn mockery. Let us remember that, after all, the apostle declares that there is a salvation in the figure baptism, but this salvation is not that salvation which puts away sin, the filth of the flesh. The apostle declares that this salvation is now, but the putting away of sin is not now; that was accomplished when Jesus died and rose again; He was put to death for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification. Redemption, in the real sense of the word, was finished when Jesus had finished the work which God gave Him to do, and was raised again from the dead,. So the apostle here connects baptism with the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." The Apostle Paul sets forth the same great truth which is here declared by Peter in **(Romans 6:3-4)**: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptised into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Here the meaning of the apostle evidently is that by real heartfelt experience of death to sin, and life to holiness and God, we have been baptised into Him, and into His death, and therefore we are in water baptism buried with Him, and rise therefrom to walk in newness of life. So Peter in the text connects our water baptism with the resurrection of Christ. The resurrection of Christ in His work for us by which we are saved, while we testify to this work as having been wrought in us by being baptized, and this baptism is the answer of a good conscience toward God; it is our confession of what the Lord has done for us in the resurrection of Christ. Baptism, then, is a form of presenting a reality'; it is a form, but not an unmeaning form. The ordinances of the house of God appointed in His word are all of them filled with meaning. In them we do not find redemption, or justification, or eternal life, but they all testify of these things. So the supper tells of Jesus' body and blood, upon which we live and by which we are cleansed from sin. Baptism also sets forth three special things, according to the testimony of the word. In the first place, it sets forth our faith in the death, burial and resurrection of Christ for our justification and redemption. By our baptism we declare that our hope is in His work for us, finally finished when He died, and witnessed to us by His resurrection from the dead. In the second place, in baptism we declare that it is our hope that we also have become experimentally dead to sin by the body of Christ and alive unto holiness. Dying we are buried, and living again we rise to walk in this newness of life; and, in the third place, as our bodies are buried in the watery grave, and rise again from it, we declare that our faith is that our bodies are included in the redemption of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that they shall one day also rise as did His crucified body, and be changed into the likeness of His glorified body, and so live forever with Him. In these three things are summed up all the principles of truth contained in the gospel of the Son of God, Lastly, baptism is itself salvation to all who believe. It does not indeed put away sin, which is the chief part of salvation, but it does separate us from our former lives in and of the world in the sight of all who

love God, and indeed in the sight of all men. We are henceforth known as the professed followers of Christ, as those who henceforth do not live as others live, in the vanity of their minds, but as those who live in union with that which pertains to God and godliness. It is a great help to one who loves the Lord, and who has in heart and desire been separated unto the Lord, to have it known by all that this is his hope, and it will, we think, be the testimony of all believers that they have found a help to resist temptation after worldliness by the very fact that they have been baptized in the name of the Lord. Even the world does not expect those who have made this confession to live as they did before, or as the worldly live. There is gain surely when we know that the world no longer expects us to run in the way that we once did; at least we know that in our early life young friends did not, after we were baptized upon confession of our faith, expect us or ask us to join in many things that they did insist upon our doing before. We did find in this sense a salvation in baptism. We doubt not that many have found it so. C.

REMARKS

We copy the above from the Signs of the Times of December 1, 1912. It is from the pen of Elder F. A. Chick. This article sets forth the very position held by our people. For teaching this same thing we have been called Arminians, Half-Baptists, Semi-Baptists, Bildads, and other such names.

Note that Elder Chick says, "Let us remember that, after all, the apostle declares that there is a salvation in the figure of baptism, but this salvation is not that salvation which puts away sin, the filth of the flesh." If "this salvation is not that salvation which puts away sin," and if that salvation which puts away sin is an eternal salvation, then this is some other kind of salvation. If it is not an eternal salvation, is it not a time salvation? Then, why should we be called by such names as those mentioned above, because we call this a time salvation?

The term "total depravity" is not used in the Scriptures, but they teach what we mean by that term, and what the term implies. The Scriptures teach that the sinner is depraved in all his parts. Are we heretics because we teach the same thing and call it total depravity? If not, then how can we be heretics because we teach, as the Scriptures do, that there is a salvation in baptism, and then call it a time salvation? We would call attention to the fact that Elder Chick says, "We did find in this sense a salvation in baptism." As he was already a child of God before baptism, he already had eternal salvation. He must, therefore, have found a time salvation in baptism. Elder Chick experienced this in his life. His experience is, therefore, in harmony with the teaching of Holy Writ. This adds another evidence that he is a child of God. We would add here that what Elder Chick found in rendering obedience to the Lord is also found by all other children of God who walk in that path. On the other hand, they suffer and fail to find this salvation when they walk in disobedience.

The Scriptures abundantly teach this truth-hence the apostle could say, "Knowing the terror of the Lord we persuade men." We should not make a brother an offender for a word; neither should we try to magnify our differences. We should try to minimize them, and try to get together. May the Lord help us so to do. C. H. C.

Kingdom of God

---December 17, 1912

Brother H. C. Alexander, of Foss, Okla., wants our views concerning the kingdom of God—that is, if there is more than one. God has but one visible, organized kingdom, or church. The church of God is but one. The whole redeemed family of God are sometimes referred to as the kingdom of God, kingdom of heaven, church, or some other such appellation. The context will show whether, in each case, the visible, organized church, or militant kingdom, is under consideration, or whether it is the whole family of God, all the redeemed.

He also asked: "Do you believe that the Saviour meant that the kingdom of God was within the Pharisees in **(Luke 17:21)**?" The word translated "within" in this text often means "in the midst." Hence, in this text the Saviour meant that "the kingdom of God is in the midst of you," or among you. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 27

---December 24, 1912

One more year is almost gone. This is the last issue of the twenty-seventh volume of The Primitive Baptist. The year 1912 will soon all be a matter of history. Another year, with all its joys and sorrows, is drawing near to a close. Are we sorry, or are we glad of this? No doubt all of us have made some mistakes, and have things to regret. We are well aware of the fact that we have made mistakes in our editorial work, and also in our efforts in the ministry. We do not believe we have made mistakes as to the principles we have tried to advocate. We have no apology to offer on that score. We are still satisfied with those principles. We see no reason for any change in that respect. If this should be the last line that we shall ever pen for the columns of The Primitive Baptist, we are willing to go on record as being willing to die on those principles.

While it is true that we have made mistakes, yet we have tried to conduct the paper in the way that we thought was best for the cause it proposes to stand for. Our desire has ever been to do that which was best for the cause of the Primitive Baptists, which we are sure is the cause of Christ.

We believe we can truly say that we are glad another year is gone. We would not live the year 1912 over again if we could. We have had our sorrows, griefs and disappointments during the year. We are glad that those trials are over. We may have more like them, but those are gone forever. We are glad of this. We are also one year nearer our eternal home. Our hope of a precious and glorious home where there are no sorrows nor distresses is sweet to us now. It seems to grow sweeter as the years go by. That hope has sustained us for about twenty-eight years, and we are willing to risk it during our remaining years, or days, on earth, and we feel that we shall be willing to risk it in death. We are trusting alone in the merits of a crucified and risen Redeemer.

The worthy merits of His blood and righteousness is our only hope of a better home beyond, and we are willing to risk that. Men may boast of their merits and their wonderful works, but we trust to be able to boast "in the cross of Christ," and in that only. If we have said or done one thing that has wounded one of the Lord's humble poor, we are sorry for it, and humbly ask forgiveness. We have not meant to hurt or wound the feelings of any of the Lord's dear children. If we know our heart we love those who give us evidence that they have been born of God. We desire their welfare, and want to see them happy and prosperous.

During the past year many have sent us notices of local church troubles, with request to publish. These requests have all been refused. Only one or two such notices have appeared in the paper during the year, and they were inserted in our absence without our knowledge or consent. Only one thing that is in any way akin

to anything of that kind has been published by our authority in our columns, and that was in the case of a certain man whose standing we knew. He was away from home affiliating with our brethren. Several wrote us asking for information concerning him. The cause demanded that we publish some of the facts. Good order demanded it. We are not sorry that we have maintained this position, and we desire to still maintain it in the future. Hence we now say again that no one need send us letters for publication in our columns concerning local church disturbances. If you do, they will go straight to the wastebasket. Hereafter we will not even return them to the sender, nor write a letter to the sender concerning them. We have had too many of such things sent to us, and have consumed too much valuable time in correspondence concerning them. And, again, it is very common for someone to write us about some church trouble and then ask our advice. Often the request is from one who has been excluded. Now, no man can be assured of giving correct advice unless he has all the evidence from both sides. Of course, under such circumstances as this mentioned, we have the evidence from only one side, and likely not even all of that. Hence we are not prepared to give advice. Parties will confer a great favor upon us, and save us much time and trouble if they will not write us about such matters. If it could do any good we would not mind the trouble nor the time; but our experience and observation is that it seldom does any good. It is usually the case that the party has his own mind made up, and is only making an effort to get us to agree with him. If they really want advice, and are willing to try to follow it, then we do not mind the time and trouble it takes to answer. An editor's place is a hard one to fill. He has to stand between fires very often. It is not unusual that he must stand between parties who are at variance, and endeavor to reconcile and bring them together. We have tried to do this in many instances. Brethren often do not understand each other, and many times labor under a misunderstanding. But our year's labor is done. Many times we have been discouraged, but we have not felt like we want to "quit." Our desire has been to press onward. Now we have reached the end of another year's pilgrimage, and now feel the need of the Lord's presence, help and directing hand in the year coming. Many good and comforting letters from the dear brethren and sisters have encouraged us to press on during the year now closing. We would here humbly express our gratitude and appreciation for all this, and ask if we may still have your kind support, encouragement, and help? Above all, may we have an interest in your prayers, and your assurances of the same. For this year, farewell. C. H. C.

1913

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME XXVIII

---January 7, 1913

This issue begins another volume of The Primitive Baptist. This is the twenty-eighth volume. For twenty-seven years this paper has been published and sent out in defense of the same principles that are set forth in its columns now. From the time the paper was started, in January, 1886, until the fourth Sunday in August, 1905, it was edited by our father, Elder S. F. Cayce. On that day in 1905 he laid his armor by, and the burden of editing the paper has been on us. How well we have succeeded in maintaining the standard that had already been set is not for us to say.

We know that we have endeavored to maintain the same principles. We are aware that we have made mistakes, and that our efforts have been weak. Yet we are thankful and gratified to say that the paper has received a liberal support. The circulation of the paper has been increased to about twice what it was in 1904 or 1905. This makes us feel that our labors have not been altogether in vain, and that our weak efforts are appreciated by our dear and precious brethren. We still feel our dependence upon the Lord for the guidance of His Holy Spirit and for His grace to sustain us; but we desire, by His help, to still contend for the same eternal principles of truth. We are perfectly satisfied that the doctrine we have tried to advocate is the doctrine of the Bible. It is the doctrine in harmony with true science, is according to true principles of logic, and is the truth. We have no doubt about that.

We are fully persuaded that what God has promised, He is able also to perform. We desire to still contend for that doctrine while we live on earth. The Old Baptists are the people who believe, love and cherish that doctrine. It is, therefore, our desire to make The Primitive Baptist an Old Baptist paper. We trust that our corresponding editors will write more for the paper this year than they did last. It is our own desire and intention to do more writing ourselves than we did last year. There are a few subjects we have, for some time, felt a desire to write upon, but we have had so much other work on hand that we could not write much. Some of that work has now been completed, and we think we can do more writing for the paper.

We trust that the brethren generally will consider that The Primitive Baptist is a medium of correspondence for the Lord's children. But remember that short pointed articles are much more interesting than long ones. We would urge the writers to use brevity. Do not use two dozen words to express a thought that can be expressed as well or better in half that number. Say what you have to say in as few words as possible. Do not write about your local church troubles. Remember that this is not interesting or comforting to others, and will not be published. We have managed to keep most of such things out of the paper during the last year, and we intend to still keep such out of our columns. Many have insisted that we should publish such things for them, but we have promised that we would not. So we say again that it is no use to send such things to us. Remember that such things will not even be returned to the writer hereafter. We will simply throw them into the wastebasket, and will not even consume time to write to the parties sending such articles to us. We trust all will help us to make the paper better. Send reports of your good meetings. We all like to read about good meetings, and of the Lord's children coming home and asking a place in the dear old church. Now, will you all remember us in your prayers? Will you pray the Lord to direct us aright, and to sustain us in our labors in His cause? C. H. C.

The Debate That Didn't Materialize

---January 7, 1913

Perhaps not many of our brethren will be surprised to learn that Elder Cayce, after much bluff and bluster about wanting to debate with our brethren has finally become so little concerned in the matter, that he treats our persistent endeavor to have him meet us on his own propositions with silent contempt. I accepted his own propositions just as he framed them, but he now claims he did not challenge me personally, and he shys around my acceptance of his challenge by enquiring if I am a "representative man;" "if my brethren have selected me," etc., and undertakes to discredit me in the eyes of his readers, by stating in his paper that I had written him a "filthy dirty letter." I resent this unbrotherly attack upon my personal character, by branding his statement, a malicious misrepresentation of facts and I defy him to print that "filthy dirty letter"

I wrote him in his paper and let his own people judge for themselves concerning it. In my last letter to Elder Cayce which has never been answered I had this final word to say: "If you are

going to meet me without any more ifs and ands, or dodging, say so; if you are not, say so, for I have no more time to waste on a fellow who is insincere in his loud pretensions of wanting to debate with our people.” From his prolonged silence I judge he does not aim to meet us, and so far as I am concerned the matter is ended. W.

REMARKS The above from the pen of Elder G. M. Weaver appeared in the Predestinarian Baptist for December, 1912. The elder says he accepted our propositions just as we framed them. But he has not accepted the challenge as it was made. Our challenge, as it was sent out, contained this statement: “The challenge also embraces this: Competent stenographers are to be employed to take the speeches as delivered, and the whole discussion to be published in book form.” In regard to this here is what Elder Weaver said in his first letter: “As to employing stenographers: will say, you may do so if you wish, but as I have no desire to make merchandise out of an investigation of the Scriptures, I have no use for a stenographer.”

In reply to this we had this to say in our letter dated May 30, 1912: “As to making merchandise of the matter in publishing it, will ask if it is any worse (if it is wrong) to publish the discussion than it is to publish the Predestinarian Baptist? What is the difference?” In the elder's reply he made no reference to this. Then in his next letter he has this to say concerning it: “As to having this debate reported, and brought out in book form, will say: If my brethren desire it, and are willing to bear the expense, they may do so, but I will not assume the responsibility myself.”

Thus it is plainly and clearly demonstrated that our challenge, as made, has not been accepted. The last statement quoted from him shows that what he did accept was on his own responsibility and not on the responsibility of his people. The challenge was made to his people, as a people. Will they accept it? Will he accept it for them? If he will, then will they endorse the act? If we should meet him without his having any endorsement from them, what assurance have we that they will not repudiate the whole thing, and disclaim any and all responsibility for his act?

As to his denial of what we said, we have only to say that we do not deem it necessary at this time to give space for his lengthy tirade. We suppose our word is almost, if not quite, as good as his. Besides, if his charge is true that we have maliciously misrepresented the facts, and if his doctrine is true, then we had to do just as we did do. He affirms that “God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate all things that come to pass, good, bad and indifferent.” If God did do as the elder affirms, then He did unconditionally predestinate that we should do just as we did do.

The elder took this matter up through his paper, and we presumed his wish was to continue the correspondence that way, although he does not publish what we said in The Primitive Baptist, while we have copied all he has said in his paper concerning the matter.

But he says that so far as he is concerned the matter is ended. All right-he may let it end if he desires. It only shows that his intention was to make a “blow” and a show of accepting our challenge. Again we say, let them accept the challenge and put up a man to represent them, or else cease misrepresenting us. C. H. C.

Gambling

---February 4, 1913

J. N. Sugg, of Lincoln, Ala., writes: “I want you to write a piece in The Primitive Baptist on gambling in cotton futures. I do not know of any Primitive Baptists who are guilty. Other denominations are doing it, and they try all sorts of arguments to prove that it is no harm.” We are not so much concerned about other people engaging in the practice referred to. We trust no Primitive Baptist is guilty. If there is no harm in that kind of gambling, then there is no harm in any kind. If gambling is not wrong, then it was not wrong to conduct the Louisiana lottery, which was suppressed several years ago.

If gambling is not wrong, then it is not wrong to advertise a gambling institution in the newspapers. But a newspaper containing an advertisement of any kind of lottery cannot be sent through the mails. Not only is this true, but it is against the Law to send any kind of advertisement of any kind of lottery through the mails. Evidently the United States Government looks upon gambling as being wrong. There is absolutely no good reason that can be assigned that the practice is not wrong. It is gambling, and gambling is wrong. C. H. C.

Matthew 11:12

---February 18, 1913

Brother W. M. McGee, of Chunky, Miss., requests our views on (**Matthew 11:12**). The text reads, "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." This text shows that the Lord established His church during the days of John the Baptist. If the kingdom was not in existence, then the violent did not take it. If the kingdom was not in existence, it did not suffer violence. But the kingdom did suffer violence from the days of John the Baptist, and it was, therefore, in existence from the days of John the Baptist. From the days of John the Baptist, from the very time the Lord established His kingdom, it began to suffer persecutions at the hands of wicked men. C. H. C.

1 Peter 2:10

---February 18, 1913

Brother W. M. McGee, of Chunky, Miss., asks our views on (**Pet 2:10**) (**I Peter 2:10**), and asks, "Were they not always His (God's) people?" The text reads, "Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy." No, they were not always God's people in the sense of this text. They were His by choice before time began, but the apostle was not talking about God's choice in this text. He was talking about them being made His by regeneration according to His choice.

They were a chosen generation, and are now made the people of God according to that choice. God had made choice of them, to bestow His mercy upon them. He has now bestowed that mercy according to that choice. In this respect they are now His, but were not His in that sense before regeneration. C. H. C.

Hebrews 6:4

---February 18, 1913

Brother C. E. Miller, of Fairfield, Ill., requests our views of ((Hebrews 6:4-7). which reads, "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame."

This text is often relied upon to prove the possibility of a child of God apostatizing and being finally lost. To our mind the text teaches the very opposite. If a child of God-one who has been born from above-should fall away, then Christ would necessarily be compelled to come back to this world, suffer and die again. Thus He would be put to an open shame. Failure would be stamped upon His work. But He will never suffer and die again. His work was complete and effectual. He cannot be put to an open shame. He cannot be crucified again. Therefore it is impossible for one of His children to fall away and be finally lost. C. H. C.

Some Ideas Presented

---February 18, 1913

Dear Brother Cayce: If you could put your paper, The Primitive Baptist, in pamphlet form, it would be more convenient for your subscribers in preserving them; I am sure you could get more subscribers. I have been taking it for several years, and have never got tired of it yet. I hardly think it is as interesting as it once was; it used to have more editorials. You and your associate editors are all able writers, and I suggest that you drop some of us inferior writers and have more editorials. I would like for you and your associates to write on some passages of Scripture, especially controverted subjects; it is strengthening to us weak brethren.

Brother Cayce, I wish you to give your views on **(Romans 3:21-22)**. Some say that the phrase "unto all" applies to the Adamic family, and that the phrase "upon all," to them that believe. Also **(John 3:16)**. Some hold that as belief is an act of the creature, salvation is offered to the sinner on condition of his believing. I love to hear the brethren and sisters tell their experiences, and tell of good meetings, but I prefer to hear our able ministers expound the Scriptures to anything else. I see that a great deal of our paper is taken up with experiences of late. I sometimes write a piece, but I would be willing for mine to go to the wastebasket and let the space be filled by our able editor's writing.

We could give much more space in our valuable paper by writers abridging their superfluous words, apologies of their weakness and inability to write, etc. I know that Brother Cayce will find my weakness before he puts it in print. Then after we get through apologising, we take up some more valuable space by adding that we were compelled to write to relieve our minds. The readers all know that we have some impressions to write or we would not write. If we would study our subjects well before writing, and just use words sufficient to make our ideas plainly understood, we could save much valuable space for able brethren.

For example: "I got up this morning, ate my breakfast and fed my horse, shelled some corn, went to the mill and got some meal. When I came home I found my neighbor waiting to see me." I tell him all this, and what has he learned? Simply that I had taken some corn to the mill. His supposition was, that I got up, fed my horse and ate my breakfast, shelled my corn and got it ground. So it is with some of our preachers, if they would cut short their preliminaries and preach their sermon, we could be on our way home for dinner by the time the sermon is preached. If this is put in print, some of the readers will say it is foolish and superfluous talk. If you blame me for writing it, put some of the blame on Brother Cayce for publishing it. Jake Owens. Speedwell, Tenn.

REMARKS

In regard to the foregoing suggestions we will say: We cannot publish The Primitive Baptist in pamphlet form for the reason that the expense would be too great. It would cost at least two or three times as much to get it out that way. The price would have to be increased accordingly, and for that reason many would quit taking it, and our list would not be as large as it is. The phrase- "unto all and upon all them that believe" in **(Romans 3:22)**, simply means "unto and upon all them that believe." This is the plain grammatical construction of the language, and no other construction can be placed upon it without twisting it. **(John 3:16)** does not teach that belief is a condition in order to eternal life, or anything else. Belief is an evidence of life, and unbelief is an evidence that one is in a state of condemnation. Unbelief is a state of being. The condemnation does not rest in the fact that one does not believe.

If you will read (John 3:19) you will see that the condemnation rests in the fact that men loved darkness rather than light. The Saviour says that "this is the condemnation." Their unbelief, then, was not the cause of their condemnation, but was the evidence of it. Not only is all this true, but it is also true that belief is not a voluntary act. No man ever believed any proposition

because he wanted to. People believe when they receive evidence sufficient to convince their judgment that a fact exists, and not before.

We think it would be a good thing if the writers would express themselves in as few words as possible. It is useless to tell how one feels impressed to write. It will be taken for granted that one writes because he is impressed to do so-whatever may have caused the impression. Short pointed articles are much better and of more interest than long ones. Long accounts of tours are of but little, if any, interest to any except the people who live in the section visited. It is not necessary to tell who furnishes conveyance to each place, where we get dinner every day, and where we spend each night, and such like items. It is to be supposed that we are fed and lodged and conveyed along the way. Stating these things cannot comfort, edify or benefit a single reader. Hence, it is a needless use of space.

Now, as to leaving out letters and writing more ourselves will say that we have a great deal of matter sent us that we do not have space to publish. We cannot publish all that is sent to us. Yet a writer will sometimes say: "This is submitted to your better judgment. Do with it as you think best. If you throw it in the wastebasket it will be all right with me." Some such expressions as these are often used. Then if the article does not appear soon we get a letter asking why the letter is not published, and even ordering the paper stopped. So we never know how one is going to feel about such matters. We can only do the best we can. We cannot please all, no matter what or how we do. We will just do the best we can, and ask those who are pleased to help us all they can. C. H. C.

Musical Instruments

---February 25, 1913

We copy the following from the Musical Million, published by The Ruebush Kieffer Company, at Dayton, Va. It may interest some of our readers. C. H. C.

There is no New Testament authority for the use of the musical instrument in worship. As for the comfort some get out of exhortations in Psalms to use instruments in worship, that is completely nullified by the severe rebuke administered in ((**Amos 6:5**) (**Amos 6:5**). As for the New Testament teaching there is absolutely no authority given for the use of anything aside from the human voice and heart in the worship of the Creator, but much in line with "singing and making melody in the heart," worshipping "in spirit and in truth." The musical instrument as an aid to worship is as distinctly out of place as is the prayer wheel or string of beads. Any additions made to the heaven created instruments of worship weakens the spirit of true worship.-D. K. in Gospel Herald.

The Church

---April 1, 1913

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-Will you please write an article on the setting up of the church? Some of my neighbors say that there is no organic church of Christ here on earth. Your brother in hope, Jas. L. Arnold. R. 2, Bradford, Tenn.

REMARKS

Some of your neighbors must be infidels. Evidently they do not believe the plain statements of Holy Writ. ((**Dan 2:44**) (**Daniel 2:44**) is very plain. The God of heaven was to set up a kingdom in the days of the kings represented by the toes of the image which Nebuchadnezzar saw. This was evidently the Caesars. While Tiberias Caesar was reigning this was fulfilled. The forty eighth division of the Psalms shows that this kingdom was to be established, and that it would be on Mount Zion. The Saviour gave laws, rules and regulations to govern the members of this

church, or kingdom. These are all a “dead letter,” and are absolutely useless and worthless if there is no organized kingdom of Christ on earth. C. H. C.

Questions on Regeneration

---April 1, 1915

Brother Cayce:

Is it wrong to say that regeneration makes immoral men better morally? What part of the regenerated man do you exhort to obey? Please answer in The Primitive Baptist, and oblige.

OUR ANSWER

To the first question we answer, no; it is not wrong to say that regeneration makes immoral men better morally. We have known some men who were immoral before regeneration, and when they were regenerated, or born again, they left off their immoral practices. The grace of God received in the heart in regeneration teaches “us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world.” If the grace of God in the heart will not make one a better man, then nothing will.

When we exhort to obedience, we try to follow the example of the apostles. One good example, we think, is in (**Romans 12:1**), “We beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.” He cannot render acceptable service to God unless he presents his body. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 3:2

(I Corinthians 3:2)---April 8, 1913

The text referred to means that the brethren at Corinth were unable to receive the strong meat of the gospel. They had been deluded and led into error. They had decided that it was through the instrumentality of Paul, Apollos, or Cephas that they were in Christ. They could not receive the fundamental truth that they were in Christ independently of the work of the preacher. They could feast upon experimental and practical truths, the milk; but they could not feast upon the fundamental principles, the strong meat, of the gospel. C. H. C.

Matthew 24:19-20

---April 8, 1913

Brother H. J. Brown, of Board Camp, Ark., requests our views on (**Matthew 24:19-20**). The Saviour is here talking to His disciples about the destruction of the temple. In the destruction of the temple when the city was surrounded by the Roman army, women devoured the flesh of their own children. Some of the Lord's followers escaped, by fleeing into the mountains, when the army made their attack upon the city. Hence the Saviour said pray that it be not in winter. This all refers to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. C. H. C.

Revelation 12:1

---April 8, 1913

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Please give your views on (**Revelation 12:1**). Who was the woman? Who was the man child that was to rule all nations? Was what John saw in the past or future? Please answer through The Primitive Baptist. Your brother in hope, J. H. Miller. Camden on Gauley, W. Va.

REMARKS

The woman was the church. She was a wonder when she first appeared, and she has been a wonder from then until now. The child was Christ. The woman had already appeared. This was in the past. Some things recorded in that chapter which he saw were in the future. C. H. C.

Luke 23:43

---April 22, 1913

Sister Mattie Trice, of Nebo, Ky., writes us that she thinks the thief spoken to in (**Luke 23:43**) was saved, and asks our opinion of the matter. We will say that language could not be plainer. He prayed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." The Saviour said unto him, "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." Paradise is not the grave, but a place of peace or rest. The grave is sometimes called hell, but is never called paradise. To deny that this thief was saved is to deny the plain, positive, emphatic statement of the Saviour. Those who do so may be professed Christians, but they have very little regard for the Saviour's words. C. H. C.

Matthew 18:18

---May 20, 1913

A. J. Oden, of Edinburg, Miss., requests our views on (**Matthew 18:18**). This verse is the conclusion of the Saviour's teaching to the disciples concerning one brother trespassing against another. When they follow the teaching laid down there, in the instruction given by the Saviour, the same is approved by the Lord. When we follow the instruction of the Saviour, He approves of it. He does not approve any other course; and when we pursue any other course we do not have the blessing of His approval. C. H. C.

Habakkuk 2; Habakkuk 3:19 AND Malachi 4

---May 20, 1913

Brother D. S. Blake, of Concord, N. C, requests our views on ((**Hab 2:14**) (**Habakkuk 2:14**) and (Malachi 4). According to ((**Hab 2:14**) (**Habakkuk 2:14**) we think the time will come when the gospel in its purity will be preached in every nation and among every people. This will be after the "fullness of the Gentiles be come in" and the Jews have been "grafted in again." All the efforts of modern missionism will not help to bring about the fulfillment of this prophecy. There will be a time of great persecution before this is fulfilled. In (Malachi 4) we think the prophet is telling of the coming of Christ and of the gospel day. He does not refer to the final end of time, but to the end of the law dispensation and the ushering in of the new dispensation, or the gospel day. C. H. C.

Missions

---May 27, 1913

In order to elicit some interest in this hackneyed subject, I will venture to make some remarkable remarks; some startling statements, and I trust the remarkable remarks will not miss the mark, nor the startling statements fail to startle. On some subjects men are sleepy; on some sound asleep; and on others dead asleep. The greatest subject in the world is Missions, hence the greatest sin in the world is anti-missions. God sent His Son to seek and save the lost, "to rescue the perishing;" and the Son sent His disciples on the same mission.

This mission is their only commission, and to oppose missions is to oppose the salvation of sinners, All other errors claim some Scripture support but anti-missionism has not the semblance of Scriptural support. Not only does all Scripture oppose it, but it opposes all Scripture. Some things are better understood by comparison, and some by contrast. Comparison shows the similarities; contrast the dissimilarities. We have vocabulary tables showing similar words. These words are called synonyms; also tables of dissimilar words called antonyms or words of opposite meaning. Such as light and darkness, cold and heat, high and low, up and

down, far and near, heavy and light, good and evil, life and death, rough and smooth, sick and well, love and hate, heaven and hell, saint and sinner, God and devil, etc.

The good often appears better and stronger in contrast with the bad. Contrast applies to both principles and practices, to doctrines and duties. A man may be unable to pay his debts or to discharge any duty. His inability may excuse him but can't exonerate him. Inability don't pay debts and is no compensation to the creditor. If one is able, and refuses, he is more guilty and should be forced to do his duty. But if he is opposed to the paying of debts and to the discharge of duty he is an anarchist, and should be cut off from the privileges of society.

Let us now apply these principles to the subject. A man may be an omissionary from want of ability, but his inability may be culpable. Many hide behind inability and ignorance, which is generally more culpable than either or both. With a world of means and opportunities for knowing and doing, who can be excused from either? If the widow was commendable for giving her two mites any one is censurable for not doing it. The least was her all and if it was her duty to give that, it is the duty of all to give the least and all rather than not give at all. But if one is ABLE to give and refuses to do so, he is a remissionary, and is more guilty than the omissionary, and how much more God only can judge.

But the anti-missionary reaches the utmost extent of guilt, because he is opposed to both the principle and practice of giving, notwithstanding the unspeakable benefits that accrue from giving. He is an anarchist in the Kingdom of heaven, and in all the kingdoms of the world, for both heaven and earth commend and command the principle and the practice of both benevolence and beneficence. It is commendable to all but devils. The man who is always receiving like the dead sea, and never gives, is deader than the sea-salt has no savor for such. As a Gentile, he has been given the opportunity to hear, and believe, and be saved, but he is opposed to giving the opportunities to others whatever the fatal results may be in not doing so. Opposed to others hearing lest they should also believe and be saved! But it may be chided that they are not opposed to the salvation of others, but opposed to extending them the appointed means to that end.

No anti-salvationists, but anti-missionists. But is not that a delusive dodge? If a house with sleeping inmates is on fire, and you have the opportunity and the means of rescuing them, and don't act, would you not be charged with their destruction by both human and divine law? If you were exhorted to do so, and refused, would you not be still more guilty? But if in principle and practice you should be opposed to helping and saving the perishing, could anything be added to such guilt? There are heaven appointed means and agencies for the procuring and perpetuating natural life. This is conceded by all. Is not the same true in the spiritual realm? If we fail to use the God appointed means and agencies and opportunities for the production and perfection of spiritual life, are we not as much more culpable as the benefits are superior? If we are sent to the lost for their salvation, and fail or refuse to go, will not their blood be required at our hands? But, suppose one goes further than failure or refusal to go, because he is opposed to all such means and agencies and instrumentalities appointed for the salvation of others, is he not as guilty as can be, yea infinitely more so than in the other case, as infinite interests are involved? Is he not deserving not only of the pie, but of the bottomless pit, not only of hell but of the lowest and hottest hell, not only wrath but wrath to the uttermost.

I do not charge that an anti-missionary is directly opposed to the salvation of any or all, but he is opposed to being sent or used himself, and also opposed to any one else being so sent and used. That is, he is opposed to any means being used for the salvation of any one. If one is opposed to the use of means and agencies appointed for natural life, without which natural life cannot be produced or preserved, then his guilt is measured by the value of natural life. So, if one refuses because opposed to the use of appointed means for spiritual life, his guilt is measured by the value of spiritual life. This is true, though the natural or spiritual life is not

dependent on him, provided he is sent of God for such a purpose. If God appoints means to the end, he cannot oppose the means without opposing the end. Such dodges are thus deceitful devices of the devil.

When God puts righteousness to the line and judgment to the plummet, as He will do to all of us, how can the anti-missionary stand? Answer: Just like any other transgressor can stand, namely, by repentance and confession and abandonment of his anti-missionary sins. For such and to this end, this effort is made. Let the anti-missionary repent and forsake his anti-missionary sins if he hopes for forgiveness. Is there a sin or crime among men that can compare to this opposition to the salvation of men? I affirm that the greatest criminals are religious criminals. Their "damnation heresies" are religiously garbed as Satan's "ministers of righteousness," and they generally go as wolves in sheep's clothing.

Their saying, "Lord! Lord!" and believing much truth, and doing much good in the name of the Lord cannot save them from the sentence: "Depart from me, for I know you not."

What communion hath light and darkness, and what agreement has Missions and Anti-missions? They are as opposite as good and evil, Christ and Belial.

Do the Scriptures teach Missions or Anti-missions? They can't teach both, Some errors may seemingly have one or more Scriptures in their support, but who has dared to claim one Scripture in support of anti-missionism? O, they say, if eternal and unconditional and personal election and predestination are true, and true they are, then there is no need of missions. But who said so? If God said so, where? Ah, the author of that damnable heresy is the adversary of the souls. It is just like him. Such conclusions are in the Scriptures but the Scriptures every time give the devil as the author, and he who preaches it is a minister of Satan pretending to preach righteousness.

REMARKS

The above effusion is from the pen of Rev. J. B. Moody, D. D., and appeared in the Baptist Builder of January 15, 1913. For downright Phariseism and dirty mudslinging we believe it is just about the limit. According to Elder Moody, the Anti-missionaries, as he terms them, should have a place in the lowest depths of the bottomless pits of hell. This only manifests the corruption of his wicked, abominable and deceitful heart. Judging from his utterances in the above article one would be forced to conclude that his heart is a sink of sin-a cage of unclean birds-desperately wicked-"as black as the ace of spades" -as bitter as Satan himself.

We pity the poor, proud, haughty, wicked sinner which he manifests himself to be. We can feel to excuse him on the ground that he is old and childish, pettish and has a disordered liver-and possibly his mind is not as strong as it was in his younger days. We are always sorry for old people who are growing weak minded. The elder says: "God sent His Son to seek and to save the lost, 'to rescue the perishing; and the Son sent His disciples on the same mission.'" We do not know where the elder obtained his information concerning this matter. He never got it in the Bible, for it is not there. We wonder if this not one of the devil's inventions, and the elder is advocating it for him? Christ Jesus came into this world to save His people from their sins. {see **(Matthew 1:21)**}

The work of regeneration is a creative work, and requires creative power. Elder Moody, with all the modern Missionaries in the world, cannot create the smallest atom that floats in the atmosphere. Neither can they help in the work of creation. The only thing men can create is a "fuss" or a disturbance. No one man can even do that unless another man will help him. God is the great Creator, and He used no means or instrumentality in the work of creation in the beginning. Neither does He use means or instrumentalities in creating sinners in Christ. God will raise the dead in the resurrection morning, and He will not use Dr. Moody as an instrument or means in doing that work. Neither does the Son use Dr. Moody as an instrument

or a means in raising sinners out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ. The one is done just like the other. "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom He will." -(John 5:21).

Again, the doctor says: "But the Anti-missionary reaches the utmost extent of guilt, because he is opposed to both the principle and practice of giving, notwithstanding the unspeakable benefits that accrue from giving." In this statement the doctor makes a charge that is absolutely false, so far as our people are concerned. We are not opposed to giving; but we are opposed to giving in order to sustain and uphold the false systems and theories which have been invented by men. We are opposed to the widows, orphans, and hungry poor of our land "giving all" for the support of high salaried preachers, agents, secretaries and managers of the different boards which have been created by the ingenuity of men, and all which are unauthorised by the word of God.

We are also opposed to men obtaining money under false pretense, and that is what this modern missionary scheme does. It represents to the people that the heathens are going to hell every day by the multiplied thousands for want of the gospel, and that the gospel is not sent because of a lack of funds; and the funds are lacking because of the pride and covetousness of the people here. The idea that the eternal destiny of men and women in foreign lands depends upon money and the liberality of the people here is preposterous. It is absolutely untrue, and the obtaining of money under such claims is simply to obtain it under false pretense. It is a penitentiary crime to get money under false pretense, unless it is done under the cloak of religion! This is what our people are opposed to, and some honest people will be living to oppose it as long as the world stands-no matter how much Dr. Moody may wish they were all in the lowest pits of hell.

The rich man in hell believed the same doctrine Dr. Moody is advocating now. Abraham, in heaven, did not believe it, but advocated the same principle we advocate now. Hence Dr. Moody's doctrine is from hell, and the doctrine we advocate is from heaven. Therefore, Dr. Moody, and those who advocate the same principles he does, are hell-sent preachers. May the Lord pity them. C. H. C.

Isaiah 45:7

---June 3, 1913

Brother E. M. Vandiver, of Winnsboro, Texas, requests our views of ((7) (**Isaiah 45:7**). The text reads, "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things." The darkness and evil referred to in this text is not sin, but punishment for sin. ((**Amos 3:6**) (**Amos 3:6**) is another text very much like this. It says, "Shall a trumpet be blown in the city and the people not be afraid? shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?" Here is the evil mentioned also by this prophet. But this evil is a punishment for sin. Notice ((**Amos 3:2**) (**Amos 3:2**), "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities." This was to Israel, and the evil was the punishment sent upon them for their iniquities.

Any man who says the evil in these places is sin and wickedness believes that God is the author of sin. He cannot believe otherwise. If he says God creates sin, he must believe that God is the author of sin. When he says he does not believe God is the author of sin, and also says God makes or creates sin, he does not tell the truth. There is no way out of this. C. H. C.

Romans 8:15-23; Galatians 4:5

---June 3, 1913

Brother E. C. Carter, of Blue Ridge, Texas, requests our views of (Romans 8:15-23) and (**Galatians 4:5**). We suppose it is the subject of the adoption that he wants our views on, as he

states he has been interested in that subject. We haven't time or space to write at length on the subject. Get your Bible now and read (**Romans 8:15-23**). In (Romans 8:15) the apostle says, "Ye have received the spirit of adoption." They receive the spirit of adoption in regeneration. In that work one is born of the heavenly parentage-made akin to God, though he is still akin to Adam. Hence, he now has two natures.

Adoption is to take one out of one family and put him into another. Adoption does not change relationship, or kinship. We are made akin to God by regeneration. Then when they are made akin to God they have the spirit of adoption-desire to be taken into the family of God; hence, are waiting for the adoption. The adoption, for which they are waiting, will take place in the resurrection when the body is raised from the grave and taken into the heavenly family in glory. Jesus came into this world and suffered, bled and died, for His people, that they might receive the adoption of sons. See (**Galatians 4:5**). He rose from the dead that they might also rise and be adopted into the heavenly family. The resurrection of their bodies is made secure by the resurrection of His body. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 7:14,15

---June 10, 1913

A. J. Oden, of Edinburg, Miss., requests our views on ((4) (I Corinthians 7:14-15). The reading is as follows: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy. But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace." We suppose the main point the brother wishes our views on is the expression, "A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases."

But we will say, first, that the preceding verse has reference to the legitimacy of the children. The marriage was legal, and the children are, therefore, legitimate. Now, if the unbelieving wife or husband departs, or leaves the believing one, then the believing one is not under bondage. That simply means this: If Mr. A. is a believer and marries Miss B. who is an unbeliever, and Miss B. then refuses to live with Mr. A., or refuses to remain with him, then Mr. A., is not under bondage. That is, he is not bound to live with her.

Some people say this gives Mr. A. the right to marry again, but it does not, for ((0) (I Corinthians 7:10-11) say, "And to the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife." So if Mr. A's wife departs he has no right to marry again. He must remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her. This is the plain requirement here. C. H. C.

London Confession and Fall of Man

---June 10, 1913

Some time ago we received a letter from Brother T. W. Todd, of Manitou, Ky., from which we take the following extracts:

We are divided here about the fall of man. I believe Adam was able to keep the law, but others claim that Adam had to fall so God could carry out His plan of salvation. They say that if Adam had stood he would have frustrated the plan of salvation. I know your views on that subject; but I want to know if the London Confession of Faith which you publish is the whole Confession, or is it just a sketch. I have been told that there is a brother in our country who has a London Confession which says that Adam could not have stood.

To this we will say that if Adam could not have kept the law, then his condemnation for the violation of the law is not just; and if his condemnation is not just, then the law was not just.

But the apostle says **{((2) (Romans 7:12))}** that the law is just. If the law is just, then the punishment for the violation of the law is just; and if the punishment is just, then the man could have kept the law. He did not have to violate it.

To say that man had to violate the law in order that God carry out His plan of salvation is to say that man had to commit sin in order to be saved in heaven. This would not only make eternal salvation conditional, but would make it conditional upon the wicked works of men. That is worse than the rankest Arminianism we ever heard.

Some people accused the apostle of preaching and teaching the principle "Let us do evil that good may come." The apostle denied the charge and said that it was a slanderous report. He did not teach that man had to violate the law in order that God carry out His plan of salvation. The man who does teach that teaches heresy of the very worst sort. He must want a cloak to hide behind to do some meanness.

As to the London Confession of Faith will say no man has a true copy of that Confession which says Adam could not have stood. That Confession never did say any such thing. The London Confession which we have published and for sale was copied from Hassell's History. We have a copy of that Confession, as adopted by the Philadelphia Association in 1742, and published in 1831, which is the same, except two chapters added on singing of Psalms (chapter 23), and laying on of hands (chapter 31). The same Confession is in Crosby's History of the English Baptists. We never heard before of one claiming that the London Confession said Adam could not have stood. No honest man who is informed can make such a claim.

The Confession says (Chapter IV Sec. 2), "After God had made all other creatures He created man, male and female, with reasonable and immortal souls, rendering them fit unto that life to God for which they were created, being made after the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness and true holiness; having the law of God written in their hearts, and power to fulfill it; and yet under a possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will which was subject to change." This positively says they had **POWER TO FULFILL IT**. That is what those English Baptists said in 1689.

Another point we call attention to here is that these Baptists said God made man with a reasonable and immortal soul. Those who are now teaching that man is wholly mortal-soul, body and spirit-and that when man dies, "he dies all over," are not like those English Baptists in 1689. They have departed from Baptist faith. They are not Primitive Baptists. C. H. C.

Questions

---June 17, 1913

J. M. Presnell, of Rominger, N. C, asks us the following questions:

1. Was Adam made perfect?
2. Was he a fit subject for heaven in his created state?
3. Was he made in the image of God in purity?
4. Does the Bible teach that God made the serpent? If so, where did he get the power to tempt Eve to eat the forbidden fruit?
5. Is lust sin? It seems to me there was a place in Eve for the conception of lust before she ate the fruit. "When lust has conceived it brings forth sin."
6. Wasn't there sin brought forth before she ate the fruit?

OUR ANSWERS

1. Yes, in the sense that he was without sin. He was not perfect in the sense that it was impossible for him to become contaminated.

2. No, he was not a fit subject for heaven in his original state. If he was, then God made a mistake when He put him in the garden. But God made no mistake. Hence, he was not a fit subject for heaven, but a fit subject for the garden as long as he obeyed God's law.
3. He was made in the image of God in his being-in his makeup. Man is in the likeness and image of God. A likeness is a picture. God is represented as having a head, eyes, ears, nose, mouth, body, arms, hands and feet. Man possesses these- hence he is in the likeness of God. Man is one, composed of three-soul, body and spirit. God is one, composed of three- Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Hence, man is in the image of God. This is the way in which man was made in the image of God, and not in the sense of purity. Man did not possess that spiritual life which prepares him for heaven.
4. The Bible says God formed the crooked serpent. But we judge you mean to ask if God made the devil. Some say He did, and some say He did not. We wonder how they know. The first account we have of him was in the garden. Anything farther than this is speculation, and speculation is gambling. We prefer not to gamble. We have spent very little time investigating the genealogy of the devil. We are not concerned about him, his kingdom, nor his children. We are warned to resist him-to let him alone. Failing to do so will get people into trouble.
5. No, lust is not sin. It brings forth sin when it is conceived.
6. No, sin was not brought forth before she ate the fruit. Sin is the transgression of the law. She sinned when she transgressed the law, although she was deceived. The man was not deceived. He transgressed wilfully. Sin entered into the world by one man. {See **(Romans 5:12)**} C. H. C.

I Corinthians 6:9-11

I Corinthians 6:9-11

---June 17, 1913

J. E. Rinehart, of Rienzi, Miss., requests our views of (I Corinthians 6:9-11). We gave a short statement of our views of this text in our issue of November 15, 1910, as follows: The apostle shows that certain characters shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

Then he tells the Corinthians that they were once in the same condition of these characters.

“Such were some of you.” But the Lord had cleansed them by His Spirit and had brought them out of their former condition. It was not done because of their good works, because they had not been doing good works. But since the Lord has washed them and cleansed them by His Spirit they are capacitated to do good works.

Brother Rinehart also says: “Seeing that some are guilty of either one of those things before being born again can being guilty of either one of these things make a man unfit for the kingdom or the church?” If the man has done these things, and was afterward regenerated, or born again-cleansed, washed, sanctified, justified-by the Spirit of God, and then ceases to practice those things, he is entitled to membership in the church, so far as these things are concerned. If a man continues to be a transgressor of God's law after regeneration, he has no right to membership in the church; but one who has been regenerated, and then lives the right kind of life, has right to membership in the church. C. H. C.

Genesis 6:6 AND Exodus 32:14

---June 24, 1913

Joseph A. Brown, of Foss, Okla., requests our views on **(Genesis 6:6)** and **((2:14) (Exodus 32:14); (Genesis 6:6)** reads, “And it repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him at His heart.” This was said in Noah's day before the flood. (Genesis 6:7) says, “And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have

made them.” Just one hundred and twenty years from that time the Lord sent the flood and destroyed man from the face of the earth. (Verse 3)says, “Yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.” This was just one hundred and twenty years before the flood. Hence, this is what the language refers to, and has no reference whatever to the eternal salvation of sinners, as modern theologians usually teach.

((2:14) (Exodus 32:14) says, “And the Lord repented of the evil which He thought to do unto His people.” This was said concerning the children of Israel when they were in the wilderness worshiping the golden calf which Aaron made. Moses was in the mount receiving the law which the Lord had written on tables of stone. The Lord told Moses what the Israelites were doing, and said they were a stiff-necked people, and threatened to consume them. Moses made intercession for them, and the Lord heard his cries in their behalf and their punishment was suspended. But as a result of this sin three thousand of them were destroyed in one day-see ((2:28) (Exodus 32:28).

These passages cannot mean that God changes, as men do. The Lord says {**(Malachi 3:6)**} “For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.” The Lord does not change. His love, tender care and protection is ever the same. His children may so live as to bring down upon themselves His displeasure and the chastening rod, and be punished severely for their wickedness-yet the Lord ever remains the same. They may deny Him, yet He abideth faithful-He cannot deny Himself. Thank and praise His holy name that these things are so. C. H. C.

Matthew 16:19

---June 24, 1913

Brother J. T. Copeland, of Bremen, Ga., requests our views on **(Matthew 16:19)**, which reads, “And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” etc. Brother Copeland asks about the keys. Keys are used to unlock, or to open doors. Peter preached the first gospel sermon to the Gentiles. He used the keys then, and unlocked the door of the church to the Gentiles, and it has never been closed against them since that time. When the seventy were sent out by the Saviour before His crucifixion He told them to “go not into the way of the Gentiles,” the door of the church was closed against them then. The keys were given to Peter and he used them in opening the door unto the Gentiles. C. H. C.

Warning

---August 19, 1913

We have received two letters from brethren in Louisiana concerning a man claiming to be a Primitive Baptist preacher. He claimed to be a lawyer, and that he lived in Oklahoma. He went by the name of Morrow while in Louisiana. One letter states that he went from there to Mississippi and then assumed the name of J. H. Thompson. The brethren are warned to beware of him. We thought best to publish this statement rather than to publish the letters, as this short statement is sufficient. Other Primitive Baptist papers are requested to copy.

It is rather strange to us that brethren will be “taken in” by men going over the country claiming to be Primitive Baptist preachers. When a stranger goes into your community, and no Old Baptist there has ever heard of him, and he claims to be an Old Baptist preacher, the rule is that he will do to watch. As a rule you will be safe in letting them alone. C. H. C.

Penick Croaks

---August 26, 1913

The puerile effort of our neighbor, Elder C. H. Cayce, in his last issue to reply to the invincible article of Dr. Moody in the Builder of January 15 on anti-missions is the weakest of all the weak things and the most childish of all childish things this anti-missionary editor has said. This anti-missionary boy imagines himself a man in ability to reply to such a giant as Moody. His mashed toes cause him to squirm and whine out some very ugly words at a father in Israel simply because he cannot answer his arguments. Moody wrote against anti-missionaries no matter in whose ranks they are found. Elder Cayce confesses he is one of them and rails back at Moody by calling him and other missionaries "hell sent preachers." One thing is certain, Cayce don't and won't accept it and try to carry out the commission of our Lord, so if he has any commission at all for his anti-mission work it must be from some other source.

Judging from the spirit Elder Cayce manifests in his editorial toward Moody and all missionaries he must have his commission from the wrong source. We are indeed very glad that Elder Cayce let his readers see some things that Moody said and with our faith in them and in the truth we hope it will do some of them good. They are good people, but have been misled by such money loving sheep fleecers as Elder Cayce, who prefers, no doubt, to have them give their money to him, that he may live in fine style, buy and own bank stock, etc., instead of giving it to send the gospel of love and light to the lost for whom Christ gave His blood. His greed for gain and hatred for his brethren who seek to carry out the commission of Jesus manifests itself in such bitter personal attacks as he made on Moody for simply writing the truth against NO MAN AS A MAN, but against the awful error of anti-missions.

The Builder has seen this money loving spirit seek to hide itself behind the boisterous attacks it makes on those who try to help on the cause of Christ, while its covetous nature stalks abroad for money to further personal and selfish ends, and with only good will for all and a simple loyalty to the truth and to the people we do not propose to remain silent while men who do little or nothing for the good of humanity continue to try to hurt and hinder those who seek to do good. Better stop your ugly personal attacks on missionaries and discuss principles. -I N. Penick in Baptist Builder, June 4, 1913.

OUR REPLY

The above is the croaking of Rev. Dr. I N. Penick. He takes exception to our reply to Dr. Moody's harangue which appeared in that sheet some time ago. It is to be noted that Rev. Penick never gives space in his sheet for any reply we make to their slanderous misrepresentations of our people, but we have given space for every article we have replied to from their pens. Will Dr. Penick give space in his paper for our reply to Dr. Moody or for this reply to himself? No. He dare not let both sides of a question go before his readers. This shows the unfairness of the man. If he will insert our reply to Dr. Moody in his paper, and will submit a bill to us, we will pay for the space at the regular advertising rates. This act of Penick is his usual way of doing business. He will misrepresent our people, as Moody did in the article we replied to, and then put up the "baby cry" of personal attack, and such like, without giving his readers both sides. No honest fair man would continue such practices. We will see if Dr. Penick continues it.

He says Dr. Moody's article was invincible. Yes, it was wonderful!-just about as invincible as a snow ball in this hot weather. He says our reply was the weakest of all the weak things we have said. Well, it was not necessary to say anything so very strong to answer the invincible (?) misrepresentation of Rev. Dr. Moody.

He says we imagine ourself a man. No, Dr. Rev. Hon. Iracund N. Penick, we are not so large in our own estimation as the wonderful, magnificent, grandiloquent editor of the Builder is. Neither do we claim to be quite so profound in wisdom as the great Dr. Moody. If the Queen of Sheba could be here now and behold the wonderful attainments of Moody and Penick she could say "The thousandth part hath not yet been told." Solomon is so wonderfully eclipsed now! It

can no longer be said that he was the wisest man. Poor old Solomon. But, “such a giant as Moody!” Yes, we have read of a giant who in ancient times defied the armies of the living God. That man was an uncircumcised Philistine. We suppose the modern Softshell Missionaries now have his counterpart, as the Dr. Penick boasts of his giant. There was a stripling of a lad who boldly marched out with his sling to meet the giant. As Dr. Penick says we are just a boy, we suppose we are the counterpart of that lad. All right, Doctor; thank you.

The Doctor says we whine at a father in Israel, but it appears already that Dr. Moody is of the uncircumcised Philistines from what Penick has said, and is, therefore, not a father in Israel. He must be an alien. He speaks the Ashdod language any way. By the way, it seems that some folks love to be fathers, any way. They seem to be willing to “father” most anything. But Dr. Moody is no father of ours in any sense of the word, nor is Dr. Penick. Nor is there any person living on earth of whom either is the father in a gospel sense. They have never yet begotten one person to a belief of the truth, for they do not teach it. Dr. Penick says we cannot answer giant Moody's arguments. Why did he not publish our article and let his readers see for themselves that we did not answer them? He knew better than to do so. He knows we did answer them.

He says we confess that we are an anti-missionary. We made no such confession. Anti means opposed to, and we will plead guilty to being opposed to the modern, unholy, unscriptural, unrighteous inventions of men as practiced by Moody, Penick & Co., in the name of Christianity. Moody, Penick & Co. charge upon us that we are opposed to the preaching of the gospel, and will not let our denial of that charge appear in their papers; and **THEY KNOW THAT THE CHARGE IS UNTRUE.**

He says we rail back at Moody, and call him and other missionaries hell sent preachers. Again, we press the question, Why did he not publish what we said? Were we justifiable in our statement? Let us look at it again. The rich man in hell taught the same doctrine that is taught by Moody and Penick. He taught that men might be kept from going to hell through the instrumentality of preaching. Abraham, in heaven, did not believe that doctrine. Then, who teaches the same doctrine that is taught in hell? Moody and Penick. If they are not hell sent preachers, they should quit teaching a hell taught doctrine.

He says we “won't accept and try to carry out the commission of our Lord.” What was the extent of the command? **(Mark 16:15):** “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.” **(Colossians 1:5-6):** “For the hope which is laid up for you in heaven, whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel; which is come unto you, as it is in all the world.” Here the apostle says that the gospel is come into all the world.

(Colossians 1:23): “And be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven.” The gospel was preached to every creature under heaven. Moody and Penick are trying to accomplish a work which has been done nearly nineteen hundred years. They are nearly nineteen hundred years behind the times, and yet charge us with ignorance. Poor little i. n. penick!

He says he judges that we have our commission from the wrong source. Yes, our commission is from the wrong source for us to preach the same doctrine that is advocated in hell. Yes, we let our readers see what these fellows have to say. We are not afraid for our readers to see both sides; but Elder Penick will not let this article appear in his paper. He does not want his readers to get the other side of the question.

Now, is it not wonderful that we are such fleecers of sheep! Elder Penick, do you own any bank stock? Dr. Penick is the man who teaches that people may be saved from an endless hell by the expenditure of money-yet he owns bank stock! If he would put the money into the missionary channel instead of bank stock, according to his doctrine, it would save some souls from an endless hell. Their claim is that it costs about five dollars to save a soul in Tennessee. If Elder Penick has only fifty dollars invested in bank stock, then, according to his own doctrine, ten

Tennessee souls go to an eternal hell because he invested the money in bank stock instead of putting it in the state missionary channel.

Again: We find the statement in the Baptist and Reflector of November 11, 1909, that "it costs ten cents to evangelize a heathen." At this rate, if Dr. Penick has fifty dollars invested in bank stock, according to his own doctrine, five hundred souls are sent to an endless hell because he invested his money in bank stock instead of using it to evangelize the heathen! This is the horrible teaching of these self-righteous, money hunting, money loving, hireling preachers!

We are NOT AGAINST Moody or Penick AS MEN; but we are opposed to such ungodly teaching, and we shall, by the Lord's help, continue to expose them. If they do not want us to reply to them, they must stop their unholy thrusts and ungodly misrepresentations of us and our people. They are doing good to humanity by getting the peoples hard earned dollars under the pretense of using it for the eternal salvation of souls, thus denying the work of God, and substituting filthy lucre for the blood of Christ and the work of the Spirit. Up to this good hour Dr. Penick has not agreed to affirm that "Missions as taught and practiced by the Missionary Baptists are authorised by the word of God." C. H. C.

Job 14:10-12

---September 2, 1913

Brother P. G. Garrett, of Windsor, Mo., requests our views concerning the sleep mentioned in ((**Job 14:12**) (**Job 14:12**), and refers to verses 10 and 11. The passage reads, "But man dieth and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up: so man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." We understand this sleep to be the sleep of death. The body dies, and is not raised to life again as it was, but when time ends-at that time it shall be awakened out of sleep. The Lord's people will then awake to an eternal day of love, joy, peace and happiness. They shall be changed-body as well as soul-to a glorified state. Their bodies will be immortalized. They will be raised spiritual, in glory. C. H. C.

Bogard Objects

---September 2, 1913

In the Baptist Flag of August 21, 1913, B. M. Bogard quotes this from us in the Cayce-Srygley debate, page 148: "Every one who ever has, does now, or ever will really and truly desire to meet God in peace, heaven will be their home by and by." Dr. (?) Bogard objects to this, but does not quote the entire sentence. The whole paragraph reads: "Do I believe they are taken home to heaven against their will? No, sir; God gives them a will, if you please, and that will springs from the divine life which God implants within the soul, and they long to see His face, and want to live with Him in heaven, and want to be free from sin, and want to be saved; and every one that ever has, does now, or ever will really and truly desire to meet God in peace, heaven will be their home by and by."

This shows that we held that those who have that real and true desire received it from the Lord. Bogard simply garbled our expression, and he could have had no excuse for doing so. No honest man will thus garble the language of another when he has it before him in plain print. It seems as though these hireling preachers will go to much trouble to garble and misrepresent people.

But he and his people have charged that we teach that a man is bound for hell, no matter how much he may desire to be saved. But, presto, change! Bogard is now the man who teaches that a

man is going to hell, no matter if he does desire to be saved! “The legs of the lame are not equal: so is a parable in the mouth of fools.” -(7) (Proverbs 21:7). C. H. C.

Cows Laugh

---September 2, 1913

Another brother vents his spleen in The Primitive Baptist at Dr. Moody and others for what they have said against the spirit of anti-missions. By this continued howling those brethren will surely convince their readers that they are not only anti-missionary, but that opposition to the spread of the gospel is their most loved doctrine. This W. E. Brush calls Moody, et als., in capital letters, “POOR, IGNORANT, IDOLATROUS HEATHENS.” To hear an ordinary Hardshell call J. B. Moody IGNORANT, etc., is enough to make cows laugh. Wonder how that writer would find out that anybody is ignorant?-I N. Penick, in Baptist Builder, July 2, 1913.

REMARKS

Here is Penick again with his false charge that our people are opposed to the preaching of the gospel. He knows this charge is false, and it appears that he makes it wilfully and maliciously. If it is not maliciously he will retract. He knows it is the new inventions they have and the doctrine they teach that we oppose, and not that we oppose gospel preaching. But he says this “is enough to make cows laugh.” Well, we do not know whether the cows laughed or not, but it made Penick bellow. C. H. C.

Job 7:1 AND Job 14:6

---September 9, 1913

Brother R. M. Lovett, of Strong, Ark., requests our views of ((Job 7:1) (Job 7:1) and ((Job 14:6) (Job 14:6), and asks, “Can a man shorten his days on earth?”

((Job 7:1) (Job 7:1) reads, “Is there not an appointed time to man upon earth? are not his days also like the days of an hireling?” The marginal reference uses the word warfare instead of appointed, and the original word often means warfare. It appears from what follows in this chapter that the word warfare would be a more nearly literal translation than the word appointed. But if the word appointed is the correct translation, or the proper word here, it does not intimate that there is a certain, unalterable, fixed time at which every man shall die. A time is appointed unto man upon earth-not a certain, fixed time for him to die.

((Job 14:5) (Job 14:5-6), reads, “Seeing his days are determined, the number of his months are with thee, thou hast appointed his bounds that he cannot pass; turn from him that he may rest, till he accomplish, as an hireling, his day.” In this connection Job refers to the tree springing up again, but that man does not die and return again to this life, but that he shall be changed. ((Job 14:14) (Job 14:14) says, “If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come.” When will the change come? In the resurrection of the body. His appointed time is until then. Hence it is appointed, that at a certain time, God's people shall be raised again and changed from natural to spiritual, from mortal to immortal. That is a time appointed of the Lord.

(Deuteronomy 5:16) says, “Honour thy father and thy mother, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee; that thy days may be prolonged, and that it may go well with thee in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.” Here it plainly says “THAT THY DAYS MAY BE PROLONGED.” This was a command in the moral law. Again, (Deuteronomy 6:2), “And that thy days may be prolonged.” The Apostle Paul recognised and taught the same truth.

(Ephesians 6:2-3), “Honour thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.” There they are admonished by the apostle to honor their father and mother that they may live long on the earth.

If a man takes the life of his fellowman, and is condemned by the courts, and hung for the crime, he has not honored his father and mother, and dies early as a result of his wickedness and failure to observe this first commandment with promise. C. H. C.

Not Worth Much

---September 9, 1913

The Rev. Dr. J. P. Greene, of Liberty, Mo., president of William Jewell College, declared in a sermon: "Of the nineteen hundred Baptist churches in the State of Missouri, one hundred are not worth a darn." He explained that the churches that are "not worth a darn" believe in close communion and baptism and they were orthodox, but he did not think a church was orthodox unless it was doing something for Jesus Christ. He said he wanted every church to be a force in its community. "I want them to help the children, to help the widows and the poor, and to help the civic life of that community. I want them to have a hand in the sports of the boys and the pleasures of the girls, in all the good things."

REMARKS

The above clipping is from the St. Louis Post Dispatch. It shows something about what the Missionary Baptists fellowship in their ranks. We thought some of them were not worth much, but it seems that some of their people are getting their eyes open to this foreign mission humbug, and are cutting out some of their giving toward its maintenance, and for this reason the Rev. Dr. Greene says "they are not worth a darn." People who do not give to the support of their inventions and men made institutions are pigmies in their estimation. We only trust that the Lord's children who are deluded by them may get their eyes opened. C. H. C.

Question of Order

---September 9, 1913

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Very Dear Brother-

Would it be contempt of the church for a member to have a cause with another member and refuse to take gospel steps? And upon being admonished by four or five different members of the church at different times he still refuses to take gospel steps and says he will not attend church any more and wants his name taken from the church book? Please answer in The Primitive Baptist. With best wishes to the paper and its editors, and may the God of all truth direct you in the way of all righteousness. Yours in hope, J. M. Walker. Elmore City, Oklahoma.

REMARKS

Such a procedure is most assuredly treating the church and her rules with contempt. If A is grieved with B he should go to B and tell him his fault, as directed in (Matthew 18). If he does not do this, then he should be willing to bear with B. If he is not willing to bear the grievance in silence, it is his indispensable duty to go to B. As stated, a refusal to do so is to treat the church and the rules of her Law Giver with contempt, and the party should be brought under censure of the church. C. H. C.

Good Meetings

---October 7, 1913

We have just attended the meeting of the Cumberland Association, which was held with the church on South College Street (Third Avenue South), Nashville, Tenn. The following named brethren in the ministry were present all or part of the time: S. N. Redford, of Texas; J. D. Parten, of Oklahoma; J. W. Kerr, of Indiana; W. T. Clayton, of Kentucky; H. P. Houk, of

Alabama; D. T. Self, H. L. Golston, R. O. Raulston, Thos. Weaver, J. M. Fuqua, E. S. Frye, H. G. Agee, D. Wauford, J. H. Phillips, N. J. Hinson, J. H. Pickard, W. P. Russell, A. J. McWhirter, J. Bunyan Stephens and the writer, all of Tennessee. Sixteen discourses were delivered at the meeting house, including the service Monday night.

The preaching was all a unit-not a discordant note was heard. Love flowed from heart to heart and fellowship abounded. One dear sister (Sister Colburn) came home to the church Saturday night, and we had the privilege of baptizing her in the Cumberland River on Monday afternoon. She came out of the water shouting praises to the Lord, and said she had been walking in the crooked road for years, but was now in the straight path. This was a glorious meeting, and one which will be long remembered.

We also had the privilege of attending the West Tennessee Association at Bethabara Church, near Waverly, Tenn., on the third Sunday in September, and Saturday before and Monday after. This was also a glorious meeting. The Lord's sweet presence was manifested. We were informed that four united with the church during this meeting at the services held at night at the homes. We failed to take a list of the names of the ministers present, and will not give any of their names, as we may not remember all of them.

We also had the pleasure of attending the Forked Deer Association held with the church at Harmony, near Idlewild, Tenn., on the second Sunday in September, and Friday and Saturday before. This was also a good meeting, indeed. Several brethren in the ministry were present, including Elders J. G. Webb and S. N. Redford, of Texas. We are not sure that we can call the names of all of them to mind now, and we took no list of them, so we will not try to give their names. The first association we had the privilege of attending this year was the Round Lick, which was held at the old Round Lick Church, near Watertown, Tenn, on Saturday, Sunday and Monday, embracing the first Sunday in September. A number of brethren in the ministry were present at this meeting, and the Lord's presence was also manifested. Love and fellowship abounded at all these meetings, and we are sure they will not be soon forgotten. C. H. C.

Mormon Questions

---October 28, 1913

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I have been requested by a Mormon to ask you some questions for you to answer through your paper. First. Where was Jesus from the time of His crucifixion until His resurrection?

2. Can we prove that Jesus Christ was the Son of God?

3. If some of us are God's children, and some are the devil's, can we prove who they are? He said He would give you fifty dollars for a whole Bible. Please answer through The Primitive Baptist. Your brother in hope, J. M. Little. McKenzie, Ala,

OUR ANSWER

From the time of His crucifixion until His resurrection the body of Jesus lay in the grave. His Spirit was in paradise, the abode of sanctified souls after death. "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." -(Luke 23:43).

The fact that Jesus was raised from the grave a living man proves that He was the Son of God. This question from this Mormon savors of infidelity. He is evidently an infidel wearing a cloak of religion. Jesus was the Word. The Word was with God and was God. The same Word was made flesh. See (**John 1:1,14**). (John 1:18) emphatically states that He was the Son of God. The same statement, calling Him the Son of God, is found in many places.

God's children are known from others, by us, by their fruits. In an unregenerate state all are the children of wrath by nature -all are children of Adam. God's children are made different from

others by regeneration. We can know them only by their fruits; but God knows them whether we do or not. Some of the questions from this Mormon savor more of the fruits of infidelity than a child of God.

Who would be willing to go that man's security to give fifty dollars for a whole Bible? We would not sell to him or his security on a credit. How would they, know it was a whole Bible if they should see one? It seems to us these folks would be rather quiet on the Bible question, since their representative, Mr. Slover, repudiated Smith's so called inspired translation while in discussion with us at McKenzie, Ala. C. H. C.

Baptism

---November 4, 1913

Brother Wesley Mainer, of Paris, Ark., requests us to explain (**Ephesians 4:5**) (the one baptism), in connection with ((**8:24**) (**Acts 18:24-25**) (John's baptism); ((**0**) (**Luke 12:50**) (Christ's baptism); (**Luke 1:8**) (Spirit baptism); (**Matthew 28:19-20**) (commission baptism); (**Matthew 3:11**) (fire baptism). He says, "Please explain and say what one is to be used in this age."

The baptism mentioned in Ephesians is the ONE baptism which puts one into Christ, or makes one a member of the mystical body of Christ. It makes one a child of God. It is done by one Spirit. See (I Corinthians 12:13). The baptism mentioned in ((**8:24**) (**Acts 18:24-25**) is water baptism. That mentioned in ((**0**) (**Luke 12:50**) was a baptism of suffering. Jesus was to be baptized or overwhelmed in suffering. None of His children ever endure such suffering as He did. There is no baptism mentioned in (**Luke 1:8**), but we suppose (**Mark 1:8**) is the text referred to. This is a baptism of the Holy Spirit, and may have reference to the outpouring of the Spirit in a miraculous way, as on Pentecost. The baptism in (**Matthew 28:19-20**) and ((**6**) (**Mark 16:16**) is the same, and is water baptism. They were commanded to baptise in water. The baptism of fire, in (**Matthew 3:11**), is a purifying, a purging or burning of evil. This is going on now and is by the Holy Spirit. "Our God is a consuming fire." "He shall sit as a refiner's fire."

From the foregoing we have this conclusion: There is just one baptism which puts sinners into Christ, and that is the work of the Holy Spirit-not the work of the preacher, nor the preacher and the water. Then there is a baptism which is a symbol. It is an outward ordinance or washing, which represents the inward work of the Spirit. It represents the inward washing or cleansing which is performed by the Holy Spirit in the ONE baptism which puts the sinner in Christ. The Holy Spirit is carrying His work on now, and those who have thus been operated upon by the Holy Spirit should be baptized in water to show forth or declare the work of the Spirit in their hearts. C. H. C.

Mark 9:38-40

((9:38) (Mark 9:38-40)

---November 4, 1913

Sister V V Hankins, Sulligent, Ala., requests our views of ((9:38) (Mark 9:38-40), and asks, "Did John mean that he did not believe like them, or did he mean that he would not follow them naturally?" John meant that the one referred to was not keeping company with them-he was not going along in the company of the disciples. This is made clearer in ((**9**) (**Luke 9:49**), which says, "because he followeth not with us." C. H. C.

Mark 16:16-18

---November 4, 1913

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-Will you please give your views on ((6) (Mark 16:16-17,18), “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” Now was it the apostles that were to do these things? or was it those who believed when the apostles did the preaching?

We have some so-called preachers here who claim that they have been baptised with the Holy Spirit and can do those things; and others who say that there never has been a man that received the Holy Spirit except the twelve apostles. I do not believe either one of the positions in the light in which they preached it. I believe every one of God's children receive the Spirit of God. I believe one of their positions is just as false as the other; neither one is nothing more than fatalism. Now, Brother Cayce, give your views through The Primitive Baptist. Yours for the truth, J. H. Seratt. R. 5, Dyersburg, Tenn.

REMARKS

It was the apostles who were to do the things enumerated. ((20) (Mark 16:20) says, “And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following.” These apostles possessed the Holy Spirit in such a measure that they were able to perform these miracles. We know that some claim to perform them now, but they are imposters, and wilfully misrepresent. Get them to try taking some arsenic, if you can.

On the other hand, if no one possesses the Spirit now, then no one is a child of God now, for the apostle says, “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.” -(Romans 8:9).

Again, “He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” -(I John 5:12). C. H. C.

Who Are Landmarkers?

---November 18, 1913

Brother Cayce, who are the so-called Landmarkers? How long have they been born? What man is their father? I know scarcely anything about them. There is one here that calls himself that. The first time I talked with him, from his talk I judged him to be a mixed blood-as the mule,-a cross between Uncle Alex and Wesley. The next time he was a modern Missionary. The next time he talked in pretty fair imitation of an Old Baptist. So I saw that he had no anchor and was likely to drift into most anything..... With brotherly love and best wishes, I am yours in hope, J. H. Quinnelly. Wisner, Miss.

REMARKS

The “Landmarkers” are a set of Missionary Baptists who have lately sprung up among the Missionaries objecting to the boards and conventions in mission work. They are Missionary Baptists, and the only difference between them and other modern Missionaries is simply a question as to who shall handle the pie. This is all the difference we can see. C. H. C.

Mr. Slover Denies It

---December 9, 1913

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Sir-In your paper of October 28, 1913, I note the following statement from you, viz.: “It seems to us these folks would be rather quiet on the Bible question, since their representative, Mr. Slover, repudiated Smith's so-called inspired translation while in discussion with us at McKensie, Ala.” Now, this is to inform you that you have made a mistake, although you might not have done it intentionally, when you wrote that Mr. Slover repudiated the inspired

translation that was referred to above. I trust this will cause you to see this mistake, if you have not seen it before; and I take this method in order to ask you to make a correction of this error in your paper at an early date. If we cannot see alike in regard to the subject of religion, we should act honest and truthful in every sense of the term when speaking or writing on what each other believes.

Hoping this correction will soon be made, I still remain an advocate of honesty and fair dealing with all, and a believer in the inspired translation. F. M. Slover. McKensie, Ala., November 3, 1913.

REMARKS

We give space to the above from Mr. Slover, the gentleman who represented the Mormons, or Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, in discussion with us in McKenzie, Ala., some time ago. He denies that he repudiated their so-called inspired translation of the Bible, but the people who were present know. Their translation says, in (I Timothy 5:10), "if she have washed the saints' clothes." An agreement, or rule, had been signed at his request before the debate began that the King James translation should be taken as the standard of evidence, and that translation says, "if she have washed the saints' feet." In the debate we put the Greek words meaning feet and clothes on a blackboard, and challenged the gentleman to say which word the apostle used. He could not say, but finally said that the rules said the King James translation should be taken as the standard of evidence, and that Cayce had left that and gone to the Greek, but that he (Slover) proposed to stick to the rule, and would accept the King James translation.

In accepting the King James translation he certainly repudiated the Smith translation. We did not misrepresent him. We told the truth. But he says "we should act honest and truthful in every sense of the term," etc. Then Mr. Slover should not have told that Cayce failed to notice so many proof texts introduced by him. You should have been honest and truthful, Mr. Slover. C. H. C.

Mt. Zion Association

---December 30, 1913

Since we were in the investigation meeting of the Mount Zion Association in November we have been so busy that we have not taken time to write for the paper concerning the matter. The brethren who composed the committee found that there had been some disorder years ago in the Mount Zion Association. The brethren did not deny that some disorder had been among them. But they had long ago rid themselves of all the disorder. They did all that they could do, and all that could be required. They are certainly a band of zealous and orderly Old Baptists.

We cannot publish a full account of the meeting, as it would require too much space, but the whole thing is to be printed in pamphlet form, and will contain much valuable information on church order. The pamphlet will be called "Church Order." A copy can be had, as soon as they are out, by sending to Elder B. F. Hollind, Horton, Ala., or to our office. The copy is in the hands of the printer, and the work will soon be done. Notice will be given as soon as they are ready to send out. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 28

---December 30, 1913

This issue of The Primitive Baptist closes the twenty eighth year of its publication. These twenty eight years have wrought many changes, but some things have not changed. The paper stands for the same principles now that were advocated in the first issue. Principles are eternal

and never change. Some men have changed during these years, and have forsaken and turned away from those principles, but we cannot see any good reason why they should be forsaken. Those principles have stood the test of persecution and opposition from every quarter and from all opposers of truth, but they yet stand, and will continue to do so. We are satisfied with the principles we have contended for, but we are not satisfied with our own efforts. We have made mistakes-many of them. We do not claim to have reached a state of perfection, neither do we expect to do so while we remain in this world, but we desire to improve as much as possible. We desire to “forget those things which are behind,” and “press forward,” endeavoring to profit by the mistakes of the past. We may have made some mistakes which were very glaring to some of our many readers. We trust they will throw a mantle of charity over our imperfections and pass our mistakes by.

We have tried to make The Primitive Baptist an Old Baptist paper. Whether we have done this or not is for our readers to judge. We have been made to feel that we were, in some degree, at least, succeeding in our efforts in that respect by the liberal patronage we have received, and the interest many dear brethren and sisters have taken in extending the circulation of the paper. The circulation has increased a little during this year. Sometimes we receive a complaint that the price of the paper is too high, but those who complain know nothing about what it costs to publish the paper; and many of those who complain at the present price would still complain if the price was only fifty cents a year. The price is absolutely as low as it can be made and the paper be self-sustaining, and it would not be self-sustaining at the present price if the subscription list was much smaller than it is.

A few years ago the price was one dollar a year-only twenty five cents less than the present price -while everything else was about fifty per cent lower than at present. The price of the paper is even lower at \$1.25 a year than it once was at \$1 a year, for it is now about twice as large as it used to be. It has been our desire to give as much good reading matter as possible. We have not tried to give our subscribers as little as possible, but as much as possible. The price of other religious papers the same size as The Primitive Baptist ranges from \$1.50 to \$2 a year, and some of them are not as large as The Primitive Baptist.

We have had trials and conflicts, yet the Lord has been good. We trust that we are thankful for all His blessings. Many expressions of love, fellowship and encouragement have been received from the dear brethren. We feel unworthy of it all, and trust that we appreciate it. We humbly trust that we may be so kept by the Lord's grace that the love, confidence and fellowship of the brethren may never be betrayed by us. Wishing all our readers a prosperous and happy New Year, and asking an interest in your prayers, we bid you all adieu for the year 1913. C. H. C.

1914

Introduction to Volume 29

---January 6, 1914

We are now entering upon the duties of a new year. This issue begins a new volume of The Primitive Baptist. Twenty eight years ago the first issue of this paper was sent out by our sainted father, Elder S. F. Cayce. He continued as editor until he was called from his labors on the fourth Sunday in August, 1905, since which time we have been trying to fill that place. We now begin the publication of the twenty ninth volume.

Many changes have been wrought during the past twenty eight years, and we know not what changes await us during the year 1914. During the past few years many have forsaken the right way, and are following after the inventions of men, and are following the world in the mad rush for money and fame. It seems that some in our day are as willing to betray the Master for a few

pieces of silver as was Judas nearly nineteen hundred years ago. But in the midst of it all there have been a few who would not forsake the truth-the right way. As it was in old Elijah's day, and in Paul's day, so it is now-there is "a remnant according to the election of grace."

There will continue to be a remnant who will contend for the true faith, which was once delivered to the saints, as long as time lasts. The Lord will never leave Himself without witness. The candlestick may be removed from one community or place; but when it is, it will be planted in another place, so that there will still be true witnesses on the earth.

We are satisfied with the principles we have tried to advocate since we began the labor of editing *The Primitive Baptist*. We are satisfied with the Old Baptist Church and her ordinances. We believe (may we not say we know?) that church to be the one our Lord set up while He was on earth, and we see no room or place for improvement on the Lord's work. We are satisfied with the order of the Lord's house. We asked for a home among the Old Baptists on the second Sunday in August, 1889. We were satisfied then with the order of the Lord's house, and we have seen no reason for a change. We are still satisfied with it. We can only promise that we expect, the Lord being our helper, to continue to defend her cause and to advocate her principles during this year if our life is spared, and if we live longer we hope to still be found at our post. By the grace of God we are not afraid of the enemies of truth, and we do not ask them to show any quarter, neither do we expect to show any.

We need the Lord's help to sustain us and to keep us in the right way. It is our desire to be bold, yet humble and meek. We desire to manifest the Spirit of the Master, and at the same time to be a fearless soldier in the warfare the Master requires. We also feel that we need the help of the brethren and sisters. We need your words of encouragement and acts of kindness. Let us perform our deeds of kindness to our brethren and friends while we live. It will do them no good to speak words of kindness when they are gone. We have often felt to be cast down and discouraged in the past, but have been encouraged by the many kind words we have received from the brethren to press on in the service. We trust we appreciate the many kind expressions of love and fellowship we have received from them.

We have felt sure that the Old Baptists would support a paper which would stand unflinchingly and uncompromisingly for the principles of truth. They have not yet deceived us. Our circulation has steadily grown for several years. True, the circulation did drop off a little during one or two years-about a year after some special offers were made, but it has been steadily growing again for a few years, so that we are now printing 9800 copies each week. Be it remembered, however, that this includes all that we are sending free to the poor and destitute brethren and sisters who are unable to pay for the paper, and we are sending a good many. Our gifts in this way have amounted to about \$300.00 during the past six months. We trust the brethren, sisters and friends will continue to take an interest in helping to extend the circulation of the paper.

We think our people should be zealous in circulating good wholesome literature, in which the glorious principles of truth are set forth. Many of the Lord's children are led astray and are blinded by false teaching. Let us do our best to get the truth before them. We cannot expect them to be looking for it when they know nothing about it. Let us do our best to put the truth before them so that they may "get a taste of it," then they will likely want more. We have sent *The Primitive Baptist* free for a year or so to many who had given us evidence that they were children of God and that their hearts were open for a reception of the truth. Some of our readers-perhaps many -will be able to call to mind letters they have read in our columns from some who have said they were convinced of the truth of the Old Baptist doctrine in reading *The Primitive Baptist*. Let us continue to endeavor to circulate the truth. Our labors will not be in vain. Many have written for our columns in the past, and we trust they will continue to do so. It is true that we have received many letters which we did not have space for; but the more letters we

have to select from the better the paper can be made. We would rather have short articles, as they are more interesting, as a rule. Do not make your letters too long. Whatever you have to say, say it in as few words as possible. If your letter is not published, do not become offended. Remember that we have to leave some letters out for lack of space, and that we shall try to use our best judgment in selecting what goes in the paper. Then, also, look over our many imperfections and shortcomings and remember us in your petitions when at the throne of grace. C. H. C.

Tour in Illinois

---January 6, 1914

We left home on Thursday night, December 4, to fill appointments in Illinois, as arranged by Elder S. A. D. Sanders, of Pawnee. We reached that place on Friday evening and filled an appointment there that night, and also on Saturday, Saturday night, Sunday and Sunday night. Besides the appointments at Pawnee we were at Hopewell one day and night, Waverly two days and nights, Indian Creek two days and nights, Astoria two days and nights, Winchester two days and one night, Concord two days and three nights, Girard one day and Mt. Nebo two days.

We met the following named brethren in the ministry: Elders S. A. D. Sanders, J. A. Modlin, Julius Smith, J. A. Conlee, Baxter Hale, W. R. Dyer, G. W. Murray, A. W. Murray, Giles Reeder, S. Flannagan, L. E. Sutton, D. M. Masters, W. A. Chastain and John Willeford, who are satisfied with the order of the Lord's house. They have no use for the progressive measures which have recently been advocated by some among our people. Neither do they have any use for the doctrine that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated all things that come to pass, both good and bad. Neither do they have any fellowship for the position that the soul or spirit of the man dies when the body dies, and that the whole man goes to the grave at death, and that at the resurrection the wicked will simply be annihilated.

This doctrine is very much akin to Russellism, the "biggest" humbug of recent years. We found these people to be sound in doctrine, if we are any judge, and orderly in practice as are usually found in most any section. We have seldom been to any section of country, if ever, but what there were some little irregularities existing. In this section we found one or two places where some of their members affiliate with secret orders, but this is the exception and not the rule. They are gradually working out of that practice, which we look upon in the South as being wrong, and the brethren generally do not approve of it there.

But we think it best to let them attend to the work of getting it straight themselves, for they should know more about how to straighten out their matters than we do who are away from there. If we would attend to keeping matters straight at home-keeping our own house in order-we would usually have enough to do. We do not mean by this that we should remain silent on such matters, for it is right to contend against wrong anywhere, but we should not try to regulate their affairs for them when they are trying themselves to get all things in order. Let them get matters straight in the way they deem best, even if it does seem to take a longer time than we think it should. We need their forbearance toward us; and unless they do so, we often feel sure that we could not retain

their sweet fellowship. So we should all exercise patience and forbearance toward our brethren.

Our trip among these dear brethren and sisters was a pleasant one, indeed. They were kind and good to us-much better than we felt to deserve. They manifested that they endorsed our feeble efforts to speak in the name of the Master, and proved that they appreciated our visit among them. They were anxious to do everything they could for our comfort and welfare, and it appeared to us that they felt like they could not do enough. We felt to be so unworthy of such kindness as was shown us, and such manifestations of love and fellowship.

May the Lord abundantly bless every one of them, and enable them to walk in the straight and narrow way, to "ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and find rest for their souls," and permit us to meet again on earth, if it can be His will, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Pour or Spill

---January 20, 1914

We trust Brother Salsman will pardon us for calling attention to the fact that one definition of the word "spill" is "to cause or allow intentionally to flow out and be lost or wasted; to shed, as blood." Hence, the expression, "Christ spilled His blood on Calvary," can be properly used, meaning that He "shed His blood on Calvary," or that "He intentionally allowed His blood to flow out on Calvary." We are sure that no brother uses the expression meaning that Christ's blood was wasted. None of it was wasted or shed in vain. Please pardon this little statement from us, and write again. C. H. C.

False Prophets

---February 3, 1914

We never saw or heard of the text, "Beware of false prophets," nor the text, "A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit," etc., applied to the two natures the child of God possesses until we read the above letter. We have always thought the false prophets were false teachers, and that the corrupt tree was the unregenerate sinner and the good tree was the child of God. The corrupt tree has to be changed-made a good tree-in order that it bear good fruit. So, the alien sinner must be made a child of God, made a good tree, born from above, in order that he perform good works, or render spiritual service unto the Lord. C. H. C.

Feet Washing

---March 24, 1914

A few weeks ago we received a letter which contained the following: "I would like to ask a question through The Primitive Baptist, as there is quite an opinion in regard to feet washing. Where should it be done, is the question, and where is the Scripture that they washed feet at time of communion? I have a five dollar bill for any Baptist or reader for the information where I will find that Scripture." We wrote a private letter in reply to the brother, and have decided to publish the same, omitting name and post office.

While we think that feet washing is required, and that the proper, or most suitable, time is at the close of the communion service, yet we are aware that it has not been a universal practice, and we do not think it right to make it a test of fellowship. Those who fail to engage in the practice do not know what they are missing. The following is a copy of the letter we wrote the brother in reply to his letter:

Dear Brother: Replying to yours of January 14, will say, get your Bible and turn to **(John 13:14-15,16)**, and read as follows: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." Here it is plainly stated, that "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet." The Lord said this. He either was correct in this statement or else He was wrong. If He was wrong, then we should say, "Ye also ought not to wash one another's feet." Will you say, "Ye ought not to wash one another's feet," or will you say, "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet?" Was the Saviour right or was He wrong? Verse 15 says, "I have given you an example." An example is something to be followed. If the Lord was right in this statement, the example which He set in washing the disciples' feet should be followed. Again, "That ye should do as I have done to you," is a statement also made by Him in that same verse. An example which is right is something that those people to whom it is given are under obligation to follow. Any thing which one ought to do is something which is wrong for him to leave undone. Anything which one should do is some thing which he is obligated to do. This obligation of doing rests upon him, and he is blameworthy if he fails. From this it is evident that there can be no question but what the followers of the Lord are required to wash each other's feet, or to engage in the practice of feet washing. Now the question is, as asked by you, "When should this be done?" I note that you promise to give \$5.00 to anyone who will show when this was, or when it should be, practiced.

By referring to (John 13:2) you will find that John says, "And supper being ended." And in verse four, John says, "He riseth from supper," and then goes on and relates the entire circumstance of the Saviour washing the disciples' feet, down to and including verse seventeen. Then beginning with verse eighteen, he goes back and relates the conversation which took place during the eating of the passover supper, at which (passover supper) He instituted the sacramental supper, or communion. To show you this is the same conversation I refer you to this fact-in verse twenty one he records the Saviour's language thus, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, That one of you shall betray me." (Matthew 26:20-29) gives an account of the eating of this passover and the institution of the sacramental supper. In verse twenty-one he tells us that the Saviour said, "Verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me." This shows that the conversation was during the passover supper. (Matthew 26:26-29) shows that the sacramental supper was instituted at the close of this passover. Then John's language shows that when the supper was ended the Saviour washed the disciples' feet. Please read these references, and others, and investigate, according to this way of harmonizing the matters recorded concerning this question. I think I have shown you what you asked for. Shall I look for the \$5.00? Yours in hope, C. H. C.

Misrepresentation

---March 24, 1914

We have more than once adverted to the difficulty of stating fairly a position one does not himself accept. It is an easy thing to mistake a position of that kind: it is a hard thing, requiring an effort, to state it accurately. This is so even when there is no disposition to make a wrong impression. But however absurd or dangerous a position may be, however we may abhor it and feel the need of exposing and counteracting it, we cannot justify misrepresentation. There is no argument in that sort of thing, and the reaction may be as dangerous as the error that is attacked. One gets the impression from reading history that error has gained more than it has lost by the unfair treatment of its advocates.

We ought to have more confidence in the truth of what we believe than to resort to any artifice in its defense. Truth does not require it, and error cannot be much hindered by such means. If one cannot be candid and fair, he can at least be silent; and we have the idea that in such cases silence is the best service that can be rendered.

The above is taken from "Clifton's Comment" in the Baptist Builder of March 11, 1914. We think Brother Clifton and some of his brethren would do well to consider what is said in this little article when they are writing about the people they stigmatize as Hardshells. It is no unusual thing for them to misrepresent our people. Many of them may do so unintentionally, but they do it all the same. Many instances could be pointed out where we have been misrepresented, but it is not necessary here. Many such instances have already been pointed out. Misrepresentation of a position we oppose does not help our position, neither does it meet the approval of sober, fair minded, thinking people. We should deal honestly with each other, even though we differ. Honest people can differ, and yet be friendly, and treat each other with due respect. C. H. C.

Reply to Elder Petty

---April 7, 1914

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-Will you allow me space in your valuable paper for a few thoughts? While I was reading Brother M. B. Petty's reply to Brother Hardy, I happened to have some thoughts about it. It seems that Brother Hardy thinks the Lord had a purpose in all things; and it seems that Brother Petty doesn't think so, from his bitter reply to Brother Hardy. It seems to me that if God has not a purpose in all things, there would be some things by chance; and if some things are by chance, the probability is that all things are the same way. While thinking this over it seems to me that this would be the solution of Brother Petty's position: There happened to be a long time ago a God; He happened to be all wise, seeing the end of all things, saying, "My counsel may happen to stand, and I may happen to do all my pleasure." He happened to think of making this earth out of nothing; He happened to make it.

The earth and water were all together, and He happened to separate the waters from the earth. He happened to call the dry land earth, and the water seas. He happened to appoint her her bounds that she could not pass. He happened to cause a mist upon the

earth and water it. There happened not to be a man to till the ground. God happened to take of the earth, and happened to make a man with all the faculties of seeing, hearing, smelling, and with a soul. And he happened to be lifeless; and God happened to breathe into his nostrils the breath of life, and man happened to become a living soul. And God happened to make the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air. And he happened to plant a garden in Eden, and cause to grow in Eden every tree that was good for food and pleasing to the eyes.

And God happened to put the man in it to dress and keep it. And He happened to tell the man that he could have free access to all the trees except the tree of knowledge of good and evil, "Thou shalt not eat, lest in the day thou happen to eat thou may happen to die." After this God happened to see that it was not good for man to be alone; and He happened to say, "Let us make him a helpmeet." So He happened to cause a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and He took a rib, and He happened to make a woman of it. And He happened to present her to Adam to see what he would call her. Adam happened to call her woman; and she happened to be flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone. And he (Adam) happened to love her, and they happened to dwell together in peace.

And there happened to be in the beast family one that happened to be more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord happened to make. He happened to be called the serpent, the devil; but God didn't have any purpose for him, nor nothing else He had happened to make. But this serpent happened to go to our mother Eve, and happened to talk with her about the tree of knowledge of good and evil. She happened to tell him what God had happened to tell Adam, that, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The serpent happened to tell her that God doth know that thou shalt not die; but thy eyes may happen to be opened, and thou shalt be as gods, knowing good and evil. And she happened to believe him; and when she saw that it was a tree to be greatly desired to make one wise, she happened to take of it and happened to give to her husband and he did eat, and they happened to die, just like God happened to say that they should die. And their eyes were opened and they happened to see their nakedness, and happened to be ashamed; and they happened to go to work to try to hide their shame. And they happened to hide themselves among the trees of the garden, and the Lord happened to come in the cool of the day, and happened to call for them; and they happened to answer Him.

He happened to say, where art thou? and they happened to say, We heard thy voice walking in the garden and were afraid, because we were naked. The Lord happened to say, who told thee thou wast naked? hast thou happened to eat of the tree which I commanded thee not to eat? The woman happened to say, The serpent happened along and beguiled me, and I did eat. And Adam happened to say, the woman thou gavest me, she gave to me and I did eat. And the Lord happened to tell the serpent, Because thou hast done this thou art cursed above all cattle and every beast of the field; and upon thy belly thou shalt happen to go, and dust shalt thou happen to eat all the days of thy life. And I will happen to put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall happen to bruise thy head, and thou shalt happen to bruise his heel. And the Lord happened to say to the woman, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou happen to bring forth children; and thy desire shall happen to be unto thy husband, and he shall rule over you. And God happened to tell

Adam, Because thou hast hearkened to the voice of thy wife, and hast happened to eat of the tree I commanded you not to eat, cursed is the ground for thy sake. Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth; and in the sweat of thy face shalt thou happen to eat bread all the days of thy life until thou happen to return unto the dust from whence thou wast taken.

And God happened to turn them out of the garden, and happened to place a flaming sword and cherubim which turned every way to keep the tree of life, lest man should happen to eat and live forever. And Adam happened to know his wife, and she happened to conceive and happened to bring forth a son. And they happened to call his name Cain; and he happened to be a wicked man; and happened to be a tiller of the ground. And the woman happened to conceive again, and happened to bring forth another son; and they happened to call his name Abel; and he happened to be a keeper of sheep, and happened to be righteous.

And in process of time Cain happened to bring of the fruit of the ground an offering to the Lord; and the Lord happened to reject Cain and his offering; and so Cain happened to be angry about it. And Abel happened to bring of the firstling of his flock an offering to the Lord, and the Lord happened to accept Abel's offering. And Cain and Abel happened to talk about this in the field.

Now, it won't do to say that God purposed or predestinated any of this, that would make God an unjust God. But it happened that Cain rose up and killed his brother Abel. No doubt Brother Petty would contend that right where Cain's wicked acts set in God's predestination stopped. If so, He has none at all now. While reading Brother Petty's reply I happened to think that there happened to be a country called the United States; and in the United States there happened to be a state called Alabama; and in Alabama there happened to be a great man; and he happened to be called M. E. Petty. And he happened to be so many inches high, and so many inches from the end of his fingers on his right hand to the end of his fingers on the left hand. And he happened to weigh so many pounds. He happened to be black headed; he happened to be black eyed.

And Peter happened to say, Who by taking thought can add one cubit to his stature? Can Brother Petty? No purpose of God in this. Brother Petty happened to be a great sinner once and did not know it. He happened one time to see and feel that he was a great sinner, and as a result of this feeling he happened to pray to God for His mercy; and the very breathings of his soul were, Lord, have mercy on me, a sinner. The Lord happened to hear him and forgive his sins, and he happened to rejoice in God his Saviour. If Adam could have kept the law that God gave him in the garden, and had kept it, Brother Petty never would have been a sinner; therefore, never could have been saved. So that council between the Father and Son before the world began would have been a failure.

Now, I want to say in conclusion, that I feel like all this fuss about predestination that is going on among Primitive Baptists is useless. After they have quarreled over this thing and bit and devoured one another, and hurt each other's feelings, and caused divisions, sorrow and strife-after all this, the predestination of all things stands just like it did before. I feel like I would be glad to strike hands with all my brethren in peace, on both sides of the fence. I feel like I want to die in peace with all the dear children of God; and God forbid that I should ever offend them in word or deed. Let us not quarrel about

these things and accuse each other's doctrine of originating with the devil; but I do feel like this strife has come from there. The thing we should be concerned about, is to see that we make our calling and election sure. What we have written is not from a spirit of malice or hatred toward anyone, but in love to all. Wm. Dorris. Steens, Miss.

P. S.-Brother Cayce, I have been a reader of The Primitive Baptist a long time, and I appreciate the paper; but I have written you two or three letters and you have never published one. Now if this meets with your disapproval and finds the waste basket, please send it back to me; and when my subscription is up you may know what to do with it. I will not support a paper that will treat me so unfair. Wm. Dorris.

OUR REPLY

On another page of this paper will be found a letter from Wm. Dorris, which he has written concerning a letter which appeared in our columns some time ago from Elder M. E. Petty. One reason why we give space to the letter from Brother Dorris is because of what he says concerning our failure to publish other letters from him, and that we can stop his paper if we do not publish this one. We do not publish his letter in order to get him to continue taking the paper, but in order that our readers may see what kind of things sometimes come to our hands.

We call attention to his rigmarole, which contained the word happened so often. He seems to think that if anything happens, then it occurred by chance; and that if one thing happens, then all things happen, or occur by chance. We would suggest that Brother Dorris study a standard dictionary a little before he presumes to so severely criticise Elder Petty, or others. We ask Brother Dorris to pardon us for the suggestion, as he may have a dictionary of his own make, as we have observed that it is common for some who teach that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated all things that come to pass to deny the meaning of words.

Webster's International Dictionary defines "happen" as follows: "To occur by chance; to come about without previous design; to fall out; as, I know him, as it happens; it so happened that we did not meet. To occur as an event; to come to pass; to befall; as, to tell me what has happened. To happen, in modern usage, has lost almost entirely its earlier implication of chance, and signifies merely to take place or occur," etc. So, all these things mentioned by Brother Dorris did happen or occur. But did he prove that God did predestinate all those things, although they did all come to pass? No, he did not prove it; he cannot prove it; no other man can prove it.

Brother Dorris says that "While I was reading Brother M. E. Petty's reply to Brother Hardy, I happened to have some thoughts about it." Now, it seems to us that he is wrong in this statement, according to his position, that God has purposed or predestinated that everything shall come to pass just as it does, or that everything which happens is by chance. He has contradicted himself, and when a witness contradicts himself he renders his own testimony invalid.

Brother Dorris argues and contends that God has a purpose in all things that come to pass, or that God predestinated all things that come to pass. He even argues that God predestinated that Cain should slay his brother, Abel. Then Cain was only carrying out God's purpose or predestination when he committed that crime. Then, according to this position, God punished Cain, and pronounced a curse upon him, for carrying out His predestination. The Lord said to him, "And now art thou cursed from the earth, which

hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand; when thou tillest the ground it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth."-Genesis iv. 11, 12. Not only is this true, but if God's predestination is not against His will, and He predestinated that

Cain should slay Abel, then Cain was doing God's will when he slew his brother. Then God pronounced that curse upon Cain for doing His will! BOSH! Again: God said, "And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood FROM THY HAND." According to the position of Brother Dorris the earth opened her mouth to receive Abel's blood from the hand of God's predestination, and not from the hand of Gain. The position of Brother Dorris makes God a liar. Again: The devil, Adam and Eve all carried out God's predestination, and did God's will, according to Brother Dorris. Yet, God punished the man and cursed the earth for his sake, because the man did what He purposed and decreed and willed that he should do! We wonder upon what principle of justice God did this. Brother Dorris cannot show the justice of such proceeding, and no other man can show it. As God is a God of justice, and all His acts are in accordance with the very strictest principles of justice, the position of Brother Dorris is therefore false.

Brother Dorris says, "Brother Petty happened to be a great sinner once and didn't know it." We cannot understand how Brother Petty, or any other man, was ever a sinner according to the position taken by Brother Dorris. According to Brother Dorris, Brother Petty has always done just what God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated that he should do. If God's predestination is in harmony with His will, and Brother Petty always did what God predestinated, then he was always doing God's will. If God's will is right, then Brother Petty was always doing right. Hence, he was never a sinner, unless it was a sin to do right.

When Brother Petty realised in his heart that he was a poor sinner in the sight of God, he never felt that he had been doing God's will all along, and he does not feel that way yet. If Brother Dorris ever felt and realised in his heart that he was a poor sinner in the sight of God, we will guarantee that he did not pray thus: "Lord, have mercy upon me; Lord, be merciful to me, a poor sinner. I have only done what thou didst predestinate that I should do. Lord, have mercy upon me; I have been doing Thy will all the time." We wonder if he ever uttered that kind of prayer. It would have been in harmony with the doctrine he is now advocating. But no one has ever believed the doctrine Brother Dorris is now advocating while he realizes his sinfulness in the sight of God. If a child of God ever believes that doctrine it is only when he loses sight of his own sinfulness in the sight of God.

Brother Dorris says, "If Adam could have kept the law that God gave him in the garden, and had kept it, Brother Petty never would have been a sinner; therefore, never could have been saved." Well, we have heard some such expression as that "the end justifies the means." And we have heard that some advocated such an idea as "Let us do evil that good may come." But we do not go on hearsay now. Here it is flatly stated! Adam had to violate the law so that Brother Petty would be a sinner in order that Brother Petty could be saved! May the Lord pity a man who is so deluded by the devil as to advocate such a blasphemous heresy!

It is the devil's own invention. The eminent Apostle Paul, in **(Romans 3:8)**, says, "And not rather (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say), Let us do evil that good may come? whose damnation is just." Somebody circulated the report that the apostle taught the idea, "Let us do evil that good may come." The apostle denied the charge and said that it was a slanderous report. But you can tell that Brother Dorris advocates it, and you will tell the truth on him. If Paul was an Old Baptist, then the doctrine advocated by Brother Dorris is not Old Baptist doctrine.

The Arminian theory is that a man must do something good in order to be saved in heaven, thus making the eternal salvation of men depend upon their good works. But Brother Dorris says man had to do wrong-commit sin-in order to be saved in heaven, thus making the eternal salvation of men rest upon their wicked works. Neither position is the truth; but if you had to choose one of the two, which do you think would be preferable? As for us, we would rather say that the eternal salvation of men depends upon their good works than upon their wicked works. Perhaps the reason why some men do so badly, and tell so many lies is because they think, like Brother Dorris, that their eternal salvation in heaven depends upon wicked works, and they do a whole lot of wicked works in order to make their salvation more certain!

But the salvation of men in heaven does not depend upon their works, either good or bad. See **(Ephesians 2:8-9,10); (II Timothy 1:8-9)**. Here the statements are plain-"not of works," and "not according to our works"-no matter whether good or bad. Brother Dorris says he feels like all this fuss that is going on about predestination is useless. If his doctrine is the truth, God predestinated that all this fuss should go on; and if it is useless, then some of God's predestination, at least, is useless. We wonder if the Lord could not find anything better to be doing than to be busy about predestinating something that is useless!

If God did predestinate everything that comes to pass, then He must have predestinated that some people should advocate that doctrine, and that all this fuss should exist on account of it. All of it is only carrying out God's predestination, according to Brother Dorris' position. But Brother Dorris objects to the fuss. Hence, he objects to some of God's predestination. The devil has always objected to God's predestination. If Brother Dorris and others who agree with him really object to the fuss, and want it stopped, we can tell them how to stop it. We are sure the rule will work. It is a sure cure. It is this: Let no one advocate the blasphemous, heathenish heresy-which came from the devil and will go back there-and the fuss will stop. But it will not stop while the doctrine is advocated.

If this strife came from the devil, as Brother Dorris says, then God did not predestinate it, unless God's predestination came from the devil. If God's predestination did not come from the devil, and the strife did come from there, then there is one thing God did not predestinate. If this is one thing God did not predestinate, then God did not predestinate everything, and Brother Dorris is wrong. If God did predestinate everything, then He predestinated the strife; and, therefore, Brother Dorris is wrong when he says it comes from the devil. Brother Dorris is wrong, no matter which way the question turns. How can we be concerned about anything only what we are concerned about, if God has predestinated everything that comes to pass? For, if God has predestinated everything that comes to pass, then He has predestinated that we should be concerned about the

very things which we are concerned about. And if God has predestinated that we should be concerned about the things we are concerned about, then He has also predestinated that we should not be concerned about something else.

Well, this might be continued on and on, but this is enough for a fairminded and reasonable person who feels his own sinfulness in the sight of God. God's ways are equal, and our ways are unequal. God did not predestinate the meanness we do, and did not predestinate everything that comes to pass. May the Lord help us all to see the truth, and to turn from every false way and from every invention of the devil, is our humble prayer.

Brother Dorris, we have now given your article space in The Primitive Baptist. Will you continue taking the paper? C. H. C.

Questions Answered

---April 14, 1914

Elder C. Cayce:

My Dear Brother-Your letter came today, and I was glad to get it. I have a very kind remembrance of Brother Claud; he is a bright gift to the church. I also knew his father; he has been to our home, and was a great preacher. I have been a Bible student for thirty years, and do not believe that any man, or set of men, can make a law that will not be a plague to them and the church, if enforced in the church. It is our business to obey the law, but not to make the law.

Your paper is good, and a sound doctrinal paper and I thank you for the sample copies sent me, which I enjoyed well. But I am opposed roman made law. I will ask you a few questions, and if you answer them satisfactorily I will take the piper and try to get others to do the same. I would be delighted if we could agree:

Question:

1. If the church can make laws, and have a right to do it, would not that imply that God's law was defective?
2. If the church has a right to supplement or add to God's law, who knows what the law of the church will be ten years hence?
3. If a man writes a law and that law is adopted by many churches, whose service are they in while the law is being enforced?
4. When Nebuchadnezzar took the five Hebrews to Babylon they took a harp with them, and it was much comfort to them while there, which was seventy years. When they returned they brought that old harp and all Israel rejoiced at the return of the harp. They said it looked old, but the tone was sweeter than ever before. They had it at the laying of the cornerstone of the temple. Is it not a fact that you have a nonfellowship for Daniel, his four cousins and the harp under the new Bullard law that many churches adopted within the last few years? Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego and a sister could not come to us with that old harp.
5. The Bullard law declares against protracted meetings, or limits the number of days to three that you may serve God at the same place and time. Would not that nonfellowship law exclude Jesus Christ and all the apostles? They all went to protracted meetings.

6. Are not all men servants of those they obey?
7. Where did you get your fellowship?
8. Where did you get your nonfellowship?
9. Are not all those carnal weapons in the church?

Don't tell me that this was back under the law. Christ did not repeal the law; He fulfilled the law and said it was good. God has never changed. If you can find what was acceptable to God in a man's manner of life in the antediluvian age, it is the same now, whether the preacher is in a good humor or not. Please answer these questions. If you do it, I will work for your paper, if I think you answer the best you know. Men are not so blind on this matter. Job S. Anderson. Summit, Ga.

OUR REPLY

Yes, Brother Anderson, we will take pleasure in answering your questions, though we do not suppose we will answer them the way you may want them answered.

Question

1. The church has no right to make laws. God's laws which are given for the government of the church need no amendment. They are not defective.

2. If the church had a right to supplement or add to God's laws, no one could know what the law would be ten years hence. Neither could they know what it would be if they had a right to take from God's law. This is the reason why no one can tell now where the Progressive Organ Baptists will be ten years from now. They are taking away God's law.
3. If people are serving a manmade law in religious matters they are serving man. On the other hand, if they are following men in refusing to obey God's law in church matters, they are also serving men. And this is what the Progressives are doing.
4. God's people now possess the harp which God has given them. He has supplied them with the harp and organ to use in His worship and praise. The Progressives say this old harp will not do; that organ possessed by our old members is somewhat dilapidated; the tones are not smooth and sweet; these old folks can take a back seat, and we will have a manmade organ and Babylonish music instead in order to tickle the fancy of the world, and so we may stand higher in the estimation of the Ashdod family. The Progressives are the people who are tired of the old harp. We are the people who will not have anything else. There is nothing can take its place.
5. The Saviour and the apostles never had a protracted meeting after the modern sort. They never sent for a modern revivalist and had their music and other paraphernalia. It seems that the Progressives are not satisfied with the old way, but must have the modern inventions of the world to increase their numbers.
6. Yes.
7. From the Lord.

8. From the Lord. **(Romans 16:17-18)**: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of

the simple." (**Th 3:6**) (**II Thessalonians 3:6**): "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us." (**II Timothy 3:1-7**): "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning and never able to come to the knowlege of the truth." (**Titus 3:9-10,11**): "But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain. A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." This is authority enough, and some of it describes the Progressive spirit pretty plainly.

9. No, they are not carnal weapons, but weapons which God has given for the protection and preservation of His church separate from the world. If Christ fulfilled the law, it is not now in force for us to worship under. It was acceptable to God under the law for the high priest to make offerings for sin year by year, but this is not required under gospel service. In fact, law service and worship is forbidden under the gospel worship and service. (**Galatians 4:9-10,11**): "But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." These people were engaging in law service and worship, and the apostle rebuked such in this quotation. C. H. C.

Do We Need Baptist Churches?

---April 21, 1914

In the Illinois Baptist of January 10, 1914, is an article from Elder H. E. Pettus under the above heading. He is writing on the question of the different churches, or orders, uniting. Elder Pettus is one of the parties who left our people recently and joined the Missionary Baptists, and is now identified with that people. He does not favor the Missionary Baptists uniting with other orders, or forming such a union with them. He says:

I haven't a word to say about Protestant churches uniting. They are at liberty to do as they please, as far as I am concerned; and I believe many of them could unite without making any great concession either in doctrine or polity. But what about a Baptist Church going into such a combine or union? It means this: "Goodbye to Baptist principles." What difference does that make? It makes a great deal with a Baptist, Why so? Because Baptist principles are Bible principles.

Now let us see! All of the above churches named, except the Baptists, sprinkle for baptism. Well, what of that? Just this: No church that sprinkles can stand for a regenerated membership. Why not? Sprinkling was instituted by the Catholics. What

for? In order to baptise weakly babies who were not able to be immersed without endangering their lives. Why baptise babies? Because they (Catholics) believe babies, even, must be baptized or they (babies) will be lost if they die without baptism.

It seems from the above that Elder Pettus objects to the proposed union on the ground that other orders practice sprinkling for baptism, contrary to Scripture, it being a Roman Catholic practice. Elder Pettus is not consistent in objecting to the Methodists on the ground that they practice sprinkling for baptism, contrary to the Scriptures, while he is practicing other things contrary to the Scriptures, or which are unauthorised, and which are just as bad. Where is your authority for your B. Y. P. U., W. M. U., LadiesAid, W. C. T. U, Southern Convention, Northern Convention, State Convention, Foreign Boards, Home Boards, Laymen's Movement, Boards employing ministers and assigning their field of labor, and the many, many, other things practiced by the Missionary Baptists which are unauthorised by the Bible? But look at this statement from Elder Pettus:

“Well,” says one, “perhaps if the churches would unite they would not sprinkle babies.” Well if they sprinkled at all, and all who are sprinkled are believers, the ordinance of baptism, which is a symbol of the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, is perverted, and we would be following the Pope of Rome instead of Jesus Christ. Such a course would be to our shame, and the cause of Christ disgraced; and no true Baptist church is disposed to go into such a union.

In this statement Elder Pettus seems to object because in pursuing such a course they would be following the Pope of Rome. It seems to us that it would be no worse for them to follow Rome in this than in other respects. In a Circular Letter published in the Minutes of the Philadelphia Association for the year 1806, we find this statement, “It is, however, a very remarkable circumstance, that in modern missions Papal Rome has led the way.” See Minutes of the Philadelphia Association, page 429. Modern missions is the foundation upon which the Missionary Baptist denomination rests. Hence, they are followers of Rome in their very foundation, or fundamental principle. PAPAL ROME LED THE WAY-JESUS AND THE APOSTLES DID NOT. They are not following Christ, therefore, in their very foundation principles. C. H. C.

Views Given

---May 19, 1914

We have received requests recently to give our views on a number of passages of Scripture. We have so many requests of this kind that it would be impossible to write at length on each one. So we have decided to answer each one that we can in a very brief way.

(Matthew 22:8-9,10)Mrs. Y. M. Dukes, of Pavo, Ga., requests our views on this passage. It is the parable of the marriage feast of the king's son. One was found at the feast without a wedding garment on. We think this parable refers to the Jews. They refused to enter into the true service of the Lord and forsook the right way under the law service. The good and the bad being gathered represents the Gentiles being brought into service, as well as the Jews. The wedding garment represents gospel service. One cannot remain in the feast of the marriage without

the garment of gospel service. Law worship and law service does not now admit one into the church. In the closing out of the law dispensation and the setting up of the gospel kingdom, law worship and law service are excluded.

Mrs. Y. M. Dukes, of Pavo, Ga., requests our views on this passage. It is the parable of the marriage feast of the king's son. One was found at the feast without a wedding garment on. We think this parable refers to the Jews. They refused to enter into the true service of the Lord and forsook the right way under the law service. The good and the bad being gathered represents the Gentiles being brought into service, as well as the Jews. The wedding garment represents gospel service. One cannot remain in the feast of the marriage without the garment of gospel service. Law worship and law service does not now admit one into the church. In the closing out of the law dispensation and the setting up of the gospel kingdom, law worship and law service are excluded.

((8) (Luke 4:8) Sister Dukes requests our views on this also, and asks, "Was it ever intended for old Satan to serve the Lord?" No. The command there quoted by the Saviour was not to Satan. Satan was tempting the Saviour, endeavoring to persuade Him to serve him, and the Saviour quotes the commandment of the law to refute Satan's temptation and argument.

Sister Dukes requests our views on this also, and asks, "Was it ever intended for old Satan to serve the Lord?" No. The command there quoted by the Saviour was not to Satan. Satan was tempting the Saviour, endeavoring to persuade Him to serve him, and the Saviour quotes the commandment of the law to refute Satan's temptation and argument.

((9:7) (Acts 9:7) AND R. D. Elkins, of Woodville, Ala., asks us to harmonise these two passages. says, "And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man." says, "And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of Him that spake to me." They heard a voice-that is, they heard Saul's voice when he said, "Who art thou, Lord?" and "What wilt thou have me do?" but they saw no man-that is, they did not see who he was talking to. They heard not the voice of the Lord. But they heard a voice, which was Saul's voice.

AND **((9) (Acts 12:9) R. D. Elkins, of Woodville, Ala., asks us to harmonise these two passages. ((9:7) (Acts 9:7) says, "And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man." ((2:9) (Acts 22:9) says, "And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of Him that spake to me." They heard a voice-that is, they heard Saul's voice when he said, "Who art thou, Lord?" and "What wilt thou have me do?" but they saw no man-that is, they did not see who he was talking to. They heard not the voice of the Lord. But they heard a voice, which was Saul's voice.**

(I Corinthians 15:46) Brother Elkins requests our views on this text also, and asks if it means that an infant is born natural and must be born again before it can reach heaven. The apostle, in this chapter, is treating upon the subject of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints. Their bodies are natural by reason of the natural birth, but they are to be made spiritual in the resurrection, and this is because the saints have been regenerated, born again- made akin to Christ, the

second Adam, in regeneration. and show clearly that the infant is saved the same way the adult is saved.

Brother Elkins requests our views on this text also, and asks if it means that an infant is born natural and must be born again before it can reach heaven. The apostle, in this chapter, is treating upon the subject of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints. Their bodies are natural by reason of the natural birth, but they are to be made spiritual in the resurrection, and this is because the saints have been regenerated, born again- made akin to Christ, the second Adam, in regeneration. ((0:15) (Mark 10:15) and (Luke 18:17) show clearly that the infant is saved the same way the adult is saved.

(Isaiah 4:1) Brother J. L. Harder, McKensie, Tenn., requests our views of this text. It reads, "And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel; only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach." The word seven in Scripture denotes a perfect number. The word woman or women refers to institutions. Sometimes the word woman refers to the true Church, but is always in the singular when it does.

Brother J. L. Harder, McKensie, Tenn., requests our views of this text. It reads, "And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel; only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach." The word seven in Scripture denotes a perfect number. The word woman or women refers to institutions. Sometimes the word woman refers to the true Church, but is always in the singular when it does.

Sometimes it refers to some other institution. The word women always refers to other institutions. In this text it refers to institutions claiming the name of Christ, for He is the one man referred to. The true bride depends upon the husband to furnish the bread and clothing when he can. These women propose to furnish their own bread and clothing. Hence they are not the true bride or church. All they want is to wear His name. They expect to live by their own efforts, and they expect to be saved in heaven because of their own good deeds. They propose to eat their own bread and wear their own apparel. The true church depends upon the Lord to furnish the bread, or to provide a living, and she expects to reach heaven and immortal glory upon no other ground than that of the righteousness of Christ imputed to her. She is depending upon Him to furnish the bread and the clothing. This is the Old Baptist Church.

(Revelation 17:8) Brother C. A. Harris, Paris, Ark., requests our views of to the end of the chapter. To our mind, this embraces a great deal-much more than we can write about now, or have space for. It certainly refers to Rome as a city, or to the pope in Rome, and to the Roman Church. She rode upon the beast, and made war with the saints, and has been drunk with the blood of martyrs. "The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth." The city of Rome is built upon seven hills or mountains.

Brother C. A. Harris, Paris, Ark., requests our views of **(Revelation 17:8 to the end of the chapter)**. To our mind, this embraces a great deal-much more than we can write about now, or have space for. It certainly refers to Rome as a city, or to the pope in Rome, and to the Roman Church. She rode upon the beast, and made war with the saints, and has been drunk with the blood of martyrs. "The seven heads are seven

mountains, on which the woman sitteth." The city of Rome is built upon seven hills or mountains.

That is where the Roman power has been seated. The ten kings who are to give their power to the beast refer to the different branches of Protestantism, we think. ((7) **(Revelation 17:17)** shows that they will agree with the beast. Steps are being taken now, and have been for several years, looking toward a general union of the different orders. Protestantism is giving her power to Rome. See how Rome is gaining in power in our own land. The private secretary of our president is a Roman Jesuit. He attends to and performs much of the work of the president. We almost have a Catholic president. Sooner or later the Old Baptists will have to hide in dens and caves and meet under cover of darkness, if they meet at all, in order to worship and serve the Lord together. The privileges we now have will be taken from us, and we will be put in prison, tortured, drowned, starved, burned, and put to death in every conceivable way-as our foreparents. History repeats itself. We do not appreciate the privileges we now have. The dark clouds are gathering fast, and we are sure we can hear the sound of the thunderings as the storm approaches. It will come as a torrent on our poor heads. May the Lord protect and sustain us, is our humble prayer.

THE RESURRECTION - Brother W. G. Cox, Social Circle, Ga., requests us to give our views on the resurrection and about knowing each other in heaven. If the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is not true, then Jesus was not raised; and if He was not raised, He was an impostor, for He taught that He would rise again on the third day. As to knowing each other in heaven will say that all fleshly ties and relationships will be done away. Natural love and natural ties will not exist there. No man on earth knows, or can tell, how much the saints will know in heaven. We "now see through a glass darkly, but then face to face." We now only "know in part." "It doth not yet appear what we shall be." We are sure that they will know more in heaven than they do here, but we cannot say how much more. It appears that the disciples knew Moses and Elias when they were with the Saviour on the mount of transfiguration. They may know them as Moses and Elias in heaven, but no natural ties or affections will exist. There has been much speculation on this question, and we suppose no one can settle the matter definitely.

PREDESTINATION OF SIN - We are in receipt of a letter from a man whom we met while in Illinois, in December, 1913, in which he differs from a position he heard us take when we were there. We took the position then, and do yet, that God did not predestinate sin, and that the punishment of the wicked will be eternal. The writer of the letter says he believes God did predestinate sin, and argues that God predestinated all sin. He denies the resurrection and future punishment of the wicked. We were informed that this man was one of Elder Carnell's admirers and followers. We do not care to enter into a controversy with him.

HOLY ROLLERS - A. M. Cristy, Lanton, Mo., says, "I would be glad if you would give me your opinion of the sect known as Pentecostal people, or Holy Rollers. They claim to heal the sick, drink poisons, get a second work of grace, speak with tongues, prophesy, and interpret tongues. I heard one of them state they had raised a man from the dead. Please send me Scripture, chapter and verse, that will forever fix their doctrine." This is a broad request. It would be rather hard for us to find language to

express our opinion fully concerning such teaching and such claims. If you wish to know how sincere these people are in making such claims, get some of them to go with you to a drug store, and then you get some carbolic acid, arsenic, or some deadly poison from the druggist, and then ask those hypocritical fanatics to swallow it.

The way they will refuse will make you smile. If you have a cripple in your community, or one whose joints are all drawn with rheumatism, try to get them to prove their power in healing such cases. Their humbuggery will be exposed at once. Any fool can utter strange sounds with the tongue. When the disciples spoke with tongues, they uttered another language. These fanatics do not speak any language at all in this jargon. Hence, they do not speak with tongues. Get some man who understands and can speak Greek, Latin, German, French or Spanish, to give them a few sentences in either of those languages, and see what kind of "out" they will make in trying to interpret tongues. If they do anything, they will make fools of themselves. As to their statement that they had raised a man from the dead, it is utterly and basely false. Ask them to prove it. Get them to go with you to a cemetery and try their hand in your presence. They will not go, but you can try to get them to go, and thereby prove that they are falsifying. As to their claims here mentioned, it seems to us that any person with ordinary intelligence would know better. But if some man should come along teaching that the devil is a goat, or a small fish in the deep blue sea, some people would have no better sense than to "fall in" with the notion. Concerning the claim of sinless perfection in this life, the following Scriptures forever silence that claim: **((Ki 8:46) (I Kings 8:46); (((0) (Ecclesiastes 7:20); (I John 1:8-9,10)**). There are many more, but these are enough. C. H. C.

Fraternal Effort in Religion

---May 19, 1914

It must be very gratifying to everyone who is deeply interested in religious welfare and religious work to note that the different denominations are not only dwelling together in harmony, but have joined hands to promote the work of soul saving, which, after all, is the very reason for the existence of religious organisations.

To be plain, if we accept as true the teachings of the New Testament Scriptures, the life of an individual in this world is but a mere breath compared to the eternity that he must spend either in heaven, the place of reward, or in hell, the place of punishment. The very purpose for which religious organisations are founded, the real main reason for their existence, is that men and women may be prepared to meet their God in the great final day when judgment shall be pronounced. This being the case, the churches all have in view the same purpose-the promotion on earth of the work of the Master, the saving of souls. What matters a few differences as to interpretation when there is no difference as to purpose?

The fact that church bodies are coming more and more together in their work does not mean that the separate organizations will lose their identity. It is, perhaps, better that they should not, for there are more organisations to carry on the work as it is and this is better than a great concentration in what might be one great unwieldy body. But the churches are united in purpose- the same purpose-and the Christian who cannot heartily rejoice in the success of religion, under the direction of whatever organization it may be promoted, has not yet learned the great purpose for which the church was created.

Unconverted people notice the great harmony that exists between denominations; they have noticed the passing away forever of all bickerings, and they have noticed how the members of the different denominations have joined hands in promoting Christianity, and the effect on these unconverted must be good. They take notice that there is something more, something greater, in church organizations than the mere promotion of some peculiar doctrine of that church. They have noticed that all are working toward a common cause, and while there may be some difference as to certain doctrines, the right to hold these differences is freely and cheerfully conceded, but the right to use these differences as an excuse for failure to cooperate in the great work of all churches, soul saving, is not only denied, but is repugnant to the best Christian thought of today. It is a glorious thing to see "brethren dwelling together in harmony." It not only means "peace on earth and goodwill toward men," but it means that a great army has enlisted under the banner of the cross, and are fighting together for a common cause. The great Mississippi Sunday school convention that is now in session in this city, where peace, harmony, cooperation and goodwill abound, is illustrative of the growth of the spirit of religious tolerance and the desire to fight, side by side, in the cause of the Christian religion.

REMARKS

The above was clipped from a paper published in Meridian, Miss., and sent to us. It needs no comment-it speaks plainly that the so called churches are proposing to do the work Christ Jesus came into the world to do. If men and women or churches can save souls, then Christ died in vain-there was no need for His death, for they could save souls as well without His death as with it. The foregoing shows that people are plainly denying Christ. C. H. C.

Baptism

---June 2, 1914

Elsewhere in this paper will be found a request from Mrs. Arch Perry, of Winder, Ga., that we write on the mode of baptism, and that we write fully.

To write fully on the mode of baptism in one short article is more than we can do. We can only mention a few points. In the first place we will say that if any person who has not heard of baptism should be given a New Testament, and he should read it through without interruption, and without any person offering comment, he would never decide that baptism was pouring or sprinkling.

The first chapter in which baptism is mentioned in the New Testament is (**Matthew 3:16**), "And Jesus, when He was baptized, went up straightway out of the water." If baptism is not by immersion, why was He in the water? Who would gather the idea here that baptism was by pouring or sprinkling? No one.

In (**Mark 1:4-5**), we have this language: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." Why "in the river" if baptism is by pouring or sprinkling? If baptism is by pouring or sprinkling, it was not in the river of Jordan; but the writer says it was in the river. ((**9**) (**Mark 1:9-10**), "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized by John in Jordan. And straightway

coming up out of the water, He saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon Him." It is plainly stated here that Jesus was baptized in Jordan and came up out of the water. This is folly, if baptism is sprinkling or pouring.

In (**John 3:23**) we find this language: "And John also was baptizing in Aenon near Salem, because there was much water there; and they came and were baptized." Much water is not needed for sprinkling or pouring. But the reason why John baptized in this place was "because there was much water there." He could not baptize with a little water, as many modern divines suppose, because sprinkling or pouring is not baptism. Could any person, who had never heard about baptism, read this text and gather the idea from it that sprinkling or pouring is baptism? No.

Concerning Philip and the eunuch, we read in (**Acts 8:26-39**): "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing."

It has been said that as the eunuch was traveling in a country where there was no water, he was carrying water in a jug in the chariot with him, and that he referred to this water in the jug when he said, "See, here is water." If so, they did not come to the water; but the Book says "they came unto a certain water." Hence, they did not have the water with them. Again: The Book says both Philip and the eunuch "went down into the water." It appears to us that this would be a rather great strain on that jug-for both Philip and the eunuch to go down into the water which was in it! Poor old jug!

We do no violence to the language, nor to God's word, if we take a word out and place the true meaning in its stead. We have, in this text, the sentence, "And he (Philip) baptized him (the eunuch)." If pouring is baptism we do no violence to the language if we put the word poured in the text in place of baptized-hence we would read it, "And he poured him." To pour is "to cause to flow in a continuous stream," etc. See Standard Dictionary. So, we would understand that Philip caused the eunuch to flow in a continuous stream, if baptism is pouring! Poor eunuch! To sprinkle is "to scatter in drops or small particles." So, if sprinkling is baptism, Philip scattered the eunuch in drops or small particles! It seems to us that this would have been rather hard on the eunuch. Poor fellow-are you not sorry for him? We do not see how he could possibly have gone on his way rejoicing after such a performance as this. Do you think you could go on your way rejoicing if you were scattered in small particles?

But we can consistently read the text: "They went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he immersed him." Or, "and he buried him." This is enough, if there were no other, to prove that sprinkling or pouring is not baptism.

We find this language in (**Romans 6:3-4**): "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Here we have the plain

statement that these people were buried with Christ by baptism. If they were buried by baptism, then anything short of a burial is not baptism.

Albert Barnes, who was by no means a Baptist, in his comments on this text says: "It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." He also says, "I presume that this is the idea which would strike the great mass of unprejudiced readers." We would just say that this is the idea which would strike all unprejudiced readers.

If one of your relatives were to die, and your neighbors should take the body to the cemetery and pour or sprinkle a little dirt on the head, and then say, "We have buried your relative," would you think these neighbors were your friends?

You know you would not. Then are those people acting the part of friends to the Saviour when they pour or sprinkle a little water on the head of one of His children who has died to sin, and call it baptism, when the apostle, by inspiration from God, says baptism is a burial? You are the jury.

The original word, baptizio, is never translated sprinkle or pour. It cannot be so translated. No scholar has ever attempted to translate it that way. It means to immerse. Much more could be said, but this is enough at present. Sister Perry is at liberty to have this article published in any paper she pleases, as she suggests in her letter. C. H. C.

He Gives It To Cayce

---June 23, 1914

Dear Brother Cayce: Enclosed you will find a letter from W. M. Belcher to me; and if you think it worth while I would be glad if you would tell Belcher where he got his authority from to preach. Dear brother, I hope the Lord will still sustain you. Your brother in Christ, D. C. Bishop. Randle, Wash.

THE LETTER

Elder D. C. Bishop: Dear Brother in Christ, as I Trust-I received your kind letter awhile back, and was sorry to hear that you are not well. I am not well either, but on foot. Well, Brother Bishop, it seems as though you were surprised at me saying that those Baptists who claim to be Primitives, such as Cayce and others that vindicate the same doctrine, are not the Primitive Baptists; for they have left the primitive faith.

They have revised the ancient articles of faith; they have revised their hymn books, and you cannot get a hymn book that our forefathers used except the old "Bilop's Sweet Songster," and they will not use them. Well, you sent me The Primitive Baptist paper and had marked a certain article for me to read, and made a request that I tell you what I think of it. I must be frank with you, as I am with everybody, and will just say that a portion of it is as rotten as the ground that the man that wrote it is made out of; and the man that says that we are not to preach to the sinner does not know what he is talking about. I could cite you to many Scriptures positively to the contrary, but as you did not receive the Scriptures that I cited you to before I will refrain from bothering you with any more.

And if Cayce's word and others go further with you than the Bible, I will just leave you to choose for yourself. And I will say this, that the Scriptures which they quote are very correctly quoted, but badly misapplied; for they (the Scriptures they use) were not to the

purport in which Cayce and others use them, and are full of guile and misleading; and are dangerous as the poison of asps and deadly in their nature, Now, if you wish to know who I think the Primitive Baptists are, I will just say the Old Regular Baptists are the people. You might think by this I was leaving out the United Baptists, but not so; for they are the same as we, who are still holding the same old articles of faith, using the same old hymn books, constituted on the same principles, preaching the same doctrine that our forefathers preached and the same that the apostles preached. I think I have said enough for you to understand just where I stand.

And while I have written these lines to you in love, I must say that I hope love will still exist; yet I detest the doctrine, or a portion of it, that is advocated by Cayce and others. I have been so busy that I could not write sooner, as the biggest part of the last two weeks has been taken up in visiting the sick and attending funerals. Truly yours, W. R. Belcher. Mossy Rock, Wash.

OUR REMARKS

Elder Belcher says we are not the Primitive Baptists because we have revised the articles of faith. This is a mistake. The articles of faith in use among our people are the same in substance as they were before the so called Regular Baptists were born. We suppose the people he refers to as Regular Baptists are the people generally known as Burnamites, or Penceites, or Bradleyites. They are a very young set-much younger, even, than the Missionary Baptists. In fact, we do not see why they do not go on with the Missionaries, where they belong, for they teach practically the same doctrine. If these Burnamites claim to be primitive because of their doctrine, they involve themselves in a difficulty, for the Missionaries had long before split off from us on account of the new theology they introduced. If holding to those principles constitutes them the primitive order, then the Missionaries would be the original Baptists, and the Burnamites are not.

They would have to go to the Missionaries in order to be identified with the original order of Baptists. So these so called Regulars are in a dilemma-and they cannot get out. The truth is that the Missionaries departed from the original doctrine and practice of the church, and these so called Regulars have done the same.

As to the revising of hymn books we would wonder if the hymn books were inspired. We wonder what hymn book they used before "Bilops Sweet Songster" was ever published! We wonder if they ceased to be the original order of Baptists when they began using that book! We confess that we never saw a copy of "Bilops Sweet Songster." But, really now, does not that argument "knock the black out?"

Concerning preaching to sinners, we suppose he means that his preaching is instrumental in regenerating alien sinners, and that they should be preached to in such a way as that they will hear, believe and obey the preaching, and thereby become children of God. That was Andrew Fuller's idea, and it was the teaching of Rome long before his day. But it was not the teaching of Christ nor the apostles, and is not the truth. The Saviour said in **(John 8:43)**, "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." In ((7) (verse 47). speaking to the same people, He says, "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God."

These expressions are so plain that they need no comment. The only way to prove that the Old Baptists are wrong on this point is to prove that the Saviour lied, and no man can do that. Paul, the eminent apostle to the Gentiles, taught the same great truth in (**I Corinthians 1:18**): "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." This text is so plain that it needs no comment or explanation. In (**I Corinthians 2:13-14**) he says, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." This is another expression which is too plain to need comment. The apostle emphatically declares by inspiration that the natural, or unregenerate, man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God-the things "which we speak." The beloved disciple John, in (**I John 4:5-6**), says, "They are of the world; therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us.

Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." If Elder Belcher proposes to preach in such a way as that the world will hear and believe his preaching, he simply classes himself as being of the world in his preaching. The world hears (receives) the preaching of those who are of the world-so John says. And he says that "hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." If the world receives the preaching of Elder Belcher, then he does not preach the truth. John informs us that we may know it is that way.

We confess that this doctrine is deadly to false teachers, and that it is deadly to their doctrine. The truth kills error. C. H. C.

Our Debt to the Missionary Reply to Rev W. Bruce Doyle

---July 14, 1914

An article from the Wadesboro (N. C) Messenger and Intelligencer, by Rev. W. Bruce Doyle, has been sent to us, and we wish to reproduce a few sentences from it and say a few words by way of comment. He says:

We owe the avoidance of war largely to the missionary; Until our missionary era war was the normal condition of nations. England waged a hundred years war not long before she sent out the cobbler to India. We had five French and Indian wars, a long war with England, and still another war with England, and war was almost the normal condition of the American people before Carey set sail as a missionary.

The gentleman enumerates some wars we have had, but failed to mention the bloodiest struggle the United States had, which was of about three years duration. This was the Civil War-the war between the States. The gentleman also fails to tell the cause which brought about any of these wars. What did the missionary religion have to do with the hundred years war of England? Does the gentleman not know that this war was the outgrowth of the teaching of some who engaged in missionary enterprises? Was not the Revolutionary War brought about primarily by the religious intolerance of those who engage in missionary enterprises? Was not the Civil War the result of churches which engage in missionary enterprises interfering in political matters? The gentleman certainly knows, if he is informed, that the Civil War was waged as a result of mixing

politics and religion-a uniting of church and state-by the modern missionary religionists. What gave rise to the Boxer uprising in China a few years ago, which Rev. Doyle mentions in his article? The missionaries. They went to China under the pretext of preaching the gospel, being supported by the people at home. Perhaps many a poor widow gave her last penny for the support of those missionaries, who were living in luxury. These missionaries meddled with Chinese governmental affairs which was none of their business. As a result there was an uprising among the Chinese to drive them out. Who can blame them? No reasonable and sane person can, If they should come here and begin to interfere with our governmental affairs they would be driven away. But the missionaries asked for protection from their home countries. The "Powers" -Uncle Sam, England, and perhaps others-immediately sent warships, guns, and ammunition over, with soldiers, to subdue John Chinaman, and he had to submit to the missionaries remaining. Yes, these missionaries would have the gospel shot into people with Gatlin guns if other means fail. This has been Roman Catholic policy in the centuries past, and seems to be the policy of others.

But the Rev. Mr. Doyle says that "Even England's iniquitous opium traffic in China has been made possible by the missionary first biasing a path to Oriental poppy fields." This is certainly a bad admission. The low depths of degradation caused by the opium traffic in China cannot be imagined by one who has not investigated the matter to some considerable extent. It is worse than horrible. But this gentleman says it was all made possible by the missionary. Has our God ever required or commanded that which makes possible such a black, fiendish, low, dirty, filthy, business as this Chinese opium affair? No; it is not from God, and therefore, must be from beneath.

The Rev. Mr. Doyle further says:

We owe it to the missionary for much helpful consolidation.....Churches with almost identical creeds have worked in the face of each other in the home land, but their missionaries have fallen into partnership in the foreign land and there consolidated their work. The church at home with that example and that shame began consolidation. And so we have united many of our schools and home enterprises.

Yes, Protestants have doctrines that are borrowed from Rome, and the signs of the times are now that their borrowed articles will soon be returned to the rightful owner-hence the idea of a consolidation or union of the different churches. Not only have many of their schools and other enterprises been united, but congregations are uniting, and denominations are uniting, and those who are teaching and advocating and practicing such unions may soon unite with Rome. If they do not, Rome may force them to surrender in some respects. All these missionary religionists are united with, or identified by membership with, a religion whose great leaders-many of them at least-are endeavoring to unite church and state. A kind of confederacy has been formed, we understand, composed of ministers or members of different orders whose duty it shall be to see that laws are enacted which shall be for the benefit and advancement of religion.

This is only a tendency to unite church and state. Who is doing this? These missionary religionists. We owe some union and consolidation to missionaries and missionary religionists which has always resulted in persecution of the humble followers of the Master and the death of many of them who would not deny their Lord. Missionaries and

missionary religionists have caused more bloodshed than all the wars the world has ever known. If you are doubtful of this, read a few authentic histories on the question and satisfy your minds.

Mr. Doyle mentions the present upheaval in Mexico and eulogizes the missionaries. But he fails to state the fact that missionary religion is largely responsible for this upheaval. Is it not a fact that the war there is mainly what we might term a Catholic and anti-Catholic affair? Hence, is not the missionary religion really responsible for the whole thing? Remember that Rome is a missionary body or religion. She was the first religious body to send out missionaries to convert the world.

Mr. Doyle says further:

We owe it to the missionary that the home church has been kept alive. There was once a split in the Baptist Church here at home-the Missionary and Primitive Baptist Churches were the result. Today the Primitive branch of that denomination has dwindled down to a mere handful of people while the missionary branch has grown to be one of the most powerful churches on the continent.

We wonder how the home church was kept alive before there were any missionaries of the modern sort? The Baptist Church lived for about 1800 years before they had any missionaries of the modern sort, and they lived many centuries before John Calvin founded the Presbyterian Church. The introduction of Fuller's new theories, and modern missionism among the Baptists by Fuller, Carey and others, resulted in the split in the Baptist Church, to which Mr. Doyle refers.

Then Mr. Doyle says the Primitive branch has dwindled down to a mere handful of people. This statement shows that he evidently does not know. They have had no mushroom growth like some, but they are steadily increasing in number. But they do not count on number. It is quality, not quantity, that they count on. We are not after the large number, as much as some people seem to be. Our Master has said, **{(Luke 12:32)}** "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." This is a mark of true identity.

Mr. Doyle attributes the growth of the Missionary Baptists to the fact that they send out their missionaries, etc. This may be true, and it may not. The following statement from the pen of Dr. J. H. Anderson, dean of HallMoody Institute, Martin, Tenn., was published in the Baptist Builder, Martin, Tenn., of July 1, 1914:

Many of our churches are Arminian in faith and Hardshell in practice. This is verily a bad mixture, for it is devoid of consistency to begin with. That member who is soaking in luxury and who drops a copper into the contribution basket in Sunday school or the regular church services needs boosting with a spiritual dynamite. It has gotten to be easier to retain membership in the average Baptist Church than among the Masons, Odd Fellows, Knights of Pythias, Woodmen of the World, or even among the Elks, who can perhaps make out with less religion than any other organisation. Let one fail to meet punctually recurring obligations to any of these and he goes out by stress of circumstances. And yet a Baptist belonging to an organisation of transcendently more importance than all of these combined, can live loosely as to obligations to both God and man, can get a letter certifying as to full fellowship and good standing while living, or be preached straight home to glory after death.

It seems to us that this is a very clear admission of looseness in discipline, and that it is very easy to retain membership among the Missionary Baptists. This might be the reason for their phenomenal growth. They please the world, and the world unites with them.

Here is one more expression from Mr. Doyle:

That church which sends no missionaries will die-God has no need for it. That church which sends the most missionaries will thrive the most-God can use a church like that.

It was prophesied before Mr. Doyle was born that the church now known as Primitive Baptists would soon be dead, but it still lives. It is here yet, and it is here to stay. The Lord promised that it should stand forever. **{(Dan 2:44) (Daniel 2:44)}** The Saviour said the gates of hell should not prevail against it. **{ (Matthew 16:18)}** They were few in Elijah's day. He thought he was alone, and made "intercession against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal."- **(Romans 11:2-3,4)**. Seven thousand were very few in comparison with others around, but God had need for them, and could and did use them as witnesses to the truth and for the preservation of His truth. It was enough for that. The apostle adds in **(Romans 11:5)**, "Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace." There was a remnant in Paul's day. A remnant does not mean such a large number as some boast of. The remnant was enough for the preservation of truth in apostolic days. There is a remnant yet, and the truth is still preserved with them. God can and does use them as witnesses for truth, and for the preservation of His truth. He will always use them for that purpose. C. H. C.

A Letter That Helps Us

---July 21, 1914

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-If you will permit me I would like to write a few lines for our dear old paper. I have often wanted to write, but as often hesitated from different causes, but not long since in reading my paper I came across an article that made me so ashamed of my negligence that I determined to try to do better.

One of our corresponding editors in acknowledging a letter of appreciation said that such letters were so comforting and so seldom received, that he did the best he could and endeavored to write interesting and uplifting articles for the readers of The Primitive Baptist, but he seldom knew whether he pleased the readers, as so few ever gave expression to their appreciation. Brother Cayce, this came like an electric shock to me; I simply bowed my head and wept as I thought, "Oh, is everybody like me? Don't anybody write to these dear men and tell them how they love their writings, and how glad they are to read them, and what a comfort they are to the children of Israel? Can it be that we all read and enjoy and never say a word?"

Oh, I am so sorry that I have never written and thanked a single writer for our paper in all these years that I have been reading and enjoying it. My cheeks burn with shame to think of my ingratitude, I have been grateful but I have failed to tell them so. But I never dreamed that others were as unthoughtful as I was, and I intend to write each one

a letter of thanks and tell them that I do appreciate their good letters, for I do, and I am writing this to ask others of our readers who, like me, have never thanked these good men and women for their labor of love in our behalf to write them a letter tonight. Let's don't wait until some future time-so many are going home every day we can never tell who will be the next, and tomorrow may be too late,

I remember how I used to think I would write to Brother S. A. Paine, of Texas, and tell him how much I enjoyed his writings, but I didn't and now- well, you know the rest, and yet there are lots, whose writings I eagerly look forward to, still living and wondering if their writings are appreciated by me and others who read them and remain silent-let's write them a letter now.

And, dear Brother Cayce, I want to tell you that I do appreciate your efforts in our behalf in giving us such a good, wholesome paper, and I am sure we all do.

I shall never forget the first time I heard the name "Cayce;" it was in 1905, if I mistake not, when I was a mere girl; I was a Missionary Baptist and had never heard of a Primitive Baptist. I had heard of the "Hardshells" and thought they were some kind of monstrosities. I met at that time a Primitive Baptist boy whom I liked very much and whom I later married; but just after your father died he came down to see me and we went driving. He seemed very sad and when I asked him what was the trouble he broke down, sobbing as though his heart would break, said, "Brother Cayce is dead." Never having heard of "Brother Cayce," and not knowing his family well, I thought he meant his own brother and I asked him why he had come if his brother was dead. I shall never forget the look of consternation he gave me as he asked, "Don't you know who Brother Cayce was?" I had to admit that I did not. (Oh, I would know now.)

Then he gave me the paper and asked me to read. All who read that issue of The Primitive Baptist know what I read. From that day until this very minute the name of "Cayce" has been exceedingly sweet to me; I love it better all the while because it stands for all that is good and noble, and I am so glad dear old Brother Cayce's mantle fell on a man whom we can love and cherish as we did his father; yes, Brother Claud, we love you even if we don't say so. I unhesitatingly say "we," because I know all our people feel as I do. I can't conceive of them thinking any other way; we are only slow to tell you.

My husband has long since gone to be with his beloved "Brother Cayce," but not until he had the pleasure of naming a son "Cayce" and seeing his wife baptised into the dear old church he loved so well. I am writing this, Brother Cayce, to let you see how much your work is appreciated, even though we don't tell you so, and to assure you that you have my blessing and most sincere prayers. I do not tell it to you as I know I should, but I do try to tell it to God and ask Him to bless you, and not only you but all our dear ministers, and I ask no greater blessing for myself than to see my orphan boy grow up to be a Primitive Baptist minister.

It has been more than a year since I heard a Primitive Baptist preach; so far as I know I am the only Primitive Baptist in the city of Baton Rouge. None of our ministers ever come over here. I don't know why; I wish they would; yet here is where I earn my daily bread and I must stay, but I deeply regret that I cannot attend a church of our faith, so that is why I so much more appreciate our paper and the Gospel Messenger. They are the only preaching I ever hear, and I am so ashamed of not having written and thanked

the many writers of our paper who give us such sweet comfort and make us to know that even though we are far away we are not alone.

And so I am asking that we all write to these dear men and women whose writings we love so well and cheer their hearts along the way. We forget the golden rule ourselves and then wonder why others forget it. I think if we would write the golden rule on a piece of paper and paste it on our mirror where we could see it every morning as we dressed for the day, it would have a tendency to lessen the burdens of the day. I am sure the influence would not be bad, and then at night it would remind us to write that letter. Let us also lend a helping hand to the churches that are trying to build a church house; a little from us all would do wonders. Let us not forget what James tells us pure and undefiled religion is; and last, but most important of all, let us not forget to minister to the temporal necessities of the dear ministers of Christ who minister so uncomplainingly to us of spiritual things. Let's show our appreciation in deeds as well as words. Our good deeds are always given back double. Do we wonder why we are not blessed with more? The answer is simple-one talent doubled is only two; ten is twenty; and fifty is one hundred. If we only give one should we expect to receive one hundred? So those who have been giving one dollar to the minister, try giving five, and that more often, and see if we don't soon rejoice. I think some of us would be surprised at the result. Now this is for you and not for the other fellow.

I did not intend to write so long a letter and I hope I have not said anything that will cause any ill will or unpleasant thoughts, for I have only meant to admonish others to realise that they are sleeping on their rights and tell them if, like me, they are waiting for the other party to write and tell our ministers how much their work of love is appreciated and send them a solid expression of their gratitude that everybody else is doing the same thing, and our ministers are often cast down and in financial straights that we never dream of. So let's don't wait for the other fellow, but get busy and write them a letter tonight while we still have them with us. Let's don't wait until the snow-white angel band has removed some beloved brother or sister from our midst and then wish we had been more diligent and written them a letter. Now is the accepted time. I ask an interest in your prayers. Your little sister in hope of eternal life,
Mrs. M. Wilkinson 320 Florida St. Baton Rouge, La.

REMARKS

It has been a long time since we received a letter that was as great a comfort to us as the above. We could not help shedding tears of gratitude as we read it. It is so seldom that we receive such letters of commendation and encouragement. We often feel that our labors are all in vain, and feel almost like giving up in despair. It is no uncommon thing to receive letters of criticism and complaints-they are received almost every day. No one knows the trials of the place we have to try to fill unless he has had the experience. But now and then we receive a word of encouragement which helps us along the way. It is so true that if we do not like what one has done, we are quick to say something and let them know of our disapproval; but if we approve of something they have done, we take it as a matter of course, and say nothing.

We should scatter the flowers along the pathway of our friends while they live, and not wait until they are dead and then place flowers on their graves and say the good things

about them which should have been said to them while they were living. We appreciate the foregoing letter more than we are able to tell. May the Lord grant to abundantly bless you, dear sister, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Ephesians 2:15 AND Hebrews 1:1-3

---July 28, 1914

W. B. Peak, of Humnoke, Ark., requests our views of (**Ephesians 2:15**) and (**Hebrews 1:1-2,3**). He says there is a preacher there who says water baptism was never extended to the Gentiles, and that he gave these passages as proof. We must say that this preacher is very ignorant. The last command, called the "commission," given by our Saviour, as recorded in (**Matthew 28:19**), says, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The command here is plain, and embraces all nations-Gentiles as well as Jews. Cornelius was a Gentile, and the inspired Apostle Peter commanded him to be baptized. There is an abundance of testimony on this line.

(Ephesians 2:15) has no reference whatever to baptism, or other gospel command. The law of commandments which Christ abolished was the old Jewish service of types and shadows. He did not give laws, rules, and regulations to govern in His gospel kingdom, or church, and then abolish them in His death. Instead of being abolished, they are established for all time to come and are to be observed until the end of time.

has no reference whatever to baptism, or other gospel command. The law of commandments which Christ abolished was the old Jewish service of types and shadows. He did not give laws, rules, and regulations to govern in His gospel kingdom, or church, and then abolish them in His death. Instead of being abolished, they are established for all time to come and are to be observed until the end of time.

Neither does (**Hebrews 1:1-2,3**) teach that gospel commands are abolished, but rather that they are firmly established, and are to remain. It also teaches that Christ has already purged, forever put away, the sins of His people, and that He did this by Himself. We are satisfied the preacher mentioned does not believe the plain statement of this text. C. H. C.

Isaiah 45:7

---July 28, 1914

Brother J. J. Driskell, of Mortimer, Ala., requests our views of ((**7**) (**Isaiah 45:7**) which reads, "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil; I the Lord do all these things." This is a text which is relied upon very much to prove that the Lord brings to pass all sin and wickedness, or that He predestinated all sin and wickedness. The evil mentioned in this text is not the wicked acts of men-it is not the sins which they commit, but it is the punishment the Lord sends upon them for their sins. Another passage on the same line is in ((**Amos 3:6**) (**Amos 3:6**), which says, "Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not afraid? Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?"

This teaches that the Lord brings evil in the city (the church). But it is not sin that He brings, but punishment for sins. Beginning with ((**Amos 3:1**) (**Amos 3:1**) we have this

language: "Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore will I punish you for all your iniquities." This shows very clearly that the evil which the Lord creates, or brings upon His children, is punishment for their sins or iniquities. C. H. C.

Adultery and Fornication

---July 28, 1914

Brother W. E. Guthrie, of Cone, Texas, asks us if there is any difference in the original Greek word for fornication and for adultery. As respects the act, there is no difference. The act is the same, no matter which word is used, so far as the original words are concerned.

Brother Guthrie also asks, "Do you hold that when a man and wife are separated unscripturally, and one of them marries, that this gives the other a Scriptural right to marry?" Then asks, "Would you make your views a test of fellowship?" In reply to these questions will say we have repeatedly stated our position in as plain words as we know how. We will answer again the question above. If a man leaves his wife without a Scriptural reason, and marries another, he becomes an adulterer, and is, therefore, dead to his wife. This gives her a Scriptural right to marry again.

As her husband has become Scripturally dead to her, she has no husband, from a Biblical standpoint. As the Scriptures do not forbid any person having a husband she has a Scriptural right to marry again. If the husband sickens and dies, and thereby leaves the wife without a husband, she has no more right to marry again than the woman whose husband has become dead to her by adultery. If the wife is a fornicator, or adulteress, the husband has a right to put her away and marry another.

In fact, if a man knows his wife is guilty, yet refuses to put her away, and continues to live with her, he becomes party to the crime, and should be excluded from the church.

As to making our views a test of fellowship will say that we would not want one to retain membership in our church who had put away his wife for any cause except fornication and then married another. C. H. C.

Man Is To Blame

---July 28, 1914

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I have recently noticed some pieces in The Primitive Baptist touching a question that I desire some information on. Therefore, I am asking a question, and will very much appreciate it if you will give me the desired information. Question: The Primitive Baptists believe that if a man is saved it must be by grace (unmerited favor); or in other words, that all men are sinners, and that no one can bring God under obligations to be merciful unto him. Justice is as far as they have any right to, and as justice would condemn us all, as we are all born in sin without any way of making our escape from the punishment allotted to the wicked, then are we not fatalistic (our fate fixed)? Then, is it justice in God to bring a thing into a state of being from which it cannot escape and then punish it for being in that condition? Or, in other words, who is responsible for man being in the condition he is in? And if man, what course can he

pursue to escape the consequences of his evil deeds? I am asking this question for information, as it has given me no little trouble recently; and yet I realize the fact that if I am ever saved it must be by grace and not of works. Your brother in hope,

J. A. Smith. Ocilla, Ga.

REMARKS

In reply to the above will say that God made man, but did not make him a sinner. The man violated God's holy law, and thereby became a sinner-a transgressor. He is thereby involved in. sin. He fell. Man did this without compulsion. He was not deceived. The woman was deceived, but the man was not. Hence, the man is to blame for being a sinner. He fell into a pit by the transgression, and he is to blame for it.

His life became poisoned with sin. Everything partakes of the nature of that from which it springs. We are sinners, therefore, because we partake of the sinful nature of our parentage. In the transgression, the man fell down. A man can fall down, but he cannot fall up. By the transgression, man brought death upon himself. Man can bring himself into a state of death, but he cannot bring himself out of that state into a state of life.

If he is ever brought into a state of life, it must be by a stoop of mercy on the part of the Giver of life, whose law has been violated. Man is to blame for being condemned, but he is not to blame for not coming out of that condemned state. If a prisoner is brought before a civil court, charged with some crime, and is tried, found guilty, and condemned, we would all say he is to blame for the condemnation by being guilty of the crime; but we would not blame him, or attach blame to him, because he does not now remove the guilt and thus bring himself out of the condemned state.

The man is guilty of transgression of God's law. God alone, God only, can remove the man's guilt and make him clear in the eyes of that law. This is done for His people, for all their sins are charged up to His Son as their surety. He assumes all their guilt. Their guilt is transferred to Him. He has suffered in their stead, and this was mercy. Now, on account of what He has done, the Holy Spirit regenerates them, and they are given a new and higher order of life-they are brought out of the state of death which they are in and prepared to live with Him in glory. C. H. C.

Campbellism

---August 4, 1914

Elder C H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I want you to publish in The Primitive Baptist the cardinal points of doctrine of the Campbelites, as I understand that you have debated with them and know the doctrine they advocate. They are preaching here; and I thought they taught baptism as essential to salvation, but they deny it here. Your brother in hope, Jake Owens. Speedwell, Tenn.

REMARKS

They do teach that baptism in water is essential to the receiving of eternal life. The preacher among them who denies this is either very ignorant, or else he willfully misrepresents the fact. We had a discussion in Nashville, Tenn., with F. B. Srygley, one of their strongest men in this state, which began on December 25 and closed December 31, 1911. In that discussion, for three sessions, Mr. Srygley affirmed that "Faith, repentance and water baptism are conditions of pardon, or salvation, to an alien sinner,

and the Scriptures so teach." The debate is published in book form, and is in good clear type and well bound in cloth. The price is only one dollar. Campbellism is exposed in that debate. Send to us and get a copy. You will not regret it. C. H. C.

Quacks

---August 18, 1914

Medical quacks can only send the bodies of their subjects to the grave, while ministerial quacks send the soul of their subjects to an eternal hell.-J. B. Moody in Baptist Builder.

The above statement gives us some new light on the Saviour's language recorded in **(0:28) (Matthew 10:28)**, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Also, the Saviour's language recorded in **(Luke 12:4-5)**, "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear Him, which after He hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear Him."

According to Dr. Moody, you need not fear the quack doctor, but you should fear the quack preacher, for he can not only kill the body, but can cast the soul into hell. Well, this gives us a new interpretation of the text. C. H. C.

Three Questions

---August 18, 1914

Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother in Hope-I want to ask you to give your views on some questions I would like to know, only for information:

1. Did God make the devil?
2. Did God predestinate the fall of Adam?
3. Did God predestinate the work that Judas performed?

Those three questions I have pondered over, and if not asking too much of you, and if it be not an unfair question to ask you, I would be glad to see your views on them in The Primitive Baptist. Your brother in Christ, I hope, A. W. Thompson. R. 1, Wendell, N. C.

REMARKS

1. We do not know. The Bible does not say. Some infer that He did. It is better to let the devil and his origin and his works all alone.
2. No. Man fell by his own disobedience and not by the predestination of God. God knew it, but did not predestinate it.
3. He did not predestinate the wicked works that Judas would do; but His knowledge and predestination are different things. Wicked men are ready to perform their wicked works when opportunity presents, without the Lord predestinating for them to do them. C. H. C.

General Judgment and Eternal Hell

---August 18, 1914

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I would love for you to give your views on these questions:

1. Is the judgment spoken of in (**Acts 17:31**) the general judgment? I mean at the last day.
2. Is the "judgment seat of Christ" spoken of in (II Corinthians 5:10) the same as the general judgment? I don't wish to appear tedious to you, but I have in mind the case of a certain man who is a member of the Primitive Baptist Church, and this brother denies the existence of an eternal hell, claiming that it is an error crept into the church from Romanism and Armianism; that it is one of the devil's lies, and that the Baptists ought to feed the sheep and lambs of God and let the devil's preacher preach this infernal eternal torment doctrine if any one preaches it, thus denying, as you can see, the natural immortality of the human soul and claiming that the wicked will be utterly destroyed in the second death after the great judgment. He admits an intermediate state, but says that it is only two great waiting rooms, one for the saved and the other for the lost, waiting for the resurrection and judgment which will mean the execution or everlasting destruction of the wicked as spoken of by Paul, and eternal life for the righteous as recorded by (**Matthew 25:46**), and (**I John 5:10-11**), What do you think of such ideas? O. E. Duncan. Adamsville, Tenn.

REMARKS

1. No; the judgment spoken of in (**Acts 17:31**) is not, in our opinion, the general judgment, or the judgment at the last day. By reading from verse 28 on down it will be seen that the judgment here referred to is for all men who are the offspring of God-or for God's people. They are being judged now-every day-and condemned in their consciences for their wrong deeds and acquitted when they live right.
2. No; the judgment seat spoken of in (II Corinthians 5:10) is not said in reference to the general judgment. The judgment seat of Christ is here on earth, and we may say in His church, and we appear before that judgment seat now-every day. "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God," etc.-((Pet 4:17) (I Peter 4:17). With reference to the brother denying the existence of an endless hell will say we do not know who he is, but he has imbibed some of the teachings of Russell, one of the greatest humbugs of the present age. The word destroy in ((**0:28**) (**Matthew 10:28**), referred to, does not mean to annihilate.

According to the Standard Dictionary the word destroy means, "1. To bring to ruin or demolish in a way. (1) To cause the downfall of; overthrow; as, to destroy an empire. (2) To tear down; wrench apart; knock or pull to pieces; as, to destroy a building. (3) To take away completely the value or usefulness of; vitiate; ruin; lay waste; as, to destroy one's reputation; to destroy a contract; to destroy good looks. (4) To put an end to the existence of; cause to cease to be; cut off; kill; as, to destroy weeds or noxious insects; to destroy one's peace of mind. 2. To show to be false; disprove; as, agnosticism destroys itself. 3. To render of no avail; neutralise; counteract." Thus it is clear that "to cause to cease to be" is a remote meaning of the word destroy. Besides, the text does not say that God does cause both soul and body to cease to be, but that "He is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." "Annihilates a philosophical term, signifies to put

absolutely out of existence."-Standard Dictionary, page 11, under word, "abolish." If the Saviour or the apostles had meant to teach the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked, a word would have been used by them signifying the same. But they never used such a word. Thayer's Greek Lexicon defines the word used in **(0:28) (Matthew 10:28)** to mean "to devote or give over to eternal misery."

On this text Gill says: "A noble argument this, which our Lord makes use of, to engage His disciples to a public and diligent ministration of the gospel, in spite of all opposers; who, when they have vented all their malice, can only take away a poor, frail, mortal life; and which, if they did not, in a little time would cease in course; 'but are not able to kill the soul; which is immortal, and cannot be touched by the sword, by fire and faggot, or any instruments of violence; it is immortal, it survives the body, and lives in a separate state, enjoying happiness and bliss whilst the body is in a state of death, 'but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. This is a description of God, and of His power, who is able to do that which men are not; all that they can do, by divine permission, is to kill the body; but He is able to destroy, that is, to torment and punish both body and soul 'in hell, in everlasting burning; for neither soul nor body will be annihilated; though this He is able to do."

The next text referred to is **(Matthew 25:46)**, which reads, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." In this text the word which is translated "everlasting" with reference to the punishment of the wicked is the same word which is translated "eternal" with reference to the life of the righteous. The word means "eternal, everlasting." See Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon, page 11. It is the nominative or accusative case of the word "aion," which means "illimitable duration, eternity." See same book, page 11. Strong's Exhaustive Concordance defines the word thus: "Perpetual, eternal, for ever, everlasting." Thayer's Greek Lexicon defines it thus: "1. Without beginning or end, that which always has been and always will be. 2. Without beginning: a gospel whose subject matter is eternal, i. e., the saving purpose of God adopted from eternity. 3. Without end, never to cease, everlasting." Liddell 6? Scott Greek Lexicon defines it: "Lasting for an age, perpetual, everlasting, eternal." The new Testament Lexicon by Berry and published by Hinds & Noble, defines the word thus: "1. Without beginning or end, eternal. 2. Without beginning. 3. Without end, everlasting; often with "son" *life*, eternal life, denoting life which in its character is essentially eternal." So much for the meaning of the word; and remember that this word is used to describe, pr with reference to, the punishment of the wicked as well as with reference to the life of the righteous.

If the life of the righteous is of illimitable or boundless duration, so is the punishment of the wicked of illimitable or boundless duration. If the punishment of the wicked ever ceases or ends, the life of the righteous will end at the same time, for one is of equal duration with the other. The punishment of the wicked and the life of the righteous are placed in contradistinction from each other-one stands over in opposition to the other. Hence, one must be of equal duration as the other. If the life of the righteous is endless, then the punishment of the wicked must also be endless. For the righteous it is "aionion" life, and for the wicked it is "aionion" punishment. If "aionion" punishment is not "eternal" punishment, then "aionion" life is not "eternal" life. In **(I John 5:11)** the same word is used- "that God hath given to us eternal life"-it is "aionion life." To deny that

the punishment of the wicked will be eternal is to deny the plain statement of the Son of God; for He plainly says that they "shall go away into aionion *eternal* punishment." If the doctrine of eternal punishment came from Rome, the Saviour was a Romanist, for He declared that doctrine. The doctrine the brother admits-that the dead occupy an intermediate state-is Romanism, pure and simple. This is Rome's doctrine of purgatory under a new name. At the death of the body the spirit goes to God who gave it. See ((7) (**Ecclesiastes 12:7**). The Saviour said to the thief on the cross, "Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." Paradise is a place of future happiness. In (II Corinthians 12:2-3,4,) we find this language: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) how that he was caught up into paradise and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. The apostle informs us here that the third heaven and paradise are the same. The London Confession of Faith, put forth by the Baptists in 1689, says (chapter xxxi. Sec. 1): "The bodies of men after death return to dust and see corruption; but their souls, which neither die nor sleep, having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them; the souls of the righteous then being made perfect in holiness, are received into paradise, where they are with Christ, and behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day; besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none." This declaration of faith is a positive denial of the Romish heresy of an intermediate state or place for the dead. The man who denies the doctrine of eternal punishment of the wicked, and argues that there is an intermediate state of the dead, does not occupy original Baptist ground, but occupies a position which may be termed a combination of Romanism and Russellism. If he agitates the question, and argues it, thus disturbing the peace of the brotherhood, he should be admonished, and if he will not cease, then he should be promptly excluded. C. H. C.

Christmas and Easter

---August 18, 1914

It is generally accepted as a fact that December 25 is not the Saviour's birthday. At the time of His birth there were shepherds keeping watch over their flocks by night. For this reason it is evident it was not winter. As to Easter, this is only a Roman Catholic invention. All who observe it are only following Rome. The same is true also of the so-called Christmas day. December 25 was first observed as a day of mass by the Catholics, then they began claiming that it was observed in commemoration of the birth of Christ-hence they called it Christmas day-an abbreviation of Christ Mass. December 25 and Easter are both simply Roman Catholic feast days. C. H. C.

Questions on Order

---August 25, 1914

The following questions on order have been propounded to us. We give the questions and our answers following each question, but we wish to say, emphatically, and wish it understood, that no set rule, or invariable rule, will do in all cases. Each case should be judged according to its own individual merits, and the circumstances connected with it. However, our answers we believe will apply in a general way.

1. "Is the identity of the church determined by the members, or by the faith and order?" By the faith and order.
2. "Is the command to withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly not just as obligatory to the minority as to the majority?" Yes. But sometimes people might be wrong as to what is disorderly walk.
3. "When a church divides and one side withdraws from the other and gives due notice of same in regular conference, whether they be the minority or majority, is it in keeping with justice for the other side then to bring charges against them when they have no right of defense, and then publish them as an excluded faction?" When a church divides, one party withdrawing, nothing else need be expected but that the other side would then bring charges and go through the form of excluding the withdrawing party, no matter which side is in the right. We say this may be expected. And then, of course, each side usually wants to publish the other side as excluded. That is the way such things usually go. Such cases have to be judged on their individual merits. No general answer can apply to all such cases.
4. "Where a church divides, and both sides claim to be the church in order, is it prudent for sister churches or associations to receive either side to the exclusion of the other without hearing each side?" This also depends upon circumstances. They may know enough about the case to satisfy them as to which side is the church in order, and they may then consistently receive that side. If they do not know, of course they should investigate. C. H. C.

Genesis 6:6; Jonah 3:10; Malachi 3:6

---August 25, 1914

Sister Luda Sullivan, of Bon Aqua, Tenn., requests our views of **(Genesis 6:6)**; **((0) (Jonah 2:10)**, and **(Malachi 3:6)**. We think she meant **((0) (Jonah 3:10)** instead of **((0) (Jonah 2:10)**: **(Genesis 6:6)** reads: "And it repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him at His heart." **((0) (Jonah 3:10)** reads: "And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil, that He had said that He would do unto them; and He did it not."

(Malachi 3:6) reads: "**For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.**"

reads: "For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed."

In this last text we have the plain, positive, unequivocal statement that the Lord does not change. Any construction placed upon the other passages which would involve the idea that the Lord changes must, therefore, necessarily be wrong. The Lord does not change. His government of man has always been a moral government. It is not a physical government. His government of inanimate things is physical. Inanimate matter neither

obeys or disobeys God's law. He governs there by physical law. But His law to man is moral; and to His children, it is parental. Hence they disobey Him.

In (**Genesis 6:5**) we are told that "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." In (Genesis 6:7) He says, "I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth." Mankind had become extremely wicked in transgressing His laws in moral government; and, according to His law He punishes man-destroys man from the face of the earth.

In ((**0**) (**Jonah 3:10**))the reference is to Nineveh, which was a wicked city. Jonah was sent to preach to them, and they repented at the preaching of Jonah-they turned from their wickedness; so, then, the Lord did not destroy them, or send the calamity upon them. This was according to God's law- His rule in dealing with His creatures. Hence, God did not change-He only dealt with them according to His rule or law -but Nineveh changed.

In (Jeremiah 18:7-10) we read: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them." This shows that God's government with men is moral and not physical, and harmonizes (**Genesis 6:6**) and ((**0**) (**Jonah 3:10**)) with (**Malachi 3:6**). C. H. C.

Wine or Grape Juice

---September 15, 1914

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-Having had a "tilt" with some of my Methodist friends in regard to the use of wine in the communion service, I need a little more enlightenment perhaps, which you can give. They contend for grape juice, saying, "Therein is no temptation to a weak one; that grape juice was used always at the passover, etc., and that they knew of cases where weak ones had returned to drink from partaking of the wine in communion."

I told them that they could not defend their position by the Scriptures; that it was a modern custom; that never had I known of a Christian injured by immersion, nor by partaking of the wine at the Lord's supper; that Jesus at Cana did not turn the water into grape juice, but wine; that the Saviour said not to put new grape juice (?) in old bottles (?), no: but new wine. That Paul told Timothy to "take a little grape juice (?) for the stomach's sake," etc., (?) No: "Take a little wine." And the Jews certainly knew the difference between wine and grape juice.

In regard to the passover, our Brother Nye, the Jewish convert, tells me, "Grape juice was never used, but wine; and that grape juice was never used until so many unconverted people came into the church." Surely no support for the grape juice theory in that. Then, too, they did not know where the expression used by Paul to Timothy originated. I told them. And also that they read their Bibles religiously enough (a chapter a day at least), but with certainly very little understanding. They argued that

Christ “never turned the water into fermented temptation that would cause men to fall; that the grape juice was more wholesome, and withal, harmless.”

Again I told them that wine was typical of blood; blood has life, so has wine; but grape juice is placid, inert, and to my mind does not typify blood. I also asked them whether the ones of whom they knew “had contracted the taste of wine at the communion table;” and they could not satisfy me.

I believe both wine and grape juice are used, but I believe the argument is on the side of the former. There may be others who would like to know, and an answer through the columns of The Primitive Baptist may not come amiss, not to prolong, or start afresh, a controversy, but to inform us. Your brother in hope, Howard N. Stevens. 18 Smith St., Newark, Ohio.

REMARKS

In reply to the above will say that no well informed person would say that grape juice was used in the old Jewish passover supper. Several different articles were used in that supper, among them being wine and unleavened bread.

They also had in that supper what we now call gravy, and what was then called sop. See **(John 13:26)**. In eating this they dipped into the dish. See **(Matthew 26:23)**. Although there were a number of different articles in the Jewish passover supper, yet the bread and wine were the substance of that supper. In the institution of the sacramental supper the Saviour took the substance (the bread and wine) from the passover supper, and used that substance in the same. The orthodox Jew would not give a farthing for the passover supper without the bread and wine, because that was the real substance of it.

Any man who knows anything at all about the meaning of words knows that wine is the fermented juice, and not the unfermented. Unfermented grape juice is not wine. Hence, for any man to say that the Saviour did not use wine is to say that the Bible lies about it. But the Bible does not lie. Hence, the man who says the Saviour did not use wine misrepresents the matter, either ignorantly or otherwise.

The Corinthians used fermented juice, or wine, in the supper. They abused the supper, and made it a drunken feast. See (I Corinthians 11:21). In partaking of the Lord's supper some of them drank to excess and were drunken. The apostle rebuked them sharply for this, but he did not reprove nor rebuke them for using the wine in the supper. He approved the use of wine in the sacramental supper, but he did not approve drunkenness, or drinking to excess, or making a drunken feast of the Lord's supper.

Wine, then, is the proper thing to use in that supper.

Again: If we substitute grape juice, or anything else, for the wine in the sacramental supper, we say by this that the Lord of glory did not know what was best to use. This would be no less than presumption, and we know that some men are very presumptuous.

Again: If we have the right to substitute grape juice for wine in the sacramental supper, we have the same right to substitute water, or anything else. We have as much right to substitute buttermilk for the wine as we do to substitute grape juice. We could more consistently substitute gravy for the wine than we could grape juice, because gravy was used in the passover supper and grape juice was not.

A Methodist might be tempted, and might take to drink, or return to it, on account of using wine in the sacramental supper, but an Old Baptist would not. The sacramental supper does not belong to the Methodists, any way. It is one of the Lord's ordinances in His house, or in His church, and was delivered to His church. "And keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you."-(I Corinthians 11:2). The Methodist society was not organised by the Lord, but by Mr. Wesley; hence it is not the Lord's church. The Old Baptist Church is the church the Lord set up, and the ordinances were delivered unto her; and hence that is where the true sacramental supper is, and it is nowhere else. The use of the wine in the observance of the Lord's supper does not cause her members to get drunk. If they get drunk it is from some other cause, and they should be dealt with. Perhaps the Methodists are afraid to use the wine. It may be a temptation to them; and it may be that they cannot resist the temptation. And if they get drunk, perhaps they cannot afford to deal with them, because they need the money they contribute. But the Old Baptists can afford to deal with any of their members who should get drunk. C. H. C.

John 3; John 14

---October 6, 1914

Brother Clinton Watkins, of Mount Vernon, Ind., requests our views of (John 3:14), which reads as follows: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up." We suppose he desires our opinion as to how, or in what way, the Son of Man was to be lifted up. Modern theologians teach that He was to be lifted up through the gospel, but this is not the teaching of the text. The serpent in the wilderness was not lifted up in the gospel, or proclamation of the law, either. It was lifted up on a pole, or tree. Even so was the Son of Man lifted up on the tree-the cross on Calvary. (**John 12:32-33**), says: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This He said, signifying what death He should die." This proves very clearly that the "lifting up" of the Son of Man had reference to His being lifted up on the cross. This was for the benefit of His people, who are called believers. C. H. C.

Revelation 22:18-19

---October 13, 1914

In another column will be found a request from Elder G. E. Mayfield, of Elgin, Oregon, for our views on (**Revelation 22:18-19**), which reads as follows: "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

To add to is to engage in things religiously which God has not commanded, and if we do that, and we are His children, He will visit us with the plagues which are written therein. These things are to His children, even to the church, for (Revelation 22:16) says, "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches." They have no reference to the eternal happiness of God's children beyond this vale of tears, but these things have much to do with their happiness here in this life.

To take away from these things is to fail to do the things which the Lord has commanded and which He requires of His children in rendering service unto Him. If we fail to do what He teaches us He takes away His blessings from us which He has promised those who walk in obedience unto Him. The holy city is the church -for there is where the testimony of these things is placed. Hence they lose the fellowship of the church by failing to do what the Lord commands, and they lose the blessings of the manifest presence of the Lord. C. H. C.

On A Tour

---October 13, 1914

We left home on Thursday, August 6, at 4 o'clock p. m. with a heavy heart. We could but wonder if the Lord was in the matter. We arrived in Stevenson, Ala., in the night, and attended the Sequachee Valley Association held with the church near the town on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, August 7, 8 and 9. A large crowd was present most every day, though many were kept away on account of rain. Several brethren in the ministry were present. We would like to give their names, but might overlook some, so we will not give the names of any. The preaching was all a unit, and fellowship seemed to abound. It was an enjoyable meeting.

After the association adjourned we filled appointments as follows: At Jasper, Tenn., on Monday night, Lookout Valley on Tuesday, and in Chattanooga Tuesday night. These meetings were pleasant. Elder A. J. McWhirter, of Eagleville, Tenn., was with us at Lookout Valley and Chattanooga. On Wednesday morning we left Chattanooga in company with Elders R. O. Raulston and A. J. McWhirter for Knoxville, Tenn., where we tried to preach that night. On Friday morning we went to Noeton, Tenn., in company with many others, to attend the Powell's Valley Association. Several ministers were in attendance, but we failed to note their names, and we do not remember the names of some of them, so will not give any names. It was an enjoyable meeting. Love and fellowship abounded, and the preaching was all a unit. There was not a discordant note sounded.

On Monday morning we went to Bluffton, Tenn., in company with Elder W. C. McMillon, son of Elder Samuel McMillon, to fill an appointment at Bethany Church on Tuesday. A very good congregation was present and the meeting was pleasant. We also had service at night. On Wednesday we went to Barnard, N. C, Elder McMillon accompanying us, where we had an appointment for Thursday, near there. The meeting at this church was also a pleasant one.

On Friday we went to Salisbury, N. C, arriving there about 8 o'clock that night. We were at the Abbotts Creek Association, which convened with the church in Salisbury on Saturday, Sunday and Monday, August 22, 23 and 24. A large crowd was at this meeting. Twenty four brethren in the ministry were in attendance, several of whom we had never met before, among whom were Elders P. D. Gold, of Wilson, N. C, editor of Zion's Landmark, Joshua Rowe, of Baltimore, Md., and J. A. Ashburn, of Winston-Salem, N. C. We would be glad to give the names of the ministers present, but cannot do so, as we did not make a note of their names.

This was a glorious meeting-one we shall not soon forget. Love and fellowship was manifested throughout. The preaching was all of a oneness, and no spirit of envy or

strife was manifested. From the Abbotts Creek Association we filled appointments as arranged for us by Elder W. C. McMillon at High Point, Pine, Abbotts Creek, Linnville Union, Winston-Salem, and Walnut Cove. Then we filled appointments, as arranged by Elder A. L. Moore, at Martinsville, Riverview, Reedy Creek, Ridgeway, Friendship, Axton, Goodwill, Spray, Cascade, Danville, Wolf Island, Reidsville, Burlington, and Durham. The day for the meeting at Cascade was rainy, so that only four or five were present. We were at Ridgeway two days-Saturday and Sunday.

The congregation was small at Reedy Creek also. The congregations were good at nearly all the other appointments. At Danville a sister came to the church asking for a home with them there. She was received, and her baptism appointed to be attended to at their next regular meeting. We met several brethren in the ministry but did not make any note of their names, and cannot call the names of all of them to mind now. From Durham we went to the Seven Mile Association at Reedy Prong Church, near Benson, on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, September 18, 19, 20. Several brethren in the ministry were present at this meeting, and a large crowd attended. It was another sweet meeting. The preaching was all a unit, and love and fellowship was manifested throughout the entire meeting.

From the Seven Mile Association we filled appointments at Oak Forest, Four Oaks, Hannah's Creek, Benson, and Bethsaida. The congregations were good and the meetings were pleasant at all these places. Elder J. E. Adams was with us at each place, and on to Angier. We appreciated his company very much.

Then we attended the Little River Association at Coats, N. C., on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, September 25, 26, 27. The following visiting ministers were present: P. D. Gold, T. B. Lancaster, J. T. Collier, J. W. Gardner, Thos. Bell, J. F. Farmer, C. A. Davis, J. T. Spencer, W. G. Turner, Bernice Wood, and C. H. Cayce, and Licentiate I S. Smith and J. W. Proctor. Their home ministers present were Elders T. F. Pierce, J. A. T. Jones, J. T. Coats, J. E. Adams, J. H. Johnston, W. A. Simpkins, A. D. Johnston, G. W. Stephenson, L. H. Stephenson, and W. M. Monsees. Friday was a rainy day and the attendance was small, but on Saturday and Sunday the attendance was large. It was estimated that from 5,000 to 8,000 people were present on Sunday. The order was extremely good, considering the fact that the crowd was so large. The preaching was all a unit at this meeting, as at the others, and love flowed from heart to heart. All seemed to be of one mind and sentiment. It was a pleasant meeting, indeed. Elder J. T. Coats is the moderator, and this place is his home. He enjoyed the meeting very much and took great pleasure in entertaining the brethren in his home, as also did many others. The entertainment provided could not have been better.

Every thing tended to make the meeting an enjoyable one and the Lord's sweet presence was manifested. From this association we went to Angier on Monday, accompanied by Elder J. F. Farmer, where we had meeting on that day and at night. Elder J. E. Adams was also present, and he and Elder Farmer preached at night. Elder Farmer is the pastor of the church, and is much beloved by the brethren. The meetings at Angier were sweet and delightful. From Angier we went to Willow Spring, and met a lovely band of faithful brethren. The meeting was pleasant at this place. From Willow Spring we came to Raleigh on Wednesday morning, the home of Elder W. A. Simpkins, and had meeting in the day and also at night. Elder Farmer came and was with us here. The

meetings were pleasant both morning and evening, and the brethren and sisters heartily endorsed our feeble efforts to speak in the name of the Master.

The tour has been pleasant to us to the present. At each place we have been heartily received and the brethren have all been good to us-much better than we feel to be worthy of. Today (Thursday, October 1) we are at the home of Elder W. A. Simpkins, in Raleigh. We expect to go from here to the Bear Creek Association.

When we reach home we will write concerning the remainder of the trip. We expect to return home in two weeks from this writing-in time to attend our home association. May the Lord's rich blessings rest upon all whom we have met and who so kindly administered to us on our journey, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Question Of Order

---October 20, 1914

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-Your view is requested through The Primitive Baptist on order. I will state a case so that you may see the point for consideration. A brother was charged with a wrong in conference. The one charged denied the charge and demanded the proof, and proposed to acknowledge the wrong and ask forgiveness if the proof was produced. There was a failure in producing the proof. The proposition to "acknowledge the wrong and ask forgiveness" was utterly disregarded. It has been repeated, and efforts made to get them to terms of reconciliation. All efforts are a failure. So the question is, What is the order of that church? Did they disregard the discipline of the Bible? We hope to see a reply from you soon. It is important to more than the writer. Yours in hope, W. M. McCain. R. 1, Bellville, Ark.

OUR REPLY

The brother who was under charge has made a mistake, whether guilty of the charge or not. Although he denied the charge and demanded the proof, yet he proposed to acknowledge the charge and ask forgiveness for the wrong, provided he was proven guilty. That proposition is a virtual acknowledgment of his guilt, and at the same time it virtually says he is not sorry of his guilt, unless his guilt is proven.

On the other hand, if he is innocent, the proposition says he will acknowledge that he is guilty, if it is proven on him, although he is innocent. A false charge might be proven. If he is innocent, then the charge was false. If the charge had been proven his proposition was that he would acknowledge it, although he was innocent. Thus, he proposed to acknowledge that a false charge was true, provided it was proven. The brother has placed himself in a dilemma, and our judgment is that he should withdraw his proposition, confess his wrong in making it, and ask forgiveness for the same. C. H. C.

Tour In North Carolina

---October 27, 1914

In our issue of October 13 we gave an account of our tour in North Carolina up to October 1st, and promised to write a brief account of the remainder of the trip after returning home. We will now try to comply with the promise. We left Raleigh on Friday morning, October 2, for Peachland to attend the Bear Creek Association. We were met at the train by Brother J. W. Jones, the clerk of the association, and conveyed to his

home, where we spent the night. Saturday and Sunday were both rainy days so that the congregations were small at the association on both days.

The congregation was larger on Monday, but not near so many people were there as would have been had the weather been favorable. Notwithstanding the fact that the weather was so unfavorable, the meeting was good, and was enjoyed by all who were there. The following brethren in the ministry were present at the meeting: Elders J. F. Mills, W. T. Mills, W. T. Broadway, H. Taylor, B. L. Treece, W. R. Helms, J. E. Williams, H. M. Williams, W. C. Edwards, B. H. Harrelson, Samuel McMillon and the writer. Elder Mills is the moderator, and is highly esteemed by the brethren. Two sisters came forward on Monday and asked for a home with the church there, and they were gladly received.

After the association we filled appointments at High Hill on Tuesday; Wingate, Tuesday night; Pleasant Grove, Wednesday; Wadesboro, Wednesday night, Albemarle, Thursday; Lexington, Thursday night. Elder McMillon was with us at all these appointments, and did everything in his power to make the trip pleasant for us. Elders Taylor, Mills, Edwards, Treece, and Williams were also with us at some of the places. At most of the places the congregations were large and attentive, and the meetings were all pleasant.

From Lexington we went to Greensboro on Friday, where we had meeting at night. At this place we met Elders G. O. Key and J. R. Crews, who were on their way to the Salem Association. The meeting was a pleasant one, and the brethren seemed to enjoy our feeble efforts to speak in the name of the Master. On Saturday morning we went to Burlington to attend the meeting of the Salem Association, which was held on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, embracing the second Sunday in October.

The following brethren in the ministry were present at the meeting: Elders P. W. Williard, J. A. Ashburn, C. A. Davis, Samuel McMillon, S. P. Terry, W. C. Jones, W. A. Gourley, J. M. Crews, A. M. Denny, G. O. Key, A. G. Morton, J. F. Spangler, B. F. McKinney, J. R. Crews, and the writer; and also the following licentiate ministers were present: W. P. Matthews, J. W. Gilliam, Jr., T. A. Stanfield, Albert Page, and R. E. Adams. Elder Williard is the moderator of the association, and is highly esteemed. Brother W. L. Teague, of Winston-Salem, is the clerk, and Elder J. A. Ashburn, of Winston-Salem, is assistant clerk. The business sessions were held in a hall which was furnished free. The preaching services were held in a large warehouse which was also furnished free. The places were conveniently located, and large crowds were at each service, and the order was good. The people gave good attention to the preaching and the Lord's presence was manifested. It was another good meeting.

On Monday afternoon we bade farewell to Elder McMillon, who had been with us so much, and to his companion and daughter, and others who were there, and left for High Point with Mr. Greer, who is a good Old Baptist in sentiment, and who conveyed us in his car to that place, where we boarded a train for Salisbury to meet an appointment that night. We were met there at 7:20 and conveyed to the meeting house, where quite a number had gathered for the meeting. We were again kindly received by these good people. We spent the night with Brother C. B. Owen and his kind family, and on Tuesday morning we bade them farewell and started for home. We reached home safely

at noon on Wednesday, October 14, and found all as well as we had expected, for which we hope we feel thankful to the Lord.

The trip was a pleasant one to us in many ways. We had the privilege of meeting many brethren we had never met, and perhaps many of them we will never meet again in this life. They were all kind and good to us. We feel that they were much better to us than we deserve. We humbly trust that our visit among them will not result in harm to them. Their great kindness to us will not be forgotten. We may forget the names of many of them, but we will not forget their tender care for us. May the dear Lord shower down His rich blessings upon them, is our humble prayer. We humbly ask all the dear brethren, sisters and friends to kindly remember us at a throne of grace. C. H. C.

Matthew 25:1-13

---November 10, 1914

Several parties have asked our views on (Matthew 25:1-13), which is the parable of the ten virgins. There is a difference among the brethren concerning the teaching of this parable, and we cannot understand why brethren insist on having differences discussed, when those differences are not vital. One brother has written us rather harshly because we have not replied to his request on this Scripture as he thought we should. We would like for him, and some others, to occupy our position a little while. They might then be in a position to exercise a little more patience.

Now, we will give just a few of our thoughts in connection with this parable. We do not set up our views as standard; neither are we going to allow any discussion of differences in our columns. Controversies tend to widen differences, for a wrong spirit is nearly always manifested.

The word then, the first word in the chapter, is used here in the sense of therefore. It denotes a reason; for this reason "shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins."

The kingdom of heaven is likened unto ten virgins, not likened unto five virgins. Five of the virgins were wise and five of them were foolish; and the kingdom of heaven was likened unto all of the ten. They all slumbered and slept-both the wise and the foolish. At midnight the cry was made, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh." Midnight denotes a time of darkness, and all were slumbering. So, at the closing out of the law dispensation, at the time of the coming of Christ into the world, it was a time of darkness-gross darkness-and all were slumbering.

The foolish said, "Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out"-or, "our lamps are going out." Their lamps had been burning once; but they are going out now. There was a light in law worship and law service in the law dispensation; but as the law dispensation is going out, the light of that worship and service is also going out. The light was only a borrowed light, it is true; but it was needed then. In the night time, we need the light of the moon, which is a borrowed light; but when the day has come, and the sun has risen, the light of the moon is not needed, and goes out. The day of gospel worship has now come; the sun of gospel light is shining; the light of law worship is no longer needed, and it has gone out. "

But the wise said, Not so; lest there be not enough for us and you: but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves." We do not presume that the wise virgins would tell the foolish ones to go and buy that which was necessary for them to have in order that they have a home in heaven. The grace of God in the eternal salvation of poor sinners is not for sale. If it is, we cannot imagine who keeps a supply on hand for sale. But there is something for sale without money and without price. See **((5:1) (Isaiah 55:1-2)**: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.

Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness." This language was addressed to Israel, the Lord's children. There was something they could buy; but they could not buy redemption or regeneration. Again, **(Revelation 3:18)**: "I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see."

This language was for the church at Laodicea! They were the people of God. There was something for them to buy; and they could buy it in no other way than in rendering the service to the Lord which He required of them, and in being diligent in the same. The Lord does not require law worship or service; but He requires gospel worship and service. The light of law worship and law service has gone out.

"And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut." The readiness here, we think, is the engaging in the gospel worship and service. The door is shut on law worship and law service. That is closed out. It is not admitted in the gospel kingdom or church of Christ. The Lord has closed the door against that, and no man has the power or authority to open the door and admit law worship and law service into the church.

"Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not." He does not recognize law service. The light of that service has gone out. He now requires gospel service. Law worship and law service is not acceptable to Him. Those who engage in that kind of service are not recognized by Him. He will not receive them or their service. If the church engages in it, the candlestick will be removed.

"Watch therefore." For the reason that all this is true, we should watch. How necessary it is that we watch, and not engage in law worship and law service. If we do engage in such, we may be assured of the fact that the Lord will not recognize it, and that He will not receive us into the manifestation of His presence here. "For ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." He comes in the manifestation of His Spirit often; we know not when He will thus come. We should be diligent in rendering the service He requires, so we may be ready for Him when He does thus come. "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be."-(Revelation 22:12). He comes quickly, or often.

The final and great lesson taught in the parable is that we should watch. It teaches the necessity of doing this. The reason for doing this is that the law dispensation is at an end, and the light of the law worship and law service was going out. Hence, the great lesson taught is the closing out of the law dispensation, law worship and service, and the ushering in of the gospel dispensation, gospel worship and service. Now, in closing, we only ask our readers to consider the thoughts we have given. If they are not in harmony with the Bible, do not receive them. We do not want, and neither will we have, controversy on the matter. We give our views only because so many have requested us to do so. C. H. C.

Hebrews 5:9; John 3; John 5; Revelation 22:14

---November 10, 1914

Brother W. H. Butler, of Woodville, Ala., requests our views of **(Hebrews 5:9); (John 3:5)**, and **(Revelation 22:14)**, and says, "We have a Campbellite here who claims that the Primitive Baptists cannot harmonise these Scriptures." Brother Butler, why did you not harmonize them for him? Or, rather, why did you not show him that they are in harmony with the doctrine of the Primitive Baptists? So far as the passages are concerned, they already harmonize, and the doctrine taught by the Primitive Baptists is not contradicted by them.

(Hebrews 5:9) reads: "And being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him." This text does not say that none are saved only those who obey Him. No gospel service is acceptable to the Lord unless it is rendered from a principle of love. No one will deny this. See (I Corinthians 13:1-4). "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God."-

reads: "And being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him." This text does not say that none are saved only those who obey Him. No gospel service is acceptable to the Lord unless it is rendered from a principle of love. No one will deny this. See (I Corinthians 13:1-4). "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God."-**(I John 4:7).**

Therefore, everyone that renders acceptable service to God has been born of God. The service he renders proves that he has been born of God. Hence, it is true that the one who renders acceptable service to God will be saved-not because he renders the service, but because he has been born of God. But some will be saved who do not obey. Infants and idiots will be saved, but they do not obey. If the Campbellite says none will be saved only those who obey Him, then he denies that infants and idiots will be saved. Jesus was made perfect, and became the author of eternal salvation. If He was, and is, perfect, then He does not fail to save any whose salvation He undertakes. Hence, He saves all that He desires to save. He saves all that the Father gave Him. He is perfect, and His work is perfect. Hence He makes no failures.

(John 3:5) reads: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The Saviour, in this text and the connection, is treating upon the subject of the new birth. To be born again, or from above, is to be born of water and the Spirit. The Greek word kai, from which the word and is here translated, may also be correctly

translated even. The text, then, means the same as "Except a man be born of water, even the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The water is the cleansing work of the Spirit which is performed in regeneration. Baptism is a work; but the apostle says, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."

reads: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The Saviour, in this text and the connection, is treating upon the subject of the new birth. To be born again, or from above, is to be born of water and the Spirit. The Greek word kai, from which the word and is here translated, may also be correctly translated even. The text, then, means the same as "Except a man be born of water, even the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The water is the cleansing work of the Spirit which is performed in regeneration. Baptism is a work; but the apostle says, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."

They are not saved by any righteous work which they have done. It is by the cleansing and renewing work of the Holy Spirit. This washing or cleansing is not an outward work, but an inward cleansing-an inward washing. The water, then, in **(John 3:5)**, is not the natural water, but is the inward work of the Holy Spirit.

(Revelation 22:14) says: "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." The city is the visible organized kingdom of God here on earth-the Old Baptist Church. It was represented by the land of Canaan. The land of Canaan belonged to the Jews-the Israelites. It was theirs by gift and by birth. The land flowed with milk and honey. The Israelites enjoyed the blessings of that land by walking in obedience to the Lord's commands. They did not become Israelites by obedience, but they enjoyed the blessings of the land by obedience. So, the church of God belongs to spiritual Israel.

says: "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." The city is the visible organized kingdom of God here on earth-the Old Baptist Church. It was represented by the land of Canaan. The land of Canaan belonged to the Jews-the Israelites. It was theirs by gift and by birth. The land flowed with milk and honey. The Israelites enjoyed the blessings of that land by walking in obedience to the Lord's commands. They did not become Israelites by obedience, but they enjoyed the blessings of the land by obedience. So, the church of God belongs to spiritual Israel.

It is theirs by gift and by birth; but they enjoy the blessings therein by obedience to the Lord. They have no right to live in the church if they walk in disobedience. When walking in obedience the Lord's children have a right in the church and enjoy the blessings therein. C. H. C.

Unknown Tongues

---November 17, 1914

Brother Isaiah Freeman, of Dick, Miss., requests our view concerning the unknown tongues mentioned in (I Corinthians 14). They have especial or direct reference to speaking in the Hebrew language; and the teaching is that they were not to do this (speak in an unknown language) unless there be one present to interpret the language spoken so that the hearers could understand and be benefitted thereby. It had no reference to the modern fanaticism of some who claim to speak in an unknown tongue. C. H. C.

Matthew 19:24

---November 17, 1914

S. J. Blood worth, of Columbus, Ga., requests our views on (**Matthew 19:24**), which reads, "And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." What gave rise to this statement was the young man going to the Saviour and saying unto Him, "What good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" The man expected to go to heaven by his good works. He claimed that he had kept the law; but the Saviour tried Him on that platform and showed that he had not kept it. No one can get eternal life by doing good works, or by keeping the law. It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a man to be saved that way. Hence, it is utterly impossible for one to be saved in heaven by doing good works. It is utterly impossible, therefore, for the Arminian doctrine to be true. C. H. C.

Pinkstaff and Kirkland

---November 24, 1914

We have received several letters asking us about Elder W. A. Pinkstaff and Elder J. J. Kirkland, who are on a tour among the Progressives in Georgia. One letter said, "It seems to me that I saw some instrument which this elder signed, and published in your paper, agreeing to cease his labors among the Progressives. Is that true?" Having received so many inquiries, we have thought it proper for us to make the following statement: Elder Pinkstaff did sign an agreement that he would cease affiliation with the Progressives. On the strength of that agreement we made appointments for Elder Pinkstaff in our country some time ago.

After the appointments were made we received information that he was still considered a Progressive in the section of Illinois where he had been living for some time. After he filled those appointments he wrote us requesting us to make appointments for him again. We wrote him under date of August 20, 1913, that we could not make them unless he would come out plainly on some points, which he refused to do. A letter had been published in the Pilgrim's Banner from him. We asked him about that. Here are some extracts from his reply, dated August 24, 1913:

I agreed when Brother...and I came together that I would discontinue all affiliations with those people. It was published in your paper. I have had nothing to do with them since. I think I have said enough for the Baptists to understand my attitude in this matter. I have nothing more to say in regard to this matter. I wrote to Brother Barwick

regarding his prices for advertising, and in the letter told him of our meeting, and he published it of his own accord. He is the only man I have written to. He told me I did right in signing the agreement; advised me to work for peace among the churches. I have kept our agreement to the letter. I still stand there. I judge from your letter that I am not worthy of your fellowship, and that of the precious saints of God I met and who so heartily endorsed what I preached when I was with them last spring; therefore I am perfectly willing to drop the matter and to forever remain out of your presence. Your letter breathes lack of confidence in me, distrust, and a desire that I remain from your association...Yours in hope, W. A. Pinkstaff.

We sent the following reply under date of September 1, 1913: "Dear Brother-Yours of August 24th has been received. In reply will say that your explanation concerning your letter in the Banner is satisfactory. But other matters are not satisfactory. Now, I want to tell you that I did not write the letter because of animosity, or ill feeling toward you. I trust that I was trying to act faithfully toward you, yet you seem to take exceptions. I was sorry I could not be at home when you were here, for I wanted to talk to you on some of these matters. My mother did talk to you and told you what she thought and how the Baptists in this section stand, and you know they were afraid of you.

Concerning the Progressive move, our people, as you know, are opposed to it; and they will not heartily receive you, unless you come out plainly and renounce the same. It is true that you signed an agreement with, but our people want to know if you are really in sympathy with that move, or are you really in sympathy with those who oppose it. Now, you can very easily settle the matter by saying plainly how you stand in the premises." Elder Pinkstaff has failed to come out on the matters referred to in the correspondence; and we refused to make appointments for him in our section last fall. Other brethren have done the same thing. We visited the section last fall where Elder Pinkstaff has been living and preaching. Our people there do not recognize him.

He and another elder caused division in some churches there, and Elder Pinkstaff was pastor of one or two of those factions when we were in that section. He has not visited our churches since the spring of 1913, and we would not have made the appointments for him then had we known what we learned afterward. But his present visit among the Progressives in Georgia shows where his sympathy is. We have a card from Elder Hanks also stating that Elder J. J. Kirkland is also in that country among the Progressives. Well, we suppose that is all right. He has no recognition with the Primitive Baptists of this country, or any other denomination. C. H. C.

Questions on Order

---November 24, 1914

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I ask the following questions for information, and I want you to answer them through your paper. Please give an explanation on them as soon as you can. 1st. If a church receives and allows a heretic to preach in her stand, or allows a disorderly man to preach in her stand, or if she depart from the faith, or if she goes into disorder, or becomes so confused that her sister churches do not feel willing to tolerate her conduct-if one or more sister churches withdraw from such a church without taking up labor with her as the eighteenth chapter of Matthew teaches, would it be disorder, or wrong,

on the part of the withdrawing churches? 2nd. In the case of churches, does the Bible justify any labor as official labor only labor done by sister churches? 3rd. If in the case of churches the rule in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew is the only rule by which a church can withdraw from an erring church, if the sister churches fail to labor with the erring church, are they not disobedient churches, and become equally guilty with the erring church? 4th. If in the case of churches the eighteenth chapter of Matthew is the rule to go by, ought we to confine such labors to churches composing an association, and thus let an associational line figure in such cases? 5th. If in the case of churches the eighteenth chapter of Matthew is the rule to go by, and a church commits just any sort of a disorderly act, is she supposed to be in order until said rule is applied to her case and she is announced in disorder by sister churches which applied said rule? 6th. Was this the general practice of the Baptists before our time? Yours for the truth, C. B. Bowlin. R. 1, Laurel, Miss.

OUR REPLY

In answer to question one will say that a church may allow a heretic or disorderly man to preach in her stand on account of being ignorant of the man's heresy or disorder. If a church departs from the faith, she may lose her identity as a gospel church even if she is never labored with by sister churches. However, it is right and proper that sister churches should labor with her, or try to do so, to reclaim her from her error. A portion of a church may depart from the faith (either a minority or a majority) and those who maintain the true order may bestow labor on those who have departed, and failing to reclaim them, they may withdraw from them. In such case the true gospel order remains with the party who has contended for the true order of the church, no matter whether other churches have bestowed labor or not. 2nd. That depends upon circumstances. If a whole church should depart from the faith, official labor is that bestowed by sister churches. 3rd. It is certainly true that if the eighteenth chapter of Matthew is the only rule to govern in the case of erring churches, then if the sister churches fail to bestow labor, they would become offenders themselves. 4th. We do not think associational lines should control such matters. Associations are not higher courts. 5th. This depends upon circumstances. If the eighteenth chapter of Matthew is the rule to go by, and a church is in order until sister churches bestow labor and announce her disorder, then many of the churches identified with the Missionary Baptists today are in order, for there were many churches that went with the Missionaries in the division that were not officially labored with. They simply departed from the faith, and our churches declared against such departures in a general way. Not only is this true regarding the modern missionary movement and trouble, but it is true in regard to other departures along the line. 6th. The answer to question 5 answers this question also. C. H. C.

Hebrews 10:38-39

---December 1, 1914

Brother W. P. Rawls, of Monroeville, Ala., requests our views of ((0:38) (Hebrews 10:38-39), which reads, "Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition: but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." "The just shall live by faith." God's people live by faith. They walk by faith, and not by sight. They embrace

the sweet promises of God by faith. They do not die, but live. "The life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me."-(Galatians 2:20). If God's children draw back, and refuse to walk as the Lord requires, and fail to obey Him, they do not please Him.

He has no pleasure in their disobedience. They may draw back, and live in disobedience to their Lord and Master, but they are not utterly cast down, for the Lord upholds them with His hand. Hence, they "are not of them that draw back unto perdition." C. H. C.

Jonah 3:10

---December 1, 1914

Brother J. C. Davis, of Atmore, Ala., has requested our views of ((0) (Jonah 3:10), which reads as follows: "And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil, that He had said that He would do unto them, and He did it not." We gave our views on this question not long since; but will say that the repentance here is not as man repents. The Lord does not change. See (Malachi 3:6). The Lord threatened destruction upon the city of Nineveh for their wickedness, and when Jonah began proclaiming the same, the king proclaimed a fast, and the inhabitants of the city turned from their evil ways and cried unto the Lord. Then the evil, or destruction, with which the Lord had threatened them, was withheld, and in this sense the Lord "repented of the evil, that He had said that He would do unto them." This was in perfect harmony with His law as expressed in ((8:21) (Ezekiel 18:21), "But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die." C. H. C.

Apostasy

---December 1, 1914

Under the above heading, Curtis Porter, in the Christian Pilot, argues that the children of Israel who fell in the wilderness (23,000 in one day) all went to hell. This only shows ignorance, for all who know anything about the Scriptural account of the matter know that it was a temporal destruction, and that not a word is said about them being sent to hell. But that is the way these fellows prove their doctrine-they do not prove it at all. He says: "If Baptist doctrine is true on this subject the devil is the biggest fool I ever heard of, for he has been trying for 6,000 years to get a child of God, and if he has not succeeded he is a fool for not quitting." Well, we will agree with the gentleman that the devil is a fool; if he were not a fool he would have learned before this time that he could not get one of the Lord's children, and would quit trying. But, behold! the devil is not the only fool living. The devil has not learned the truth-that the Lord will not let him have one of His children; and Mr. Porter has not learned it, either. It seems that the devil and Mr. Porter agree. "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

According to Mr. Porter the devil got 23,000 of the Lord's children in one day. If he did do that, he got them because the Lord did not want them, or else it was because the Lord could not prevent it. It certainly could not have been because the Lord did not want them; and the devil also wanted them, and the devil got them; he had power to take

them in spite of the Lord-the Lord could not prevent it. Then, if the Lord could not prevent the devil getting these, neither could He prevent the devil getting any others he might want. Hence, the devil will get all he wants, but the Lord will only get what the devil will not have. Those who are saved are saved because the devil won't have them. Oh, beautiful theme! Oh, glorious Campbellism! Praise the devil for salvation! C. H. C.

1 Peter 2:8

---December 8, 1914

Brother W. J. Pitts, of Forreton, Texas, requests our views of ((Pet 2:8) (I Peter 2:8), which reads, "And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offense, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed." We suppose the clause, "whereunto also they were appointed," is what he desires our opinion upon. The real meaning of the text is that they who were disobedient were appointed to stumble at the word. God's appointment is that those who are disobedient, in a state of unregeneracy, stumble at the word. C. H. C.

Views Given

---December 8, 1914

Brother R. L. Dickerson, of Falkner, Miss., requests our views on several passages. We haven't time or space for lengthy comments, but will offer a few thoughts on the passages as follows:

(Genesis 6:5-6,7)This text reads: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him at His heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them." This text is in line with one upon which we gave our views not long since concerning Nineveh. The same remarks will apply to this text. The Lord expressly declares in that He does not change. He does not repent as man repents. It is His will and according to His law that He punish man for his sins. Hence, according to His law He punished the people of the old world for their sins. This does not show a change in the Lord, but shows that He does not change.

This text reads: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him at His heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them." This text is in line with one upon which we gave our views not long since concerning Nineveh. The same remarks will apply to this text. The Lord expressly declares in **(Malachi 3:6)** that He does not change. He does not repent as man repents. It is His will and according to His law that He punish man for his sins. Hence, according to His law He punished the people of the old world for their sins. This does not show a change in the Lord, but shows that He does not change.

((2) (Matthew 8:22) This text says: "But Jesus said unto him, Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead." One of His disciples had said, "Suffer me first to go and bury my father." This teaches, simply, that the child of God should not let anyone, not even the earthly father, come in between him and the service of God. The service of God should be first. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness."

This text says: "But Jesus said unto him, Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead." One of His disciples had said, "Suffer me first to go and bury my father." This teaches, simply, that the child of God should not let anyone, not even the earthly father, come in between him and the service of God. The service of God should be first. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness."

((26) (Luke 14:26) This text says: "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." This teaches that the child of God should not allow anyone to come between him and the service of God. He must love God more than all others-even more than he loves his own life-in order that he be a true and faithful follower of the Lord.

This text says: "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." This teaches that the child of God should not allow anyone to come between him and the service of God. He must love God more than all others-even more than he loves his own life-in order that he be a true and faithful follower of the Lord.

(John 1:18)AND says: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." says, "And I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts: but my face shall not be seen." The Lord said this to Moses. Moses was only permitted to see the Lord's glory. He was not permitted to see His face. No man can see His face and live. But Jesus had seen the Father's face in glory. He came from God out of heaven. This no man on earth but Jesus had ever done, and no man on earth has ever yet done that. The Lord's people will see Him face to face after awhile, but they do not see Him that way while here. C. H. C.

AND **((3:23) (Exodus 33:23); (John 1:18)** says: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

((3:23) (Exodus 33:23) says, "And I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts: but my face shall not be seen." The Lord said this to Moses. Moses was only permitted to see the Lord's glory. He was not permitted to see His face. No man can see His face and live. But Jesus had seen the Father's face in glory. He came from God out of heaven. This no man on earth but Jesus had ever done, and no man on earth has ever yet done that. The Lord's people will see Him face to face after awhile, but they do not see Him that way while here. C. H. C.

Ezekiel 36:25-27

---December 8, 1914

Sister Mattie Clayton, of Hurdle Mills, N. C, requests our views of **((25) (Ezekiel 36:25-26,27)**. which reads as follows: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and

ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh.. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them."

Much could be written in connection with this text, but we haven't space to enlarge upon the subject. We have so many requests that we are compelled to give only a brief answer to each.

This text figurates or represents the Lord's work in regeneration. The sprinkling of clean water is what the Lord said He would do, and it represents a cleansing work. The Lord said He would cleanse them from their idols and from their filthiness. This He does in the work of regeneration. There is a washing, a cleansing, in regeneration. See (**Titus 3:5-6**).

In this work the Lord puts a new heart and a new spirit within the person. After regeneration one possesses a heart and a spirit which he did not have before. The Lord takes away the stony heart, and this kills the person to sin, or to the love of it. He gives a heart of flesh, and this makes the person alive unto God. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord."-(Romans 6:11). In this work the Lord puts His Spirit within the person. Hence, the Spirit of God dwells within the person who has been born from above.

This makes him a partaker of the divine nature-just as the natural birth makes him a partaker of the sinful nature. He now has two natures, and from these two natures springs his desires. On account of the two natures there is a warfare; these two natures are contrary the one to the other. From the divine nature which he possesses springs the holy and righteous desires and aspirations, and from the old or sinful nature springs the unholy and sinful desires and aspirations. If one walks in the statutes of the Lord and keeps His judgments, it is because this work of regeneration has been done for and in him. Thus, his good works, of a spiritual nature, are "fruits of faith and evidences of regeneration." C. H. C.

Questions Answered

---December 15, 1914

Sister Evie Graham, of Bethesda, Tenn., has asked us a few questions, which we will try to answer: "Are there any commandments in the Bible to the unregenerate sinner? Is there anything addressed to him that he must do in order to eternal life?" There are moral commandments in the Bible which the alien sinner is required to obey; but there is nothing which the alien or unregenerate sinner is required to do in order to be born again, or in order to receive eternal life. The moral obligations are resting upon those who have natural life; and the spiritual obligations are resting upon those who have spiritual life.

"Who is the Saviour addressing when He says, 'Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish?'" This is in (**Luke 13:3**). He was talking to the Jews. Some perished by the falling of the tower in Siloam; and these would perish like they did unless they repent. There is no intimation of eternal damnation nor eternal life in the text or context.

“Who was He addressing when He said, 'Seek ye the Lord?' This is the language of the prophet, and was addressed to Israel -the Jews. The Jews were a typical people, representing the Lord's spiritual people. The Jews had forsaken the law service which the Lord required of them as His people in the law dispensation, and they were commanded to seek the Lord. So, now, God's children often turn away from the gospel service which the Lord requires of His children in the gospel dispensation, and they should turn from that and seek the Lord. C. H. C.

Psalms 55:12-14

---December 22, 1914

Brother W. T. Fuqua, of Farmington, Ky., wrote us last January as follows: “I cannot find who David is talking to in ((5:12) (Psalms 55:12-13,14). If you have any light on the subject, please give it in our much beloved paper, The Primitive Baptist, which has been coming to my home from its infancy, and is so much comfort and satisfaction to me in my old and afflicted and shut-in days. My stay on earth will soon be over, and when I am gone you may say that old man died in the Primitive Baptist faith in full. It has been my meat and drink for about sixty years, and I am willing to die on it-just waiting.”

In the place cited by our dear old brother, David says: “For it was not an enemy that reproached me; then I could have borne it: neither was it he that hated me that did magnify himself against me; then I would have hid myself from him: but it was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company.” It appears to us that this refers to those who had proven to be false to him. They had been his friends; but had proven false. We have witnessed the same even in our day. Not only has the writer experienced this, but we are sure that Brother Fuqua has also experienced the same thing.

You have had some friends in the past that you esteemed as dear brethren in the Lord; you took sweet counsel together; you walked together in the sweet service of the Master; you enjoyed their companionship and association; but they have forsaken the right way; they have reproached the cause you love. While they had apparently been your friends for years, they turned to be your enemy as concerning the truth of the gospel and the true service of God and the church of Christ. They have turned away from all this, so that you cannot walk together now.

We do not expect anything else but opposition from those who are outside the church, and who are in avowed opposition to the truth. What they may do or say does not wound our feelings, nor hurt us. But when one in whom we have had confidence, one whom we have loved and esteemed as a brother in the Lord, turns away from the truth, and brings reproach upon the cause, it hurts us; it brings sorrow and distress to our poor hearts. The perils of false brethren is a conflict hard to endure, and it cannot be endured without bringing deep sorrow.

In commenting on this Scripture, Gill says: “And so such persons, who have walked together to the house of God and in it, have attended together on public worship, and walked together in holy fellowship; when any of these forsake the assembling of

themselves together, scoff at religion, speak evil of ordinances, reproach the saints, or persecute them, it is very shocking, cutting, and grieving indeed."

May the Lord bless these few thoughts to your good, and may His grace sustain you, dear brother, in your declining years, is our humble prayer. We have been delayed in replying to this request, as well as many others. We have so many of them that we cannot reply promptly every time. We trust Brother Fuqua will pardon the delay. C. H. C.

Romans 14:10

---December 22, 1914

Elder A. L. Ray, of Baker Hill, Ala., requests our views of (**Romans 14:10**), and asks, "When and where is the judgment seat of Christ?" The text reads: "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." It appears to us that the apostle was reproving the brethren concerning the eating of meat and herbs, and the esteeming of one day above another. It seems that some esteemed one day above another, and that others did not; and that some condemned others on this account.

This was a matter to be left to the conscience of each one, and no one should be condemned by his brother on account of his view of the matters considered here. The apostle brings to the attention of the one who would condemn his brother for these matters the fact that he must, himself, "appear before the judgment seat of Christ," and that he may be guilty of something worse than his brother whom he condemns. To our mind, the apostle is teaching the necessity of forbearance. We think that the judgment seat of Christ is in His kingdom, and His kingdom is the church-the Old Baptist Church.

"We," the apostle and the members of the church of God at Rome, "must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."-(II Corinthians 5:10). We receive here in this life the things we have done, whether good or bad. God's people receive heaven, and the blessings of immortality beyond this life, on account of what Jesus has done, and not on account of what they do or have done.

The judgment seat, then, here referred to is not beyond this life, but we must all appear there while we live in the world; and God's children stand condemned there or acquitted, according to the lives they live. Hence, we should all "take heed to ourselves." We should endeavor to examine self, and try to order our lives, try to walk uprightly before the Lord, instead of being engaged so much in trying to get the mote out of a brother's eye. C. H. C.

Matthew 16:9

---December 22, 1914

Sister Martha Daly, of Ash Grove, Mo., has asked our views on (**Matthew 16:9**), which reads, "Do ye not yet understand, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up?" What gave rise to this was that the Saviour had told them to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and the disciples thought He had

reference to natural bread or leaven, and thought the Saviour had reference to the fact that they had no bread.

In (Matthew 16:8) He says, "O ye of little faith," etc. He seems to reprove them. He calls their attention to the time that He fed five thousand upon five loaves and that they took up so many baskets full of the fragments. He is simply teaching them to beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees. The doctrine of the Pharisees is taught yet, and it becomes His children to beware of it. Sister Daly also asks if it is all national Israel that shall be saved, or is it all spiritual Israel. It is all spiritual Israel. All the Jews were not spiritual children of God. "They are not all Israel, which are of Israel: neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed."-(Romans 9:6-7,8).

She tells us that a certain party says all will go to heaven after they have been punished in hell as much as they deserve. If this be true, then no one would ever go to heaven, for if they are to be punished in hell as much as they deserve, they would never get out. But suppose they do get out, will they go to heaven all scorched up with the fires of hell? This idea is not much less, if any, than infidelity. It denies the atonement of Christ. It denies the doctrine of the imputed righteousness of Christ. It denies the Bible.

She also says someone says that no Christian has doubts, etc. Well, there must be some doubting done for everyone, and as the party referred to by the sister leaves the impression that he does no doubting for himself, then we will do his doubting for him. There must be some doubting done for him, and as he does not do it for himself, we will do it for him. John the Baptist was a child of God, and in the service of God when he baptized the Saviour, yet he afterward had serious doubts, and sent messengers to the Saviour to inquire "Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" We do not wish to encourage you, dear sister, in doubting, but as you do have them, we wish to assure you that you are in good company. C. H. C.

Luke 18:15-17

---December 22, 1914

We have been requested to give our views on **(Luke 18:16)**. (Luke 18:15-17) reads: "And they brought unto Him also infants, that He would touch them: but when His disciples saw it, they rebuked them. But Jesus called them unto Him, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whose ever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." In ((0:1) (Mark 10) it is said that "He took them up in His arms, laid His hands upon them, and blessed them." Little children, then, receive the kingdom of God, and they receive it because of the blessing which Jesus bestows. "For of such is the kingdom of God." The kingdom of God is composed of just such characters as this-of such.

"Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child." This means that a little child receives the kingdom of God, and that the adult receives it the same way that a little child does. If a little child receives the kingdom because of infantile purity, then the adult must receive it that way too. He cannot receive it

any other way only the way a little child receives it. Then, if the adult cannot receive the kingdom of God because of his infantile purity, neither does a little child receive it that way. If the adult must hear, believe and obey the conditions of the gospel in order to receive the kingdom of God, then a little child (an infant) must receive it that way too. But an infant cannot understand and obey the conditions of the gospel, and cannot, therefore, receive the kingdom of God that way.

And as the adult must receive the kingdom of God the same way that a little child does, then the adult cannot receive it by hearing, believing and obeying the conditions of the gospel. A little child receives the kingdom of God because of the blessing which Jesus bestows. For that same reason, and in the very same way, the adult also receives the kingdom of God. Both of them receive the kingdom without conditions on their part. The doctrine taught by the Old Baptists is the doctrine Jesus and the apostles taught, and is the truth. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 29

---December 22, 1914

This issue closes volume twenty nine of The Primitive Baptist. There will be only fifty one issues in this volume, as we will miss next week. Another year, with its joys and sorrows, has passed away. It is gone forever. Not one moment of the time can ever be recalled. Much of the time has not been used as well as it should have been, perhaps; but the year cannot be lived again. We are conscious of the fact that we have made many mistakes during the year 1914; but we are also conscious of the fact that the man who never made a mistake never made anything. We hope that we may be able to profit, to some extent at least, by some of the mistakes we have already made, and try to avoid them in the future, and not make them again.

But we do not expect to never make any of them again; but we are only hoping for improvement. We desire to press forward, as admonished by the apostle, forgetting the things which are behind. We do not expect, however, to attain to a state of perfection in this life; but we desire to press toward that end as near as possible. We have no regrets for the principles we have tried to advocate. We love those principles more dearly, it seems to us, if possible, as the days and years go by. We would rather wear out contending for them than to rust out. For several months times have been hard with us. We have been in a severe financial strain. We have said nothing about this, and this is all we are going to say about it here-only that our collections have been smaller than for the same time of year for many years. We hope our brethren will stand by us in this distressing time.

We have had much illness and affliction in our home during the past year. Our readers know that we had a severe attack of pneumonia last winter, and were unable to work for several months. Since then our brother-in-law (Brother H. L. Miller) has been in very poor health, and has undergone two surgical operations, and is in a hospital in Nashville, Tenn., where he had an operation performed on December 5th. We hope he will soon be able to return home. The great amount of sickness we have had has caused our expenses to be a great deal.

Notwithstanding all the sickness, sorrows, trials and afflictions, the Lord has been good to us. He has bestowed many blessings upon us, and we feel that we have been unworthy of the least of them. We still desire to render service, honor, praise and adoration unto His holy name for all His wonderful benefits.

Bidding our many readers a loving farewell for the year 1914, and wishing each one a merry Christmas and a happy New Year, we ask a continued interest in your prayers, and that you will pardon all our faults and mistakes which you may have discovered or observed in us in the past. C. H. C.

1915

IIINTRODUCTION TO VOLUME XXX

---January 5, 1915

With this issue we begin the thirtieth volume of The Primitive Baptist. Twenty nine years ago (January 1, 1886) the first issue of the paper was sent out. If we are not mistaken, about five hundred copies of that first issue were printed. Perhaps quite a number of them were given away as sample copies. While our circulation is much larger now, still it is not what we would like for it to be.

During these twenty nine years many changes have taken place. Many joys and sorrows have been experienced by our readers. But the doctrine of God our Saviour has undergone no change. Principles are eternal, and never change. There has been no change in the policy of this paper. The paper stands now upon the same platform upon which it stood at its birth. Those principles were dear to the heart of our sainted father, Elder S. F. Cayce, who fell in the pulpit proclaiming them.

He was willing to lay down his life for them, and died in the service of his Master. Those same principles were loved and cherished by our grandfather. They were loved and preached and contended for by our great-grandfather, Elder Fleming Cayce. The blessed and eternal truth of the doctrine of the eternal salvation of poor sinners of Adam's race by the sovereign, free, rich, and reigning grace of God has cheered the hearts of our fathers in every age. This is the only doctrine that can comfort the heart of a poor sinner in a dying hour. It was good enough for our fathers, and it is good enough for us. We are perfectly satisfied with the principles we have contended for in the past. We are not satisfied with our efforts. They have been poor; we have made many failures, and many mistakes. But we can say that we enter the new year and the new volume of this paper with a renewed determination to still continue to contend for the same principles. We desire to "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." That faith is the doctrine believed and advocated by the Primitive or Old School Baptists.

We have tried to keep controversy out of The Primitive Baptist. It is our purpose to continue on that line. While the brethren in some sections are "striving over words to no profit," and are in strife and confusion, we have tried to keep it all out of our columns. We have been censured, sometimes very severely, because we would not admit of it; but we have tried to adhere to that course and to that decision-not to admit of it. If we

cannot help to settle a trouble, we do not desire to help spread it and make it worse. Hence, we are still determined to keep such out of

The Primitive Baptist, as much as possible. Other papers may be started for a war, but we do not desire to see so much war in our own ranks, especially a war that is uncalled for. We are ready, we think, to fight a heresy; but we are not willing to engage in a war where brethren are biting and devouring each other. We would be glad to see perfect peace and harmony restored in all the borders of our beloved Zion. We should all exercise more forbearance and Christian love and charity toward each other.

We should not make a brother an offender for a word. Local troubles, which can concern only those in the locality of the trouble, should not be published broadcast and heralded to the world. To do this, or to attempt to do so, is to manifest a wrong spirit. It is not the spirit of love. "Charity hides a multitude of sins." Charity does not publish the failures or wrongs of a brother broadcast to the world. Sometimes it becomes necessary to notify the brethren generally that some person is in disorder at home, because he imposes himself on brethren where his true standing is not known. This is necessary for the protection of the brethren. Then, when one is in disorder and the brethren are warned of the fact, they should let that disorderly person severely alone, no matter how much they may think of him-no matter how well they think he can preach.

Some men sometimes seem to preach very ably, and yet their lives are not what they should be-they are not orderly in their walk. Their feet are not "beautiful," because they do not walk right. We know of some such men, who are not recognized by the brethren at home, and yet are received by the brethren in other places. This is wrong, and there is absolutely no excuse for it. It is a flagrant violation of every principle of right and true discipline. For instance, we are informed that some brethren in a portion of Alabama receive and recognize a party who has no recognition at all with our people in his home section; and notice has been given, too, of the person's disorder. If those brethren in Alabama should exclude a man for immoral conduct, or for any other reason, they would not expect the brethren in any other section to recognize that excluded man. They would expect the brethren to recognize and respect their act. Then, they should do the same thing. If the brethren who are doing this do not know who we are having reference to, we are mistaken. A hint to the wise should be sufficient. Enough has been said in this paper already for them to know who we refer to. We hope the brethren will stop this at once, as we do not wish to make it public what brethren are thus disregarding the discipline of the Lord's house. The Primitive Baptist is being published in defense of the Primitive or Old School Baptist cause, and we desire to publish just what is for the benefit and advancement of that cause.

What we judge not to be for the advancement of that cause, we desire to leave out of our columns. Hence we have often requested the brethren to stop sending articles to us for the paper concerning their local church troubles. This does not mean for you to send them to us. Some brethren have seemed to think when we make this request that we mean for them to send them to us, that we want as many of such items as we can get; for such items have sometimes been sent immediately after the request was made. Now, we mean what we say. We do not want them, and we will not publish them knowingly, and will pay no more attention to them.

You need not send them to us and ask us to return them if not published. They will not be published nor returned, but will be thrown into the wastebasket and destroyed as soon as received. This is plain language, we know, but we suppose it can be understood, and it seems that we have to be plain. We hope the brethren and sisters will continue to write for the paper on such matters as will be for the mutual comfort, instruction, benefit, and encouragement of the many readers of The Primitive Baptist. Try to make your letters brief and to the point. Tell what you have to say in as few words as possible. A long article is not necessarily an able one or a good one. Do not write a long article just because you think it has to be long in order to be good. The best article is usually the one that says the most in the fewest words. The short, pointed, articles are the ones which are read with the most interest.

If you write an article and it does not appear in the paper in a week or two, please do not write and ask us why we have not published it. It only puts us to trouble to search for the article, and then to lose the time to write that perhaps the article has not reached its turn. We are now nearly, or about, three months behind in publishing letters we have for the paper, and we have some articles much older than that which we desire to publish as soon as we can. We desire to publish obituaries, church news, items concerning good meetings, accounts of tours, and such items of news as soon as possible. We do not wish items of that kind to be delayed in appearing in the paper, but sometimes we cannot give them space as early as we would like. We try to do the best we can along that line.

Again, do not become discouraged and quit writing if you send a letter that is not published. We have many articles we would like to publish if we had the space. Remember that the more articles we have on hand to select from, the better paper we can give you. We trust that some of our corresponding editors will do more writing for the paper this year than they have been doing. Some of them have done very well, while others have done practically nothing in this respect. We trust they will do better. We also expect to do more writing, if our health and circumstances will permit, than we did during some of the months last year. For several months last year we were not able to do any writing; but our health has improved, and we hope to be able to do more work this year.

We wish to try to do our best to give our subscribers a good paper; and we shall do our best to make The Primitive Baptist an Old Baptist paper in every sense of the word. To this end, we ask the help and cooperation of all our readers; and especially do we feel the need of divine guidance. We humbly ask all the brethren and sisters to remember us in their prayers. Pray that the Lord may direct us in the right way and that He would enable us to walk therein; and that He would sustain us by His Holy Spirit's presence in every trial, difficulty, and conflict. C. H. C.

Out of Order

---January 5, 1915

For some time we have felt that it was our duty to say to our readers that Elder J. B. Little, of Abbott, Ark., is out of line with the Baptists in that section. At first we refused to publish anything about this matter, and would not do so now but for the fact that Elder Little has started the publication of a paper, which is devoted almost entirely to

making war on the Baptists in that country. We do not pretend to say that no wrong step was taken by Little Flock Church in the exclusion of Elder Little-that is not for us to say; but the fact remains that he was excluded, and the churches of the Salem Association, of which Little Flock Church is a member, recognise the fact. The churches of that association rejected Elder Little and his party.

The Baptists elsewhere must recognize the act of the churches there, or else we may as well dispense with all pretense of gospel order and discipline. When a man is excluded, and he then begins to use every endeavor to destroy the church, it is as good evidence as is needed that he is wrong. Such persons should be let severely alone. We notice, too, that Elder Little is taking up with every excluded person who will take up with him-at least, we see him taking up with some who are excluded. C. H. C.

Among The Filipinos

---January 12, 1915

On page 11 of the Advent and Review and Sabbath Herald of October 8, 1914, under the above heading, the following statement may be found over the signature of Floyd Ashbaugh: "It is sometimes pathetic to see the efforts some of the Lord's poor make to purchase books containing the gospel. One man sold a pig to get the price. A woman pawned her jewelry. A family arranged to make small monthly payments from their meagre earnings. And all that they may have the truth of God." Some of our readers will remember that this is from the land where a man lives who wrote home a few years ago concerning the work of the missionaries in the Philipines. His letters were published in The Primitive Baptist. They delude the natives there as much as they can, as well as the people at home. C. H. C.

Revelation 12:7

---January 12, 1915

Brother L. E. Lindsey, Statesboro, Ga., asked us some time ago to give our views on (Revelation 12:7-12). He asked if it means that the devil was up in heaven. No, it does not mean that the devil was in the heaven of ultimate glory. The heaven refers either to the church or to the Jewish heaven-we are inclined to think it refers to the church. If it has reference to ultimate glory, and the devil was once an angel there, and raised a war in that place, then God's people might not be safe when they get there. There are no wars in that place. C. H. C.

Federal Council of Churches

---January 12 1915

We notice that there has been formed a kind of union or council of the different denominations called "Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America." On one of their letterheads we find the list of those who are in this federation, but we fail to find the church of Christ in the list. The church of Christ has never been found in any such movement; but when such a movement is consummated and their desires accomplished, the church of Christ may as well seek a hiding place, for they are sure to be persecuted. The following list is given of which the federation is composed: Baptist Churches,

North; National Baptist Convention; Free Baptist Churches; Christian Church; Congregational Churches; Disciples of Christ; Friends; German Evangelical Synod; Evangelical Association; Lutheran Church, General Synod; Mennonite Church; Methodist Episcopal Church; Methodist Episcopal Church, South; African M. E. Church; African M. E. Zion Church; Colored M. E. Church in America; Methodist Protestant Church; Moravian Church; Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.; Presbyterian Church in the U. S. (South); Protestant Episcopal Church Commissions on Christian Duty and Social Service; Reformed Church in America; Reformed Church in U. S.; Reformed Episcopal Church; Reformed Presbyterian Church, General Synod; Seventh Day Baptist Church; United Brethren Church; United Evangelical Church; United Presbyterian Church; Welsh Presbyterian Church. There are just thirty in the list. We make this statement simply to acquaint our readers with the fact. C. H. C.

Elder J. B. Little

---January 12, 1915

We have often wondered what a man in disorder will sometimes resort to in order to carry his point. It seems that Elder J. B. Little, of Abbott, Ark., is no exception to the rule. We did esteem Elder Little very highly, but he has lowered himself in our estimation very much by the course he is pursuing. Instead of being submissive to his brethren, he refused to abide by their act. The churches in his own association do not recognize him. Then he started the publication of a monthly paper, and about all it contains is a defense of himself for the course he pursues and abuse of all the brethren who do not take sides with him. We have just come in possession of the following letter from him addressed to Brother B. F. Conyers, Huntingdon, Tenn.: Abbott, Ark., Dec. 20, 1914. B. F. Conyers, Huntingdon, Tenn.

Dear Brother-I am mailing you today sample copies of my paper. I note Elder Moses Sandage, of Ark., is to be at your church soon. Elder Sandage does not live in my section of Ark., but has visited and affiliated with an excluded faction here, and then wrote letters to some of our papers saying we were excluded. I am offering one year's subscription to my paper to Elder Sandage to say (for publication in my paper) who we were excluded by, and for what crime or sins. If you can get him to make a statement for publication I will send the paper to you for 12 months. I am now preparing for the press a pamphlet in which we will publish the course of Elder Sandage and his allies here. If you do not care to do so show him this letter and ask him if he cares to make a statement for publication. Your brother, I hope, J. B. Little.

The above is an exact copy of the letter, and we have it on file in our office. Anyone interested may call and see the original. Elder Little was excluded by Little Flock Church. A number of the members went with him. We do not say that no mistake was made in the dealings of the church. It is seldom the case but what some mistake is made in troubles of this kind. But the churches of that association, as we have already stated, recognise the side who excluded Elder Little as being the church in order. Of course the Baptists elsewhere, who are orderly, will recognize those churches there, and cannot afford to recognise Elder Little.

As to his paper, we can say from what we have seen of it, that no peace loving Baptist would want to read it. There is nothing in it to comfort a poor saint of God who is a mourner in Zion. We can understand very well how it might please a chronic grumbler

or a quarrelsome faultfinder; and we can understand, too, how that it might please one who would rejoice at the downfall of the Old Baptist cause.

Elder Moses Sandage visited the churches in Elder Little's country, and, of course, visited the party of Little Flock Church which is recognized by the churches there as being in order. This is why Elder Little says he visited and affiliated with an excluded faction there. As to that matter, Elder Sandage pursued the same course which we think we would have done under the same circumstances. If we were to make a tour in that country, we would visit the same churches that Elder Sandage visited. We would visit the churches of the Salem Association.

If Elder Little were possessed of the right spirit, he would quietly submit to his brethren, and stop this wholesale warfare, and conduct himself in such a way as to restore himself to their confidence and fellowship; but the course he is pursuing will not do that. We simply make this statement and publish Elder Little's letter so that our readers may see what he is resorting to. C. H. C.

Elder Little Objects

---January 19, 1915

Our readers will remember that in our issue of January 5 we stated that Elder J. B. Little is out of order. If the reader has a copy of that issue, you may get it and read that article again. In our issue of January 12 we had another article concerning the same matter.

Before the issue of January 12 was out Elder Little wrote us the following letter:

Abbott, Ark., Jan. 9, 1915.

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I notice in The Primitive Baptist of Jan. 5th under the heading, "Out of Order," over your signature, you say that I am excluded and the Baptists everywhere must recognise the act of the churches here or else we may as well dispense with all pretense of gospel order and discipline. I believe, Brother Cayce, in this matter, you, like many others, have been misled, misinformed, and that you have accepted as facts things that are not facts, and have done us and all sound Baptists an injustice by this article. I have seen so much writing from your pen, also from the pen of Elder Lee Hanks, many of whose articles in The Primitive Baptist seemed to have been within the last two years under the direction of divine Providence, written especially for a defense of my order and those who stand with me here. And now for you to come out publicly and say you feel it your duty to say Elder Little is "out of order," "excluded," etc., is an injustice to the cause you are, no doubt, desiring to defend. And I am writing you this to kindly request you to retract this statement as public as you have made it; or if this does not suit you, to qualify your unqualified statements by informing your readers that you are informed this was true, and that you for the present feel inclined to accept the information as correct. Can I have a promise from you that you will do this at the earliest convenient issue of your paper? I am, I hope, your brother, J. B. Little.

Well, of course we were informed of the matter. Who knows anything about a matter of which he has not been informed? And of course we feel inclined to accept what our brethren say. We are aware that the churches of the Salem Association do not recognize Elder Little; neither do the churches of her corresponding associations. Now for the

Baptists to disregard the act of those churches is to simply say that we will dispense with all gospel order and discipline. If the brethren in one section cannot recognize the act of their brethren, or the act of the churches, in another section, what order can we have? All can see at once that there would be no such thing as order. We trust the brethren will take heed to this. C. H. C.

Foreign Medical Missions

---January 19, 1915

We have before us a copy of the Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, dated October 8, 1914. The publication is devoted to the foreign mission enterprise. Pages 6 and 7 seem to be devoted to the medical department of the mission work. On page 6 is a picture showing a crowd of Indians gathered at the door of the dispensary of the medical mission in Peru. Here is what is said concerning the same:

Here is a picture of a common scene round our dispensary door as the Indians flock in for treatment. Then, too, the calls for help come ever more urgently from remote places. I was called to visit one sick person over the mountains where the way was so difficult that the Indian guides had to take my feet and place them in the niches of the rocks in order that I might get down the precipice. But God is blessing. In this morning's group, of which I send you the picture, we found the following cases:

A woman with a broken collar bone, a man with neglected broken ribs, one with an ulcerated throat, another with an ulcerated leg, a case of pleurisy, and one of hemorrhage of the lungs, two persons with aching teeth, a case of stomach trouble, and two persons with fever, besides many others with minor ailments. And this is not an unusual scene. They come to us from great distances, sometimes traveling eighty miles or more. We do all in our power to help them, and see to it that no one leaves the mission without an inspiration to live a better life. F. A. Stahl.

Plataria, Peru. On the same page is an article concerning the work of a missionary nurse in Brazil. Here is the article as it appeared in that paper: In connection with evangelistic tent efforts in the Brazilian interior, Miss Louise V Wurts has been doing the work of a missionary nurse. One interesting experience she thus narrates: "A little negro boy of seven years had been paralyzed by a fall. The elimi native organs of the little body had ceased to work and in a little while he would have died from autointoxication. For eleven days he had been suffering." We went to work on the poor little fellow with massage and fomentations. I prayed in Portuguese, although I had been here only three months. But God heard that prayer. Quickly the little boy began to re *a line is out of the paper here, which we cannot supply* the lad was carried to the tent on the night devoted to health and temperance, and walked up on the platform, where we demonstrated what rational methods of treatment will do under the blessings of God.

"The neighbors, who had looked in at the windows when we were treating the boy with hot and cold water, had said to the mother, after we had gone away, 'He will die with that treatment.' But she had replied, 'He will die without it.' Now, the mother says, 'they have nothing to say.' The Lord is blessing the evangelistic service. Twenty candidates were baptized yesterday, as truly converted and as staunch people as one ever saw."

On page 16 appears a picture of five little girls in a group, with this title: "A Home Group Whose Pennies Go to Missions." It appears to us that the foregoing is all so glaring a humbug, practiced in the name of Christianity, under the plea of soul saving, that it needs no comment for intelligent people to discover the false claims.

Think of it! In one morning's group among those who went to the dispensary for free treatment were, "A woman with a broken collar bone, a man with neglected broken ribs, one with an ulcerated throat, another with an ulcerated leg, a case of pleurisy, and one hemorrhage of the lungs, two persons with aching teeth, a case of stomach trouble, and two persons with fever, besides many others with minor ailments." These all get free treatment, of course. Those with aching teeth can have their teeth treated—fillings, treatment, and all paid for by the pennies begged from the children and poor dupes in this country; and that money begged from them, too, under the plea that those poor heathen are going to an endless hell by the multiplied thousands every day for want of the gospel!

Where, in the Bible, can the command be found to beg money from the poor in any country; to get the children's pennies; to scour the country for funds—under the pretext of preaching the gospel to the lost, and then use that money for free medical treatment, free dentistry, free medicines and so on, in foreign lands? We ask, Where is any such command, or even an intimation of such, in God's word? We challenge the whole combined foreign mission fraternity to cite the passage.

Then, the poor little negro boy that was so unfortunate as to have a fall! Of course such a thing never occurs in our home land! No poor child ever has such a misfortune here, either white or black! Ah, bless your life, they maybe wounded here, and lie in a dark hovel pinched with hunger, and freezing with cold, and die without notice. Nobody cares. But let a little negro boy in Brazil or Africa get hurt, and wails of distress are sent all over the land by these foreign missionary fanatics. And these nurses, doctors, and dentists are supported in this work by the contributions from the people of this country.

The poor widow, with a house full of hungry dependent children, is deluded into the belief that the money she may give for these foreign missionaries may be the means of saving some poor soul from the torments of an eternal hell, and thus they get their support. No, they do not tell those poor people that they are not required to go hungry in order to give to the cause; but if such a person does give, it is heralded far and near very often—praise is given, and they are assured that they will have stars added to their crowns of glory, and that a higher seat will be accorded them nearer the great white throne of God. Verily the Lord has told us about them in **(Philippians 3:18-19)** "For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." C. H. C.

Why Did Christ Die?

---**January 26, 1915**

Elder C. H. Cayce: After reading several copies of your paper, The Primitive Baptist, I am made to wonder why it was that Christ had to come to earth and suffer death for His people. Please tell us through your paper just why Christ died for a people who were saved before the world was made. Did Christ die to save a people, or did He die for the

saved? Please tell us just what Christ suffered death for, and greatly oblige all concerned. With best wishes to all, I remain, your brother in Christ, G. W. Birchett. R. 1, Couch, Mo.

REMARKS

We find, by consulting our subscription list, that Mr. Birchett does not take The Primitive Baptist. We suppose he has read a few copies. We are of the humble opinion that Mr. Birchett thought he had written some stunning questions when he penned the above lines. But we will proceed to kindly notice the same.

In the first place, we state most emphatically that we do not teach, and the Primitive Baptists do not teach, that people were saved before the world was made. We do teach, in harmony with the Bible, that God purposed before the world was made to save people. He saves them now in time, according to the purpose which He purposed before the world was made. Mr. Birchett does not seem to know the difference between the doing of a thing and the purpose to do a thing.

God saves people. Mr. Birchett certainly will not deny that. If He does save people, He either intended to save them before He saves them, or else He did not intend to save them. If He did not intend to save them, and does save them, then He saves them by accident, and not on purpose. If He does not save people by accident, then He saves them on purpose; and if He saves them on purpose, then He intended or purposed to save them before He did save them. We suppose that Mr. Birchett intended to write the above letter, or purposed to write it, before he did write it. He either purposed to write it, or else he had no purpose concerning the matter; and we will admit that some of his questions sound to us as though he had no purpose in the matter at all. But we will take a charitable view of the matter, and grant that he purposed to write the letter; then, the letter being written was the fulfillment of his purpose. Even so, God purposed to save people; when one is saved, it is the fulfillment of God's purpose.

As to whether God purposed to save people or not we refer to **(Ephesians 1:3-4,5)**

”Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will.” This text emphatically says that some persons were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world.

They were not saved before the foundation of the world, but they were chosen then. The expression, “before the foundation of the world,” means before the ages of time began. As God made choice of them before the ages of time began, it follows that He purposed before the ages of time began that He would save them in time, or regenerate them in time, according to that choice. The text also teaches that those who were chosen were also predestinated unto the adoption of children.

The word “predestinated” means determined or purposed beforehand. Hence, God purposed or determined beforehand that they should be brought into His heavenly family. This purpose or determination beforehand was before the ages of time began. Hence, they are regenerated in time and brought into the heavenly family in fulfillment of God's purpose which He purposed before time was. Now, the question, “Did Christ die to save people, or did He die for the saved?” He died to save those that God

intended to save. They were Christ's by gift. The Father had given them to Him. (**John 6:38-39**) "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which He hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day."

This text emphatically expresses the fact that some were given to the Son. As we are taught in (Ephesians 1:3-4,5) that they were chosen in Christ before the ages of time began, it necessarily follows that they were given to Christ before the ages of time began. Then Christ came into the world to satisfy the law in their stead, or in their behalf. He came into the world to save them. (**Matthew 1:21**) "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name JESUS: for He shall save His people from their sins. HE SHALL SAVE HIS PEOPLE FROM THEIR SINS." This is what He came into the world for. They were His, because the Father gave them to Him; yet they were sinners, but Christ came to save them from their sins.

As to what; Christ suffered death for, will say that it was to deliver His people, or His children, from the curse of the law. It was to save them. (**Hebrews 2:14-15**)

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." The teaching here is clear that He came into the world to deliver His children. He came to save them.

Again, (**Hebrews 9:11-12**) "But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." This language clearly teaches that, as high priest, Jesus obtained eternal redemption for those for whom He shed His blood, and that this was done when His blood was shed; and that, having done this, He entered into the holy place not made with hands, that is, into heaven itself. This is what Christ has done for His people. We trust that this is clear enough for Mr. Birchett to understand it. It is enough to make clear, it seems to us, what our teaching is on this line. Much more proof could be given; but if a man will not believe this, he will not believe any other proof which might be produced. C H. C.

John 6:47

---February 2, 1915

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Sir-I would like for you to discuss in The Primitive Baptist your views on the teaching of the passage in (**John 6:47**); also comment on the following sentences: "He that limpeth hath the ball." Here it seems to me that the subordinate sentence, "He that limpeth," is used to designate or point out the particular person in possession of the ball, and is not the cause of his possessing it.

Again: "He that cutteth himself hath pain," and "He that marrieth hath happiness." These look to be similar to the one in (**John 6:47**). It is evident, though, that pain and happiness are the results or effects of the acts mentioned in the subordinate sentences. The cutting is the cause of the pain; and marrying, the cause of happiness. It is claimed by some that belief is the cause of eternal life, and that (**John**

6:47) teaches so, and the above sentences were given to illustrate the contention. I hope you may be able to write on this subject at once and discuss it fully. Yours very truly, T. H. Cotten. 214#W. Capitol St., Jackson, Miss.

REMARKS

(John 6:47) reads, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.” This sentence is not at all like the sentence, “He that cutteth himself hath pain,” or “He that marrieth hath happiness.” That is, they are not alike in meaning, though similar in form; but in the latter sentence it is understood that life precedes cutteth and marrieth; having life, one cuts himself, and pain follows as a result. It is absurd to say that, having life, one believes and obtains life as a result.

The sentence evidently contains the idea that the life previously existed; and that, having the life, one believes as the result. In the sentence, “He that marrieth hath happiness,” the previous possession of life by the one marrying is understood. Suppose we have it this way, “He that marrieth hath natural life.” Would the party presume to argue that the man had to marry in order to obtain natural life? Would he presume to say that the man obtained natural life as a result of marrying? To obtain life is one thing and to obtain happiness is another.

Again: the sentence, “He that limpeth hath the ball,” is one also which expresses previous possession of life. Having life, he limps. Hence, the party who, possessing life, and limps, is the party who has the ball. His limping is not the cause of his having the ball; but the limping party is the one pointed out as the one who has the ball. If **(John 5:24)** is taken in connection with **(John 6:47)** it will show very clearly that belief is not the cause of life, but that life is first. That passage reads, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.”

This is the King James translation. A strict literal translation in modern English would read, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, that he that hears my word, and believes Him who sent me, has eternal life, and comes not into judgment, but has passed out of death into life.” Here it is clear that one who believes is one who has passed out of death into life. The same idea is expressed in **(John 6:47)** . **(John 5:24)** simply settles the matter.

There is no room for argument or quibble here. We would also refer to **(John 1:11-12,13)** “He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.”

In this text believe is in the present tense, and were born is in the past tense in the English, but in the original were born is in the perfect tense. It denotes something that was completed at some time in the long ago. Hence, at some time in the long ago, those who now believe were born of God. Or, we may express it this way: At some time in the long ago these persons were born of God, and now believe. We have said that if any man would take this sentence and parse it, analyze it, diagram it, or treat it any way he may, according to the rules of language, and make it appear that the belief in that text preceded the being born of God, we would quit the Old Baptist Church and join his church and preach for them as long as we live and never charge a cent for it, and whip

every Old Baptist we meet with that text. Try that proposition on them and see how they undertake it. C. H. C.

Elder Little and Party

---February 9, 1915

In Elder J. B. Little's little paper, the "Old Paths," for February he vents his wrath upon us for what we said concerning him in our former issues. In one place Elder Little says: "The statement of yours, that J. B. Little was excluded, I brand as false, and challenge you to prove it. I know you are looked upon as a defender of the faith of our people, and now will you even attempt to prove your statement? Or will you take your own medicine, when you say such men as Little should be let 'severely alone?' Well, now, dear reader, what do you think of that?"

Does that sound very much like Elder Little is being led by the spirit of humility in his present course? As to his charge that our statement is false, will say that this is the kind of writing he has been putting forth in his little magazine. Every man who differs from him seems to be a falsifier; at least Elder Little seems to think so. But of course, as Elder Little says we have made a false statement, that settles it. If it suits Elder Little to use such language concerning us, we do not suppose it will hurt us for him to do so. On another page Elder Little says: "Your expression, 'we trust the brethren will take heed to this, seems to me to be a mistrust, or a trust which will not be realized, as almost every mail brings encouraging letters from prominent ministers (some of them from West Tennessee), brethren and sisters in many states.'" He then gives a short quotation from several letters, but does not give the author of any of them. However, we suppose he has them; we do not call them in question. Then he says: "Like expressions of fellowship and encouragement might be extended to a considerable length. See article from Elder J. C. Denton, on page 402 of this issue, for which expressions I desire to thank God and take courage.

It seems though that Brother Cayce is not willing, it seems, for these brethren and sisters to judge for themselves. Perhaps he thinks they are too ignorant to know whether they get comfort from the Old Paths or not, and he-Priest like-has to tell them that it contains nothing to comfort a mourner in Zion, and that it is only suitable to the wants of chronic grumblers, and that he 'trusts the brethren will take heed to this.'" If our readers will get The Primitive Baptist of January 5, January 12, and January 19, and read our articles they will see that Elder Little has put some things together which we said that were not said together at all. It is nothing less than a plain garbling of what we said.

If Elder Little is so honest as he has been trying to make believe in his paper he will correct the above matters. It cannot be plead that he did this through ignorance, for he has sense enough to know better. As to his personal thrusts of falsifying and priest craft, will say that we care nothing for that. It is the way he is defending himself in his ungodly course. As to his receiving letters of encouragement and endorsement, will only say that we suppose he has been receiving them. It is nearly always the case that a man will draw away disciples after him. But we happened to know some who have written to Elder Little, and what some have said would have but little weight at their home. We read one statement from an old preacher concerning his church, how they

were in confusion, etc., since he had grown old and could not preach for them, etc. We happened to be acquainted there.

When that church got another pastor they had members who believed in open communion, instrumentalities in regeneration, and some members affiliating with secret orders, though the church had agreed to lay the secret orders down when they got another to preach for them. Of course they have had some trouble and confusion in trying to get themselves straight. Will Elder Little endorse what that church had, and what that pastor evidently encouraged? Whether he would or not, Elder Little boasts of receiving such endorsements.

Elder Little begins one of his articles concerning us by quoting questions 16 and 17 and the answers thereto on page 7 of *The Primitive Baptist* of January 5. It seems that he was very careful not to quote questions 9 and 13 and their answers in the same article. If he would read them again and take some of it to himself and act accordingly, it is our opinion that he would raise himself in the estimation of some of the brethren who are acquainted with the course he is now pursuing.

Today (January 30, 1915) we received a letter from Elder Little dated at 2 o'clock a. m., January 30, Abbott, Ark., which was mailed at Abbott, Ark., January 29 at 6 p. m., and received in Martin this morning. If our readers will excuse a slang expression we will say "That is going some." Following is the letter:

Dear Brother-Your letter of recent date in which you inform me that your subscription list (or address of your subscribers) is not for sale received. And after serious meditation about what duty to God demanded of me, and the proper way to discharge that duty, and considering with sadness of heart the present factionized condition of the Primitive Baptists, I felt a desire to pray to God for wisdom to guide me right. Notwithstanding the fact that I had as I thought written you my last private letter relative to your articles and your attacks on my order and course in *The Primitive Baptist* of Jan. 5th, 12th, and 17th. I had a (to me) comforting dream after retiring last night, in which you and I, together with a very large concourse of Baptists were gathered together at my house (I have in days past had the pleasure of feeding more than one hundred persons at one time at my home during gatherings of our people). In my dream last night I saw a much larger gathering of Baptists at my home than I ever had seen, or had even ever thought of having, and I addressed you with some of the words I used in my reply to your article of January 5th, "Out of Order."

I refer to my words on page 412 of the Feb. No. of the *Old Paths* where I said, "The statement of yours that J. B. Little was excluded I brand as false." This expression being to me a very serious, as well as a very emphatic one, was in my mind much for a short time after written. I picked up my Bible one day and opened at (Jeremiah 37), and read what I could not remember ever having read before, thus, "Then said Jeremiah, It is false: I fall not away to the Chaldeans." I felt to be the Jeremiah (in figure) in this case and I was strengthened and confirmed. In my dream last night I repeated these words to your face, and I thought you and I were both moved to embrace each other in our arms, and tears of joy and love flowed freely from our eyes. There were other prominent and to me very important and comforting things in my dream or vision, of which I will not now speak, but wish to say that I feel that that dream is in some degree at least the cause of me writing you this letter.

I wish now to ask you plainly if you would be willing to come here and investigate the situation here. I will pay all your expenses myself if you will do this. My dream gave me some hope that the breach between us can, by the direction of that providence which no finite mind can comprehend, be healed, and that love which cannot be expressed with words may be mutually felt between you and I for each other. Please let me know soon if you would be willing to come. Your brother, I hope, J. B. Little. 2 o'clock a. m., January 30th, 1915.

As to Brother Little's dream, we know nothing. However, will say that a charge of falsifying is not very likely, it seems to us, to cause one to desire to embrace him in love. As we have said before, we did love and esteem Elder Little, but his course is proving to us that he is in the flesh, or following after the flesh. His course is not right. As to going there to investigate the matters there will say that if both sides desire that we, with others, go there to investigate the troubles and the differences between the brethren and try to reconcile matters, and, if we fail to do that, then find who is the church in order, we are willing to go.

We do not care to investigate only one side. Now, if it is desired that this trouble cease, let the brethren on both sides agree for an investigation, and then let it be shown how the investigation shows matters to be. The brethren abroad who love order would certainly recognise that. We do not care to keep up a continued controversy in our paper concerning the matter. We are just in receipt of a letter from Elder J. J. Turnipseed which we publish in this issue. In his letter he mentions a matter in Alabama, about Chana Creek, and perhaps another place. We have received a notice concerning that from some other party. We know nothing of the particulars of that matter, and we are not in a position to say who is wrong, or anything about the matter. Hence we have said nothing and published nothing. This is the course we think best to pursue until we are satisfied in our own mind to some extent, at least, as to whether one is doing right or not. C. H. C.

Christmas

---February 9, 1915

We have received a request from Mrs. B. Mullis, of Marshville, N. C, for more information concerning Christmas. We stated it was of Roman Catholic origin, and that December 25th was not the birthday of our Saviour. For the benefit of all our readers we have decided to copy the following articles concerning the matter. First, we copy the following from the Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge: Christmas, a Christmas festival celebrated on December 25, in memory of the birth of Jesus Christ. The English name Christmas, like the Dutch Kerstmisse, or Kersmis, is formed analogous to such names as Candlemas, Michaelmas, etc. In the Romanic languages the name is derived from the Latin Natalis, Natalitia, or Nativitis, Italian Natal, Spanish Nadal, or Natividad, French Noel. The German Weihnacht is a literal translation of the Hebrew Chanukah, the name of the Jewish festival of the dedication or purification of the temple by Judas Maccabeus. The Scandinavian Juul, and the Anglo-Saxon Geol, mean "wheel," and refer to the winter solstice.

When the festival of Christmas is first spoken of in the ancient church it was celebrated by the Eastern Church on January 6, under the name of Epiphania, and by the Western

Church on December 25, under the name of Natalis. This discrepancy is easily accounted for, however, by the circumstance that the gospel gives no date of Christ's birth, but simply tells that it took place during night. But the date of the Epiphania is arbitrary, so far as it rests upon an inference of merely allegorical import,-the first Adam was born on the sixth day: consequently the second Adam ought to be born on the sixth day, -and the festival itself had something allegorical in its character. It was celebrated, not so much in memory of the actual birth of Christ, as in memory of the first manifestation of the divinity of Christ; the name Epiphania being the word commonly used in the Greek language to denote the manifestation of a god in human shape. Later on, however, from the beginning of the fourth century, when the restless searchings of the nature and person of Christ drove men's minds into many singular errors, the Eastern Church began to feel the importance of emphasising the actual birth of Christ by a separate festival distinct from the Epiphania, with its somewhat vague historical bearing; and from a sermon of Chrysostom, delivered, it is believed, on Christmas Day, 386, it appears that the Natalis of the Western Church was rapidly though gradually adopted throughout the East. (The reader will bear in mind here that the Eastern and Western Churches were the Eastern and Western Catholic Churches.-C. H. C.)

What foundation there originally was for the Roman date of December 25 is difficult to decide. On account of this date, some connect the Christian festival of Christmas with the above mentioned Jewish feast, Chanukah; and many features seem to speak for such a relation between them. Others connect it with the Saturnalia, or Brumalia, or some other Pagan Roman feast; and here, too, the single features are often strikingly resemblant. Others, again, inveigh against the date as arbitrary, and not in harmony with the gospel narrative, etc. Nevertheless the fact remains, that the whole Western Church unanimously agreed upon this date, and that the Eastern Church adopted it without much contradiction; which fact goes far to show that the date cannot well have been a mere assumption, but must have had some kind of tradition to support it. The date once fixed, Christmas gradually became one of the three great annual festivals of the church. The whole period from Nativity to Epiphany was consecrated,-December 26 as a memorial of the martyr Stephen; December 27, of St. John; December 28, of the Massacre of the Innocents, etc. The four Sundays preceding Christmas were incorporated with the cycle, under the title of Advent, as a preparation for the festival. The day itself was celebrated by three masses-one in the night, one at daybreak, and one in the morning; and the costliest of utensils and furniture were used. During the middle ages the celebration assumed, in accordance with the taste of the time, quite a theatrical aspect.

The manger was shown, with the Virgin sitting beside it, surrounded with chanting angels. The wise men, the shepherds, Joseph, etc., were also represented; and a complete Mystery was formed. As a remnant of this symbolical representation of biblical events which formerly found so much favor both with the priests and with their flocks, it may be mentioned, that, in the third decade of the present century, the custom was still kept up of rocking a doll, in a cradle adorned with lights, on the top of the spire of the Cathedral of Tubingen at twelve o'clock Christmas night, while a band of wind instruments blew the Hymn of the Nativity.

No other Christian festival penetrated so deeply into the household as Christmas, probably because its character is essentially joy. Such as it appears in the household, however, many features indicate that there were non Christian elements present in its origin. The use of lighted tapers reminds forcibly of the Jewish festival of purification. The giving of presents was a Roman custom. The Yule tree and the Yule log are remnants of an old Teutonic nature worship. In the household also, the festival gradually sank down into a mere revelry. In England an abbot of misrule was chosen in every large household; in Scotland an abbot of unreason; and during the term of the festival he was the master of the house. By an act of Parliament this custom was forbidden in 1555; and in England, as everywhere, the Reformation brought in a kind of refinement in the celebration of Christmas by emphasizing its Christian elements, and excluding every feature which had not, or could not be given, a religious character. Under the influence of evangelical Christianity, Christmas has become a children's feast, and the Roman Catholic Church has followed the example. The dissenters of the Church of England, taking offense at the coarse and unchristian character which the festival had retained from the middle ages, abolished it altogether; but of late years the celebration of Christmas in some form or other has become wellnigh universal in England and America.

We also copy the following from the "International Cyclopedia," published by Dodd, Mead & Co., of New York: Christmas, the day on which the nativity of the Saviour is observed. The institution of this festival is attributed by the spurious Decretals to Telesphorus, who flourished in the reign of Antoninus Pius (13861 A. D.), but the first certain traces of it are found about the time of the emperor Commodus (18-92 A. D.). In the reign of Diocletian (284-305 A. D.), while that ruler was keeping court at Nicomedia, he learned that a multitude of Christians were assembled in the city to celebrate the birthday of Jesus, and having ordered the church doots to be closed, he set fire to the building, and all the worshipers perished in the flames. It does not appear, however, that there was any uniformity in the period of observing the nativity among the early churches; some held the festival in the month of May or April, others in January. It is, nevertheless, almost certain that the 25th of December cannot be the nativity of the Saviour, for it is then the height of the rainy season in Judea, and shepherds could hardly be watching their flocks by night in the plains.

Christmas not only became the parent of many later festivals, such as those of the Virgin, but especially from the fifth to the eighth century, gathered round it, as it Were, several other festivals, partly old and partly new, so that what may be termed a Christmas cycle sprang up, which surpassed all other groups of Christian holidays in the manifold richness of its festal usages, and furthered, more than any other, the completion of the orderly and systematic distribution of church festivals over the whole year. Not casually or arbitrarily was the festival of the Nativity celebrated on the 25th of December.

Among the causes that cooperated in fixing this period as the proper one, perhaps the most powerful was, that almost all the heathen nations regarded the winter solstice as a most important point of the year, as the beginning of the renewed life and activity of the powers of nature, and of the gods, who were originally merely the symbolical personification of these. In more northern countries, this fact must have made itself

peculiarly palpable-hence the Celts and Germans, from the oldest times, celebrated the season with the greatest festivities. At the winter solstice, the Germans held their great Yule feast, in commemoration of the return of the fiery sun wheel; and believed that, during the twelve nights reaching from the 25th of December to the 6th of January, they could trace the personal movements and interferences on earth of their great deities, Odin, Berchta, etc.

Many of the beliefs and usages of the old Germans, and also of the Romans, relating to this matter, passed over from heathenism to Christianity, and have partly survived to the present day. But the church also sought to combat and banish (and it was to a large extent successful) the deep rooted heathen feeling, by adding (for the purification of the heathen customs and feasts which it retained) its grandly devised liturgy, besides dramatic representations of the birth of Christ and the first events of His life. Hence sprang the so-called "manger songs," and the multitude of Christmas carols, as well as Christmas dramas, which at certain times and places, degenerated into farces or fools feasts (q. v.).

Hence also originated, at a later period, the Christ trees, or Christmas trees, adorned with lights and gifts, the custom of reciprocal presents, and of special Christmas meats and dishes, such as Christmas rolls, cakes, currant loaves, dumplings, etc. Thus, Christmas became a universal social festival for young and old, high and low, as no other Christian festival could become.

In the Roman Catholic church, three masses are performed at Christmas- one at midnight, one at daybreak, and one in the morning. The day is also celebrated by the Anglo-Catholic church-special psalms are sung, a special preface is made in the communion service, and the Athanasian creed is said or sung.

The Lutheran church, on the continent, likewise observes Christmas; but the Presbyterian churches in Scotland, and the whole of the English dissenters, reject it in its religious aspect, as & "human invention," and a "savoring of papistical will worship," although, in England, dissenters as well as churchmen keep it as a social holiday, on which there is a complete cessation from all business. But within the last hundred years, the festivities once appropriate to Christmas have much fallen off. These at one time lasted with more or less brilliancy till Candlemas, and with great spirit till twelfthday.

The following is copied from Hassell's History, page 182: The precise time of our Saviour's birth, for some wise purpose, seems to have been lost eight of by chronologists. But it may be set down as having most probably occurred a few months before the death of Herod the Great, four years before the common Christian era, in the year of Rome 750, and in the year of the world 4000. Learned men have investigated this point, but, with all their researches, have not been able to fix precisely either the year or the day of His birth.

The early Christians were divided on this subject, and of course it must be a matter of uncertainty to all succeeding generations. In view of this uncertainty, not even the exact year, much less the exact month being known, how groundless and puerile appears the custom of the Romish and English, as well as other communions, as holding sacred the twenty-fifth day of December (new style) as the day of Christ's nativity, and adorning

their houses of worship with flowers and evergreens as a part of their religious devotion on that day!

The following is from the same book (Hassell's History) page 408: Not even the exact year, much less the exact month and day, when Christ was born is stated in the Scriptures, or is known to mortals. The sixth of January was in the second and third centuries thought to have been the day; but it was decided by the Catholics in the fourth and fifth centuries that the 25th day of December was the day. (A footnote says, "December being the height of the rainy season in Judea, it is not likely that flocks and shepherds were, during that month, found by night in the fields of Bethlehem.") As Rome, the centre of Paganism, was made the centre of Catholicism, so the Pagan festivities of the Saturnalia, Juvenalia and Brumalia, which occurred in December, were very conveniently and hilariously transmuted by a worldly "Christianity" into the festival of Christmas. We suppose the foregoing is sufficient evidence concerning the matter of Christmas. Much more such evidence could be produced, but this is enough. We wish our people would cease the Christmas celebrations. C. H. C.

Drunkards and Tunkers

---February 9, 1915

On another page of this paper will be seen a request from Sister Martha Shearer that we tell her where the Dunkard Church started. We quote the following from "The Religious Denominations of the World," published by Wm. Garretson & Co., page 162: The first appearing of these people in America was in the fall of the year 1719, when about twenty families landed in Philadelphia, and dispersed themselves, some to Germantown, some to Skippeck, some to Oley, some to Conestogo, and elsewhere. This dispersion incapacitated them to meet for public worship, and therefore they began to grow lukewarm in religion. But in the year 1722, Messrs.

Baker, Gomery, Gants, and the Trautes, visited their scattered brethren which was attended with a great revival, insomuch that societies were formed wherever a number of families were within reach one of another. But this lasted not above three years. They settled on their lees again, till about thirty families more of their persecuted brethren arrived in the fall of the year 1729, which both quickened them again and increased their numbers everywhere. These two companies had been members of one and the same church, which originated in Schwardzenau, in the year 1708.

The first constituents were Alexander Mack and wife, John Kipin and wife, George Grevy, Andreas Bloney, Lucas Fetter, and Foanna Nethibeim. These had been bred Presbyterians, except Kipin, who was a Lutheran; and being neighbors, they consorted together to read the Bible, and edify one another in the way they had been brought up, for as yet they did not know there were any Baptists in the world. However, believersbaptism and a congregational church soon gained upon them, insomuch that they had determined to obey the gospel in these matters. They desired Alexander Mack to baptise them; but he, deeming himself in reality unbaptised, refused; upon which they cast lots to find who should be administrator. On whom the lot fell hath been carefully concealed.

However, baptised they were in the river Eder by Echwardsenau, and then formed themselves into a church, choosing Alexander Mack to be their minister. They increased

fast, and began to spread their branches to Merienborn and Epstein, having John Nass and Christian Levy to their ministers in those places. But persecution drove them thence, some to Holland and some to Creyfelt. Soon after the mother church voluntarily moved from Schwarzenau to Serustervin, in Friejland, and from thence migrated towards America, in 1719; and in 1729, those of Grey felt and Holland followed their brethren.

Thus we see that all the Tunker churches in America sprang from the church at Schwarzenau, in Germany; that the church began in 1708, with only seven souls, and that in a place where no Baptist had been in the memory of man, nor any now are. In sixtytwo years that little one became a thousand, and the small one a great nation. The above is sufficient as to the claim of the Dunkards. As to the Sabbath, will say that the old Jewish Sabbath was Saturday, the seventh day. Constantine the Great, the father of the Catholic Church, instituted the Sunday Sabbath. The Gentiles were never under the Sabbath law. C. H. C.

The European War

---February 16, 1915

Brother B. A. Akers, of Tekoa, Wash., asks us to give our views concerning the great war now being waged in Europe. Somehow we do not feel like writing at length on the matter just now. We know that it is dreadful, and we feel that the Lord is pouring out His wrath upon those people, or that He will do so. It seems to us that the recent great earthquake in Italy is but a manifestation of the judgment of God. It is true that Italy is not actively engaged in the war now; but may we not reasonably suspect that Romanism is in some way responsible for it? The Pope, the head of Romanism, you know, has headquarters at Rome, Italy. As time passes, indications are that still more nations are going to become involved in the conflict. We would not be surprised that our own country becomes involved before the war ends, though we sincerely trust not. Our humble prayer is that the Lord, in His providence, may so direct and control and overrule affairs that our own nation may not become involved in the wholesale slaughter of men.

What the end of it all will be we cannot tell. It looks dark and gloomy to us. We feel sure that prophecy is being fulfilled, but we cannot tell what the outcome will be. It may be that it will finally result in the complete overthrow and destruction of the power of Romanism. We are sure, from the teachings of God's word, that the power will be finally destroyed, but we cannot tell whether this war will result in this or not. It may result in her gaining more power; or, rather, regaining power she once had; but if it does so result, she will finally lose the power entirely. She is to be overthrown. However this may be, it behooves us to be watchful and prayerful.

There seems to be a restless spirit everywhere among all the people. There is a spirit of unrest, a warring spirit, evidently manifested everywhere, even in the church-the true church. This spirit of strife, war, confusion, and unrest will surely be visited with the sore judgments of God. It may be that in the European war Rome will regain her power and the Lord's poor will again be visited by Roman persecution, and thus allowed to suffer for their wrongs, and thereby brought together in love and union once more. We

would be glad to see the brethren all bury their little differences and dwell together in love, peace, and union; but we would be grieved to see them driven to that by persecution. We mean that it would grieve us to see the persecution come, even though it may take that to bring them together. May the Lord look upon His poor and afflicted and bleeding Zion in mercy and pity, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Foreign Mission Gifts

---February 16, 1915

On page 1 of the Advent Review and Sabbath Herald of October 8, 1914, the following statement appears over the signature of A. G. Daniells, President of the General Conference: The toil and sacrifice, the separations and the sorrows, of this movement for a single year are too great either to trace or to express. Every year death reaps its cruel harvest. Filling the gaps breaks hundreds of family circles, and causes the repetition of hard labor to master the languages and make necessary adjustments all around. To hold the ground already occupied and to enter the doors everywhere thrown open to the missionary forces require constant and earnest effort on the part of all believers in foreign missions.

And the work of raising funds can never cease. The years pass quickly and consume the annual appropriations. There can be no letup in giving, The movement is on in full force. The missionaries are at the front with their wives and children. The schools, printing houses and dispensaries are all operating. This great work cannot stop. To continue means the full expenditure of present appropriations, and that calls for continued giving on as large a scale as the church has ever contributed to the cause of foreign missions.

And why should not a work so helpful, so uplifting, and so transforming, continue and steadily enlarge? If any endeavor in the world is worthwhile, this is. If money is of value for any purpose, it is of special value for this movement. Of course every effort must be exerted to hold every inch of ground they have already taken, and that requires strenuous effort. Then, the work must not be allowed to come to a standstill, for it could not so remain for a very long time; for everything will go backward unless it be pushed forward. Hence, "The work of raising funds can never cease" while the world stands, or until the people discover the humbuggery of this foreign mission business and simply quit giving for its support." There is a generation that curseth their father, and doth not bless their mother.

There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet is not washed from their filthiness. There is a generation, O how lofty their eyes! and their eyelids are lifted up. There is a generation whose teeth are as swords, and their jaw teeth as knives, to devour the poor from off the earth, and the needy from among men. The horseleech bath two daughters, crying, Give, give. There are three things that are never satisfied, yea, four things say not, It is enough." --(0:11) (Proverbs 30:11-15). C. H. C.

More About Elder Little

---February 16, 1915

In the February issue of the Old Paths Elder Little quoted the following questions and answers from Elder Lee Hanks in The Primitive Baptist of January 5, 1915:

Q. 16. Can a church receive or restore a member without the unanimous consent of all the members, and can a council force fellowship? Ans. No. It is a rule among Primitive Baptists to receive members by the unanimous consent of all the members present. We cannot receive a member if one objects. We cannot force fellowship. The church is the only disciplinary body.

Q. 17. Do associations have the right to recognize factions or ministers setting aside the decision of a church? Ans. No; the association cannot lord it over the church. When a church settles a question there is no appeal to a higher court, for there is none. The law is already made.

Elder Little copied these questions and answers in making his reply to what we had said concerning him. Then he comments as follows:

Now, dear reader, listen! listen listen! There was a difference in opinion among Baptists here on the above two questions, and I took the position, the precise position, the exact position, of Elder Lee Hanks, who answered these two questions, and who is associate editor of Elder Cayce's paper. The brethren who differed with me here took the exact opposite position to Elder Hanks answers, and there sprang division among the churches here over these two points of order.

The above statement from Elder Little pointedly states that the trouble there is an associational matter, association ruling churches, etc. While we do not know all about the trouble- we are not acquainted with every move made and everything that has been said-yet we do know that this is not the cause of the trouble. It was not over these points at all. These questions have never been raised. Elder Little came all the way from Abbott, Ark., to our home to see us regarding the trouble there. He then spoke of publishing a pamphlet to "expose" things there.

We advised him not to do that, and told him it was the wrong course for him to pursue. We told him it would not, and could not, help to settle the trouble or to get the brethren together, but would only make bad matters worse. He has not only published a pamphlet, but is publishing a little monthly magazine, the whole of which is devoted to making war on the brethren everywhere who do not fall in line with him, and especially against the churches of the Salem Association and other associations in that country. He is evidently doing all he can, not to heal the breach and get the brethren united together, but to make bad matters worse. Judging from the course Elder Little is pursuing, there can be no question in our mind but what he is determined to rule or ruin.

We are in receipt of the following statement concerning the questions and answers above: While we have seen the above questions with answers published, this is the first we have ever heard there was a difference among the brethren here on these questions. We heartily endorse the answers to these questions, and nothing else than this has been done by church or association. Signed: John A. McNeely, Clerk of Salem Association. J. D. Caudle, Clerk of Little Flock Church.

In the same issue (February) of the Old Paths is an acknowledgment from Elder Little's party for calling a council. Our readers will remember that in our issue of February 9th is a letter from Elder Little in which he proposes to pay our way if we will go there and investigate the matter. It seems that he wants a council composed of only one, provided he can get us to go there and take testimony from his side only. We wonder who gave him the authority to ask us to go there in the capacity mentioned? His

“church” certainly did not do so, just after they had made confession that they did wrong in calling a council before.

If they did wrong then in calling for a council, it appears to us that it would be wrong for us to go there for the purpose he requests, and wrong for him to ask us to do so. That acknowledgment says that they called the council to settle a difference in their church. If it was to settle a difference in their church, then the trouble was not on account of a difference concerning the questions quoted by Elder Little from The Primitive Baptist, as referred to at the beginning of this article.

But Elder Little is now sending circulars over the country concerning us, and offering pamphlets to persons to get them to send him the names of persons who are taking our paper. A letter in this issue from Albert M. Ruth shows that a circular was sent to him. Brother Ruth sent it to us. One was also sent to Elder James Duncan, Ripley, Miss. Elder Duncan was a member of the council which Elder Little's party is now sorry they called. Elder Duncan sent the circular to us, and says: Dear Brother-I am sending you a circular received of Elder J. B. Little. I have no desire to assist any man that is in disorder to scatter his troubles. And I know that Little is in disorder. Yours in hope, James Duncan.

The acknowledgment of Elder Little's party for calling the council also virtually acknowledges that they did not abide the decision of the same, although they had agreed that they would do so before it was called. They claim that some things were suppressed which should have been made known to the council. If that be true, no one is to blame only the council or Elder Little's party. If the council did not refuse them the right or privilege, then they had the privilege of making everything known that was necessary. We do not suppose the council denied them this privilege.

Then they must have had the privilege of bringing everything before the council that pertained to the matter, and if they did not do so, it was their own fault. No one else is to blame. We do not desire to be continually referring to this matter, as stated last week. We shall not now, if ever, notice the harsh letter of Elder Denton in the February number of the Old Paths. His article shows that he is in a “strait.” It does not deserve attention. We have only referred to these matters to warn our brethren of the disorder, and that in aiding Elder Little they are only aiding disorder. We have now done what was our duty to do. If the brethren refuse to heed the warning we are clear. C. H. C.

Remarks to W. E. Wilson

REMARKS TO W. E. WILSON ---February 16, 1915

We have serious doubts as to whether the person should have been received. He showed that his sympathy was with the “Absoluters” when he tried to get back among them. It looks rather bad to us that our people will take a man who is so bad that the “Absoluters” will not have him. He should be required to prove by his life that he is all right before he is received. The church of Christ is no reformatory. C. H. C.

John 9:6-7

---February 23, 1915

Brother C. H. Gilliam, R. 2, Fulton, Ky., asks our views on (**John 9:6-7**) and asks, “Was the blind man a child of God before he washed or did he become a child by the washing?” The text reads, “When He had thus spoken, He spat on the ground, and

made clay of the spittle, and He anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and said unto him, Go wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent.) He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing.” As to whether the washing was necessary in order that he become a child of God, it is only necessary to observe that the text says he “washed, and came seeing.” If the washing was necessary in order that he become a child of God, or in order that he have eternal life, it should have said that he “washed and received life.” A child of God may be blind to the truth, and need anointing in order that he be able to see the truth. Apply this to your own experience. It is applicable to the experience of the Lord's children, and to many things they realize in their experience. It has no application to the unregenerate. But the blind Pharisee, or the unregenerate sinner, cannot understand how the eyes of God's children are opened to many things along the line, typified by this circumstance. Make the application here, Brother Gilliam, and you will have no difficulty with this text; and the Arminian cannot refute your position. C. H. C

Remarks to W. T. Morrisett

---March 2, 1915

We cannot find words to express the gratitude of our poor heart for such expressions and manifestations of Christian love and fellowship which the above letter brought to us. We could not keep back the tears of gratitude. Were it not for such manifestations of Christian love as this, we feel that we would surely sink down in dark despair. Somehow, it seems that the good Lord does put it into the hearts of His dear children sometimes to cheer us along the way. Yes, Brother Morrisett was here at our association, and it did our poor hearts good to have him and many other dear brethren and sisters in our home. Our home has been an Old Baptist home all our life. Our brethren are always welcome there. It seems to us that we have been passing through the furnace of affliction for several months. We trust our brethren and sisters will pray the Lord in our behalf. Brother Morrisett, we do appreciate your kindness more than we can tell. May our blessed Master bestow His kindness upon you and your dear ones, and manifest His love to you, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Holiness and Hebrews 12:14

HOLINESS AND (Hebrews 12:14)---March 2, 1915

Brother J. A. Martin, Vardaman, Miss., wrote us some time ago that he is living among a number of persons who claim to have reached a state of sinless perfection in the flesh, and that they quote (**Hebrews 12:14**) in support of their position, and asks our views on this text. It reads, “Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.” According to the contention of these “Holiness” folks a man is required, in this text, to attain to a state of holiness in the flesh in order to see the Lord, or in order to enter heaven. If their contention be true, then no man will ever enter heaven, for Solomon, the wisest man, said, “For there is no man that sinneth not.” -((Ki 8:46) (I Kings 8:46); ((Chr 6:36) (II Chronicles 6:36). In both of these places he uses the exact words quoted. The man who says he does not sin, admits he is not a man. Again, the same wise man said, “For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.” -(((0) (Ecclesiastes 7:20).

This language is plain, and the man who claims that he does not sin simply denies these plain statements, and there are many others. As to **(Hebrews 12:14)**, the text does not at all teach that one must reach a state of sinless perfection in order to be saved in heaven; it does not even intimate such a thing. If it did teach that, it would be a positive contradiction of the statements already referred to. The Bible contains no such contradiction as that. The word which is translated holiness in that text means sanctification. Sanctification means set apart to a holy or religious use. They do not attain to this by their own acts or life. It is the work of God. "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." -(I Corinthians 6:11). Here it is plainly stated that they were sanctified by the Spirit of our God. They were set apart to a holy or religious use by the Spirit of God. Again: "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." - **(0:10) (Hebrews 10:10)**. Here it is plainly stated that they were sanctified by the will of God through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ. This is the way they were set apart to a religious use. Again: "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called." -(Jude 1:1) (Jude 1:1-25). Here it is plainly stated that they were sanctified, set apart to a holy or religious use, by God the Father. Now, that this work has been done, since the Lord has set them apart to a holy or religious use, they should follow after that, as admonished in **(Hebrews 12:14)**.

They should follow after that unto which the Lord has set them apart. In other words, as the Lord has set them apart to a religious use, they should endeavor to walk in obedience to His commandments. This is the teaching of the Scriptures, and no intimation of the doctrine is found which is taught by these modern "Holiness" people. Some folks may be so blinded and deluded as to believe that they have reached a state of sinless perfection in this life, but they are few. There may be many who hypocritically claim they have reached such a state. We have but little confidence in a man who makes such a claim. C. H. C.

Foreknowledge of God

---**March 2, 1915**

Sometime last year Elder A. J. Webb, of Lawrenceville, Ga. sent us an article clipped from a county paper there, which was signed W. B. McDonald, on the foreknowledge of God. The gentleman denied that God foreknows all things, and his main reason is that God did not want to foreknow all things. Well, if his reason be true, and there is one thing which God did not foreknow because He did not want to foreknow it, we would like to know how God found out that He did not want to foreknow that thing. Hence, it is clearly seen that the gentleman admits the very thing he is trying to deny.

"Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." -**(9) (Isaiah 46:9,10)**. In this text the Lord declares that He declared the end from the beginning. As He did declare the end from the beginning, He must have known from the beginning everything that would transpire unto the end. And He says, "My counsel shall stand." He could

not have known that His counsel should, or would, stand, unless He knew everything that would have a tendency to prevent His counsel standing, and that He had power to overcome it.

If He did not know everything that would transpire unto the end, He could not have known but what something might transpire which He could not control. But as He knew nothing could transpire which He could not control, He therefore knew everything that would transpire. Again, He said, "I will do all my pleasure." If He did not know everything that would transpire, He did not know but what something might transpire which would prevent Him doing some of His pleasure. But He knew that He would do all His pleasure. Therefore, He knew everything that would transpire. This text is enough to forever settle the fact that God foreknew all things, no matter how much some other passages may seem to contradict that point. C. H. C.

Exodus 2:12 AND Proverbs 9:1

---March 9, 1915

Brother J. M. Boshart, Woodville, Ala., requests our views on **((2) (Exodus 2:12))**. He asks, "What did Moses hide in the sand?" The text says, "He slew the Egyptain, and hid him in the sand." The Egyptain was an enemy of the Israelites. He asks "What are the seven pillars in **((9:1) (Proverbs 9:1))**" We do not know what they represent. If any of our brethren have any mind on that point, we will give space for an article from them. They may represent the seven divine attributes of Jehovah; and then they may not. We are not able to understand figures so well as to make everything represent something. C. H. C.

Matthew 5:13 AND Mark 9:49-50

---March 9, 1915

Brother J. B. Foster, of Settle, Ky., has requested our views of **(Matthew 5:13)** and **((9:49) (Mark 9:49-50))**. **(Matthew 5:13)** reads, "Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men." This language is in the Saviour's sermon on the mount, and was addressed to His disciples. Salt has a preserving quality, and in that sense a saving quality. Meat is preserved by the application of salt. Salt never has made any meat, but it saves the meat already made.

So, the disciples of the Lord have a preserving quality.. It is for the sake of His people that the Lord preserves the earth today. They have a preserving quality, and for their sake the world stands. In another sense also the disciples, ministers, and witnesses of the Lord have a preserving or saving quality. They do not possess this by reason of themselves or their own merit; but the Lord has seen fit to bestow this upon them. "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." -(I Timothy 4:16). This saving is not unto eternal life. It is not a saving in the sense of regeneration, for Timothy was already a child of God and a minister of the gospel. Besides this, those who hear in the sense of this text are those who are already children of God, those who are already born of God- "We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us." -(I John 4:6). By taking heed unto himself and unto the doctrine, Timothy would save himself and those who heard him with the same kind of saving, or in the same way. By doing

this (taking heed unto himself and unto the doctrine) he would save those who heard him in the same way that he would save himself. He would save himself, and those who heard him, from delusion, from false ways, and from false doctrines. In that respect he was the salt of the earth; and so are God's ministers now. But if they lose the savour, or preserving quality, by failing to take heed unto themselves and unto the doctrine, they become worthless. They become good for nothing, but to be cast out, and trodden under foot of men.

When one of the Lord's followers, and especially a minister, fails to take heed unto himself and unto the doctrine, thus living a life unbecoming the Lord's children, and imbibes false doctrines, advocates heresy, he loses that saving quality. He is then good for nothing. He should be cast out of the church. We should all take heed unto our selves. We are required to take heed unto ourselves first, not take heed unto others first. Some of us may be so busy trying to get the mote out of our brother's eye that we have no time to get the beam out of our own eye. If we would spend the proper amount of time in taking heed unto ourselves, getting the beam out of our own eye, we might not have much time to even look for a mote in a brother's eye, much less to be spending time trying to get the mote out of his eye.

We do not feel just now to be well enough satisfied concerning **((9:49) (Mark 9:49-50))** to write upon that text. At least, we do not now feel like writing upon it. We will ask Elder John R. Daily to look into this and the preceding verses in connection with (Matthew 18:6-9), and write an article on the same. Brother Daily, please examine the original language in these places, and give us your conclusions. C. H. C.

Romans 6:1-6, 23

---March 9, 1915

R. F. Osborn, Shannon, Miss., requests our views on (Romans 6:1-6,23). We haven't space to comment at length, and must make our comments brief. "What shall we say then?" The things previously stated in the preceding chapter being true, what shall we say? "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?" The apostle here anticipates and answers an objection which the world often offers to the doctrine of grace. They often say that if they believed this doctrine they would take their fill of sin. This only shows they have not had their fill; they still love sin; they have not been killed to it. Hence the apostle answers, "God forbid." Because salvation from sin is all of grace, and the grace of God abounds in salvation, is no reason why the child of God should continue in sin.

The doctrine of grace is not a licentious doctrine. "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" This is a statement made in the form of a question. It is a stronger way of saying that one who has been killed to sin cannot live any longer therein,. A child of God cannot live in sin. He may "drag out a miserable existence" there, but he cannot live there. There is no living in sin for him. His living is in the way of righteousness, not unrighteousness. The child of God is dead to sin, but alive unto God; see (Romans 6:11). "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death?" This is the baptism which puts the sinner into Christ and is by the Spirit of God; see (I Corinthians 12:13). "Therefore," for this reason; this being true; "we are buried with Him by baptism into death." ***Start

Baptism is a burial, and in baptism we are separated from the world; we are brought out from the world in our life by baptism because we have been baptized into Christ by the Holy Spirit. "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." As Christ

was raised up from the dead, and as we have been raised up out of death into life-being baptized into Christ, into the one body by the Spirit-and now, this being true, we are buried with Him by baptism, and being raised up (baptized-buried and raised again), we should now walk in newness of life. Our life should be such as that we may say by our walk that "we have been with Jesus and learned of Him." "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death."

The word which is translated planted means "born together with, of joint origin; connate, congenital, innate, implanted by birth or nature; grown together; united with; kindred." Thayer's Greek Lexicon says, "If we have become united with the likeness of His death (which likeness consists in the fact that in the death of Christ our former corruption and wickedness has been slain and has been buried in Christ's tomb), i. e., if that is part and parcel of the very nature of a genuine Christian to be utterly dead to sin, we shall be united also with the likeness of His resurrection, i. e., our intimate fellowship with His return to life will show itself in a new life consecrated to God." "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him."

The expression, "our old man," means, "as we were before our mode of thought, feeling, action, had been changed." -Thayer. The old man denotes our former condition, as we were in nature; but we have been killed to that. Our old former condition has been crucified or destroyed. This is done when one is born again, made partaker of the divine nature, killed to sin. This is done by the operation of the Spirit of God upon the soul or spirit of the man, "that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." We should then follow the divine nature, which the Lord has given. We should "through the Spirit mortify the deeds of the body." We should not live after the flesh, or that old corrupt nature, but should live after the Spirit, walk in Him.

(Romans 6:23) reads, "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Wages is what one gets for what he does. Sin is the transgression of the law. Sin, then, is what men do. Death is what they get for it. "The wages of sin is death." Death is what men get for what they do, for they transgress God's law. This death is everlasting banishment from the peaceful presence of God. Men are lost on account of sin. Reprobation is not unconditional; but eternal life is unconditional.. The whole race of man has been plunged into everlasting ruin and misery by sin. "But the gift of God is eternal life."

God, in His mercy, intervenes, in the person of His Son, and through what He has done some of the race are snatched from everlasting ruin. He gives eternal life to them. He does not simply offer life, but He lifts them up out of their deplorable state, and makes them alive in Christ; He gives them eternal life; He gives them a righteous life; He gives them that life by which they will live with Him in eternity. This is done "through Jesus Christ our Lord." C. H. C.

John 17:20 AND John 20:31

---March 16. 1915

Brother J. E. Yancey, Boas, Ala., asks our views on the above named passages of Scripture. **((0) (John 17:20)** reads, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word." We think the expression "these alone" refers especially to the apostles. Those "which shall believe on me through their word" refers to those who believe on the Saviour from the teaching of the apostles. This text is often quoted to prove that belief is necessary in order to eternal life; but it does not intimate such a thing. One must have life in order to believe. Just as one must have natural life in order to believe a natural truth, even

so one must have spiritual life in order to believe a spiritual truth. Hence, those who believe on Him through their word are those who have been born again. We showed in The Primitive Baptist of February 2 that one who believes is one who has already been born again. **((0:31) (John 20:31)** says, "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name." The farmer works his farm that his family may have life; but he does not work his farm in order that his family may obtain life. Even so, one does not believe in order to obtain life; but having life, he believes and continues to live. C. H. C.

2 Corinthians 5:20

---March 16, 1915

J. A. Hogan, Hartley, Ark., has requested our views of (II Corinthians 5:20), which reads, "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. The apostles, and the Lord's ministers now, are ambassadors for Christ." Knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men," says the apostle. He did not persuade dead people to do something in order to obtain life; but he would persuade the living to obey the Lord. He would persuade them to walk right, to talk right, to act right, and to live right. The Corinthians had been deluded into believing a false doctrine, and were not walking right. In this respect they were not reconciled to God. They were not satisfied with the doctrine of God our Saviour. In this respect, also, they were not reconciled to God. The apostle would beseech them to be reconciled to God, to His doctrine, and to His ordinances. He would beseech them to be content with that. So should the ministers of the gospel today beseech the Lord's people to be satisfied and content with the doctrine of the Bible, and with the ordinances of the Lord's house. C. H. C.

Foreknowledge and Predestination

---March 16, 1915

Brother J. M. Conner, Caledonia, Miss., has asked us to explain the difference between God's foreknowledge and His predestination. We haven't the time nor space to write at length upon the question now, and will only state that God's foreknowledge or His wisdom is one of His attributes. It is a part of His very being. But His predestination is His act; it is the act of His mind. This is the difference-at least, a great difference. To make them one and the same thing is to destroy the teaching of the Bible. "For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son." Foreknowledge and predestination are not the same here; for predestination comes after foreknowledge. C. H. C.

Revelation 5:6

---March 23, 1915

Sister J. H. Brock, Eldorado, Okla., has requested our views of **(Revelation 5:6)**, which reads, "And I beheld, and, Io, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." We think the four beasts are the four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The Lamb is Christ, the Saviour. He was the Lamb, and He was slain for the redemption of His people.

The horns and eyes, it is said, are the seven Spirits of God, or the seven divine attributes of Jehovah. He was God manifest in the flesh. In Him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. It pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell. He possessed all the attributes of the Father. He is and was one with the Father, and was equal with Him. C. H. C.

Jacob and Esau

---March 23, 1915

Brother G. W. Burnsed, Groveland, Ga., requests our views on Jacob and Esau, and the text, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Jacob was a representative character, representing the Lord's people. See **(Deuteronomy 32:9)**. The Lord loved Jacob. His name was changed to Israel. The Lord loved Israel. He loved His people. He did not love Esau. He passed Esau by and bestowed the blessing upon Jacob.

Just as the Lord made choice of Jacob, {see **(Romans 9:11)**} so He made choice of His people, for Jacob represented them. Just where the Lord found Jacob, {see **(Deuteronomy 32:10)**} that is where He finds all His people-in the wilderness of sin. The Lord leads them all, as He did Jacob of old. The Lord finds them, and makes them akin to Him. He leads them about and instructs them, and keeps them. C. H. C.

Remarks to Elder C. L. Clark

---April 13, 1915

Words are inadequate to express our appreciation of Brother Clark's words of sympathy and encouragement. Were it not for such expressions as these from the dear children of God, we feel that we would often despair. But thanks be to the Master that He gives us such range now and then among the "pleasant fields of Holy Writ." Yes, our position is a trying one. We are often from two to six months behind with articles coming in for publication, and most all of them are old when published, as we desire to take them in their turn, publishing only the really necessary ahead, but some people become so impatient that they think we are not going to publish their article and write and tell us to stop the paper on that account.

Oh, that God may give us grace to hold up under all circumstances, all criticisms and abuses, and with an eye single to God's glory and the help and advancement of His cause push onward in sending forth the paper each week filled with such matter as God gives us to see is right. We also appreciate Brother Clark's renewal and suggestion that all our readers renew. If every reader of the paper would send us as much as one dollar now, though they are ahead with us, it would enable us to get on our feet again from the terrible strain caused by sickness and financial embarrassment, and no doubt relieve our mind to such an extent that we would be free to think and act for the better in our editorial work. May God bless our dear readers, and place it in their minds to render such aid as is necessary to hold us up under all circumstances. C. H. C.

Sunday School Frauds

---April 13, 1915

Mayor Roberts and some of his machine of Terre Haute, Ind., are having a good deal of trouble in Uncle Sam's court for using repeaters in elections and other election frauds. If fraudulent, dishonest and criminal for a man to vote in one precinct in a city and then be rushed in an automobile to another city precinct and voted, is it any less reprehensible or any more honest for a church or Sunday school to use repeaters, who have already been counted in one Sunday school in a city, and are almost bodily pulled into another in order to be counted and to make a show?

Up in Pike County, Ky., men have been tried and convicted recently for selling their votes for \$1 and the rise, in a recent Kentucky election. Is a church or Sunday school any the less reprehensible, that pays Sunday school pupils cigars or free shaves to get them to attend on a given Sunday, when they want to make a big show? Does the fact that it is done in the name of religion and on Sunday make such methods any more honest or honorable than when done on a week day in a state or national election?

The above appeared in the News and Truths of March 31, 1915, which paper is edited by H. B. Taylor, at Murray, Ky. Here we have a plain admission that the Sunday schools practice such frauds as that men are prosecuted for by the courts of the land, when practiced in state affairs. And this, too, by an institution which claims for its object the bringing of souls to Christ! Oh, shame, where is thy blush! What honest, well informed person can believe that such a thing as this can have for its real object the salvation of souls? Such practice as this only educates the young and rising generation to engage in deceptive practices, and even engage in swindling schemes for worldly gain. No wonder the jails and penitentiaries are crowded. No wonder that murder, theft, robbery, lying, cheating, and all kinds of immorality are increasing so rapidly. The Lord only knows what the end will be. And in the face of all such things as these, some Old Baptists allow their children to go to Sunday school. If you love your children, for the Lord's sake keep them away from such schools. C. H. C.

Paul's Regeneration

---April 13, 1915

Brother D. M. Raulston, of East Chattanooga, Tenn., asks when Paul was regenerated. He says, "I feel almost sure I know what you will say, or what you teach, but I want to be positive." He was regenerated while on his way from Jerusalem to Damascus to bind and cast in prison those who called on the name of the Lord. When he was brought before the king, Agrippa, for the doctrine he taught, and his teaching was there called in question, and he made his memorable defense before the king, the first thing he did was to relate his experience; he told what "great things the Lord had done for him."

As he was on his way the Lord spoke to him. When the Lord speaks to the dead, He imparts life. Saul was in love with sin, and a hater of the Lord; but he was made alive to his condition. He saw that he was a great sinner, and cried out, "Who art thou, Lord?" The Lord did not need a preacher to introduce Him, or to make Him known to Saul He said, "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest." This was equivalent to saying, "I am your Saviour." Saul now possessed a will which he did not have when he left Jerusalem. When he started on the journey he had a will to persecute the saints of God; but now he had a will to know and do the Lord's will. Hence he said, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Will springs from life, and as he now has a righteous will—a will to serve the Lord—which he did not have before, it simply shows that he now has a life which he did not have before. C. H. C.

Revelation 22:17-19

---April 13, 1915

Brother T. A. Simmons, Belleville, Ala., has requested our views of (**Revelation 22:17-18,19**), which reads, "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely. For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come."

The Spirit of God in the heart of every child of God prompts him to right living. It says for him to come and walk in the right way, in obedience to the Master. It says for him to go home to his friends. And the church says for him to come. "Come and go with us, for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel." "And let him that heareth say, Come." The minister of the gospel of Christ, and those who hear with an understanding heart say, Come. Those who are required to come are those who are thirsty and who have the will. Thirst and will both spring from life.. The living are the ones who are required to come. "If any man shall add unto these things." We should do what the Lord requires, and no more. It is as bad to add to as it is to take from. Both are forbidden here. If one adds to, and does things not required, then the Lord has promised to add the plagues. If he takes away, fails to do what is required, then his part is taken away out of the book of life, or from the tree of life, and out of the holy city. The holy city is the church. His part is taken away. He is rejected, and the blessings which the Lord bestows upon His obedient children are denied him. C. H. C.

Hosea 2:3 AND Isaiah 50:1

---April 13, 1915

Brother C. H. Wells, Plattsburg, Miss., has asked us to give our views of ((**Hos 2:3**) (**Hosea 2:3**) and (**Isaiah 1:1**), and also asks us why the church is called the Baptist Church. As to the name, will say that John was called a Baptist, and the Lord gave him that name. He baptized the persons who first composed the church. The church was composed of baptized believers. Jesus organized His church and the first members, those whom He first placed in the church, were baptized persons who had been baptized by John.

We would call them Baptists, then. Hence what is known as the Baptist Church is the church of God. They have been called by different names in the different ages and countries since the days of the apostles; but the name of a thing does not change its nature. The identity of the church of God has remained with those who contended for Scriptural doctrine and practice in all the ages since the church was established by the Saviour while on earth. As we do not feel like writing on the two passages of Scripture referred to, we thought it would not be out of place to give our readers the benefit of Gill's comments on them as follows. C. H. C.

We do not deem it necessary to copy Gill's comments in this book.-C. H. C.

Isaiah 35:6-7

---April 13, 1915

Brother J.M. Coleman, Copeland, Ark., requests our views of **((6) (Isaiah 35:6-7))**, which reads, "Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of dragons, where each lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes."

We have thought that this was figurative language, representing something of the joy and peace that fills the heart of the poor sinner who has realized his lost and ruined condition in and by reason of sin, when Jesus is manifested to him in the pardon and forgiveness of his sins. If you can remember when you first realized that Jesus was your Saviour, that He was the chiefest among ten thousand and altogether lovely, we think you have realized something of what the prophet here refers to. C. H. C.

Tour in Illinois and Missouri

---April 20, 1915

We left home on Friday morning, February 12, to fill appointments which had been arranged for us by Elder F. M. Pope in Illinois. We arrived in Neoga late in the afternoon. Brother Pope met us at the train, and conveyed us out to Concord Church, near Neoga, and we tried to preach there that night. Also filled appointments there Saturday and Sunday and in Neoga Sunday night at the home of a dear old brother who was not able to go to the church. Elders F. M. Pope and D. E. Baker were with us at this church.

Elder Pope was called home Sunday evening on account of illness of some of his family. Elder Baker remained with us at Neoga. The meetings were all pleasant, and we enjoyed our stay among those good people. From Neoga we went to Arthur, where we tried to preach on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday nights, and spent the time at the home of Brother Floyd Butler, who moved to Illinois from Macon County, Tenn.

Many people in Arthur had never heard an Old Baptist preach. Some of them seemed to think the doctrine was not so bad as some people seemed to think it was. We tried to "give them something to talk about," if they did not believe it. We were kindly treated at this place, and were sorry to leave Brother Butler's family. We went from Arthur to Hindsboro, Brother Butler accompanying us, where we filled appointments Thursday and Friday, February 18 and 19. We met Elder F. M. Reeds at this place. This is his home; and we spent one night with him. He has not been well for some time, but we were glad to find him improving, and trust that he may be fully restored to health. We had a pleasant stay at Hindsboro, and shall not forget their kindness to us.

From Hindsboro we went to Providence, where we had meeting Saturday and Sunday. The meeting at Providence was very pleasant indeed.

Next, we went to Bethlehem, where we had meeting Monday night, Tuesday, and Tuesday night. This meeting was also pleasant. Then we went to Sugar Creek, where we filled appointments on Wednesday and Thursday. This church is in the village of Nevins, near Paris. We spent the two nights in Paris; Wednesday night with Brother H. E. Gill and family, and Thursday night with friend Silas Moffett and family. Both are very pleasant families. Mr. Moffett is a strong Old Baptist in belief, but will not come into the vineyard. The meetings at the church were pleasant, and the brethren and friends were all kind and good to us.

On Friday we went to Concord (New Concord), near Kansas, where we tried to preach that night, and also on Saturday and Sunday and at nights. Elder Pope was

with us here, and is the pastor of the church. He is highly esteemed by the members and friends there. The meetings at this place were very much enjoyed; it was pleasant, indeed, to be with these people. We shall not soon forget their kindness to us.

On Monday we went to Mt. Zion, near Windsor, and filled appointments there on Monday night, Tuesday night, Wednesday and Wednesday night. The meetings at this place were very pleasant. Elder W. A. Chastain is the pastor, but he was not with us, as it is so far from his home. They were good and kind to us, and we trust the Lord may bestow His blessings upon them.

On Thursday we went to Bayle City, arriving there at about 7:51 that evening. Elder Pope met us at the train. The night was dark, the wind blowing a gale, and the snow falling thick and fast. But we were soon comfortably situated in the home of Elder Pope with him and his pleasant family. Elder Pope is a splendid companion, and we enjoyed being with him. Bayle City is the home of Elder D. E. Baker also. We filled appointments at the church near this place on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, and also Friday and Saturday nights, and on Sunday night at the home of Elder Baker. We enjoyed our stay with these good brethren. The meetings were all pleasant, and well attended, considering the inclemency of the weather. Elder J. L. Dobbs, of Springfield, was present Saturday and Sunday.

On Monday morning we took our leave of Elders Pope and Baker, regretting that we could not be with them more, going on our journey to Missouri to fill appointments as arranged by Elder E. B. Bartlett. The first appointment in that state was at Bryant's Creek, near Elsberry. We arrived in Elsberry in the afternoon. We were met at the train by Friend Perry (we do not remember his initials), who lives with his mother, and conveyed to their home, where we spent the night comfortably and pleasantly. Tuesday morning we went to the meetinghouse, where we had the pleasure of meeting Elders Bartlett and J. A. Conlee. Elder Conlee is the pastor of the church, though his home is in Waverly, I11. We filled appointments here Tuesday and Wednesday. The meetings were pleasant, though the congregations were small. We are hoping to hear that some have united with the church there soon, for some gave evidence of a desire to follow the Saviour.

On Thursday we went to the vicinity of Sand Run Church, Elder Bartlett accompanying us and Elder Conlee returning home. We regretted that Brother Conlee could not be with us more. On Friday we met with the brethren at Sand Run, and tried to preach to them. The meeting was pleasant, and we enjoyed being with those people. At about midnight we went with Elder Bartlett to his home in Buell; and met with the church at Elkhorn on Saturday and Sunday. Elder Stuart Flanigan, of Springfield, III, was with us here at this church. He and Elder Bartlett serve the church jointly.

The congregations were larger here than at some of the places we visited, and we trust that the church may prosper. They were kind and good to us, and we enjoyed their company and association. We next went to Bethel Church, Elder Bartlett still accompanying us, and filled appointments there on Monday and Tuesday. The attendance was small each day, but the meetings were pleasant. From Bethel we went to Macedonia, Elder Bartlett with us, where we filled appointments on Wednesday and Thursday. The meetings at this place were also pleasant, though the attendance was small.

Thursday night we again went with Elder Bartlett to his home, and on Friday he accompanied us to Siloam, or near there. The appointments were at a schoolhouse near the home of Brother Enoch Branstetter, as the Burnamites had the use of the meetinghouse at this time. There was a division at this place a number of years ago, the Burnamites leaving the original Old Baptist principles, but both sides

continue to use the house, and this was the time that they had the use of it. On Friday a Sister Henderson died, and her funeral was to be conducted on Saturday; and as she had a number of relatives who lived in the vicinity of the schoolhouse who desired to attend the funeral, the appointment for Saturday was called in. We attended the funeral, which was preached by Elder W. J. Hardesty at Goshen Church. We filled an appointment at the schoolhouse that night and on Sunday. The meetings were pleasant at this place also. On Monday morning Elder Bartlett bade us farewell, he returning home. We were sorry to separate from him. He had been with us all the time that we had been in the state, and we enjoyed his company. We trust the Lord may bless his labors. We went that morning to visit our brother-in-law, Brother H. L. Miller, who was at Fulton for his health. We were agreeably surprised to find him so much improved as he was. That evening we took our leave of him, promising to try to return in a few days, and went to Moberly where we had to remain over night.

Next morning we went to Madison, where we were met and conveyed to Mt. Pleasant Church. We filled appointments there Tuesday and Wednesday. The congregations were large for weekdays and were very attentive. The meetings were very pleasant, indeed. Elder Hutchinson was present each day, and we enjoyed his company. Elder S. L. Pettus was with us on Wednesday. We were glad to see him again. The brethren all seemed to enjoy our feeble efforts in trying to proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ, not only at this place, but at the other places visited. We returned to Moberly Wednesday evening, and on Thursday went to Fulton again. Our brother-in-law was so much improved that he was well enough to come home; so he came with us. We arrived home Friday morning, March 26, and found all as well as when we left. Our hearts were all made glad, that Brother Miller was able to be at home again, and those who had been at home were as well as when we left. We feel to be so thankful to the good Lord that everything is as well with us as it is.

This was a very pleasant tour, taken all in all, though the congregations were small at some places, and some seem to be in a kind of careless state; yet we found some faithful ones at the different places. The Lord will not leave Himself without witness. There will always be a few faithful ones. They were all kind and good to us, and we shall not soon forget the many acts of kindness shown us. May the Lord bless each one we met, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Throgmorton vs Throgmorton

---April 20, 1915

In the Illinois Baptist of April 3, 1915, under the heading of "Questions and Answers," we find the following, supposedly the production of the editor, Elder W. P. Throgmorton: Baptists, ever since the Freewills started as a separate people, held aloof from them, because of their doctrine and practice. It was a Baptist principle to make correct doctrine and practice a test of denominational fellowship. Now the Freewills are taken into denominational fellowship and not asked to surrender a single doctrine or practice. But Brother Wells says we have surrendered "not a one." Baptists formerly invited to the Lord's table only persons of "the same faith and order." Now Freewills are invited who are of different faith and order. Brother Wells declares that the Free Baptists have become Baptists. And yet they have not given up a single thing which has always differentiated them from the Baptists. According to Brother Wells it has come to pass among Baptists, "Men are free to preach the truth as they see it." So a man can preach anything which he thinks is truth and be a Baptist. No wonder the Northern Baptists are becoming like

Alexander Campbell once said his people were. He said, "All kinds of men are preaching all kinds of doctrines under the broad banners of the reformation." And in the Northern Baptist Convention we have from Orthodoxy to Unitarianism; from open membership to "close communion" the strictest. We are glad to be so little identified with it as we are. Perhaps the Fullerites have been encouraged in their looseness and broad liberalities by the stand taken by this same Elder W. P. Throgmorton in his debate with Elder Lemuel Potter at Fulton, Ky., in July, 1887, on the question, "Who are the Primitive Baptists?" In his first speech in that debate Elder Throgmorton used the following language. See Throgmorton-Potter debate, pages 2, 3, 4:

Let me define a Missionary Baptist Church affirmatively and negatively, as to policy and as to constitution: 1st. It holds that the gospel should be preached to every creature, and that every sinner should be exhorted to repentance and faith; that repentance and faith are duties as well as graces; and that the reading, and especially the preaching of the word, is a means of conviction and conversion of sinners. 2nd. It holds (or may hold) that it is right to pay a minister a salary, but does not make such payment a test of denominational fellowship. 3rd. It holds (or may hold) that missionary associations, conventions, societies, boards and committees are warranted by the word of God; but it does not make cooperation with such things in the way of paying money into their treasuries a test of denominational fellowship. 4th. It holds (or may hold) that the Sunday school is authorized by the word of God; but it does not make participation in Sunday school work a test of denominational fellowship. 5th. It holds (or may hold) that it is right to have denominational institutions of learning; but it does not require patronage in the way of contributions, or otherwise, to such schools, as a test of denominational fellowship. 6th. It holds (or may hold) to the doctrines taught in the old Philadelphia confession of faith, but it does not make strict Calvinism a test of denominational fellowship, I wish to say a few more words on this matter of fellowship.

There is a distinction between Christian, church, associational, and denominational fellowship. We may entertain Christian fellowship for a man who is not even a Baptist. An individual Baptist Church may have tests of fellowship as to its own members which it does not make a test with sister churches. An individual Baptist Association may require tests as to the churches in its own membership that it does not require of other associations in order to fellowship with them. For a church or an association to belong to the Missionary Baptist denomination, it must simply be in a general union with the churches and associations of the denomination. There may be two associations of Missionary Baptists which have no correspondence directly with each other; yet both belong to the general union.

We judge that the Freewills, to whom Elder Throgmorton is now objecting, would accept each of the six principles which he laid down in defining what a Missionary Baptist Church is. They would not object to Number 1; they will agree with No. 2; they believe No. 3; they practice No. 4; they hold to No. 5; they will give their hand on No. 6. Then why may they not be with the Fullerites in general union?

The union of the Fullerites and the Freewills is no violation of a single principle laid down by Elder Throgmorton, or contended for by him, in that debate. He said, "For a church or an association to belong to the Missionary Baptist denomination, it must simply be in general union with the churches and associations of the denomination." All that is necessary to be a Missionary Baptist, according to this, is simply to be in general union with the churches and associations of the denomination. If that is all that is necessary, and Elder Throgmorton said it is all, then it makes no difference what they believe, teach, or practice, they are

Missionary Baptists if they are in general union with the churches and associations of the denomination.

A great man like Elder Throgmorton should not shift his positions this way. How can we know, now, what a Missionary Baptist is? Was he right when he was in debate with Elder Potter? If so, he should stick to it now. Principles are eternal, and never change. If the principles he contended for then were right then, they are right now. If he refuses to stand upon those principles now, we will accord honesty to him and concede that it is because he does not now think those principles are right. If they are not right now, they were not right then. If they were not right then, the Missionary Baptists are not the Primitive Baptists; they are not the original Baptists.

If those principles were right then, and Elder Throgmorton is now departing from them, then he is now departing from the principles of the original Baptists. Hence, either way you take it, Elder Throgmorton is not one of the original Baptists. He is departing from the original Baptists, to say the least of it, whether he was right then, or whether he is right now. Poor fellow, he is in a hole, and a stopper is in the mouth of the hole. C. H. C.

Mourners Benches

---April 27, 1915

Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-I would like to have an expression from you on the following questions: Why, and in what way, are Baptists opposed to mourners benches and effort meetings held for the purpose of getting souls saved? Do you know of any Old Baptist Churches or associations that have declared non fellowship for them? In reading Baptist Articles of Faith can we not safely take it for granted that they are opposed to those things, even if they do not specify them? What would you say concerning the act of an Old Baptist brother who goes to a meeting of that kind and helps in that kind of work? Is an Old Baptist brother eligible to register under the name of Old Baptist who engages in that kind of work? Would like to have your answer through the paper in the near future. Yours in hope, Buford Oldham. Owenaville, Ind.

REMARKS

Old Baptists are opposed to mourners benches and effort meetings held for the purpose of getting souls saved, because the very object of such meetings is contrary to the whole teaching of the Scriptures. The eternal salvation of poor sinners does not depend upon the efforts of men. If the eternal salvation of sinners does depend upon the efforts of men, then they are justifiable in engaging in anything men may invent in order to the accomplishment of that end.

And if this be true, then anything may be engaged in, which has that object in view, whether the Bible authorizes it or not. But it is wrong to engage in any sort of religious practice which the Bible does not authorize. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works." (II Timothy 3:16-17).

The word throughly in this text has become obsolete (gone out of use), and means thoroughly. From this text we learn, (1) that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God; (2) that all Scripture is profitable; (3) that it is profitable, for doctrine; (4) that it is profitable for reproof; (5) that it is profitable for correction; (6) that it is profitable for instruction in righteousness-that is, in right living; (7) that it is all for

the man of God-that is, for the child of God; (8) that it is given for the perfection of the child of God-that the child of God may reach a state of perfection in the service of God, not a state of holiness as taught by the modern Holiness people; (9) that it is given that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

This being true-that the Scripture is given that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works then it must be true that the Scripture teaches everything that we ought to believe or practice religiously. If the Scripture teaches everything that we ought to believe or practice religiously, then it is wrong to believe or practice anything religiously that the Scripture does not teach. The Scripture does not teach that sinners are regenerated, or born of God, through the efforts of men, but that regeneration is the work of God alone.

Hence, all such efforts are wrong. They are not only wrong, but are a flagrant denial that regeneration is the work of God alone. The man who engages in such says by his act that he does not believe that "salvation is of the Lord." His act proves that he believes salvation is of the efforts of men. It is really little better than infidelity. It is not much worse to deny the existence and being of God than to deny His word and His work. It is also presumption to engage in such work; for in so doing, the man presumes to accomplish the work that God has reserved to Himself, and which He, alone, does. The regeneration of the sinner is of God's own sovereign will and work. See **(John 1:13)**.

In that text John denies that regeneration is of the will or work of man. It is not of the will of the flesh. It is not of blood. If it is not of the will of the flesh, the will of men has nothing whatever to do with it. If the will of men has nothing to do with it, then their effort meetings have nothing to do with the regeneration of sinners. They claim to be very willing and anxious to save souls; but they say the thing in the way of the salvation of the sinners is that the sinners are unwilling. But John says it is not of the will of the flesh; hence the will of the sinners has nothing to do with it. It is not of blood; hence it is not the work or doing of men that regenerates the sinner. The doings of men have nothing whatever to do with it. "But of God."

It is of the sovereign will and the sovereign work of Almighty God that sinners are regenerated or born of God. Sinners are born of God by the work of God, and not by the work of men. Aid societies and efforts of men will not result in the birth of a single heir of promise. "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." -Galatians iv. 28. Sarah's aid and Abraham's effort resulted in the birth of Ishmael, who was a mocker; but did not result in the birth of Isaac, the promised child. So, their aids and efforts now may result in the birth of Ishmaelites, but cannot, and do not, result in the birth of a single promised child. There is no good reason for such practice, and there is every reason for opposing it.

As to any Old Baptist Church or association declaring nonfellowship for such practice, will say that we know of no Old Baptist Church or association which believes in or practices such. In fact, to believe in or practice such is not to be an Old Baptist. In our articles of faith we have this item: "That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are a revelation from God, written by inspiration of God, teaching, as they do, all that we ought to believe, know or practice religiously." This is the second item in the articles of faith or abstract of principles appearing in our columns nearly every week, and which this paper has been pledged to defend ever since it has been published. All our churches have an article containing the same in substance.

The old London Confession of Faith teaches the same thing in the following language contained in Chapter I, Sec. 6: "The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down or necessarily contained in the Holy Scripture; unto which

nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelation of the Spirit, or tradition of men." This is what the apostle believed; it is what the Baptists believed in 1689, and it is what Old Baptists believe now. If one believes otherwise, he is not an Old Baptist. Hence, if one believes in those effort meetings for the salvation of sinners, he is not an Old Baptist. He is no more entitled to be called an Old Baptist than a bed bug is entitled to be called an angel of mercy.

These confessions show what Old Baptists believe. This is what they have fellowship for. It virtually says that they do not have fellowship for anything that is contrary to this. No person can fellowship a thing and at the same time fellowship another thing that is diametrically opposed to that thing. Hence, no man can endorse the Baptist confession of faith, and at the same time endorse effort meetings for the salvation of souls.

Any member of an Old Baptist Church who takes part in and engages in such effort meetings should be reprov'd or admonished, and unless he repents, should be excluded from the fellowship of the church. To engage in such is disorderly, because it denies the teaching of God's word, and every person who walks disorderly should be withdrawn from. "Now, we command you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us." -(Th 3:6) (II Thessalonians 3:6).

We think the foregoing answers all the questions propounded by the brother. We know that we have been plain. It was not with the intention of wounding the feelings of any person, but because we feel that the question needs to be dealt with plainly. We trust that what we have said may be blessed to the good of some of our readers. C. H. C.

Free Moral Agency

---April 27, 1915

L. E. Lindsey, of Statesboro, Ga., requests our views on "free moral agency," and refers to one who believes in a second work of the Holy Spirit, and that there is only one salvation, and that Christ died for everybody, and that we have got to meet the conditions or be damned forever.

As to "free moral agency" will say that the Arminian world talks about this as though they think the human will is on an equipoise or equilibrium, without any bias to either good or evil. They claim that the sinner is free to either accept or reject the Lord-accept the Lord and be saved, or reject the Lord and be condemned. They claim that the sinner is free to act for himself either way, hence a "free moral agent." As to the freedom, will say that man does act freely. The sinner acts freely in committing sin. The unregenerate sinner loves sin. He prefers sin rather than holiness or righteousness. If he rejects sin or unrighteousness, then, and accepts holiness, or accepts the Lord, he does not act freely, for he prefers unrighteousness.

The reason why he prefers sin and unrighteousness is because his nature is poisoned with sin. Unrighteousness is in harmony with his nature. No one can prefer that which is not in harmony with his nature. Therefore, the sinner is not free in the sense that his will is unbiased. Will being a product of life, it necessarily follows that the will is like the life from which it springs, the will and the life are necessarily alike in nature. From the natural life springs a will for natural things. The natural life is poisoned with sin, and the will which springs from that life, must, therefore, also be a poisoned will. The will is, therefore, biased to evil or sin.

This being true, if the sinner accepts Christ, he accepts what he does not really want. To say that God saves the sinner upon such a condition as that is absurd, to say the least of it. But that is about as good as any of the modern theology. In order that one act freely in the service of God, he must first possess the holy or righteous life, the life of Christ, which is a higher order of life than the natural life. From that holy or righteous life springs a holy will, or a will for righteousness. If one accepts Christ, then, because he prefers holiness or righteousness rather than unrighteousness, it is because he already possesses the righteous life, from which the righteous will springs. He is already a child of God. In talking to people who had not the love of God in them the Saviour said, "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." (John 6:40).

Those people had no will to come to the Saviour. "YE WILL NOT," is the language of our Lord. He certainly knew what He was talking about. These people did not have the love of God in them, and were destitute of a will to come to Christ. They had no such will as that. They did have a will for unrighteousness, but not for righteousness. This is a complete refutation of the doctrine of "free moral agency" as it is taught by the whole Arminian world. Much could be written on this line, but this will do for the present.

As to the second work of the Holy Spirit, will say that the Bible says nothing about such a thing as some people call a "second work of the Spirit" or a "second work of grace." It is the office work of the Holy Spirit, the third Person in the adorable Trinity, to regenerate sinners; and the Holy Spirit is also promised as a Comforter of God's children; but this in no wise teaches what some are pleased to call a "second work of the Holy Spirit." What they mean by such statements is that one must become wholly sinless, or reach a state of sinless perfection. The Bible in no place intimates that one can ever reach such a state in this life. We have already written some articles on this question, which have been published in our columns heretofore; so we will not write more on that now. If there is only one salvation, or one kind of saving, spoken of in the Bible, then no man under heaven can harmonize the Bible. In **(Ephesians 2:5)** the apostle says, "By grace ye are saved." They are saved by the unmerited favor of Christ.

This being true, they are not saved by reason of any good thing done by them. The same apostle says, in another place, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us." -(Titus 3:5). They are saved according to God's mercy, and not by any righteous works performed by them. The same writer says, "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." -(I Timothy 4:16). Here is a saving which follows as a result of doing some thing, and that doing is a righteous doing. Here is a saving, then, which follows as a result of righteous doing. But this saving is not an eternal saving, or the receiving of eternal life. The receiving of eternal life is "not by works of righteousness which we have done," but according to God's mercy.

Timothy was a child of God, already in possession of eternal life, when Paul wrote the language to him just quoted. Hence, it was too late for him to save himself in that respect; but it was not too late for him to save himself from false doctrines and wrong practices by taking heed unto himself and to the doctrine and continuing therein. He would save others-"them that hear thee"-in the same way that he would save himself by doing what the apostle here admonished; hence he would save others from false doctrines and wrong practices. Christ said He laid down His life for the sheep. He did not lay down His life for the goats. Hence He did not die for all the race.

If the receiving of eternal life is conditional on the part of the sinner, and the sinner must hear and understand the conditions in order to perform them, then no sinner would ever be saved. "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." -John viii. 43. Jesus says they CANNOT hear. If they must do this in order to be saved, then they must do what they CANNOT do. Their salvation, therefore, would be IMPOSSIBLE. C. H. C.

Ephesians 2:1-5

---May 4, 1915

Brother D. M. Raulston, of East Chattanooga, Tenn., asks, "What do you believe **(Ephesians 2:1)** teaches-especially the word quickened?" The words hath he quickened in (Ephesians 2:1) are not in the original, but are in (Ephesians 2:5). The word quickened, as here used, means to make alive; to vivify; to revive; to resuscitate, as from death or an inanimate state. The language simply means that the Lord made them alive from the dead. They had been dead in trespasses and sins before this work was done; but when this was done they were raised up out of a state of death into a state of life. They possessed natural life before this work was done; but they now possess a higher order of life-the divine life. They have been made partakers of the divine nature, and have been given eternal life. C. H. C.

The Christian Sun

---May 4, 1915

A copy of a paper bearing the above name has been sent to us with a request that we notice some of the contents. The paper is published at Elon College, N. C, and the copy we have before us is dated February 3, 1915. We have been told by the so-called "Christians" that they have no creeds or confessions of faith, but we find one printed on the front page of this paper. The second article says that "Christian is a sufficient name for the church."

They are real anxious to wear the name Christian, whether they even resemble one or not. "And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach." -(Isaiah 4:1). Evidently the order represented by The Christian Sun is one of the women the prophet mentioned, for they are evidently not depending on Christ for life and salvation, but upon their own works and righteousness.

Their third article of faith says that "The Bible is a sufficient rule of faith and practice;" but we notice that they have Sunday schools, Christian Endeavor societies, women's missionary boards and societies, and so on. If the Bible is a sufficient rule it authorizes everything that should be practiced in the name of Christianity; and no man can show Bible authority for these societies and institutions that these people are engaging in. When did any apostle organize a Christian Endeavor society or Women's Missionary society or board at Ephesus, or at Corinth, or at any other place? They did not do such a thing. These people have no right to claim that they have the Bible for their guide, for they are not following it.

There are several things in the editorial department which we notice that are contrary to the teaching of God's word. We haven't space for all of them. To give space to all the teaching the paper contains that is contrary to the Bible, we would have to reproduce most all of the paper. However, we will copy the following, which appears in that paper under the heading of "God's Quest of Men:" God is seeking

ever to break into the lives of men. It doth not yet appear what we shall be when He will no longer break into our lives but will abide in us continuously. If we could see Him constantly, our desire for Him would be so great that He would abide in us to fill us with His own life and light and love.

God is seeking for men who will keep their faces turned toward Him and their eyes fixed on Him. Moses was such a man; David was such a man; Paul was. And God used them mightily to make His will and His way known unto others. God is depending on men and women who have their eyes upon Him, to make known to others His love and the power of salvation. He is not depending upon angels, nor institutions, nor societies, nor literature, nor invention, nor wealth; He is looking for and depending upon men to spread His truth, preach His gospel, make known His love. God will not, God cannot, save the world, the pagan, the heathen world, till men upon whom He is depending get ready to go forth to save for Him.

God is looking for and depending upon men, not ghosts or angels or spirits, to break the bread of life to the hungry and save those who are starving. God did not have to make Himself and His work of grace dependent upon men; but He did do so, of His own volition, of His own wisdom. "I heard the voice of the Lord, saying. Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I; send me." - (Isaiah 6:8).

If that does not "cap the climax" we would like to see the statement that would. The very idea that "God is depending upon men and women" "to make known to others His love and the power of salvation," is preposterous. It is ignorance personified. The idea of a man posing as a teacher, and yet using such language as that, is astonishing, indeed. The very idea that the great Creator and upholder of all material things, the great Sovereign Ruler of the universe, being dependent on poor, weak, puny, insignificant man for anything! The nations of the earth are accounted as the small dust of the balance in His sight, yet He is dependent on some of those small particles to make His love known, and to make known the power of salvation! Lord, pity such ignorance. It must be either ignorance or brazen effrontery.

Then "God will not, God cannot, save the world, the pagan, the heathen world, till men upon whom He is depending get ready to go forth to save for Him." This is nothing less than blasphemy. "With men this is impossible" -impossible to be saved-" but with God all things are possible," says our Lord; but this modern Solomon, blasphemer, and perverter says that with God this is impossible, but with men it is possible! "Let God be true, and every man a liar." Shall we believe what the Lord says, or shall we believe what this perverter says?

As for us, we believe what the Lord said, and we know that this blasphemer has not told the truth concerning the matter. God is not dependent upon men or measures for the salvation of sinners from everlasting ruin. Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, and He made perfect and complete satisfaction, reconciliation, atonement for the sins of all His people, and He is not depending on puny man for the work of atonement to be effectual. The Holy Spirit regenerates, and God is present everywhere at one and the same time, and is as able to save a sinner in heathendom as He is in America. He can save the sinner as well in one place as another. God looked one time and said that there was none to help. If this modern perverter tells the truth, God lied when He said there was none to help. But God did not lie; He told the truth; and this man has not told the truth. May the Lord pity such men. C. H. C.

Missionary Hope of Salvation

---May 11, 1915

Our Home Mission Board, through its evangelists, missionaries and missionary pastors is keeping the gospel fire burning. Your gifts are a part of the fuel. The gospel of Christ is the only hope of America's safety. America's safety is the greatest hope of the world's salvation.-Sel,

The above is from News and Truths, Murray, Ky., March 31, 1915. We find in this that the gifts from the people are a part of the fuel which keeps their gospel fire burning. We will agree with them that this is true; that the gifts of the people-the money they get by telling the people that the heathen are going to bell for want of the gospel-compose the greater portion of the fuel which keeps their gospel fire burning. We are aware that money is, by far, the greater part of the fire of their discourses and writings.

It is "money, money; give us money, or we die." With them, it is "no money, no gospel." Of course the fire will go out, unless it is supplied with fuel, and as money is the fuel, if money is not supplied, their gospel fire would cease to burn. Well, fox fire never did burn anything. It will scare people sometimes, who are in the dark; and their gospel fox fire has a great tendency to scare people into "getting religion." This may be one reason why they have so many members-perhaps many of them have been scared by their gospel fox fire. Fox fire never shines only in the dark. The shining of their gospel fox fire always stops when it comes in contact with the light of truth.

"America's safety is the greatest hope of the world's salvation." The hope of salvation, according to these fox fire Fullerites, is not in the atoning merits of the blood of Christ, or the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, but in America's safety. Poor hope, this. Their hope is very different from that of the apostle." In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." -(Titus 1:2). Paul's hope was not based on the safety of America, but on the promise of God. He was depending alone on the Lord. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." -(I Timothy 1:15). This was the apostle's hope of salvation, and it is the only hope of salvation now." Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you, who by Him do believe in God, that raised Him up from the dead, and gave Him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God." - ((Pet 1:18) (I Peter 1:18-21)

The only hope of salvation is in God, and not in the safety of America. At least, that is where the hope of the child of God is-in God. The redeemed person, who has been born again, knows that he was not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold. All the silver and gold that these money sharks have ever begged from the people, or that they may ever yet beg from them, under the pretext of saving souls from eternal ruin, has never resulted in the eternal salvation of one sinner, and never will cause the salvation of one of the race. C. H. C.

Gill on Romans 7:2-3

---May 11, 1915

Brother E. M. Knighten, of Minden, La., requests us to publish Gill's comments on **(Romans 7:2-3)**, and asks if this harmonises with his comments on **(Matthew 19:9)** and other such Scriptures. In order to show whether they harmonize or not, we give space for his comments on both passages. The following is on **(Romans 7:2-3)** "For the woman which hath an husband," etc. The former general rule here illustrated by a particular instance and example in the law of marriage; a woman that is married to a man," is bound by the law to her husband;" to live with him, in subjection and obedience to him, "so long as he liveth;" except in cases of adultery, **(Matthew 19:9)**, and desertion, (I Corinthians 12:15); by which the bond of marriage is loosed, and for which a divorce or separation may be made, which are equal to death: "but if the husband be dead she is loosed from the law of her husband;" the bond of marriage is dissolved, the law of it is abolished, and she is at entire liberty to marry whom she will, ((9) (I Corinthians 7:39).

"So then if while her husband liveth," etc. True indeed it is, that whilst her husband is alive, if" she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress;" she will be noted and accounted of as such by everybody, except in the above mentioned cases: "but if her husband be dead," then there can be no exception to her marriage;" she is free from that law;" of marriage by which she was before bound:" "so that she is no adulteress;" nor will any reckon her such; she is clear from any such imputation:" though she be married to another man;" hence it appears that second marriages are lawful.

From the above it is evident that Gill here makes an exception from Paul's language in Corinthians-that if the unbelieving wife departs, then the believing husband is at liberty to marry another woman. It is clear to our minds that the apostle meant no such thing, for he said in the same chapter, in a preceding verse, "let them be reconciled." If the believing husband marries another woman after the unbelieving wife has left him, he places himself in a position which renders reconciliation impossible. We know that the apostle did not thus contradict himself, especially in the same chapter. Besides, our Lord makes no such provision. The only provision our Saviour makes whereby one may put away the companion and marry again is for fornication.

Here is what Gill says on **(Matthew 19:9)** "Whosoever shall put away his wife;" separate her from his person, house, and bed, and dismiss her as his wife, no more to be considered in that relation to him," except it be for fornication;" or whoredom, for defiling his bed: for this is not to be understood of fornication committed before, but of uncleanness after marriage, which destroys them being one flesh: "and shall marry another" woman" committeth adultery;" Mark adds, "against her;" which may be understood either of the woman he marries, which not being lawfully done, she lives in adultery with another woman's husband; of his former wife, and to whose injury he has married another; and he not only commits adultery himself, but, as in **(Matthew 5:32)** "causeth her to commit adultery" also, by being the occasion of marrying another man, when she is still his lawful wife; "and whoso marrieth her which is put away," for any other cause than adultery," doth commit adultery" also; since he cohabits with another man's wife. In this comment on **(Matthew 19:9)** Gill places the only construction which can be placed upon the Saviour's language. The apostle does not contradict the Saviour. C. H. C.

Close Communion

---May 18, 1915

J. A. Tomlin, Franklin, Tenn., has written us that he likes our doctrine, but cannot see into the "close communion" of the church. We have often remarked that our people do not practice close communion. We are aware that our practice on the communion question is called that; but it is not communion that we are "close" on- it is baptism upon which we are "close." We will commune with any member of our church who is in good standing and good order at home, no matter where his home is. But we do not commune with those who are not members of our own order. In order to become a member of the Primitive Baptist Church, one must be baptized by a Primitive Baptist minister-one who has been authorized to administer baptism for the Primitive Baptists. Those thus baptized break bread (commune) together. See **(Acts 2:41-42)**. Only those who had been baptized broke bread. Those who had been baptized did not break bread with those who had not been baptized. We practice that yet. This one text is enough to show that our people are right on the communion question. Much could be written on the question, but our space is limited, and we have to be brief. C. H. C.

Heathen Souls

---May 18, 1915

In the words of Pastor Gossner: "Believe, hope, love, pray, burn, waken the dead! Hold fast by prayer; wrestle like Jacob! Up, up, my brethren! The Lord is coming: and to everyone He will say: 'Where hast thou left the soul of these heathen? With the devil? O, swiftly seek these souls, and enter not without them into the possession of the Lord.'"

The above appeared in the News and Truths, Murray, Ky., of March 31, 1915, from the pen of A. B. Simpson. We would like to know who can tell what these Fullerites believe. At one time they will claim to believe that salvation is altogether by grace, without creature effort or merit, and at another time they pose as soul savers, set aside the blood of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit in the eternal salvation of poor lost souls. It depends upon where they are as to what they say, or upon what they are trying to do-at least, it seems so. If they are in combat with Campbellites, they are great sticklers for salvation by grace.

If they are endeavoring to raise some funds for the so-called mission business, then the whole responsibility for the salvation of souls-especially the heathen-rests upon the people here who have a few dimes saved from their hard earnings. We wonder how this man ever found out that the Lord would demand, or say, "Where hast thou left the souls of these heathen? With the devil?" There is no intimation of such a thing in God's Book. It is no better than the devil's own invention. It is for no other object than to humbug the people, and to get their hard earned dollars under the false pretense of saving souls. These people evidently think that the Lord cannot save sinners, and that He has committed the work into their hands.

The prophet must have seen some of their claims and works by revelation and inspiration from God for he describes them very plainly: "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither His ear heavy, that it cannot hear; but your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid His face from you, that He will not hear. For your hands are defiled with blood, and your fingers with iniquity; your lips have spoken lies, your tongue hath muttered perverseness. None calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth: they trust in vanity, and speak lies; they conceive mischief, and bring forth iniquity. They hatch cockatrice eggs, and weave the spider's web: he that eateth of their eggs dieth, and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper. Their webs shall not become garments, neither shall they cover themselves with their works: their

works are works of iniquity, and the act of violence is in their hands. Their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood: their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity; wasting and destruction are in their paths. The way of peace they know not; and there is no judgment in their goings: they have made them crooked paths: whosoever goeth therein shall not know peace." -Isaiah lix. 1 to 8. But the Lord is not dependent on these "soul-savers" for the salvation of sinners. He accepts of none of their help. The Lord saves them without the help of man." Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bosrah? this that is glorious in His apparel, traveling in the greatness of His strength? I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the winefat? I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment. For the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come. And I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me. And I will tread down the people in mine anger, and make them drunk in my fury, and I will bring down their strength to the earth." -((63:1) (Isaiah 63:1-6). C. H. C.

Princeton and Billy Sunday

---May 18, 1915

Brother P. L. Combs, of Farmersburg, Ind., sent us the following clipping from the Literary Digest for April 24, 1915, which we reproduce without comment. Comment is unnecessary. The authorities of Princeton University refused to invite Mr. Sunday to hold services for the benefit of the students, and Professor West's objections to him are stated in the following clipping. We commend the stand taken by the authorities of Princeton University. It is a pity that all others do not take a like stand. C. H. C.

1. In matters of religion there is only one standard for Christians, and that standard is our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. I gladly admit that Mr. Sunday means to be evangelical in his statements. But many of his utterances are, to put it mildly, not Christlike, and some of them are travesties of the teaching of Christ. Take the following samples, less vulgar than many others, which are both a caricature and a perversion of one of the most sacred scenes in the New Testament: "Mary was one of those sort of unneedabiscuit, peanut butter, gelatin, and pimento sort of women. "Martha was a beefsteak, baked potato, applesauce with lemon and nutmeg, coffee and whipped cream, apple pie and cheese sort of women. "So you can have your pick, but I speak for Martha. So the churches have a lot of Marthas and a lot of Marys-merely benchwarmers. Hurrah for Martha!" "So Martha was getting dinner and poked her head in the door where Mary was sitting and said:" Mary, carest thou not that I serve alone?" Wouldn't it make you tired if you were doing all the work and had your hands all over dough and sweat rolling off as you cooked the potatoes, if your big, lazy sister was sitting doing nothing? Then Jesus said: "Tut, tut, Martha, thou carest for too many little things." Take another and worse instance, where Christ in prayer is turned to a jesting use: "And as he prayed the fashion of his countenance was altered. Ladies, do you want to look pretty? If some of you women would spend less on dope, pasassa, and cold cream, and get

down on your knees and pray, God would make you prettier." Very funny, no doubt: and very blasphemous.

2. At times Mr. Sunday is irreverently familiar toward God. This appears clearly in the scene at his Philadelphia meeting on January 8:

"Why, if I thought I could get any nearer God by kneeling or get nearer to Him by taking off my coat, I'd do it." Here Sunday suited the action to the word and tore his coat from his back. Seizing it by the collar in his right hand, he swung it around to lend emphasis to his utterances.

Here is another sample: "When I am at heaven's gates I'll be free from old Philly's blood. I can see now the day of judgment, when the question of Philadelphia and of me is taken up by God." You were down in Philly, weren't you Billy? The Lord will ask me. "And I'll say to Him, Yes, sir, Lord, I was there. Did you give them my message of salvation, Billy?" I gave them your message, Lord. I gave it to them the best way I could and as I understood it. You get the files of the Philadelphia papers. They printed my sermons, Lord. You'll see in them what I preached, will be my answer.

"And the Lord will say, Come on in, Bill; you're free from Philadelphia's blood." Turning to the Bible as exemplar, Prof. West declares that "there is no place in that book for swaggering impiety." "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord, is the right attitude of soul in the presence of God." The professor goes on to charge that "many of Mr. Sunday's remarks are personally abusive, or disgusting, or slanderous."

Here are citations: "If a woman on the avenue plays a game of cards in her home, she is worse than any blackleg gambler in the slums." If a minister believes and teaches evolution, he is a stinking skunk, a hypocrite, and a liar.

"If I were the wife of some of you men, I'd refuse to clean your old spittoons. I say let every hog clean his own trough." Your wife has as good a right to line up before a bar and fill up her skin with the hoggut you do as you have."

The statements that are "plainly indecent" are "fortunately few," remarks the professor, but the following he thinks should be read with the thought in mind that they are "the words of a professed minister of the gospel of Christ spoken at a religious service:" "I can understand why young bloods go for dancing, but some of you old ginks-good night." Ma and I stopped in to look at a ball at an inauguration ceremony. Well, I will be hornswaggled if I didn't see a woman there dancing with all the men, and she wore a collar of her gown around her waist. She had a little corset on, Oh, I can't describe it, "You stand there and watch man after man as he claims her hand, and put his name on her list. Perhaps that fellow was her lover and you won her hand-and you stand and watch your wife folded in his long, voluptuous, sensual embrace, their bodies swaying one against the other, their limbs twining and entwining, her head resting on his breast, they breathe the vitiated air beneath the glittering candelabra, and the spell of the music, and you stand there and tell me there is no harm in it! You're too low down for me.

"I want to see the color of some buck's hair that can dance with my wife! I'm going to monopolize that hugging myself." Then Herodias came in and danced with her foot stuck out to a quarter of 12, and old Herod said: 'Sis, you're a peach. You can have anything you want, even to the half of my kingdom. She hiked off to her licentious mother."

Professor West closes in these words: "Every passage quoted in this article is taken from the official copyrighted report of Mr. Sunday's Philadelphia addresses, published with his sanction in the Philadelphia Evening Telegraph during January

and February. Their accuracy cannot be questioned. It is true that these quotations are not the main stock and substance of his addresses, but some of the occasional ornaments, giving what is called punch to his discourses. They are things of the sort singled out for special separate printing in The Evening Telegraph, often in large type, as 'jolts. So they are.

"So in the name of decency and of the purity and sanctity of our Christian faith, Princeton University positively refuses to approve Mr. Sunday's performances as suitable for the edification of our students. In times of hysterical excitement we think it our right and duty to stand firm against all inflammatory moboratory in whatever field it may appear." For his quiet and sensible stand in this matter President Hibben deserves the thanks of all friends of education and religion.

A Debate

---May 25, 1915

Beginning on Tuesday, June 29, we will hold a four days debate at Headland, Ala., with W. T. Goalen, a Campbellite. The discussion will continue during Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, June 29 and 30, and July 1 and 2.

We have agreed to stay at the church near Headland and be with them on the first Sunday in July and Saturday before, after the debate closes. C. H. C.

Luke 16:19-31

---May 25, 1915

J. Rod Hilliard, of Goldston, N. C, requests our views on the "rich man and Lazarus," account of which is found in (Luke 16:19-31). He asks, "What hell is the rich man in?" Our opinion is that the rich man represented the Jews and Lazarus represented the Gentiles. During the law dispensation the rich man (Jews) fared sumptuously every day. They had the law and the prophets. The oracles of God were committed unto them. The Gentiles were poor, and were called dogs by the Jews. "The dogs came and licked his sores." "It is not meet to give the children's bread to the dogs." "Truth, Lord, but the dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from their master's table."

Hell is torment. The rich man had his good time during the law dispensation, but he is now in torment. The Jews are in torment, and are scattered over the earth, and have been ever since the destruction of the city of Jerusalem. The Gentiles have been carried to Abraham, and are resting in his bosom. They are now enjoying the blessings of the same faith which Abraham had. They are enjoying the blessings of the gospel, while the Jews are deprived of those blessings. C. H. C.

"Pastor" Russell

---May 25, 1915

A brother recently sent us a clipping from the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., giving a synopsis of one of the sermons of that modern religious humbug. The best class of newspapers are now refusing to publish his sermons. The brother asked us to copy the article and comment on the same. We are too crowded for space to give room for such humbugs as Russell. It seems to us that his miracle wheat deal is enough to convince any honest man that there is nothing to Mr. Russell.

We suppose he would be glad to know that there is no place of future punishment, called hell. We presume that he is such a man that it is not likely that he will escape that place, if there is such a place. That is the kind of fruit he seems to manifest. We suppose he would be glad to know that there is no such place, as the way for some people to escape it is for no such a place to exist. Russell's teachings cannot be true in the face of facts set forth in a little pamphlet we have published bearing the title, "General Judgment and Eternal Hell." The price is only ten cents for a single copy; 12 copies, \$1; 100 copies, \$5. Get a lot of them and circulate them among those who are being led into Russellism. C. H. C.
Note-The little pamphlet is now out of print.

All Infants Saved

---May 25, 1915

On another page of this paper will be found a letter and experience of a sister in Christ whose name is not given. In the letter she asks us this question: "Are the nonelect infants who die lost?" We would say to the sister, first, that this question supposes that there are some nonelect who die in infancy. Please remember, dear sister, that this can be only a supposition -that one dies in infancy who is not one of the elect. Now, let us say that God's elect are all saved. Those who are not of God's elect are not saved.

Then, if all who die in infancy are saved, it necessarily follows that all who die in infancy are of the elect of God. Then the question would necessarily be, Are all those saved who die in infancy? To this we would most emphatically say, YES. Then, we say that those not of God's elect do not die in infancy. Those who die in infancy are embraced in the number of God's elect, and all of God's elect are saved; hence, all that die in infancy are saved.

In **((0:15) (Mark 10:15))**, the Saviour says: "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." You must receive the kingdom of God just as a little child receives it, or you shall not receive it at all. If you receive the kingdom of God as a little child, and a little child misses it, then you will miss it, too. If one of the adult family of Adam's race receives the kingdom of God, then every little child receives it. Not only is this true, but the language carries with it the very idea that a little child receives the kingdom of God-not simply that one special little child receives it, but A LITTLE CHILD.

That expression embraces every little child. It is therefore true that everyone who dies in infancy is saved. We would, therefore, say to the sister that she may be assured, from the language of our blessed Saviour, that her little child is now, in spirit, resting in the presence of God and enjoying the glories of heaven. We would also say that the sister, in her letter, certainly expresses the very breathing and desire of the heaven born soul. She certainly expresses the desire which springs from the renewed heart. We certainly believe that she is a child of God, and that heaven will be her home when she is done with the sorrows and heartaches of this life. We have taken the liberty of publishing her letter as well as her experience, trusting that she will not object. May the Lord continue to bless her, and lead her to a full understanding of His truth, and enable her by His grace to walk in the right way, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Atonement

---May 25, 1915

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Friend and Brother, I Hope-I do not belong to any church, but am a strong believer in salvation by grace and grace alone. At times I feel like I want to go home to my friends (the Primitive Baptists) and tell them what I hope the Lord has done for me, as I believe they are the true church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, but I am too sinful to be which such good people. Brother Cayce, please answer the following questions for me through your paper: Did Christ atone for the sins that His people commit after regeneration? Second, Is it the child of God that commits the unpardonable sin? Your friend, Andie Presnell. Rominger, N. C.
OUR REPLY

Yes, Christ atoned for all the sins of all His people, whether those sins be by word, thought, or deed. It is true that those who have been born of God are chastised for their disobedience, but suffering chastisement does not make atonement. If you have a child who violates the law, and the child is arrested and fined, you would chastise the child for his wrong, but that would not satisfy the law. You would pay the fine, and thus satisfy the law; but you would not allow the child to go unpunished. You would chastise the child.

So Christ has satisfied the law, or made atonement, for all the sins of all His people; but when they transgress the Lord's commandments they are chastised for the same. In answer to the second question we say, most emphatically, NO. God's people are not in danger of eternal damnation, but those who commit what is called the unpardonable sin are. See **((29) (Mark 3:29))**. C. H. C.

Matthew 25:14-30

---June 1, 1915

Brother Oscar Campbell, Isabell, III, requests our views of the parable of the talents, as recorded in (Matthew 25:14-30). It is not necessary to take up space to quote the verses here. Get your Bible and read them. We have space to offer only a few remarks. There are three servants. One received five talents; another received two, and another received one. Each servant was given talents according to his ability.

The servant who received five talents had ability to improve five. The servant who received two talents had ability to improve two. The servant who received one talent had ability to improve one. Two of the servants used the ability which had been given them; for the Lord had certainly given them the ability which they possessed. The ability which the Lord's people have is the ability which He has given them.

The other servant did not use the ability, but abused it, and hid his Lord's money (the talent) in the earth. He was a wicked and slothful servant. Many of the Lord's children are slothful. We are commanded to "Be not slothful in business." We are often too slothful in the business the Lord requires. The Lord comes to reckon with His servants, and those who are faithful receive blessings from His hand, and those who are slothful are cast into outer darkness. He withdraws the manifestations of His presence from them, and they are left to grope in darkness. They have to suffer the chastening rod for their disobedience. These are some of our thoughts in connection with this parable. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 14:34,35 AND 1 Timothy 2:9-12

---June 1, 1915

Brother F. M. Thornton, of Primrose, Ga., asks our views on (I Corinthians 14:34-35), and (I Timothy 2:9-12). The first text reads, "Let your women keep silent in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." The other text reads, "In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; but (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works.

Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." It seems to us that the language of the apostle recorded in these two places concerning a woman speaking in public is as plain as can be. We do not know how such a practice could be condemned in stronger terms. It is a plain command in the first text to "let your women keep silence in the churches." No one having regard for Holy Writ can say, in the face of this text, that it is Scriptural or right for a woman to preach, or to make a speech in church.

For a woman to do that is to simply flagrantly transgress this plain and positive command. No true church would, or should, tolerate it. From the teaching of the second text it is also plain and clear that the costly array, fine jewelry, and outward adornments worn nowadays by many women professing to be followers of the meek and lowly Nazarene, is very unbecoming the women professing godliness. Such costly and brilliant array is invented by the prostitutes, and comes from the slums, and then professing Christian women follow the examples coming from such persons and places. It is a shame and a disgrace to Christianity. We do not mean to advocate the idea, either, that one should be droll and dirty. One may pride himself in drollery as well as in costly array. Either extreme is wrong. The true followers of the lowly Jesus should try to be neat and clean. They can be clean, if they try. And they should try to wear clothing that is neat-not loud nor gaudy on the one hand, nor droll on the other hand. It is wicked and sinful to wear costly jewelry and dress, while so many of our fellowmen, and especially so many of the Lord's dear children, are in want-many of them having to go hungry for lack of food, and in winter many of them suffering for want of fuel and clothing.

If we are guilty, we may rest assured that the Lord will not let us escape the severity of His punishments. We may think that we are able to dodge the law, but we are only deceiving ourselves. The Lord does not reverse His law, nor allow the guilty to go unpunished. Sooner or later we will be overtaken, and the Lord's wrath will be poured out upon us. Some have said that the apostle was a woman hater, and that this is the reason of his penning the language here quoted from him. This kind of language will do very well for an infidel or for a blasphemer, but does not become a believer in the Lord. This language was written by inspiration as much as any other expression in the Book. It is God's will concerning the matter made known to us in His Book. There is only one way for the church of Christ and the meek and humble followers of the Lord to do in the matter, and that is to observe the teaching and follow the same. C. H. C.

News and Truths

---June 8, 1915

Hon. Rt. Rev. H. B. Taylor, of Murray, Ky., in his little sheet called News and Truths, rants at us for what we said some time ago concerning these so-called soul savers. He devotes a whole page to us in the issue of May 26. But the pages are

very small. What he says amounts to but little. He succeeds very well in showing lack of ability to answer, and displays ability to blow and sling mud. He may be a fair sample of some of his cult. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 15:22

---June 8, 1915

Sister Mollie Buttrey, of Burns, Tenn., requests our views of this text which reads, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The next verse says, "But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." Sister Buttrey says that some of the Baptist believers have some dispute regarding this text, and that some hold the all who are made alive in Christ are the same all who die in Adam, and "that the devil had a people from the beginning, and that the devil's people never fell in Adam. Now if the devil had a people from the beginning, that would be Two-Seed doctrine, one of Christ and one of the devil!" They are right in saying that the all who die in Adam, as mentioned in this text, are the same who are made alive in Christ.

In this chapter the apostle is treating upon the subject of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints. The others are not mentioned in this chapter at all. Besides, the text does not say "As in Adam all died," but "As in Adam all DIE." The whole race of Adam died in him when he transgressed God's law in the garden, and in that respect, or in that particular, they do not die now, but are already dead in that respect; but the text says die. The people under consideration are dying now-every day. This is a physical or corporeal death that the apostle is here talking about, and a deliverance therefrom. He is treating upon the resurrection of the bodies of the saints.

They all die in Adam, and they shall be made alive in Christ. Christ was the firstfruits. He is coming again to gather His jewels home; hence, "Afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." This is the order. Christ's people are all that are mentioned in this text. They shall all be made alive in Christ, notwithstanding the fact that they die in Adam. Their bodies may lie in the dust for a million of years, yet they shall be made alive in Christ at His coming. All the race of Adam are alike by nature; they all possess a nature that is poisoned with sin. But God made choice of some of them to eternal life, that they should be redeemed by Christ and regenerated by the Holy Spirit, and finally saved in heaven, soul, body, and spirit.

Christ died for them and redeemed them; satisfied the law in their behalf. The Holy Spirit regenerates them; and at the death of the body the spirit goes to God, where it rests until the last day. Then the Saviour will return to earth again-not as a sin bearer, but to gather together the bodies of His saints. In that day the Lord Himself will descend from heaven and awaken the nations under ground, and the bodies of the Lord's people will all be raised in the image and in the likeness of the risen body of the Saviour; they shall all be changed from natural bodies to spiritual bodies. This mortal shall have put on immortality. The grave will be swallowed up in victory. There will then be no more pain, sickness, sin and death, but an eternal day of love, joy, peace, and happiness in the presence of God, where His people shall all see Him as He is and be like Him. C. H. C.

The Word

---June 15, 1915

We wish to offer just a few remarks on one thing in the above, not simply to differ from Brother Fisher, nor to open a controversy, but to call attention to a fact, which

is this: The word which John says was in the beginning with God, and was God, and was made flesh, was the logos word. Logos is the Greek word John uses, and he says the logos was made flesh. In **(Romans 10:17)** "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," the "word" here is rama, not logos. But it is the rama of God-the speech of God.

Rama means speech. It also often contains the idea of power. Hence it is by the power of God's speech that one receives or possesses hearing. God speaks and thereby gives the ability to hear. "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God." This gives life and ability to hear. Then when they hear gospel preaching after that work has been done for them, it begets a belief of the truth, a belief of the doctrine of God our Saviour-a gospel faith. We do not offer these remarks for controversy, but for the consideration of Brother Fisher, as well as all our readers.
C. H. C

Mark 16:16-18

---June 15, 1915

Brother J. T. McCool, of Reform, Ala., requests our views of ((6) (Mark 16:16-18), which reads, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that beieveth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." This language follows the command of the Saviour to the eleven to "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

Then those who believe your preaching and obey the same (" He that beieveth and is baptized") shall be saved. They will be saved from false teaching, from false practice, and from false ways. They shall be saved from an untoward generation into the church of Christ." And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils," etc. These things shall be signs that I have sent these men as apostles; these things shall be signs that I have sent these men under this command to "go into all the world," etc. ((20) (Mark 16:20) says," And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following."

The apostles did all the things enumerated as the signs which should follow. No other persons have ever been able to do those things. No other persons, therefore, were ever under that command. He spoke directly to the eleven, and said unto them-the eleven-" Go YE." It was a part of the office work of Christ to send His apostles out, and He sent them; and they performed the miracles enumerated as signs that He did send them. Since that day it has been the office work of the Holy Spirit to call and send out ministers of the New Testament. The Holy Ghost makes them overseers of the flock; and they are not to preach for filthy lucre. A man who will not preach without the salary gives little evidence that he is called by the Holy Spirit. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 15:29

---June 15, 1915

Brother George J. Dame, of Sacramento, Ky. requests our views of (I Corinthians 15:29), which reads, "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?" To our mind this text teaches that baptism is a figure or representation of a burial and a

resurrection. In baptism we say that we believe in the resurrection of the dead, because it is a representation of a burial and a resurrection. In this chapter the apostle is dwelling upon the doctrine of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, and in this verse he points out the fact that baptism is a representation of a burial and a resurrection. Now why do we baptize that way, if the dead rise not?

The language, therefore, proves that baptism is a complete immersion—a burial—and it also proves the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. When one is baptized, he is serving God, or else he is serving Satan. If he is serving God, and God accepts the service, then he must be rendering that service from a principle of love. If he is rendering the service from a principle of love, then he has already been born of God, for "Every one that loveth is born of God." **(I John 4:7)**. When we baptize one, we baptize the body.

We do not baptize spirits. Then, if one is serving God in being baptized, and it is the body that is baptized, then the person baptized serves God in body. The body certainly engages in this service. We should be careful to avoid extremes. It is an easy matter to get into an extreme, or into an error. C. H. C.

Hebrews 10:26-27

---June 29, 1915

On another page of this paper will be found a request for our views on **((0:26) (Hebrews 10:26-27)**. The text reads, "For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." If we consider the next two verses in connection with these they may throw some light on these. ((0:28) (Hebrews 10:28-29) reads, "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

To our mind, this language teaches that the child of God may sin against light and knowledge. If one knows the truth, and has been given to see where the true church is, and yet remains out of the church, and out of duty, he is sinning willfully; he is sinning against light and knowledge. He has no excuse for his sins or rebellion. "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins." There is "a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation." He has a guilty conscience. Worry and trouble will be his lot. He will have an almost continual dread. He will probably spend many sleepless nights. There will be a continual dread on his mind all the time.

It was a fact that under the law dispensation, the transgressor was killed under the testimony of two or three witnesses. There was no excuse or mercy under the law. That being true, "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

To sin against light and knowledge now; to refuse to walk in the commandments of the Lord under the gospel; to refuse to obey what little the Lord requires of His children, is to tread the Son of God under foot; it is to count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and is to do despite unto the Spirit of grace. One who does this is worthy of punishment worse than death. We say "what little the Lord

requires of His children." We do not mean that there is only a little for them to do, but that it is a little in comparison with what He has done for them. There is plenty to do-enough to keep us busy. If we would all put in our time doing what the Lord requires of us, and not put in so much time trying to do what He has not commanded, we would be kept busy enough. We would have less time to bite and devour each other. We would have less time to be finding fault with our brethren, and making them "an offender for a word." There are some things worse than death; and the Lord sometimes visits His children with punishment that is worse than death for their disobedience. We have an idea that Brother Carnell has been enduring some of that punishment. We would kindly advise and admonish all such characters to deny themselves, take up their cross, and walk in humble obedience to the Master, and thereby find sweet rest that they are so much longing for. C. H. C.

Won't Let God

---July 20, 1915

We are in receipt of a letter from Brother W. M. Humphreys, of Mesquite, Texas, in which he says: "I heard a so-called preacher assert in a sermon a short time ago that the reason God did not save the sinners of Mesquite was because they would not let Him. Please state in The Primitive Baptist what you think of such preaching." It would be hard for us to find language to express just what we think of such preaching as that. It is no better than blasphemy. It is ignorance personified. The very idea that a sinner, a poor, little, insignificant particle of all God's creation will not let God save him! And yet God made all created things, and upholds all created things by the word of His own power, and is able to blot them all out of existence in the twinkling of an eye! For one to say that a small particle of all that creation will not let God save him, is to display his ignorance more than anything else would, Perhaps the sinners of Mesquite will not let God damn them, either. If they are able to prevent God saving them, and will not let Him do that, then they may also be able to keep God from damning them, and they may not let Him do that, either. They may not let God either save them or damn them. Poor god! This is the Arminian god, but not the God of the Bible. The God of the Bible is able to save, but the Arminian god cannot save. C. H. C.

Regeneration

---November 16, 1915

We have been urgently requested, and we promised some time ago, to write an article on the subject of regeneration. There seems to be much misunderstanding among the brethren on the question in some sections of the country, and we are of the opinion that there is no real or material difference among the brethren on that question. We think that some have become unduly alarmed, and are simply confused, and do not, perhaps, understand each other. But we will state our views just as we have always tried to preach, and just as we have ever believed since we have had a name among the Old Baptists. What we have tried to preach on the question has never caused trouble among them that we have ever heard of. The Saviour says, in (John 3:3), "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." The word man is translated from a word which means anyone. Hence, "Except anyone be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." The word again is translated from a word which means from above. Hence, "Except anyone be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of

God." The word man, or the word anyone, simply refers to the race-except anyone of the race of Adam be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. One must be born from above in order to that end. It is the sinner of Adam's race that is the subject of the new birth.

It is not some kind of spirit, or eternal child, that comes down and takes up its abode in the Adam man, and remains in him until the Adam man dies and then goes back to heaven where it came from, thus leaving the Adam man out of the benefits of salvation. In (John 3:6) the Saviour says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

By the expression, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," the Saviour does not mean to teach that the person born of the flesh is nothing more than a lump of flesh, for the Scriptures abundantly teach that man is a complex being—a being composed of soul, body, and spirit. He simply meant the same that is abundantly taught elsewhere, that in the natural birth the person partakes of the nature of the natural parentage. In creation, God gave a fixed and immutable law, that everything partakes of the nature of that from which it springs; and the Saviour teaches that great truth in that expression. Even so, in the expression, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit," He teaches the great truth that in being born of the heavenly parentage one partakes of the nature of that parentage.

This language also teaches that as the first birth is natural, the second birth is spiritual. Regeneration is a spiritual work. As it is a spiritual work, it is accomplished or performed by the work of the Spirit of God upon the spirit of the man. The Spirit of God does not operate on the body in regeneration, but on the spirit of the man. The work of regeneration makes the sinner a partaker of the divine nature. See (II Peter 1:3-4): "According as His divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him that hath called us to glory and virtue: whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust."

The work of regeneration is an inward work. See (**Philippians 1:6**) "Being confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." This does not mean that regeneration is a progressive work, or that the Lord begins regeneration and completes it later on, for it is an instantaneous work. But he does mean that the work of the Holy Spirit, the Third Person in the Holy Trinity, in the salvation of the sinner, is begun in regeneration, and will be carried on to perfection. It was the work of Christ, the Second Person in the Trinity, to make atonement, and He carried that work on to perfection. No part of it was left undone. Even so, no part of the work of the Holy Spirit will be left undone, and it is the work of the Holy Spirit to bring in all the heirs of promise, and it was the work of Christ to make atonement for them.

In the work of regeneration, the sinner is given a new heart. He is not given a new lump of flesh which we call the heart, but he is given a new seat of affection, for the heart is the seat of affection. In a state of unregeneracy, the heart is wicked and deceitful. See (**9**) (**Jeremiah 17:9**) "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" Without the operation of the Spirit of God, the Spirit shining in the heart, no one can know the wickedness and deceitfulness of his heart; but the light of the Holy Spirit shining in the heart, makes the wickedness of the heart known to the sinner in whose heart the Spirit is thus shining.

Without this operation of the Spirit in the heart no one knows, or can know, the Lord. But the Lord gives a heart to know Him. See (**Jeremiah 24:7**) "And I will give them an heart to know me, that I am the Lord: and they shall be my people,

and I will be their God: for they shall return unto me with their whole heart." The Lord gives the sinner a heart to know Him. In a state of unregeneracy the sinner has a stony heart; but the Lord takes away the stony heart and gives a heart of flesh. See **((9) (Ezekiel 11:19-20)** "And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh: that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God."

The stony heart is not susceptible of spiritual feeling or emotion, but the Lord gives a heart of flesh, which is susceptible of spiritual emotion. With this new heart, which makes the sinner a child of God, he hates sin; he loathes sin; he abhors unrighteousness, and longs to be free from sin, and to be pure and holy as Jesus is. The fact that one begins to hate sin, and to long to be free from it, and to be pure, and holy, and righteous, as Jesus is, is evidence that the Lord has given him a heart of flesh. It is proof of the inward work of grace. To take a man's heart out of him is to kill the man. A gentleman once said to us concerning this matter: "Cayce, you know that will never do! The very idea of taking a man's heart out of him! You have sense enough to know that this would kill the man right now!"

We replied that we were aware of the fact that it would kill the man to take his heart out of him; but that this is the very first thing the Lord does for the sinner in the work of regeneration-it is to kill him. Hence, the apostle says, **(Romans 6:11)** "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." The Lord kills to the love of sin, and makes alive to the love of holiness. See **(Deuteronomy 32:39)** "See now that I, even I, am He, and there is no god with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand." As the sinner is thus killed to sin, and to the love of it, he does not then love sin as he once did. He loves holiness and righteousness as he once did not.

In the work of regeneration, the Lord puts His Spirit within them. He gives them a new spirit. He gives them a new heart -a heart of flesh. See **((26) (Ezekiel 36:26-27)** "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." This brings about a great change in the sinner. He is no longer an unregenerate sinner, but a saved sinner, a sinner who has been born from above. It is accomplished by the operation of the Spirit of God in the heart, in the spirit or in the soul, of the sinner; and this makes the sinner a child of God. The work is not accomplished by the work of the Spirit on the body, for the Spirit does not operate on the body.

When we were a boy we heard an old preacher in this country use an expression which was amusing to us then. The quaintness and peculiarity of the illustration caused us to remember it. Since then we have been enabled to see more in it than the mere quaintness of it. He said: "The grace of God in the heart of the sinner is like grease in a gourd. You may put grease in a gourd, and it will soak through and show on the outside. So the grace of God in the heart cannot be hid; it will show on the outside."

There is much in this illustration. According to modern theology, if you put grease on the outside of a gourd, it would soak through to the inside; but it will not do so. If you rub grease on the outside of a gourd it will not soak through to the inside. Modern theologians seem to teach that the grace of God on the outside of the sinner will soak through to the inside. This is the reverse of the truth. The truth is that the grace of God implanted in the heart (put on the inside) by the work of the

Holy Spirit, will soak through and show on the outside. This work of the Spirit will manifest itself in some way in the life of the recipient of it.

It makes known to him the fact that he is a sinner in the sight of God, and thus he is made to mourn on account of sin. He is brought low, at the foot-stool of God's sovereign grace and mercy, and made to plead for mercy—just what he realizes he must have if ever permitted to see God in peace. But the grease put in the gourd does not take away the old nature which it had, but the grease soaking through and showing itself on the outside makes manifest that something has been done on the inside.

There is another nature now permeating the gourd, and the two natures may both be seen in the same gourd. Even so, the grace of God in the heart of the sinner, implanted there in the work of regeneration, does not take away the old nature which he had, but it gives him another nature; and both natures may sometimes be seen manifested in the person. These two natures are contrary, the one to the other. This causes the warfare in the child of God; and this warfare will continue as long as he stays on earth.

This work of regeneration brings the sinner out from under the law of sin and death. The atonement of Christ satisfied that law, and regeneration brings the sinner out from under it and places him under another law. He is then under law to Christ. See (I Corinthians 9:21): "To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law." This brings him under obligation to render service to the Master. He is under law or obligation to Christ, because he has been made a child of God by the operation of the Holy Spirit in his heart or soul.

The unregenerate are in a state which the apostle calls in the flesh. The child of God is not in that condition, but is in the Spirit. See (Romans 8:8-9): "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." The child of God is not in the flesh in the same sense that the unregenerate sinner is, for he possesses the Spirit of Christ; and he is, therefore, said by the apostle to be in the Spirit. It is true that he still has the same old nature that he had before; and he may follow the inclinations of that old nature, and thereby fail to receive and enjoy the blessings which the obedient child receives and enjoys.

Hence, the apostle says, in (Romans 8:12-13): "Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." The child of God should not follow after the flesh, or the inclinations of the old sinful nature; but he should follow after the Spirit; he should through the Spirit mortify the deeds of the body; he should follow after the inclinations of that divine nature which has been implanted in his heart or spirit; and in doing this he receives the approving smiles of the Saviour; by doing this he enjoys blessings which he would not otherwise enjoy.

A wonderful change is wrought in the sinner in the work of regeneration. Saul of Tarsus was a great man in his own estimation before regeneration. In those days names meant some thing. His name was Saul, and that name meant great. He was a Pharisee of the Pharisees. He was indeed a great man from a worldly point of view, in regard to worldly wisdom, or worldly attainments. He was not only great from that standpoint, but he was great in his own estimation; he was a self-righteous Pharisee. But while he was on his way from Jerusalem to Damascus with

letters of authority to bind and cast in prison those who were calling on the name of the Lord, the Lord of glory spoke to him and said, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutes!" -((9:4) (Acts 9:4-5).

The Lord there made him alive from the dead; he was raised up out of a state of death in trespasses and sins into a state of life in Christ. When the Lord speaks to a sinner who is dead in trespasses and sins, He makes him alive from that state. See **(John 5:25)** "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." Saul heard that voice and was made alive from that dead state. "Suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven: and he fell to the earth," etc.- ((9:3) (Acts 9:3-4). Prior to this time he was very erect-he was great in his self righteousness; but now he is brought low before the throne of grace and mercy. His cry was, "Who art thou, Lord?"

He now realises something he had never before realized. He is found lying prostrate on the ground. Perhaps some of our readers can remember that they felt unworthy to kneel on God's footstool, and you prostrated yourself on the ground, and placed your face and lips in the dust, and plead for mercy. Saul's prayer was a prayer for mercy. It was an evidence of the quickening or regenerating power of the Spirit of God in his heart. After this, his name was called Paul. His name was changed-why? Because names meant something. The name Paul means little. He is no longer great, but is now little. The grace of God in the heart always makes the sinner little. It never causes one to be self exalted; but makes him feel and realize his own unworthiness. When he follows the influence of that grace after regeneration he feels his own imperfections, and he does not desire to make his brother an offender for a word, and he will not do so.

He is not so particular about the words used to convey an idea; his desire is to get the truth and the sentiment. The sentiment is what he desires, more than the words used to convey the sentiment. "Love suffers long, and is kind; envieth not; vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." -(I Corinthians 13:4-7)

The Campbellite position is that regeneration is effected by moral suasion or moral influence. They do not hold that regeneration is a moral influence, but that it is brought about by moral influence. In fact, with them regeneration is nothing more than moral reformation, while it is a reformation instead of a reformation. In that work the sinner is formed anew in his soul, or spirit, or heart. The body is not formed anew in regeneration; it is still mortal and corruptible. It goes to the grave that way. In the resurrection at the last day the body will be formed anew; it will be made spiritual; it will be made immortal and incorruptible. Then the entire man will be made pure, holy, sinless, and be in the perfect image of Christ. You may call the resurrection of the body what you please, this is what is done for it in the resurrection. See **(I Corinthians 15:42-57); (I John 3:2); ((21) (Philippians 3:21).**

In regeneration the man is made good in heart. His heart is made good, and the man is then a good man, because he has a good heart. The Saviour says, in (Matthew 12:33-35): "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit. O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure

bringeth forth evil things." Why were these people not good? Because their hearts were not good.

That is the reason. How is the heart made good? The Lord gives a good heart. He takes away the stony heart, and gives a heart of flesh. This makes the man good. If not, the Saviour would not have said, in the very next verse, "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things." The man having a good heart makes him a good man, but that does not make his body spiritual, nor remove the nature he had before. It gives him another nature, which is a divine nature; and that divine nature is implanted in his heart. If that does not make a man a better man, we confess that we do not know what would make him better. If it does not make him better, we do not see how a tree can be known by his fruit. We know a tree is a good tree because it produces good fruit. We know the man is a good man, because he brings forth good things. Regeneration gives him a good heart, and then the Saviour calls him a good man. Having been made a good man, he manifests the same by his life. He then brings forth good fruit.

Elder G. M. Thompson was considered one among the ablest men of his day. He wrote a book called "The Measuring Rod; or the Principles and Practice of the Primitive Baptists," which was published in 1861. It is a refutation of Two-Seedism. On pages 79, 80, 81, and 82 he says: The Bible represents the new birth or regeneration, as producing a great change in the sinner; but it does not only prove the change, but it proves that the sinner is the subject of that birth or regeneration. It is the sinner's heart that is circumcised to love the Lord; it is the sinner that is purged from an evil conscience to serve the Lord; and it is the dead sinner that is to hear the voice of the Son of God, and live. In the work of regeneration, the stranger is made a citizen, the enemy is made a friend, and those who know not God, are made to know Him and love Him.

The debtor receives forgiveness, the criminal receives pardon, the captive receives liberty, and the guilty receives justification. The change is great, and all this change is wrought in the sinner, the son or daughter of Adam. The change was so great in Saul, the vilest persecutor, that he became the humble follower of the Lord Jesus Christ, and labored to build up what he had tried to tear down. ... When Paul wrote to the Ephesians, he believed that in regeneration the sinner experienced a change, for he says, "Ye were once darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord."

Again, to the Colossians, he says, "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness and translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son." As these people deny that in regeneration the sinner is "changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness," they cannot belong to the Apostolic church, for we see that the doctrine of a change in the sinner was a cardinal article in the Apostolic faith. The first Baptist I ever read of required all, before baptism, to "Bring forth fruits meet for repentance," or to give evidences of a change. If one of these Arians had gone to John, denying a change, and had demanded baptism of him, he would have rejected them, as he did the Pharisees and Sadducees. And they would today be rejected by the New Testament church, if they were to come declaring that "they had never experienced any change, that they loved sin as well as they ever did." By the "Golden Rule" they cannot be the true church, and have no right to bear its name. If there are any among them that have ever been born again; have ever been made a new creature in Christ Jesus; have ever been changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness, I would say, "Come out of her, my people," for the doctrine is at war with the Bible, is at war with the interests of the true church, and is at war with your own experience. Again, on pages 86 and 87, he says: The apostle tells us that the Son of God was "made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of

sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father." -(Galatians 4:4-6).

In this passage it is the son that is redeemed, and it is the very same son and heir that receives the Spirit of God's Son, that also receives the adoption of sons; there is no distinction made by the apostle. The child, the heir, must be redeemed, because it had sinned, and fallen under the curse of the law; it must be made free, because in a state of bondage; and it having become an enemy to God, the Spirit of God's Son must be sent into its heart, to circumcise it to love God, and it is by the renewing and regenerating influence of that Spirit that it is enabled to cry, Abba, Father.

Again, on pages 169 and 170, he says: His elect are predestinated unto the adoption of children, and it is according to this unalterable purpose that in the fulness of the dispensation of times they are called to be saints, receive the adoption of sons, are born a second time, or become new creatures in Christ Jesus. The apostle's doctrine teaches that it is the man that is dead in sin that is quickened, that it is the enemy that is made a friend, and the stranger and foreigner that is made a child and fellow citizen. This is a great change, and is the work of God, for Paul tells the Ephesian saints that they are the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God before ordained that they should walk in.

Just here we quote the following contained in a letter to us from Elder R. O. Raulston, 806 Dodds Avenue, Chattanooga, Tenn.: I have lived among the dear Old Baptists for more than forty years, and have heard our precious brethren preach from all parts of the country, and if I have ever been so enlightened by the sweet Spirit of the Lord as to be able to understand them, they have all believed and contended that the salvation enjoyed by the poor sinners of Adam's race in regeneration was an inward work of the Spirit of God upon, or in, the soul or spirit of the sinner; and all have understood that the individual thus dealt with through the mercy and goodness of God was a saved sinner, and looked upon as a child of God; and still all have fully agreed with the expression of the poet, where he says: Here I am, behold who will; Sure I am a sinner still; I believe our people fully understand that the unspeakable treasure possessed by them they have in an earthen vessel. They have believed that He who has begun a good work in them will perfect it, and they have hoped and trusted in the Lord to immortalise and spiritualize their vile bodies.

Now, we have stated our views plainly, it seems to us. This is just the way we see the matter. We do not care to, and we will not, "split hairs" on questions that some may bring in by speculation. If every church who has a preacher in it who is agitating this question would call in his liberty and stop him from preaching until he agrees to stop agitating the question, our people would have no trouble, no strife, no confusion, and no division on the same. The preachers are the ones who cause trouble in the Old Baptist Church.

It seems to us that we have been plain enough in the foregoing for anyone to know that we do not believe the "whole man" doctrine; but for fear some person might not remember, we will say, most emphatically, that **WE DO NOT BELIEVE THE "WHOLE MAN" DOCTRINE**. When we say we do not believe a thing, there is no man under heaven who has any right to say that we do, and no honest man who reads this will hereafter do so. Some have accused us of believing that, but every honest man who has thought so will say it no more, and will be willing to correct his statements that we did.

Now, we will say, in conclusion, that we do not want any agitation of this question, and we are not going to have it in our paper. This article ends the matter, so far as

our columns are concerned. No one need to send us any communications arguing this question either way, for they will go into the fire as soon as we see what they are. We have written in plainness, but we have done so in love for the cause of our blessed Master. We have been silent for some time, and have written nothing for our columns, hoping that peace might be restored, until we have felt that circumstances and the cause absolutely demanded that we say this much, and give our readers to understand that we do not believe the "whole man" doctrine, and that we were not going to allow any quarrel in The Primitive Baptist on the question. While we do not believe the "whole man" doctrine, we wish it also understood that we do not believe what has been called the "hollow log" doctrine. Both are wrong and we will not accept either.

While we do not, as stated, believe the "whole man" doctrine, yet we are not responsible for any wrong construction which any man may place on our language; but no honest man who reads this article will hereafter place such a construction on our language as we here deny that we believe. May the Lord grant to give us all the spirit of love and forbearance, that we may be willing to bear with others, as we would wish them to bear with us. If we would manifest more of the spirit of love and forbearance, instead of secretly working to destroy a brother, we are sure there would be less trouble in our beloved Zion. May the Lord have mercy upon us all, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Statistics

---November 30, 1915

Brother J. S. Vickers, of Newton, Ala., requests us to publish the census reports concerning the number of Primitive Baptists in the United States.

According to the census report for 1906 there were 102,311 Primitive Baptists in the United States. This includes only the white members. A separate report is given of the colored Primitive Baptists. In the report for 1890 there were 13,960 more members reported, but that report included the colored Primitive Baptists. The 1906 report shows that there are 35,076 colored Primitive Baptists. Our readers can take these figures and make the calculations for themselves and see what the increase was, according to the 1906 census since 1890. But we will say that the census report does not give the correct total membership, as it could not be obtained. C. H. C.

About "The Good Old Songs"

---December 7, 1915

We believe The Good Old Songs is the best song book on the market, and everybody who sees it has words of praise for it. It is composed of the greatest old songs and tunes that have been sung by our fathers and mothers for a hundred years or more, and there is not a jig tune or an unsound sentiment in the book. If you love to hear sound preaching in your church, why not use a song book that is free of unsound sentiment? How do you like to hear a good, sound sermon and then a rotten song right after it? Song of Solomon service is part of the praise to the Lord for His goodness and mercy to poor sinners. Then isn't it right to sing the truth when you praise Him? C. H. C.

Remarks On An Experience

---December 21, 1915

We think that the above is an experience of grace. If the writer will but compare her own experience with the idea that it is "up to the sinner" to do his part in order to be saved, she will know that the Lord did all the work of saving in her own case. If the Lord did all the work of saving in her case, it must have been because the Lord had made choice of her to salvation -the Lord chose to save her. And if Christ died for her, it must have been because the Lord had chosen to save her. If the Lord does what He chooses to do, and He has chosen to save all that Christ died for; and if Christ died for all the race, then all the race will be saved. As some of the race will not be saved, and the Lord does what He chooses to do, then the Lord did not choose all the race, and Christ did not die for all the race. We would suggest that the sister send us \$1 and get a copy of the Cayce-Penick debate and read that. She may get some light on the question of the atonement of Christ in reading that book. C. H. C.

Endorsement on Regeneration

---December 21, 1915

As Elder Cash was editor of the Messenger of Peace we deem it not to be out of place to put the following short article from him in this book:
THE ARTICLE In The Primitive Baptist for November 16, 1915, is an editorial by Elder C. H. Cayce on the subject of "Regeneration" which we wish to approve and indorse. The treatment of the subject from the Bible standpoint can never do harm, and this article of Brother Cayce's has no speculation in it, but treats the matter from the right point of investigation-What is done for the sinner in the new birth? which the Bible answers.

We gave this subject a brief treatment in the August 1, 1915, issue of the Messenger in a sketch of a sermon on the "New Heart." Like Elder Cayce, we have no use for what is known as the "whole man doctrine," as some have described it; neither do we believe it a safe and Scriptural way to treat it, as some have done, from the question, What part of man is born again in regeneration? There will always be a mystery about the subject, and it is better to leave it where the Scriptures leave it than to endeavor to explain as some have done who have brought confusion.-Elder Walter Cash, in Messenger of Peace.

Close of Volume 30

---December 21, 1915

This issue of The Primitive Baptist closes the thirtieth volume of the paper. Since the publication of this paper was begun, January 1, 1886, thirty years have passed by. Many changes have taken place during that time. Now another year is drawing to a close. Soon another leaf will be turned in the pages of time, and the pages of this year will be closed forever. Many have been the sorrows of some during the year 1915. Some have had their seasons of rejoicing.

There have been some seasons of sweet joy, and some of deep sorrow and regret. Truly life has been a mixture of joy and sorrow with us. Sometimes sorrows sweep down over the soul like billows. "Thy billows have gone over me," says David. Sometimes he was low down in the valley, in darkness and gloomy despair. Then, again, he was on the mountaintop, in adoration and praise to the Lord.

Sometimes I am exalted, On eagles' wings I fly. Thus wrote the poet, in describing his own life and daily experience. But these seasons of rejoicing, and of being on the mountaintop, do not last long. Darkness and gloomy despair seem to so soon hover down over us, and then, Sometimes I'm in the valley, And sinking down with

woe. Oh, how the heart bleeds, then, and longs for a ray of heavenly light, and for a ray of sunshine from the face of the blessed Saviour. Were it not for His precious and sure promises we would surely give up in utter despair.

Our troubles and sorrows are many, and they are great. Sometimes it seems that they are almost unbearable. We have them to bear ourselves. No human on earth can help. Many of them have never been told. Only our Lord knows. He, only, can help. We used to look forward to joys and pleasures in life, but we do not now. We can only hope for rest and joy beyond the river. But we do feel to be reconciled to our lot here on earth, whatever that may be, and whatever may befall us. We have found the Lord's grace to be sufficient in the years that are past, and we now, in darkness and gloom, feel to trust implicitly in Him for restraining and sustaining grace.

We need His restraining grace to restrain us from doing things that are wrong, and we need His sustaining grace to sustain us in all our sorrows, trials, conflicts, and distresses. When the heart is broken and sad, we need His grace to bind up our broken hearts. The year 1915 has been one of much sorrow to us. As the year draws near a close it seems that the curtain of night is drawn around us. But we are humbly trusting that as another new year is ushered in it may bring the light and sunshine of a new day. With an aching heart and deep sorrow of soul, we bid adieu to the old year, and bid our readers adieu for the year 1915. We humbly ask an interest in the prayers of every one of our readers who love the Lord, His cause, and His service. Do pray the Lord to guide and direct us, and to sustain us by His grace, that we may be able to walk humbly before Him and in the right way. C. H. C.

END OF VOLUME TWO

1916

BY ELDER C. H. CAYCE

Volume III, 1937

CAYCE PUBLISHING COMPANY

THORNTON, ARKANSAS

TO MY BELOVED WIFE who has untiringly labored with me and for me during these many years, and TO MY SAINTED FATHER AND MOTHER who cared for me when I could not care for myself, and TO MY DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS who have been so kind and good to poor me all these years is this and any following volumes LOVINGLY DEDICATED

PREFACE

We have received many words of endorsement of the previous volumes. This volume, and the volumes which may follow, if we are permitted to continue the publication of our editorial writings in this form, will show clearly that we are still endeavoring to maintain the same principles upon which we have stood during all these years. They will also show that our people are still standing where they have always stood.

If we know our poor heart our desire in the publication of these volumes is the glory of God and the advancement of His blessed cause, and the benefit of His humble poor. We desire that the Lord's dear children who are blinded by false teachers may be enabled, by the reading of some of these pages, to see where the true church is, and where the truth may be found. May the blessings of our Lord

rest upon the reader, is the humble prayer of THE AUTHOR Thornton, Arkansas,
August 20, 1937

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME THIRTY-ONE

---January 4, 1916

Volume thirty-one of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST begins with this issue. Through trials and difficulties the paper has been published for thirty years, and established on a firm footing. So far as the financial outlook is concerned, it is not bad. It is true that the stringency of money matters during the past year has affected our business, and crippled us in a measure, yet the paper is on a better footing than it has ever been. This has been accomplished by hard work, close attention to business, rigid economy, and careful attention to detail in management. While this is true, it is also true that there is yet room for improvement along this line. Our subscription list is not as large as it should be for a paper the size of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. We should have a great many more subscribers, considering the amount of reading matter the paper contains. The price of the paper is exceedingly low, considering the size of the paper, and that it is issued weekly. We trust our readers will all take an interest in helping to increase the list this year.

We also trust that the brethren and sisters will continue to write for the paper. It is true that we have had much more matter sent to us than we had space for; but let it be remembered that the more we have, the more we can select from. A great many private letters have been sent to us with request for publication, many of which we have given space for. Many of these letters are good, and are of general interest, but it is more often the case that private letters are of interest to only a few—just to those who are personally acquainted with the writers. We will have to leave out many letters of that kind for want of space. The paper is for the benefit of the cause in general, and we wish to publish such things as will be of general interest to the readers. It is true that what may be of interest to one may not be of interest to another, but we desire to give as great a variety as possible.

We trust that our readers will take more interest in sending items concerning the good meetings. If you are at a good meeting, and there are some additions to the church, send us a short notice of it for publication. Such items are always read with pleasure. Do not send a long account of such meetings, telling when you left home, whom you visited, and where you went for dinner, and where you spent the night, and how many and who were there. Such detail as this is uninteresting, and is tiresome, and destroys all the pleasure which may have been realized by simply reading a statement of the fact that there was a good meeting, and that so and so were received into the fellowship of the church, or that so and so were baptized. Please bear these things in mind. It would save us much annoyance. Many times we have to ponder in our mind for an hour or more whether to give space to some article which may be considered to be very important to the writer, or perhaps to a few others, but which we know cannot be of general interest. We are puzzled to know whether we may be justified in using the space for matters of that kind for the satisfaction of the few who may possibly be interested, notwithstanding all the detail gone into.

There has been considerable discussion and quarreling in some sections over questions that we do not think should be disturbing our people. We have tried to refrain from taking any part in such matters. In our issue of November 16 we gave

our views on regeneration, and stated that we would not allow the question discussed through our columns from the standpoint that some have been discussing it, which has been causing trouble in some sections. We still expect to adhere to that decision. No matter which side one may be on, we will not publish an article on the question which discusses it from that standpoint. If you want to tell the benefits of regeneration to a poor sinner of Adam's race, that is all right; but if you want to argue the question as to what part or how much of the sinner is born again, you will have to excuse us. We do not believe that there is any material difference among our people on that matter, and we do not intend to lend any aid to an unprofitable war on the question. The brethren may not all use the same words to express themselves; but a brother who is prompted by the love of God in his heart will not make a brother an offender for a word. We do not propose to do that.

We have learned that some are still trying to make it appear that we believe the "whole man" doctrine; and some have even gone so far as to say that we said some things which we did not say, and never even thought of saying. No honest man will do this. We must again call attention to what we said on that line in the issue of November 16, 1915. So far as we are concerned the discussion of that matter is at an end, either publicly or privately, and we have no more to say concerning it. If we know our heart, our desire is that THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST may be so conducted that it may tend to unify the Lord's humble poor, and be a source of comfort, consolation and encouragement to them. We desire that it may never be a source of war, strife, discord, and confusion among the Old Baptists. If we know our heart, we love the cause of the blessed Master above everything else in this world, and we love the Old Baptist Church above everything else. The Old Baptist cause is the cause of the Master. We do not wish to cause trouble among the Old Baptists. Neither do we wish to help spread confusion among them. We would rather give up the publication of the paper, and have our pen laid down forever, and our mouth be forever closed, than to cause trouble among them. Contending for the same old truths that have ever characterized the church of God will not cause trouble among them. Very often trouble is started by some evil-hearted or designing man. Such a man can usually put on a great show of humility. We are sure that we have met some of them in our time. They can put on a great pretense of zeal for what they call the truth, while, if you knew their secret life, it would make you shudder. No wonder the cause suffers, and no wonder the church is in confusion when she has such men in her midst.

We expect, by the Lord's help, to continue on in the same principles for which this paper has stood since the first issue of it in January, 1886. "The Holy Ghost witnesseth that bonds and afflictions abide me; but none of these things move me; neither count I my life as dear unto myself, so I finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus," says Paul, the eminent apostle to the Gentiles. We feel to adopt that language as our own just now. Many times we have felt like our labors were all in vain and were a failure, and that we ourselves are a failure, and that it would be just as well for us to "ground arms" and quit; but we have not felt like we want to quit for some time. We used to, in our younger days, often think, "Well, we will quit; we will go home and stay there;" but for quite a while we have felt like we want to press on, notwithstanding all the trials and conflicts, for our hope is that the trials and conflicts will have an end after a while. No matter how hard the trials may be, nor how great the sufferings, nor how long they may last here, they will soon be over, and are but for a moment, as compared to eternity. They are not to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in the

Lord's dear children beyond the river. That glory and the joys over there are sometimes sweetly anticipated by us. Our hope reaches over there, and we sometimes long to go. Some of our loved ones are already there, we are sure. Our blessed and loving Saviour is there, and we so much desire to look into His blessed face. We wish to ascribe more perfect praise to Him than we can here on this earth. Until then, we desire to be reconciled to His will and to our lot here on earth, and to continue on in His service, patiently waiting the time when He will take us home unto Himself.

We humbly ask our dear brethren and sisters to remember us in their prayers. Please pray the Lord to direct and sustain us in the right way. C. H. C.

Reply to J. M. Hicks

---January 4, 1916

On another page of this paper will be found a letter from J. M. Hicks, of Rominger, N. C., in which he asks us some questions. We give the questions and our answers here.

1. Does God lead men to disobedience?

No. If men walk contrary to the commands of God, and they do so because God leads them that way, there would be no such thing as disobedience. It is not an act of disobedience for a man to go the way that God leads him. God does not lead men into disobedience at all.

2. Does God love to see His children in disobedience?

No. If He does, then He loves to see what is displeasing to Him; and that is an absurdity. Any sensible person can see that such a thing is an impossibility and an absurdity. The children of Israel in the wilderness walked in disobedience, and God did not love to see that, for we are told that "With many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness." **-(I Corinthians 10:5)**. They disobeyed the Lord, and the Lord was not well pleased with them. It is true, therefore, that God does not love to see His children in disobedience.

3. Don't God's children receive blessings by keeping His commandments? Yes. The Saviour says, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." **(John 13:17)**. "If ye know these things." What things? The things He has commanded, of course. Then, "happy are ye if ye do them." There is a happiness promised here to those who do the things commanded which is not promised to those who fail to do them. No man under heaven can dispute this, without disputing the plain statement of the Son of God. No matter what men may say, the Lord cannot lie. His word is true. An abundance of testimony could be produced that God's people receive blessings by keeping His commandments, but this one plain statement is enough to convince any honest searcher after truth. C. H. C.

Acts 20:9-10

---February 15, 1916

Brother W. R. Walker, of Grant, Ala., requests our views on **((0:9) (Acts 20:9-10)**. The reader can turn and read it. It is the circumstance of the young man falling from the third loft and taken up dead when Paul had preached until midnight. Brother Walker wants to know if the apostles had power to raise those who were physically dead. It appears in this case that Paul healed this young man. It also appears that he raised some others to life again. It was all by the special influence of the Holy Spirit in enabling the apostles to work miracles, in accordance with His promise in **((4) (Mark 16:14-20)**.

C.H.C.

Discipline

---February 15, 1916

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother-I am not a subscriber to your paper, but read your piece on regeneration in November issue and think it the best I ever read on the subject. I want your views on the three following subjects:

1. How should the church deal with a disorderly walker?
2. When a brother trespasses against another brother?
3. When a brother goes astray?

What I want to know is the difference between the three offenses, and how the church should deal with each. Yours in hope,

G. W. DAVIS.

R. 2, Boaz, Ala.

OUR REPLY

In answer to the first question, we would say that no general answer can be given that will cover every case that might come up. If a member is walking disorderly, and that disorder is such that can be forgiven, or amends made for it, such member should be labored with in order that he may be reclaimed. If the disorder is such as cannot be forgiven, or is so grievous that he cannot make amends for it, then he should be promptly excluded from the fellowship of the church.

Concerning the second question, will say the eighteenth chapter of Matthew explicitly covers such cases. If you will read that chapter you will find it to be so plain that no comment is necessary.

Our answer to the first question also applies to the third. There are some things of which a person may be guilty that the church cannot afford to bear with. There is a sin unto death; see **(I John 5:16)**. No amends can be made for a sin unto death. The church cannot Scripturally reclaim such a person.

C. H. C.

Difference in Belief

---February 15, 1916

The unregenerate believes in Christ just as you believe in George Washington- because you have read about him and heard people talk about him. A Scriptural believer in Christ is one who has the witness within, and he believes from the testimony of that witness. See (I John 5:10). C. H. C.

King James Translation

---February 22, 1916

Brother J. J. Beck, of Sandy River, Va., writes as follows: "How and in what manner were the translators (of the King James Version) chosen? I have been told that they were chosen by the king; that there were one hundred and forty-four; that they were sent out in groups of twelve to do the work. Is that true?"

For the information of Brother Beck, and any others who may be interested, we copy the following from the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge:

At the Hampton Court Conference (1604) the demand of Reynolds for a new translation was really the starting point which eventuated, mainly through the

king's dislike (pretended or real) of the Geneva, in the Authorized Version, -the work (in all) of fifty-four scholars (forty-seven on the list), divided into six companies, of which two met at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge, for the space of six years; after which six men, two from each place, met in London to superintend the publication. Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, who wrote the arguments of the several books, and Dr. Miles Smith, who wrote the noble preface, were the final correctors. The preface states, among many other matters, that their object was to make of many good translations a principal good one, to avoid extremes and produce uniformity of rendering. "Never was a great enterprise like the production of our Authorized Version, carried out with less knowledge handed down to the posterity of the labours, their method, and order of working." It was published in 1611; and a number of years elapsed before its intrinsic superiority and merits drove all other English translations out of the field. Taken as a whole, it is the best and most truly English version. Couched in noble language, it abounds in felicities. It is musical, dramatic, and even tragical. It is, in turn, pathetic and sublime, and has, withal, a directness and force which commend it to all classes and conditions of men. But it is far from perfect; and wherein, in the opinion of many of its most ardent admirers, it should be made to conform more thoroughly and consistently with the original Scriptures remains to be briefly indicated under the following heads, etc.

The foregoing is a brief history or account of the work of the translators of our Authorized Version, or the King James translation of the Bible. C. H. C.

John 3:5-6

---February 29, 1916

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Sir and Editor-May I ask you a few questions for information? Does the phrase "born of water" refer to baptism? In the Lofton-Smith discussion here is what is said of Alvah Hovey:

"In regard to **(Titus 3:5)**, Alvah Hovey, one of the most learned Baptists this country ever produced, says, Paul had in mind baptism as representing and confessing the divine change called regeneration. Hence he teaches' that men are saved by an outworking obedient life, given and preserved by the Holy Spirit."

Here is what J. R. Graves says:

"If Brother Vaughn convinced us that 'born of water' refers to anything but the baptism of one previously born of the Spirit we never knew it, and we would have owned it to him and our readers. It means nothing else, and no Baptist that we ever heard or read of ever believed otherwise until A. Campbell frightened them away from an interpretation that is sustained by the concensus of all scholars of all denominations of all ages. So say Wesley, Adam Clark, McKnight, Albert Barnes and John Calvin in their comments on **(Titus 3:5)**. It is the same washing to which Ananias referred when he said to the penitent Saul, 'Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on His name.'

According to these scholars the phrase "born of water," in **(John 3:5)**, and the term washing, in **(Titus 3:5)**, refers to baptism. I will be glad to have your views on these Scriptures. If we will run the marginal references we will see that they refer to baptism. Were these marginal references inspired? If not, then who made these references, and what denomination did they belong to? Please answer through the columns of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. I remain, very truly yours,

W. C. MOORE.

Bellefontaine, Miss.

OUR REPLY

The phrase born of water, in **(John 3:5)**, does not refer to water baptism. Neither is the washing in **(Titus 3:5)** water baptism. However, you will note that Hovey says that baptism represents the divine change called regeneration. If it represents that, then it is not in order to it. One thing cannot represent another thing, and be in order to that thing. We are aware that the Campbellites quote Hovey to sustain their position on **(John 3:5)** and **(Titus 3:5)**, but he does not set forth their view, as this clearly shows.

The statement made by Graves that "No Baptist that we ever heard or read of ever believed otherwise until A. Campbell frightened them away from an interpretation that is sustained by the consensus of all scholars of all denominations of all ages," only shows his lack of information. He did not seem to be so well informed concerning the opinion of Baptists in former ages as some seem to think, according to that statement. Gill was a Baptist, and he lived long before Graves. He wrote much, and he held no such view of **(John 3:5)**. Here is what he says in his comments on that text:

Jesus answered, verily, verily, I say unto thee, etc. Explaining somewhat more clearly, what he before said: except a man be born of the water and of the Spirit: These are two words, which express the same thing, as Kimchi observes in many places in his commentaries, and signify the grace of the Spirit of God. The Vulgate Latin and Ethiopic versions read, the Holy Spirit, and so Nonnus; and who doubtless is intended: by water, is not meant material water, or baptismal water; for water baptism is never expressed by water only, without some additional word which shows, that the ordinance of water baptism is intended: nor has baptism any regenerating influence in it; a person may be baptized, as Simon Magus was, and yet not born again; and it is so far from having any such virtue; that a person ought to be born again, before he is admitted to that ordinance: and though submission to it is necessary, in order to a person's entrance into a gospel church-state; yet it is not necessary to the kingdom of heaven, or to eternal life and salvation: such a mistaken sense of this text, seems to have given the first birth and rise to infant baptism in the African churches; who taking the words in this bad sense, concluded their children must be baptized, or they could not be saved; whereas by water is meant in a figurative and metaphorical sense, the grace of God, as it is elsewhere; see **((25) (Ezekiel 36:25); (John 4:14)**. Which is the moving cause of this new birth, and according to which God begets men again to a lively hope, and that by which it is effected; for it is by the grace of God, and not by the power of man's free will, that any are regenerated, or made new creatures: and if Nicodemus was an officer in the temple, and took care to provide water at the feasts, as Dr. Lightfoot hints, and as it should seem Nicodemon ben Gorion was, by the story before related on him; see the note on ver. 1, very pertinently does our Lord make mention of water, it being his own element: regeneration is sometimes ascribed to God the Father, as in **((Pet 1:3) (I Peter 1:3); (James 1:15)**, and sometimes to the Son, **(I John 2:29)**, and here to the Spirit, as in **(Titus 3:5)**, who convinces of sin, sanctifies, renews, works faith, and every other grace; begins and carries on the work of grace, unto perfection; and unless a man has this work of His wrought on his soul, as he will never understand divine and spiritual things, so he can have no right to gospel ordinances, or things appertaining to the kingdom of God; nor can he be thought to have passed from death to life, and to have entered into an open state of grace, and the kingdom of

it; or that living and dying so, he shall never enter into the kingdom of heaven; for unless a man is regenerated, he is not born heir-apparent to it; and without internal holiness, shall not enter into it, enjoy it, or see God.

Ver. 6. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, etc. Man by his natural birth, and as he is born according to the flesh of his natural parents, is a mere natural man; that is, he is carnal and corrupt, and cannot discern spiritual things; nor can he, as such, enter into, and inherit the kingdom of God; see **(I Corinthians 2:14)**, and **(I Corinthians 15:50)** And therefore there is a necessity of being born again, or of the grace of the Spirit, and of his becoming a spiritual man; and if he was to be, or could be born again of the flesh, or ever so many times enter into his mother's womb, and be born, was it possible, he would be a natural and carnal man, and so unfit for the kingdom of God. By flesh here is not meant the fleshly part of man, the body, as generated of another fleshly substance; for this is no other than what may be said of brutes; and besides, if this was the sense, spirit, in the next clause, must mean the soul, whereas one soul is not generated from another: but by flesh is designed, the nature of man; not merely as weak and frail, but as unclean and corrupt, through sin; and which being propagated by natural generation from sinful men, cannot be otherwise; for who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one, **((Job 14:4) (Job 14:4))**. And though the soul of man is of a spiritual nature, and remains a spirit, notwithstanding the pollution of sin; yet it being defiled with the flesh, and altogether under the power and influence of the lusts of the flesh, it may well be said to be carnal or fleshly: hence, flesh, as it stands opposed to spirit, signifies the corruption of nature, **(Galatians 5:17)**, and such who are in a state of unregeneracy are said to be after the flesh, and in the flesh, and even the mind itself is said to be carnal, **(Romans 8:5-6,7,5)**. And that which is born of the Spirit is spirit: a man that is regenerated by the Spirit of God, and the efficacy of His grace, is a spiritual man; he can discern and judge all things of a spiritual nature; he is a fit person to be admitted to spiritual ordinances and privileges; and appears to be in the spiritual kingdom of Christ; and has a right to the world of blessed spirits above; and when his body is raised a spiritual body, will be admitted in soul, body and spirit, into the joy of the Lord. Spirit in the first part of this clause, signifies the Holy Spirit of God, the author of regeneration and sanctification; whence that work is called the sanctification of the Spirit, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, **((Pet 1:2) (I Peter 1:2); (Titus 3:5))**. And spirit, in the latter part intends the internal work of grace upon the soul, from whence a man is denominated a spiritual man; and as a child bears the same name with its parents, so this is called by the same, as the author and efficient cause of it: and besides, it is of a spiritual nature itself, and exerts itself in spiritual acts and exercises, and directs to, and engages in spiritual things, and has its seat also in the spirit, or soul of man.

From the foregoing it is evident that Gill held the view that the term water in **(John 3:5)** and washing in **(Titus 3:5)** simply referred to the cleansing or purifying work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration.

The marginal references is the work of man. We do not remember the name of the man who did the work, and it is not convenient just now to search the matter to find out. C. H. C.

Acts 22:3

---March 7, 1916

Brother G. M. D. Ray, of Harpersville, Ala., writes us as follows: "I went a few nights ago to hear a young lady speak that was going to the foreign field. She

doted on Paul being taught by Gamaliel. She claimed that this man educated Paul and sent him to the foreign field. The Scripture referred to is **((2:3) (Acts 22:3)**. I wish you would explain this for me.”

The text reads: “I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day.” This language was uttered by the apostle when he was making his defense before the people for the doctrine which he preached. He called their attention to the fact that he was a Jew, and that he was brought up in that very city at the feet of Gamaliel, having been taught by him, not the precepts or principles of the gospel, but taught according to the law and rule of the fathers. While under that influence and acting according to that training he was a persecutor of the saints. But he was regenerated, born of God, and converted from that which he had received from the teaching of Gamaliel. If the young lady proposes to be a follower of Paul, according to the life he lived while following the teaching and engaging in the practice which he engaged in while a follower of Gamaliel, then she would also be a persecutor of the saints. Those who were in line with Gamaliel, and who were of his persuasion concerning religious worship and service, gave Paul letters of authority to go to Damascus and to bind and cast in prison the Lord's humble poor. He persecuted the saints even unto strange cities. This while following the inclinations of those who were of the Gamaliel persuasion. It seems that those who are so much concerned about the foreign fields, and who are so ready to take the stomachache when the foreigners are named, are often persecutors. They are very much unconcerned about the distresses and trials and hunger of poor humanity here at home. Let us look after our own people at home, and follow the teaching of God's word, and we will get along better.
C.H.C.

Matthew 10:39

---March 14, 1916

Brother W. A. Clark, of Delvalle, Texas, requests our views of **((0:39) (Matthew 10:39)**. The text reads: “He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.” The Saviour is here teaching the great importance of His children following Him in obedience to His commandments, and in the ordinances of His house. The great principle is set forth that in the service of the Master the child of God enjoys a happiness and pleasure that is worth more than this natural life. On the other hand, to forsake the service of the Master for the world and the things of the world, is to fail to enjoy that pleasure, and is, therefore, to lose what is worth more than this natural life. This natural life, and the joys of it, are not to be compared to the sweet peace which is enjoyed by the Lord's humble poor as they walk in His delightful service. We think this is the great lesson the Saviour is here teaching.
C.H.C.

Salvation By Grace

---March 14, 1916

Brother H. P. Hamilton, of Carbon Hill, Ala., sent us a leaflet published by the Firm Foundation, a Campbellite sheet, at Austin, Texas. We had seen copies of that leaflet before, and would not notice it now had not Brother Hamilton requested us

to do so. - We will not reply to it at length, for it is not worthy of notice, much less a lengthy reply.

The writer of the leaflet pretends to believe that salvation is by grace, and then labors to prove that it is not, just as the Campbellites usually do. He says that a man cannot be saved without working. The apostle says that "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."-(**Romans 6:23**). According to the statement of the apostle, condemnation is by works and salvation is by grace; but according to this Campbellite effusion condemnation is by grace, and salvation is by works. The apostle knew what he was talking about, and the Campbellite did not that is the difference.

The Campbellite prevaricator says:

The "Hardshells" teach that grace is "unmerited favor." And then they say this grace was exhausted at creation, i. e., that God's divine favor was bestowed on the elect "before the foundation of the world," and that now the only grace (favor) God bestows upon man is to reveal to him by a dream, vision or nightmare, that he is one of the specially elect, by the grace of God before the foundation of the world. These dreams, spooks, visions, nightmares, is God's grace bestowed upon them to let them know they are one of the "saved by grace." With them it is thus: "If you want religion you don't know it; if you know it, you can't get it; if you get it, you can't lose it; and if you lose it you never had it.

In this statement the writer either willfully or ignorantly misrepresents the people he is pleased to call "Hardshells." What the Primitive Baptists teach is that God "hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."-(**II Timothy 1:9**). The grace was given for them in Christ before the world began, and they are saved in time according to that. They are not saved according to what they do, as the Campbellite wind-jammer has it. Evidently the people he calls "Hardshells" are in line with the inspired apostle, and, therefore, preach the truth.

We suppose the Campbellite writer knows nothing about an experimental knowledge of heavenly things, taking his testimony concerning the matter. But the apostle says: "It is not expedient doubtless for me to glory. I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter."-(**II Corinthians 12:1-4**). The apostle had a vision, and he could not tell it.. The Campbellite says the "Hardshells" have such things, too. Again he places us in good company. Well, we feel sorry for the poor fellow. We trust the Lord may have mercy on him, and show him what he has not yet learned-that without, an experimental knowledge of the Lord, heaven and immortal glory he will never see. May the Lord pity him. C. H. C.

Questions of Order

---March 14, 1916

The following questions are asked, not to elicit controversy, but in hope of stirring up the minds of the brethren to a study and knowledge of discipline:

1. Is it Scriptural and Baptistical to receive or restore members without the unanimous consent of all the members?

2. Can a church of Christ delegate to any other body or assembly of men the duties and obligations imposed on her by her King and Law-Giver?
3. Can a church of Christ lawfully agree to perform an unlawful act?
4. If a church should, while in a state of confusion, agree to do that which is unlawful, would it be right for that church to perform that which is not lawful and right because of her former agreement to do so?
5. Is the following statement, made by Elder G. W. Stewart, of Alabama, in the Gospel Messenger of January, 1915, according to Baptist discipline: "To undertake to make the findings, conclusions or decisions of a council binding upon the churches, or their rejection by the churches a test of fellowship, is utterly wrong, unscriptural, and usurpation of authority and power exceeding anything ever done by the Missionary Baptists in their state and Southern Baptist Conventions?"

OUR REPLY

In answer to the above questions we would say that no answer can be given such questions that will cover every case that might come up in a church. Every case must be dealt with on its own merits. Such questions as the above may be answered in a general way, and the answers apply to cases in general; but it is very seldom that any two cases are precisely alike. Hence the answer will not always apply to the case in hand. This should always be remembered in answering questions on points of order or discipline. Questions on order or discipline are often answered as though the same rule will apply in all cases, which brings confusion. Now, to the first question we will say that so far as our knowledge extends, and we believe we are very well acquainted with Baptist usage, it has been, and is now, the custom to require a unanimous voice in receiving members into fellowship, either by experience, by letter, or by restoration. While this is true, it is also true that if an applicant presents himself for membership, and a member objects to his reception, the church has a perfect right to inquire into the cause of the objection by the member. Then, if the church fails to bring about a reconciliation, and the member is at fault, the church has a right to deal with him for his fault.

In answer to question two we will say that the church has no authority to delegate her power or authority to any man or set of men under heaven. She cannot delegate her authority to anyone. She may, however, authorize her messengers, or appointees, to act for her in certain instances, or in some cases. But in doing this she does not delegate her authority to them.

To question three we say, No. If a church agrees to do an unlawful act, her agreement, itself, is unlawful. It would be a violation, of itself.

The answer to question three virtually answers question four. The right thing to do would be to confess her wrong in agreeing to do wrong. Two wrongs never made one right.

Concerning question five we will say that the language is rather strong. A council is not a law-making body. A church may be in confusion, and unable to settle a difficulty among themselves. In such a case they have a right to ask other brethren to meet with them to advise and counsel with them. The brethren thus met have no authority to rule over the church, and enforce their advice upon them, or to force them to act upon the advice. But other churches have the right to withdraw their fellowship from them for refusing to act according to the advice, if they judge the advice to be in harmony with the Scriptures or rules of Christ.

The foregoing is our opinion of the matters, expressed as briefly as we can. We do not claim to be a standard, nor to know everything. We may be wrong, but this is our opinion.

We will venture another thought here on something that has not been asked for, and that thought is this: There is entirely too much looking for something disorderly in the other fellow by a great many. Instead of examining self, and trying to keep self straight, too many of us are trying to find something in the other fellow to straighten out. If the Baptists should be divided up according to every person's notion of strict order, there would be almost as many factions as there are members. Somehow, we cannot help being afraid of the fellow who is such a "stickler" for order that he is always finding fault with somebody's "disorder." We are sometimes fearful that there is something wrong with such a person, and that he is simply trying to get attention attracted to others in order to keep his own meanness from being discovered. We do not say this with reference to the questions above, nor with reference to the party who asked them, but merely to call attention to a fact which exists, and which we would be glad were otherwise. May these thoughts be blessed to the good of our readers, is our humble desire. C. H. C.

Should Be Excluded

---March 21, 1916

Nearly a year ago we received a letter from Sister Lina Presnell, of Rominger, N. C., asking us what we thought about members of the Primitive Baptist Church being retained as members when they say they do not believe the Old Baptist doctrine. We have been a long time answering the question. We have had a number of questions that we have not answered for different reasons. One reason is that we have not had much time to devote to these matters, and have let them wait for a more convenient time. Sometimes we are asked for our views on certain Scriptures which we do not feel any impression or desire to write on. But we will now answer the sister's question by saying that we do not think a member should be retained in the church who says he does not believe the Old Baptist doctrine. There might be some of the strong doctrinal points that one might say he does not understand, and yet say he loves the Old Baptist Church, and loves their preaching, and wants a home with them, and he might be retained. But if he openly declares that he does not believe the doctrine, he should be excluded. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 15:29

---March 21, 1916

In May, 1915, we received a request from Brother T. J. Braswell, of Lyons, Ga., for our views on **(I Corinthians 15:29)**. The text reads: "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" In this chapter the apostle is treating upon the subject of the resurrection of the bodies of the Lord's children, and is arguing that question; and in arguing that question he uses the language of the text. To our mind the argument amounts to about this: If there is no resurrection of the bodies of the saints, then why do we administer baptism as we do? Baptism represents a burial and a resurrection-¹---or, rather, it is a burial and a resurrection. The person is buried in the water and is raised up again. This is baptism, when administered to the proper subject by the proper administrator. Hence, in baptism we say that we believe in the doctrine of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, and that the body of Christ was raised from the grave. Now, if there is no resurrection of the

bodies of the saints, we are wrong in our practice on baptism. If we administer baptism aright, then we are right in our teaching concerning the resurrection. This seems to us to be the line of the apostle's reasoning here. Not only is this true, but it is also true that if the doctrine of the resurrection be true, then baptism must be a burial and a resurrection. It signifies a burial and a resurrection of the body of Christ and of the bodies of the saints. It signifies this because baptism is a burial. "Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death."-**(Romans 6:4)**. If one is buried by baptism, then anything short of a burial is not baptism. If we believe in the doctrine of the resurrection we should practice baptism that way. If we do not believe in the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, we should not practice baptism that way. In our humble judgment this is the real meaning of the text. C. H. C.

Campbell's Movement

---March 21, 1916

We are in receipt of a little magazine called The Gospel Message, published at Paducah, Ky., containing an article headed "The Old Paths," which we have been requested to reply to. The article is intended to defend Campbell's plea of restoring primitive Christianity. According to their usual plea, it contends that the whole church went into Babylon, and that the identity of the church was lost, and so on. As to that position, will say that it is plainly contradicted by the Prophet Daniel, **((Dan 2:44) (Daniel 2:44))**: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." According to the Campbellite position the kingdom was left to other people, and it did not stand forever. The Saviour said, **(Matthew 16:18)**: "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." According to Campbellism the gates of hell did prevail against it, for it was swallowed up by Romanism, they say. But they, do not say truly. It is true that pagan rites and ceremonies were introduced into the church, and that a flood of corruption swept into the church, but the church was not swallowed up by the flood of corruption. There was a great apostasy or falling away, as predicted by the apostle. They fell from the simplicity of the gospel worship and service, but all did not fall. It is abundantly proven by history that there were many who did not fall in with the corruptions but stood aloof from them in all ages from the days of the apostles to the present time. The church was not destroyed, but has remained separate from the world in every age, and that church is on earth yet, and was not restored by the Campbells, for she had gone to no place to be restored from. Alexander Campbell was, for a while, identified with that church (the Baptists), now known as Primitive Baptists, but when he began teaching his heretical inventions he and his followers were dropped from the fellowship of the Baptists; then they had to set out to sea without church affiliation, and they have none yet. All that they are identified with is a project, for Campbell called his movement a project. C.H.C.

The Two Witnesses

---March 28, 1916

Brother A. H. Green, of Doogan, Ga., asked our views concerning the two witnesses spoken of in **(Revelation 11:7-8)**. He made the request last May. We think the two witnesses are the church and the ministry. We know that some do not think so-

that some of our brethren think they are the Old and New Testaments; but we think, as stated, that they are the church and the ministry. The two witnesses were to prophesy for 1260 days, or years, in sackcloth; then after a time they are to be killed and their bodies are not going to be suffered to be put in graves; then the spirit of life is to enter into them again and they are to rise up and prophesy. Their bodies are to be seen lying in the street for three days and a half. We think that this signifies that there is to be a period of severe persecution lasting for three and a half years, which will be the most dreadful persecution the saints have ever known. The Old Baptists will not be allowed to meet and worship God in a public way then, and their ministers will not be allowed to preach. Many people would stop them now if they had the power. How often has it been said that they should not be allowed to preach such doctrine as they do! The spirit of persecution is not dead, by any means, and when the enemies of the truth get it in their power they will stop the Old Baptists from preaching, if they can. Do we appreciate the privileges we now enjoy? C.H.C.

MISSIONARY CLAIMS

---May 30, 1916

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

We don't have anything here but the Missionary Baptists, and they think there is nobody but them. We have not heard a sermon preached in over four years. All the preaching we get is THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, which comes every week filled with so much good reading, which my husband and I both greatly enjoy.

The Missionary Baptists have just had a protracted meeting, and oh! what a going out of unclean spirits! Alonzo Bryant said that the people in the wilderness of Judea were prepared and baptized by John the Baptist. He said that the Missionary Baptist Church was the only church in the world that bore the marks of the church Christ set up. He said two classes of people would be saved; said the bride would be there and the guests would be there; that the guests would be happy, but not as happy as the bride. He said there was a class of people who believed they would be saved regardless of what they did; so they would go on and do just as they pleased. Brother Cayce, if you can see anything in that and think it worth notice I would like to see a reply to it in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST.

Brother Cayce, I do enjoy the good pieces that you write, and wish you would write more. Would be glad if you, or anyone else, could come through here this summer and preach for us. Remember me and mine when at a throne of grace. Your sister saved by grace, if saved at all,

MRS. FANNIE LINEBARGER

Huff, Ark.

REMARKS

We hardly think, dear sister, that the gentleman's statements are worth noticing. We are sure that they are not worth taking much space to reply to. As to the Missionaries bearing the only marks of an apostolic church, will say if that be true, then there is no apostolic church, for they have everything, almost, that the world has, and which the church of Christ did not have in New Testament times. There is no command, precept, or example in the Scriptures for a Sunday School, Woman's Auxiliary, Woman's Missionary Union, Ladies' Aid Society, Missionary Board, Southern Convention, Northern Union, State Convention, Baptist Young Peoples' Union, or the "hundred and one" other things that the Missionaries have. Andrew Fuller is the founder, and they are Fullerites, just as much as Campbell's followers are Campbellites. They are not Baptists, and have no right or title to the name.

They are Fullerites. Call them that, and you will call them by their right name. C. H. C.

Matthew 11:21

---June 13, 1916

Mrs. A. J. Nichols, of Dawson, Ky., asks our views on **(Matthew 11:21)**, and says that "our conditional friends rely greatly on this Scripture to prove that salvation is conditional on the sinner's part." The text reads as follows: "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would- have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes." There is no intimation in the text of a promise of eternal life. But if Tyre and Sidon would have received eternal life had they repented, then as they did not repent, of course, they did not receive eternal life-hence, when those cities were destroyed, the inhabitants of them all went to hell. Those conditionalists, who are such pretenders, accuse the Old Baptists of preaching that there are infants in hell. According to their teaching on this text, who is guilty? They, themselves, are guilty of the ugly thing they charge upon us. If their position be true, then all the people of those cities (men, women and children) were sent to hell when the cities were destroyed. This cannot be true; and, therefore, those conditionalists are teaching a false doctrine. They are only teaching doctrines of men and devils, and are not teaching the doctrine of God.

The truth of the matter is simply this: Tyre and Sidon were overthrown, literally destroyed, on account of their wickedness, and the Saviour was giving a warning to Chorazin and Bethsaida that the same calamity would come upon them, unless they repented, or turned from and ceased their wicked practices. This is the plain, simple, teaching of the text. C. H. C.

In Georgia

---June 13, 1916

We left home, in company with Elder J. H. Phillips, on Saturday, April 29, for Nashville Tenn., where we were at meeting with the Bethel Church on Sunday and Sunday night. The meeting was a sweet and pleasant one. This church was organized just a few months ago, and the writer is the unworthy pastor. It is a lovely and faithful little band. They are increasing in membership, and now have more than thirty. The prospects are very bright and flattering.

From Nashville we went to Burns on Monday, and enjoyed a very pleasant meeting there.

From Burns we went to Dickson, where we enjoyed a pleasant meeting Monday night.

On Tuesday morning we went to Murfreesboro, where we were met and conveyed out to Overalls by Brother George Beasley. The meeting at this church was also enjoyed by us.

We left Murfreesboro Tuesday evening, and filled other appointments as follows: Haleys, Tuesday night; Decherd, Wednesday, and Walnut Grove, Wednesday night; Crow Creek, Thursday; Chattanooga, Friday night; Woodville, Ala., Saturday and Sunday. The meetings at all these places were pleasant, and the congregations were good at most every place. The meeting at Woodville was the regular communion season. The services of communion and feet washing were engaged in on Saturday. A large crowd of Old Baptists were present. We think it was the

largest crowd of Old Baptists that we ever saw engaged in this service at one time. It was a grand meeting.

From Woodville we went to Bethel on Monday; Clear Creek, Tuesday; Flint, Wednesday; Briar Fork, Thursday. We had good meetings at all these places. From Briar Fork we went to Gravel Hill, near Corinth, Miss., and attended the meeting there on Saturday and Sunday. Elder John T. Blanchard was with us at this meeting, which was a glorious meeting, indeed. This was the regular communion time, and the delightful service was engaged in. That meeting will be long remembered by us.

On Monday we and Brother Phillips left Corinth, Miss., for Edison, Ga., where we were met on Tuesday morning by Brother B. D. Jones, and conveyed to Mars Hill Church, where we had meeting that day and on

Wednesday, and at the home of Brother Jones on Wednesday night. This was a delightful season, and we felt that the Lord's sweet presence was manifested.

On Thursday morning Brother Jones conveyed us to Edison, and from there we went to Vidalia, Ga., the home of our dear brother, Elder Lee Hanks, and we arrived there in the evening. We attended the three days meeting in Vidalia, Friday, Saturday and Sunday. This was another communion meeting, and that delightful service was engaged in on Sunday. This was another sweet meeting to us.

Since we were in Vidalia we have filled appointments at Oak Chapel, Pilgrim Rest, Norristown, New Hope, Canoochee, Long Creek, Hebron, Stilimore, Lott's Creek, Bethlehem, and Lower Mill Creek.. The meetings at all these places were sweet and delightful to us. At Oak Chapel, on May 22, a young Sister Moore, about twelve years of age, came to the church, with tears streaming from her eyes, and asked for a home with the Lord's people. She plainly manifested the work of divine grace in her heart. She was joyfully received into their fellowship and was baptized that afternoon by Elder H. V Hill, the pastor of the church. We did not have the pleasure of attending that service, as we had to go on toward the appointment for the next day.

A brother by the name of Phillips came to the church at Canoochee, on May 25, and asked for a home in the church. He formerly had membership with the Fullerites. He was received gladly and joyfully. He is to be baptized at the next regular meeting.

The meeting at Hebron began on Friday, May 26, the day we were at Long Creek. On that day Brother P. H. Byrd came back to the old church from the Progressives and asked that he be allowed to have a home with them. He was gladly received. Brother Byrd is highly esteemed, and the brethren have great confidence in him as a child of God. He has been preaching for a number of years, and was ordained by the Progressives. On Saturday, May 27, Sister Era Grimes came to the church and asked for a home. She was gladly received, and the unworthy writer was requested to administer the ordinance of baptism, which we did on Sunday morning. We spent Sunday night at the home of this sister and her parents. She told us that this was the happiest day of her life.

At Lott's Creek, on May 30, Brother C. A. Warnock was received on confession of faith from the Progressives. He stated that they were practicing and engaging in things at some of their churches which he thought were wrong and not in harmony with the teaching of God's word, and that he could see the spirit of humility and love among these Old Baptists which was Christ-like, and he wanted a home with them. He was warmly welcomed back home. Also Brother D. R. Dekle came forward and related a reason of his hope in the Saviour and asked for a home with those

good people. He was also gladly received, and his baptism is to be attended to at the next regular meeting time.

Elder J. H. Phillips has been with us all the way on this trip until Wednesday morning, May 31. He left us that morning for home, but expects to return as soon as he can, either just after the second Sunday or just after the third Sunday, and remain with us until in August. We miss him very much.

This has been a pleasant trip to us up to the present. We are doing this writing at the home of Brother G. J. Lee, near Lower Mill Creek Church, on June 1st. We do not remember when we ever enjoyed a trip more than we have this one. We have felt that the Lord's sweet presence was surely manifested. True, we have passed through some dark places, but the light places have been bright, and were enjoyed. We have had so much trouble for several months that we feel now that we are prepared to enjoy these pleasant seasons. We humbly ask an interest in the prayers of our readers. We feel that we need their prayers. C. H. C.

The Beloved Disciple

---June 20, 1916

Several months ago Sister Fannie L. Herring, of Bluffton, Ga., asked us who was referred to by Peter when he said to the Saviour, "And what shall this man do?" **{(John 21:21)}** By reading a few preceding verses it may be clearly seen that he had reference to the one called the "beloved disciple." John was called the beloved disciple. The Saviour seemed to have a special love for him, and he is often referred to as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." At least, he is referred to that way. He seems to have been mentioned in that way because he Saviour seemed to have special love for him.
C. H. C.

Campbellite Leaflet

---June 20, 1916

We are in receipt of a Campbellite leaflet sent us from New Decatur, Ala., with the request that we reply to the same. These self-righteous Pharisees are sending out, or giving out, such literature all the time, and we do not have the space to notice all such productions. The leaflet mentioned is simply a small bundle of misapplications of God's word. To begin with, they claim to be the church of Christ, when they are at least 1800 years too young to be that church. Alexander Campbell is their acknowledged founder. This is a fact well known by all who have any knowledge at all of church history. They were excluded from the Baptists in 1827, and Campbell acknowledged that they were thereby forced to form themselves into a separate society. Campbell's movement thereby resulted in the forming of another new sect. They do not follow Christ, but are followers of Alexander Campbell, and are, therefore, Campbellites. They do not teach what Christ taught, but they teach what Campbell taught. Christ and the apostles taught the doctrine of the sovereign choice of God, the effectual and sovereign work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, God's predestination or eternal purpose to save sinners, the final preservation of the saints, and other points in harmony therewith, none of which are taught by these followers of Alexander Campbell. They borrowed their doctrine of baptism in order to eternal salvation from Rome. They teach that water is the mother of God's children. See Campbell's Christian System. That book sets forth their system of theology. Campbell invented what he did not borrow from the

Catholics. Christ is not the author of it. Order a copy of the Cayce-Srygley Debate and read that, and you will see the Campbellite heresy exposed. C. H. C.

The Baptist Church

---June 20, 1916

Several months ago we received a little leaflet published by one T. O. Reese, of the Fullerite persuasion. It was sent to us by W. W. Hollingsworth, of Bessemer, Ala. The Rev. Mr. Reese, in said leaflet, endeavors to show that the Fullerites are the original Baptists, and that said order is the church established by the Saviour A. D. 33.

It is true that at the Baptist Church is the church established by the Saviour during His personal ministry on earth, but the Fullerite party is not that church. For seventeen hundred years the Baptist Church existed without any Conventions, Boards, Presidents, Secretaries, Woman's Missionary Unions, Ladies' Aid Societies, Sunday Schools, Baptist Young Peoples Unions, Christian Endeavors, Young Men's Christian Associations, Young Women's Christian Associations, State Conventions, State Boards, State Secretaries, Agents for collecting funds, Colporteurs, Association Missionaries, State Missionaries, and the thousand-and-one other things that the Fullerites have. They are no more like the church that Christ established than the devil is like the angel Gabriel. It is a well-known fact that the first missionary society among the Baptists was established by Andrew Fuller, William Carey, and others, in the back parlor of Beeby Wallis in Kettering, England, in October, 1792. This was not done on the authority of Christ, for there is no authority for any such in the word of God. It is simply presumption. Presumption is as the sin of witchcraft and these Fullerites have bewitched many of God's people. What has the world got that these Fullerites haven't got? They are not followers of Christ and the apostles, for Christ did not authorize, and the apostles did not practice, any such things as these Fullerites have among them and are engaging in: Andrew Fuller is the author of their system. He is the "daddy" of it. Christ is not the author of it. Therefore, they are Fullerites. They are followers of Andrew Fuller, just as the Campbellites are followers of Alexander Campbell. They are no more entitled to the name Baptist than the Roman Catholics are. They were excluded from the Baptists in 1832 to 1845 for their departures from original Baptist principles. An excluded party is no church; it is not even a part of a church.

Mr. Reese says: "We have more schools, more money invested in school property, and more students in school, than any other denomination except the Catholics. There are over 200,000 white Baptists in Alabama-more Baptists than all Protestants combined." According to this statement, who are most like the Catholics? The Fullerites are. They patterned after the Catholics in inventing all the ponderous machinery which they have. They are more like the Catholics now than any other people are, according to Mr. Reese's statement. They do not favor the church of Christ at all, and have no more right to claim to be that than the Catholics have.

May the Lord grant to open the eyes of His children who are blinded and led astray by them, and may He pity such pretenders. C. H. C.

Acts 2; Acts 28:31

---June 27, 1916

Sister Martha Shearer, formerly of Branson, Mo., now of Dewey Ball, Mo., requests our view of the expression, "For the promise is unto you, "in **((39) (Acts 2:39)**.

This is a plain statement of the apostle, "The promise IS unto you," and "this is the promise that He hath promised us, even eternal life." The promise was eternal life. How did the apostle know that the promise was to them? Because they had been pricked in the heart by the preaching of the gospel, and a cry had been uttered by them as to what they should do. This was an evidence of life—an evidence that they had been born from above, and were already in possession of eternal life. "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God."—(**I Corinthians 1:18**). Gospel preaching does not give life, but it manifests the life which the hearer already possesses. If this effect has been produced upon you by gospel preaching, as was produced upon those people on that day, then "the promise is unto you." This is evidence that the promise is unto you. May the Lord bless you. C. H. C.

John 8:30-47

---**June 27, 1916**

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother in Christ—Will you, Brother Phillips, Brother O. F. Cayce, or some brother who has light on the subject write on the eighth chapter of St. John, beginning at the 30th verse, (((**O**)) (**John 8:30**)) "As He spake these words, many believed on Him. Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on Him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed;" and the conversation on down to the 44th verse, and the 47th verse? Were those He called the children of the devil in the 44th verse and those not of God in the 47th verse the same characters that believed on Him in the 30th verse?

Now, Brother Cayce, I don't ask this through idle curiosity, nor to test somebody's ability, but with a heartfelt desire to learn the truth. I do so much enjoy the dear PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. It is ~ wonderful blessing to the scattered and isolated children of God. It is all the preaching I have heard this year—it and the Gospel Messenger. I have been confined at home sick, with little hope of being better from a natural point of view. Pray for me. Your unworthy brother,
WALTER LEONARD

Canton, Ga.

REMARKS

No; those persons addressed in verses 43, 44, and 47, were not those who believed, spoken of in verse 30. In verse 45 He tells them that they believe not. This language was not to the believing, but to the unbelieving Jews. There were two classes present, and He was talking to the unbelieving class, and John puts in a few words in relating the conversation, and tells in verse 30 that some believed on Him, and then tells in verses 31 and 32 what Jesus said to those who believed; then he returns to the conversation with the unbelieving Jews in verse 33., Read the chapter carefully with this thought in mind. C. H. C.

Ephesians 1 AND 2 Timothy 1

---**June 27, 1916**

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother—I will ask you a question for some instruction. In the first chapter of Ephesians, Paul says, "According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world." Now I would like for you to explain and tell me what the foundation of the world is.

Now **(II Timothy 1:8)** says, "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." Explain and tell me what world the apostle had under consideration.

NEWT MALUGEN

R. 2, Trenton, Tenn.

REMARKS

The expression, "before the foundation of the world," in Ephesians i. means "before the ages of time began." That is the full and true meaning of the original language. The expression, "before the world began," in **(II Timothy 1)** means the same thing; They both mean that something was done by the Lord before this material universe had any existence. The Lord made choice of them before time began--before this material universe had any existence. He treasured grace in Christ before the material universe existed--before time began--for their salvation, and they are saved in time, or regenerated, born again, according to that grace and God's purpose. It is God's work to save, and He saves according to that purpose and grace. C. H. C.

Trial of the Robbers

---July 11, 1916

We have received a leaflet sent to us by Brother Abe Ryan, Eva, Ala., bearing the above title. It is published with the manifest object of obtaining money for the modern mission business, the foreign mission humbug, at that. We are requested to comment on the thing. It is a plain and palpable garbling of God's word. There is absolutely no sentence in all God's word which can possibly be construed to teach that the tithes required of the Israelites under the law were used in sending the law or its teachings among the Amorites, Hittites, Hivites, Jebusites, or other "ites" to make them Israelites. This leaflet has for its object the 'purpose of getting people to pay tithes (money) into the foreign mission business in order to get aliens to become fellowcitizens with the saints--to send the gospel to regenerate the heathen, and thus make them Israelites. This is a wrong application of the teaching of God's word, to begin with, and a misappropriation of funds. The proper name for such an act is embezzlement of funds, is it not? It seems to us that the fellow who is guilty of embezzlement is guilty of a penitentiary offense. Of course it is all right with these fellows to make a misappropriation of funds, since they do it under the cloak of Christianity and with the pretense of saving souls. We say pretense of saving souls--for it is only a pretense. The apostle says, "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."-**((Pet 1:18) (I Peter 1:18-19))**. These foreign mission zealots claim that the silver and gold contributed to the foreign mission cause is used to redeem the people from sin and from hell. Do they tell the truth, or did the apostle tell the truth? We confess that we are inclined to believe what the apostle said. If the apostle told the truth, then these foreign mission zealots are false witnesses. They are not entitled to credit upon their testimony in this case.

In Hebrews vii. the apostle is dwelling upon the law worship and law service, and speaks of the paying of tithes under the law and tells us in **((2) (Hebrews 7:12))**, "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the

law." Here we are plainly informed that this business is changed. He also tells us in the tenth chapter that the law had a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of those things. So the tithing under the law represented something else under gospel worship and service. This being true, the claims and teaching of these fellows cannot be true.

Under the New Testament, in gospel service, the giving is not to be done as it was under the law. In law service one-tenth was required. It was by levy and by taxation. Under the gospel it is not by taxation. It is contrary to the spirit of the gospel to assess a member, or to levy a tax upon the members.

"As a man purposeth in his heart, so let him give." The giving should be from a willing mind and heart-not because one is assessed

The whole spirit and tenor of the teaching of these modern missionary zealots is contrary to the spirit and teaching of the gospel. Their service in a law service, and is no kin to the services of the gospel. C. H. C.

Matthew 12:28; Luke 11:20; Luke 17:21

---July 11, 1916

G. W. Presnell, Hackett, N. C., has requested our views of **(Matthew 12:28); (Luke 11:20)**, and **(Luke 17:21)**. **(Matthew 12:28)** reads, "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." **(Luke 11:20)** reads, "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." These two passages have reference to the same thing. These passages teach that Jesus cast out devils by the Spirit, or finger, of God, meaning a divine agency. The fact that He performed such work as He did was evidence of the existence of the kingdom of God. The language teaches that the "kingdom of God is come unto you," or "come upon you"--that is, the kingdom of God has come among you. It was here then-at the time the Saviour used the language.

((0) (Luke 17:20-21) says, "And when He was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, He answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! For behold, the kingdom of God is within you." The kingdom of God did not come with observation-that is, with outward show. "Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! For, behold, the kingdom of God is within you." That is, the kingdom of God is among you. The kingdom was among them then. It was already right in their midst, but they did not know it. They did not see it. They did not observe it. It did not come with outward show. They could see things of an earthly nature, for things of that nature, come with an outward show, and they could see and understand natural things. But the kingdom of God was not of this world, and is yet not of this world. It was composed of spiritual subjects then, and is composed of such subjects now. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. **-(I Corinthians 2:14-15)**. The Old Baptist Church makes no outward show. The natural man, the unregenerate sinner, does not see it in its beauty. There is nothing in it for him to enjoy. The unregenerate do not love that kingdom. They hate and despise it. But the Lord organized it, and put it here, and He put it here to stay. No matter how much the world may despise that kingdom and try to destroy it, the Lord has preserved and kept it through the ages past, and He will continue to preserve and keep it. The world can not hurt the church. It is when vile and

wicked men creep in among them that trouble comes. As long as the church harbors, shields, protects, and retains fornicators, whoremongers and others of impure lives, in her communion and fellowship, she may expect trouble, strife, discord and confusion. Of course, if a man loves sin as well as he ever did, we need not expect him to live a sober, or moral, upright life. If he has been killed to the love of sin, he does not love sin as he once did, and he would be found living a different kind of life. If he does not live a different kind of life, he has no business in the church of God, and the church will have trouble with such men, or on account of such men, as long as they are retained in the church. C. H. C.

Greater and Lesser Sins

---July 18, 1916

As Brother Clemons suggests that we answer the questions asked by Sister Fannie L. Herring, in her letter elsewhere in this paper, we will venture to offer a few remarks.

First, we will suggest that Jesus was God manifest in the flesh. He was God as well as man. He was not asking questions in order to learn. As God He knew all things. If He had been wanting to learn something, He would have asked the Father instead of lawyers and doctors. He knew these Pharisees and their teaching, and they could not answer His questions.

He chose Judas as a disciple, and as a witness-yet Judas was a devil. Why He would choose a devil to the work of the ministry in the beginning of the gospel kingdom is something we cannot understand, unless he was to be an object lesson for His humble followers in the coming ages. We may know them now by their fruits. If they bear such fruits as Judas did, we may know what they are. "By their fruits ye shall know them." He stands as an object lesson to us that such characters will betray the Saviour. They will betray His blessed truth. They will not do to trust. They can be hired to betray the truth and to betray the Lord's true and faithful and humble followers. Judases creep into the church sometimes now, and we know that is what they are by their fruits.

Yes, there are some crimes worse than others. There are some wrongs which the church can bear with. If there were not, then none of us could be borne with, and the church would have no members, for we all do wrong. But there are some wrongs which the church cannot bear with without becoming a transgressor herself. The church cannot afford to bear with drunkenness. She is commanded not to do so. She cannot afford to retain a fornicator. If the church retains and fellowships such characters, the judgments of God will be visited upon her. 'But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat.' "Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." --(**I Corinthians 5:11,13**). No body of persons claiming to be the church of Christ can retain in her fellowship persons who engage in such practices as these without living in open rebellion to the King and Lawgiver in Zion. And as certain as they do so, just that certain will they, sooner or later, suffer the vengeance of His wrath. The guilty shall not go unpunished. On the other hand, we all have our faults and failings, and are commanded and required to bear with each other's imperfections, shortcomings, and mistakes; to watch over each other for good, and not for evil. We are commanded to "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." If Brother B or Brother R sets the standard, and all must come to

that, and all must see just as Brother B or Brother R thinks, then Brother B or Brother R fail to "forbear in love." Such a spirit is dangerous and destructive to the welfare and peace of the church of God. We are sorry it is so, but must confess that we have seen such a spirit manifested. Is it akin to the spirit of Judas? Our readers may answer for themselves. But we do know that it is a bad spirit, and that it is dangerous. It is wrong--very wrong. We should remember that we all are guilty of wrongs, that we all make mistakes. But such a spirit is Pharisaical. It says that "I am perfect; I never do wrong; I make no mistakes; I need no forbearance exercised toward me, and shall exercise none toward others. Every brother must use my words or be accursed." We say this is wrong. We need each other. We should be willing to bear with each other; we should not make a brother an offender for a word; we should exercise longsuffering. Charity suffereth long--there is no end to it, as long as we do wrong ourselves. These little petty differences, minor offenses, and differences in expression should be borne with always. A spirit of "rule or ruin" will not do that. May the Lord help us all to remember these things, and to live accordingly, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Views Wanted

---July 25, 1916

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother--Does a man have to be married and have children before he can be ordained to preach? There has a question arisen among us to that effect, and we want your views on same. You may answer through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST.

J. A. BRADEN

Hornersville, Mo.

REMARKS

No, a man does not have to be married and have children before he can be ordained to preach. Paul was never married. The requirement that the bishop be the husband of one wife simply means that he should have only one wife at a time. It does not mean that he must marry in order that he be ordained. Neither does it mean that he should never be married more than once. It simply means that he should be the husband of one wife and one wife only. It does not mean that he must marry, as stated. Neither does it mean that he should not be allowed to have a wife. His circumstances may be such that, although he may have been married, yet he has no Scriptural wife. This does not forbid that he have a wife. If he has been married, and the woman is dead, or is a fornicator, then he has no wife. There is no law against a man having one wife, and he has the right to marry. He does not have that to do in order to be ordained to the work of the ministry, but he has the right. C. H. C.

Sunday Work

---August 1, 1916

We have received the following question: "Do the Primitive Baptists reject the fellowship of a member that is employed by a firm, such as a railroad company, and works seven days a week? Do Primitive Baptists bar against Sunday work?" We have never known of a Primitive Baptist Church withdrawing fellowship from a man because he was employed by a company that required him to work on Sunday, and we have met with quite a number of brethren who were employed by railroads. We have understood Primitive Baptists generally to think that people should not work on Sunday when it can be reasonably avoided; but we have always thought that

they willingly excused the brother who had such a position with a company who required his services on Sunday. It would be just as reasonable and as justifiable in the church to exclude a sister for cooking breakfast or dinner on Sunday as to exclude the brother for working at his job on Sunday when his employer requires it. So far as we can learn, and so far as we can find, it is no more violation of the Scripture to work on Sunday than on any other day. The only reason we can see why one should not work on Sunday is because it is a violation of the law of the state, and the state law provides for certain lines of work being carried on. The Sabbath law, under the law dispensation, required the Jew to work six days, and a failure to work six days was as much a violation as a failure to observe the Sabbath. Besides, the seventh day (Saturday) was the Sabbath day. The Gentiles were never under that law. It was to the Jews only. The Gentiles have never been under it. As stated, the only reason why it is wrong to work on Sunday, as we understand the matter, is simply because the state law forbids it. It is as much wrong, morally, for the good sisters to work on Sunday as it is for the men to do so. The women generally have as much work to do on Sunday as they do on any other day--perhaps more. Why don't the men make provision by law to stop so much of the women's work being done on Sunday? Evidently they do not care to be deprived of the pleasure of the hot breakfast and dinner. They are not so much concerned as to the amount of work the women have to do; but they are concerned that they themselves have provision made so that they will not have to work on Sunday. Much of this, too, is under the cloak of Christianity--a pretense. C. H. C.

About The Minstry – Questions Answered

---August 8, 1916

The following is so timely, and so Scriptural, and so much in harmony with our own views, that we copy it from The Gospel Messenger for August, 1916. It deserves to be published in every Old Baptist paper in the United States, and it is a great pity--yes, a shame and a disgrace, that its teaching is not put in practice. It is a shame that some claiming to be Primitive Baptists will retain men in their fellowship, and shield and protect them, when they are guilty of such immoral practices as some of those things mentioned. No wonder there is trouble, strife, division, confusion and discord in the church, when such men are retained. When men are guilty of such immoral conduct, it is no wonder they claim that the body is still in the same condition as the alien sinner. May the Lord pity us. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

DEAR BROTHER STEWART:

For the information and satisfaction of a number of us, will you kindly answer the following questions through The Gospel Messenger:

1. Do you think Primitive Baptists should uphold, tolerate and fellowship preachers or elders who are known to be guilty of gross public offenses, sins or crimes, such as drunkenness, fornication, adultery, lying or fraud, etc.?

Answer. Genuine, orderly Primitive Baptists do not uphold, tolerate or fellowship such preachers, or elders, for such conduct as that just mentioned is not disorderly merely, but is downright wickedness and violations of the moral law of God, and will not be tolerated by our orderly people any more than would thieves, robbers and murderers, with which they are classed in **(Revelation 22:15)**. Read it. The royal law governing the ministry provides that the bishop, preacher, pastor, minister, or elder (all these terms mean about one and the same thing) must be blameless, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, a lover of good men, just, holy, temperate, a pattern of good works, in the doctrine showing uncorruptness,

gravity, sincerity; must be faithful and be an example to the believers in the word, in conversation, in spirit, in faith, in purity, and must have a GOOD REPORT of them that are without. And he MUST NOT BE given to wine, nor greedy of filthy lucre, nor a brawler, nor covetous, not a novice, etc. St. Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus. Read them all carefully. Would you employ an unchaste person to -train and educate your daughters? Would you employ a drunkard, a liar, murderer, gambler or any other immoral person to train and educate your sons? Would you put a donkey in a parlor? Then if you would not, do not tolerate and fellowship a man of bad or doubtful character as a preacher, teacher or pastor, for as the other things mentioned would be an abomination among men, so the latter would be a greater abomination before God and men.

2. Suppose there is much common or general talk about a preacher that tends to show that his conduct is not such as becomes the gospel of Christ, and while perhaps there is nothing that has come to light or has actually been proven on him to 'show that he is guilty, yet his conduct is such as to cause general suspicion that he is guilty of dark, criminal, dishonorable practices, what then?

Answer. The Scriptures already referred to answer this question, when the apostle says he must have a good report of them that are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil. See **(I Timothy 3:7)**. The good report required relates to the moral character of the minister, and not to his doctrine, for many who do not like nor care for his doctrine or religion will give him credit for good character, and I can truly say that I have never yet known a minister that deserved a good report of them that are without who did not have it. A minister who has not a good report of those without is not likely to have a good report of those that are within, and if he has not this good report, then according to the Scriptures just quoted he is in reproach and the snare of the devil. And a minister in that condition preaching among Old Baptists! God forbid! Abominable! Horrible! Demoralizing! There is no more authority for putting a man of bad or suspicious character in the ministry and in the pulpit, than there is for putting a profane, ungodly man, or a heathen, or a Hottentot, there, because all such is forbidden. The duty of the minister is to teach, edify, build up and keep the flock together; but this other sort, the man of bad or suspicious character, will do exactly the opposite. The walk, character, and everyday life of the minister should be encouraging, confirming, inspiring to, and an actual defense for, the people and church of God, and such they are divinely intended or appointed to be. On the other hand, if his life is not above suspicion, many mourn, grieve, scatter and perish visibly. On the common report that a certain man was a fornicator, Paul told the church to put away from among them that wicked person. See **(I Corinthians 5:1,13)**. In that good old church of Jesus Christ, when they wanted deacons, the direction was to look out men of "honest report." John says "Demetrius hath good report of all men, and of the truth itself." **((Jn 1:14) (III John 1:14)**. Hence we should never recognize a man of bad report or suspicious character as a minister of Jesus Christ, because, 1st, it is rebellion against God's law. Second, because such a man cannot edify, but mortifies the church of God, all lovers of truth and respectable people generally. Third, because the church and lovers of truth must droop their heads in shame among the sons of God and before all men. Fourth, because if such a preacher be tolerated, there are only a few places he can go and be tolerated at all, and then not by all perhaps, and because many sincere lovers of truth will not hear him, and if they learn that he is to be at a certain meeting, they will not go there, or if they have gone to meeting and find that such a preacher is there, it casts a dark shadow and a gloom over all to them, and there is no more joy in that meeting for them.

Would you undertake to introduce a fallen woman,--a woman of bad character, into good, honest, virtuous, and respectable society, and encourage or persuade them to recognize her as their equal, and to follow her example and teaching? Do you answer, No? Then, for God's sake and the church's sake, never do the other, for it is a far greater abomination before God. Toleration of such a preacher will have the effect of driving away some of the purest and noblest members of our churches and be the cause of many of the bleating lambs of God staying away and never entering or uniting with the church--in fine, such toleration would sooner or later cause the church to become extinct, visibly.

If the church where a man has membership tolerates such things, then what should the sister nearby churches do? Answer: If the church where such a character has membership, will not stop him from preaching and exclude him, too, then the sister churches in that section should labor with the offending church on account of her inconsistency and great sin before God, and then, if she refuses to deal with that man, they should, after due course of gospel labor, withdraw fellowship from her, and publish to all that they have withdrawn from them; for in this way only can the reproach and burden be taken off the church and cause of Christ. But if other churches refuse, or fear, or neglect to act, then the sin, and shame and reproach rest upon them all, and upon the ministry in particular, for if such a condition obtains or becomes a matter of toleration, you may ascribe it to a slothful or cowardly, or unfaithful ministry.

4. Where a minister has been expelled from the church on account of gross immorality or conduct, such as lying, stealing, public drunkenness, fornication, adultery, seduction, etc., and then repents and desires to be restored by the church to fellowship and to the ministry, can the church Scripturally restore him to his former position?

Answer. Let me answer your question by asking you one. Can a woman who has justly forfeited her respectability, good character and standing with good society be restored to her former or good character and standing in society? If so, how? Or can a church by the act of restoring such a character as the one now under consideration give, impart to, or cause him to have the good, blameless character which God's law requires him to have? Can the church by such act of restoration cause the churches generally to love, and have confidence in him as a faithful minister and to be received and welcomed by them, if not as an able minister, yet as a faithful and true servant of God--cause him to be an example in word, in faith, in purity, to all the flock, and cause him to have a GOOD REPORT of them which are without? If she can do all this, then she can consistently restore him: otherwise, her attempted act of restoration is nothing but a sham and a farce. A true minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ, while he feels and confesses his inbred corruption of sin, and is made to mourn on account of it daily, yet maintains a good character with his brethren and before all men; but a minister of bad or suspicious character, loving his own sensuality, lust or greed more than he does the church and people of God, will do all he can to sustain himself--will lie, defraud and resort to all the tricks and trades of the hypocrite to sustain himself. A true minister would rather shut his mouth and abide on the outside forever than to be the cause of reproach and suffering to the church and people of God.

5. Does not the blessed Jesus, His apostles and the spirit and tenor of the whole Bible teach that we should forgive, bear with, and labor with one another, and that, if we forgive not, neither shall we be forgiven, and so on?

Answer. It certainly does; but these directions and admonitions relate to the everyday life and conduct of the people of God and church members in their relation to each other; for we all, being weak, fallible, and sinful in our very nature, are prone to do wrong, and we do wrong, more or less, daily, and if we do not bear with and forgive one another, we never can live together in peace, love and harmony; but such directions should never be so construed or interpreted as to shield and retain members, whether they be private members or ministers; for to do so is a misapplication and hurtful perversion of the Scriptures relating to private offenses or trespasses against one another, to the sustaining of corruption and disorder. I am sorry to have to confess that we, in many places and instances today, are guilty of perverting God's law of discipline as any other people are in reference to the doctrine of grace. Did the Lord direct the first church to labor and bear with Ananias for lying, which was a gross public offense? No; for He killed him at once for it. Did Paul direct the church to labor with and forgive the fornicator? No, but he directed them to put that wicked person from among them. But you may ask, Did not Peter lie, and was not that a gross public offense? Yes, Peter, under the excitement of fearful events and of natural terror, lied in saying that he did not know Christ and was not His disciple; and under the excitement of unexpected personal danger, any of us are apt to do just what Peter did; but oh! notice; just as soon as Peter came to himself and realized what he had done; how sincerely, deeply, and bitterly he repented and wept! It is not such a liar as that that is so abominable and offensive; it is the cool, calculating, premeditated liar that you cannot put up with, but must exclude. - Suppose a man steals or commits unjustifiable murder, and then repents, confesses and asks the church's forgiveness. Can she forgive him and retain him in her body? Show me one instance in the New Testament where a gross public offender, guilty of willful, deliberate public offense was labored, borne with and retained by the church, or where the church is directed to do such a thing. There are sins unto death, and for which we are not directed to pray. **(I John 5:16)**.

6. If, after all, there is a preacher of bad or suspicious character, and the churches of his section, knowing of it, allow him to go on anyway and refuse to deal with and stop him, and suppose that you know all this, and that preacher were to come to your section and church, would you recognize him and preach with him? Answer. I would not, any more than I would an Arminian in an official way, for the reason that, if churches ignored the law of the Lord, then I certainly would ignore them to the extent of refusing to honor and recognize him as a minister of Jesus Christ. The fact is, I' am not able to command language sufficient to express the wickness, horror and abomination of such things; and, if it were possible, there ought to be a disciplinary dynamite placed under all such disorder to explode it into invisibility. G. W. STEWART.

EXTRACT FROM BOOK OF MORMON

---August 22, 1916

A few weeks ago we were with Elder J. H. Phillips at Pleasant Grove Church, in Henry County, Tenn. A Mormon apostle was there, and seemed anxious for a dispute. In conversation with him we stated that the Book of Mormon taught that all are saved who do not hear the gospel preached. He denied it, and asked us to show it. As we did not remember the exact wording of the language in the book, and did not remember just where it was, not being familiar with that book, we could not show it to him, but promised that we would find it and publish in our columns. We give the language below just as it appears in the Book of Mormon, from the Second book of Nephi, chapter 6, verses 48 to 56, inclusive:

And he commandeth all men that they must repent, and be baptized in his name, having perfect faith in the Holy One of Israel, or they can not be saved in the kingdom of God. And if they will not repent and believe in his name, and be baptized in his name, and endure to the end, they must be damned; for the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel, hath spoken it; wherefore he hath given a law; and where there is no law given there is no punishment; and where there is no punishment, there is no condemnation; and where there is no condemnation, the mercies of the Holy One of Israel have claim upon them, because of the atonement: for they are delivered by the power of him: for the atonement satisfieth the demands of his justice upon all those who have not the law given to them, that they are delivered from the awful monster, death and hell, and the devil, and the lake of fire and brimstone, which is endless torment; and they are restored to that God who gave them breath, which is the Holy One of Israel. But woe unto him that has the law given; yea, that has all the commandments of God, like unto us, and that transgresseth them, and that wasteth the days of his probation; for awful is his state!

This language so clearly teaches that those who do not have the law--or what they preach, as gospel--are saved on account of the atonement, that it does not take a Solomon to understand it. Evidently, the law is that those who hear the preaching are required to repent, believe, and be baptized; and when they hear the law proclaimed, that they cannot be saved unless they obey it. Hence, it is certain damnation to those who hear it and fail to obey it. On the other hand, there is no punishment to those who do not hear the law, for the law is not given to them; and "where there is no punishment, there is no condemnation." It necessarily follows that all would be saved, if no one heard the preaching. The preaching, therefore, sends people to hell, according to the Book of Mormon. Again: those who do not hear the preaching are saved by the atonement of Christ. Those who hear the preaching are saved by obeying the law. Hence, there are two ways of salvation, according to the Book of Mormon. Not only so, but those who hear the preaching are not saved by the atonement of Christ. This being true, according to Mormonism, then Christ died in vain, for the apostle has said, "For if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead is vain. "**(Galatians 2:21)**. Mormonism not only denies that sinners are saved by the atonement of Christ if they hear the preaching, but it teaches that Christ died in vain, and teaches that preaching is the ministration of damnation, for all would necessarily be saved if the law was not given by the preaching. This is only a small part of the inconsistency of Mormonism.

C.H.C.

A CONTRADICTION

---August 29, 1916

We have received a copy of two letters written by Elder J. B. Hardy which we think our readers should see. Hence we give them space below. The reader can see the contradictions without comment from us. The Fort Worth council which he endorses was a council held by those who advocate the absolute and unconditional predestination of all things that come to pass, both good and bad. The first letter below was dated September 8, 1903, and the second one was dated December 1, 1908. Since the second letter was written we copied an article written by him, and replied to it, in which he advocated the idea that nothing is lost by disobedience and nothing gained by obedience. If he wants recognition among orderly Baptists

he should get himself straight, and no orderly Baptist should want to recognize him until he does that. We feel it a duty we owe our brethren to let these things be known. We have nothing personal against Elder Hardy, and our only intention and desire is that people be consistent. C. H. C.

FIRST LETTER

MRS. TOM TAYLOR:

My Dear Friend and Sister in Christ, I Hope-I have just heard a letter read from Sister Rogers to my brother, in which she says your mind has become dissatisfied, and that you are desirous of uniting with the church. I rejoice that your mind is thus exercised. Sister Rogers also informs me that J. S. Newman came to Blum, following me, and told you that I was agreed with him in doctrine, and offered this as a pretext to induce you to unite with his party. My sister, do not suffer yourself to be deceived. I am not agreed with J. S. Newman, neither in doctrine nor practice. J. S. Newman would not endorse what you heard me preach; and if you believe that, you cannot join his disorderly party. My father and I are perfectly agreed with my brother who was with me at your place, and J. S. Newman is not agreed with either of us; and he should not seek to thus deceive you.

I was at the Fulton meeting, but did not endorse all they did there; and they published my name in connection with their work, without my consent. If J. S. Newman was there, he knows that I publicly objected to some things they did. I do believe the London Confession of Faith, every word of it; and so does my brother. I also endorse the findings of the Fort Worth Council, and J. S. Newman does not. So we are not together.

Now if you wish to become a member of the Primitive Baptist Church, go to Elder Rogers' church and join. Yours in hope,

J. B. HARDY

Eldorado, Ill., September 8, 1903.

P. S.-I write this to prevent a deception being palmed off on you. J. B. H.

NOTE.-The brother referred to by Elder Hardy in the above is Elder J. R. Hardy, a rank Absoluter.-C. H. C.

SECOND LETTER

ELDER W. J. TAYLOR:

I have often heard of you, Brother Taylor, and have always had a great anxiety to meet you, and my anxiety has increased ever since I had a debate at Urbenett last summer and the brethren told me of your humble, godly life, faithfulness in our Master's cause and ability as a minister of the gospel. I hoped to meet you at the debate, but failed; and my desire has become so great to meet you that I have decided to pay you a visit. If it would be agreeable I would like to visit every church in your association, and get acquainted with your brethren. I do love to meet and counsel with humble, faithful servants of my Master, who have been, and are, faithfully protecting the little children of God from the approaching enemy, and gathering in the little lambs. If I am not mistaken, you and I are perfectly agreed in doctrine. I understand, from the report I have had of you, that you are not an extremist; that you are opposed to the extreme views on predestination held by some, and do not hold conditional time salvation in such a way as to exclude the necessity of grace in obedience. While this has been charged upon us, I never heard one affirm any such thing, and I am sure none of us brethren believe it. You will find my views set forth by the Fulton Council. I was there. I would like to say so many things to you, but hope to be able to meet you soon and talk with you for our mutual strengthening and comfort. If it is agreeable for me to visit the churches of your association, I would desire and expect you to be with me at each church; for in this perilous time it becomes us to know what is being preached in our midst and

to our brethren over which the Holy Ghost has made us overseers. Besides, my visit there would be as much to see you and enjoy your godly counsel. I could be there Tuesday, the 22nd of this month, and continue thirteen or fourteen days. If you make appointments for me, let them close near Elder Davis. I want to visit him, and would like you to go there with me. Please let me hear from you soon. I am, I hope, your brother in Christ,

B. HARDY

Croft, Kan., December 1, 1908

A Debate

---September 5, 1916

We have agreed, the Lord willing, to meet C. M. Stubblefield, of Paducah, Ky., in a debate of four days, to be held at Mt. Moriah Primitive Baptist Church, near Elva, Ky., to begin on Monday, October 9th. The following propositions will be discussed:

1. The Scriptures teach that God gives spiritual or eternal life to alien sinners without conditions on their part. C. H. Cayce affirms and C. M. Stubblefield denies.
2. The Scriptures teach that faith, repentance, confession, and baptism, are, to the alien sinner, conditions to be performed and complied with, in order to salvation, or remission of sins. C. M. Stubblefield affirms and C. H. Cayce denies.

Two days will be devoted to each proposition. The speaking should begin promptly at 10 o'clock each day. C.H.C.

Article Copied

---September 5, 1916

On another page in this paper will be found an article from Elder D. Hopper, which is copied from the Primitive Baptist Signal of July 18, 1916. Elder Z. Stallings replied to this article in a late issue of the Trumpet, and copies of the Trumpet were scattered broadcast in some sections of the country containing his reply. Some brethren who did not know just what the elder was replying to have asked us to publish the article written by Elder Hopper, so that they could see for themselves whether Elder Hopper had advocated heresy or not. In accordance with that request we are giving the article space in this paper. Read it carefully for yourselves and see if it is not just the way Old Baptists have always preached. It is a brand new idea to us that some are now advocating that the body does not take any part in the service of God, or that the body plays no part in the service. It is a brand new thing to us among Old Baptists that the body of the child of God is yet a child of wrath, and is no part of the child of God. But read the article from Elder Hopper and compare it with the Scriptures of divine truth. God's word is the standard to measure the article by. C. H. C.

The Curtain Raised

---September 5, 1916

NOTICE.-The following articles on this question which we reproduce from our writings are not put in this book with any desire to wound the feelings of any brother, or to dig up these old matters, or to make any brother feel bad. We reproduce them because we do not feel that we would be dealing honestly or in sincerity to leave them out. At that time there was a war on among the brethren.

Since then the trouble has been adjusted between many of them, or most of them, and at this time they are together and dwelling in peace, so far as that old war is concerned. The putting these articles in this book, and what may follow in additional volumes, since those matters have been settled, will show that Primitive Baptists can adjust and settle their differences when they try. C. H. C.

Our readers are well aware of the fact that a war has been waged in some sections for some time. In Texas the war has been on for quite awhile. One side has been charging the other side with believing what they term the "whole man" doctrine. Elder J. S. Newman and those who are in line with him, or who affiliate with him, have been charged with believing that doctrine, although he and others have repeatedly denied believing it. For some time there have been some who have been charging the same thing upon us. In our issue of November 16, 1915, we gave our views on the question of regeneration, and hoped that would satisfy those who had been thus charging us; but it seems that it failed to satisfy some. For a good while those who are in line with Elders Webb, Redford & Co., of Texas, would not say whether they endorsed our editorial or not. Finally two of these preachers came out in an article in the Trumpet in reply to our article. We have continued to remain silent and to take no part in this unholy war, trusting or hoping that it might cease, and that these brethren who seem determined to have strife and confusion would tire of their unholy course and stop their unbrotherly thrusts and unholy warfare. But it seems that they are determined not to even hush, and are determined to make us engage in war with them. Some have been saying that we had been working in a secret way; and it has been told to some of the members of our home church that we had something hid, behind the curtain, etc. Now, it seems to be our imperative duty to remain silent no longer. It is not only our duty to defend ourselves, but we feel that we owe it to the cause of the Master to speak out now and expose false ways and defend the truth, as we understand it. We trust that we realize the great responsibility resting upon us as we take up our pen now in defense of the time-honored principles of our fathers. We realize our own weakness and our own liability to err and go wrong. We do not ask a single reader to follow us because we advocate a thing. Do not follow us because we are editing a paper. Do not follow us because our sainted father was a preacher and an editor before us. Please do not follow us, only as we follow Christ. "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ. "**(I Corinthians 11:1)**. If we know our heart our desire is to present the truth, and to do so in the love of the truth. We desire to speak the truth in love. **(Ephesians 4:11-25)**.

We are also conscious of the fact that when a person goes to an extreme and another person begins to contend against that extreme, it is a very easy matter for him to go to an extreme also, but in the opposite direction. We realize our weakness here, too, and our liability to get wrong, if we are right now. Hence we realize our dependence upon the Lord for the guidance of His Holy Spirit, and for His sustaining grace.

Having all these things in view, and asking an interest in the prayers of our readers that the Lord may, in mercy, guide and direct us in the right way, we here take up our pen to enter the fight for the principles which have characterized our people in ages past. In doing this, we are not promising our readers a paper filled with controversy and wrangling, but we do promise to expose false doctrines and false ways. We do not propose to spare any man or set of men. It makes no difference to us who advocates a wrong, it shall be our intention to speak against it. We are aware of the fact that things have been said on both sides of this war which should not have been said; and expressions have been used which should not have been

used, and which have been misconstrued. There has been too much hair-splitting. The truth of the matter is, in our humble judgment, that hair-splitting is the cause of much of the trouble and differences. Another cause is that some have evidently set themselves up as standards, and all others must use their words in expressing themselves or else they are heretics. We have had some experience with some who seemed to think that we must use their words or else we are not "in it" at all. Now, before we go further we wish to make this statement: We have no money to throw away, but we will give any man twenty-five dollars who will produce an article that has ever been published over our signature that we will not re-publish and endorse the doctrinal sentiments of it now. We will also give any man twenty-five dollars who will produce any article which has ever appeared over our signature, or any letter which we have ever written, that crosses or contradicts a doctrinal sentiment in any other letter or article which we have ever written. Just here we wish to re-affirm a statement we made in our article on regeneration which appeared in our issue of November 16, 1915, as follows:

It seems to us that we have been plain enough in the foregoing for anyone to know that we do not believe the "whole man" doctrine; but for fear some person might not remember, we will say, most emphatically, that WE DO NOT BELIEVE THE "WHOLE MAN" DOCTRINE. When we say that we do not believe a thing there is no man under heaven who has any right to say that we do, and no honest man who reads this will hereafter do so. Some have accused us of believing that, but every honest man who has thought so will say it no more, and will be willing to correct his statements that we did.

We also wish to quote a statement from our "Introduction to Volume Thirty-one, "in our issue of January 4, 1916:

We have learned that some are still trying to make it appear that we believe the "whole man" doctrine; and some have even gone so far as to say that we said some things which we did not say, and never even thought of saying. No honest man will do this. We must again call attention to what we said on that line in the issue of November 16, 1915. So far as we are concerned the discussion of that matter is at an end, either publicly or privately, and we have no more to say concerning it. When the articles were written from which the foregoing extracts were taken, it was our intention and full determination that we would have no more to say concerning this matter; but we have been censured because we have been saying nothing, and the charge has been made, as already stated, that we have something hid, that we have something behind the curtain, and other like things have been said, until it has become absolutely necessary for us to have more to say-so it seems to us, and many of our good brethren have advised and insisted that we remain silent no longer.

Now, perhaps we have had something behind the curtain. If so, we are now going to raise the curtain and let our readers see some of the things which are there. The first thing we mention is the fact that we received the following declaration of non-fellowship, which was sent to us by Elder S. N. Redford, with the request that we publish the same in our columns:

Whereas, Elder J. B. Downing has, in our own stand and from the pulpit of his own church, affirmed, contrary to **(Galatians 5:17)**, that it is not the flesh or physical being of man, but the sinful principle in man, that is opposed to God and holiness; and

Whereas, He holds that the flesh (which we know to be natural, vile, sinful, unholy, and corrupt) is an essential constituent or part of the now real child of God; and

Whereas, There are some among us who hold that there is some kind of change of quality or condition produced on the flesh in regeneration;
We, Harmony Church of Christ, believing the above-named things to be heresy, do therefore solemnly declare that we have no fellowship for said heresy; and hence, have no fellowship for its advocates, and will not affiliate with them.

Done by order of the church while in conference February 28, 1914. ELDER R. V SARRELS, Mod.

H. H. WARREN, Church Clerk.

The above resolution shows for itself what has been advocated by some who are charging that others are advocating what they call the "whole man" doctrine. In the first place, this resolution denies that it is the sinful principle in man that is opposed to God and holiness, and sets forth the idea that it is the material body, the body of flesh in the abstract sense, that is opposed to God and holiness. We know that Old Baptists have always contended that it is the sinful life or nature which man possesses that is opposed to God and holiness, and that this is the teaching of the apostle in **(Galatians 5:17)**. In that text the apostle says, "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." The apostle could not have meant in this that the material body, the mere lump of flesh, "lusteth against the Spirit." There could not possibly be any such thing as lust in the flesh, the material body, in the absence of life. Hence, he must have meant that the natural life, which the man possesses, lusts against the Spirit. Or, in other words, he meant that the old, sinful, depraved nature we possess lusts against the Spirit. In verses 15 and 16 he says, "But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh." If the apostle had reference to the material body when he used the term flesh in verse 17, then he must have had reference to biting and devouring done by the material body or mouth in verse 15. Do you suppose the apostle had reference to such biting as men do sometimes when they are mad and engaging in a "fisticuff" fight? He certainly did not have reference to that. It is evident, then, that the expression he used as to biting and devouring one another is a figurative expression, meaning that by wrong talking and wrong acting their love and fellowship is destroyed, and their happiness is marred. This being true, it must also be true that the term flesh in verse 17 does not have reference to the material body but to the sinful life or nature which we possess. The child of God has two natures. So this text teaches. Old Baptists have always said that this text teaches that the child of God has two natures-one sinful and corrupt, and the other holy and divine. The sinful and corrupt nature is received in the natural birth, and the divine nature is received in the new birth, or in regeneration. In regeneration it is the man, the sinner of Adam's race, that receives the divine nature. That divine nature is implanted in the soul or spirit of the man by the direct and immediate operation of the Holy Spirit, and the man then possesses two natures-the sinful nature and the divine nature. These two natures are opposite to each other. They spring from opposite sources. They are contrary to each other.

The child of God would live a perfectly holy and sinless life. This is the desire of every child of God. Have you not that desire? Though this be your desire- though you would do that-yet you cannot, because you still have the same old sinful nature which you have always had since your natural birth, and which you will have as long as you stay in this world. Here is where the warfare within springs from. It is from the fact that you have these two natures which are contrary to each other,

and which come from sources that are contrary to each other. If this has not always been Old Baptist teaching, we confess that we have never known what the Old Baptist doctrine is. But we have been trying to preach this for a little more than twenty-six years, and we never heard of that doctrine being objected to by one claiming to be an Old Baptist until we received the above declaration of non-fellowship.

Now, we confess that we have kept this thing quiet, hoping those brethren in Texas would get their troubles settled, and that it would not come to Tennessee, We confess that we should have raised the curtain sooner, perhaps, and showed the brethren what we had behind it, but if we erred in not doing so, we trust we erred on the side of charity. But the curtain is up now, and you can look upon the scene in the first act. Look at that beautiful, wonderful, inspired declaration of non-fellowship! Is it not a beautiful thing?

According to that declaration, it is down-right heresy to say that the body "is an essential constituent or part of the now real child of God." There you are! If the body is no part of the now real child of God, then real children of God are spirits only, and the bodies are children of wrath, or children of the devil, as you may be pleased to term it. Then if the spirit only is the child of God, and the body is no part of the child of God, then the child of God lives in the Adam man, or in the child of wrath, until the Adam man dies; and the Adam man dies and goes to the grave a child of wrath. If he is raised in the last day, he will be raised a child of wrath, or else he will be changed some time between death and the resurrection. And again: If he goes to the grave a child of wrath, an unjust character, and if all persons go to the grave that way, then there would be no such thing as a resurrection of the just-for there would be no just to be resurrected. And if the resurrection is regeneration, then all who are resurrected at the last day would be regenerated. If all who are resurrected at the last day are not regenerated, then the resurrection is not regeneration.

Again: If the body is no part of the now real child of God, then no part of the child of God goes to the grave, unless the soul or spirit goes there. But the soul or spirit does not go to the grave; therefore, no part of the child of God goes to the grave, if the body is no part of the child of God. If this is true, then, that the body is no part of the child of God, then there is no resurrection at the last day for the children of God, for none of them would go to the grave. Let us frame the argument another way:

1st. The body, which is no part of the child of God, goes to the grave. -Sarrels.

2nd. The soul or spirit does not go to the grave.

3rd. Therefore, no part of the child of God goes to the grave.

This would be the inevitable conclusion of the position that the body is no part of the child of God. Now let us have another argument showing the truth of the matter:

1st. The body, which is the mortal part of the child of God, goes to the grave.

2nd. The soul or spirit does not go to the grave.

3rd. Therefore, the mortal part of the child of God goes to the grave, but the immortal part does not.

At the resurrection the body of the child of God will be raised and made immortal, made spiritual, and glorified. It is the body of the child of God which is thus raised at the last day; and, therefore, the body is a part of the child of God.

A denial that the body is a part of the child of God is eternal Two-Seedism. That is precisely what the eternal Two-Seeders would say. If we have to say that the body is no part of the child of God in order to be an Old Baptist, we have never been

one. But we do not have to say that in order to be an Old Baptist, for the Old Baptists have never believed any such heresy.

With this we drop the curtain, closing scene one of act one. We will raise the curtain again soon, and show you another scene from what we have hid behind the curtain. We hope to be plain and candid, and we hope that we may be able to write in the proper spirit.

C.H.C.

Elder J. B. Little

---September 12, 1916

Some of our readers will remember that some time ago we made a statement in this paper that Elder J. B. Little, of Abbott, Ark., is in disorder, and that we had been informed that associational rule was not a matter in dispute in that section. Since that time Elder Little's party gained the church property in a suit in the courts of the state. We do not know who is in the wrong mainly, but it is usually the case that there is wrong on both sides. The association recognized the party who is with Elder Barton. We make this statement in justice to all parties, as we see it. It seems in the briefs prepared for the Supreme Court there was some little dispute between the parties as to the authority of associations. It seems that some brethren who have examined the briefs think that Elder Little and his party are in the right. They may be. We do not know, and we do not care to have anything more to do with the matter as it stands now. C. H. C.

Curtain Raised Again

ARTICLE NO. 2

---October 3, 1916

Since our issue of Sept. 5, in which appeared our article under the heading, "The Curtain Raised," we have received the following letter from Elder R. V Sarrels, of Texas, whose name was signed to the declaration of non-fellowship as moderator of the church which passed the said declaration:

Anson, Texas, 9-21-16.

DEAR BRO. CAYCE:

Today I read your article, "The Curtain Raised," and I was simply shocked to know that you would publish that Resolution as now being on record as a permanent expression of the faith of my church and me. I wrote you Oct. 12-14 and renounced that 2nd statement of the resolution and told you that my church was going to do the same thing the next meeting. At the very next meeting she officially revoked the 2nd part of that resolution. I am not simple enough to try to score you, but unless you have a letter at Temple promising positively to clear up that false impression that you have made I am going to expose you in the debate and in every Primitive Baptist periodical that will permit me the use of their columns. And also I aim to make it known to each of your Associate Editors. -

If you write me at Temple, Texas, send it in care of G. M. Halbert. In hope,
R. V SARRELS.

P.S: We are going to raise the curtain "Higher."

As the above letter refers to a letter which Elder Sarrels wrote us dated Oct. 12, 1914, we give that letter below, just as it was written:

Anson, Texas, Oct. 12, 1914.

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

I have just received a letter from Elder S. N. Redford and he has inclosed a letter that you have written to him. I am glad that it has been sent on to me. I note in this letter that you have refused to publish some resolutions which have been adopted by my home church. Now I tell you that I am glad that you have not published them. While I think that in the explanation you will find that there is enough said to convince one what was intended by my brethren. We surely do not want to do anything that is wrong in the sight of God and in the light of His truth. When those resolutions were adopted there was a crudeness about the heresy that they were meant to oppose, and as a result there was a crudeness about the statement against the heresy. My church aims to change to matter and state in words more definite the real issue.

When Elder Downing began to claim what he does in regard to the work of God in Regeneration he was not very clear in making us see just what he believed and as a result we were thrown in a cramp in stating the matter just as it ought to be stated. But there was one thing that we all realized about the matter and that was that he was contending that Regeneration does something for a man in his entirety. This my brethren did not believe, and they were forced to take some kind of a stand against it. You saw what we had to say in regard to the matter. Now since that time we have been able to get him to say just what he does believe on this subject and we are going to change what we have done in that particular complaint and put it just as he has said it. He made use of the following statement when he was being questioned about the matter: "I believe that in Regeneration man is made a real child of God through and through, soul, spirit, and body, just like the Holiness believe that a man is sanctified allover." This I do not believe and neither do my brethren believe this and they are not going to live with it in the church. This very idea is what we were making our complaint against and I want to say now that if you believe this they surely declared against you.

Now brother Cayce, Elder Downing wrote to you and you immediately made a reply favorably to his position. I wrote to you and you did not answer me. I wrote to you again and you have not noticed me. I wrote to several other of the Eastern brethren at the same time and they have all answered me, and have done so favorably to what I have been contending for. I have often wondered why you did not answer me! Are you afraid to take a stand on the matter? If not, I should certainly be pleased to know why you have remained silent on the matter. You certainly would have done me a favor by writing to me and telling me what you thought about the matter.

1st: The Scriptures teach that in Regeneration man is made a real child of God in soul, or spirit, only.

R. V SARRELS Affirms.

J. S. NEWMAN Denies.

2nd: The Scriptures teach that in Regeneration man is made a real child of God in soul, spirit and body.

R. V SARRELS Denies.

J. S. NEWMAN Affirms.

There is one thing that is certain; we must accept one or the other of the above propositions, or we must accept nothing. There is no middle ground in this matter. I am made to wonder which one you are going to take! I have tried to get those who have challenged my position to sign the second proposition and we shall discuss the matter. No man has done so. I wonder why! Will you sign the second statement? If not, then you are forced to acknowledge the truthfulness of the first one, or else you do not believe anything about Regeneration. Elder Newman has

made his brags about what he is willing to do, and yet when he is brought square to the point he will never do anything. He is simply aware of the weakness of the second statement.

I have never meant to claim that the body is no part of a child of God. I Believe that man is made a real child of God: but the body is part of the man, therefore the body is part of the child of God. I have ever preached that man is the subject of God's salvation, and that it is man who is made a child of God by Regeneration. But I notice in your letter to elder Redford that you believe that "The Scriptures abundantly teach that a man is a being composed of soul, body, and spirit; and the Saviour says: 'Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.' The man who is composed of soul, body, and spirit must be born again and the one who is born is a child of God." Now, is a man born again in soul, spirit, and body? If not, and if it takes Regeneration to make one a child of God, will you please explain just how this man is a real child of God to a greater extent than he is born of God? Now, brother Cayce, you or no other man on this globe can show this matter up in any sense. I have been grossly misrepresented in regard to what has been advocated here on the subject of Regeneration. Some of you eastern brethren have sat over there with one side of the matter in your hands and rendered a verdict. You must know that you have some power but we Texas people have sense enough to attend to some things. We appreciate your proffered service in regard to the councils here in Texas but wish to tell you that we have a way of doing things here and if you are not willing to put up with it you have my permission to withdraw.

I am sending you one of my pamphlets on Regeneration, and when you have read it I do really want you to tell me what you think about it. I want you to notice that I stress the point that it is man who is the subject of salvation, and that something that is foreign to man is not that that is saved. I want you to notice that I claim that man is saved or born again in soul, or spirit, and that since it takes Regeneration to make a real child of God, this man is by Regeneration a child of God just like he is regenerated. Will you deny this? It is not given to me to say what part of Paul was a child of God, for I verily believe that this idea that the spirit is the child of God is wrong, but we do certainly have a right to tell just how Paul was a child of God. I believe that man is born again now in his spirit, or soul, and it is very easy for me to see that this man is a real child of God just like he is born again. Man is now born again in part; man is now a real child of God in part.

Now, there is one thing that we Texas Baptists want you to know, and that is that we are ever ready to defend, in any right way, what we believe, with you or any other living man on this globe. Please remember this, and know that we should be glad to have some of these fellows who are doing so much talking about what the Bible teaches to come up to the real issue and prove what God does for a man in The work of Regeneration. We are going to sit down in the halls of justice and judgment and wait for some man to quit "skimming in top-water" and get right into the life core of this matter and render a satisfactory explanation of his position. We simply want the matter explained. And until you or some one else does this we are going to continue to preach that God works on the inward parts of a man and that as a result of this work this man is saved in his inward parts that the very same work that is done for the soul in the new birth will be done for the body in the resurrection; that this dual person is the subject of gospel address; that there is something about each child of God that will lead him away from the fold of God, and that this something is the unrenewed part of this man. I am yours in hope, R. V SARRELS.

We received a letter from Elder Sarrels before we received the above, and it may not be amiss to let our readers have the benefit of that letter also. Here it is, dated April 25, 1914:

Anson, Texas, April 25, 1914.

DEAR BRO.:

Feeling that you are a man of mature judgment I have a desire to submit to you a few questions, Your honest opinion is what I want. Your expression of belief on the following point has been made public property in our vicinity. I feel that the question has been put to in a general sense only: There is a disturbance among some in my immediate country over a point of doctrine, and the question concerns a fundamental truth in its last analysis; Will you please help us by noticing and replying to the following:

From some remarks found in a letter from several of the brethren I am sure that some of you have been asked whether it is incorrect to say that the body is no part of the child of God; I am sorry that things have been said that have forced a strict analysis of this thing, but we are driven to state the matter in a way that will stand a rigorous test. I do not deny, but grant, that man as a complex being is scripturally addressed as a child of God; I do not deny, but believe, that the body is an essential constituent of the being that is now born of God in spirit; But I give verbatim a statement that is causing us trouble: "I believe that in Regeneration a man, is made a child of God through and through, soul, body, and spirit," Do you believe this statement? If not, how would you meet it? Dear brother, I want to know and defend the truth of God: I believe that the sinful body is not in Christ. It is not regenerated, and hence is not the new creature. It is an essential constituent of the being whose regenerated spirit is the new creature, but the body is not the new creature. The renewed soul and the sinful body are ONE in constituting the human being, man; but they are not ONE in constituting a spiritual entity. The sinful body is not reckoned as being equal to or consistent with the renewed spirit, but as being Opposed to it. The body is not in the new birth brought into the holy family of God, and hence is not in the STRICT sense of the term a child of God. The question that concerns us here is, not what beauty and perfection an omniscient God can see in the glorified bodies of His saints, but what the real condition of the body is now. Before Regeneration no part of the man is a real child of God. In regeneration the spirit of the man is made a spiritually existing, holy subject of the eternal kingdom of God. But this is just what the body is not made. Whatever the new birth does for the spirit, this is just what is not yet done for the body. I believe that man as a complex being is a subject of gospel address. To him are given the holy commandments, and by him are they kept or violated. But I do not believe that this complex being is a spiritual entity. The spirit of this complex being is a spiritual entity, but the spirit and body taken together do not now compose a spiritual entity.

I am a man only twenty-four years old and have been trying to preach for the Old Baptist for a little over seven years. I wish to know the truth and how to defend it. If I am right on the point of doctrine herein considered, please tell me so and advise me how better to defend it. If I am defending an unholy cause, please be faithful with me and tell me so, giving reasons for your objections.

I remain an unworthy brother interested in a suffering cause.

R.V SARRELS

P. S. No one in my knowledge has ever used such an unguarded expression as to say the body is no part of a child of God.

R.V.S.

May I have an immediate reply?

Now we wish to call attention to some statements in the above letters, and especial attention to the fact that the declaration of non-fellowship published in our issue of Sept. 5th was dated in February, 1914. Now, notice this statement in the postscript of the above letter dated April 25, 1914: "No one in my knowledge has ever used such an unguarded expression as to say the body is no part of a child of God." In April, 1914, Elder Sarrels says no one in his knowledge has ever used such an unguarded expression as to say that the body is no part of a child of God; but in February, 1914, Elder Sarrels' name appeared signed to a declaration of non-fellowship for the idea that the body is a part of the child of God. The resolution declares that it is heresy to say that the body is a part of the child of God, and Elder Sarrels' name was signed to it as moderator of the church, but two months after said resolution was passed, Elder Sarrels had no knowledge of it. Then in October, 1914, he had knowledge of it! If that is not getting things somewhat twisted we confess that we do not know how statements could be twisted.

Just here let us call attention to the fact that Elder Sarrels says that man as a complex being is a subject of gospel address, and that the commandments are given to him, and that by him they are kept or violated. We will have use for this before this series of articles are finished.

Now, we wish to call attention to the statement in the first letter above, dated Sept. 21, 1916, that he wrote us Oct. 12, 1914, and renounced the second statement in the resolution, etc. Compare this with the statement made in the letter of April 25, 1914, that no one had said such a thing. Now, let us have the statement made in the letter of Oct. 12, 1914: "When those resolutions were adopted there was a crudeness about the heresy that they were meant to oppose, and as a result there was a crudeness about the statement against the heresy. My church aims to change to matter and state in words more definite the real issue." This is a plain and simple admission that they did not know what they were declaring non-fellowship for. He further says: "He was not very clear in making us see just what he believed," etc. This is an admission that they did not know just what Elder Downing believed, but they declared non-fellowship for it any way! If they did not know just what he believed, how could they know that he believed a heresy? It appears, though, that according to the best understanding they had as to what Elder Downing was teaching, he was advocating the idea that in regeneration the man, the sinner of Adam's race, was made a child of God. Evidently his idea was that the body is the mortal part of the child of God. But this is what Elder Sarrels declares non-fellowship for. This is according to his own admission in the above letters, and what the resolution was, no matter how he may try to explain it away. It will not be explained away.

He says they all realized that Elder Downing was contending that regeneration does something for a man in his "intirety." We suppose he meant entirety. If we grant that this was what they meant to declare non-fellowship for, then we must conclude that they do not believe a single thing is done for the body in regeneration. If they do not believe that, then they believe that not a single thing is done for the body in regeneration. If they believe that, and if they believe the truth, then the man does not receive a single thing in regeneration that yields a better influence over the body.

Again, he says: "I believe that the sinful body is not in Christ." If the body is not in Christ, in any sense, then in death the body is not asleep in Christ. If the soul or spirit does not sleep in Jesus, then nothing sleeps in Him, if the body is not in Him.

It is the MAN that is in Christ after regeneration, or else inspiration is a lie, for the apostle said, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." As it is the MAN that is in Christ, and the body is a part of the man, then the body is a part of the MAN that is in Christ. The body, then, is the mortal part of the child of God, and sleeps in Jesus. So far as we are able to see, Elder Sarrels and those who are with him had as well deny the resurrection and be done with it.

Again, he says, of the body, that it "is not in the strict sense of the term a child of God." Then, we suppose the body is a child of wrath, and the regenerated spirit in the body is a child of God. According to this notion the child of God dwells in the child of wrath until the child of wrath dies, and then the child of God goes to heaven, and the child of wrath goes to the grave. This denies any resurrection from the grave, for a child of God, for it is not a child of God, but a child of wrath, that is in the grave. If there is any resurrection of the body at all, according to this notion, it is a universal resurrection to condemnation, for the child of wrath will be resurrected to condemnation.

Poor Sarrels! This young "smart Alex" is wise above what is written. That is what is the matter with the Old Baptists—they have some young preachers who are too smart. They have learned more than is written, and more than our fathers knew. And they have some preachers who have not been made better by regeneration, and who claim that they love sin as well as they ever did.

We have some letters from Elder John M. Thompson which we will publish soon, in which he denies that regeneration makes a man better. We will publish his letters so our readers can see for themselves what he says. We want no man to preach in our churches who is not made better by regeneration.

We now drop the curtain, and let you think a while on the second scene. We will raise it again soon, and may raise it higher if it is necessary. C. H. C.

CURTAIN RAISED AGAIN

Article No. 3

---October 10, 1916

We promised last week that we would give some letters from Elder J. M. Thompson soon, and we do that this week. In our issue of Nov. 16, 1915, we published our views on regeneration, and stated that we would not publish more on that question, hoping the brethren would drop the matter and not continue the unholy war. Elder John M. Thompson evidently did not endorse our article, so he wrote us the following letter on Jan. 18th, 1916:

-Tipton, Ind., 1-18-16.

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:-

Dear Brother-In sorrow I write you owing to the strange position you have taken on the vital subject of regeneration. Regeneration is one of the essentials in the eternal salvation of sinners, on which there should be agreement.

Regeneration implies previous generation. When God generated man He produced an entity, a natural being. Created, **{(Genesis 1:27)}** is from bara. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground," etc.-**(Genesis 2:7)**. Formed is from yatsar. - He formed man of dust, which He had previously created. That is he formed man in body of dust He had previously created-natural dust formed into a natural body. The body, or the man in body, that was formed of dust returns to dust. This is not true of man in his entirety. The regenerated man departs from the body, which returns to dust, and is with Christ, **(Philippians 1:23)**. Created (bara) man in his own image does not mean that he formed (yatsar) man of the dust of the ground.

Therefore man, in the Bible, is spoken of as complex, consisting of parts. God says, I will put my law in their inward parts. Paul says, For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? "Save the spirit of man" in this passage signifies that the spirit of man is a than. "What man save the spirit of man." Jesus promised that if a man believed in him he should never die. This can not mean the body, for it does die. Then it is evident that there is an inward man that believes that does not die when the body dies.

In your article on regeneration, P. B., p.p. 5,9,10, Nov. 1915, you say regeneration is a spiritual work by the Spirit of God upon the spirit of man; that in that work the sinner is formed anew in his soul, or spirit, or heart; that the body is not formed anew in regeneration, but that it will be formed anew, will be made spiritual, in the resurrection; and you quote as your belief: "The apostles' doctrine teaches that it is the man that is dead in sin that is quickened...that is made a child and fellow citizen." In this I understand you to teach, that in regeneration the spirit of man is formed anew, is made spiritual, but the body is not, but that it will be formed anew in regeneration (we suppose he means to say in the resurrection.-C. H. C.), will then be made spiritual; that man in spirit is quickened in regeneration, is made a child of God. Yet, strange indeed, you say, that the work of regeneration does not take the old nature away, but gives him another nature. This you say of that that is regenerated-the spirit. But Paul says that old things have passed away and all have become new with the new creature (man) in Christ. You say that the generation of vipers were not good because their hearts were not made good; that God makes the heart good, which makes the man a good man. According to your former position and what follows you taught that it was not the body that was made good, formed anew, made spiritual, -but the spirit, or soul, or heart; that it gives him (the man that is formed anew, made spiritual) a new nature. You say the work of regeneration is an inward work; that he (the man) has been made a child of God by the operation of the Holy Spirit in his heart or soul. You also say that in the resurrection the body will be made spiritual, immortal and incorruptible; that then the entire man will be made pure, holy, sinless, and be in the perfect image of Christ. This may by some be construed to mean that the entire man, body, soul, and spirit, will be made pure, holy, sinless, in the perfect image of Christ in the resurrection, at the last day. But I construe your statements to mean that the body only, in the resurrection, will be made pure, holy, sinless, spiritual, in the perfect image of Christ, for you further say of the resurrection of the body, this is what is done for it. I understand you to teach that man, except his body, is formed anew, made pure, holy, sinless, in the perfect image of Christ, in regeneration by the Holy Spirit of God, and that regeneration is instantaneous when the man in spirit or soul is quickened, is made a child of God. Amos I correct?

You teach that the evil man is made good by the Lord making his heart good. Then you say, "If that does not make a man a better man, we confess that we do not know what would make him better." Primitive Baptists have held and do hold that alien sinners are totally depraved, not good. If not good naturally, by nature the children of wrath-Paul-morally depraved, how is it possible that regeneration can or does make them better? Man prior to regeneration is a good man if regeneration makes him a better man-good, better, best. He has to be good before he can be made better. So the Newman-Collings contention cannot be true.

As to the two natures in regenerated people, Paul locates the bad nature in the body, but never in the regenerated soul, spirit, or heart. I cannot conceive that it is possible for a man in spirit, soul, or heart to possess a vile-nature according to your presentation of the great change in regeneration in soul, spirit, heart.

You inform us that communications arguing regeneration will go into the fire. Strange! Truth relative to regeneration cannot be argued and error exposed! A fundamental tenet of our faith suppressed! thus it appears to me. I feel constrained to request that my name be discontinued and your paper to me be discontinued. -

I am for principle regardless of financial consideration. The Lord bless truth and faithfulness. J. M. Thompson

The above letter came as somewhat of a surprise to us. We were surprised at some statements it contained. We had neither time nor inclination to discuss these matters by private letter, and we had no desire to have the matter discussed through our columns. If we were to take up a discussion of these matters with every brother who writes us, we would have to employ one or two special stenographers, and then have no time to devote to anything else. We simply cannot discuss every matter of difference in private correspondence, and it is folly to think of doing such a thing. We sent the following letter to Brother Thompson in reply:

Feb. 19, 1916.

ELDER JOHN M. THOMPSON:

Dear Brother-I am very much surprised at the tone and contents of your letter of Jan. 18th.

According to your statement and argument a good man is no better than a bad man; a good tree is no better than a bad tree; and if a thing that is bad cannot be made better, then the soul or spirit of the unregenerate must be good, or else they are not made good in regeneration, and are, therefore, still bad. I am utterly surprised that you would take such a position. My brother, please do not think me presumptuous or impertinent when I tell you that you know too much about language to make such an argument, or to take such a position. I am sorry to see that you would do this.

Now, I wish to say that I do not care to discuss the matter further. I have said my say in the paper, and there is no room for misunderstanding. You and others may read things into the article which I did not say, but I am not responsible for that. I have no more to say concerning the matter.

I have today had your name taken off the editorial staff, and also had your name dropped from the mailing list, as you requested.

I hold no ill feeling nor malice toward you. I trust that after you have carefully considered the matter you will feel differently to the way you manifested in your letter. Yours in sorrow,
C. H. CAYCE.

In reply to this letter Brother Thompson wrote us as follows:

Tipton, Ind., 3-18-16

ELDER C. H. CAYCE: Martin, Tenn.-

In as much as you impertinently charge me with insincerity, with making a false statement, and misrepresent me, I do not consider it proper that I address you as I would otherwise have done.

In language good is positive, better is Comparative, and best is superlative. Bad is positive, worse is comparative, and worst is superlative. An alien sinner is a bad man in soul. Regeneration makes him good or righteous in soul, but it does not make him better in soul. He would have to be good in soul before regeneration for regeneration to make him better in soul. If you understand grammatical comparison of adjectives you know I am right in this. You surprise me in your opposing note.

You can exercise your pleasure concerning any further say. I am confident I am correct, and am willing to submit the question to any unprejudiced scholar. If you see your error and scripturally confess it will correct your unjust offense. J. M. Thompson.

P. S. If a thing that is black can be made whiter (which is impossible) then it might reasonably be said that a bad man morally can be made a better man morally. A thing has to be white before it can be made whiter, even so a man has to be a good man morally before he can be made a better man morally. When a thing is black it may be made to be white, but not whiter, even so a bad man morally may be made to be a good man morally, but not to be a better man morally.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS COPIED

In or about the first part of the year 1913 Elder J. L. Collings, of Glen Rose, Texas, sent out a list of questions, which we suppose was sent to quite a number of brethren. A copy of them was sent to Elder John M. Thompson, and he replied under date of May 21, 1913. We have before us a copy of the questions and a copy of his reply. We give the questions and his answers as follows:

Q. Do you believe that regeneration makes a man better morally?

A. I do not believe that regeneration makes a man better morally. I believe it causes a man to think, desire and do better morally. It makes him better in soul morally but not in act. It enables him to do better morally. "Makes" is too strong here as pertains to his actions morally.

Q. What according to the Scriptures is the child of God?

A. The inner man in regeneration is the child of God; God is the Father of spirits. - Paul.

Q. To whom are the Scriptures addressed-to the inner man or the child of God as a complex being?

A. The Scriptures are addressed to the regenerate soul, -not to the body, which is only natural, without spiritual discernment.

Q. Do the righteous acts of men make them better at heart, or are the righteous acts fruits of the righteous heart?

A. Righteous works are fruits of the righteous heart. They do not make men better at heart.

Q. Does a Christian obey because he is better in heart, or does he obey to become better in heart and soul by God's grace?

A. A Christian obeys because he is better in heart. God's grace makes them better in heart.

Q. Does grace in the heart make men better or worse, or does it change him at all?

A. Grace in the heart makes men better in heart. The change is in the inner man. Grace does not force obedience: "Let us come boldly unto a throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need."- **{(Hebrews 4:16)}** not to force.

Q. I believe the sinner is passive in regeneration but active in obedience. Do you?

A. I do believe the sinner is passive in regeneration.

Q. Do you believe that Paul persecuted the church of God after regeneration, either in whole or part?

A. I do not believe Paul persecuted the church after regeneration, if regenerated on his way to Damascus.

Q. Is it the whole man doctrine to say that regeneration makes an immoral man better morally?

A. The whole man doctrine as I understand its advocates, is, that the body as well as the inner man, is born of the spirit, - born again; and not to say that regeneration makes a man better morally. Both statements are wrong. Regeneration causes men to do better morally, but does not make him do better, does not force him to do better.

Q. Is it the whole man doctrine that in regeneration the man, in body, soul, and spirit, is made spiritual, sinless, and pure?

A. It may be, and it may not be the whole man doctrine that in regeneration man is made spiritual, sinless and pure; some may teach that way, and others to the contrary. The contention in Texas is wrong. "Make" is too strong in the use some make of it.

The above answers were signed by Elder John M. Thompson. From these answers it appears that, according to Elder Thompson, regeneration made a man better in soul in 1913; but from his letters it appears that regeneration does not make a man better in soul now. Since he boasts of his scholarship (so it appears to us; we do not mean this as an insinuation), we wonder what institution of learning he has graduated from during the past three years. Any how, his answers to those questions and his letters show a change. We wonder whether that change was wrought in the "inner man"-that is, in his soul or spirit-or was it in his material body of flesh? Evidently there has been a change with him. We wonder if that change was wrought by the direct and immediate operation of the Spirit of God upon the inner man. Perhaps it was just the inner man that has been changed, and not Elder Thompson at all. If that is the way of it, we humbly beg Elder Thompson's pardon for even thinking such a thing as that he has changed; and we humbly beg the pardon of that inner man in him for charging what he had done to Elder Thompson. Of course, if the inner man is made as pure and sinless in regeneration as God is, and the inner man in Elder Thompson has been regenerated, then the inner man in Elder Thompson never does wrong or makes a mistake. - And if that inner man never does wrong nor makes a mistake, and if that inner man wrote those answers, - then they were correct when written. And if that be true, then in 1913 regeneration did make men better in soul, but it does not make them better now. So, according to this, regeneration did something for men then that it does not do now. We wonder why it does not do as much for them now as it did then. Perhaps that infallible inner man can tell us. If he can, we would be glad for him to do so. But perhaps that inner man did not write both, the answers and the letters. If not, we wonder which or what part of the writing Elder Thompson did himself. It is really Elder Thompson we would like to reply to. We do not know how to preach or write to spirits.

Elder Thompson does not wish to call us brother. Very well. Our letter to him was intended to have been written in the very best of feeling, and we told the truth when we said we had no ill feeling toward him. The reader can judge for himself as to whether we misrepresented him or not. Now, this was not Elder Thompson that does not wish to call us brother. It was Elder Thompson's regenerated spirit saying this to our flesh; and as his regenerated spirit is the child of God, and as our flesh or 'body is no part of a child of God," of course we are not brothers. He was not saying this to our spirit, of course. Perhaps Elder Thompson would admit that our spirit is a child of God, and perhaps he would not.

But Elder Thompson says that the "spirit of man" in **(I Corinthians 2:11)** signifies that the spirit of man is a man. This is another new thing to us. We never knew before that the spirit of man was a man. According to this, there is a man in a man, and the man in the man is regenerated. The man who has the man in him is not

regenerated. It is the Adam sinner, then, who has the regenerated man in him, and the Adam sinner is left out of the matter entirely, only as he is tormented and worried and crossed with and by the child of God that is in him- for awhile. This is evidently Elder Thompson's view of the matter, for he says that the regenerated man departs from the body. As the regenerated man departs from the body, then the body is no part of the regenerated man. This simply leaves Adam sinners out, and they are not regenerated at all. So far as we are concerned, if it is not us, it makes no difference to us if it should be a mule. But in **(Philippians 1:21-26)** the apostle is teaching no such thing as that the regenerated man departs from the unregenerated man; but he is teaching that there is a better life for him beyond this vale of tears, and that he had a desire to depart this mode of existence, and to be present with the Lord. - There is nothing in the apostle's language that even intimates that the body is no part of the child of God, or that there was a child of God dwelling in him, and that he was not a child of God. Instead of such an idea being conveyed by the apostle, the idea is very clearly embraced that Paul himself was a child of God, and that he would be given to dwell with Christ on that very account.

It is true, and the Scriptures abundantly so teach, that the spirit or soul does not die when the body dies. When the body dies the spirit goes to God. The body dies because it is mortal, and on account of sin; but it is the mortal part of the child of God.

The Saviour said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."-**(John 3:3)**. To Nicodemus He said, "Ye must be born again."-**(John 3:7)**. He was not talking to a spirit when He said this, but He was talking to a MAN. In this new birth the Spirit of God operates on the spirit of man, and that operation of the Spirit makes the MAN a child of God. It does not make the body of the man spiritual; but it does make the man a child of God, and that child of God has a mortal body. We know that the Scriptures teach this, no matter what we may think about it, and no matter how mysterious it may appear to us. There are mysteries about this thing that no man on earth can explain, and all this effort to explain an inexplainable thing only serves to mystify the matter all the more. And that is what causes the trouble among the Old Baptists, too.

Again, we know that the MAN is made partaker of the divine nature. See **(II Peter 1:3-4)**. Peter was talking, or writing, to men and women when he used the language recorded in the place referred to. Turn and read it. Those men and women had been made partakers of the divine nature, and they still had the same old sinful nature, which they had before regeneration. As they still had that sinful nature, which they were liable to follow, the exhortation was necessary which the apostle gives in the verses which follow.

But Elder Thompson claims now that regeneration makes a bad man a good man in soul, but does not make him a better man in soul, and he also claims that in regeneration the soul or spirit is made pure and sinless. If regeneration makes the soul pure and sinless, we do not see how it could be made any better, unless it can be made better than pure and sinless. If regeneration makes the soul or spirit good, and it cannot be made better than pure and sinless, then we do not see how the soul or spirit of the child of God could be made any better. So it seems that, according to Elder Thompson's contention, the soul or spirit is not simply made good in regeneration, but it is made as good as the best! If the soul or spirit is made as pure and sinless in regeneration as God is, and is made good, as Elder Thompson claims, and can then be made better, as he says, then God can be made better, too.

We know that good is positive, better is comparative, and best is superlative. When two good things are compared to each other, we know that one would be called good and the other called better. We also know that when three good things are compared to each other, we would say that one is good, another is better, and another is best. But suppose we had four articles of a kind, and not one of them bad, and no two of them exactly alike-then what? Would we say that one is good, another is better, and another is best, and another is-what? Nothing? Where are you now? Oh, grammar! Grammar! GRAMMAR! Now, you see what you have done with your wonderful knowledge of grammar! We know that the grammatical comparison of adjectives is simply a comparison of objects, one with another. An adjective is a descriptive word. It simply describes the object. An object may be described as being bad, and another object may be called worse, in comparison with that object. An object may be described as being black, and another may be described as being blacker, in comparison with that one. The object described as being black is not so black as the one described as being blacker in the comparison; but, according to Elder Thompson's statement, it is no whiter than the object which is blacker, for he says that a thing must be white before it can be whiter. Strange logic, indeed.

Again, according to his contention, a good man in soul is no better than a bad man in soul. If a thing has to be made good before it can be made better, then a good thing is no better than a bad thing. We have always thought that a good thing was better than a bad thing, and we confess that we think so yet. But Elder Thompson says that he is willing to leave it to any unprejudiced scholar. Perhaps he could not find One that is unprejudiced. If a scholar should say he is wrong, of course he would be prejudiced. If Elder Thompson is right in his contention, then a sound apple is no better than a rotten one; sound meat is no better than tainted meat. Suppose some of the good sisters try him by putting a dish of tainted meat on the table for him and ask him if it is good meat. Of course he would say it is not good. Then put a dish of good meat on the table before him--meat that is sound-and ask him if that is not better meat. Any sane person knows that he would say it is better.

Perhaps it would not be amiss to give Webster's definition of a word right here. According to Webster's International Dictionary, published by G. & C. Merriam Company in 1915, to regenerate is "To cause to be spiritually born again; to subject to regeneration. Hence, to make a radical change for the better in; to reform completely." This being true, it follows that the regeneration of the sinner makes a radical change for the better in the sinner. Hence, regeneration makes men and women better. To deny this is simply to deny the meaning of words, as well as to deny the teaching of the Scriptures. The word regeneration in **(Titus 3:5)**, in the original, means "rebirth, reproduction, renewal, re-creation; * * * hence, moral renovation, regeneration, the production of a new life consecrated to God, a radical change of mind for the better."-Thayer's New Testament Lexicon. This is Thayer's definition of the Greek word translated regeneration in **(Titus 3:5)**, and Webster says that to "regenerate is to make a radical change for the better in." It is, therefore, true that regeneration makes men and women better. We would not want a man to preach in our church who is not made better by regeneration, for we would not think regeneration had done anything for him if it had not made him better. We have always thought that the grace of God in the heart made men and women better, and we have been trying to preach it that way for a little more than twenty-six years, and no one professing to be an Old Baptist ever objected to it until this new theory now being advocated was invented, or brought into our ranks.

Elder Thompson says that "the Scriptures are addressed to the regenerated soul-not to the body, which is only natural, without spiritual discernment." The commandments, admonitions, and exhortations, then, are all given to the soul or spirit in the man, and not to the man himself. And the regenerated soul or spirit is pure and holy and cannot sin, and therefore cannot disobey. And the body is still a child of wrath, still dead in sin, like the unregenerate sinner, and cannot obey, and is not even required to obey. No commandment is given in which it is embraced.

((6) (James 5:16) says, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." We wonder what was the matter with them. Remember that Elder Thompson says the Scriptures are addressed to the regenerate soul, and the regenerate soul is as pure and sinless as God is; yet they needed a healing of some kind. Do you not wonder what was the matter with these pure and holy and sinless spirits? And again, can anything that is pure and sinless as God is have any fault? If so, then God may have some faults. But God is without fault; and anything that is pure and sinless is without fault. Then the regenerated soul has no faults to confess. The regenerated soul, then, could not obey this command; and the body could not obey it, for it has no spiritual discernment, so Elder Thompson says. Others say it is still dead in sin, just like the alien sinner, and cannot obey. Pray, then, who could obey this command? The spirit could not, for it has no faults to confess; and the body could not obey it, for it is still dead in sin like the alien sinner; besides, it is not required to obey it, for Elder Thompson says the Scriptures are addressed to the spirit.

Elder Thompson says that the spirit is the child of God, for God is the Father of spirits. So is God the Father of all men, in the sense of creation. He is the Creator of all men. If He is the Father of spirits in the sense of begetting them, or in the sense that is contained in Elder Thompson's contention, then the unregenerate sinners have no spirits. If they have no soul or spirit, then when they die they "die all over," and there is no eternal punishment. If there is eternal punishment, and they have spirits, and God is the Father of their spirits, then some of God's children suffer eternal torment. Again, if God is -the Father of spirits, and there are no spirits but what God is Father of, then God is the Father of the devil. Do you not think, according to this, that He has at least one awfully bad son? Or, if like begets like, is he not really a good devil? And are not all spirits good? We have always thought that there were some bad spirits, and we think so yet; and we think that some who are holding these new theories have manifested a bad spirit.

We here let the curtain drop again, and promise that we will soon raise it again and let you look behind it. We have some more things that are interesting. There are some folks closer to home who have given us some things that we have kept back; but we are going to let you see them. - C. H. C.

Questions and Answers

---October 31, 1916

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother-Please answer the following questions for me. There are a few in our country who believe in the absolute predestination of all things that come to pass, and they call us who don't believe as they do, "so-called Primitive Baptists."

1. Who are the so-called Primitive Baptists, the Absoluters or the ones that contend against them?
2. Do you have to believe in the absolute predestination of all things that come to pass, good and bad, to be a Primitive Baptist?

3. Are God's children driven by a higher power to obedience than the privilege God gives them to obey?
4. Don't God's children receive blessings in obedience that they would not receive out of obedience?
5. Who is it that sins against the Holy Ghost?

6. Who was the multitude that Christ was preaching to on the mount?
7. Who is it that denies the Lord that bought them? Brother Cayce, please answer the above questions through your good paper. Your brother in Christ, I hope,
J. M. HICKS
Rominger, N. C.

OUR ANSWERS:

We haven't space to answer the above questions at length. They have all been answered or discussed through our columns time and again for years. We will simply answer them by number.

1. The "Absoluters" are not the Primitive Baptists, though they claim to be.
2. No.
3. God gives them the ability to obey. Service requires action. If they are passive in what they do, they do not obey at all.
4. Yes. See **(James 1:25)**.
5. We have written on this question, and cannot answer it here and give any reason for our position, as we haven't the space. Hence we only say here that all sins not atoned for by Christ are directly against the Holy Ghost, and such persons never have forgiveness.
6. If you have reference to the sermon on the mount, as recorded in the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters of Matthew, He was not talking to the multitude, but to the disciples. See the first verse of the fifth chapter.
7. False prophets. Some of God's people deny Him and are destroyed so far as the true Christian life on earth is concerned; but we have thought that the expression in the text in mind from which this question sprang has no reference to buying in the sense of atonement, for the language in the original has in it the idea of a despotic ruler. Hence, the Lord has rule over them, as over all His creatures, and they are under His rule, as under a despot. He rules over such characters by His inflexible law, and not by parental government. This may be the sense of that text. C. H. C.

An Enquirer

---October 31, 1916

In your paper of May 23 L. H. writes a grammar lesson, and puts forth a strong letter on man being saved before he has faith. If that is the case, and I believe it is true since reading the grammar lesson and the Bible on the subject, now I want to ask how or why all this money spent through the Southern Baptist Convention, purposely to convert the heathen, when God will convert them at His own will? Now we are taught in **(Romans 10:9)**, that "If thou wilt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." And in verse 13, "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. Now how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?" Verse 17, "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

Explain the above; also the 18th verse. I have been taught all my life that the gospel was the power of God unto the sinner, or to the one who was unsaved.

Yours in Christ,

J. R. SCOTT

Grenada, Miss.

REMARKS

We cannot write at length here on the question submitted above. We will offer only a few remarks.

“So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.” Hearing comes by the word of God. This is by the speech of God. That is, God speaks and gives the hearing ear, or the ability to hear. Then faith comes by hearing. God calls and sends His ministers out to preach the gospel; and they go, preaching. None hear the preaching only those to whom God has given the ability to hear. Gospel faith is produced in those who do hear, which faith is a belief of the truth, a belief of the doctrine of God our Saviour. It seems that this faith has been produced, to some extent, in Brother Scott by the servants of the Lord proclaiming the gospel through the press, and all this shows that the Lord has, at some time in the past, spoken to Brother Scott, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and given him the ability to hear.

C. H. C.

Curtain Raised Again

ARTICLE NO. 4

---November 14, 1916

In our last article we promised to let our readers see some things concerning some parties nearer home. According to that promise we now raise the curtain again and let our readers see some of the productions from Elder W. E. Brush.

Under date of May 9, 1916, he wrote us the following letter while we were in Georgia filling appointments in that country:

Greenfield, Tenn.,

May 9, 1916.

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

My Dear Brother-After long and due and prayerful consideration, as I hope, have decided that it would be best for me to come off the staff of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST paper. It's indeed sad to me for us to come where the ways separate (and I don't mean by this that I declare non-fellowship for you), as I have been with the paper so long, and have walked together with its former editor, Elder S. F. Cayce, your dear father, and my father also in the ministry, and a man whose sacred memory lingers still, and shall ever linger in my poor heart, and it's with tender emotion that I remember his kindness to one so unworthy as myself. And since his departure to the better land our association together has been just as sweet and pleasant until this unhappy affair came up in Texas, and from there came on to this country to the extent, at least, that it has caused confusion among our dear brethren.

But now to get at my reason for coming off the corresponding staff of the P. B. is because I feel that you are in sentiment lined up with the Primitive Baptist Signal, of Texas, edited by Elder Collings, in which such statements as the following are found, and that, too, from the pen of Elder M. W. Miracle, who is the editor of the “Good Old Songs Department” of the P. B. to-wit: “I am forced to the conclusion

that man in his completeness or complexity is born again in the change we call from nature to grace. No man can arrive at any other logical fact from the context. It is to say that man is born again in spirit, but such an expression does violence to the whole tenor of the Scriptures. Just as well say that a man is out of debt in part."-P. B. Signal, Jan. 4, 1916. Now Elder Miracle has come out plainer in this statement than anyone that I have read after, but I only think the more of him for that. But now, Brother Claud, if the above statement is old or primitive doctrine, or in other words, the doctrine of the Bible, I have never known nor believed it yet. One thing I know, and you know it as well as I do, that doctrine like the above statement contains has not been advocated among the Old Baptists for the past twenty years, and if very many of them receive it today I will be very much surprised. The only way to get very many of them to accept it is to get them to believe that you don't believe it; and that has been the great effort of most of its advocates, and is yet. Now, my dear brother, you may say that you don't believe what Elder Miracle has said. If you don't, why do you keep him as the editor of the "Good Old Songs Department" of your paper? And if you do believe as Elder Miracle, why don't you come out plain and above-board and say so, so the Baptists would know where to place you? There are not very many of your readers that read the Signal, and therefore have no opportunity to know the doctrine that is being advocated by the Signal, but are led by the writings of Elder Lee Hanks, especially, to believe that the Newman faction in Texas are the sound element of Baptists out there. Well do I remember how he would make reference to them as sound orderly Baptists and as being in line with the Baptists of the East, while he was on his tour out there last year. I don't pretend to say that all the disorder in Texas has been on one side. I don't think that. Neither do I think that all the error has been on one side, for I condemned Elder Sarrels' idea that these bodies, or the bodies of the saints, do not render service to God. But, as I told Elder Newman, in my condemning his erroneous idea that our bodies did not serve God, I did not mean that our bodies had been quickened or made alive-but simply meant, as I have believed all the way along that it's the man that is born again, but not born again all over. If he is born again all over why not come out and say so. And, as it presents itself to me, if I object to you saying that man is born again in part, I certainly must believe that he is born again in whole. If I don't, please tell me what I would believe. Now, my dear brother, if any man on earth can work out this problem for me he certainly will do me a great favor. When a man says, "Oh, it won't do to say that man is only born again in part," and then, in the face of this statement, say that he don't believe that man is born again in whole-now then the man that neither believes that man is born again in part nor in the whole, pray, for the sake of truth, tell me what that man does believe. With this question I come to the feet of all my brethren that have taken this position, and wait for them to answer this question. Will they do it? Or will they make an attempt to do so? Or will they do as some have done-pass it by without even making an attempt to answer it. I will wait and see.

Dear Brother Claud, as stated already, I have been a corresponding editor of the P. B. for some time, even before your father's death. In fact, I went on the staff by his request; and now permit me to briefly outline what I have ever understood the dear paper to contend for. Now if I am wrong, I want you to be faithful and point out to me wherein I have been mistaken all this long time. First, it has stood for the doctrine of election and predestination, and that unconditional on the part of the sinner. That is, that God did, from all eternity, because He loved them with an everlasting love, choose for His own glory a people; and that this same

unchangeable God did predestinate that these same people should be conformed to the image of His Son, and that this same God, for His great love that He had for these people; sent His only begotten Son into this low ground of sin and sorrow to suffer and die for these chosen people; and that He (Jesus) did, in keeping with His Father's will, suffer and die for the elect, and for them alone; and that, by His suffering, dying, being resurrected and ascending home to glory, obtained eternal salvation for all of the elect-that is, every one that was embraced in the choice of God, predestinated by Him, died for by Jesus, will, one sweet day, be with Him in glory, freed from all the troubles of a life like this. And now all that God the Father chose in Christ, Christ died for, the Holy Spirit (the third Person in the divine Trinity) will, here in time, make known to the heirs of promise what God the Father and Jesus Christ have done for them, by going where they are and revealing this one most noble truth to them. And now in this revelation I have understood the P. B. to teach that men and women, together with children as well, were taught to know God, whom to know is life eternal; and that in this teaching they were taught to know God only in soul, spirit, or heart; that this work of regeneration or the new birth did not teach men to know God in the flesh. Amos I right? Or have I been mistaken all this long time as to what the P. B. taught on this point? I never understood it to teach that this revelation that the Spirit makes to the heirs of promise here in this life, with its purifying power, reached the entire man and partially purified him all over; or in the revelation, or the work of quickening the heir of promise, it left him, in some mysterious way unexplainable, quickened, both soul and body that is, it did not leave any part of him dead in trespasses and sins, and if not dead in trespasses and sins, then necessarily alive in Christ. Now if the P. B. stood for this late (to me) heard doctrine, I confess I never knew it until a recent date. But at this point, and with reference to this point of doctrine, I always understood the P. B. to stand for this principle-that in the work of the new birth, or regeneration, or quickening, or giving His sheep eternal life (and many other expressions that have reference to the same great change), that this work was wrought in the soul, or spirit, or heart, of God's people while they yet live here in time; that this change was an inward work, and only brought eternal life to the soul, or spirit, or heart, and left the body just as it was before the Spirit of God entered the heart; that is, it left the body in an unquickened state, or in an unregenerated state. Amos I mistaken with reference to this point? If I am, will you please explain to me wherein I have been mistaken all this long time? Further, at this point I have understood the P. B. to believe that where Jesus said, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish," that the Spirit in this work gives eternal life to His people in soul, or spirit, or heart. Amos I right or wrong? Will you tell me? Is it not a fact, my dear brother, that THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST paper has ever (until late) stood for the truth that in regeneration the saint receives eternal life in his soul or heart, and that while this body is still natural, that God's people may and can, and, in fact, ought to bring this old body under subjection by the Spirit, that we should present these vile bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable service; that we should mortify the deeds of the body. Then I have always understood the P. B. to teach that the saint is two in one, composed of an inward and an outward man, the inward man being the renewed soul, or spirit, or heart of man, and the outward man being this old body that is still subject to death and must die, because it has no eternal life. Paul said, **{(II Corinthians 4:16)}** "Though the outward man perish, the inward man is renewed day by day." I have ever understood the P. B. to believe and teach that the outward man was this old body, and the inward man was the renewed soul, or spirit, or heart, of God's people. Amos I right? And as this mortal body of clay comes on down to the tomb,

to which it's fast coming, perishing, as it were, by degrees as it gets older and grows weaker, the inward man grows stronger in the Lord, or in the most blessed faith that was once delivered to the saints; and the nearer death he comes, the stronger, in this sense, he is. His hope of heaven and immortal glory beyond this life grows brighter as the days go by. And, as David said, our flesh shall rest in hope. Yes, I have always understood you and your dear sainted father to teach that in regeneration the souls, or spirits, or hearts, of God's children were prepared for heaven and immortal glory, and that these vile bodies had to await the resurrection at the final and last day for the preparation that would prepare them also for heaven, when the soul that was purified in time by the operation of the Spirit shall be reunited with the body; in this you know of any other state that men may occupy, please tell me where it is and what it is and go to the grave, as you know as well as I do, and stay there until the Lord of heaven shall come the second time without sin unto salvation and shall call all the sleeping bodies of His children from all places where they have fallen. Then, and not until then, will these mortal bodies be out of a state of death and in possession of the Christ life.

Dear Brother Claud, it's with a sad heart that we separate in this way, but I cannot, with a clear conscience, stay with the P. B. paper any longer, conditions being as they are; yet I hope that you dear brethren will see what I think is the mistake of your life. May the God of all grace help you to do so. I still desire that we be friends, though we can't see alike. I read in the Scripture where two men of God came to the place that they could no longer walk together. So I yet esteem you as a servant of the Most High God, but feel sure that you are wrong at this point, and with reference to the teaching of God's word on this subject; and an error never does harm as long as it lies still, but when you begin to stir it then it will cause trouble. Your poor brother in hope of heaven, W. E. BRUSH
P. S.-Brother Claud, here is what Elder Sylvester Hassell says on the subject under consideration, in the three questions asked by himself or some other one, and answered by him, as found in his paper of a recent date:

1. What is regeneration?

A. It is the impartation of spiritual or eternal life to a human being.

2. What part of that work takes place in time?

A. The impartation of such life to the soul, or spirit, or hearts, of men. **(Romans 2:29); (Jeremiah 31:33).**

3. When is the body regenerated?

A. At the final resurrection at the second personal coming of Christ to the world.

(Romans 8:23); ((20) (Philippians 3:20-21).

Dear Claud, in the above is found just what I believe on this very important subject, and just what I have understood Old or Primitive Baptists to believe on this subject. I accept it without qualifications. Do you? Will you please let me know if you accept the above as Elder Hassell sets it forth; and if not, wherein do you not accept it? for I am anxious about the matter, for I realize that without a change this matter will speedily go east of the Mississippi River, just as it's gone west, and Brother Claud, I hate to see this. It makes my heart sad to realize that conditions are such that every day we live is drifting us further and further apart. I hope that you shall find it in your good heart to prayerfully and carefully answer the questions that I have asked you in this letter, for if you can show me that I am wrong I assure you that no man would be more ready to lay down or surrender than myself, and, as far as I would be able to do so, make amends for the mistakes that I had made. So, hoping to hear from you at an early date, and also hoping that you are well and enjoying the other blessings that it takes to make an Old Baptist preacher enjoy himself in this life, which is the holy presence of Him who walked

quietly on the sea of Galilee and bade the waves and sea be still and they obeyed Him. May you ever feel His holy presence in your soul to that extent that you shall be satisfied with the goodness of God's house. In hope,
W.E.B.

Concerning the foregoing we have to say, first, that this paper stands for the same principles and the same truths which it has stood for since the first issue was sent out on January 1st, 1886. In our issue of Sept. 5, 1916, we offered to give any man twenty-five dollars who would produce any article or letter containing any doctrinal sentiment contradicting the doctrinal sentiment contained in any other article or letter we had ever written. No one has yet produced such an article or letter. This is evidence that it cannot be produced. If it could be produced, they would have produced it before this time. Hence, this paper is standing for the same principles which it stood for before Elder Brush joined the Old Baptist Church, and which it stood for when he was ordained, and which it stood for when he went on the editorial staff, and which it stood for when we began the work of editing it, and which it has stood for during those years; and we are standing upon the same principles which we were standing upon when we united with the church in August, 1889, and upon which we stood when we were ordained in December, 1896, and upon which we stood when we began our editorial work upon the death of our dear father in August, 1905. There has been no change on that score. The last sermon our father delivered in our church at home was on Friday before the fifth Sunday in July, 1905, and his text was [\(Jeremiah 6:16\)](#), "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." We have felt that this discourse was for our especial benefit, and the words spoken were our father's dying words to us. It has been a special warning to us not to leave or deviate from the same old principles which he had advocated in this life. Therefore, as we stand where we have always stood, if Elder Brush and we have come to the parting of the ways, it is Elder Brush who has left the old path and not us. If we have left it, let him produce the article or letter from our pen which shows a departure from a doctrinal sentiment before held to. We again state that we will give him twenty-five dollars to produce it. It cannot be produced. Elder Brush once agreed with us. This he admits; but he declares that he does not agree with us now. But we stand where we have stood all along the line. Therefore, Elder Brush has changed. This is the logical conclusion, as proven by our offer of twenty-five dollars reward for evidence of a change on our part, and his admission that we were once agreed and are not agreed now.

As to what Elder Brush says he has always understood the paper to stand for, we will attend to that point further on.

Concerning Elder Miracle we have this to say: When we established the "Good Old Songs Department" and arranged with Elder Miracle to edit that department we knew that he was a great "Sacred Harp" singer and a lover of the old songs and took great interest in the cause of sacred music and the old songs. For this reason we procured his services to edit the "Good Old Songs Department." We did not know then how he stood in regard to the fight in Texas, and did not ask him. But we learned afterward that he proposed to remain neutral, which he did until driven by the Webb faction to take sides, and then he lent his sympathy to the other side. Now, this is the truth of the matter, whether some believe it or not. Now, because we do not "fire" Elder Miracle off the paper, these fellows have turned all their batteries loose on us, but we propose to go on attending to our own affairs.

Again, it seems that these brethren would have us drop Elder Miracle, and have nothing to do with him or with Elders Newman and Collings because some expressions have been used by them, or by some brethren on that side, which they do not endorse. What would they have us do? Evidently the only course they would have us pursue is the one they are pursuing, which is to "line up" with Webb, Redford, Sarrels & Co. This is what Elder Brush and, those with him are doing. Now, suppose Elder Miracle has used an expression we do not approve of, and which we have not seen proper to use. Is it a "killing crime" for us not to throw him away on that account? If so, what is Elder Brush doing in "lining up" with Elder Sarrels, since he says he dead state of death! As though there may be such a thing as a live state of death!

Again, Elder Brush said, "Is it not a fact, my dear brother, that THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST paper has ever (until late) stood for the truth that in regeneration the saint receives eternal life in his soul or heart, and that while this body is still natural"-and then these words follow with a pencil mark through them-"or carnal or a child of"-Now, what did he start to say? Could he have started to say anything else only that the body is still a child of wrath? Why did he mark those words out and not finish his sentence? Evidently that is what he believes now, and what he started to say. Has Elder Brush always believed that? Let the following article answer, which is copied from the Primitive Baptist Signal of April 1, 1915: Jan. 21, 1915.

ELDER R. V SARRELS:

My Dear Brother-I have read your article in the Trumpet of Dec. 17 on the subject of the new birth, and it seems that the subject is very clear to you, but to me your article is very confusing. But I know that I am ignorant and don't know very much about the less mysterious subjects in the Bible, and more especially this great subject that has puzzled the minds of some of the greatest gifts that the church has ever had. No doubt it was to the new birth, together with other fundamentals, the apostle had reference when he said, "without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness." Now Elder Sarrels, there are sometimes more than one side to a proposition, and we may only see one side, and not see IT in the right light. We come now to notice your text at the head of your article already named, "Therefore, if any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature." Now, the first question I want to ask you is, What does it take to constitute the man? Paul said it was the MAN that was in Christ Jesus. It makes no difference how it may appear to us, nor to what extreme we may go on either side, it still remains a fact that Paul said the MAN. Our Master said to Nicodemus, "Except a MAN be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." This was a mystery to this ruler of the Jews, nevertheless our Master did not modify it to suit his understanding. Now, my brother, if you can, tell me how a MAN can be in Christ and his body in no way changed or affected, when he is not a man without his body and the MAN is in Christ-not simply his spirit, but the MAN. That is what the Bible says. It makes no difference what you may think about the matter, nor what I think; our think so's do not weigh very much, unless they are in keeping with a "Thus saith the Lord."

My brother, is it not a fact that it takes soul, body and spirit to make man? If it does, and the MAN is in Christ, is not the body in Christ in some sense of the word? If not, please explain how the MAN could be in Christ, and at the same time the body, which is one of the component parts of MAN (in fact, if it were not for the body there would be no man), is not changed in any way at all no not so much as to be under the commandments of Christ, for I note that you say in your article

that no living man can prove by God's word that we serve God in our flesh or body relation. Now I suppose that you mean by this statement that we don't serve God in, or with, our bodies. Why don't you come out plain and above-board so people of ordinary sense would know just what you mean? I take it for granted that you mean that no living man can prove by the Bible that men serve God with their bodies. If this is not what you mean, please tell me what you do mean.

Paul said to the Roman brethren, "I beseech you, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. "**-(Romans 12).**

1. Now, Brother Sarrels, if this one text don't plainly command of the Lord's children the very thing that you said "no living man can prove by God's word," I have misunderstood you, and I do not think that I have. My dear young brother, I am not so much surprised at you making a break like this as I am at your fathers in Israel not calling your attention to the matter. Is it possible that jealousy would cause God's ministers to do as did Saul of old-shut their eyes to everything but one, to-wit, the death of the Lord's anointed, and go plunging on to their own destruction, as did Saul? I know that young men are often led by Satan to think more highly of themselves than they ought to think, and to decide that "I am able to explain matters better than men who have been in the ministry longer than I have been living, but of course have not had the opportunity to know things as I have, and are therefore not able, like me, to explain matters."

I am sure you will agree with me that it's only in service to God that we can glorify Him, and if so, we can serve God in our bodies as well as our spirits. "For ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." **(I Corinthians 6:20).**

I note in your same article you say, "I think it is not safe to say that the body is not a part of the new creature." Now, how could the body be a part of the new creature without having been changed in some sense? Please answer this question, for it is one of great importance. Could not the soul or spirit just as well be a part of the new creature without a change as the body? If not, why not? seeing that the entire man is alike contaminated in sin-or, in other words, the whole man is dead in trespasses and sins. Now, I have never understood, neither do I yet understand, that a man is so changed that he cannot sin in any sense of the word. We know that John said, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for His seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." The same writer said, "If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and His word is not in us."

Then I believe just as Elder J. S. Newman expressed himself to me in a letter, "I believe that eternal life is implanted in the heart or soul of man, but it so affects his whole being that -it makes him hate the things he once loved and love the things he once hated. Yes, the very lips that we used to curse with, we now praise God with; and the feet that once carried us to the ballroom now carry us to the church of God." My dear brother, if you had a neighbor that had been a wicked man, and he claims to have been changed from nature by grace, and yet he still lives the same wicked life that he has been living heretofore, what evidence have you that he has met with any change? Paul, in addressing the Corinthians, said (after naming whoremongers and drunkards, and a number of other wicked things men practice), "And such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified." Paul, how did you know that these people had been washed, and that they were not the same vile persons that they once were? It must have been because of the

lives that they were living. Yes, they must have been living different lives from what they had formerly lived, otherwise the apostle would have had no evidence that they had met with a change.

Elder Sarrels, it does seem to me such a pity for the Baptists of Texas to divide over nothing but preacher jealousy. I feel sure that if there were, or had been, one-half dozen preachers taken away from Texas, and not allowed to return, that you would have had NO trouble over the WHOLE MAN DOCTRINE as it is called. Indeed, I hope that you will take what I have written you in the spirit that I hope I have written in, for I know that I do not aim to be too severe. What I say, I aimed to say in the spirit of my Master. Yet, sometimes we all need rebuking in the spirit of Jesus. So I hope you will not think me your enemy because I am telling you the truth. The best friend that a man has on earth is the man that comes to him with his faults. The great trouble with many of us today is we go to the other man and tell him how far Brother So and So has gone wrong, in place of going to the brother ourselves and in the spirit of Jesus telling him of his wrongs. In doing this we become a violator of God's law ourselves.

When you have been in the work of the ministry as long as I have, then you will know by experience things that you had never thought of taking place. Dear brother, let's be careful that we don't take a position that we will meet ourselves coming back before we get far. One of the hardest struggles of a preacher's life is to keep off of extremes. At least, I have found it so in my case-if indeed I am worthy to be found among the number. I am so much of my time in doubt.

I pray God's richest blessings to rest upon you all through life, that He may give you to know the truth as it is in Christ Jesus the Lord, so far as it is His holy will to reveal it to you, and then give you grace to be reconciled to abide in the calling wherewith He has called you; that you may ever be found among the number that is content to spend their time preaching Jesus the way, and not spend your time (for it is valuable), as some of our dear brethren are doing, wrangling about words to no profit. God's word forbids such. If you can find it in your heart to do so, pray for me and my family.

Your brother in hope,

W. E. BRUSH.

This letter from Elder Brush to Elder Sarrels will serve as an answer to the letter from Elder Brush to us. Elder Brush has a long article in the Trumpet of Oct. 19, giving us "down the country." This letter of his to Elder Sarrels will serve as an answer to that also. We simply answer Elder Brush with Elder Brush. It appears to us that he should observe a little of the advice he gave Elder Sarrels-"Let's be careful that we don't take a position that we will meet ourselves coming back before we get far." Elder Brush has simply met himself coming back, and did not get far, either.

When Elder Brush wrote this letter to Elder Sarrels he certainly knew that he was then occupying the same ground that our father occupied in his lifetime, and that we were occupying, and that this paper had occupied from the time he first became acquainted with it. If "every day we live is drifting us further and further apart," it is only because you are getting farther and farther from the position you formerly occupied, and not because we have gone anywhere. We have gone nowhere. In January, 1915, we stood upon the very position advocated by Elder Brush in his letter to Elder Sarrels. We had stood there all the time, and we stand there yet. We would now plead with you, Brother Brush, and with others who are doing like you are, to lay these vain speculations and notions down-quit this eternal fault-finding, speculating, hair-splitting, and striving about words, and stop going farther from

the truth, and come back to the ground that you once occupied, and let us live in that peace and fellowship which was left us by our blessed Master, and which is destroyed by nothing else only our own striving for mastery, envy, hatred, malice, jealousy, and wrong doing.

The foregoing shows who is responsible for all the confusion and trouble at this time, and not another thing is necessary to show this, but we have a little more yet behind the curtain. We shall show that soon, and we will soon be done with this series of articles. It is not our intention to continue them indefinitely, but we do expect to show what we started in to show. It is not pleasant to us, but we feel obligated to do it.

C.H.C.

The New Birth

---December 12, 1916

The following article was written by Elder F. A. Chick, and was first published in the Primitive Monitor of February 15, 1890, and was copied on the editorial page of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of September 13, 1894. Elder R. W. Thompson was editor of the Monitor when the article appeared in that paper, and is still the editor of that paper. This article shows what position our father occupied at that time, and what this paper stood for then. This was before Elder W. E. Brush became a corresponding editor, and is what the paper stood for when his name was put on the staff; and it is where we stand, and where this paper now stands. What man in Texas or Tennessee objected to the sentiment contained in that article in 1894? We never heard any "kick" against it in our country then. Who has changed? We hope the brethren may see the error of the way they are going and the wrong in waging the present war and cease the strife. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

And now, as I take my pen to write upon this subject embraced in your question, I only wish to kindly and candidly express my views, with some of the reasons for them, and I trust what I may say will hurt the feeling of no brother or sister, even if they feel compelled to differ with me. First, you ask me what I understand by the terms old man and new man. These terms occur but twice in the New Testament. In both cases they are the language of Paul. In **(Ephesians 4:22); (6:24)** he says, "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lust, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Here he says to his brethren at Ephesus, that the teaching of Christ is that they should put off the one and put on the other. In **((9) (Colossians 3:9-10)**, he says, "Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." Here he declares that his brethren have already put off the one and have put on the other, and upon this fact bases some admonitions to the conduct of his brethren. First, I desire to call attention to this one consideration, viz.: that the "new man" is not addressed and told to put off the old man, neither is the "old man" addressed and told to put on the new man. But Paul is addressing his brethren, saints at Ephesus and saints at Colosse, just as I am now addressing you, Brother Tompson, and the readers of the Monitor. And he says to these believing men and women that they should do this, or that have done this, viz.: have put off the old man and have put on the new. Here, if I may so speak, are three men instead of two. But, indeed, the expression, old man and new

man, are simply figurative expressions for the two opposing principles which every believer finds dwelling in his own heart and waging ceaseless warfare there. We are not to suppose for a moment that the apostle means that we are to understand by these terms two fully developed men, with soul, body and spirit in each, and both dwelling in us, you and I, who constitute a third distinct man or woman. It seems to me that anyone who has the slightest acquaintance with the use of figures of speech would see at a glance that the apostle had no such meaning as this. Neither does he mean by the "old man" the body and by "new man" the soul. When told to put off the old man he does not mean that we shall commit suicide. In **(Romans 7:23)**, we read, by the pen of this same apostle, "But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members." Here we have Paul speaking of the two men, but under the terms, "Law of my members" and "law of my mind." Notice again, here is Paul the speaker, and in Paul are the two laws, or the "old man" and the "new man." The figure of speech has changed, but the idea presented is the same. In **(Galatians 5:17)** Paul says, "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Here he calls the "old man" the flesh and the "new man" the Spirit. And here again, notice that he says these are contrary the one to the other, - so that "ye" believers cannot do the things ye would. All the way along he addresses men and women, and tells them that in them are two opposing and enduring forces, the one of which they are to put off, and the other to put on. Sometimes this "new man" is called "the hidden man of the heart." But by whatever name they are called, Paul always means the same thing. On the one side he means that tendency to evil which grace makes manifest in every child of God; and on the other he means that disposition to serve God which grace implants in every heaven born soul. The one he calls "the flesh," the other "the spirit;" the one, "the law of the members," find what all these things mean. And every narration of Christian experience tells the simple truth about all these things. No one ever heard a child of God say, "my old man," or my "new man," felt, said, or did so and so. But always I saw, heard, or acted so and so. We all say when we are telling the simple story of our experience, and we have no "axe to grind:" "I saw myself a great sinner; I could do nothing to save myself. I grew worse and worse, and at last Jesus was revealed to me as my Saviour." We never say, "my old man," or "my new man," felt all these things, but I myself. When in **(Romans 7)**., Paul says, "I sin," straightway he says, "Yet not I, but sin that dwelleth in me." It is I, and yet not I, and yet it is I all the time. And so, on the other hand, when Paul says, "I labored more abundantly than they all," immediately he corrects himself and says, "Yet not I, but the grace of God, which was with me." His language appeals to all our feelings on both sides. I do not know that a volume would make it all any plainer. I labor, but yet I must be humble, for it is not I that labor, it the grace of God. How humbling this is! In one place Paul speaks of the Spirit crying, Abba, Father. In another place he speaks of the Spirit by which we cry, Abba, Father. Now, both are most blessedly true. The Spirit cries Abba, Father, but it is, after all our cry. We are not left out. I have introduced these texts for the purpose of showing the terms "old man" or "new man" do not shut out the believer, but that in every child of God is found the warfare caused by these two men, or laws, or principles. It matters not by what name they are called. I do not understand that the "old man" is the "Adamic man," but a law or principle in the Adamic man. And the "new man" is also a law or principle in the same Adamic man. The old man is not redeemed, and neither is the new, but the Adamic man is redeemed from the dominion of the "old man" and to the dominion of the "new man." -The "old man" is not born again, and neither is the "new man," but the Adamic man is born again.

And the new birth is when this new man comes in and abides, to go out no more forever. The old man is sin and death, the new man is life and righteousness. From the one we are redeemed and to the other we are redeemed. Neither the old or new man are redeemed. The one needs it not and the other is that from which we are redeemed. The "new man" is indeed an entirely "new man," and his origin is God. He is a "new man" so far as we are concerned, but he is elder than the hills. This new man is the law of truth and holiness, and they are eternal. But we receive this in our hearts when born from above, and so it is new to us. With us that which is natural is first, and then that which is spiritual. But in reality the spiritual world is first, only we do not see or enter it until we are born again, or born from above. No greater mistake was ever made than when the two terms, "old man" or "new man," were supposed to present two literal, whole men, in a literal sense. Out of this grew all that absurd theory about the sinner of Adam's race not being born again, but a spirit of some sort or kind. I have read and heard much about this last named theory, but have never got a clear conception of the theory in my head, and my heart rejects it at once.

Again you ask, "Who is the new creature?" "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature," etc. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." What you have written about on your letter seems to me more satisfactory than anything that I can write. I certainly think the subject of the "new creature" is the "new creature." Of the "new creature" Paul says, "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." The apostle says here we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus, etc. If, therefore, we are created in Christ WE must certainly be "new creatures." I did not know that it was claimed that any other being than a renewed, quickened sinner was called the "new creature." There is a text in the eighth chapter of Romans which seems to me to bear upon the same matter, "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." Mark it is in Us. Now he goes right on to talk about the same under the name "creature," saying, "For the earnest expectation of the creature" (the same new creature, the man in Christ) "waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God," and so on in the verses that follow, all along in these verses in **(Romans 8)**. The new creature is indeed meant, but it is the "new creature" which we ourselves become as the workmanship of God, created in 'Christ unto good works. We are never called new creatures, except as we possess the Spirit of Christ, and the Spirit of Jesus is not called a new creature, except as it is one of the sinners where it dwells. Indeed, the term "creature" could not belong to an eternal spirit or being of any sort. But it may well belong to us who have begun to be. Naturally and spiritually the sense in which the man in Christ is a new creature is seen as we glance further on in the text: "Old things are passed away; behold all things are become new." A wondrous change has happened to him. He is not yet the same man he was before in many ways. And to be born again and renewed in the spirit of his mind is all that will avail him. Circumcision or keeping the law avails nothing. Rejecting circumstances avail nothing either. To become a new creature is the essential thing; and to be a new creature is the result of the work of God in us. All is done for the sinner, all is done in the sinner. There is no "new creature" but the saved sinner. What a wonderful contrast -between the "old creature" and "new creature."

1917

Time Salvation

---January 2, 1917

Brother P. D. Burns, of Bentonville, Ark., requests our views on what is called time or common salvation. It seems to us to be unnecessary to write on this question now. It has been threshed out time and again, and nearly every issue of the paper contains something connected with the subject. However, we will say that we are not a stickler for the term "time or common salvation." The Scriptures teach that there is a salvation enjoyed by the child of God as a result of his walking in obedience, and that enjoyment is here in time. Hence it is called a "time salvation." If a brother prefers to call it by some other name, we have no objection, just so he holds to the truth which is meant to be expressed by the use of the term.

In (**John 13:17**) the Saviour said to the disciples, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." In this language there is, most assuredly, a happiness promised the persons addressed provided they do the things. He was speaking to the disciples, and they were children of God. The first thing necessary, however, is to know these things. Then, "if ye do them" a happiness follows as a result. They do not get that happiness if they "know these things" and fail to do them. The happiness is promised "if ye do them." True, this language was spoken by the Saviour at the time He washed the feet of the disciples, but the same principle is true concerning every act of obedience which the Lord requires. Hence, there is a rest, a happiness, enjoyed by the Lord's children as a result of their obedience to the Master. This is not a promise of rest or happiness beyond this life, or in the world to come, but a promise of happiness now-right here-for "happy are ye" is the promise. The happiness is now. Hence, they are saved from sorrow, leanness of soul, a troubled mind and conscience, by doing "these things."

In (**I Timothy 4:16**), the apostle says, "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." This language was addressed to Timothy, who was already a child of God and a minister of the gospel. He had eternal life already. Hence, so far as eternal life is concerned, he was already in a saved state. He was brought into that saved state by the grace, mercy, power, and work of God, and not by doing something himself, nor by another man doing something. But here the apostle says that "in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." He would save himself by "doing this"--so the apostle affirms. He does not get eternal life, or eternal salvation, by doing; but he saves himself by "doing this." He does not save himself from an eternal hell by doing; but he certainly does save himself from something else. By taking heed unto himself and unto the doctrine, and continuing therein, he saves himself from many "gins and snares" set by Satan; he saves himself from walking in, or going into, many places where he might go, and where a child of God should not go. He saves himself from the doctrines and commandments of men. He saves himself from false ways, from false doctrines and practices. By doing this, he not only saves himself, but he also saves those that hear him. Those who hear him are those who have already been made alive from the dead by the Spirit and power of God. "Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye can not hear my words. He that is of God heareth God's words. Ye therefore hear them not; because ye are not of God," says the Saviour. Hence, those who hear are already of God---have already been born of God, They are already children of God. But they are to be saved from false doctrines and practices, just as Timothy was. And this was to be accomplished by Timothy in "doing this"--taking heed unto himself, and unto the doctrine, and continuing in

them. This saving is not regeneration, and no part of it. Regeneration is first; and then they need to be saved from false ways by having the gospel preached to them. But the man's preaching is not worth much, unless his walk is right. He must take heed to himself. That is the first and most important thing for the minister to do, and in doing that and taking heed to the doctrine he will save himself, and those who hear him, from wrong doctrines and practices. This is a saving which follows as a result of doing something. Eternal life is not given men and women as a result of their doing something. Hence, this is a saving which is not eternal. It is a saving which takes place here, and the benefits of it are here in time, and not in eternity. God's people in eternity who have never heard or known the truth here will be just as happy, and as much glorified, as those who have known the truth here. They will miss nothing in eternity on account of not having known the truth here. But those who do not know and practice the truth here miss something here. They are not saved from false doctrines and false ways.

In **(Hebrews 2:1 to 4)** the apostle says, "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will?" Here the apostle teaches that under the law dispensation every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward. In that dispensation the Lord punished His children, or chastised them, for their disobedience. There was no escape then. Now, if that was true then, it is much more certain and sure now, under the gospel dispensation-"How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation." This is a stronger way of saying that we cannot escape. Condemnation is the opposite of salvation. By neglecting this salvation we receive the opposite, which is condemnation, and there is no escape. If this salvation is eternal, and we neglect it, then we cannot escape the opposite, which is eternal condemnation. But our escaping eternal condemnation does not depend upon our not neglecting. We do not escape eternal condemnation by our zeal or diligence in the service of God. Escaping eternal condemnation, and receiving eternal life, having eternal salvation, is the free and unmerited gift of God. But here is a salvation which God's children are required not to neglect; and we are told that we cannot escape the opposite of the salvation if it is neglected. The condemnation is not eternal, and as that is the opposite of the salvation, then the salvation is not eternal. Hence, here is a salvation, a joy and pleasure and delight which follows as a result of zeal and diligence in the service of God, as He requires.

These are only a few of the many places in God's word which might be produced along the same line. How necessary that we study the - Scriptures, and search them diligently, to know the truth as it is therein revealed. May the Lord help us to search for and know the truth, and then practice the same,
C. H. C.

Revelation 12:7-8

---January 9, 1917

Brother W. C. Clark, of Upton, Texas, requests our views concerning **(Revelation 12:7-8)**, in connection with **((0:18) (Luke 10:18)**. The language referred to in

Revelation is, "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven." In Luke the Saviour said, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." This heaven, we think, refers to the Jewish heaven, or law heaven. It does not refer to the place of final happiness for the Lord's people. If it did, they would not be safe when they get there, for they might sin then and be cast out of that place. Evidently it refers to the Jewish age, or law dispensation, or law heaven. The first verse of (Revelation 12) says, "And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." This woman certainly was the church, and the church was set up by the Saviour in the last days of the law dispensation, or Jewish heaven. Verses 9, 10, 11, read, "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world." He was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. "And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of His Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death." As to the time, we refer to **(John 12:31)**, where the Saviour says, "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out." These are a few things we would call attention to in connection with the text referred to by Brother Clark. But whatever the heaven is, it cannot be ultimate glory. C. H. C.

Old Editorial

---January 16, 1917

It has been charged that we have changed-that we are not advocating now what we advocated a few years ago. We publish the article below to show that we have not changed-that we believe now just exactly what we did when the following article was written by our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, and published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of July 5, 1894. C. H. C.

THE NEW BIRTH-MAN BORN AGAIN

There appears in this issue, on page 210, an article from Brother P. J. Howard, headed, "The Dalby Doctrine," in which he seems to object to the idea of dividing up man by arguing that one part or another "part of man" is born again, for he says, "The question is not what part of man is born again." But while he objects to the idea of dividing man he makes two men out of one. Nor does he wait until after man is "born again" to make him two men, but he presents the unregenerate man, the man who has been born of Adam only, as two men, i. e., a flesh man and a spirit man.

We intended, first, simply to write a few remarks to follow Brother Howard's article, and in reply to him, but thinking we could not do justice to the subject in so short space we concluded to write an editorial under the above heading, and notice, first, some ideas advanced, and expressions made, by Brother Howard. In his two men theory he contradicts what Paul says: Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.-(I Corinthians 15:46-48).

Of course the apostle does not mean, here, that the first man, the Adam man, has no spirit, but he simply means that he is only a natural man, bearing the image, possessing the nature, etc., of the earthy. When we are born of Adam, we come into the world bearing his image, possessed of his sinful, corrupt, nature. Hence the Saviour says, **{(John 3:6)}** "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." And He certainly does not mean by this expression, "is flesh," to refer only to the real body or fleshly substance of man, separate and apart from his soul or spirit, for that would convey the idea that man born of Adam, born of flesh, was nothing but flesh, had no spirit, for the Saviour continues (in same verse), "and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," which would convey the idea that man, the entire man, born of Adam, born of flesh, "is flesh;" has nothing about him except flesh, else he has (before regeneration) been born both of the flesh and of the Spirit. Hence by the expression, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," the Saviour must have meant that man, the entire man, soul, body and spirit, is in an unregenerate state, having been born (only) of Adam, of the flesh, "is (therefore) flesh." Not that this entire man, in substance, is nothing but a body or lump of flesh, but the idea is simply this: Inasmuch as everything, not only man, but from man down to the very lowest order in the animal kingdom, and everything also in the vegetable kingdom, partakes of the nature of that from which it is born; it follows that man, the children of Adam, partake of, and are born with, his nature, and his only; hence the expression, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." And this being true makes it absolutely necessary for us, for this man, this man who, in this sense, "is flesh," and only flesh, only natural, to be born again. Hence the Saviour says, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." But remember that He could not have meant in the expression, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," to refer to the flesh in substance, when He said "is flesh," for, as we have seen, that would convey the idea of man, born of flesh, being nothing but a lump of flesh. So, then, it must also be true that in the expression, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit," the Saviour did not refer to the spirit of man abstractly, but simply meant that as we, in being born of Adam, are flesh, natural, even so in being born of God we are made "partakers of His divine nature", **{(II Peter 1:4)}** are made spiritual, become spiritually minded, can then discern the things of the Spirit. **{(I Corinthians 2:14-15)}** Man who is born of the flesh, being only flesh, only natural, corrupt; being a portion of that stream which comes from a corrupt fountain, the Saviour said to Nicodemus, **{(John 3:3)}** "Except a man (the man, Nicodemus, not the spirit man, or the spirit of man, but except that MAN who has been born of the flesh) be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And again, he says (verse 7), "Ye (Nicodemus) must be born again." Peter writes to persons who had thus been born again. They were born, first, not partly born, nor born in body only, but as men and women, children of Adam, they were born, first, of Adam, of the flesh, and as such were only flesh, corrupt, sinful, defiled in soul, body and spirit; hence the apostle said of -them:
 For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away. -**{(Pet 1:24) (I Peter 1:24)}**. But as they had afterwards been born of God, born of the Spirit, born again, Peter said, also, of these same people: Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.----**{(Pet 1:23) (I Peter 1:23)}**.

In being born of Adam we receive, or partake of, his nature, his natural, sinful, fleshly nature, and when we are born of God, born again, born of the Spirit, we are made partakers of the divine nature. Hence the expression, already quoted, from

the Saviour: That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.-(John 3:6). Having thus been born of Adam, born of the flesh, and afterwards born again, born of incorruptible seed, born of God, the individual is a complex being, one composed of, or possessing, two distinct natures-the nature of Adam, which "is flesh," corrupt, sinful, natural, and the divine nature, **{(II Peter 1:4)}** which "is spirit." This was the case with the Apostle Paul, and he calls these two natures, possessed by himself, the inner and the outer man, and says: For that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law, that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh), dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am; who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.- **(Romans 7:15-25)**. Notice he says, "so then with the mind (not with the spirit, but with the mind) I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." He certainly does not mean to say that he serves sin without any mind, or that his natural mind never serves sin. The experience of every child of God would contradict such a statement, for they very well know that they are continually harassed with vain, foolish, and wicked thoughts which arise in their minds. Hence in the expression "with the mind" the apostle certainly refers to the divine nature received from God, in being born of God, and in the expression "but with the flesh," etc., he means that nature which is of the flesh or that we receive in being born of the flesh. Paul also calls these two natures the old and the new man, saying: That ye put off, concerning the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts.-(Ephesians 4:22). Of course Paul did not mean that they should put off their fleshly bodies, as such, but that they should endeavor to keep the fleshly nature in subjection, not live after the flesh, the desires, propensities, doings, etc., of the fleshly nature, but that they should through the Spirit mortify the deeds of the body, and as such he says: And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. **(Ephesians 4:24)**.

Again we would say, Paul did not mean for them to put on the Spirit as a guide or covering to themselves, for this no man can do, but he meant for them to put on or be led by the promptings of the new man, the divine nature which they had received, or been made partakers of, in being born of God. To show that these thoughts are not new among Baptists and that the idea did not originate with Geo. Dalby, we will now give a few quotations from "Gill's Exposition of, or Commentaries on, the New Testament." We have already shown, however, that Paul taught the very doctrine denominated by Brother Howard as the Dalby doctrine. Hence we did not learn it from Dalby (having never heard him nor seen any of his writings). Neither did we learn it from Gill, for the writer held the very views, and entertained the ideas already advanced, before he had ever examined Gill on the subject or had ever (even) seen his Commentaries. But while this is true it is a great source of comfort to know that the very ideas held by the poor, weak, and imperfect writer, as stated above, in our weak way, were held and advanced by

such a learned and gifted man as Elder John Gill, more than one hundred and fifty years ago. In his comments on **(John 3:6)** he says:

“That which is born of the flesh is flesh,” etc. Man by his natural birth, and as he is born according to the flesh of his natural parents, is a mere natural man; that is, he is carnal and corrupt, and cannot discern spiritual things; nor can he, as such, enter into, and inherit the kingdom of God; see **(I Corinthians 2:14); (15:50)**. And therefore there is a necessity of his being born again, or of the grace of the Spirit, and of his becoming a spiritual man; and if he was to be, or could be born again of the flesh, or ever so many times enter into his mother's womb, and be born, was it possible, he would still be but a natural and a carnal man, and so unfit for the kingdom of God. By flesh here, is not meant the fleshy part of man, the body, as generated of another fleshy substance; for this is no other than what may be said of brutes; and besides, if this was the sense, spirit, in the next clause, must mean the soul, whereas one soul is not generated from another: but by flesh is designed, the nature of man; not merely as weak and frail, but as unclean and corrupt, through sin; and which being propagated by natural generation from sinful men, cannot be otherwise; for “who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one;” **((Job 14:4) (Job 14:4))**. And though the soul of man is of a spiritual nature, and remains a spirit, notwithstanding the pollution of sin; yet it being defiled with the flesh, and altogether under the power and influence of the lusts of the flesh, it may well be said to be carnal or fleshy: hence, flesh, as it stands opposed to spirit, signifies the corruption of nature; **(Galatians 5:17)**; and such who are in a state of unregeneracy, are said to be after the flesh, and in the flesh, and even the mind itself is said to be carnal; **(Romans 8:5-6,7-8)**. And that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit: a man that is regenerated by the Spirit of God, and the efficacy of His grace, is a spiritual man; he can discern and judge all things of a spiritual nature; he is a fit person to be admitted to spiritual ordinances and privileges; and appears to be in the spiritual kingdom of Christ; and has a right to the world of blessed spirits above; and when his body is raised a spiritual body, will be admitted in soul, body, and spirit, into the joy of his Lord. Spirit in the first part of this clause, signifies the Holy Spirit of God, the author of regeneration and sanctification; whence that work is called the sanctification of the Spirit, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; **((Pet 1:2) (I Peter 1:2); (Titus 3:5))**. And spirit, in the latter part, intends the internal work of grace upon the soul, from whence a man is denominated a spiritual man; and as a child bears the same name with its parent, so this is called by the same, as the author and efficient cause of it: and besides, it is of a spiritual nature itself, and exerts itself in spiritual acts and exercises, and directs to, and engages in spiritual things; and has its seat also in the spirit, or soul of man. And, also in his comments on **((2) (Romans 7:22-23))** he says:

For I delight in the law of God, etc. This an unregenerate man cannot do; he does not like its commands, they are disagreeable to his corrupt nature; and as it is a threatening, cursing, damning law, it can never be delighted in by him: the moralist, the Pharisee, who obeys it externally, do not love it, nor delight in it; he obeys it not from love to its precepts, but from fear of its threatening; from a desire of popular - esteem, and from low, mercenary, selfish views, in order to gain the applause of men, and favor of God: only a regenerate man delights in the law of God which he does, as it is fulfilled by Christ, who has answered all the demands of it; and as it is in the hands of Christ, held forth by Him as a rule of holy walk and conversation; and as it is written upon his heart by the Spirit of God, to which he

yields a voluntary and cheerful obedience; he serves it with his mind, of a ready mind freely, and without any constraint but that of love; he delights together with the law, as the word here used signifies; the delight is mutual and reciprocal, the law delights in him, and he delights in the law; and they both delight in the self-same things, and particularly in the perfect obedience which the Son of God has yielded to it. The apostle adds, after the inward man; by which he means the renewed man, the new man, or new nature, formed in his soul; which had its seat in the inward part, is an internal principle, oil in the vessel of the heart, a seed under ground, the kingdom within us, the hidden man of the heart, which is not obvious to every one's view, it being not any thing that is external, though never so good; this in its nature is agreeable to the law of God, and according to this a regenerate man delights in; but then this restrictive limiting clause supposes another man, the old man, the carnal I, according to which the apostle did not delight in the law of God; and proves, that he speaks of himself as regenerate, and not as unregenerate, or as personating an unregenerate man, because no such distinction is to be found in such a person; nor does such a person delight at all, in any sense, upon any consideration in the law of God, but is enmity against it, and unsubjected to it; nor can he be otherwise, without the grace of God.

But I see another law in my members, etc. That is, he saw, he perceived it by experience; he felt the force and power of inbred corruption working in him, and as a law demanding obedience to it; and which he might well call, another law, it being not only distinct from, but opposite to the law of God he delighted in; the one is good, the other evil; this other law is a transgression of the law of God, and which he observed to be in his members, i. e. in the members of his body; not that it had its seat only, or chiefly in his body, and the parts of it, but because it exerted itself by them, it made use of them to fulfil its lusts: the same phrase is used in the Targum on **(Psalms 38:3)**; which renders the words there thus, there is no peace in my members, because of my sin: now this law was warring, says he, against the law of my mind; by the law of his mind is meant, either the law of God written on his mind in conversion, and which he delighted in, and served with his mind, as renewed by the Spirit of God; or the new nature in him, the principle of grace wrought in his mind, called the law of it, because it was the governing principle there; which reigns, and will reign in every regenerate person through righteousness, unto eternal life, though the law of sin opposes all its force and power against it; that is not only contrary to it, lusts against it, but wars, and commits acts of hostility against it: the state of regenerate persons is a warfare, they have many enemies to combat with, as Satan and the world; but those of their own household, within themselves, in their own hearts, are the worst of all; there is an intestine war in them, as it were a company of two armies, flesh and spirit, sin and grace, combating together; and so it will be as long as this life lasts.

-
Then, again, in his comments on **(Ephesians 4:22,24)** he says: That ye put off concerning the former conversation, the old man, etc.] Which is the corruption of nature; why this is called a man, and an old man, see the note on **(Romans 6:6)**: the putting him off, is not a removing him from the saints, nor a destroying him in them, nor a changing his nature; for he remains, and remains alive, and is the same old man he ever was, in regenerate persons; but it is a putting him off from his seat, and a putting him down from his government; a showing no regard to his rule and dominion, to his laws and lusts, making no provision for his support; and particularly, not squaring the life and conversation according to his dictates and directions; and therefore it is called a putting him off, concerning the former conversation: the change lies not in the old man, who can never be altered, but in

the conversation; he is not in the same power, but he retains the same sinful nature; he is put off, but he is not put out; and though he does not reign, he rages, and often threatens to get the ascendant: these words stand either in connection with verse 17; and so are a continuation and an explanation of that exhortation; or else they point out what regenerate souls are taught by Christ to do, to quit the former conversation, to hate the garment spotted with the flesh, and to put it off: for the allusion is to the putting off of filthy garments, as the works of the flesh may be truly called, which flow from the vitiosity of nature, the old man; which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; the old man, or the vitiosity of nature, has its lusts: and these are deceitful; they promise pleasure and profit, but yield neither in the issue; they promise liberty, and bring into bondage; they promise secrecy and impunity, but expose to shame, and render liable to punishment; they sometimes put on a religious face, and so deceive, and fill men with pride and conceit, who think themselves to be something, when they are nothing: and through these the old man is corrupt; by these the corruption of nature is discovered; and the corruption that is in the world is produced hereby; and these make a man deserving of, and liable to the pit of corruption; and this is a good reason, why this corrupt old man, with respect to the life and conversation, should be put off.

And that ye put on the new man, etc. Which some understand of Jesus Christ, who is truly and really man, and a new or extraordinary one, (**Jeremiah 31:22**); and as such is God's creature, and is made after His image, and which appears in His perfect holiness and righteousness; and the phrase of putting on well agrees with Him, (**Romans 13:14**); (**Galatians 3:27**); whose righteousness is a garment, pure and spotless, and which is put on by the hand of faith: though rather by the new man is meant, the new nature, the new principle, or work of grace in the soul, elsewhere called a new creature; and it bears the name in opposition to, and distinction from the old man, or corruption of nature, before spoken of; and because it is de novo, or anew, put into the hearts of men; it is not what was in them naturally; nor is it any old principle renewed, or wrought up in another and better form; but it is something that is infused, that was never there before: and because it is new in all its parts; such who have it, have new hearts and new spirits given unto them; they have new eyes to see with, and new ears to hear with, and new hands to handle and work with, and new feet to walk with; and they live a new life and conversation; so the Jews say of a man that truly repents of sin, and does not return to it, that he is a new man; now to put on this new man, is not to make ourselves new creatures; for this is not by the power of man, but by the Spirit of God; this is God's work and not man's; it is He who made us at first, re-makes us, and not we ourselves; besides, these Ephesians the apostle writes to, were already made new men, or new creatures; but to put on the new man, is to walk in our lives and conversations agreeably to the new man, or work of grace upon the soul; as to put off the old man, respects the former conversation, or a not walking as formerly, and agreeably to the dictates of corrupt nature, so to put on the new man, is to walk according to the principles of grace and holiness formed in the soul: and of this new man it is further said, "which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness;" the principle of the soul is created, and therefore is not the effect of man's power, which cannot create; it is peculiar to God only to create; it is a creature, and therefore not to be trusted in, and depended on; for not grace, but the Author of grace, is the object of trust: it is created after God, by His power, according to His mind and will, and after His image, and in His likeness; which greatly consists in righteousness and true holiness; called true, in opposition to the

typical and ceremonial holiness of the Jews, and to the pretended holiness of hypocrites; and denotes the truth and genuineness of the Spirit's work of sanctification upon the heart; unless this should rather be considered as the effect of His grace upon the soul; for so the words may be rendered, unto righteousness and true holiness; for the new man is of such a nature, and so formed, as to tend to acts of righteousness and holiness, and to engage men to the performance of them: some copies read, in righteousness, and holiness, and truth; and so the Ethiopic version seems to have read.

This is certainly sufficient to show that Gill, as already stated, held the same views advanced by the writer. Not only so, but the quotations show that he did not hold to the idea of sanctification, or sinless perfection, in the flesh. Neither did he teach that for MAN, the man who is first born of the flesh and "is flesh," in being born again, born of God, had his sinful nature (that received from Adam) removed or eradicated; but he did- teach that MAN thus born again was made partaker of a divine nature, and in this way becomes a complex being, a being composed of two natures, hence the warfare which - goes on, and will continue to go on, in every child of God so long as his pilgrimage lasts in this world.

We had thought enough had been said, sometime ago, in our columns on this subject, and as we do not wish to publish continued controversies between nor among our brethren we had stated that nothing more would, then, be admitted on the subject. But as nothing has recently appeared in our columns on the subject, we cheerfully give space to Brother Howard's article, and at the same time offer our own thoughts or ideas in connection with the extracts from the great gift (perhaps the greatest since the days of the apostles), Elder John Gill, all of which we request all our readers to read carefully and prayerfully, comparing all with the great standard of truth, the Book of books, and here let the subject rest.

May the Lord bless us all with a spirit of forbearance and brotherly love, is our prayer, for Christ's sake. Amen. C.H.C.

Confusion

REMARKS TO ELDER W. L. SMITH

---January 23, 1917

What Brother Smith is begging and pleading for in the above is just what we have been pleading among our brethren here, both in conversation and in correspondence; but our pleadings have been in vain. We have never felt disposed to quarrel with our brethren about what part of the man is born again in the work of regeneration. - The Saviour said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." We have been satisfied with it that way, and we are satisfied with it that way yet. We do not think the brethren should be engaging in a war on this question. We have begged for peace; but it has been said publicly that "The man who is always pleading for peace, is always in the wrong." If we are wrong on this question, we have been wrong all the while. We occupy the same ground we occupied when we made our first effort to speak in the name of the Master twenty-seven years ago, and the same ground our sainted father occupied. We see no reason why we should change now. May the Lord help us. C. H. C.

The Real Issue – An Old Editorial

---January 23, 1917

It has been charged that we have changed-that we are not advocating now what we advocated a few years ago. We publish the article below to show that we have

not changed -that we believe now just exactly what we did when the following article was written by our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, and published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of November 1, 1894. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

Brother Potter, in the Church Advocate of October 1, certainly does us an injustice, whether intentional on his part or not. It will be remembered that in our issue of July 5, current volume, there appeared an article from Brother P. J. Howard, of Benton, Ill., under heading "The Dalby Doctrine," in which Brother Howard labored to show who or what it is that is "born again," and in so doing said:

The question is not, what part of man is "born again," but what man is it that is born again? Is it the man we see, the flesh man, or is it the man we don't see, the spirit man? This is the question. That it is "man" that is "born again," no one questions; but which one of them, "the inner man" or "the inward man," or "the outward man?"

In the same issue of our paper appeared an editorial headed, "The New Birth, Man Born Again," in which we undertook to show that man (though possessed of both soul and body) born of Adam is only natural, and that we, in being born of Adam, receive or partake of his nature; and that in the new birth the "man" is born again, and that he (the man) then receives or partakes of the "divine nature" and becomes, therefore, a child of God. Be it remembered, however, that we did not say, nor intimate, that man (either before or after the new birth) had no soul, but on the other hand, in commenting on **(I Corinthians 15:46-48)**, we said: Of course the apostle does not mean here that the first man, the Adam man, has no spirit, but simply means that he is only a natural man, bearing the image, possessing the nature, etc., of the earthy. When we are born of Adam, we come into the world bearing his image, possessed of his sinful, corrupt nature. Hence the Saviour says, **{(John 3:6)}** "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." And He certainly does not mean by this expression, "is flesh," to refer only to the real body or fleshy substance of man, separate and apart from his soul or spirit, for that would convey the idea that man - born of Adam, born of flesh, was nothing but flesh, had no spirit.

It can certainly be seen, from this, that we did not wish to be understood as conveying the idea that man has no soul. Not only so, but we showed that Brother Howard's exegesis of the Saviour's language, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit," involves that very idea, for Brother Howard argued that the Saviour meant by this expression that it is the spirit of man (only) that is born of the Spirit of God, or that it is the spirit of man, abstractly considered, that is born of the Spirit of God, and we showed that if this was what the Saviour meant, it would follow that when He said, in the same verse, **{(John 3:6)}** "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," He would have meant that man "born of flesh is flesh," only, or has nothing about him but flesh (until born of God). In arguing thus we said:

Hence by the expression, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," the Saviour must have meant that man, the entire man, soul, body and spirit in an unregenerate state, having been born (only) of Adam, of the flesh "is (therefore) flesh." Not that this entire man, in substance, is nothing but a body or lump of flesh, but the idea is simply this: Inasmuch as everything, not only man, but from man down to the very lowest order in the animal kingdom, and everything also in the vegetable kingdom, partakes of the nature of that from which it is born, it follows that man, that children of Adam, partake of and are born with his nature, and his only, hence the expression, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." And this being true makes it absolutely necessary for us, for this man, this man who, in this sense, "is flesh" and

only flesh, only natural, to be born again. Hence the Saviour says, "That which is born of the Spirit is spirit." But remember that He could not have meant in the expression, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," to refer to flesh in substance, when he said "is flesh," for, as we have seen, that would convey the idea of man, born of flesh, being nothing but a lump of flesh.

Notice that we here wrote of "man, the entire man, soul, body and spirit, in an unregenerate state," and we now ask in all candor, how could we, or why would we, do this if we thought man had no soul? Notwithstanding our language conveys no such idea, but on the other hand really contradicts the idea of man having no soul, and notwithstanding we wrote on the subject of the new birth, heading our article "The New Birth, Man Born Again," Brother Potter, in the face of all this, says: We have seen men who seemed to try to go around the word "soul," as though it was dangerous to even say "soul." We repeat that here is the real issue. The question is not whether it is the man that is born again, but has man a soul that lives after the body dies? This is the question. Some men say "no" to this question, and we say "yes." We do not believe as some we have heard talk. Elder Skeeters said to us at one time, that we were commanded to pray, lifting up holy hands, and he wanted to know where we got holy hands unless they were made holy in the work of regeneration, in time. This is the Dalby doctrine, and Skeeters and Dalby were fellow-advocates of that doctrine, and in the division of the Baptists of three or four associations on that question, and some other troubles, Skeeters and Dalby stood together. Elder Payne stood with them, and we knew all three of these men personally, and have talked with them, and Payne, at one time, in correspondence with us, admitted that there was a distinction of soul and body, so we asked him where the soul went to when the body died, and his reply was, that if we would tell him where light went to when we blew out the lamp, he would tell us. He fought the very idea of any part of man going to heaven when the body died. All that it took to constitute man, they claimed, went to the grave, and slept until the resurrection. Those fellows are very noisy in preaching that MAN is born again. This is the Dalby doctrine. Does Brother Cayce believe that doctrine? He declared that what Brother Howard thought to be the Dalby doctrine was the apostles' doctrine, and referred to Dr. Gill to disprove Brother Howard's position, and then afterwards stated that he had learned that Dalby was not in good standing, and that he did not wish to defend a man that was not in good standing, as though he must defend a man in order to defend his doctrine.

In all candor, we would ask: Between whom is this an issue? Has there been any dispute between Brother Howard and us, as to whether "man has a soul that lives after the body dies?" If so, how did Brother Potter find it out? Certainly not from our editorial. Why, then, should he ask: "Does Brother Cayce believe that doctrine?" Does he not know that when we spoke of the "apostles' doctrine, and referred to Dr. Gill to disprove Brother Howard's position," that we did not, at all, intimate that the apostles taught that man has no soul? Doesn't he know that we simply argued that the apostles taught that it is "man" that is born again? Doesn't Brother Potter know that the extracts from Gill correspond precisely with our own views, as stated in our editorial? Doesn't he know, also, that we did not quote Gill to disprove the idea of man having a soul? We would further state that while we believe the Scriptures teach that the "man" is born again, we do not mean, nor understand, by this that the sinful nature is removed or eradicated from man in the new birth, but that he is, in this, made partaker of the divine nature. We also believe that in this work Spirit operates upon spirit, and that it is, therefore, a spiritual work. While on

a tour once, in the state of Arkansas, we fell in among, or visited, some churches where a difference had arisen among brethren on the subject of the new birth, and the question of what is it that constitutes the outer and the inner man, and these questions, with some others, had caused a division which we greatly deplored and, as such, labored to bring them together. To effect this we drew up a "Basis of Agreement," upon which we thought they could consistently come together and which both parties said they were willing to adopt. And as the fourth and sixth resolutions in said "Basis of Agreement" embrace points which have recently been discussed we will here state them, believing that all who have written on these subjects through our own columns or through the Church Advocate, will endorse them:

Fourth As there has been a seeming difference in our opinion on the subject of the new birth, and as we desire to be understood by each other and by our brethren abroad, we would hereby express our belief on that question as follows: We believe that the new birth is brought about or produced by the work of the Holy Spirit, and that in this work Spirit operates upon spirit, and as such, that our bodies are not wholly sanctified, nor the sinful disposition of the flesh removed. We believe, however, that sinners are the characters benefited in the new birth, and that they (the sons and daughters of Adam) are, in this, born again and thereby become children of God. But while this is true, we do not believe that they become sanctified in body, but just as is expressed in the minutes of Salem Association: "We believe the Adam man is the man that is regenerated and born again; and we believe that the Adam man before regeneration is in possession of a soul, or spirit, which is evil from the fall of Adam; and when the Adam man is regenerated, then and there he is in possession of two natures, which we call a division-the "inner and the outer man." And we believe these two natures, or two principles, is what keeps up the Christian warfare, which we think will continue until our pilgrimage on earth winds to a close. We further believe that our mortal bodies will then go to the grave, or be sown, mortal, and that they, the same bodies, will, in the resurrection, be raised immortal, sown natural but raised spiritual.

Sixth-As there is and has been a difference among us as to what constitutes what is termed in the Scriptures the "inner man" some claiming that the "inner man" is that new principle or "the divine nature" received in regeneration and that there is, therefore, no inner man until after regeneration, while others of us hold, or believe, the soul to be the "inner man," be it, therefore, hereby agreed that we all believe, fully, that man has a soul or spirit prior to regeneration which will continue to live or exist beyond or after the death of our mortal bodies. And we further agree that whether it be correct to call this the "inner man" or not, that it is an internal or invisible something which cannot be seen nor explained, and is that which gives man a pre-eminence over the brute.

Of course all who can subscribe to the above must believe that man has soul, whether the soul be what is termed the "inner man" or not, and that the soul does not die with the body, but lives on beyond and after the death of the body. And as we wrote said "Basis of Agreement," it is very evident that we believed then, as we do now, and as we did when we wrote our editorial on the subject of the new birth, that man has a soul. Hence the injustice done us in Brother Potter's editorial.

The Resurrection - Old Editorial

---January 30, 1917

It has been charged that we have changed-that we are not advocating now what we advocated a few years ago. We publish the article below to show that we have

not changed-that we believe now just exactly what we did when the following article was written by our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, and published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of June 21, 1894. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.--(John 11:25).

Brother S. J. Rosson, of Lonelm, Ark., has requested, some time since, our views or understanding of the above text. In attempting to comply with his request we feel our weakness and inability, but having a desire to comfort the dear people of God, and to give them full benefit of any light we may have upon any portion of God's word, we will endeavor to give Brother Rosson, together with all others into whose hands THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST may go, our understanding of the text. Be it remembered that this language was spoken by the Saviour to Martha when she was weeping over the death of her brother, Lazarus. When she heard that Jesus coming was she arose and went to meet Him, and then said to Him:

Then said Martha unto Jesus, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. But I know, that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee. Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto Him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.--(John 11:21-24). Notice, Martha said "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." Notice, too, that the Saviour did not say nor intimate that she was laboring under a mistake. He did not say anything whatever that could possibly be construed to mean that Martha was mistaken, or that there would be no resurrection of the dead. Instead of teaching, or telling, Martha that she was laboring under a mistake or a delusion, He gives her some comforting assurance that her hope is not in vain; not a mere fancy nor an imaginary delusion. What a comfort to hear the words, "I am the resurrection and the life." Jesus being the very life of His people, it follows that to have Christ in us the hope of glory is to have eternal life. Hence He says (verse 26), "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." But while this is true-positively and absolutely true-it is also true that all have to die; the verdict has gone forth, "dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Some might think this a contradiction; but not so, for we learn. Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.--(7) (Ecclesiastes 12:7).

This not only proves that the spirit in man, or of man, does not die, but the language of the Saviour (already quoted, **(John 11:26)**) shows that in spirit he will continue to live with God, not simply to exist in death, eternal death, but NEVER DIE. - Not only so, but his dust, that which has returned to dust, shall be brought forth again from the dead; hence the Saviour said in the language of the text: "He that believeth in me, though he were dead (or though he die), yet shall he live." The Saviour says: Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.--(John 5:24).

Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.--(John 6:47) Which shows again that the children of God have a life which is everlasting, cannot die, though their mortal bodies do die. Hence the Saviour would comfort Martha with the assurance that Lazarus was yet living, in spirit, and that his body was only sleeping in Jesus. This being true of the children of God, when they pass away from this mode of existence, that they only fall asleep in Jesus, Paul says: For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.--(1 Th 4:14) (I Thessalonians 4:14). Not only so, but

those who are alive, yet living, when the Saviour shall come will also be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye; hence the apostle goes on to say: For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.-((Th 4:15) (I Thessalonians 4:15-17).

This certainly shows that both those who sleep in Jesus (die) and those who remain (are living) unto His coming, will all be changed. The bodies of all the saints will be fashioned like unto the glorious body of the Son of God, and as such Paul says: Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold! I shew you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?-(I Corinthians 15:50-55).

And in the same chapter he (Paul) shows that this glorious change does not consist in an exchange of these mortal, corruptible bodies of ours, being exchanged for immortal, incorruptible, spiritual bodies but it is a CHANGE from mortal to immortal, from corruptible to incorruptible, from natural to spiritual.

It is sown in corruption; it is raised in corruption. It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.- (I Corinthians 15:42-44).

These expressions show that the same body sown (or buried) is the body that will be raised, resurrected, brought forth from the grave. Hence Paul preached a resurrection in which the grave will lose its victim. He therefore said the saying will then be brought to pass, that "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" All this being true, the apostle could say, with assurance:

And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you.- (Romans 8:10-11).

And this again shows that if we have been born of God, made alive in Christ, that the spirit is life, and that, in this sense, those who are believers in Christ never die; and it also shows that their mortal bodies will be quickened, made alive, raised from the dead. Thus will be fully and entirely freed from sin with all its disturbing results, freed from sorrow, bereavement, pain, sickness, and death, as well as all the temptations of the wicked one, and forever at rest with our blessed Saviour, together with all the redeemed family of our God. Then shall we sing:

And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.- (Revelation 5:9).

No wonder that the Saviour could comfort Martha, in the language of our text, saying, "I am the resurrection and the life," for it is in Him that we live by faith, by Him that we have been made alive, in spirit, and by Him that our vile bodies will be changed, and by Him that we will live forever as priests unto our God.

May this be the happy lot of Brother Rosson, together with all the dear children of God into whose hands THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST goes, is our prayer, for Christ's sake. These lines, written at the home of Elder H. J. Clark, Waco, Ky., while on a preaching tour in Kentucky, are submitted to Brother Rosson and all our readers in the hope that they may be blessed of the Lord to your comfort, and with an earnest desire that you remember this poor feeble editor at a throne of divine grace. Brethren and sisters, one and all, "pray for me and mine." May the Lord bless you all. C. H. C.

PLEADING FOR PEACE

REMARKS TO A. R. YARBROUGH

---January 30, 1917

We are sorely grieved over the deplorable state of affairs in Zion, but we are powerless to stop it. For months and months we tried to keep out of the war, and remained out as long as we conscientiously could. We were falsely accused and misrepresented because we would take no part in it. We had to enter the fight or be a traitor to the cause. It was forced upon us. Those who brought the trouble can stop it by simply ceasing the fight. We expect to publish only a few more articles under the heading of "The Curtain Raised," but we do not expect to surrender any of the principles for which this paper has stood for thirty-one years. The Lord will not leave Himself without witness, and He will have people prepared to love and enjoy His truth while the world stands. Our subscription list has grown during the past six months, and is still growing, though some have prophesied that the paper would go down. Perhaps they desired it. Our trust is in the Lord. C. H. C.

The Inner and Outer Man

AN OLD EDITORIAL

---February 6, 1917

It has been charged that we have changed-that we are not advocating now what we advocated a few years ago. We publish the article below to show that we have not changed-that we believe now just exactly what we did when the following article was written by our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, and published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of August 19, 1892. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

We have been requested to write our views as to the inner and the outer man, also to state when it is that the children of God partake of flesh and blood. And in attempting to do so we feel our inability to write anything that will be of any benefit to God's humble poor, and especially so when it comes to writing upon any subject that is not alike understood by the household of faith. But in the fear of God and with a desire to see the children of God more united and more of one mind I will offer such thoughts as I have, hoping that the good Lord may bless the same to the benefit of His dear people.

The text which speaks of the children being partakers of flesh and blood will be found in (**Hebrews 2:14**). But before quoting this I would first call attention to

verses 9--13: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that He by the grace of God should taste death for every man. For it became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. And again, I will put my trust in Him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me." All this shows that Jesus tasted death for His people, tasted death for "every man;" that is to say, every one that lives (eternally), or has eternal life, has that life through Jesus Christ. And the expression: "Behold I and the children which God hath given me," shows very conclusively who are embraced in the expression "every man." Not only so, but the connection shows that the mission of Christ was to save sinners, sons and daughters of Adam by nature, but as they were the chosen of God, the elect of God, and had eternal life treasured in the Lord Jesus Christ for them, it became necessary that Jesus Christ suffer in their room and stead and meet the demands of the law in their behalf; and to do that He had to take upon Him a body of flesh and blood. His elect were sons and daughters of Adam, and in that sense were partakers of flesh and blood, and as such Jesus, their surety, their Redeemer, had to appear in the world as a "man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." The term, "partakers of flesh and blood," then, has no reference whatever to the work of regeneration nor to anything done at that time, but is only expressive of the kind of characters Jesus came to save-not eternal spirits, but sinners, "partakers of flesh and blood," those embraced in the covenant of grace and heirs according to promise. And as they are under the law and under its curse, it was necessary that Jesus Christ, their surety, come under the law in order that He meet the demands of the law, in all its requirements, and thereby release them from all the demands of the law, yea, redeem them from all iniquity. Hence the Apostle Paul would say, in the language of the text (v. 14): "Forasmuch then as the children are (not that they become, but are) partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil." This certainly shows that the term "partakers of flesh and blood" is only expressive of the kind of characters Jesus came to save, those who are "by nature children of wrath, even as others," and that to do so He appears, too, in a body of flesh and blood; and so the Apostle Paul continues: "And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people."

Having shown that we understand this term, "par-takers of flesh and blood," to be expressive of the kind of characters Jesus came to save, or of the condition His covenant people are in, or who they are, I will next give the three places in which Paul uses the expression "inner" or "inward" man, in one of which it will be observed that he also uses the term "outward" man, and of course the idea of such a term (outward or outer man) is conveyed in the other quotations also, as the inner or inward man is mentioned. "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man."-((2) (Romans 7:22). "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day."-(II Corinthians 4:16). "That He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with

might by His Spirit in the inner man.”- **(Ephesians 3:16)**. A careful reading and examination of these verses, and their connection, will certainly show that Paul was referring to two natures, or two principles, possessed by the child of God, one of which he calls the inner or inward man and the other the outward man. Not that there are two persons (or men) dwelling in the body, it (the body) being only a hull or dwelling place for the two; that is not it at all. But the child of God, having been born of the flesh first, born of Adam, has a nature or principle about him that is of the flesh or of Adam, and this Paul calls the outer man, and as he has been born of God, born again, he has also another principle, nature, or disposition about him, which Paul calls the inner or inward man. Especially does the apostle make it plain in (Romans 7) (entire chapter) that this is what he means by the expressions, inner, or inward, man and outward man. Having been born of Adam and afterwards born of God, Paul, like all others who have been born again, was a complex being- had a principle or disposition that was common to his nature as a child of Adam and also another principle or disposition that was the result of “being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.”

Paul not only calls these the inner, or inward, man and the outward man, but he also denominates them the “old man” and the “new man.” He says in **((9) (Colossians 3:9-10)**: “Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.” No one will presume that Paul meant to teach or say that they had put off their natural bodies, their flesh and blood, but that they had put off that old principle or disposition of living after the flesh, living in the love and practice of sin, and had put on the new man, that new principle or disposition which they had received in being born of God. They had done according to the teaching of the apostle in **(Romans 8:13)**: “For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.” And as such Paul would admonish them: **{((2) (Colossians 3:12-17))}** Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any; even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness. And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord. And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord - Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him.

All this shows that Paul not only calls that new principle or disposition which we receive in being born of God the new man, but he admonishes us to live after, or follow, its leadings or promptings and to keep in subjection the leadings or promptings of the old principle or disposition, the leadings of the outward man. And Peter also would teach the same lesson in his instruction to the sisters of the church, **((Pet 3:3) (I Peter 3:3-4)**: “Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.” We would love to see the dear brethren and sisters everywhere endeavoring to observe these admonitions and laboring to keep the unity of the spirit in bonds of peace, instead of caviling and contending about words to no profit. Brethren

sometimes fail to consider the connection of a text, or the subject that is being treated upon, and in that way draw a wrong conclusion, or make an erroneous deduction from the text, though they are sound in the faith of the gospel; but another brother, who sees the text in a different light, having, perhaps, noticed more carefully the subject treated upon, will discover the mistake, but instead of obeying the injunctions of the apostle himself he brands his brother (because of his mistaken view of the text) as believing in two seeds in the flesh, or of being an Arminian, and in his zeal to prove that such is the case, he will make an explanation of some other text that is just as foreign from the idea intended to be conveyed by the writer as is the opinion of the other brother in regard to the text explained by him.

Hoping that the good Lord may bless these hastily written thoughts to the good of His people and that the time is not far distant when the dear saints of God, who profess to be members of the true church of Christ, Primitive Baptist, will not be so much disposed to cavil and speculate over deep, mysterious and unrevealed things, but seeing eye to eye, loving and esteeming one another better than themselves and watching over each other for good, will all pull together as a band of brethren and sisters in the Lord, I submit the same to their consideration. And would also beg to be remembered in their prayers and that they remember our dear loved ones at home while the humble editor is, at this time, on a tour trying to preach the gospel of the Son of God to the dear brethren and sisters in the state of Ohio.

C.H.C.

The Christian Warfare

---February 13, 1917

It has been charged that we have changed-that we are not advocating now what we advocated a few years ago. We publish the article below to show that we have not changed-that we believe now just exactly what we did when the following article was written by Elder R. A. Biggs, and published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of January 25, 1888. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

ELDER S. F. CAYCE:

Dear Brother-I thought this evening that I would pen down a few lines for the consideration of the many readers of our family paper, THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, at the request of Brother Joel Little, on the following text, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"-(Romans 7:24). By noticing the connection, it will be seen at once, that the apostle is here setting forth the spiritual conflict going on in the believer's heart, or, in other words, is describing the Christian warfare. By noticing the sixth verse of the preceding chapter, we will find the "body of death" that the apostle and every child of God desires to be free from. What is it? Listen to the apostle: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him (Christ), that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." So Paul sees himself, and in himself he sees the law of sin, the law of the members, the old man, the body of sin; and on the other hand he sees the law of holiness, the law of his mind; and these two laws are what he calls "the old man" and "the new man." This brings to view the "Shulamite." And what do we see in the "Shulamite?" As it were, a company of two armies, striving for supremacy. The "Shulamite" is the sinner saved by grace. One of these forces, "the old man," "the body of sin," the sinner is redeemed from; and being quickened by "the new man," the spirit of holiness, becomes conscious of the fact that when he would do good evil is present with him. Again Paul speaks to somebody when he says, "Put

off the old man, and put on the new." He does not speak this to the old or new man, but to the real man, the Christian, the believer; put off the old and put on the new man. The old man, the body of sin, will never be saved; but we, the believers, shall be saved from him. The new man needs no saving, but comes to the sinner to deliver him from the dominion of the old man, "the body of sin." So here are three men, or rather one man in whom are found two opposing forces or principles, which figuratively are called "men." Paul and all the children of God hope to be finally saved from the one by the other. Then Brother Little and others will understand us, that the body of death, in our text, that the apostle desires to be delivered from, is, in our understanding, the body of sin, the old man. The children of God are, all their life, subject to this bondage, but will, ere long, be delivered. For the earnest expectation of the creature is that it will be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God, notwithstanding our wretchedness and shortcomings. This is our expectation and hope. Then, dear children, press forward and upward, for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. Not having time to finish this, as I would like, I send it as it is. In love to all saints,

R. A. BIGGS

Selden, Texas, December 5, 1887.

AN OLD ARTICLE

---February 20, 1917

It has been charged that we have changed-that we are not advocating now what we advocated a few years ago. We publish the article below to show that we have not changed-that we believe now just exactly what we did when the following article was written by Elder R.A. Biggs, and published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of October 8, 1888. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

Selden, Texas, September, 1888.

ELDER S. F. CAYCE:

Very Dear Brother-I send you the following article to insert in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, at the request of several brethren. The article was published in the Landmark of October 15, 1886, and is as follows: verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now"-is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live."-(John 5:25). This is the language of our Saviour, and all lovers of truth ought to acknowledge His word as the truth. "Thy word is truth." Then what are we to learn from this truth stated in the text? There are two grand leading truths in this text. What are they? Answer: First, Man is dead. 2. Men live only by hearing the voice of the Son of God. This is the truth plainly stated by our Saviour, and is a confirmation of truth stated in the penalty announced to our foreparents in the garden of Eden, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." This is the first testimony we have on record of this death; and again, "you hath He quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins. "-(Ephesians 2:1). This is another plain testimony of the truth, "Even when we were dead in sin hath He quickened us. "-(Ephesians 2:5). "And you, being dead in your sins," etc., "hath He quickened. "-(Colossians 2:3). This is a direct Scriptural account of the state of fallen man. This is a true statement of our fallen, depraved, condition before God. In this condition we do not love God, neither can we love Him. And why? Because we are dead to God and godliness; hence, to love or know God we must live; and how do we live? They that hear the voice of the Son of God live, and those alone live unto God.

Preaching the glorious gospel of Christ is a wonderful thing, and for a glorious purpose; but the preaching of the gospel does not give life to the dead in sins, but ministers of Christ proclaim, or preach, a power that can, or does, quicken or make alive the dead. Just back of all of our preaching is a miracle of grace performed by God Himself, and that is to give or impart life to the sinner, hitherto dead in trespasses and in sins; and then such a one is influenced by and through the preaching of the gospel of the Son of God, for the Scriptures say: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." It will be noticed that such as heard believed; hence, hearing is not in order to life, but is evidence of life; hence, when I see a sinner that hears the gospel, as the word of the Lord, and believes on Jesus as his Saviour, I take it that such a one is passed from death unto life, and his hearing and believing are evidences of the fact that such have eternal life. It is the voice of the power of God's Spirit that gives the hearing, seeing and understanding heart; and being thus alive spiritually, repentance and belief follow as a sequence, and believing, hope springs up, as a consequence, that is both sure and steadfast. I cannot put anything between the Spirit and the sinner dead in sins. If we do, it is not the immediate, or direct, operation of the Spirit, and the Scriptures tell us it is the "Spirit that quickeneth." The Spirit is the life. I wonder if in the resurrection of the dead from their graves, there will be a preacher, or a Sunday school, or any other medium besides the immediate and direct power of God in calling them from their graves? If so here, why not there, for both are brought from death the same way, for our Saviour tells us so. Our text says the hour is coming, and now is, that the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God and live, and then in verse 28 He tells us: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth." It seems to me that if God uses any means outside of the immediate, direct, and effectual operation of His Spirit in quickening of the sinner, dead in sins, He will also in the quickening of the dead in the grave. If the voice of the Son of God can only be heard, life imparted by or through preaching what some term the gospel, the same means will be needed in the future resurrection of our vile bodies from their graves, or else we will not hear the voice of the Son and come forth, and we know such will not be the case then: neither do I believe that such will be the case here; but that God and God alone gives life, and then the dead live, and are then capacitated to be influenced by the preaching of the gospel to repent, to believe the gospel preached, and believing they rejoice with joy that is unspeakable and full of glory. All these fruits may come by the influence of preaching, but these fruits are grown on live trees, not on dead ones. Kill the sinner to the love of sin, and then he will love God, and this is God's work; "I kill and I make alive." Where there is no life there is no hearing, seeing, feeling, tasting nor acting; but having life one can and does feel, and is conscious. Just so, spiritually; if we are sorry for sin, and grieve on account thereof, it is because we are alive spiritually. That is what caused the three thousand who heard Peter's preaching to cry out, "what shall we do?" They had feeling, or his preaching would not have pricked them in their hearts; that is, his preaching taking effect on them, shows that they were alive, for we might prick a dead man a hundred times, and that in his heart, but it would be of no avail. But Peter's words, as the word of the Lord, fell into three thousand hearts that were circumcised by the Spirit of God, and hence they felt it and cried out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" "The Lord opened Lydia's heart, and she attended dead do not realize that they are lost. Paul influenced the jailer because he was alive, and all such may be and are influenced by the living; and God does, no doubt, use

preaching and His written word to convict such as this jailer, to lead such to repent, to believe, to obey the ordinances, and follow in all the good works enumerated in the Bible. But back of all this, as before stated, there is a miracle that is wrought by the Spirit, or power of God, as manifested in the case of Lazarus. The Son of God cries, "Lazarus, come forth;" and he obeys Him. Then He says to His disciples, "loose him, and let him go." In love to all the saints, R. A. BIGGS.

Circular Letter

---February 20, 1917

The following Circular Letter was written by Elder W. N. Tharp, of Liberty, Ind., and published in the minutes of the White Water Association for 1911. Elders John R. Daily and E. W. Harlan were appointed as a committee, in connection with Elder Tharp, to examine the letter before it was published. We copy the letter just as it appears in the minutes. We believed then what the letter teaches, and we believe that way yet. As to whether others believe that way now or not is not for us to say. C. H. C.

THE LETTER

The White Water Primitive Baptist Association in session with the East Fork Flat Rock Church, in Rush County, Indiana, to the several churches composing our body, greeting:

In token of our love and fellowship we send you this annual epistle, and as a subject we desire to call your attention to the words of Jesus to Nicodemus, (**John 3:7**), "Ye must be born again."

That which must be is essential; without it we cannot obtain that for which it is accomplished. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God," nor enter into it. Whatever other qualification we may have for the kingdom of heaven, the lack of this prevents us from entering.

"Born again" clearly implies a second birth. The same person that was born of the flesh must be born of the Spirit. Jesus said to Nicodemus, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit;" but this must not be construed to mean two persons, lest we contradict our text, which says, "Ye must be born again."

The first birth delivers us unto the environments of the material world through the flesh. Without this birth we could have no personal individuality nor any tangible relation to material things. The second birth delivers us into the environment of the spiritual world through the Spirit, by the Spirit; and without this second birth we could have no personal individuality in the kingdom of God, nor any knowledge of the things that God has prepared for them that love Him.

The second birth is sometimes spoken of as a change; that the person is changed. The word birth does not imply an entire change of the one born, but a change of relation; delivered from their former dependence into such a relation with the things about them that makes them desire the things that pleasantly affect their senses. In the first birth we are brought into relation with good and evil, and in our depraved state we are not able to choose between them; and laying hold on whatever gives us present pleasure, we run headlong into sin, finding more pleasure in the ways of sin than in the ways of righteousness; abusing all the appetites and passions of the body and mind, which are given to us as blessings, thereby bringing disease, sorrow, and death.

But thanks be to God! we are "born again," and into an environment where there is no sin or evil. Nothing but good is in our way. This is why John said, "Whosoever is

born of God doth not commit sin." There is no sin in this new heaven and new earth. Peter said, "We, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness;" therefore we cannot sin. Our sin is in the flesh and must remain while we live in this world, because we are not removed from its environment.

The change in the walk and conversation of the child of God is not the result of the destruction of the fleshly desires, but it is the result of a new life, giving him a knowledge of better things, which can only be enjoyed by those who are born again. We still often find ourselves engaged in our former practices of sin in thought, word, or deed, which, with the mind, we hate, but with the flesh we love. For this reason Paul said, "With the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." All our thoughts and actions with the old environment are mixed with sin, but all our thoughts and actions within the new environment are holy, righteous and pure, being above the law and emanating from the spirit of holiness. By being born again we receive a "measure of the Spirit," "an unction from the Holy One," which causes us to love and seek the things that are above, where Christ sitteth, and to think on "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report." -

Admitting that the child of God is at the same time in both environments, it is easy to understand how it is that he is sometimes disobedient. The child of God may walk in sin, but he cannot live in it; it is death to him. "How can we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" "To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." When we go astray it is not that we cease to love God, or the things in His kingdom, but that we are drawn away by our own lusts (fleshly desires). "Wherefore," says James, "my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath; for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God. Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save your souls." The change for which we are waiting is still in the future, and will be consummated when we pass from this mortal state to the glorious immortal state. Job said, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come." Paul said, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." This new birth of which we speak and write is wholly the work of God. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Man made Christians are like those who made them, without any spiritual life, therefore without any knowledge of spiritual things. As Jeremiah said of the wooden idols, "They must needs be borne, because they cannot go."

W. N. THARP

Good Meetings

---February 27, 1917

On Saturday before the first Sunday in January we had the pleasure of being with the church at Round Lick, near Watertown, Tenn., once more. The congregation was small, but the meeting was pleasant.

On Sunday and Sunday night we were with the church called Bethel, in Nashville, Tenn. Elder J. H. Phillips was with us there. Elder Phillips had just closed his singing school at that place. The improvement in the song service had been great. We were delighted to see such improvement, and so much interest manifested. At the night service a young Brother Reid, son of Brother J. H. Reid, and young Sister Dorothy Monroe asked for a home in the church. They were joyfully received.

On Thursday afternoon, January 25, we went to Jackson, Tenn., and spent the night with Elder D. Hopper very pleasantly. We enjoyed the visit with him very much. Friday morning we left Jackson and went to Hattiesburg, Miss., where we were met at the train, and spent the night with Brother McDonald. Sister J. D. Davis, of Braxton, had learned that we were to be at Ideal on Saturday and Sunday, so she went from Braxton with us. On Saturday morning Brother A. N. Vance came for us and conveyed us out to the church, where we had meeting on Saturday and Sunday. On Saturday Brother S. A. Odum and wife and Sister Davis asked for a home in the church, and were gladly received. They were baptized Sunday morning by the unworthy writer.

On the first Sunday in February, and Saturday before, we were with the church at Palestine, near Laurel, Miss. Several brethren from sister churches were present, and the meetings were sweet and delightful. The Lord's sweet presence was manifested at the meetings at both these churches.

On Wednesday night we were with the church in North Chattanooga, Tenn. Elder Golston was with us there, and also on Thursday. The meeting was a pleasant one. We were disappointed that we did not get to meet Elder Raulston there, but he was away filling appointments that had been published in the paper for him.

On Thursday we were at Woodville, Ala., and also at night. The meetings there were good, and we enjoyed our visit among those good people. They are a lovely band of brethren and sisters, and fellowship abounds among them.

On Saturday and Sunday we were at old Flint Church. This is the oldest church (Baptist Church) in the state of Alabama. Elder Harvey Houk, the pastor, was with us there. Elder Andrew Houk was also present on Sunday. Other brethren in the ministry were also present. The meetings were delightful, and we felt that the Lord was present. Where the Lord manifests His delightful presence, there is joy and peace. The brethren there, and at other places where we have been, are satisfied with the "good old way" that our fathers have trod, both in doctrine and practice, and want none of the new-fangled notions of men, nor any of the wrangles over questions that gender strife.

On the third Sunday, and Saturday before, in February, we were with the church at Brush Creek, Graves County, Ky. Elders K. M. Myatt, J. R. Scott, J. B. Halbrook, and R. L. Perry were present. Again the Lord's delightful presence was manifested, and the meetings were sweet and delightful indeed. The congregations were not large, but the Lord graciously manifests His sweet presence in small congregations as well as in large ones; and where the Lord is present with speaker and hearer, the meeting is glorious, whether the congregation is large or small. We shall not soon forget this delightful meeting at old Brush Creek. May the Lord graciously grant to continue His heavenly blessings with and upon them, is our humble prayer.

We ask that our readers please remember us in their prayers. We are dependent upon the Lord to sustain and keep us, and feel to be poor and needy.. C.H. C.

A Pleasant Tour

---February 27, 1917

We left home on Friday before the third Sunday in October, 1916, in company with Elder H. L. Golston, for the Amite Association, in South Mississippi. We attended that association on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, and it was a pleasant and enjoyable meeting. Several ministers were present. Then we filled appointments at most of the churches in that association, as arranged by Elder C. L. Clark. There were some additions to some of the churches at some of the meetings. Then we went into Southeast Mississippi and filled appointments as arranged by Elder J. A. Ford. There were several additions to some of the churches at some of those meetings; and the meetings were all pleasant and delightful in that section. Then we went into the bounds of the Antioch Association and filled appointments as arranged by Elder J. W. Jones. After filling those appointments we went to Glenwood, Ala., and filled an appointment there. At that place we had the great pleasure of meeting Elder J. E. W. Henderson, whom we had never met until that time. Then went on to Southeast Alabama and filled the appointments as arranged by Elder M. E. Petty; then to Phoenix City, Alexander City, and Goodwater, then Decatur. The meeting at Alexander City was rained out. There were some additions at some of the churches in Southeast Alabama, also; and the meetings were usually sweet and delightful. For several weeks during the first part of the trip we suffered a great deal with a rising on our neck, but we had a good nurse along in the person of Elder Golston, who took good care of us. He was good and kind and tender in dressing the sore every day for quite awhile. We missed one appointment on account of illness, and only two or three appointments were missed on account of bad weather. Taken all in all this was a pleasant tour, and shall not soon be forgotten by us. We were with Elder Golston ten weeks,-and it grieved us much when the time came for us to separate at Decatur. We arrived home on Sunday morning, December 24, and found all as well as usual, for which we felt so thankful. That was our regular day at home. The meeting at home was sweet and delightful. At the request of the brethren and sisters we had meeting on Monday also. The Lord's divine presence was sweetly manifested-at least, many of us felt that way about it.

We shall ever remember the great kindness manifested to us by the brethren and sisters while we were on this tour; and the many expressions of love, sweet fellowship and sympathy, and endorsement of our feeble efforts to speak in the name of the Master, are held in grateful remembrance. May heaven's richest blessings be showered down upon them all, is our humble prayer; and we ask that they all still remember that we need their prayers.

This is late for an account of this tour, we know, but we have neglected writing it sooner, and have had so much to do that it seemed we could not find the time. We cannot now go into detail, but only make this brief statement. Too much detail is often given to accounts of tours, any way, we think. C. H. C.

Glorious Hope - An Old Article

---February 27, 1917

It has been charged that we have changed-that we are not advocating now what we advocated a few years ago. We publish the article below to show that we have not changed-that we believe now just exactly what we did when the following article was written by Elder K. M. Myatt, and published in THE PRIMITIVE Baptist of April 1, 1889. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

ELDER S. F. CAYCE: -

My Dear Brother-Through the mercy of a crucified Redeemer, I am spared to the present; the afflictions of my body are so I am at home.

I do not want to be conspicuous; neither do I want to crowd out better matter, but I have a desire to communicate a few thoughts to the readers of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, but if in your judgment you think my thoughts unprofitable cast them aside. Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ, wrote to "them that are sanctified by God the Father, . preserved in Christ Jesus, and called." Paul said to the brethren at Rome, "whom He (God) did predestinate, them He also called; whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, He also glorified." Question: If He calls all men in a numerical sense, will not all that He calls be sanctified and justified and glorified? Again: If any that He (Jesus) calls go to that awful place called hell, will they not go there justified? Paul said to Titus that "the grace of God that bringth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us" how to live in this evil world, looking forward to the blessed hope, which is Jesus, who gave Himself for all that were sanctified, preserved and called. What for? "That He might purify unto Himself a peculiar people." Why are they peculiar? Because they are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, peculiar for good works. The call is prerequisite to good works. Ephraim said he was a cake unturned, but when the Lord turned him, he was turned, and then he repented. Again, "turn me, O Lord, and I will run after thee." Prior to the call they are dead in sin, but when Jesus calls, they hear; and they that hear, live, from the fact they are called by His word, and His word is Spirit, and His word is life; and "the promise is to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." So we find that this call is effectual. Therefore they are blessed, from the fact they are chosen. "Blessed is the man whom thou choosest and causest to approach unto thee." Again, "Blessed is the man that standeth not in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful," etc., "but his delight is in the law of the Lord, "from the fact that he is blessed with the Spirit of God, which is eternal life, and that life causes action, as Paul said to the brethren at Philippi: "It is God that worketh in you to will and to do." Again, to the brethren at Rome: "Know ye not that it is the goodness of God that leadeth thee to repentance?" So repentance and all good works are the fruit of the Spirit, which make manifest that the subject has been called with an holy calling, and that calling is according to His (God's) own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began; but His people are saved in time according to that purpose, and those that are saved are sinners of Adam's race, and those Adamic sinners are born again. Old things are done away and all things become new, but at the same time old nature is the same; "for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, -but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope." So the dear child looks forward to the consummation of all things, because "the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." So when I awake in His likeness I shall see God and be satisfied; and all of God's sanctified ones are called from nature to grace, and in the resurrection morn they will be called from corruption to incorruption, and that by the Spirit of Jesus. Then the ransomed of the Lord can sing the sweet anthems of praise to Him who hath called them from darkness to light. Solemn thought! Will I be there to chant His praise?

K. M. MYATT.
Clinton, Ky.

ORIGIN OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS

---March 6, 1917

Brother Joel M. Rogers, of Williston, Tenn., writes us as follows: "I would like for you to give me the reference to the author of the first Sabbath school, and date and purpose; also the first church-taught Sabbath school."

As authority on this question we refer to the Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, and to the International Cyclopedia, published by Dodd, Mead & Co., or to any other reliable encyclopedia. For the benefit of our readers, as well as for the benefit of Brother Rogers, we copy the following from the International Cyclopedia:

Sunday schools were founded about the close of the year 1751 by Robert Raikes, a printer in Gloucester C. H. C. Business leading him into the suburbs of the town, inhabited by the lowest class of the people, he was struck with concern at seeing a group of children, miserably ragged, at play. He was informed that "on Sunday the street was filled with a multitude of wretches, who, having no employment on that day, spent their time in noise and riot, playing at chuck, and cursing and swearing." To check this deplorable profanation of the Lord's day he engaged four women, who kept dame schools, to instruct as many children as he should send them on the Sunday, in reading and the church catechism, for which they were to receive one shilling each. In a short period a visible improvement was effected both in the manners and morals of the children, who came in considerable numbers; they attended church with their mistresses, and a great many learned to read and say their catechism. Such was the origin of the Sunday schools. Within the last forty years the Sunday school has entered upon a third stage of its history. The improvement and multiplication of week-day schools obviate the necessity for teaching reading in Sunday schools, so that they have gradually become restricted to religious instruction.

This is enough to satisfy the mind of an honest enquirer as to the origin of the Sunday school, and as to what its original purpose was—the education of the poorer classes who were unable to attend the literary schools during the week. It is noted that they were taught to read the catechism; but it may be said that the catechism was used in all literary schools then—at least, this was the general rule. The object of the school was purely for literary training. C. H. C.

A DEBATE

---March 13, 1917

We have agreed to meet Mr. F. O. Howell in public discussion at Vaughn's Chapel, the discussion to begin at 10 a. m., on Tuesday, March 27, and continue four days. Mr. Howell represents the people calling themselves Christians. Vaughn's Chapel is on the Trenton road, between Idlewild and Trenton. All are invited to attend.
C. H. C.

Romans 6:17

---March 13, 1917

Brother J. B. Adams, Farmington, Ky., requests our views of **(Romans 6:17)**, and asks, "Why should God be thanked that we were once the servants of sin?" - That text reads, in the King James translation, "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you." It is not the teaching of the apostle here that we are to thank God

that we were once the servants of sin. At least, that is not what we think he meant to teach. The idea is that he thanked God that they are not servants of sin now, though they once were. - The original language, as is more clearly expressed in the Revised Translation, has in it the idea that could more clearly be expressed in modern English in this way, "But God be thanked that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye have obeyed from the heart," etc. Another idea which is not clearly brought out in the King James translation is that they were delivered, and that, for this reason, they are no more the servants of sin. The idea is, "unto which, ye were delivered." They were delivered from the power and dominion of sin; though they were once the servants of sin, Paul thanked God that they were no more the servants of sin; they have been delivered from that and have obeyed from the heart that form of teaching or doctrine unto which they had been delivered. Their hearts were made good when they were thus delivered. Hence they obeyed from a heart that had been made good. They were first made children of God, and then they obeyed.

This is the teaching of the apostle in this text, as we see it, expressed in few words.
C. H. C.

Remarks to Elder J. W. Richardson

---March 13, 1917

The above from our dear old brother is appreciated. We have ever understood the Old Baptists to teach that regeneration is by the direct and immediate implantation of life, without any means or instrumentality whatever, and that people are converted through persuasion, or by arguments. One may be converted through the instrumentality of preaching-if you wish to use the term instrumentality-but one is not regenerated that way.

There is a legal repentance required of every violator of law. If one is guilty of the violation of law-let it be God's moral law, or any other righteous law-it is his duty to repent; it is his duty to turn from such violation or wrong doing, and live in obedience to the law. Then there is a gospel repentance required of gospel subjects. As Brother Richardson says, if these things are kept in view, the difficulty would be removed. C. H. C.

Letter to Elder Leonard

---May 8, 1917

The following was written as a private letter, and returned by Elder Leonard with request for it to be published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST.-C. H. C.

ELDER WALTER LEONARD:

My Dear Brother-Your letter concerning your experience and ministerial life was received on March 12th, and was placed by the clerk in the office among the letters for the paper, and I have just now read it for the first time. I wish to say that there are trials and conflicts all along the way, if I know anything about the matter. Many times have I been greatly discouraged. Often the way has looked dark and gloomy to me, and I could see no ray of light at all. Remember the afflictions of Job. He lost all that he had. Satan was allowed to take all that he had, but could not touch his life. The Lord's humble poor, and especially His ministers, are often sorely tried. Their faith is often tried. When they are tried sufficiently, they shall come forth as gold; for they are tried as gold is tried. The gold is put in the furnace in being tried, and the Lord's children are tried in the furnace of affliction. In the midst of all the trials and conflicts, the Lord is a stronghold. He is a stronghold in time of trouble

We can only trust Him; and the best that we can do is to try the best we can to do what we feel to be our duty. We should not shun to do what we feel is our duty to do. The Lord is faithful. We may often be unfaithful, and we may deny Him, and refuse to do what He requires at our hand. God is not mocked. If we only try to do what is right, we may leave the result with the Lord. We may often not be able to see the Lord's hand with us; but He will make things manifest in due time. In due time we shall reap, if we faint not. "Many are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord delivereth him out of them all." We may not be delivered just when, or how we would like to be; but this is the Lord's sure promise. He is faithful that has promised. "All the promises of God in Christ are yea and amen to the glory of God." I have sometimes been to the end of the way, as it seemed to me. I could see no way of escape. Then in an unexpected way deliverance would come. I have endeavored to go on in the discharge of duty, as I felt was required, until the very last moment; despair and ruin staring me in the face; that all was gone in a seeming moment more. Then deliverance would come from an unexpected quarter, and when hope of deliverance was gone. This has been my life along the way. Still, I may be a poor deceived mortal. I cannot say that I am a servant of the Lord. I cannot say that I know I am a child of God. I can only hope and trust. All my trust and hope and confidence is in Him. If I die, let me die trusting in a gracious and merciful Redeemer. My dear brother, my humble prayer is in your behalf. If I was able and could do so, I would every burden from you. I will do what I can. I enclose a little mite. May the Lord grant to bless you, is my humble prayer. Yours in love and fellowship, C. H. CAYCE.

The New Birth

---June 12, 1917

A brother asks us this question: "When does the new birth take place? Is it at the time one is quickened, or is it when one is delivered from the burden of sin and guilt?"

Different figures are used in Scripture representing the work of regeneration. Although different figures are used, they all represent one thing, and that one thing is becoming in possession of eternal life, or the impartation of that life. Becoming in possession of eternal life is represented in Scripture as a birth, as a resurrection, as a creation, as a translation, as a deliverance, etc. All these different figures represent the same thing. To quicken is to make alive from the dead. It is to raise up out of a state of death into a state of life. It is a resurrection. See **(Ephesians 2:1-6)**. This is an instantaneous work. This is done by the Lord speaking to them, and when He speaks to them He imparts the divine life. See **(John 5:25)**.

The lesson taught in all these figures is that the sinner is passive in receiving eternal life. We cannot very well get more out of a figure than is intended to be taught in it.

The very fact that a child cries is unmistakable proof that a living child has been born. So when one begins to mourn on account of sin and to cry unto the Lord, begging for mercy, it is positive proof that he has been born of God. Then one may ask, "Why does he mourn if he has been born of God?" We answer, Because he does not know he has been born of God. When the fact is made known to him that Jesus is his Saviour and that he has been born of God, then he rejoices. The fact is one thing, and the knowledge of the fact is another thing.

Our brethren all agree that the sinner is passive in receiving eternal life, and that it is by the sovereign will and work of Almighty God. This is the fundamental point, and we are all agreed on it. We should not, therefore, cavil over the minor matters.

C. H. C.

John 3; John 5

---July 3, 1917

The text reads: "Jesus answered" and said unto him (Nicodemus), "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." There is a difference of opinion among brethren as to what the Saviour meant by the expression "of water and of the Spirit." Some conclude that the water referred to is water baptism, but if that be true no individual can possibly be "born again" without, nor except in the act of, water baptism, for remember that this "being born again" is the subject under consideration. The Saviour had said to Nicodemus, "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Other brethren, realizing this, and seeing that to say the water referred to is water baptism would, as we say, involve the idea of baptismal regeneration or of baptism being necessary in order to the new birth, conclude that the water spoken of by the Saviour was the amniotic water or the water of the mother's womb in the first or fleshly birth, but we do not so understand the text.

Now, brethren, let us be considerate and endeavor to understand what the Saviour is teaching. Is He teaching the necessity of being born of the flesh, or of being born of an earthly parentage? Or is He teaching the necessity of being born a spiritual birth, of being "born again?" It will certainly be admitted by all that He is teaching the necessity of another birth, a spiritual birth, in which we are "born again;" for, as already seen, he had said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus, however, could not understand how this could possibly be. He, of course, knew that in being born of the flesh, in being born of an earthly parentage, he had first to be in his mother's womb; hence he asks the question, "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he (the man who is old) enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" Then comes the Saviour's answer to the question, or questions, propounded by Nicodemus, and in answering says, in the language of the text, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man (old or young) be born of water and of the Spirit, he (the man) cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Now, brethren, can't you see, that if the Saviour meant by the expression water, the water of our mother's womb, that (we) man would, sure enough, as Nicodemus imagined, have to enter the second time into his mother's womb; for the Saviour said, "except a man be," which shows that he (man) had not been, "except a man be born of water and the Spirit," thus connecting the "water and the spirit;" not that He had under consideration two births, one of water and another of the Spirit, but He does have under consideration another birth-not the first, but another, a second birth, a new birth, a "born again," which "born again," is to be born of water and of the Spirit. This water, then, we understand to be that which purifies or cleanses from sin. Man who is born of the flesh is corrupt, is defiled with the pollution of sin, hence needs to be purified or cleansed. The Lord Jesus Christ, however, loved His people, the church, even while dead in sin; "and gave Himself for it (the church), that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." This water, or the water mentioned by the apostle in this text, viz., (**Ephesians 5:26**), we understand to be the same cleansing element, the same water, referred to by the Saviour in our text, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." It will certainly be admitted by all our brethren, that none can

enter the kingdom of God without this sanctification, this cleansing; and this being true, Paul lets us know that Christ gave Himself for that purpose; gave Himself for the church (His people) “that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. Neither can any enter the kingdom of God without being “born again. Being “born again,” then, and being cleansed “with the washing of water by the word” must be one and the same thing. Both are expressions showing that poor sinners, who are polluted with sin, yea, dead in trespasses and sins, need to be made new, even “new creatures” in Christ, “created in Christ Jesus.” And as the Saviour is talking about the necessity of this work, this is certainly what He means. Again, Paul says, **(Titus 3:5)**, “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. This “washing of regeneration” is the same thing that is referred to by the apostle in the expression “washing of water by the word,” and this word is Christ. Hence this “washing of regeneration” must be the same work or process that is referred to by the Saviour in our text, “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” This being “born of water and of the Spirit,” or “being born again,” is brought about or effected by the Spirit of God, and is therefore the work of God; hence it is “not by works of right hence, in the expression, “and renewing of the Holy Ghost,” it is the creature, and not the Holy Ghost, that is renewed, for the Holy Ghost needs no renewal; but man, being unclean, being defiled with sin, needs to be renewed, needs to be made anew, and this renewing is done by the Holy Spirit; hence called “the renewing of the Holy Ghost.”

The water mentioned in the text as well as that referred to by the apostle in the expression “by the washing of regeneration” and “with the washing of water by the word,” all, according to our understanding, represent the grace of God and the blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. In **((4:8) (Isaiah 44:8)**, God says, “For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed.” The Saviour also says, **(John 4:14)**, “Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst, but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life;” and again, vii. 38, “He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.” All these expressions of Scripture show, not only that a cleansing, a washing, or a new birth, is absolutely necessary in order that poor sinners be prepared for heaven, but they also show that the element by which they are cleansed, or that which is applied by the Spirit in their cleansing, is represented as “water.” Hence the Saviour continues, verse 6, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh;” but some brethren conclude that this explains His expression “born of water,” but we should notice that He did not say born of water and born of the Spirit; but said (all in one sentence) “born of water and of the Spirit.” This does not embrace two births, but one birth, a new birth, a “born again” birth, and also shows the element in which or through which that birth is effected, “of water,” meaning of or through the grace of God, the blood of Christ. The text also shows by what power or agent this birth of water, this birth through the grace of God, is brought about, i. e., “and of the Spirit.” Hence the Saviour, after showing the necessity of this birth by saying “that which is born of the flesh is flesh,” and by this also showing that if the second birth was effected in the way that Nicodemus imagined or mentioned, that the man would yet be a natural man only, would yet be born of the flesh only. He therefore adds, “and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit,” showing that to be “born of water and of the Spirit,” to be born again, is a spiritual work. And He then continues, “Marvel not that I said unto thee,

Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth (or pleaseth, blows sovereignly or independently of man's will or agency), and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." That is to say, as it was with Nicodemus about the wind, or as he could not tell from whence the wind came nor whither it goeth, "so is every one that is born of the Spirit;" he cannot tell how nor whence it came nor whither it goeth; but he does know that, like the blowing of the wind, it was all independent of his natural will or agency. Nicodemus, however, could not understand this, hence asks, "How can these things be?" But the Saviour said, "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell' you of heavenly things?" Meaning, by the term "earthly things," things which take place on the earth or in this world. But notwithstanding this "new birth," this being "born of water and of the Spirit," this being "born again" takes place, with the children of God, HERE IN TIME, that does not enable man with his natural mind to comprehend or understand it, and as the Saviour said, **(John 10:26)**, "Ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep," and again, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, because they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

May God help us who have reason to hope, or believe, that we have experienced this birth and thereby given the ability to comprehend spiritual things, "things of the Spirit," not only enable us to understand these things, but may He give us cause to rejoice in and feast upon the glorious results or benefits that are manifested unto us in the same. And may we all be found walking in the "ordinances of the Lord blameless," thus proving or showing our "faith by our works," is our prayer, for Christ's sake. Amen. -

This is what I believe."C. H. C.

The above article was written by our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, several years before it was re-published and endorsed, as above.

Card Playing

---July 3, 1917

A short time ago we received the following letter, which explains itself:

Dear Brother-Would be glad if you would answer a few questions in regard to members of the Old Baptist Church playing cards "-for past time," of course. They have a game here called Rook. Other churches are criticizing. Even the ones that "are reaching over with the long-handled hoe" are losing faith in us; but knowing this, they still play. Also, what do you think of the deacon of the church having a party? Maybe I am too old-fashioned; but I think I love the Old Baptists, and it pains me to have them "slurred." I stayed at home from church Sunday because it was communion time, and I did not feel like taking part in the service unless I had the right feeling in my heart for the brethren. Was it wrong to stay away?

It is strange to us that any church, claiming to be an Old Baptist Church, will tolerate any such conduct and practice by her members. Fashionable so-called churches have their societies and card parties and amusements, but the church of God has never engaged in such, and she has never tolerated such. These so-called churches, in some places, have rooms fitted up and prepared for their adherents and friends to meet and play cards and engage in other games, such as pool, billiards, etc. They claim that they do this to prevent the people going to other places to engage in such amusements. Thus they confess that their members love the world and worldly amusements, and have not been killed to such. But the Old Baptists have always held that the humble followers of the lowly Saviour have been

killed to the love of such things, and that the church of God has never needed them. Card playing at home, unless it is a game that is of actual benefit, in which the person can and does learn something of real value, has a bad influence. It may be fascinating and somewhat exciting, and is. Human nature loves fascination and excitement. Having learned and tasted the fascination and excitement in card playing, the person is then more easily tempted and persuaded to engage in the card game in the gambling den, or gambling hall. The influence is bad. Most of those who frequent the gambling dens, and who are gamblers, got their first "taste" of card playing at the social card table. An Old Baptist who engages in such practice has very little respect for himself and for the church of God. The church should not tolerate such. The church of Christ is above the world, and true Old Baptists have been called out of the world. Even the world expects better things of them than they do of other people.

And then a deacon giving a party at his home! Shame! Shame on the man wearing the name deacon who would do such a thing! And shame on the church wearing the name Primitive Baptist that would retain a man in her fellowship who would do that! A deacon is supposed to be a man of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom. See **(3) (Acts 6:3)**. It is preposterous to suppose that those men who were set apart by the apostles to the deaconship ever did such - a thing as give a "party" at their homes. The qualifications of the deacons are plainly laid down in (I Timothy 3:8-10): "Likewise must the deacons be grave, not doubletongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless." Turn to the chapter and read it all. The deacons should set such examples as are worthy of emulation.

If the Old Baptists engaged in all such practices as other people engage in, what would be the difference between the Primitive Baptists and other people? The Lord's people are a peculiar people zealous of good works. God's people are crucified unto the world and the world unto them. They are dead to sin and alive unto God. At least, that is the way the apostle expressed it. If they love the world, and the things of the world, and love sin as well as they ever did, then they are not dead TO sin; they are not crucified to the world, and they have no right to membership in the church of Christ. We simply say, most emphatically, that such conduct and such practice should not be tolerated by an Old Baptist Church, and no true Primitive Baptist Church will continue to tolerate it.

You should not stay away from your meetings because some of the members are doing wrong. Two wrongs will not make a right. You should go to your meetings, and you should labor to restore such erring ones, to get them to forsake such wrong conduct, and if they cannot be reclaimed, then the church should withdraw fellowship from them. After all due labor, patience, and forbearance, if the church will not do her duty in the case, then those who stand upon gospel order and practice can and should withdraw from such disorder. The identity of the church would be with those who withdraw from the disorder.

These are some of our thoughts concerning the matters mentioned. May the Lord help us all to live right, to live in such a way as to honor Him and to honor the profession which we have made. May He help us all to live in such a way as to prove our claim true that the Primitive Baptist Church is the church of Christ.
C.H.C.

Debate Postponed

---July 10, 1917

The twenty-fourth of July is the time agreed on between Elder J. L. Davis and the writer for a discussion in Texas; but circumstances over which we have no control are such that we cannot go to Texas just now. Hence, the debate will not be held at that time. We wrote Elder Davis several days ago asking that the debate be postponed until the latter part of October or until November. We have not yet heard from him; but as we cannot go in July, and as the time is about up, we are publishing this notice now, so that our brethren may know how things are. There are duties which have come up unexpectedly which require us to stay here at home, or in this vicinity, for the present. So we simply take the liberty to call the debate off for the present time, and will try to get an agreement with Elder Davis for a later date. We trust that it may all be arranged in a way that will be satisfactory to all parties. C.H.C

A Progressive Mixture

---July 10, 1917

In the Pilgrim's Banner for July, 1917, a Progressive paper edited by Elder R. H. Barwick, of Columbus, Ga., we find an account of a tour by Elder J. T. McArthur, of Cordele, Ga. Elder McArthur is identified with the Progressive (organ) party of Georgia, and the Banner is published in the interest of that party. Elder McArthur first visited the disorderly faction of the Sequachee Valley Association, near Chattanooga, Tenn., a faction that has no recognition among the orderly Baptists of Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, or elsewhere, that we have any knowledge of. Then he visited some of the churches in the Elk River Association, which is another faction in disorder, and which has no recognition among the orderly Baptists. Both these factions have secret order affiliation and other disorders among them. In the last named association Elder McArthur was with Elder W. A. Pinkstaff, and affiliated with him. Then he says:

After leaving the above named churches it was my privilege to meet with the brethren of the College Street Church of Nashville, Tenn., where we had services for two nights. Dr. J. Bunyan Stephens is the pastor of this church, assisted by Elder W. L. Murray, of Nashville. I was received very kindly by the church and above named elders. After leaving Nashville I went to Dresden, Tenn. Was met by Elder A. B. Ross, who conveyed me to Shiloh Church, where it was my privilege to preach to his congregation morning and evening. Elder Ross, I learned, is an able defendand of the doctrine we love. He and his brethren received me very kindly. He and his church is a member of the Greenfield Association and Elder Ross is their moderator. From this church I was conveyed over to Palmersville, where I met with the brethren of this church at their regular meeting time, Saturday and fourth Sunday in April. This is a strong and flourishing church, pastored by Elder J. J. Kirkland. Elder Kirkland is much beloved by his people. After leaving this church I came back towards Nashville and spent several hours very pleasantly with Elder W. E. Brush, at McKenzie. Elder Brush is moderator of the Obion Association. Most likely Elders Brush and Ross will pay our people in Georgia a visit some time this year.

I visited the homes of all the above named elders while in Tennessee, and was very cordially received by them and their brethren. I also visited Brother W. W. Mullins at his home while in Nashville. Brother Mullins is editor of the Regular Baptist, published at Nashville, Tenn. After leaving McKenzie I boarded the train for

Knoxville, a distance of over three hundred miles, to visit the Baptists of East Tennessee, which I will give you a report later.

This extract from Elder McArthur's account of his trip is sufficient to show what some folks are mixing up with. Elder J. J. Kirkland and his church at Palmersville have no recognition among orderly Baptists. That church was with the Elders Kirkland in their departures a few years ago, and has not been recognized by the churches of the Greenfield Association for a number of years. The churches which Elder McArthur visited in East Tennessee were churches which went with the Kirkland departure from the Powell's Valley Association several years ago. W. W. Mullins is with the Burnam party, who separated from the orderly Baptists years ago on the means question. They hold and teach that God uses means and instrumentalities in the regeneration of sinners. If Elders Brush and A. B. Ross wish to visit that Progressive party of Georgia, we have no desire to hinder them, and we do not publish this in order to stop them from making the visit. We only give space to this as a matter of news, so that the brethren generally may know what some of the preachers are doing, and what they are mixing with. We do not know what this Brush, Ross, excluded Progressive, Kirklandite, Burnamite mix-up means; but it looks like there is going to be a general union of forces of disorder and excluded factions. "Birds of a feather flock together." "A man is known by the company he keeps." - C.H.C.

An Old Article

---July 17, 1917

Nothing is of more interest to us poor Adam sinners than the subject of salvation. This subject, and what inspired writers have said on the same, has given me more concern than any subject encouched in the Book of all books. The subject of salvation will, or ought to, interest anyone who has had a knowledge of same shed abroad in their hearts. We have learned that to be saved from destruction or eternal punishment we must be delivered by the all powerful hand of Almighty God. We have been taught by a direct and immediate operation of God's Holy Spirit that we were lost, ruined and unable to pay our indebtedness, and being sinful and corrupt were wholly unable to satisfy divine justice. The law of God being a just and holy law and we, being unjust and unholy, were wholly unable to meet its demands. Hence, we can only say, "Worthy art thou who wast slain and hast by thy blood redeemed us to God." We can only praise Him for this precious salvation that was treasured for us so long ago. Paul says of this salvation, "By grace are ye saved." Again, he says it is "by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, not according to our works, but according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world." No one of God's humble poor would undertake to say that we are delivered from sin and condemnation, raised from a life of ruin and degradation to a life akin to God by our work, or even according to our works, because our works were evil like ourselves. But don't conclude because a child can't assist in its birth that it never does, after birth, become able to obey the orders of its parents. Anyone who has been taught to know the source from whence this valuable deliverance comes ought to then read the Holy Bible and learn that we are delivered in a timely sense according to our works. This same Paul, speaking directly to the same person says, first to Timothy, "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." "Save thyself." By grace you are already saved. If Timothy must save himself by doing something after that he was a saved man, and was even preaching the everlasting gospel of the Son of God, does it not follow that it

was according to how he took heed unto himself and unto the doctrine, continued in them, etc.? "All that hear thee." Those who heard Timothy in the sense that they repented of their wrong way of living, living after the flesh, and joined the church and were baptized, of course were saved from many hurtful things in time. Only those who were saved with an everlasting salvation could hear Timothy in the sense spoken. No one would believe for a moment that they could hear Timothy in the sense spoken independent of the gracious influence and sustaining presence of God's unerring Spirit. Yet there are some things required of us, and while we are happy to admit that we must have God's gracious influence and strengthening presence to guide and uphold us in order that we do the things required at our hands, we insist that sometimes we have to repent of our wrongs and get in the straight and narrow way where Jesus ever abides before we can have Him with us. The way that leads unto life here is straight and narrow, and to have the gracious presence of Jesus we must get in the way. We must not conclude because we go to the right of the way and have to suffer under the chastening rod of God that the way is not still strewn with the good things that are ever ready and waiting for those who deny themselves and walk in the way. We don't find the straight and narrow way many times because we follow our own sinful lusts for the sake of other things. Again on the day of Pentecost some who had been delivered from sin and degradation felt condemned because of the way they had been living, and they enquired of the apostles what they must do. Don't take my word, but take the dear old Bible, and read and see if the apostle didn't tell those persons to repent and be baptized, because their sins had been untoward generation-not from eternal ruin; but come out from among those evil persons and be separate; in that you join the church and be baptized, and instead of living like you have heretofore you follow Jesus in the straight and narrow way. If those very enquiring persons couldn't come out from the world, why, tell me, did the apostle waste breath and time admonishing them to do it? The apostle knew that they could turn from their evil ways and live right. Hence the exhortation, "Repent and be baptized, everyone of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for (because of) the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Some say to me sometimes that God only requires or enables part of His children to obey Him. But Peter failed to leave such impressions in the above text, since he exhorted every single one to repent. Some Baptists try to say, because they stay at home and run after the almighty dollar and don't attend their conference meetings as they should, that God doesn't work in all of His children to go to church. The apostle said that we are to present these very old Adam bodies of ours a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God and he left the impression, as did Peter, that he meant every one of you, not just a part. When we live after the flesh and die in the sense spoken, remember that this is one of the many things that we do that are displeasing to God, and as sure as we live after the flesh that sure we may expect to die to our usefulness, die to our influence and to our happiness and enjoyment as Christian sons and Christian daughters. If you are tempted don't say that you are tempted of God, or that it is according to God's pleasure, because "God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man." When we fail to hear Timothy and save ourselves from the things under consideration, let us not say that we went to the straight and narrow way, but failed to have divine influence to guide us on, but let us confess when we live wrong and talk wrong that the wrong is of our own selves and according to our own sinful lusts, and not because God failed to fulfill any promise of His. "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise." If there is but one salvation, and that eternal, there is not any more harmony or consistency in the Bible than if harmony and true consistency had never been known.

In hope,

Z. STALLINGS.

Humboldt, Tenn.

The above article was published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of April 10, 1906. It is exactly what we believed then, and it is exactly what we believe today. Nobody objected to it then; why should they today? C.H.C.

John 11:39

---July 17, 1917

Take ye away the stone.

It seems to have been the custom in those days that a stone be placed over a grave or sepulchre. A stone was placed over the sepulchre where the Saviour was buried, and the women who went to His grave early in the morning of the first day of the week said, "Who will roll away the stone?" The stone over the grave of Lazarus has no reference whatever to a stony heart. It simply shows that Lazarus was dead, and that he was buried according to the usual custom. In the resurrection of Lazarus was a wonderful display of the power of God. He could have raised Lazarus just as easily without the stone being rolled away as after it was taken away. The stone being over the grave did not hinder His ability to raise Lazarus. But if He had raised him without the stone being first taken away then those unbelieving Jews would have said it was all a "sham" and that Lazarus was not dead. Then the question might be asked, Why did the Saviour not roll the stone away Himself? We answer, It was not necessary that He roll it away. They could do that themselves. They could not give life to Lazarus, but they could roll away the stone. The Saviour did what they could not do. So He tells them to roll away the stone, and when it is taken away, they Can see Lazarus lying there now dead, and "behold he stinketh." Now, the Saviour cried with a loud voice, "Lazarus, come forth," and he obeyed, the Saviour imparting life with the command. They have seen Lazarus was dead, and they have seen that life was imparted to him, and he came forth. There is absolutely no room to dispute the fact that the dead was raised. Hence this is a wonderful display of the power of Christ, showing that He had power to raise the dead. Even so now He has power to raise the sinner out of a state of death in sin to state of life in Christ.

The sinner is not commanded to take the stony heart away, or to take the stony heart out of the flesh. In **((9) (Ezekiel 11:19-20)** the Lord says, "And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh: that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances and do them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God." Here we have the positive promise of the Lord, the God that cannot lie, that He will take away the stony heart and that He will give a heart of flesh. He does not tell us to do what He has promised to do for us, and He does not promise to do for us what He commands us to do. Having the stony heart taken away, and a heart of flesh given, is equivalent to being born again, and sinners are nowhere commanded in God's word to be born again. This taking away of the stony heart and giving of a heart of flesh is something the Lord will do "that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances and do them." Then the stony heart must be removed in order that acceptable obedience be rendered to the Lord; then the stony heart must be removed before the sinner 'obeys. So, if the Lord commands the sinner to remove the stony heart, and the sinner cannot render acceptable obedience until the stony heart is removed, and the Lord cannot or will not save the sinner until the stony heart is removed, it looks to us as though there

is no hope for the poor sinner. They do get it somewhat mixed, sure enough. But the Lord takes away the stony heart and gives them a heart of flesh and puts a new spirit within them. The Lord thereby qualifies them for His service. But someone might ask, "Does not the Lord somewhere command somebody to purify their hearts?" Certainly He does, but He is not talking to alien sinners. **((8) (James 4:8)** says, "Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double minded." James is not talking to unregenerate sinners; he is talking to the brethren, to children of God, those to whom the Lord has given a heart of flesh. In the eleventh verse he says, "Speak not evil one of another, brethren." He uses the term "brethren" all along in different places, so it has no application whatever to the unregenerate. Some brother, then, might ask, "How are they to purify their hearts?" Peter tells us how. ((Pet 1:22) (I Peter 1:22-23): "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." They purified their souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit. To obey the truth through the Spirit, one must first be in possession of the Spirit, or must have the Spirit before they obey. Then they do not purify their souls unto eternal life, but unto the unfeigned love of the brethren. They are in possession of the Spirit before the obedience is rendered; and the Lord promised to put a new Spirit within them, and when the Lord puts that Spirit within them they are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." All the Lord's dear children, to whom the Lord has given a heart of flesh, should endeavor to "purify their souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren." C.H.C.

Galatians 3; Galatians 6:18

---July 17, 1917

For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

To our mind this text represents our becoming in possession of eternal life as being baptized into Christ. To be baptized into Christ is to pass out of a state of death in sin into a state of life in Christ; is to be killed to the love of sin and made alive to the love of holiness. It is to be quickened into divine life; it is to be raised up together with Christ. It is also set forth in Scripture as a regeneration, being born again, born of God, begotten again, being translated; and other figures are used to represent the same thing.

This becoming in possession of eternal life is called being baptized into Christ, because a true baptism signifies that the one baptized is dead to sin, has become dead to sin, and is alive unto God. So, in becoming in possession of eternal life one dies and is made alive at the same time—they are become dead to sin and alive unto God at the same time. So, to be baptized into Christ is to be killed to sin, killed to the love of sin, and made alive in Christ. It is to be raised up into a state of life in Christ. This baptism is not a water baptism. It is a baptism of the Holy Spirit. John, who baptized the Saviour and those in the region of Jordan, said of Jesus, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."

The Apostle Paul, in **(I Corinthians 12:13)**, says, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." To be baptized into one body is to be baptized into Christ; it is to be baptized into the body Christ. The redeemed of the Lord are represented as being the body of Christ. To be baptized into the body of Christ, or into Christ, is to be brought into the family of the redeemed, or

into the heavenly or spiritual family. This is not done by many preachers, but by one Spirit; it is a work of the Holy Spirit.

There is a washing in baptism. In water baptism there is an outward washing which is a symbol or figure of the inward washing by the Holy Spirit. The baptism or washing of the Holy Spirit is an inward work, and it is the work which brings us into a saved state, or into Christ, or the body of Christ. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour. "--(Titus 3:5-6). In this text it is expressed as the "washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." It is a work of washing or cleansing by the Holy Ghost. So by one Spirit we are baptized into one body, baptized into Christ. In this work the Holy Spirit comes in direct touch or immediate contact with the heart. In water baptism, the outward washing, the water comes in direct touch or immediate contact with the body or person baptized. So in the - inward washing or cleansing, the Holy Spirit comes in direct touch or immediate contact with the heart or soul. C. H. C.

An Oversight

---July 31, 1917

In the last two issues of the paper there were some appointments for Elder C. A. Clemmons, sent us by himself, in the bounds of the Fellowship Association. These appointments were inserted without being called to our attention. We are sorry that it becomes necessary for us to say anything about this people in our columns; but the publishing of these appointments make it absolutely necessary, as we see it. This association declares non-fellowship for the Mt. Zion, Powell's Valley, Sequachee Valley, Mud Creek, Flint River, Hillabee and Wetumpka Associations. In fact, they declare non-fellowship for everything north, west and south of them. Elder Clemmons baptized a preacher who had been excluded from the Sequachee Valley Association. That is, he baptized the man when he stood excluded from a church in that association. The Fellowship Association appears to have the wrong name. The name Non-Fellowship Association appears to be more befitting them. As to whether they are in proper condition or not, we merely refer our readers to the little pamphlet entitled "Church Order," which may be had from this office at the price of one copy for 15 cents, or two for 25 cents. The advertisement of this pamphlet appears often in our columns. We would be glad for every Baptist in the land to read it.% C. H. C.

McARTHUR SQUEALS

---August 14, 1917

In the August, 1917, issue of the Pilgrim's Banner Elder J. T. McArthur rants on us and our people at a considerable rate on account of our copying the extract from his account of his visit as published in the July issue of that paper and the short comment we made on the same. Elder McArthur now charges our people with all sorts of disorder, crime, and ungodly conduct. Now we care little for his ranting, nor for his charge. Of course, all reasonable and sensible people will know that all his charges are true, because Elder McArthur and his people are anxious to get among our people and to get recognition by them. If our people are so ungodly, and we are such reprobate sinners, why do Elder McArthur and his people seem to be so anxious to get among them, and why are they so anxious for our people to recognize them? If our people are such corrupt profligates as Elder McArthur

represents them to be, why does Elder McArthur want to visit them, and preach among them? Truly, "The legs of the lame are unequal."

We care not for his ranting. We have said all that we care to say now concerning him and his people. We do not care so much about the course of Elder McArthur and his people now, anyway, as they are separate from orderly Baptists, and have no recognition by them, and it was not so much the movements of Elder McArthur that we wanted our people to know about, as it was what others were doing. "Requiscat in pace," Elder McArthur. C. H. C.

Will Not Publish

---August 14, 1917

We hereby serve notice that we will not publish any more appointments for any of those brethren who' are going around among the churches riding a hobby on regeneration, and how much of the man is a child of God, and that the body of the child of God is still under the law of sin and condemnation like the alien sinner, and who are stirring up strife and confusion among the brethren on these things. We say we will not publish any more appointments for any of these brethren if we know it. Some of them will write and address us as "dear brother" and will then do all they can, seemingly, to injure us, and will tell that we are advocating things which we do not advocate. It seems that some are even trying to slander us, and it comes to us that some have said some very ugly things about us. We would here simply suggest that some parties might better be careful what they say. This is said for the benefit of some who are posing as preachers, and the guilty party will know who we refer to. C. H. C.

What Shall We Do?

---August 14, 1917

For quite awhile we have been pondering the question seriously, and, we trust, prayerfully, "What shall we do?" If we know our own heart our desire is to do the right thing, and to pursue the proper course. Now, here is the cause of this serious enquiry with us: Our readers know that a war has been waged for some time, and that some have been charged with advocating the whole man doctrine, or whole man change doctrine. This disturbance began in Texas, and we tried to keep the matter out of our columns. We kept silent on the matters of difference and said nothing for quite awhile, as our readers generally know very well. Because we were saying nothing some were accusing us of believing the whole man doctrine. To try to satisfy the minds of some on the matter and let all know where we stand, we wrote an article expressing our views and published the same in our columns in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of November 16, 1915. Then we had no more to say on the subject, except to refer to the matter in our introduction to volume thirty-one, for awhile. Still, some continued to charge us with things we did not believe nor advocate. They began to say we had something hid, had something behind the curtain, that we had things wrapped up, and other such charges. This continued until a number-yes, many-brethren were asking us about these things, and rather demanded, or insisted, that we come out again. Finally we were forced, seemingly, to defend our position and our course and expose some things, or else be a traitor to the cause we espoused years ago. Hence we wrote several articles under the heading of "The Curtain Raised." Then some of the parties who were charging us with having things hid behind the curtain "raised a howl" because we were speaking

out. Then we quit writing again, hoping the brethren would cease their ungodly attacks; but since we have quit having anything to say again, they have continued making attacks upon us and charging us with things which we have never believed nor advocated. As proof of this, we have but to refer to most every issue of the Trumpet for a number of months past. Almost every issue of that paper for several months has had an article making attacks upon us. We have been charged in that paper with advocating the whole man doctrine, the soul-sleeping doctrine and we hardly know what else. Recently we were accused of duplicity, even, in an article in that paper. Now, seeing all this, we have often, as stated above, seriously pondered the question, "What shall we do?" We have finally been able to reach a conclusion as to the course we should pursue.

There was an appointment for us to be at New Hope, near Milan, Tenn., on Tuesday, June 26, 1917. The appointments for the tour were published in several issues of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Elder Insko, the moderator of the association (the Big Sandy), accompanied us on part of the tour. New Hope Church is in the Big Sandy Association. We went to New Hope, according to the announcement, accompanied by Elder Insko. When the hour for service came Elder R. C. Taylor, who is joint pastor of the church (if we are not mistaken) with Elder Z. Stallings, said to us and to Elder Insko, "It is preaching time; go into the stand." Accordingly, we walked into the stand, Elder Insko going with us, and took a seat by our side. When they had finished singing that song Elder Stallings walked into the stand and said, "The time has come that we must have an understanding before we can go any further with this business." He then proceeded to state that the brethren there had had an understanding among themselves that we could not preach there until we gave our reason for not publishing some appointments which he had sent us for Elder J. M. Thompson and Elders Carter and Bishop and make apology for not publishing them, whereupon we walked down out of the stand, and Elder Insko did the same. He (Elder Stallings) stated that this was not a church act, but simply an agreement by and among some of the brethren. We stated our reasons for not publishing the appointments, which we do not deem necessary for us to state here. There was some discussion, and finally a motion was made and seconded that we be not allowed to preach in their stand until we make apology for not publishing the appointments. The motion was put to a vote. We counted nine votes for the motion and seven against it. Elder Stallings counted ten for the motion and eight against it. We were informed that one of the parties who voted for the motion was not a member of the Old Baptist Church at all, at New Hope or any other place. We suppose Elder Stallings was acquainted with all the parties voting. We asked that a copy of the motion be given us in writing, and it was finally agreed, and by motion and second, which was carried, the clerk was instructed to furnish us with a copy of the same. Up to this good hour (August 8, 1917, at 5:30 p. m.) we have not received what they agreed we should have. At the union meeting of the first district of the Big Sandy Association at Mud Creek Church, on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, July 27, 28, 29, we saw J. S. Browning, the clerk of New Hope Church, and asked him for the writing. He said that the brethren agreed at the last meeting at New Hope not to put the matter to record yet, and told him to wait about sending the writing to us. He said that this was not an act of the church, but simply an agreement among the brethren. Our readers may judge as to the good order of such proceeding. We told them that there was evidently something else wrong besides the mere fact that we did not publish the appointments. We have evidence that this is true. Now, these brethren have drawn the line against us, and we have been able to decide as to what course we would pursue. We are sorry the brethren

are determined to have war and trouble and confusion; but we can see but one of two things to do—one is to step down and out, betray the cause we love, or else we must fight and defend ourselves and defend the cause we hold sacred. We do not propose to quit the field. We do not propose to be a deserter. We do not propose to be a traitor. We do not propose to be a dastardly coward. The only thing left for us to do, then, is to fight, and make proper defense of the principles we have ever stood for since we united with the Old Baptist Church at Greenfield, Tenn., on the second Sunday in August, 1889, and which we have tried to defend since the first effort we made to speak in the name of the Master on Saturday night, January 4, 1890. We want to make our defense in the proper spirit, and with the right motive in view; still, we shall be plain and shall show no favor. We ask no favor, and shall show none. Our trust and confidence is in the good Lord, who has sustained us through many dark trials and sore conflicts. His grace has been sufficient all the way, and we yet trust Him. May His loving hand still guide, direct, and protect us, is. our humble prayer. We ask every lover of truth who reads these lines to beg the Lord in our behalf, that He may direct us aright, and enable us to go in the right, that He would protect us from the hand of the enemy, and enable us to fight the good fight of faith in the spirit of the Master, and that we may be able to rightly expose every false way, and to rightly expose every man who would sow, and is sowing, discord among brethren. God hates the man who sows discord among brethren. See **((9) (Proverbs 6:19))**. It is even an abomination unto the Lord. We trust we may never be guilty of that act, but we promise now that we will have something to say in the future. We trust that we may say it in the right spirit. C. H. C.

Elder Murray's Statement

---August 14, 1917

Below will be found a statement from Elder W. L. Murray in regard to the quotation made a few weeks ago from Elder McArthur's account of his trip in Tennessee. We also publish a statement from Brother W. A. Shutt, who was present when Elder McArthur made his first visit to College Street Church in September, 1916. The reader will note that the visit referred to in McArthur's account, which we quoted from, was in April 1917, and was his second visit to that place, made at the invitation of some of the members of that church.

We do not deem it necessary to make further comment.

Question to Elder Murray: On May 30, 1917, our brother, O. F. Cayce, wrote you asking that you make correction of a misrepresentation you made of him in the Trumpet of January 4, 1917. Why have you not made the correction? And do you intend to do it? Will you tell? C. H. C.

THE STATEMENT

In THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of July 10, 1917, appears an extract from Elder J. T. McArthur's account of a trip he made in Tennessee, as published in Pilgrim's Banner. From Elder McArthur's account of his trip one would think he received a very cordial welcome at College Street Church, in Nashville, Tenn. I was present at his appointment at this church, and I know whereof I speak. He was given what I consider a very cold reception. Dr. Stephens announced the appointment the third Sunday night in April, the appointment being for the Tuesday night following. I was present when the appointment was announced. I knew Elder McArthur was in disorder. I felt, however, that the members present were not informed as to his standing, although he had been there once before in company with another elder, at which time it was reported that he was in disorder. So I felt that it would not be

best to protest publicly at that time, but that it would be proper to inform the members privately of his standing. This, I proceeded to do as opportunity afforded; however, I did not advise anyone not to go to hear Elder McArthur preach. So he filled his appointment, and was met by a congregation of eight persons, only four of them were members of that church. On being informed who Elder McArthur was, and that he was the man who had been there once before in company with Elder Pinkstaff, one sister called some of the other members and advised them not to go to hear him, so I was informed afterwards.

After services I returned home in company with one of the brethren who was present, he being the clerk of the church. We had not gone far until he told me that he did not like such preaching. The other brother who was present said the same thing, later. The next night being prayer meeting night Elder McArthur came back. He was invited to do so by a brother who was not a member of that church. As opportunity afforded I talked to the members of the church privately, and informed them as to Elder McArthur's standing among the Baptists. Then at the June conference I mentioned the matter publicly, calling their attention to the fact that Elder McArthur had been affiliating with the disorderly faction of the Sequachee Valley Association, and therefore, it was not expedient for them to receive him into their house. It was suggested by one of the members at this conference that the church take some action against Elder McArthur preaching there any more. And, if I had urged it, I feel assured that the church would have passed a resolution to that effect, but I told them that I didn't suppose it was necessary to do that. It was agreed, however, if he sent another appointment that he would be informed that he was not wanted.

Now, I know this is a correct statement of the matter. So, the reader may judge for himself how "kindly" Elder McArthur was received by College Street Church. After referring to me and other ministers whom he had met in Tennessee, Elder McArthur said, "I visited the home of all the above named elders while in Tennessee and was very cordially received by them and their brethren." Now, I say emphatically that this statement is incorrect. He did not visit my home; and that isn't all: he was not invited to go to my home. I have made this statement that those who read it may know the truth of the matter, and the present attitude of College Street Church toward Elder McArthur. Hoping that this will be satisfactory to our good brethren everywhere, I am your unworthy brother in hope,
W. L. MURRAY

Nashville, Tenn.

BROTHER SHUTT'S STATEMENT

Elder C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother-On September 11th and 12th, 1916, Elders W. A. Pinkstaff and J. T. McArthur preached at College Street Church at night, and were heartily received by Elder J. B. Stephens and the rest of the members of the above named church, and were invited to come back and to give them an appointment whenever they could. A number of the members of Bethel Church were present at both meetings, and upon our arrival at the church house we saw Elder Pinkstaff walking up and down the sidewalk in front of the church. I went in the house and there met Elder McArthur and sat down by him and asked him where he had been, and he informed me that he had been to the Elk River Association. I asked him what preachers were present, and he told me that only the home preachers were there. I asked him who they were and he said that they were Elders Pinkstaff, Woodfin, Willis, and himself being the only visiting preacher present. I told him I had heard of all these except himself. I asked him if they came direct from the Elk River meeting to Nashville,

and he said, no, that they stopped over at Murfreesboro. I asked him if they had meeting at Overalls Church near Murfreesboro, and he said no, that they went out to Brother Willis' church, New Providence. Then he asked me where Brother Pinkstaff was, and I informed him that he was outside the church walking up and down the sidewalk. He got up and went out, saying he wanted to see Brother Pinkstaff a minute. When he went out I informed the brethren and sisters present who were members of College Street Church that these men were not in line with our Baptists, that they had just come from the Elk River Association, and that the Elk River had no correspondence except the Red River Association, and that the Red River and the Elk River people were all mixed up with secret orders, Absoluters, Progressives, and everything else, but they went ahead and preached them after being warned about them, and they also preached them the following night. Elder Pinkstaff said in his discourse that "God had to raise a man above the law before He could save him," and Elder McArthur said, "The righteousness of Jesus Christ would not take any man to heaven."

It being circulated around over the city that these men were not in order and that they were from among the Absoluters and Progressive element, they took up quite a bit of time defending themselves as to the absolute doctrine, branding it as a false report, but did not say they were not Progressives. The first night after meeting, these men wanted to meet the preaching brethren of the city, saying they understood there were some of them in the city. Elder J. B. Stephens arose and said, "They meant they wanted to meet with Elders Womack and Stansel, which was right; the preachers ought to visit each other more than they do." Now you remember Stansel was excluded from College Street Church a few years ago, when he with several more declared non-fellowship for College Street Church, and was afterwards received by the Absoluters and was ordained by them to the work of the ministry, and Elder Womack is known far and wide as being an Absoluter, and is pastor of the University Street Church that was dropped from the Cumberland Association a few years ago. Sister Erwin and I were talking to McArthur and asked him if he was in fellowship with Elder Ranks, of Georgia, as we understood he was from the same state, and he said he was not. I told him that the Cayce, Ranks, Morris, and Hassell line of Baptists were the only ones that we recognized here in this country, and he informed us that when he had to tie up with any certain line of Baptists in order to be recognized as an orderly Baptist he would get out of the ranks. McArthur told Sister Erwin he would like to visit Bethel Church sometime and preach for us, but we never gave him any invitation, as we only want sound preaching among us. We have no time for the Progressives, Absoluters, secret order, nor any other kind of preachers that are not in line with the sound element of Baptists. We do not want any dissecting tables set up in our little church, and if anyone comes along and sets up one to dissect man on, we will certainly kick the legs out from under it in a very few minutes. We only want to be plain, true-blue Old Baptists, not wanting anything preached that is calculated to cause discord among the brethren. Yours in a sweet hope of brighter days,
908 Acklen Avenue,
Nashville, Tenn.
W. A. SHUTT.

Made Acknowledgment

---August 21, 1917

Last week we told of the action of New Hope Church, near Milan, Tenn., in forbidding us preaching in their stand. On August 9th they had conference and the

church confessed her wrong and asked our forgiveness and the forgiveness of any others who might be offended at what she had done. So far as we are personally concerned they are forgiven, and we think the confession will be satisfactory to Martin Church. We make this statement in justice to New Hope Church, and also because we are glad that they have seen the error of their course and act. If all who have done wrong would confess their wrongs, and all would mutually forgive, and bear with each other, it might not be such a hard matter to settle troubles.
C. H. C.

Explanation by Elder Ross

---August 21, 1917

Elsewhere in this paper will be found an explanation from Elder A. B. Ross, in which he proposes to tell how he became associated with Elder McArthur. We do not care to go into detail in the discussion of this matter, as it is unnecessary. We publish Elder Ross' statement, and the readers can judge for themselves. We would only call attention to the fact that Elder Ross admits that he casually remarked that maybe he would go to Georgia sometime. This was said to Elder McArthur when that elder requested him to visit the Progressives in Georgia. This is equivalent to an admission that he left the impression on the mind of Elder McArthur that he would visit his people sometime. It is evident, too, that he left the impression on the mind of Elder McArthur that he would visit them sometime, or else Elder McArthur would not have said what he did. Elder McArthur seemed to think it probable that Elder Ross would visit them this fall. This looks like something more than the casual remark was made that he might visit Georgia sometime. The reader will take notice, too, that Elder Ross admits that he was suspicious that Elder McArthur was not in order before he made the appointment for him at Shiloh. The following is a letter we received from Elder Lee Hanks, written July 12, 1917:
ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

My Dear Brother and Fellow Laborer in the Church of God-I deeply regret to see some that are determined to have division. I have written privately and publicly and labored most tenderly for peace. At the suggestion of Elder Oliphant I wrote that "Basis of Union," hoping to unify our people thereby. I have felt all the while that we are one people, and that those lines were wrong to be drawn between precious brethren. I still feel that we are brethren and ought to be together. I regretted to see those lines drawn in Texas and division brought on over minor differences. On the grand essentials we are one people. Divisions are so destructive to our peace and the welfare of Zion. Two years ago when I was in Tennessee I found the good Baptists there sweetly united in love. They loved you and you loved them. All received me so kindly. I shall never forget them. I was at the home of Elder A. B. Ross and visited his churches, and he and his churches received me most cordially. He told me at his home that Elder Sarrels' book on regeneration should be replied to-that he did not want it numbered among Old Baptist literature. He condemned it, and spoke of writing to Elder Stallings on this line. The Trumpet came while I was there; he threw it down, and one of the children tore it. He seemed to me to look upon the Trumpet with disgust on account of their extreme measures. He told me he wanted to come to our country in the early fall of 1915 and visit a number of associations in company with Elder Newman. He wanted to take the tour with Elder Newman, and wanted Elder Newman to go through his section of Tennessee, and assured me lie endorsed him and would gladly make his appointments. It was a surprise to me recently to see Elder Ross has now received

and preached a Progressive minister who is not in fellowship with orderly Baptists here at all. I like him as a man and Christian, but could no more recognize his order than I could the Missionaries, until he sets himself right. And then notice the Progressive minister went with the Kirkland church and the Arminian secret order excluded Kirkland faction of East Tennessee and helped ordain a minister for them. Of course that is his business. I met Elders W. L. Murray, A. B. Ross, J. C. Ross and Z. Stallings on my tour, who treated me kindly and brotherly. I am sorry to see them drifting away. I am sure you are advocating the same doctrine today you did the first time I met you. Your sainted father took a bold stand against the Wallingford-Smoot doctrine of no-change, hollow log, etc., about thirty years ago, which gave us trouble then. Elders Respass, your father, Bentley, Chick, Gold. Mitchell, Henderson, J. J. Byrd, Tharp, Biggs and I condemned that doctrine then, as you have shown from their articles. I am sorry to see a spirit that "you have got to say everything like I do or be denounced." W~ should not make a brother an offender for a word. We have no popes in the Old Baptist Church. We are brethren; and preachers belong to the church, and not the church to them. Elders Webb and Newman came through our country preaching, and both preached good sound doctrine then. Neither one came among us riding hobbies. (We think Elder Webb's visit to that country was several years ago.--C. H. C.) I am sure all the good brethren in your country and Texas, too, endorse the sentiment in that "Basis of Union," if they will lay down prejudice. I wish all would accept it and let us all live in peace. We are brethren and should strive for things that make for peace. I pray that God may save His poor afflicted people from division. Yours in hope,
LEE HANKS.

This letter above shows very plainly where A. B. Ross stood when Elder Hanks visited this country in the spring of 1915. But this is not all. When Elder Hanks was at our place on that tour he told us of the contemplated visit of Elder A. B. Ross to Georgia with Elder Newman. As we knew that the weather was more likely to be good in Georgia in November and December than in this country, and thinking it would be better for Elder Newman to come here in September and October and then be in Georgia in November and December on account of the weather, we suggested to our brother (O. F. Cayce) that he write Elder Ross in regard to the matter, which he did on May 25, 1915, as follows:

ELDER A. B. ROSS:

Dear Brother-You remember me letting you have a copy of Elder Sarrels' book, "The Bible Doctrine of Regeneration?" I intended to ask you what you thought of it every time I would see you but never could think of it. I guess you have read it. Please write me what you think about it. I will appreciate it. I am reading it closely now, and think I will finish it soon.

Brother Hanks told me that Elder J. S. Newman is going to visit his country this fall, and said that he and you had something to say about him coming through here. What do you think about it? Brother and Brother Phillips say they would be glad to have him. If he were to come do you think it would be a good idea to get him during the meeting of the associations if we can? And then have him visit the churches too?

Please let me hear from you about both the above things.

We are depending on you to be with us at our next meeting, as I understand you promised Brother Phillips you would. Be sure not to fail us. Your brother, O. F. CAYCE

In reply to that letter the following was received, which is dated May 27, 1915:

MR O. F. CAYCE:

Dear Brother-In reply to yours of the 25th will say that I think some of Elder Sarrels' expressions are far-fetched. If I understand him I cannot endorse his position; in fact, I do not believe his writing can be harmonized. Yes, I think it all right for Brother Newman to visit this country. I favor it, though I do not think that he can be here during our associational meetings, as I think he is to be in Georgia at that time. I told Brother Ranks that I thought I would visit his country at the same time Brother Newman is to be there, and we would arrange for Brother Newman to come back home with me, though I do not yet know whether I will go or not. Anything you may do regarding his coming will please me. I do not know of a man who I had rather would visit us than Brother Newman. Yes, I intend (D. V) to be with you next meeting. Amos to start this afternoon to the Obion union meeting.

Fraternally,

A. Bunyan Ross.

The following letter dated May 28, 1915, was sent in reply to this letter:

Elder A. B. Ross:

Dear Brother-Your letter of yesterday was received this morning. I showed it to Brother Claud, and when he read it he told me to write you to make no arrangements to leave our association this fall until after our association meets. He talked to Brother Hanks about Brother Newman coming and Brother Hanks agreed for him to come here first and be at our corresponding associations and then go from here to his (Brother Hanks') section of country. Brother intends to take the round with Brother Newman and tells me to ask you to be sure to wait until after our associations are over and then go to Georgia if you want to, as (he says) every one of our ministers will be needed this fall because it is a critical time in some sections and we want to try to keep every bit of trouble and extreme views out of this section. He also asks that you please do your best to attend all our corresponding associations that you can. It is his intention now to be at all of them but perhaps one-the Big Sandy. He can't be there as he is under promise to go to two associations in the north, one of them on the fifth Sunday⁹in August and the other the first Sunday in September. He will go from the Highland to the one that meets the fifth in August. After being in Indiana on the first Sunday in September he intends to come back here and go with Brother Newman on part of his round at least.

Say, suppose you make your arrangements to go to Georgia with Brother Newman after our association, instead of before? I know you would enjoy it. Brother also says that the last of October and in November is a much better time to go to Georgia than it is to come here. What do you say?

Of course we haven't got Brother Newman's promise to come here at all, but we are both writing him today, and I ask that you please write him also. I believe it would do good for him to come, and you know the more invitations he has the more he will feel like we really want him. Can't you write him? His address is Elder J. S. Newman, McGirk, Texas.

Amos glad you are making your arrangements to be with us next meeting. Don't forget that I am expecting you to spend one night at least with me. I have some correspondence that I want to show you.

Please let me hear from you further about the above matters.

Your brother in hope,

O. F. CAYCE.

The next reply was a postal card addressed to Elder C. H. Cayce, dated June 1, 1915. The contents of the card shows that Elder Ross wrote us something before in

regard to one Mr. Morgan with whom he had held a discussion at Shiloh, near Dresden, Tenn., and that Elder Ross wanted another debate with Mr. Morgan. The following is what Elder Ross said:

ELDER C.H.CAYCE:

Dear Brother-The reason I wrote you about Morgan was because he said in one of his letters to me that he was not afraid to meet me nor our champion Cayce. In reply I told him that our people would want an abler man than he was to meet our champion Cayce; that if he would call out Hardman we would call out Cayce, and they could take up the propositions that we (Morgan and myself) discussed at Shiloh, as I could not get him to repeat the discussion with me I sent in the propositions to him, but cannot get him into it. I sent your book today. I wish for you victory in your debate. Wish I could be with you. I will write Brother Newman and try to get him to come during our associational meetings and put off my trip to Georgia later.

In hope,

A. B. Ross.

Now, the above correspondence speaks for itself. No comment is necessary. It shows very plainly where A. B. Ross stood up to June 1, 1915, if he was honest and sincere in what he wrote. Perhaps all this was only a "casual remark," as he states with reference to what he said to Elder McArthur. Not only does this show where Elder A. B. Ross stood at that time, but it also shows that we were not working secretly, as has been charged. The following is a letter dated July 26, 1916, which speaks for itself:

ELDER JOHN FUQUA:

Precious Brother-

You will find enclosed a copy of a letter written by Brother O. F. Cayce to Elder John R. Daily and Elder Daily's reply, which speaks for itself. We are aware of the fact that they are trying to hide the real issue, and thus mislead good brethren. They may succeed in this for awhile, but I am sure the Lord knows and that Revelation will make it manifest. Brother John, no man is more grieved over this sad state of affairs than I am, but we are not the aggressors in this fight. We have only acted in the defense. We stand just where we have always stood, and where the Primitive Baptists have stood from time immemorial. Elder Cayce set in to turn the Primitive Baptists of this country and the south to the Newman faction in Texas, and to down the Webb and Redford side in Texas. The real issue is that the Newman side is, and has been, teaching that the body of the child of God is changed in regeneration. We do not believe that the body is yet changed, but it will be in the resurrection. Elder Potter wrote a pamphlet in the year 1895 against the whole man change theory, and he says on page 50, "He simply believes that to have the Spirit of Christ is to have Christ in you. And if Christ be in you, we do not think that it necessarily follows that the body is quickened, for although He be in you, the body is dead because of sin, for it has undergone no change, and although the body is dead, and the spirit is the very opposite." This quotation from Elder Potter expresses what we believe. I call attention to another quotation from Elder Potter that I am sure is applicable at this time, page 56, "For those who advocate the error to say, that if we oppose them we will stir up strife, is to simply ask us to be quiet until the error - has such a hold on us that we cannot shake it loose." Brother John, if we sit still and let an error get a hold on our people, are we faithful? Has it not always been the case that those who introduced error into the Old Baptist ranks have tried to keep the main issue in the background until they can get a hold? Error will always

find followers. Our association stands just where she has always stood, and by the grace of God we expect to stand there. We shall be very sorry if any of our brethren are misled and thereby turned against us; but time will bring to light. We are not uneasy about our brethren turning against us that understand the real situation. Brother Claud has been at work on this privately for some time before we knew it. After I found it out I said to him more than once, "Let's not bring the Texas trouble here." When he was wanting to bring Newman here I told him, "Let's not invite either one to come here." That was last summer. The Newman side in Texas found out that he stood with them on the subject of regeneration before we did. They knew it when he took Elder Redford off of the editorial staff, but at that time we did not know it. We thought he did it to keep the Texas trouble away; but if that was it why did he put M. W. Miracle, a Newman man, on? It is true they are not having much to say on the subject in the P. B., but they boost the Newman side in Texas, who are coming out on the subject in the P. B. Signal, a paper published by J. L. Collings in Texas. Now, my dear brother, don't be misled in this matter. I wish I could see you. I wish you could be at our union, which meets next Friday. Brother Fuqua, I know that there is an effort being made to make it appear that there is a spirit of jealousy in this association, but there isn't a word of truth in it. I want you to come to our association this fall. You will find us just where we have been all the time, and I feel sure we will have no trouble in our association. Elder A. B. Ross and I are sending you some extracts from both sides which present the real difference, and which also clear up some misrepresentations with respect to a man being a better man after regeneration. It has also been told that child of God in body does not render service to God. Now, my brother, we believe that the child of God renders service

P. S.-Write me soon.

The above letter, as stated, was dated July 26, 1916. In this we are charged with dishonesty, and working secretly. And we are also charged with falsifying. We have stated more than once that we discontinued the Southwestern Department, edited by Elder Redford, in order to try to keep the matter out of our columns. Article after article had been sent us for the paper from Texas. The last straw was the declaration of non-fellowship against all who hold that the body is a part of the real child of God. The name of Elder Sarrels was signed to that declaration as moderator of the church. Long after that declaration was passed Elder Sarrels wrote us that he knew of no one who had said such a thing. He advocated the same idea in his book on regeneration. As we have stated before, so we state again, that when we got Elder Miracle to edit The Good Old Songs Department we did not know which side of the Texas affair he was on, or whether he was on either side. We did not know, and we did not ask him. After that department was started, we learned that Elder Miracle was proposing to be neutral, and not taking sides at all. He continued thus neutral until the Webb and Redfordites drove him to speak out to defend himself, just as the Rosses have done us here in Tennessee. These things we know to be facts, and Elder Ross knew that we had so said when he wrote the above letter; and hence, a charge that we had lied. As to the charge that we were working secretly, we have only to say that Elder Ross knows that we are not of the sneaking kind. All people who know us are very well aware of the fact that we are inclined to be open and candid in what we do. They know that it is not our make-up to do things in an underhand way. Elder Ross knows that this charge is absolutely untrue and without foundation. It simply had its origin in his vain imagination and the wicked spirit by which he is being governed in this affair. We are sorry that this is true, but we must say that it is a fact, however much we may deplore it. We would be glad if he would lay this matter down, and retract his wrong statements and pursue a godly course in his future life.

Again: Elder Ross says that he said to us, "Let's not bring the Texas trouble here." Let it be remembered that Elders S. N. Redford and J. G. Webb had both recently been to this country, and that they had the trouble up in Texas when they were here. Not only so, but they have continually affiliated with the Webb party. Note that in the Webbite papers they are continually being requested to visit this country. This is clear evidence and positive proof that the brethren, Elders J. C. and A. B. Ross, were not really for the position herein intimated-of having nothing to do with either side; but that they really wanted to line up with and recognize only the Webb and Redford side of the affair. The reader will note, too, and please remember, that this is in the face of what Elder A. B. Ross said in his correspondence with us in the year 1915. Elder A. B. Ross may say that he was deceived, and that he did not understand the matter as to what is being taught by the Newman side, as Elder J. C. Ross terms them. But Elder A. B. Ross went with us to Rock Springs in the year 1915 and read an article to us which he said he was writing to the Signal. He said that he had been requested to go on the editorial staff of the Signal, and that he had decided to do so, and was writing an article for that paper stating his belief on the question that was agitating the minds of the brethren in Texas. We know that the sentiment he read to us, which he said was his article, was the same sentiment we have held to and advocated all the time, and which we hold to now, and which he now denounces as the whole man doctrine. If we believe the whole man doctrine now, he believed it then, if he told us the truth. Now, he may take either horn of the dilemma which he chooses. If he believed then what he said he did, and does not believe what we do now, then he has changed, for we now believe what he said was his belief then. So, no difference what Elder A. B. Ross may say regarding the matter, his contention is untrue, one way or the other. The reader will also note that Elder J. C. Ross virtually denies that any believed or advocate the idea that the child of God does not serve God in, or with, the body. Now, we are sure that he has been a reader of the Trumpet all this while, and also that he has read Elder Sarrels' book on regeneration. We haven't the space to take up these matters in this issue, but we will show later on what some of them have advocated. We make no charge against them as to what they have advocated along this line, but what we can produce in black and white from their own pens. In a recent issue of the Trumpet is a long article from Elder A. B. Ross, in which he takes us to task for the article published concerning his affiliation with Elder McArthur, and then he also says some other things. This article was sent to the Trumpet after we had told him that we would give space for his explanation of the matter, and against the advice of Elder J. N. Wallace, of Providence, Ky. Elder Wallace told us that he tried to get Elder Ross not to send that article off for publication. We will pay some attention to it later on. One more thing we wish to state in this article is that we were in Georgia and Alabama in the latter part of June and the first of July, 1915. We went there understanding that Elder A. B. Ross wanted Elder Newman to come to this country, according to his statements in the letters published above. We had no idea but what it would be agreeable with Elder J. C. Ross also. But when we returned home, after having had an agreement and understanding with Elder Newman and the brethren who were to arrange appointments in the south, that he would be excused from that country in September and October to visit our section, we found the Elders Ross raising a great and strong objection to Elder Newman coming to this section. When we learned about this, we wrote Elder Newman that there were objections to his coming, and requested him not to come. We also wrote Elder Hanks, who had the arranging of his tour in that country in hand, to go ahead and

arrange for him in that country. This, remember,"in the face of the correspondence published above. This shows whether we were trying to bring trouble here or not. We are giving space to these things in order that our readers may know precisely how some matters have been, and how we have tried to have no war with these brethren, and what we have had to bear from them. We know that they have hurt themselves, but we have to make some defense now or be traitors, as we said in last week's paper.

Again we ask an interest in the prayers of all our truth-loving readers. C. H. C.
ELDER ROSS' STATEMENT

Inasmuch as I have been shown up in the wrong light by Elder C. H. Cayce in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of July 10th, no doubt because he did not understand the situation, I now offer the following explanation:

That in April, about the 9th, I received a letter from Elder McArthur, from Springfield, Tenn., asking that I send him my views on the subject of regeneration; also, a minute of our association. Mind you, this is the first time I ever heard of Elder McArthur. I sent as per request my views on regeneration, also the minute. On Sunday following, after preaching at Little Zion, my regular appointment, Brother Tyson, who is a member of Palmersville Church, which we have no connection with, had me to announce an appointment for Elder McArthur, of Georgia, at that church the following Sunday, the 4th. Remember, this is the first that I knew that Elder McArthur was from Georgia, nor did I yet know of a certainty that he was the same who had written me. When I arrived at home Sunday afternoon I found a letter from Elder McArthur, written from Murfreesboro, Tenn., in which he stated that he was preaching through Tennessee and would be at my town, Dresden, on Thursday morning on the early train, and that he was going to stop off and stay over with me a day or two, and that if I thought advisable I could have an appointment for him at Shiloh Thursday, and one at Little Zion Friday. I now became uneasy about his standing, as I had announced the appointment for him at Palmersville Church, which is in line with the Progressives, and with which we have no connection whatever. Not knowing what to do, and not desiring to misjudge an elder till I knew his standing, I went to Elder J. B. Halbrook for advice, and stated to him just as I have stated above. He advised that I let him come on, that perhaps Elder McArthur had met Elder Kirkland, pastor of the Palmersville Church, and did not know he and his church was in disorder, and as I did not know Elder McArthur's standing if he proved to be a Progressive I would not be to blame for respecting him. So, I made an appointment for him at Shiloh, but none at Little Zion. So he came Thursday and preached, and spent the night in my home. After we came home from church I told Elder McArthur all about the standing of Palmersville Church, that we considered her and her pastor, Elder J. J. Kirkland, in disorder, and that we had no connection whatever with her. When Elder McArthur took his leave next morning he insisted that he and his people had been badly misrepresented, and that he would be glad if I could come and see for myself, to which I casually remarked: That maybe I would come to Georgia sometime, with no thought under the sun of ever visiting Elder McArthur's people. Hence, the write-up by Elder Cayce. My brethren at home know just how this is, and that I have stated the truth, and that I have always opposed errors of all shades. Neither are they uneasy about my yoking up with any disorderly faction.

In conclusion will say to my brethren at large, If I have made a mistake tell me, and I am willing and ready to make amends. What I did I did ignorantly.

In hope,"
A. B. Ross

Dresden, Tenn.

A False Statement

---August 28, 1917

In the Baptist Trumpet of July 19, 1917, the following statement appears. We copy the letter in full, so that our readers may have the whole thing:

Inasmuch as Elder C. H. Cayce is denying a departure and is lining up with Elders Newman and Hull and their followers of Texas, I feel called upon to make the following statement, that the brethren may see his departure. That after attending the Forked Deer Association in 1913 (while Elder Redford was in this country), while on my way from Brother Arnold's home to the train, accompanied by Elders C. H. Cayce and John Grist, Brethren O. F. Cayce and Arnold, the question of the whole man change doctrine, as advocated by Elders Hull and Newman (for it is a fact that Elder Hull was the first to advocate it, and later taken up by Elder Newman) was discussed, and that Elder Grist remarked during the conversation that a number of brethren would not have it, and then, referring to me, said, "There sits (we were all in the hack) an old brother now that will not have it." To which I replied, "Yes, I am here to fight it whenever it springs up." Elder Cayce then said, "Hush, now brethren, hush (putting - his hand over Brother Grist's mouth), it is not time for it yet; it is the truth but the brethren must be educated to it." During this association Brother O. F. Cayce said to me, "Who ever heard of a man being born again in part?" Because I contended that man was born in spirit or soul, I asked, if this is, and has been the doctrine of our people all along, why not time for it? Why must our people be educated to it? Why is it now causing so much trouble? I am old now, about ready for the grave, I have been a Baptist almost half a century, and I do know that the doctrine of body change as held by Elder Newman is not, nor never has been Old Baptist doctrine; and what these brethren can hope to gain by trying to force it into recognition to the division and destruction of the churches, I cannot understand. I know the brethren in this part who have espoused the cause of Elders Hull and Newman, deny believing their whole man change theory, to which I will reply, a man is known by the company he keeps; and the best way to convince the brethren that you do not believe it, is to quit trying to force into recognition those whose expressions certainly teach (regardless of their denial) that they do believe it. I might be ever so sound in the doctrine of truth, but try to force into recognition the modern Missionary doctrine, I would be just as guilty of the trouble caused by it as though I was advocating the Missionary doctrine. If you do not believe the whole man doctrine, why such expressions: "Who ever heard tell of a man being born again in part, soul or spirit?" It is an evident fact that man is born again in part, or he is born again in his entirety. In your denying man being born again in part (soul or spirit only) you affirm that he is born again in his complexity.

May the dear Lord save His children from every false way and the snares of designing men. Your old worn out brother in a sweet hope,"

W. T. JACKSON.

Fulton, Ky.

Now, go back and read that statement again. What do you think of THAT? Right here, once and for all, we will most positively and emphatically say that no such conversation we ever had. W. T. Jackson, and no other man, woman, or child, ever heard such a conversation between us and Elder John Grist, or between us and any

other person, living or dead. Besides that, we are told that Brother Arnold says he did not go with us to the train from that association. He sent his son with us, so we are told that he has said. Write to Brother James Arnold, Bradford, Tenn., and ask him, if you want to know whether he went with us, or if he sent his son. And ask him if he ever heard such a conversation. We have not asked him a thing about it. But we do know that no such conversation was ever had. It seems to us that if age would have anything to do with it W. T. Jackson is getting almost old enough to learn better than to make such statements as this. But it seems that some people never learn to tell the truth. And it seems that some 'people advocate the idea that the body is still under the law of sin and death, and is still in the same condition as the alien sinner, and then try to prove their doctrine to be true by their conduct and course of life, and by the things they say. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."-(Matthew 12:34). A man is known by the company he keeps, and he is also known by the words that he speaks. May the good, Lord pity and have mercy on those who would thus falsely accuse - and falsely charge their fellow men, is our humble prayer.

Elder John Grist read the article in the Trumpet and wrote us the following letter concerning the same:

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother-I see an article in the Baptist Trumpet of July 19th, 1917, over the signature of W. T. Jackson, in which he says he feels called upon to show that Elder C. H. Cayce is denying a departure and lining up with Elders Newman and Hull, then makes reference to a trip with myself and Elder C. H. Cayce, O. F. Cayce and Brother Arnold from Harmony Church to the train. He says that the question of whole man change doctrine was discussed, and that Elder Grist remarked during the conversation that a number of brethren would not have it and referred to him, to which he says he replied, "Yes, I am here to fight it whenever it springs up." "Elder Cayce then said, 'Hush, now brethren, hush,' (putting his hand over my mouth) 'it is not time for it yet; it is the truth, but the brethren must be educated to it.'

When I read the above I could but wonder if it was only a dream, for I surely know that I never heard such a conversation in my life, neither has any man ever put his hand over my mouth to stop me; and I further know that Elder Cayce has ever agreed with me that in being born again the flesh of the alien sinner (to speak of it in an abstract sense) is not changed, nor have I ever heard a man claim that it was. Also, I will further say that I never heard it preached by Elder Hull. I have heard him preach more than any man I have ever met. I could not tell how many times I have heard him say publicly that the flesh is not changed in regeneration. So I ask, what in the world is the matter?

I close, in love to all,
JOHN GRIST
Friendship, Tenn.

Elder Newman has stated, time and again in public print, that he does not believe that the flesh is changed in regeneration. He has said that he believes that the man's life is changed, and that regeneration makes a bad man a good man, that it makes men better, and so on. Elder Newman has been falsely accused, as we have. But he is able to take care of himself. Those who accuse him, as a rule, know that their charges are untrue, just as W. T. Jackson knows that the above statement is not true. We know that it is not true, and we know that he knows it. If his church is faithful, and desire to retain none but truthful people in their fellowship, they will see after this case and attend to it accordingly. We shall see what we shall see. No

further statement from us is necessary at this time. We will only add that this is a sample of some statements that are made by some others concerning us. Our readers may know by this something of the way some folks are doing who are accusing us of advocating the whole man doctrine and of believing the soul-sleeping doctrine.

May the Lord pity them, and enable us to "bear all things." "C. H. C.

HAIR AND RAIL SPLITTERS

---September 4, 1917

We are in receipt of a letter from a dear brother in a distant state which contains the following language:

I have been greatly interested in the controversy among you brethren in Tennessee and Texas, and I have read your statement in the last week's issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST stating what you will do. I hope your course is for the best, but I don't know. I love you, and pray that God may direct you. I would be so glad to see peace and union again among the brethren; and I hope a division may not result. I think it so uncalled for, if I rightly understand the contention over the doctrine of regeneration. I endorse your article on that question, and I think most Baptists would, and to me it seems to be more a war of words than of principle, when the brethren really understand each other. Can't you get some of your "hair-splitting" brethren to quit that business and go to splitting rails? I believe it would be better.

We have been trying to get them to quit the "hairsplitting" business. We had not suggested for them to go to splitting rails. We are sure it would be better for them and better for the cause if they would follow this suggestion.

We are sorry of the trouble, and have been pleading for peace; but our pleadings have been to no avail. Some of them have said that the man who pleads for peace is always in the wrong. We heard this statement made in a discourse delivered by one of them, and the statement was sanctioned by others of them who were present. We thought of the statement made by the apostle, "Be at peace among yourselves."-(Th 5:13) (I Thessalonians 5:13). And "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord."-(Hebrews 12:14). And "The fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace."-[\(James 3:18\)](#). We wondered if Jesus was wrong, or if He had the wrong name applied to Him. The prophet said, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace."-((9:6) (Isaiah 9:6). We thought of other passages of similar import, and which are along the same line. We love peace in the nation, in the state, in the county, in the civil district, in the town, in the neighborhood, and in the home. We do not love war. But some of these brethren have said that nothing but a division would satisfy them. We have not wished for either a war or a division. Neither have we wished to "ride a hobby" on regeneration, or any other question. We have not been disposed to "make a brother an offender for a word." We have been willing to allow each brother the privilege of expressing his views in his own language. But we are not allowed that privilege. Unless we accept every word that they use, and use the same words to express our views that they use, then, in their esteem, we are heretics. If we had such a disposition as that, and were to conduct ourselves in that manner, would it be less than high-handed presumption? Would it be any worse for us to be that way than for others to?

When these brethren have the matter decided and worked out to their own perfect and entire satisfaction as to just how much and what part of the man is born again, and how much and what part of him is a child of God, if any part of him is, and the whole thing is fully and satisfactorily settled, according to the plain declarations of Holy Writ, we have another question we want them to decide and settle for us. In Revelation we read of a beast that had seven heads and ten horns. We want them to give us a Scriptural and scientific answer to the question as to which head had the most horns on it. And then, when they get that question settled, we have another question for them. C. H. C.

NOT CHANGED

---September 11, 1917

The following letter was not written for publication, as the reader will see, but we take the liberty of giving it space in our columns. We appreciate what the dear brother says concerning our contending for the same doctrine which we have been for the time he has been reading the paper. We sympathize with him in his afflictions, and also rejoice with him in the manifestations he has had of the love of God and the sweet fellowship of his brethren. May the Lord graciously grant to continue His great blessings upon you, dear brother. C. H. C.

EXTRACT FROM THE LETTER

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother in the Lord, I Hope-I have a great desire to write you a few lines, not for publication, but to let you know as far as words will express how I appreciate your views on regeneration. I notice that someone has said that you had changed. But I know that you have not changed in the last three years, for I have been reading your paper that long and I know that you are contending for the same doctrine that you was then; and I am willing to risk it when I come to die. And I want you to know that I endorse Brother Hanks' peace plan, as published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. But I feel too little and too sinful to be worth anything as an endorser.

Brother Cayce, when at a throne of God's free grace remember me. Farewell.

H. P. HAMILTON

Eldridge, Ala.

REMARKS TO W. R. MOORE

---September 11, 1917

We trust that we rightly appreciate the above kind letter. We feel unworthy of such expressions of endorsement, confidence, love and fellowship. We trust the good Lord may enable us to retain the love and fellowship and confidence of His dear people, and also enable us to earnestly contend for the faith that was once delivered to the saints, and to expose every false way. All our trust and confidence and hope is in Him. "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him," said Job. May the Lord bless you, dear brother, as well as others who have expressed such love and fellowship and sympathy for us in these trying times. C. H. C.

WAS HE A MASON?

---September 11, 1917

On page 341 of Elder W. A. Chastain's book, called "A Discussion on the Worship of God," we find this language:

Elder Gregg M. Thompson, who lived in Georgia for years and who was one of the ablest debaters our people have ever had, and who met Elder Burgess, a Campbellite and a champion debater, and made a grand defense of our people and doctrine, which debate is down in history as one of the grandest victories for our people that has ever been won was a Mason, so I have been told. Yet the Georgia Baptists did not non-fellowship him. But this would not make Masonry right, understand. I am not saying this in defense of any secret order, but to show that this is no test of soundness of doctrine.

Our readers are aware of the fact that there has been no advertisement of Elder Chastain's book in our columns since the same was published. We bought a copy of the book, and have glanced over its pages. We have not yet had the time to give it a careful reading all the way through. But the sentence quoted above is enough to keep us from endorsing the book, though we have noticed that several have expressed endorsement. We wonder if some of them did not overlook this expression, as well, perhaps, as others.

Secret order membership and affiliation may not be a test of soundness of doctrine, but it is a test of soundness of practice. It is a well-known fact, clearly demonstrated from history, that it has ever been held by Primitive Baptists, as a body, that her members should not have membership in and affiliate with secret orders. This has been a well-known tenet of this people. When Elder Chastain devotes so much space in his book to show that the Primitive Baptists in that country have so long affiliated with secret orders, he only shows that they have long been engaged in a practice contrary to the teaching and belief of the Primitive Baptists as a people. This is all that he can possibly accomplish by that kind of proceeding. His effort to show that they have thus affiliated with secret orders does not help his people in the least.

The reader will notice that Elder Chastain emphasizes the statement that Elder Gregg M. Thompson was a Mason, and then adds, "so I have been told." To this we wish to say that Elder Chastain should have better informed himself before making such a statement, if he did not know. Elder Thompson has gone to his reward, and is not here now to defend himself. It seems to us that this great man had enough to contend with while he was living, without a thing of this kind being published to the world about him when he has gone to his long eternal home, and is not here to defend his own practice. But, fortunately, Elder Thompson left on record his position and principles as to how a member of the church should live, and what the church member should belong to.

In describing the true church of Christ, and telling what a true church is and should be, and how the members are to live, Elder Gregg M. Thompson says, in the "Measuring Rod," page 217:

Its practice must be according to the teachings of the New Testament; and it must reject all -human institutions, laws or ordinances. It can have no Boards, Associations, Societies, or auxiliaries, to help it execute the laws of Christ, or do His work on earth.

On page 220 he says:

She never persecutes for conscience sake, but holds all human societies to belong to this world, and will not mix up, or mingle, with any of them; and, in this way, maintains her distinct visibility.

On pages 221, 222, and 223 he says:

With these landmarks before us, we may leek around and see who are the people entitled to be called the church of Christ. Who is it that mingle and mix with no

other societies? Who is it that holds and teaches the doctrine here set forth? Who is it that have no Boards, Conventions, or councils to do the business of their church? Who is it that have no societies as auxiliaries to their church, to aid them in doing the work Christ has committed to them? Is it not the Primitive Baptists, and them alone? If so, all who desire to belong to Christ's church should seek fellowship with them, and withdraw from every other society or institution. Christ prayed that all of His people might be one; and a system is established in the New Testament upon which they all may be one. Upon that platform Christian union and communion can be enjoyed, and upon no other. If our brethren, who have gone off after worldly societies, will return to the old paths, and place themselves upon the old New Testament platform, we are ready to receive them, and again live in Christian union with them. And if we have, in any point, left the platform, make us sensible of it, and we will return. Many of our Missionary brethren acknowledge that they have left the old landmarks, and that that part of their practice to which we object is "unknown to the gospel."

Now, brethren, will you net throw away what you acknowledge to be wrong, and, like Christians, come back to the old paths, that we may all walk together in love? No Bible principle, either in doctrine or practice, can be sacrificed for union. Upon the apostolic doctrine the church can stand united, and on any other foundation it is not the church. On that foundation the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. Men may persecute, and the powers of darkness may strive-but in vain-to destroy it, for God is its defense, and the Holy One of Israel its King; it has salvation for walls and for bulwarks.

Can the reader imagine that the man who wrote this was a member of any secret order, or that he affiliated with any of them? He says the church will not mix or mingle with any human society. This means that the members of the church do not do that. Can it be supposed that he was in affiliation with the Masons when he said that those "who desire to belong to Christ's church should seek fellowship with them"---that is, with the Primitive Baptists-"and withdraw from EVERY OTHER SOCIETY OR INSTITUTION?" This language is too plain to be misunderstood or misapplied. He simply teaches, as plainly as it can be taught, that the members of the Primitive Baptist Church should have membership in no other institution on earth, and that they should affiliate with no other institution in the world. This is plain and positive protesting against the members of the church affiliating with those societies. It is not only this, but Elder Thompson assuredly teaches, also, that the practice of

Such affiliation, which Elder Chastain defends, is to cease to be the church of Christ. Elder Thompson puts the matter strongly.

Elder Chastain referred to the wrong witness in this matter, sure. Perhaps the unregenerated part, or the part of Elder Chastain which is yet dead in sins and under the law of sin and death, under the law of condemnation, did this. Of course that part of him which he says is born of God and is made pure and sinless and holy as God Himself, could not make such a mistake as this." C. H. C.

PEACE RESTORED

---September 11, 1917

We have just returned home from the meeting of the Forked Deer Association, which was held at old Gibson Church on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, September 7, 8, 9, near Humboldt, Tenn. The introductory sermon was preached by Elder Z. Stallings. The ministers present were Elders J. W. Adams, Z. Stallings, C. F. Caruthers, and John Grist, who are members of that association; and the visiting

ministers were Elders W. E. Brush, McKenzie, Tenn.; W. S. Broom, Tioga, Texas; R. C. Taylor, Milan, Tenn.; S. E. Reid, Henderson, Tenn.; A. B. Ross, Dresden, Tenn.; J. C. Ross, Greenfield, Tenn.; J. N. Wallace, Providence, KY.; J. W. Lomax, Bold Spring, Tenn.; L. D. Hamilton, Lexington, Tenn.; B. P. Simmons, Rives, Tenn.; J. B. Halbrook, Dresden, Tenn.; J. R. Scott, Murray, Ky.; and C. H. Cayce, Martin, Tenn. Elder J. H. Phillips, of Martin, Tenn., was present on Friday and preached after the introductory. After the discourse by Elder Phillips the preaching service was continued by Elders Broom and Halbrook. On Saturday the preaching was done by Elders Brush, Scott, and A. B. Ross. On Sunday the preaching was done by Elders Lomax and Cayce. From the very first it seemed that the Spirit of the Master was present and manifested. All seemed to have hearts that were touched by divine love.

There was a getting together of those who had personal feelings against each other, and confessions of wrongs were made, and forgiveness asked. This was done privately. Elders J. C. and A. B. Ross and Z. Stallings asked our pardon for wounding us. Elder J. C. Ross did this a week before at the Big Sandy Association. Elder Brush did the same thing. We feel in our heart that we freely forgive them of everything which they have done which has been an injury to us, and we also trust that they have it in their hearts to forgive us if we have ever, in any way, wounded their feelings, or if we have done them a wrong.

At this meeting the preaching was all in the spirit of love and good will. All reference to matters of difference was avoided; that is, no reference was made to matters of difference. Mooted questions were let alone. The preaching was all like the Old Baptists used to preach when there were no questions of difference among them. All enjoyed the discourses which were delivered. Besides the preaching, as above stated, there was preaching at different places by some of the brethren at nights.

The brethren, in talking privately, seemed to agree that there should not be a division among us here in this country, and that we should all stop and thus end the war. An instrument of writing was read to the brethren by Elder Wallace, which we give below, and which all agreed to. At first it was only thought that we would all mutually agree to accept the same and abide by it, but it was afterward thought proper to publish the same so that the brethren generally might know just how the matter was settled and see what we had all agreed to and we all then thought proper to put our names to it, so that it might be known who had gone into the agreement, that all may know, too, that we are wanting peace and union whose names appear to the agreement. Following is the agreement:

We, the Primitive Baptists, agree, as there is a question of difference in opinion or belief among us on the subject of regeneration, that the difference is not fundamental; we do not believe any fundamental principle of doctrine is involved, when the question of difference is explained by both parties, each one explaining what and how he believes it. So we agree to drop the controversy of the subject, and let each one explain for himself, so he does not controvert or debate the subject, and does not cast reflections on the brethren on the opposite side of the question; and that we all ask forgiveness and forgive each other of all the wrongs that we have done or said, and that we all live together in fellowship and love, as we have in the past before this question came up among us. And as the Baptists in Texas are divided on this subject, that we agree that we will not let that divide us here in this country; and we further agree that we will not recognize one party of Baptists in Texas or elsewhere to the exclusion of the other; and if either side wants to come through our country and preach for us, if he will leave off controversy of this subject, and not cast reflections on the brethren on the opposite

side of his belief, that we recommend to the churches to let him come, and thus let the matter drop and die, and let the wound be healed; however, if any church is opposed to his coming, on either side, and is not willing to submit, let him pass by this church and go on to another one that is willing to receive him, and not make his preaching among the churches that are willing to receive him a bar to fellowship, so he has a good moral standing and is in order with his home church and churches, and that there is nothing against him but this question of difference--and thus save a division among our dear people in Tennessee and Kentucky, and elsewhere in the United States.

The names signed to this were:

Elders J. N. Wallace, A. B. Ross, J. C. Ross, S. E. Reid, John Grist, B. P. Simmons, J. B. Halbrook, J. W. Adams, C. F. Caruthers, J. R. Scott, L. D. Hamilton, J. W. Lomax, Z Stallings, R. C. Taylor, C. H. Cayce, W. E. Brush.

It will be noted that Elder Broom was at the meeting, yet his name does not appear to the agreement. We explain this by stating that as his home is in Texas, and not in this section, he was not requested to sign it, nor was he present when we had the agreement, or when we were conferring together. We also state that Brother Phillips left on Friday afternoon, which was before this took place.

We wish we could describe the scene and the feeling manifested when these brethren were together agreeing to the above, how that tears flowed from their eyes, they shaking hands with each other, embracing each other in their arms, and asking and expressing forgiveness of each other. We just cannot describe the scene. We cannot describe the feeling of love and sweet fellowship which was manifested. It seemed that the heart of everyone was full and overflowing with love for each other, and with gratitude and thankfulness to God.

It was also mutually agreed that if either side in Texas or elsewhere, where this trouble exists, refuse to recognize us because we recognize the other side, that we will stand together here, and that the side which refuses to recognize us will be let alone. In other words, if those in Texas which we may designate as the Newman side, refuse to recognize us because we agree to recognize either side, then we will stand together and let the Newman side go. On the other hand, if those which we may designate as the Webb and Redford side refuse to recognize us because we agree to recognize either side, then we will stand together and let the Webb side go.

We feel that this will result in our people remaining together in this country, and that the trouble is now settled among us.

On Saturday the association passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the judgment of this association that the extreme views on regeneration which are being agitated by some of our brethren is and will continue to cause trouble among the Master's children.

Resolved, That we, of the Forked Deer Association, ask our members to cease agitating such views, either publicly or privately; also that our sister associations do likewise, or our correspondence with them will have to cease. Also, that we hereby serve notice that we do not want any of the preaching brethren who will not leave off such extreme views to come among us. What we mean by extreme views is such expressions as will leave brethren on the one hand to think we believe the hollow log doctrine, and such expressions as will leave brethren on the other hand to think we believe the whole man doctrine.

A similar resolution was passed by the Big Sandy Association on Saturday before the first Sunday in this month at New Hope.

This resolution is in perfect harmony with the agreement which the brethren signed. Our heart is glad. We feel to rejoice that all our differences are now laid

aside, and that we have come together in peace and sweet fellowship. May the good Lord help us to continue, from this time on, to strive for the things that make for peace. Let us all endeavor, to our utmost ability, to strive to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Let us all bear with each other, watch over each other for good and not for evil. Let us endeavor to help each other to bear the trials, burdens, and conflicts of life. Let us never try to destroy each other. We need each other. We need to live together in love and sweet fellowship. Our enemies would rejoice to see us divided and to see our fellowship destroyed. Let us try to please our Master instead of gratifying our enemies.

On Sunday at the close of service four willing souls came forward asking for a home among the Lord's humble followers, and were received with gladness. Many rejoiced, and some shouted aloud the Lord's praise. These people are to be baptized on the next regular meeting time at Gibson, which is the fourth Sunday. These three days were days of rejoicing. We were never in a sweeter or more delightful meeting.

On page ten of this issue an article will be seen which was printed on Saturday while we were away. The latter part of that article would not have appeared had it not already been printed. We have held up the printing of this side of the paper, and delayed sending the paper out, in order to have the good news of this settlement of trouble in the paper this week. We know that many hearts will be made glad upon reading this.

One more thing now which we wish to mention is this: We stated a short time ago that Elder Wallace told us - he advised Elder A. B. Ross not to send an article to the Trumpet which we mentioned, and which we said we would reply to. We intended to say in the same article that Elder Wallace also told us that he thought we did wrong in publishing what we did concerning the matter of Elder McArthur's visit, but we inadvertently overlooked that. We make this statement in justice to Elder Wallace. But this is all settled between us and

Brother Ross, and also Brother Wallace. We do not now intend to make any reply or explanation concerning the article from Brother Ross. We have mutually forgiven each other for all wrongs, and that settles it, so far as we are concerned. If these matters are not mentioned until we do so, they will be forgotten.

We trust that we can now give our readers articles that are free from controversy. Write us about the good things of the kingdom, and of the riches and glory of the Master. Let us encourage each other to higher and better and nobler things, and let us try to pray for each other, and let brotherly love continue.

Brethren, our hope and trust and confidence is yet in the good Lord. We still need the direction of His guiding hand. Please remember us in your prayers. May His blessings rest upon every reader, is our prayer.

C.H.C.

PEACE PREVAILS

---September 25, 1917

Our readers will remember that in THE PRIMITIVE-BAPTIST of September 11 we gave an account of the settlement of the differences among the brethren in this section, and that we published the agreement which was signed by the brethren in the ministry who were present at the Forked Deer Association. We also published a verbal agreement which the ministers all entered into who were present.

We attended the West Tennessee Association at Turnbull Church, in Dickson County, Tenn., on the third Sunday in this month, and Friday and Saturday before.

At that meeting the agreement which was entered into verbally at the Forked Deer Association was reduced to writing, and was made a little more lengthy. All the ministers present signed it, and also authorized their names to be placed to the agreement entered into at the Forked Deer Association.

We have thought it to be a good idea to publish the agreement again which was published in the issue of September 11, and give the names of all who have signed it. It is as follows:

(We deem it unnecessary to take up space in this book to reproduce that again.

You will find it on page 248 of this book.-C. H. C.]

Those present at the West Tennessee Association who authorized their names to be put to this agreement, and who had not already signed it, were:

Elders J. M. Fuqua, T. J. Daily, J. A. Roberson, S. H. Reynolds, T.J. Chandler, D. M. Still, I J. Hutchinson, J. A. Pope, H. M. Sanders, A. D. Oliphant, David Wauford, A. L. Graves, T. M. Phillips, W. R. Rushton, J. T. Bryant, W. L. Murray, N. J. Hinson, M. C. Deal.

The additional agreement, which was only verbal before, is as follows:

As it was mutually agreed by the Primitive Baptist elders who were present at the Forked Deer Association on Saturday before the second Sunday in September, 1917, in our settlement of the agitation and controversy on the subject of regeneration, as the Primitive Baptists in Texas and other sections of the country are divided, we said that if one party in Texas would not recognize us nor come among us because we would recognize both factions, that the faction which would not come among us because we recognize the other could go by, and that the party that does recognize us, that we would receive them if they do not agitate this question and thus keep up strife between the two factions.

We, the elders who are present at the West Tennessee Association, further agree that we will not receive that faction, or factions, who continue to agitate this question in their writings and preaching, but if they cease to agitate and controvert this subject and do not cast reflections on the brethren on the opposite side of their belief at home, or here, or elsewhere, we are willing to receive them-that is, for them to come among us and preach for us, and we are willing for our brethren to go among them and preach for them; and now, dear brethren in Texas, or elsewhere, that are divided on this question, we do not believe that there are any fundamental principles of doctrine involved, upon which our churches are founded, when each party explains for himself. What we mean by this is that if there is any real difference it is too insignificant to cause trouble or division. Now, dear brethren, let us beseech you, in brotherly love, to drop the controversy of this subject and forgive one another of all that has been done or said on and about this controversy in a general way, and let us all live together in sweet peace and love and fellowship; and if there is any personal difference among any of the brethren let them settle that. Let them take gospel steps, as our blessed Master says, "if thy brother trespass against thee, go tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he will not hear thee, take one or two more. If he will not hear them, tell it to the church."

The ministers present at the West Tennessee Association, and who signed this, were:

Elders J. M. Fuqua, T. J. Daily, J. A. Roberson, S. H. Reynolds, T. J. Chandler, D. M. Still, I J. Hutchinson, J. A. Pope, C. H. Cayce, H. M. Sanders, A. D. Oliphant, David Wauford, A. L. Graves, T. M. Phillips, J. W. Lomax, J. R. Scott, W.R. Rushton, J. T. Bryant, W. L. Murray, J. C. Ross, J. N. Wallace, N. J. Hinson, M. C. Deal.

Elder L. D. Hamilton was also present at this association and we thought he signed this also, but we do not have his name. There were two copies of the agreement written out, and we do not have the one which had the names signed originally. It may be that Elder Hamilton's name is on the other copy and that we missed his name in copying them. Will Brother Hamilton please write us as soon as he sees this, and tell us whether or not his name should be to this agreement. We do not wish to leave any out who have signed it, or who will sign it.

On Monday we had an appointment at McKenzie. We tried to preach there that day (Monday, September 17). A very good congregation present, and a pleasant meeting was enjoyed. This is Elder Brush's home, and we spent a great part of the day very pleasantly with him. He signed the above agreement that day.

The meeting of the association was very pleasant indeed. The association while in session on Saturday endorsed the agreements as above. The preaching was all a unit, and the brethren seemed to enjoy sweet liberty in speaking. May the good Lord be praised. Let us all try to pray and labor for the peace of Jerusalem.

C. H. C.

REMARKS TO ELDER JAMES DUNCAN

---September 25, 1917

Your remark, dear brother, that there is a beam in your own eye, and your request that we help you pull it out, reminds us that too many of us have a beam in our own eye sometimes. Perhaps the trouble often is that we have a beam in our own eye, when we think there is something great that is wrong with a brother's eye. Perhaps if each one would try to attend to his own eye, and let the eye of his brother alone, there might not be so much trouble in Zion. The Saviour's instruction is for one to pull the beam out of his own eye, so he may see clearly how to pull the mote out of his brother's eye. Often when we get the beam out of our own eye, we discover that there is not so much the matter with the brother's eye as we thought. Suppose we all try this plan for awhile, and see how it works.

C. H. C.

WILL NOT BE PUBLISHED

---September 25, 1917

We have quite a number of communications on the question which has been in agitation for some time which will not be published on account of the settlement of the matter among, and by, the brethren in this section. We will not publish the letters we have on this question, because we have all agreed to lay the matter down and to drop the controversy. We trust that all will do according to that agreement. Brethren, please do not send us any articles containing reflections on any brother who may differ from you, and please do not discuss these small differences any more.

C.H.C.

BIBLE EVIDENCES

---November 6, 1917

The following article was written by our father and published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of March 22, 1894. It is good and timely, and we republish it for the benefit and enjoyment of our present readers. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.- (Romans 8:16).

Wishing to comfort and encourage the dear saints of God, we will offer a few thoughts upon the Bible evidences of salvation, or call attention to some of the Bible signs of the Lord's people. The children of God often inquire, "Amos I His or am I not?" and the unworthy writer has often remarked that, "If I could be as well satisfied that I am embraced in the doctrine of grace, the doctrine believed and advocated by the Primitive Baptists, as I am that this doctrine is true, I would certainly be a happy mortal." And when the poor, little, weak and trembling child of God hears the gospel of God's grace he feasts upon it, but yet feels to inquire, "Amos I embraced in this glorious doctrine of God our Saviour?" For the encouragement of such we wish to offer the following evidences which will, as we think, point out the Lord's people and give to such inquiring ones some assurance that they are children of God.

As a foundation for what we may write upon this subject, we have selected the text heading this article, viz.: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

The apostle, in this text, does not refer to that evidence that comes directly to the child of God by revelation, giving him to realize that Jesus is his Saviour, and lifting him up above his burden, thus giving him to rejoice in a Saviour's love and in hope of an immortality beyond the grave. Such evidence is given by revelation to the poor, mourning soul, and as such Paul says: "But, as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. "(I Corinthians 2:9-10).

And the Saviour said to Peter: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. "(Matthew 16:17).

But this manifestation, this evidence by revelation, revealing, or witnessing, to the poor soul, for the first time, that Jesus is his own personal and individual Saviour, is not what the Apostle Paul had under consideration in the text heading this article. He does not say in this that the Spirit bore witness to our spirit, or that the Spirit hath borne witness, but "beareth witness"- does yet-does "now--bear witness with our spirit." And, in order to ascertain whether or not we can appropriate this language to ourselves, feeling that it embraces us, and that our readers may have some assurance that they are embraced; that the "Spirit bears witness with their spirit, that they are the children of God," we will notice some of the evidences, some of the things testified to by the Holy Spirit. If we present to you, dear brethren and sisters, some of the things testified to by the Holy Spirit, some of the evidences of the Spirit, and you are conscious that you have realized the same things in your own hearts; have an experience agreeing or corresponding with the things presented, why, then, sure enough, the "Spirit beareth witness with your spirit," and if so, if the Spirit does thus bear witness with your spirit, the conclusion is that you are children of God; for this is the end to which this evidence points. To find the things testified to by the Spirit of God we will turn to the Bible, for we learn "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." -**(II Peter 1:21)**. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. "--(II Timothy 3:16).

These passages show that whatever is contained in the Bible is, therefore, the testimony of the Holy Spirit; the testimony, we might say, of God. And, in this Book of testimony, this Book of evidence, we find therein expressed, the character of God, also the character and condition of man, and we find also evidence concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, His mission into the world, what He accomplished, etc., etc. Then we find some evidence of how He appears to poor sinners in delivering them from the power of darkness and translating them into the kingdom of His dear Son; how He quickens them into life, bringing them up out of a state of death into a state of life in Christ. And, in addition to all this, we find also expressed the Lord's protection and preservation of His people, all of which corresponds, as we will endeavor to show, with the Christian experience.

First, then, we will look into this Book of testimony, for a short time, with reference to the character of God. Isaiah says: "Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else: I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure."--(9) (Isaiah 46:9-10). "Remember these, O Jacob and Israel; for thou art my servant: I have formed thee; thou art my servant: O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me. Tell ye, and bring them near: yea, let them take counsel together: who hath declared this from ancient time? who hath told it from that time? have not I the Lord? and there is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me."- **((21) (Isaiah 45:21)**. And the Prophet Malachi says: "For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed."--(Malachi 3:6).

We might give many more quotations showing that God is a sovereign, possessing all power both in heaven and in earth, and that "what His soul desireth even that He doeth," and that He does not need the assistance of man to assist Him in the work of salvation, but the above are sufficient on that line, and we would therefore ask: Do you, dear reader, realize your need of such a God? Do you realize that you have no power to save yourself? Do you realize the truth of what Isaiah says, or that you are only a particle of nothing? "Behold the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, He taketh up the isles as a very little thing. And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering. All nations before Him are as nothing; and they are counted to Him as less than nothing, and vanity."--((0:15) (Isaiah 40:15-17). If so, the Spirit is bearing witness with your spirit, in that you realize your need of just such a God as the Bible, or testimony of the Spirit, represents Him to be. But the Bible contains, as stated before, some evidence of what man is, and some of this we wish now to notice: "Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more. The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores; they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment."- **(Isaiah 1:5-6)**. "The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." **((2) (Psalms 14:2-3)**. "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit: the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing

and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes.”-(Romans 3:9-18).

In these quotations we have clear and unmistakable evidence of the entire or total depravity of man, the corruption of our nature; but the question comes next, have you, dear doubting one, realized such depravity in your heart? Have you realized that there was nothing good in you? that you had nothing nor could do nothing whatever to recommend you into the favor of God? Have you realized the truth of what the Saviour said- **(Matthew 19:26)**: “With men this is impossible.” If so, then we would again say the Spirit is yet bearing witness with your spirit, and that you are, therefore, a child of God.

Let us next examine this Book of evidence with regard to the mission of the Saviour: “And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus: for He shall save His people from their sins. “-(Matthew 1:21). “Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.”-((2) (Acts 4:12). “Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. “-((31) (Acts 5:31). “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation. that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief.”-(I Timothy 1:15).

These passages are sufficient to show that Jesus Christ came into this world as a full and complete Saviour, and that His mission was to save sinners, not merely to offer salvation, nor to try to get people to accept salvation, nor to save those who would voluntarily turn away from their sins and cease to be sinners-get to be good folks-but to “save His people from their sins.” This being the case, Paul would say: “For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.”-(Romans 5:19). Which shows that sinners are not saved, not made righteous, by their own obedience, but by the obedience of Jesus Christ. And we would again ask, Do you realize your need of such a Saviour? Do you feel that “If not free grace, then I am lost?” Do you realize that if your salvation depends upon your good works, your obedience, faithfulness, etc., that you are gone, world without end? Let me assure you, dear one, that if this is your experience, if you have realized all this, then the Spirit is now bearing witness with your spirit, and the testimony points to the fact that you are a child of God. If you realize that you need just such a Saviour as the Bible represents Jesus Christ as being, why, then, this is but proof that He is your Saviour.

Next we will notice some of the evidence in regard to His protecting care and preserving grace; how it is that He watches over His people and protects them through dangers, both seen and unseen to them, and brings them off “more than conquerors” over all their trials, tribulations, afflictions, temptations and distresses, until the last enemy is destroyed, and that He, in fact, is the very life of His people: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.”-((Pet 1:3) (I Peter 1:3-5). “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. “-(John 5:24). “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.”-(John 6:47). “My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them

eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."-(John 10:27-29). "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory."-(Colossians 3:3-4). "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor -angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come; nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. "-(Romans 8:28-39).

From these quotations we learn that the children of God are begotten unto an inheritance which is undefiled and that fades not away, and that they are kept by the power of God unto this inheritance. And we learn also that those thus begotten, those who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, have everlasting life, which life preceded their belief, and enabled them to believe, and that having this life, which is eternal, they shall not come into condemnation; that nothing, no power, misfortune, nor adversity, can separate them from the eternal and everlasting love of God; and that when Christ, who is their life, shall appear, then shall they also appear with Him in glory. But we come to the question again: Do you feel to need such a Saviour? Do you realize the fact that if you were your own keeper you would certainly sink down in despair? Do you feel that nothing short of the preserving and sustaining grace of Almighty God would prevent your final and eternal apostasy? Do you realize the fact that you could not possibly retain an interest in heaven upon any other principle than the immutable love and sovereign power of God? If so, the Spirit is yet bearing witness with your spirit. You realize your need of such favor and such power, having no worthiness of your own, nor no power within yourself to withstand the temptations, storms and turmoils of this life, and the Bible lets us know that He is just such a God and that He has such love for His people; hence, as stated already, the Spirit, in this, is bearing witness with your spirit that you are a child of God. But you may say, "O I am so little, it must be that I am deceived." This, however, is only another expression showing that you have experienced the very feeling realized by the Apostle Paul; for he said, "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given," etc. You may say, "Yes, but I am such a great sinner." -In this, however, you are again in company with Paul, for he said, "It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." If you feel to be a great sinner you are only realizing what Paul here expressed concerning himself, and as he not only experienced this but was also led by the Spirit of God to write it,

what he says is therefore the testimony of the Holy Spirit, and as such the "Spirit is bearing witness with your spirit," and, as such, you are a child of God.

Not only does the Spirit bear witness with your spirit in all these things, but the fact that you feast upon the gospel of Christ as preached by the true servants of God is also proof that you are children of God. We learn from the testimony of the Holy Spirit: "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." -(I Corinthians 2:12-14).

And this proves that we must first have the Spirit of God before we can "know the things that are freely given to us of God;" and it also shows that the natural (or unregenerate) man does not receive the things of the Spirit, the things spoken by Paul. But the question comes, do you receive those things? Is the preaching of salvation by grace a comfort to your poor soul? Do you gladly receive the things taught by the true servants of God? If so, you are something more than a mere natural (or unregenerate) man (or woman, as the case may be) and have therefore been born again, "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." Remember that the Saviour never commanded Peter to feed goats, no more so than He commanded him to make sheep, but the command was "feed my lambs," "feed my sheep," "feed my sheep;" and if you have been fed by the true ministers of Jesus Christ it is only an evidence that you are a child of God. And in this, as in other respects, the "Spirit beareth witness with your spirit that you are a child of God," for the testimony of the Spirit is that the ministers of Christ are commanded to feed sheep, and you realize that you have been fed by them. We might continue, almost indefinitely, the Bible signs or evidences of the Lord's people; but these are certainly sufficient to encourage the poor, trembling, tempest-tossed child, and to strengthen his -hope, to some extent at least. To such little doubting ones are these thoughts submitted in the hope that the good Lord may bless them to your comfort. So fare you well in the Lord.

These lines were written at the residence of Elder H. Temples, of Bulloch County, Ga., while on a preaching tour in this country.

- S. F. CAYCE.

GOSPEL BAPTISM AND COMMUNION

---November 13, 1917

We have been asked many times in our traveling among the brethren, sisters and friends, "Why do not Primitive Baptists recognize baptism (so-called) administered by other people, especially those who have been immersed? and why do not Primitive Baptists invite all Christian people (so-called) to commune with them?"

And feeling sure there are many more, who are pondering over these things in their minds, we copy the following editorial, written by our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, and published in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of May 10, 1894, which we trust will be of benefit to some poor, halting, trembling and inquiring one. We trust the blessings of our heavenly Father will accompany the same to His honor and the good of Zion.

C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

DEAR BROTEER CAYCE:

If I am worthy to call you brother-I am not a member of the Primitive Baptists, but claim to have been born again. I have been requested to write you and get your views of what is called "close communion" and "re-baptism." Why do you require a brother from any other church to be re-baptized? Hoping to hear from you through your paper. I am a subscriber, and very truly yours,

W. L. HAMM.
Appleton, Ark.
THE REPLY

Our readers will remember that we expressed a few thoughts relative to what is termed "local communion" in our issue of April 26 (week before last), and as Brother Hamm wishes our views on the subject of "close communion" (we suppose as practiced by Primitive Baptists) and "re-baptism," as it is termed, we will have to go over some of the same ground (notice the same Scriptures) in complying with his request; but as we were very brief before, we suppose this will be admissible. But, as baptism comes before communion', we will consider that question before taking up that of communion. And, in the first place, would call attention to the fact that there are three things which are essential in order that any baptism be a Scriptural or gospel one: Inasmuch as baptism. is taught in the Bible, it must be that the Bible describes the character whose duty it is to be baptized, or that is a proper subject for baptism. We must have a gospel (or Scriptural) subject, or the baptism would not be a gospel baptism. For instance, none would suppose an unregenerate, impenitent sinner to be a fit subject for baptism. The Bible certainly teaches that there must first be a work of grace in the heart; that the individual must be quickened into life; must be born of God, born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever, before he is a fit subject for baptism. Even those who regard baptism as being a condition (one of them) upon which eternal life is promised, admit that no impenitent character, no unbeliever, is a fit subject for baptism; and, if impenitent persons are not' fit subjects for baptism, they must be made, or must become, penitent before they are ready for baptism; and, as unregenerate persons are not penitent, they must be regenerated before they become penitent; and as regeneration is the work of God, and to be regenerated (of God) is to be begotten of God, and to be begotten of God is to be born of God; hence, none are fit subjects for baptism until born of God. One of the essentials, therefore, for gospel baptism is that we have a gospel subject-one who has been born of God, and has given evidence of this fact to the church. Our object, however, in requiring persons to relate their experience, give a reason of their hope, is not to make them fit subjects for baptism, but that the church may, in this way, ascertain whether or not they are (already) fit subjects. When one has petitioned or asked admission into the church, and when the church has heard his (or her) experience, the reason of his (or her) hope in Christ, and are satisfied with the same-believe the brother or sister to be a child of God-why, then, they have before them a gospel (or Scriptural) subject-one whose duty it is to be baptized.

Next, would say, as the Bible teaches us that such persons are proper subjects for baptism, and as the Lord commands such to be baptized, it certainly does teach us how to baptize, and teach them how to be baptized. In other words, as the Bible teaches baptism, it certainly must (and does) teach the gospel (or Scriptural) mode of baptism. It would be unreasonable to suppose that the Lord would command His people-His children-to be baptized, and yet not teach them what it takes to constitute baptism. If He has not given us 'any instruction as to the mode, or as to what baptism is, why, then, sprinkling or pouring will do fully as well, and might as

well be called baptism as immersion; but if, indeed (as is the case), the Lord has taught us that to be baptized is to be immersed-buried in water-why, then, nothing short of this can be gospel (or Scriptural) baptism.

The two essentials mentioned above-a gospel subject and a gospel mode-are recognized by a great many who do not seem to realize that we must also have a gospel (or Scriptural) administrator. Baptism, to be valid-to be a gospel baptism-must be administered to a gospel subject, in a Scriptural manner, by the proper authority (by authority of the church of Christ) and by a gospel administrator. As the Bible teaches who are proper subjects for gospel baptism, and teaches also what it takes to constitute gospel baptism (the mode, immersion in water), it also teaches who are the proper or gospel administrator of baptism. And, as this is the case, that which-is administered by any other than a gospel administrator cannot be a gospel baptism, for we would have as much right to change the mode as to have the baptism administered by any other than a gospel administrator. As the Bible teaches that it takes immersion-a burial in water-to constitute a gospel baptism, a few drops of water sprinkled or poured on one's head cannot be baptism. And as none are proper (or gospel) subjects for baptism save those who have been born of God, an unregenerate, impenitent character is not a gospel subject. Not only so, but as the Bible teaches that baptism must be administered by authority of the church of Christ, and by one authorized by the church to administer the ordinances thereof-a gospel administrator-nothing short of this can be gospel baptism. If either of these three essentials are wanting, there is no baptism. For instance, if we have a proper (or gospel) subject and a true gospel preacher-one authorized by the church to administer the ordinances- the baptism would be valid if administered in a Scriptural manner. But, suppose that a gospel preacher should take a real gospel subject (for baptism) and sprinkle or pour a few drops of water upon his head, could we call it baptism? Certainly not. Neither would the gospel preacher (one authorized by the church to administer the ordinances) have any right or authority whatever to take an unregenerate, impenitent character (even though he be a moral man) and immerse him as a subject for baptism. Why not? Simply because the unregenerate sinner is not a proper or gospel subject. In either of such cases (water sprinkled or poured by a gospel administrator upon the head of a gospel subject, or the immersion of an impenitent person by a gospel administrator), it is not gospel baptism. However, we would have as much right to say it was gospel baptism as we would to say that the immersion of a gospel subject by a man not authorized by the church is gospel baptism. No one ever supposes that a private member, not even a deacon, has any right or authority to baptize, and as such would not be willing to receive baptism at their hands; yet some are willing to hold on to an immersion administered by those who are not even members of the true church of Christ. They say, "But the preacher who baptized me was a good man." Suppose he was, does that give him authority to baptize people? Certainly not. There are a great many good men in the church; our deacons are (should be) good men; but that does not give them authority to baptize. A gospel administrator is one who has been called of God and has been set apart (ordained) by the church to the work of the ministry, and one who preaches the doctrine of God our Saviour.

Having said this much, in a general way, we will now call attention to a few Scriptures which clearly and unmistakably show that the three things mentioned are really and absolutely essential in order that we have a gospel baptism. First, we remember that some demanded baptism of John who were not gospel subjects, and as such he declined to baptize them: "But when he saw many of the Pharisees and

Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. “-(Matthew 3:7-8,9).

We will not dwell here, however, but let us have further testimony, and we will find that the Saviour Himself demanded that His baptism be administered by one having proper authority to administer the ordinance: “Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan, unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade Him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered Him.”- (Matthew 3:13-14,15). Notice, the Saviour said to John, “For thus it becometh us” (you and me), which shows that none but John was authorized to baptize Him. The Saviour had, therefore, to be baptized by a Primitive Baptist preacher in order to “fulfill all righteousness, “in order that His baptism be valid; and as the children of God are commanded to follow Jesus, they, too, must be baptized by Primitive Baptist preachers, else their baptism is not valid. Neither do we follow Christ in being immersed in water by any other except Primitive Baptist preachers, else their baptism is not valid. Neither do we follow Christ in being immersed in water by any other except Primitive Baptist preachers. John was a Baptist, named so by the Lord, and he must have been primitive for he was the first one called a Baptist. And those are Primitive Baptists, now, in doctrine and practice who are in line with John and with Christ and the apostles in their preaching and in their practice, those who are “continuing steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine.” Again Jesus said to the apostles: “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.”-(Matthew 28:18-19,20).

We learn from this that we are commanded to “go,” because of the fact that “all power is given unto me,” and as such those who “go,” being called of God, always preach the power that sends them. Hence, all those who preach any other power in the salvation of sinners than the power of God are not going under the authority of God, and as such are not authorized to baptize. Those who are called of God to preach the gospel are commanded not only to teach or preach and to baptize, but they are to “teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;” and as such those who teach things not commanded, things not authorized in the Bible, have no authority to baptize. This being true, immersion administered by them is not baptism, no more so than immersion administered by one who makes no pretension whatever, in a preaching way.

Next we will notice (**Acts 2:41-42**): “Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.” Here we have evidence that those baptized were such as had “gladly received” the word preached, which no unregenerate character ever does; for the Saviour says: “He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.”-((7) (John 8:47). To be of God is certainly to be a child of God, and to be a child of God is to be born of God; and as the Saviour lets us know, here, that none hear God's word save those who are of God, those born of God, it follows that none “gladly receive the word” save those who hear in the sense of this text. The Say-jour did not mean that none

heard His vocal voice, or the mere sound of His words, save those who are of God, but that none hear to profit, none hear with gladness of heart, save those who are of God, those born of God.

Again, Paul says: "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. "(I Corinthians 2:12-14). This shows that the natural or unregenerate man does not receive the things taught by the true servants of God in the preaching of the gospel. But those added unto the church on the day of Pentecost were such as did receive, "gladly received the word," hence they had been regenerated, born of God. Not only so, but they were added unto the church, added unto, and baptized by, that people who were steadfast in the apostles' doctrine, and no immersion administered by a people who are not "steadfast in the apostles' doctrine" can be considered valid baptism.

This brings us to the subject of communion, but having said so much on the subject of baptism, will be very brief on this. The quotation already made from Acts ((Acts 2:41-42)) shows that those baptized were such as had gladly received the word, and that they were added unto a people who were steadfast in the apostles' doctrine. Not only so, but we see from this that those who communed, those who broke bread together, were such as "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine." Of course none can continue in that which they have never been in; and as such, those who preach for doctrine the commandments of men are not continuing in the apostles' doctrine nor have never been in that doctrine, so far as their preaching is concerned, and as such they have never been added unto (in a church capacity) those who are steadfast in the apostles' doctrine, have never been added unto the visible organization or militant church of Christ. Neither can they who are "steadfast in the apostles' doctrine," those who have been added unto the true church of Christ, commune or break bread with them without violating the apostolic practice, as their practice was to commune or break bread with those with whom they were in (church) fellowship, those who had been "added unto them." Hence our practice of what is sometimes called close communion is apostolic. May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of Friend Hamm, as well as all others into whose hands THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST goes, is our prayer, for Christ's sake.

S. F. CAYCE.

THE YOUNG MEMBERS

---December 11, 1917

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother in Hope-For some time I have had a desire to write you regarding some questions which I have been deeply interested in here of late. Many times I have started to ask some of the brethren here these questions. I would then think that maybe it is just me and I would not say anything about them. And you may think if I were what I professed to be I wouldn't think anything about such. But nevertheless, I think of them in spite of all I can do, and I am often reminded of them by people who have been members of the church long before I can remember.

On several occasions here of late I have been invited to social parties, and to my astonishment have been encouraged to go. I said that I thought Primitive Baptists didn't attend parties. They would tell me that it made no difference as to whether the young people went or not, just so they did not dance. I can't see, for the life of me, that it would be any more harm for the old people to go than it would be for the young people. And to me it looks like that gives the young people the same privilege to partake in worldly things they have always had, and I didn't think Old Baptists

I have found in most all experiences I have heard or read that they hated the things they once loved, and loved the things they once hated, and according to that I cannot see how they can still love parties unless parties were some of the things they once hated, and I think that is giving away too much to the young people. Some are very easily led astray. Some may think that I am holding myself clear of all this, but not so, for I fall far short from doing as I should. I see my many mistakes day by day, and find, "For the good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do." Now to the questions:

Is it right for Primitive Baptists to attend parties?

How about young members just saying "hello" to one another when they go to church?

What do you think about one you meet one Sunday and they are just as friendly as can be, and the next Sunday will rub against you and won't speak?

When you meet a brother or sister that looks like they are trying to keep from speaking to you, is it right for you to speak, whether they do or not?

Is it right to go to church and not speak to any of the members except the pastor?

If you think I have done wrong in asking these questions please excuse me, for I will have done it through ignorance. Although I know what has been done cannot be undone, yet repentance promises forgiveness by laws divine. Therefore, I hope you will forgive me if I have done wrong in this, for I have done, it with no hard feelings against anyone. But I think some of us young members ought to wake up better to our duty and leave some things alone that we do, thinking it will be all right because none of the brethren and sisters won't know anything about it. Yes, indeed, we can keep it from the brethren and sisters, but God above knows all things. Often I am made to think of the poem:

Much we talk of Jesus' bleed,

But how little's understood

Of His sufferings so intense.

Please cast the mantle of charity over my many imperfections. If not asking too much of you, when at a throne of God remember me. A poor little querist.

OUR REPLY

The writer of the above sent a stamped envelope for a reply by private letter, but stated that we might reply through the paper, and requested that the name be withheld if we replied this way.

We thought that our readers should have the benefit of what the writer said in the letter, so we decided to publish the letter and answer the questions the best we can in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST.

In reply to the first question we will say that we do not think it right for members of the Primitive Baptist Church to attend the social parties which are generally attended and participated in by the young people of the world. How would you like to die at such a gathering? How would it look for your obituary to be published in the church paper, and the statement made in the obituary that you died at a party?

How do you think your pastor would feel while preaching your funeral under such circumstances as that? You should never go to a place that you feel ashamed for it to be said that you died there. We are commanded to abstain from every appearance of evil. The church of God is not of the world, and her members are not of the world, and they should not act like the world. More is expected of them than is expected of other people. Do you think your Master would have gone to those things?

To the second question we will say that it is as much the duty of young members to speak as it is the duty of the older ones to do so. The brethren and sisters should all give and receive a friendly greeting at the church, and at other places, too, for that matter. It is expected that Primitive Baptists love one another, and they claim to do so. This love should be manifested. Where there is love there is always respect, and respect should always be shown the members of the church. We should show respect to each other. There is evidently too much coldness manifested in some places. When the love we have, or should have, for each other is not manifested as it should be, the love grows cold, and we become indifferent. This is wrong, and we should guard against it. It is the duty of both old and young to manifest the love and proper respect for the other members of Christ's kingdom. In answer to the third question will say that a person is doing wrong to act that way. Such a thing might be done unthoughtedly, but it is the no less wrong. It is grievously wrong for one brother or sister to refuse to, speak to another. It might be possible for one sometimes to fail to see the party, and not speak on that account. In such case, no wrong is intended or done; but when the brother or sister is seen, it is very wrong not to speak.

To the fourth question we would say that we think it right to speak, whether the brother or sister does so or not. It is right to always speak to a brother or sister, and one wrong does not justify another.

The answer to the third and fourth questions answers the fifth. It is no more wrong to fail to speak to the pastor than to the other members. The pastor should be treated with due courtesy, and this is true with regard to all the members of the church.

We do not see that the writer has done wrong in asking these questions; but it manifests the fact that there is an interest in the church and in the cause of the Master. If all were manifesting the interest that should be manifested, there would have been nothing to cause the writing of such queries. It grieves us often to see such coldness and indifference manifested as is shown by some in regard to the church and the duty of the membership.

It is true that the child of God hates what he once loved, and how one can claim to be a child of God and still manifest a love for the world the same as the unregenerate do, is something we do not understand. If we love the church and the service of God, and hate the world and its vanities and sinful pleasures, we should prove it by our lives. We should show our faith by our works. May the good Lord help us all so to do, is our humble prayer. "C. H. C.

CLOSE OF VOLUME THIRTY-TWO

---December 18, 1917

Another year with its joys and sorrows, disappointments and bereavements is closing, and we cannot tell what another year will bring. But let us try to hope it will be a year of peace and quietude, especially in the dear old church of God. We shall, by the help of the Lord, be found contending for the same doctrine, principles and practice THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST has contended for since its establishment by our

dear father, Elder S. F. Cayce, January 1, 1886. We hope to be able to write more for its columns during the year 1918 than we have been able to do this year. We hope our corresponding editors, the brethren and sisters as well, will write for its columns; and let us all write the things that make for peace, and the things whereby one may edify another. Do not write us of your local troubles and ask us to publish them. Try to settle them at rather than publish them abroad. Let every lover of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST do all they can to help us put the paper in every Primitive Baptist home. Should we not try to have good, sound, wholesome reading matter for our children? The Arminian world keep their children supplied with their literature. Shall we appear to think less of the church of God and have less concern for our children than they? Surely not. We desire that all the dear brethren and sisters remember us in your prayers, that we may have the guidance of the Holy Spirit in our efforts to preach the gospel of Christ, and in our efforts to edit THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST to His glory and Zion's good.
C. H. C.

1918

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME XXXIII

---January 1, 1918

With this issue we begin the publication of the thirty-third volume of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Thirty-two volumes of the paper have been completed. What is in store for us during this year we know not. The past has been mixed with joys, and sorrows. Sometimes sorrows and troubles have come thick and fast; but there have been some joys and pleasures along the way. Were it not for the few joys and sweet seasons which we have passed through, this' world would be a gloomy place, sure enough.

In the beginning of this new year we are in the midst of wars and confusion. Nations are at war with each other, and there are dissension's in the nations. It seems that there is a spirit of war and unrest in almost the entire world. Humanity seems to be blood-thirsty in almost every respect. There are wars and dissension's among the religious denominations, as well as nations. Strife and confusion seems to prevail everywhere. Let us hope that the dove of peace may soon hover over us all.

In the beginning of another volume of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST we trust that we have no other object in view than the comfort of the Lord's humble poor, and the glory of His adorable name. Our chief desire, if we know our heart, is the furtherance of the Lord's kingdom on earth, the consolation of His children, and His glory. It is our desire that the paper be conducted in such a way that it may be a medium of pleasant correspondence for the Lord's tried and tempesttossed children; a means of their instruction; a paper filled with good news and glad tidings for the poor. "The poor have the gospel preached unto them." It is our desire that in the columns of the paper we may have proclaimed nothing but "peace by Jesus Christ." "How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things." Let us all try to keep out everything but the things that are good, and that we are all glad to hear. We are never glad to hear of trouble and divisions. Let us keep those things out of the paper. Suppose we all try for one year to say nothing about trouble and confusion. Let us all try to see how close together we can get, instead of trying to see how far apart we can get. Our people are one people, and we should not be divided as we are. Persecution would drive us closer together

than we are, and we may have to pass through a siege of it, as many have done in the ages past.

Not long since we received a letter from a brother who seemed to think we now have no freedom or liberties. We often wonder if we all really appreciate the liberties and freedom which we now have. We have the freedom and liberty of meeting together, under our own vine and fig tree, to worship God and serve Him in a public way, as we understand His word to teach that we should, where none dare to molest or lawfully make us afraid. We have the privilege of publishing and reading our religious periodicals, setting forth the truth as it is taught in the Scriptures, and no one dares to interfere with us in the same. These are privileges that are blood-bought, and that were handed down to us by our fathers. Do we appreciate them? They may not be ours to enjoy for very many years. We know not when these blessings may be taken from us. Seeing that we enjoy such blessings and privileges, should we not be zealous and ready "to every good work?" May the Lord help us to consider these things, and help us to be faithful and true to His service, and help us to be kind to each other, and help us to be devoted to His cause.

We ask that our readers pray the Lord to direct us in the right way, and enable us to walk therein.

C.H.C.

CONSOLIDATION

---January 8, 1918

Last week we made the following announcement of the consolidation of the Signal with THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. We expected when the article was written that we would have the list of Signal subscribers in time to send them a copy of last week's paper, but we did not get the list of names in time. Hence very few of the subscribers to that paper have seen the article. For that reason we are inserting it again in this issue. This issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST will be sent to the Signal subscribers. All who were taking the Signal will get THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST from now on in place of the Signal. Those who were owing Brother Collings for the Signal should now remit to us, and those who had paid Brother Collings will get credit on our books at the rate of one dollar a year. That is, if you had paid Brother Collings to January 1st, 1918, we will give you credit to that date.

All the associate editors of the Signal are retained in that department, except those who were already on the staff, either in our own department or in the Southern Department. Those who were already on the editorial staff in the Southern Department were retained there, and those who were already on our staff were retained there. We suppose this will be satisfactory to all parties.

Statements will be sent to all the Signal subscribers as soon as possible, showing what date they have been marked paid to, so that if any mistakes have been made we can get them corrected. We desire to have the books as clear of errors as possible. We all make mistakes, but we desire to correct ours when we find out about them.

We trust that all will be pleased with this change, and that all will help us to conduct the paper in a way that will be to the comfort and benefit of the Lord's children, and to the glory of His name. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

We have recently bought the subscription list of the Primitive Baptist Signal, which has been published at Glen Rose, Texas. Elder J. L. Collings has been publishing the Signal for some time. There will be a Signal Department in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, which will take the place of The Good Old Songs Department. We are sorry to have to discontinue The Good Old Songs Department; but we have found no one to edit that department since the death of our dear brother, Elder M. W. Miracle, and we do not have space in the paper for that department and for the other also. Hence we discontinue The Good Old Songs Department. Brother Collings will edit the Signal Department. We trust that this consolidation will be for the good of the cause of Christ, and for the benefit of His humble poor. We shall try to publish only such matter as will be for the comfort of the Lord's children, and such things as will make for peace. We hate strife and confusion, and we trust that we may all try to write such things as make for peace.

Those who have paid for the Signal will get credit for the same length of time on THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. That is, if you have paid for the Signal until July, 1918, and you are not already a subscriber for THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, you will get credit on our books until July, 1918. That is, we will send this paper for the same length of time as you have paid for the Signal. If you were taking both papers, we will give you credit on THE PEIMITIVE BAPTIST for all the time that you have paid for the Signal.

We suppose we will receive the Signal books in a few days, perhaps by the time this goes to press. We will immediately go to work putting the names on our list, and giving the credits. There may be some instances where one member of the family is getting one paper, and another member getting the other paper. In such cases, and only one paper is wanted, let us know at once which name to send the paper to, and we will give the proper credit and send the one paper. If you get two papers, we have no way of knowing it, unless you let us know it. Please do not put it off, because we want the list correct. There are probably some mistakes, and will probably be other mistakes made. If there are, please do not get irritated or out of humor with us, but write and tell us about it, and explain the matter to us, and we will gladly and cheerfully correct the same. We know that we make mistakes, like other folks, but we are willing to correct them as soon as we find them out. In fact, we want to correct them.

As soon as we can we will notify each Signal subscriber as to what time his subscription expires, according to the records we have. If there is any mistake, we desire that we be informed of it at once, so we can get it corrected.

We sincerely ask that all parties help to extend the circulation of the paper. In these times of war and war prices, all business is in a very unsettled condition, and the papers are suffering the consequences more than any other class. The grocery man or the dry goods man pays more for his goods, but he simply adds more on to that cost for his profit, and you pay the difference. In the paper business, paper costs more, ink costs more, and other things cost more; but the price of the subscription is just about the same as it was before the war. It is by hard work and "stinting" that the paper man "gets by." We cannot raise and lower our prices to conform to conditions just any day like the merchants can and do. When you pay for the paper for a year, you get the paper for that price, no matter what the publisher has to pay to get it out. Prices may go "sky high," but he cannot charge you any more for that year, for the year's supply has been paid for. Please think about these things, and do what you can to push the paper along.

We trust we may have the prayers and help and cooperation of all our readers and corresponding editors. C. H. C.

WELCOME TO COME

---January 15, 1918

In the Baptist Trumpet of January 3, 1918, is the following article over the signature of J. S. G., which is Elder J. S. Griffin, of Queen City, Texas, one of the associate editors of the Trumpet:

For some time I have had a mind to visit the brethren in Tennessee, and it seemed that this fall the way had opened up so that I was able to make the trip; and I consented for appointments to be made; but for fear my presence at this time would be a hindrance to their peace agreement, I feel sure it is best for me not to go. I hope that the brethren who made the appointments and were so anxious for me to come will not think hard of me for not coming. I love you brethren, and, if it is God's will, I hope to come to see you when my presence will not give an offense.-J. S. G.

We wish to say that we do not know of any who would be offended in the least for Elder Griffin to visit Tennessee. Our peace agreement was that we would recognize any of the brethren who would come among us without hobbies, preaching peace by Jesus Christ. If Elder Griffin will visit this section, we will gladly and cheerfully make appointments for him.

In our peace agreement we say that we do not believe there is such a difference that it should cause division. That is our opinion now. Our brethren should not be divided. Come on, Brother Griffin, and feel at home among us. We will try to make you feel free and at home. We will try to make you feel welcome. We do not believe our people would object to your coming. We meant what we said when we signed that peace agreement, and will stand by it. Brother Griffin, may we arrange some appointments for you? C.H.C.

CANNOT SIN

---February 5, 1918

The following article, written by the late Elder W. M. Mitchell, was first published in the Gospel Messenger of October, 1896, and copied in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST of January 18, 1897. We have been requested to publish the article again. No doubt many of our present readers have never seen it, and those who have read it once will receive no injury from reading it again. Hence we give it space, and suggest a careful reading of the same."C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for His seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.- **(John 3:9)**.

Various have been the views and comments of brethren concerning the time, meaning, and proper application of the above text. And while we have had no particular objection to the doctrine presented by some of our beloved brethren on this text, we have had serious doubts as to whether they had given the proper application of the text, or presented the main and special point of doctrine contained in the text. We have thought it possible that one might speak or write the truth, and yet not expound or give the meaning of the particular text he claims to be expounding.

It is generally conceded by nearly all whose writings we have seen upon this text, that the words "cannot sin," refers to that divine nature and holy principle implanted in and received by the sinner in the new birth, and that it doth not commit sin, and that it (and not the man) cannot commit sin, because IT, and not

the man, is born of God. But does not this view of the text pervert its meaning and - conflict with the plain wording of the text itself?

If it is something else than man that is born of God, why should the word "whosoever" be used in the very beginning of the text? Why not have all parts of the text to agree, and say, "Whatsoever is born of God" (or as one brother did say, "that thing" which is born of God), "doth not commit sin, and it cannot sin, because it is born of God." It is true that this perverted wording of the text would be in harmony with the views which some have given upon it. But is this right? The Holy Ghost in the holy apostle has made no mistake in saying, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin," and why should any faithful steward of the mysteries of God wish to change the word to "whatsoever" and "it?" Would it not be better that our views harmonize with the text, rather than to change its wording to make it harmonize with our views? If it is not the man, a real person, an accountable human being that is born of God, and cannot sin because he is born of God, who is it and what is it? Some say that part that is born of God does not sin, but the body, or flesh, of the Adamic man, sins continually. Now, this may all look very plausible and consistent with our daily experience; but, after all, is this the correct solution and meaning of the words: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin?" We think it is not. There is nothing said in the text about that part of man that is born of God, nor of that thing, or spirit, that is born; but the words "whosoever" and "he" in the text, show that it is a real person whether Jew or Gentile, wise or ignorant, rich or poor, old or young-who, if born of God, in the sense of the text cannot sin, because he (not it) is born of God.

But before proceeding further we wish to remind the Christian reader that the proper application of the text we are considering does not, in any way, conflict with any other text in the Scriptures. Nor does it conflict with the daily struggle that each believing child of God has in striving against sin. It does not conflict with what the Apostle Paul has expressed and what each believer has experienced, more or less, every day of his Christian life. Each can witness that "when I would do good, evil is present with me;" and further, each may say in truth, "I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwells no good thing." Romans vii. And, again, the very same apostle who wrote the text which we are considering also said, concerning the same characters embraced in the text, that "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us. ----(I John 1:8). And again he saith: "My little children, I write unto you that ye sin not; but if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." Now, when we take into consideration that all these last quoted texts are in perfect harmony with the words, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin," we are forced to the conclusion that, as it is man that is and must be born of God, there is some Scripturally qualified sense in which "he cannot sin, because he is born of God." About forty or forty-five years ago we remember seeing a published article from an aged minister, in which he quoted the words of Jesus: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. -(John 3). After quoting this, he said: "If this birth refers to the man mentioned in (**Genesis 1:26**) then I know nothing of any such birth." This was a startling expression to me, and one that I had never heard or read from any Primitive Baptist before; and though he was an aged and orderly minister of good standing, we could not well refrain from calling the attention of our brethren to the remark, and expressing our dissent from the sentiment contained in it.

In (**Genesis 1:26**) is written: "And God said, Let us make man in our image." Now, this is the only man that we know anything about, whom God, the Creator of all

things, ever made, and in whom all other human beings were embodied; and he is the only man to whom God ever gave a law having a bearing upon all human beings that ever should be in the world, and he is the only man whose sin and transgression became the sin and transgression of all the progeny of Adam, who were created in him, and represented by him in his act of transgression. Death passed upon all when it passed upon him, for in him they all sinned, and in him they all die. And the law of God that was thus given to Adam and to all his posterity in him is the only law ever given to men which has a bearing on his future and eternal destiny beyond this world. It is the first and original law ever made binding upon man, and the transgression of it is the first and original sin ever imputed to man. That law, in all its force and perfections is the same today as when first given to man. It has never been repealed or modified in any particular. If it required perfect and perpetual obedience at first when Adam was a pure, good and innocent creature, it requires the same perfect obedience up to this very hour, and will so require it forever, if not fulfilled and its curse removed by our Lord Jesus Christ as the Surety, Husband and Redeemer of His chosen people.

Now, to be begotten and born of God is to be begotten and born of the same Spirit, power and life that raised our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead. And none are thus born but those whose sins are put away by the sacrifice of Christ. He has fulfilled the law and redeemed His people from the curse of the law, by being Himself made a curse for them. It can curse them no more, neither can they ever again commit sin, in the eye of that law, from the curse and condemnation of which their blessed Surety has redeemed them. The law, or the power of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, hath made all who are born of God free from the law or power of. sin and death. And if thus free from the power of sin and death, it is because they are born of God into the kingdom of Christ and raised up with Him above the penal demands of the law. "And if we be dead with Him," it is not unreasonable nor unscriptural to believe that "we shall live with Him. -(II Timothy 2:11).

And now, as we must bring this article to a close, suffice it to say that when it is said, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, and cannot sin," it is nothing more or less than we find, in substance, in quite a number of other texts, such as, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."-(John 5:24). None but those who are born of God are true and genuine believers in God the Father and in Jesus Christ the only begotten Son of the Father. They cannot commit sin any more under that law from which they are made free, and as they cannot commit sin in the eye of that law, they shall never more come into condemnation under the curse of that law, neither in time nor in eternity. "Christ hath obtained eternal redemption for us." "By one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." To be born of God is to be born from the dead; it is to pass from death to life. But let us remember it is the sinner that is saved, the man that is born of the Spirit, and it is the work of the Spirit and not of the flesh.

According to the views we have long entertained concerning this text, and which we have been trying to present to our readers in this article, it harmonizes with every other portion of the word of the Lord and does not require that we should say "that part of man that is born of God doth not commit sin." It is man that is born of God, and it is man that cannot sin, because he is born of God. This is the plain declaration of the text.

But let us remember that this man that is born of God, is also said to be "delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son."- (Colossians 1). And while he cannot sin so as to ever again come under the curse and condemnation of the law from which he is redeemed and made free by the blood of Christ, yet he can and does sin and violate the law of Christ, because he is born into the kingdom of God's dear Son, and is, therefore, under law to Christ. Hence the Scriptures speak of those who are born of God sinning against Christ- sinning against the brethren- sinning against the church and against their own souls. "When ye sin so against the brethren and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ."-(I Corinthians 8:12). We see, therefore, that the Scriptures do recognize the fact that, in some qualified sense, even those who are born of God can and do commit sin; but this sin is against Christ, because they are under law to Christ, and it subjects the offenders to be beaten with many stripes. God dealeth with them as with sons, and they have the blessed privilege of claiming that relationship, and in prayer say in truth "Our Father, who art in heaven * * * forgive us our sins." As sons they sin, and mourn, and repent, and plead in the name of Jesus "forgive us our sins."

If, therefore, there is not some Scriptural sense in which those who are born of God cannot sin, and also a sense in which they do sin, why should both these things be ascribed to them? If they cannot sin in any sense whatever, why should they be admonished to 'sin not,' as in **(I John 2:1)**? And if they cannot sin in any sense, why should it be said by the apostle, "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death?" This is disciplinary, and applies to Christians in their church relations; but it shows conclusively that in their relation one to another in the church they are under law to Christ, and that according to the requirements of that law they are to "bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." (Galatians 6).

To do what the law of Christ forbids, or to fail to do what it commands, is sin; but it is not a sin of an eternal bearing-or, in other words, there is no sin that a child of God who is under law to Christ can commit, that the consequences of it will follow him any farther than in this mortal life. Our God and Father will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities He will remember no more. But it is the law of His gospel kingdom that "He that doeth wrong shall suffer for the wrong that he doeth, and there is no respect of persons."

We regret that this article is so lengthy, and now we close by quoting the words of Paul to Timothy: "Consider what I say, and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." W. M. M.

REMARKS

We give space to the above editorial from Elder Mitchell in Gospel Messenger of October, 1896, because we believe most of our readers have not read it, and because we believe it to be the true exegesis of the text. The writer has advanced the same idea, or made the same exegesis of this text twice, while in discussion with Campbellites, and we believe it to be the true meaning of the text; but this article of Brother Mitchell is the first we remember to have ever seen in print giving such an explanation of the text. C.H.C.

ELDER J. B. LITTLE

---February 12, 1918

Some of our readers will remember that about two or three years ago we made a statement in this paper that Elder J. B. Little and some others were excluded from Little Flock Church, in the Salem Association, in Arkansas. The party which claimed

to exclude Elder Little and his party were recognized by the association. A suit was had for the church property, and in the Chancery Court the decision was in favor of Elder Little and his party. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court, where the decision of the lower court was affirmed. This was some time ago. A copy of the evidence and pleading was prepared by both sides and carried before the higher court. A copy of each of these briefs were placed in our hands a good while ago, but we neglected investigating them, as we have had so many things demanding attention, and have had so many things to keep us worried. Recently we have looked carefully over these briefs, and have studied them as best we could, and must say that from the evidence here produced it appears to us that the decision of the court was a righteous one.

We have also received a minute of the New Hope Association, of which Elder T. B. Little is moderator, and we find that Elder J. B. Little and those with him were received by that association into her body as Little Flock Church.

From all this it appears that we were wrong in saying that Elder Little and those with him were excluded, for the evidence here is that they are the Little Flock Church.

We are sorry that we made the statement referred to above, and sorry of any injury done. The other side may have been honest and sincere in all that they did. We would not question the motive of any of them. Neither would we presume to say that all the wrong is on one side. No doubt both sides made some mistakes. We are sorry of the trouble and division, not only in that church, but in every place where trouble and division exists. We would be glad if all little differences were buried and forgotten, and for the brethren all to come together in love and peace and sweet fellowship once more. May the good Lord grant to give us all a longing desire for peace, and make us willing to "bear all things" for the sake of peace. C. H. C.

NOTE.-After the above was written and put in the paper we were convinced that the party which excluded Elder Little was the church and should be recognized as such. So when we moved to Arkansas, in the bounds of the New Hope Association, we did not put our membership in that association until the churches had said by their act in conference that they favored dropping Elder Little and his party from the association. The matters in the law briefs were hard for us to fully understand; and we know, too, something about how hard it is for a true Old Baptist Church to get proper results and decisions in the civil courts. We do not say this to find fault with the courts; but church matters and civil matters are entirely different things. Church matters have no business in civil courts, or the courts of the land.- C. H. C.

Ephesians 1; Ephesians 6:24

---February 19, 1918

Brother T. E. Washburn, Oneonta, Ala., requests our views of **(Ephesians 1:13)**. He wishes us to explain "the word" and "after that."

(Ephesians 1:12) reads: "That we should be to the praise of His glory, who first trusted in Christ."

(Ephesians 1:13) reads: "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise."

The meaning of the twelfth verse is "For us, who have fore-trusted in the Christ, to be to the praise of His glory." These people obtained an inheritance in Christ, because God had predestinated them to that end; and on this account they trusted

in Christ. These were the people among the Jews whom God had predestinated to the inheritance.

The gospel was first preached to the Jews; the glad tidings of salvation was first preached to them. God had a people among the Gentiles as well as among the Jews. The Gentiles heard the gospel after the Jews had heard it. That is, the gospel was first preached to the Jews, and then to the Gentiles. Then the Gentiles trusted in Christ, "having heard the word of truth, the glad tidings" of their salvation. They were first saved, then heard the glad tidings, or good news, of their salvation; then they trusted in Christ; then they were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise. They were saved before they were sealed. The sealing is not the saving. They were first saved; then they heard the news of their salvation; then they believed; then they were sealed. This is the order, and the language will admit of no other construction, neither can any other conclusion be consistently drawn from it."C. H. C.

Song Service

---February 19, 1918

A few weeks ago we copied some articles on the subject of singing from the Messenger of Peace, written by Elder Walter Cash. We have been requested to write some on the subject, and feel a desire to offer just a few thoughts.

For a long time we have noticed that our people, in many places, were lacking in their singing. They have not had the training and practice which they should have. Where they had books with notes, and had the training and practice, the books contained much of the modern "jig" music, suited only for pastime, and not at all suitable for congregational singing, or the true worship of God. Many of the songs were not sound in sentiment.

In the Bible we are commanded to sing and to make melody in our hearts unto the Lord. We are also required to sing with the spirit and with the understanding also. It seems to us that in order to sing with the spirit one must sing the truth. We have thought, too, that it is just as much wrong to sing a false doctrine as it is to preach it.

If our singing is not good, and all out of time and harmony, it is not edifying to the hearers. In fact, it may often "grate on their nerves." We have often heard singing when we wished they would stop-perhaps some of them would be about two lines - ahead of the others; perhaps some singing one stanza and some singing another; perhaps some singing too high, and some singing too low-we might say, a regular jargon. We cannot sing; the Lord has not seen fit to give us a voice for singing; but we do enjoy hearing good singing. Many times our heart has been comforted as we listened to the sweet music and the glorious sentiment proclaimed in song.

In the "Rudiments of Music" in the "Good Old Songs" we said: "Our great heavenly Father has graciously blessed most of us with the faculty of music, and has given us talents that we should improve in that sacred and heavenly science. Should we not be careful as to how we use them? They should be used in such a way as to glorify His name. All who have these talents given them should try to improve them and learn how to sing, and try to sing with the spirit and with the understanding, 'making melody in your heart to the Lord.'" This was our sentiment when that work was first published, in 1913, and it is our sentiment yet.

We like to see a whole congregation join in the singing. "All who have these talents given them should try to improve them." In order to improve the talent for singing, one must sing. Taking a back seat and listening to others will not improve one's talent. There is a song we have seen, and heard, called "The Model Church." An old man had been to meeting and on his return home he told his wife he had found the

model church that day. He went on to tell her of the good old songs which were sung, and how that the preacher said, "Let all the people sing." Exclusive choir singing was not had that day, and the poor old soldier of the cross was made to rejoice. He tells how he joined his feeble, trembling voice in once more singing that melodious tune, "Coronation," to those beautiful and soul-cheering words, "All hail the power of Jesus' name." Once more he sang as in his youthful days. He felt like some wrecked mariner who gets a glimpse of shore. He had another glimpse that day of the heavenly shore just beyond the dark and rolling stream of death, and his poor old heart was made glad, and he rejoiced once more in the blessed hope of immortality beyond.

We cannot, in the communion service, ask all the people to partake, or to join with us. The Lord's table is in His kingdom, and one must come into that kingdom in order to have a right to partake of the emblems of His broken body and shed blood. Baptism is a prerequisite to the communion. Baptism is the ordinance which initiates one into the Lord's organized kingdom on earth, and one must be in the kingdom in order to have a right to eat at the table which is in that kingdom. But baptism is not a prerequisite to singing.

We are glad to say that we have observed a great improvement in the singing in many places of recent years. We have tried to encourage churches to have schools taught and classes organized. We are sure they are a great help in the singing. We trust many more places may do this. We are sure they will never regret it. There are teachers who are reasonable in their charges, and will make low prices for their services. They love the service of God, and love the good old songs which made glad the hearts of our mothers and fathers who have gone on to that better home, and have joined in the song of that celestial city, and whose happy spirits sing the glad notes of perfect redemption. Let us try to improve the talent the Lord has given us, and encourage all to do so that we can.

These thoughts are submitted in love for the cause and in the love of the truth, as we trust C. H. C.

Joshua 24:15

---March 5, 1918

Brother T. S. Murrie, of Proctor, Okla., asks our views on **((Josh 24:15) (Joshua 24:15)**, and asks if Joshua was talking to the heathen. The text says: "And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

Joshua was addressing the Israelites. He was not talking to the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Hivites, the Jebusites, nor any other "ites," only Israelites. This is clear and indisputable, as will be seen from the reading of the first verse of the chapter, which says: "And Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel to Shechem, and called for the elders of Israel, and for their heads, and for their judges, and for their officers; and they presented themselves before the Lord." Verse 2 says: "And Joshua said unto all the people, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Nachor: and they served other gods." Verse 3 says: "And I took your father Abraham from the other side of the flood, and led him throughout all the land of Canaan, and multiplied his seed, and gave him Isaac." Any person who says that Joshua was talking to the heathen nations displays a lack of knowledge, and shows a lack of reading. The

language above is too clear to admit of controversy as to whom the prophet was addressing.

This language is often "quoted at" by the Arminian world to prove that the sinner is required to choose between God and Satan; that the right of choice is given to the sinner. If it be true that the right of choice is given to the sinner, and the sinner exercises the right and chooses Satan, or sin, and is sent to destruction for it, then he is sent to destruction for doing what God gave him a right to do. If God has given the sinner the right of choice, then the sinner has the right to his choice. If he has a right to his choice, there could be no just punishment for his exercising his right; unless it is wrong to exercise one's right. If it is wrong, then it is not right, unless it is wrong to do right. This reduces the proposition (that God has given the sinner the right of choice) to an absurdity; hence, it is untrue.

Israel had forsaken the true service of God, as He required, and were worshipping and serving idols. They were plainly commanded in verse 14 to put away the idols from among them and to serve the Lord in sincerity and in truth. But if it seemed evil unto them to serve the Lord, and if they would not serve Him, then they might choose that day as to whether they would serve this or that set of idols. One set of idols was served by their fathers on the other side of the flood. Another set was the gods of the Amorites, among whom the Israelites were then dwelling. One set of these idols was just as good as the other; neither of them were any good. Both were worthless. It would be as well for them to serve one set as the other; it made no difference whatever. What was true then is true now. One false god is as good as another. They are all wrong.

Much more could be written, but this is enough to show that the language is to Israel, and applies only to the Lord's people." C. H. C.

Revelation 16:13

---March 5, 1918

Brother Enoch Bledsoe, of Blackwater, Va., requests our views of (**Revelation 16:13**), which reads: "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet." We do not feel an inclination, or desire to offer more than a few remarks in connection with the text.

Note that the unclean spirits came out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. They were the same unclean spirits which came out of the mouth of one that came out of the mouth of the others. The false prophet prophesies falsely; unclean spirits come out of his mouth. The Lord had true prophets, and there were false prophets, which were not the Lord's prophets. The Lord has true ministers, and there are false ministers, which are not the Lord's ministers.

The unclean spirits were like frogs; they were not frogs, but they were like them. Frogs usually make more noise as spring approaches. As you travel along, and come near a low, swampy place, in spring time, you can usually hear a great noise. So, there are some spirits which make a great noise as spring approaches. As the weather turns warm, and there are signs of approaching spring, the noise of the "big meetings" begin.

Frogs are amphibious-they live in water or on land. Yet they are usually more often found in low, marshy places; that is, some of them are. Others (as toads) usually hide during the day and come out to feed at night.

Some species of them are hatched in the water-perhaps most of them. At first they are tadpoles. They change from tadpoles to frogs when the tail disappears. As tadpoles they live in the water. As frogs they live in water or on land.

Some spirits say you can't have Christians without water. They have to gather 'round the water to make Christians, or rather, to make children of God. That's like the frog.

There is another kind of frog called the tree frog. It turns the same color as the article it is on. If it is on a gray bark it will turn gray. Put it on a brown leaf, and it will turn brown. Put it on a white article, and it will turn white. Put it on a black stump, and it will turn black. Put it on a green leaf, and it will turn green.

There is a spirit like that. Some folks are always of your opinion when they are with you. Put them with others whose opinion is different, and their opinion will be different. They always agree with those they are with. They can shift in opinion as quickly and as conveniently as the tree frog can change in color.

Some frogs will hide under bushes and leaves, and will come out readily when it rains. The sprinkle suits them all right; but they seldom get in the water. So, there are some who like sprinkling all right; they seldom get in the water.

Comparisons might be made still farther. Study the nature of frogs, and compare the same with the spirits, and you will find that these are only a few that may be correctly made." C. H. C.

A Debate

---July 16, 1918

We are in receipt of a letter from Elder J. M. Fuqua, of Dickson, Tenn., in which he tells us he had written us some time ago where people would be met who wished to attend our debate with Elder Daugherty. The debate is to begin on Tuesday, August 6, 1918, at Liberty Hill meeting house. Brother Fuqua says that conveyance will be at Burns on Monday for all who wish to attend the debate. We suggest that those who intend going write to Elder Fuqua, as above, so it may be known how many to have conveyance for.

C.H.C.

Prayer Book

---July 16, 1918

Some time ago we received a letter from a brother in Texas telling us that a certain sister out there saw an advertisement of prayer books in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, and that she said she had not read a copy of the paper since, and that she wanted an explanation of the matter through our columns. If she does not read the paper she may never see this explanation, but we only have this to say:

Our advertising department is in the hands of---of---It is true that we have the right to reject any advertisement which we think is fraudulent, or of an unreliable firm. Many advertisements are inserted for people that we know nothing about. This is a matter that is simply unavoidable. Any person who knows anything at all would know that it would be impossible to go all over the United States and investigate every concern for whom an advertisement is sent us. We know, too, that parties advertise things in our paper sometimes which will not pay them. That is, parties sometimes send us an advertisement and we know that they will receive no benefit from it, or at least, very little benefit. The advertisement of a prayer book will serve as an illustration. The editor was not aware that an advertisement of that kind had been inserted in the paper. If we had known it, we would have known that the advertiser was spending money from which he would get very little,

if any, returns. We know that our people do not use prayer books. While that is true, some of them may sometimes wish to get such a book so that they can see and know for themselves what people are doing, and what the religious world is doing. So far as we are concerned, we have no more confidence in written or printed prayers than the sister has; but we have a prayer book in our library, as well as a good many other books which the Arminian world has published. We have them because we wish to know what they are doing and what they are advocating. If some people who are so particular could take an editor's place for a week or two they might not be so quick to find fault. We know that editors make mistakes, and so do other folks. If people would always remember the Saviour's teaching about the beam and the mote, they might sometimes pursue a course a little different to the one they do pursue.

We suppose that when we get to the point that we can conduct a paper that will suit every person exactly, and to which no fault can be found by anyone, no matter how perfect that one may be, then we will have a subscription list so large that it will tax the United States Government to the utmost capacity to provide mail facilities to deliver the paper to the subscribers, and the long-talked of millennium will have come. That appears to us to be so far in the future that we have no hope of living to attain such an end.

May the good Lord help us all, and, if it can be His will, remove from us the spirit of war and bloodshed which is in the churches as well as in the nations.

C.H.C.

Red Cross and Woman Suffrage

---September 3, 1918

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother in Hope-If not asking too much, would like to have your views about Old Baptists joining the Red Cross Society, and Old Baptist women voting in primaries or general elections. I disagree with some of our members about these things and would like to have your opinion. Also would like for Elder D. Hopper to write on **(Isaiah 2:4)**. Has that prophecy yet to come before the end of time? A little sister in hope of eternal life,

MRS. MAGGIE HOWARD

Devine, Texas.

REMARKS

In reply to the above questions we say that we think it is all right for our people to contribute to the Red Cross for the benefit of our soldiers on the battlefields of France, who are fighting for the preservation of our freedom and the liberties that have been handed down to us by our ancestors. We have to win the war against Germany, or else be brought under German control and military rule. This is the condition of affairs, and, therefore, we must win the war. The boys who are in the trenches are fighting that these liberties may still be handed down to our children. They are fighting for us; for this reason it is our duty to do what we can for their comfort and health. We can do this without becoming members, of the Red Cross. We are not a member, but we have contributed for the benefit of our soldiers. As to women voting, we have to say that we think it better for the good women to be home makers rather than be mixing in politics. The greatest influence is in the home, and a woman can do more good there for her country than she can ever do in other ways. Read **(Titus 2:1-5)**." C. H. C.

Church Organized

---September 17, 1918

On Saturday before the fourth Sunday in August the following elders and deacons met at Shady Grove, a few miles south of Fulton, Ky., for the purpose of organizing a church at that place: Elders J. B. Halbrook, B. P. Simmons, M. J. Perry, R. L. Perry, and C. H. Cayce, and Deacons J. A. Littlejohn, E. Perry A. M. Perry, and C. J. Russell. Elder J. B. Halbrook was chosen to serve as moderator, and Elder C. H. Cayce as clerk of the presbytery. The covenant, articles of faith, and rules of decorum were read, upon which they proposed to be constituted, and by which they proposed to be governed, which were approved, and those who signed the same were pronounced a gospel church in order, after their letters of dismission had been read. After the church had thus been organized, they sat in conference and made choice of Elder R. L. Perry as pastor and moderator, and Brother Will French as clerk. Their regular meeting time will be on the fourth Sunday, and Saturday before, in each month. They will be glad for brethren to visit them at any time. C. H. C.

A Debate

---September 17, 1918

We have agreed to meet Mr. I. B. Bradley in debate near Burns, Tenn., to begin on Monday, September 23, and holding five days. The place is Gentry's Grove, about two miles from Burns. Notice should have been given before this time, but we have been waiting to hear from Mr. Bradley concerning a request we made of him, but no hearing has been received from him. We trust all the brethren will be there who can go.
C.H.C.

Government Rulings

---September 24, 1918

On account of the scarcity of coal, and on account of paper shortage, the Priorities Board of the War Industries Board has made some rulings which materially affect our business. The amount of paper used by each newspaper must be reduced 15 per cent. In order to make that reduction the following rules have been made by the Board, and the following notice sent to us:

To PUBLISHERS OF COUNTRY WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS:

The Priorities Board of the War Industries Board has listed paper mills as an essential industry, and has rated them in fourth class for priority for coal, on the distinct understanding that the greatest possible economy in the use of paper be exercised, and that the reduction in the use of paper by the newspapers shall be 15 per cent.

Each paper mill will be put upon the priority list for coal, conditional upon their signing a pledge that they will furnish no paper to any consumer who will not also sign a pledge in duplicate that he will exercise the greatest possible economy in the use of paper, and will observe all rules and regulations of the Conservation Division and of the Pulp and Paper Section of the War Industries Board. These pledges are now being prepared and will be furnished shortly. One copy will be left on file with the mill and the other will be sent to this office.

The war committee of weekly newspaper publishers feels that the necessary saving of 15 per cent should come out of the industry as a whole, and in order to

accomplish this purpose, made the following suggestions, which were accepted by the Pulp and Paper Section of the War Industries Board and are to be effective September 1, 1918.

Each publisher shall eliminate the following wasteful practices. If for any reason a publisher desires to continue any of these practices, he must adopt some other methods to accomplish at least a 15 per cent reduction in paper used. If by November 1, 1918, a saving of 15 per cent has not been made in the industry as a whole, the matter will be reviewed by the Pulp and Paper Section and further curtailments will be necessary.

1. No publisher of a weekly, semi-weekly, or tri-weekly newspaper shall use in its production any paper except newsprint, and of a weight on the basis of not heavier than 30~x44-50lb. (basis, 24x36---321bs.)

All stocks now on hand may be used whether newsprint, machine finished, or sized and super calendered, and regardless of weight.

2. No publisher may continue subscriptions after three months after date of expiration, unless subscriptions are renewed and paid for.

3. No publisher may give free copies of his paper, except for actual service rendered; except to camp libraries and huts or can-teens of organizations recognized by the Government, such as Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., or K. of C.; except to the Library of Congress, and other libraries which will agree to bind for permanent keeping; except to Governmental departmental libraries which use said publications in their work; and except for similar reasons.

4. No publisher shall give free copies to advertisers, except not more than one copy for checking purposes.

5. No publisher shall accept the return of unsold copies from news dealers.

6. No publisher shall print extra copies, for stimulating advertising or subscriptions, or for any other use than those specified in these regulations, except not to exceed 1 per cent of his circulation with a minimum of 10 copies.

7. No publisher shall send free copies in exchange for other publications, except to such other publications as are published within the county, or within a radius of 40 miles from his point of publication.

8. No publisher shall sell his publication at an exceedingly low or nominal subscription price.

9. No publisher shall sell his publication to anyone below the published subscription price.

10. No publisher shall offer premiums with his publication unless a price is put upon the premium for sale separately, and the combined price is at least 75 per cent of the sum of the individual prices.

11. No publisher shall conduct voting or other contests for the purpose of obtaining subscriptions; subscriptions obtained in this way will not be considered bona fide subscriptions.

12. No publisher may issue holiday, industrial or other special editions.

13. Publishers shall, so far as possible, procure paper and all other materials from the nearest available source of supply, provided it is consistent with price, quality and service.

14. Publishers of papers of more than 8 pages in size will reduce the pages in excess of 8 pages 25 per cent. This reduction shall be an average reduction over one month's period.

15. Any publisher of a 4 or 8 page paper will be considered to have fulfilled the requirements of this order if he immediately puts into effect paragraphs numbered 1 to 13 inclusive, and in addition thereto reduces to the lowest possible point all press room waste.

No newspaper may be established during the period of the war, except those for which arrangements had been made and plants purchased previous to the issuing of this order, or unless it can be shown that a new newspaper is a necessity.

A sworn statement will be required from each publisher on November 1 as to how many of these rules have been put into effect by him, and what results in the matter of reducing paper consumption have been obtained. Yours very truly,

THOMAS E. DONNELLEY.

Chief of Pulp and Paper Section. August 22, 1918.

The reader will see from the foregoing that there are certain requirements which we have to meet that will make some changes necessary in the rules we have been following.

Rule No. 2 forbids the sending of a paper more than three months on time. In order to meet the requirements of this rule we will have to discontinue sending the paper to our subscribers after the time paid for expires. Our rule heretofore has been to notify the subscriber when his time was out and continue sending the paper for as long as one year on time unless notified not to send it. In order to meet the requirements of our War Board we will have to discontinue that rule, and stop the paper when the time paid for is out. This is not left optional with us or the subscriber, but is required-by the government.

Rule No. 3 forbids the giving of free copies of the paper, except for actual service rendered and for libraries. The sending of our paper free is no longer left optional with us. We will have to stop sending the paper free to all those brethren and sisters we have been giving the paper to. This is another thing that is not left optional with us. We will have to drop the names from our list who are getting the paper free.

Rule No. 7 forbids the sending of papers in exchange for other papers, unless the other papers are published within forty miles of Martin, Tenn. To meet the requirements of this rule we will have to stop exchanging papers with others. We will have to subscribe and pay for the papers we get, and others who wish to get our paper will have to do the same thing.

Rule No. 9 forbids us selling the paper to anyone below the published subscription price. We have not been doing this, but some have asked us to do so. If we desired to do what they have asked, it would be a violation of the law for us to do that now.

Rule No. 14 requires that the papers which have more than eight pages must be reduced. That is, a reduction of twenty-five per cent must be made of all pages more than eight. Our paper has sixteen pages. Hence, we have to make a reduction of twenty-five per cent in the number of pages more than eight. This reduction may be made as an average over a period of one month. In order to meet this requirement we will have to issue a paper one-half size each month. This will give us the reduction required, lacking a small fraction. In order to meet this requirement, we are having to send out this issue of the paper just half size.

We ask our subscribers to read and study these rulings made by our government, so that they may all understand the position we are placed in. We trust that no one will think hard of us or censure us for trying to carry out these requirements. We also trust that all will cheerfully accept the situation. We are involved in a great war, fighting for our freedom and our liberties, and we should be willing to make these sacrifices to save material for our government which is needed to prosecute the war.

The date to which every subscriber has paid is on the paper or wrapper opposite the name. Look at the date on your paper, and if your time has expired, please renew at once, as we will have to soon drop all subscribers who have not paid up. We will have to do this to comply with the law. A great many of our subscribers have been paying at the end of the year instead of in advance, but this order prevents us sending the paper that way any more. Please attend to this matter at once. We do not wish to drop any names from the list, but we must comply with the law. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 33

---December 24, 1918

The year 1918, with its joys, sorrows, anxieties, heartaches and brought tears, - has passed and has forever gone, and what another year will bring is altogether unknown to us. We have heard the shouts of joy and praise of God's dear people. We have seen the faces of many aglow with joy and gladness, and we have felt to rejoice with them. We have looked into the faces of many who were the very picture of sadness and sorrow. We have visited the house of mourning-fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters mourning the loss of someone who was near and dear to them by the ties of nature; and we have sorrowed and mourned with them. Many are now sleeping the sleep of death that were with us one year ago, and we are left sad and lonely; but this serves to call our minds to the fact that we, too, are swiftly passing to our eternal home, and to wean our minds from the perishing things of this fleeting, sinful world, and direct them to Him who is the Creator of all created things and the Giver of every good and perfect gift. It is through and by Him we have our being and that we are blessed with food and raiment, together with all spiritual blessings. Hence, to the Lord we owe our lives, and the same should be devoted to His service and the welfare of each other, instead of striving after the perishing things of this life to the neglect of these things. How much better it would be for us, and how much more happiness there would be in this life, if we would try to live for each other and the honor and glory of God's great and holy name. We have but a few more days, at best, to spend in this world and we, too, will be called to say farewell to our loved ones and all we may possess of the goods of this world. Will this be a joyful hour with us, or will it be one of regret? The Lord has promised not to forsake His obedient children, but to be with them in all their troubles, trials and afflictions. He will lighten up the pathway of death for those who have lived obediently and walked humbly before Him, and to such it will be a joyful hour; but to those who have lived a life of disobedience to His holy commands, following the promptings of the evil one instead of the gentle wooing of His Holy Spirit, it doubtless will be an hour of regret. Then let us try to live in such a way that His name will be glorified and that death will be a welcome visitor when he comes.

With this issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST we bid our readers adieu for the year 1918, hoping to come to you again January 7, 1919. We have desired to give our readers a paper that would be a comfort and consolation in their many trials and troubles, and that would unify, edify and build them up, instead of dividing and scattering them, and to this end we have labored; but with what results we leave our readers to judge.

The Lord willing, we shall endeavor to follow the same line in the coming year, contending for the same time-honored principles of our fathers as we have ever done. To this end we beg an interest in your prayers, realizing our weakness and

imperfections and our dependence upon an independent God." May heaven's blessings be yours." C. H. C.

1919

A Breakdown

---January 14, 1919

While printing the papers for our issue dated December 24, in some unexpected manner our large press was badly broken. - We lacked some 1,500 or 2,000 papers being done printing. As the press broke before they were all printed this many of our subscribers failed to get that issue of the paper. We assure you that we hate the accident much more than you do, because it will cost us possibly \$100 or \$200 to have the press repaired.

We are trying to issue some kind of paper for you, but if you are disappointed in any way please be as patient as you can, and remember this accident, and also that the "flu" is still raging in our office, and that ten or twelve of our hands are, or have been, sick with it during the past four weeks. Such illness has almost demoralized certain branches of work in the office. We hope to get back to normal soon. C. H. C.

Elder John R. Daily in the Daily-Hughes Debate

---January 21, 1919

We have received permission from Elder John R. Daily to publish the speeches he made in the Daily-Hughes debate. Elder Hughes was a Universalist. We wrote Elder Daily and asked him if we could publish these speeches because we consider them among the ablest we have ever read. We believe every one of our readers will receive great benefit, instruction, encouragement and enjoyment by reading them; hence, beginning this week Elder Daily's speeches will be published serially as fast as possible, as much in each issue as we can use.

We ask everyone of you to read every argument carefully, and don't fail to get the leading thought throughout the discussion-that it is sinners of Adam's race who are regenerated, or born of God, by the Spirit of God being implanted in their hearts; that it is sinners of Adam's race who are finally saved in heaven, and that these sinners of Adam's race are men and women, human beings. If you will bear this in mind continually you will receive great benefit from the reading.

Notice, also, that Hughes argued that God's people were a family of invisible spirits, while Elder Daily denied this all the way through the book. C. H. C.

NOTE.-It would take too much space to put Elder Daily's speeches in this book.

Some Questions

June 3, 1919

CAYCE PUBLISHING COMPANY:

Dear Brethren-I am sending you some questions to publish in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST and would like to have a public hearing from Elders Cayce, Petty, Bullard, Wilson, Newman and Golston. These brethren have all been in my home, and I would love for them to visit us again. In love,

A. N. VANCE

Hattiesburg, Miss.

THE QUESTIONS

Is it right to have a singing class at a Primitive Baptist Church, and have a song service before and after services?

Has the leader a right to say who shall sing and who shall not sing; or is it right for the leader to invite all who are in the congregation, that feel like singing, to take part?

Do we have the same right to invite people up in the communion service as we have to invite them to sing? If so, give the chapter and verse.

Is there anything written that is above the Bible?

How old are the articles of faith that the Primitive Baptists have subscribed to?

Isn't the Bible the only rule of faith and practice?

How old is the Black Rock Address, and who wrote it?

How old is the London Confession of Faith and who wrote it? Doesn't it contain some Absolutism?

Isn't it possible that a man can be a stockholder in a bank, be a merchant, or county officer, and carry on any kind of legitimate business and be a member of the Primitive Baptist Church?

Is it possible for a preacher to get wrong? If so, how will you start to get him right?

How far does the Bible require the members to follow the preacher?

Is it right for a preacher to entirely depend on the members for the support of himself and family?

When a preacher accuses a church of something, and the church proves that she is not guilty, and the preacher still contends that the church is guilty, where will the evidence have to come from to convince him?

What three words in the English language covers more space than "grace," "peace" and "love?"

When preachers differ on some point of doctrine or order, should it be a public or private difference?

Give the symptoms of a prejudiced and jealous preacher and also remedy? In love,
A. N. VANCE

Hattiesburg, Miss.

OUR ANSWER

Brother Vance asks our opinion concerning the things asked about, as well as the views of other brethren. The other brethren are at liberty to answer for themselves, and we will answer the questions according to our own view. We will simply answer by number.

1. We think it is. We are commanded to sing spiritual songs and to make melody in our hearts unto the Lord, who has graciously given most of us a voice and organs with which to sing, and a talent for singing. This God-given voice and talent should be improved. In order to the proper improvement of them, it is necessary that classes be taught, or that the person be taught, and this is conveniently and economically and best done in classes.

2. It is certainly proper to invite all to sing, or to take part therein. It cannot be wrong to invite those present to sing.

3. No. The communion service, or partaking of the sacramental supper, is an ordinance of the church and in the church; singing is not.

4. No. There is nothing written that is above the Bible; but sometimes men "become wise above that which is written."

5. So far as we know the London Confession of Faith is the oldest confession of faith put forth by the Baptists, now in print.
6. Yes. Our articles of faith so state.
7. The Black Rock Address was written September 28th and 29th, 1832, at Black Rock, Baltimore County, Maryland, in accordance with a call in a circular prepared and published by elders and brethren at the preceding session of the Baltimore Association.
8. The London Confession of Faith was written by messengers and ministers of upwards of one hundred congregations in England and Wales while in session July 3 to 11, 1689. The following short address, or preface, precedes the confession: "We, the ministers and messengers of, and concerned for, upwards of one hundred baptized congregations in England and Wales (denying Arminianism), being met together in London from the third of the seventh month till the eleventh of the same, 1689, to consider of some things that might be for the glory of God and the good of these congregations, have thought meet (for the satisfaction of all other Christians that differ from us in the point of baptism) to recommend to their perusal the Confession of our Faith, printed for and sold by John Marshall, at the Bible in Grace-Church Street. Which Confession we own as containing the doctrine of our faith and practice, and do desire that the members of our churches respectively do furnish themselves therewith." This is signed by the following names in the name and behalf of the whole assembly: Hanserd Knollys, John Harris, Hercules Collins, Leonard Harrison, Isaac Lamb, Benjamin Reach, Thomas Vaux, James Hitt, William Facy, Christopher Price, John Ball, William Pritchard, Richard Ring, Toby Willis, James Webb, Robert Knight, William Phips, Samuel Ewer, Charles Archer, William Kiffin, William Collins, Robert Steed, George Barrett, Richard Adams, Andrew Grifford, Thomas Winnel, Richard Tidmarsh, Samuel Buttal, Daniel Finch, Edmond White, Paul Fruin, John Tomkins, John Carter, Richard Sutton, Edward Price, William Hankins, Edward Man. We do not think it contains what is now termed "Absolutism." One section (Chapter III Sec. 1) may be construed by some to teach that doctrine, but when proper notice is taken of each word, it may be seen that it is not embraced therein.
9. Yes, most assuredly.
Yes, they often get wrong. They cause most of the trouble among the churches. When one gets wrong, the church should take the same steps with him as with any other member.
Just so far as the preacher follows Christ, and no farther.

We think that when a preacher is not preaching, or spending all his time that way, he should follow some honorable work for the support of himself and family, if he is physically able.

We do not know where the evidence would have to come from.

Those three words embrace a great deal-possibly as much, or almost as much, as any other three words in the language.

Little differences should be borne with, and should be private differences. No one is perfect-at least, if one is perfect, we would like to see him, for we do not think we have yet met such a person-and we should be willing to bear with each other on minor points.

16. These symptoms are usually so plainly manifest that we hardly deem it necessary to mention many of them here. One symptom we will mention is that the one who has become tainted with the disease will sometimes use a brother for his text in his little preaching, instead of preaching Christ and Him crucified.

Another symptom is that if the brethren invite, or request, another brother to render a service for them, instead of asking him, he becomes offended; refuses to even be present at the service rendered; thinks he has as much sense, or is as smart and as well prepared to have rendered the service, as the brother requested; thinks he is as well balanced and as level-headed as any other Old Baptist in that whole section of country. These are a few of the symptoms. One more is that every brother must use his words in expressing his views or else he is a heretic. Another symptom is that he will talk or write things (sometimes) that are not true in order to injure the brother and to create suspicion in the minds of the brethren against him. These are a few of the symptoms. You may recognize them, as well as others. The best remedy we know is to exclude the brother who has contracted the disease, but it is one that is seldom applied. The usual rule is for some brethren to fall in with him and stir trouble and confusion, and sow discord among the brethren, and cause brethren to become alienated and fellowship to be destroyed all for no reason on earth only the malice, envy, jealousy, and hatred of some preacher who aspires to leadership, and who is determined to rule or ruin. We are sorry it is so, but these are facts. May the good Lord help us all and deliver us from the perils of false brethren. C. H. C.

Preacher Not Wanted

---June 10, 1919

Brother C. A. Hall, of New Albany, Miss., asks us to answer the following question through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST:

Is it order for a preacher to go and preach at a church, when said preacher knows that several of the members of the aforesaid church do not want him to preach in said church, owing to his preaching causing confusion in said church?

If a brother's preaching causes confusion in an Old Baptist Church something must be wrong, either with the preaching or with the church. The church might be wrong-having been led wrong by some man-so that she will not receive the truth on some point. Then, on the other hand, the brother may be preaching wrong. He might preach the truth, yet not preach it in the right way. He might be making a hobby of some point, and that point be true. Many things might be considered in a case of the kind mentioned in the question; and yet we do not know that Brother Hall had any particular case in view when he asked the question. We know that we have no particular case in mind in our answering it. We are not so sure that it constitutes disorder for a preacher to preach at a church where there are objections on the ground mentioned, yet we think it is usually a safe rule for a brother to follow not to visit a church, or preach at a church, under such circumstances as mentioned in the question. Still, circumstances might be such as that it would be perfectly right for him to preach at a church when such an objection might be made. Circumstances in the case should govern. It depends upon why such complaint or objection is made. " C. H. C.

A Magnetic Healer

---July 1, 1919

We are informed that Elder R. V Sarrels has become a "magnetic healer," and that he "heals" people now. We may be a little late in announcing this fact to our readers, but we have simply overlooked it, until the present. We wonder if Luke, the "beloved physician," was a "magnetic healer." C. H. C.

Some Questions

---July 1, 1919

ELDER C.H.CAYCE

Dear Brother-Do the gates of hell prevail against the church or kingdom that is set up in this world for the indwelling of His people? When we join this church does it put us in bondage? Please answer these questions, giving your views and chapter and verse through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Your unworthy brother,

E.E.HUDDLESTN

R. 8, Booneville, Miss.

REMARKS

The gates of hell do not prevail against the church to the utter destruction of the church. The church may become extinct in any one locality, but it will be planted some other place. "Unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end."-(Ephesians 3:21). "Unto Him be the glory in the church," and this is "throughout all ages." Daniel said that the kingdom should stand forever; **((Dan 2:44) (Daniel 2:44))**. The church has come through flames of persecution, and has not yet been destroyed.

When one becomes a member of this church, they come under the rules and regulations that govern in the church. A member is under obligation to observe the rules and regulations of the church. Read the church covenant and you will see the obligation there. If one loves the church it is not a prison to him, and it is not a service that is grievous. If it is grievous for one to observe the rules, it is evidence that he does not love the church as he should. The child of God is free from law service, or is not obligated to render law service. Yet he is under law to Christ, and is under obligation to render service unto the Lord. This service is not unreasonable service; **(Romans 12:1)**. In the service of the Lord there is a warfare, and one who engages in a warfare is a soldier. A soldier is under obligation to the kingdom for which he is fighting. He is under obligation to his captain. Jesus is our Captain; **(II Timothy 2:3)**. He has made us free from the elements of the world, and we should show forth His praise by rendering the service unto Him that is due; **(Galatians 5:1)**. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 15:29

---July 1, 1919

Sister T. B. Harlan, of Reagan, Texas, asked us sometime ago to give our views on the above Scripture. We do not have the time now to write at length, though the text embraces a great deal, but will make a few remarks. The text reads, "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" This shows that the person baptized is dead. They are dead to sin, and dead to the love of it. The dead are buried and will rise again. In baptism the person baptized is buried and raised again-hence baptized for the dead. The text shows clearly to us that baptism is a burial and a resurrection. If there be no resurrection, then the baptism is wrong. But as the doctrine of the resurrection is true, then the baptism representing it is right. This is one of the things necessary to constitute Scriptural or gospel baptism."C. H. C.

Wrong To Gamble

---September 23, 1919

We are in receipt of a query from Louisiana, which says, "Is it in order for a Primitive Baptist to raffle off his horse, or is it not orderly?"

It seems to us that a question like this has but one answer, and that every person who has a sense of moral rectitude and right should be able to answer promptly, and should need no instruction from others as to what is right or wrong in such a procedure. The question might as well be asked, "is it order for one to gamble?" for raffling off a horse or anything else is gambling, pure and simple. If a member of the Primitive Baptist Church has been engaged in such practice as raffling off his horse, the church should bring a charge against him for gambling at the first conference meeting and notify the guilty party of the charge, and then deal with him accordingly."C. H. C.

Questions of Order

---September 23, 1919

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother-Please publish this query and answer same for the benefit of all. Brother P and Brother C differ on a point of doctrine and Brother C has Brother G to bring a charge against Brother P, and in the settlement Brother C comes to church and asks the church to exclude him by rescinding the act of receiving him, for the reason that he is not in fellowship with the doctrine of that church. Can that church fellowship any other church that receives Brother C? Next, if Brother P is pastor of the church that rescinded the act of receiving Brother C, is it orderly for Brother C to be invited in the stand by Brother P's home church, when his church knows that Brother C is in disorder with the church that excluded him?

Please publish this in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. In hope,
N. V PARKER.

Pocahontas, Tenn.

OUR REPLY

In answer to the above query, we give it as our judgment that no other orderly church can fellowship the church which receives Brother C.

In answer to the second query will say that in our opinion it is not orderly for Brother C to be invited into the stand or to take part in the service of the home church of Brother P. If the home church of Brother P knows that Brother C is not considered in order by the church that dismissed him, it would be a flagrant disregard of order for them to invite him to take part in their service, or to preach in their pulpit.

We would add in addition to above that the church would make a mistake in allowing Brother C to have his original letter and rescinding the act of receiving him. The proper course to have pursued would have been to have excluded Brother C for coming to them as though he was in line and in fellowship with them, when he really was not."C. H. C.

A CHILD BY BIRTH

---September 23, 1919

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother-I feel impressed to ask you some questions. They may sound silly to you. When does the Adam sinner become a child of God? Is it not a fact that the sinner becomes a child by being born of God and related to God? Would the elect be saved eternally without being born of God and made heirs? So the question is,

are we saved by the washing of regeneration, or were we saved before we were born of God? If so, when? Yours in hope,

W. J. HULL

Headland, Alabama.

OUR REPLY

In answer to the above question will say, most positively and emphatically, without fear of successful contradiction from any quarter, that the Adam sinner becomes a child of God by birth or by being born again, or from above. If one is a child of God before being born of God, then when he is born of God he is no more a child of God than without regeneration. It is true the Scriptures teach that the heirs of immortal glory are God's children in purpose before the ages of time began, but to be a child in purpose and to be divinely related to the heavenly Father are two different things. When one is born from above, or born of God, it is hut the manifestation of the purpose which God had before time; hence one is made a child of God by being born of the heavenly parentage. We are "saved by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." This is what the apostle says about this matter, and we have been of the opinion, and our opinion yet is, that he knew what he was talking about. If the sinner is saved by the washing of regeneration, then he is not saved before regeneration. It is true that the sinner, is saved by the washing of regeneration, "according to God's purpose and grace"-so says the apostle. If the sinner is saved before regeneration, then he is not saved by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost according to God's purpose and grace. If the elect are saved eternally without being born of God, then we see no reason why one should be made to partake of the divine nature by the new birth in order that he be prepared to live in and enjoy the spiritual realm. If any person could be saved eternally without being born of God, we see no reason why the infant could not be saved that way; but our people have always said that the infant is saved the same way that the adult is saved, and have always contended that infants that die in infancy are regenerated by the operation of God's Holy Spirit, and that, therefore, they are saved in heaven. If it is necessary that the infant be regenerated, it is just as necessary that the adult be regenerated.

Not only is the above true, but it is also true that our people have always contended that one becomes a child of God by birth. We think our people have always been right in this contention. We believe it is Scriptural, logical, reasonable, sensible, and cannot be any other way. - C. H. C.

Moved

---November 18, 1919

We have moved from Martin, Tenn. to Fordyce, Ark. We left Tennessee on the morning of October 29th, and arrived in Fordyce on the morning of the 30th. On account of this moving we have been unable to get the paper out as it should be. Before leaving Tennessee we made arrangements with the Baptist Builder to get out several issues for us just half size. They could not get out the full size at all for us. For some time before we left there we were short of help, and could not get our mailing list corrected up. On this account many of our subscribers have not been getting the paper regularly. We are sorry of all this delay and trouble, and we hope that our subscribers will be as patient with us as they can.

There has been much complaint about the paper coming out only half size. This was the very best that we could do under the circumstances. The prospects are not very good now for us to be able to get the blank paper to print on at all. The prices have been going up by leaps and bounds during the past few weeks, and we

noticed a few days ago that some New York newspapers are bidding as high as thirteen cents a pound for paper, and could not get a mill to furnish them. It is not going to be a question of price, but it looks like it is going to be a question of getting paper at any price. -Fortunately we purchased some paper at five cents a pound, but we do not know how long the stock will last. We bought it to be shipped as we need it. Our supply will not last many weeks longer.

We have written to the company who handle our advertising, and have given them notice that we wish to leave out all advertising. We have to give them a few months notice, according to the contract which we have with them. But as soon as possible we intend to leave all the advertising out of the paper.

We hope that none of our subscribers will quit taking the paper because we have been sending out the small size, or because we had to miss an issue or two. If you will all consider the high cost of everything, you will realize that the price of the paper is very low in comparison with other things.

We are having a time getting things straightened up since we arrived here, but we are getting things in some better working order now, and hope to soon have things straight. We are expecting more help in a few days, and will try to get our mailing list corrected up to date as soon as possible.

We have met with many good and kind people since we came here, and believe that we will like the place for a home. We know that this is a much better place so far as printing is concerned. We request all to remember to address us from now on at Fordyce, Ark.

C.H.C.

1920

NEW WAY OF SALVATION

---January 6, 1920

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Sir- I enjoy reading THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST very much, for I believe the doctrine it contends for. They have a lot of what is called preaching here, but not much preaching by the Old Baptists. They have preaching once a month. I go every time I can. I believe they preach the same doctrine they did when Christ first sent them out. I believe Mr. Gallimore and Mr. White are saved men. I enjoy hearing them preach.

There is a man here who claims that he was saved before he was born by the prayers of a pious mother."Please give me your views on that. Your friend,

J. M. BYERLY

R. 2, Lexington, N. C.

REMARKS

That gentleman has a new way of salvation-a way that the Bible knows absolutely nothing about. There is only one way of salvation. Jesus says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life. No man cometh unto the Father but by me." The word "man" means "any one," or "no one." It is by what Jesus does that one is -saved, and not by what a pious mother does. The gentleman should read his Bible more.

C. H. C.

The Small Size

---January 13, 1920

For some time past we have been issuing THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST only half size. When we were arranging to move to this place from Martin, Tenn., we made arrangements with the Baptist Builder Publishing Company, at Martin, to get out four issues of the paper for us. They could get the paper out only half size. The last issue they got out was Nov. 4, 1919. We thought that we could get moved and partly straightened up here, so that we could get the paper out after that date. But it took longer than we expected to pack and ship the office, and to get here and get arrangements made and get the business to going. We bought the plant and business of the Smith Printing Co. here and took charge of the business Nov. 11. On that day we were just one week late with the paper. The next issue was due to be mailed on that day. But we still had to unpack the material we brought with us, and some things were left with the Builder people, which they had to use, which had not been received. All these things put us still further behind. Besides this, we had only one operator to set type on the machine, and he could not set the amount of type that was needed. Then on the very day that we took charge of the business here, the motor which runs the machinery went to the bad, and there was not another motor in town that we could get. We finally found a three-horse power kerosene engine which we rented and had put in the office, but it would not pull the press which we had to print the paper on. After trying that for several days, we found a six-horse power engine at Thornton, belonging to Elder John R. Harris. We got a man to go there and get that engine, and finally got it installed in the office. By this time we were a way behind. It was then impossible to get out a full size paper, as we were still short of help to set type. All our help is either inexperienced or our work is new to them. Several were inexperienced entirely in a printing office.

Well, we have had troubles galore. Now, the motor has been repaired and again installed, at the last of the month of December.

Now, the price of news print paper is simply "out of sight." The last two shipments we have received the price was seven and one-half cents a pound. The plain white paper for one issue of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST the regular size would cost, at the last price, \$100. And there is no reduction in sight now. Some large daily papers have been bidding as high as thirteen cents a pound for paper, and could not get the mills to contract to furnish them with it. This was the report. The house we buy from is urging us all the time to use as little as possible, as they do not know how long they can furnish even a small supply at any price. One week we had to wait several days to get the paper to finish printing that edition.

In October we notified the advertising agency who sends us all the advertising that we publish that we desired to discontinue all advertising after Nov. 4. They objected and contended that we should give them ninety days notice and then fill out all unexpired contracts. The contract which we had with them requires that ninety days notice be given, which we overlooked when we wrote them. As soon as we can, we wish to leave all the advertising out of the paper; but we cannot leave it out until we can do so honorably.

One sister has written us that she takes a thirty-cent story paper, and that the editor of that paper has to pay a high price for all the matter which he publishes, and that the size of that paper has been reduced only two pages from about thirty pages; that the editor of that paper has made no complaint; that we have reduced THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST one-half; that we are complaining to the subscribers; and

that all the matter we publish in the paper is furnished free to us; and that we publish so much advertising, and that we are not living up to our contract with the subscribers, etc.

We mention this to show how some people consider things-the idea of comparing a religious paper with a thirty-cent story paper! Perhaps the story paper does pay for the reading matter which it publishes, and perhaps they have from thirty to fifty or seventy-five thousand subscribers, while we have only about twelve thousand-perhaps not quite so many if we had had the help we needed to take all the names off the list which have been due to come off for some time past. And the story paper does not depend upon the subscriptions for the paper (the subscription receipts) for its support. It is depending on the advertising; and where they get dollars for an advertisement, we get pennies. The story paper is supported by the advertising, while the advertising receipts for THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST only replaces a part of what we spend for the cause of the Master. We are not complaining; but we are stating facts. The sister will know to whom we refer when she reads this; and we will say that we are ready to refund the money which she paid for the past year, and if her feeling remains the same as manifested in her letter, if she will only write and tell us so, we will refund her money and take her name off the list, for we do not want her name on our list at any price if she feels as expressed in that letter. It may be possible that she is really a little out of humor because some of the matter she has sent was not published, or not published as soon as she thought it should be. We are not out of humor in the least, but do think it is rather hard to receive such letters when one is doing the very best that he knows how to do, or the very best he can under the circumstances. When we read the letter, we thought of the article published some time ago from the pen of our dear brother, Elder J. H. Phillips, on the subject of stoning the preacher, and felt like a few rocks had come our way, whether we were the preacher or not.

Now, we will say that it may be only a short while that we can get paper at any price to print THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST on-even half size. There is a scarcity of news print, and we do well to get enough to print the paper half size each week. We wish to say again, however, that we will do the very best that we can. We will get the paper out the regular size just as soon as we can. Remember, though, please, when you think that the price is too high for the size of the paper, that one time the price of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST was \$1.25 a year, when all other things were much lower in price than now. We never knew news print paper to be as high as it is now. We have seen the time when we could buy all we wanted at one and three-quarter cents a pound.

On account of being scarce of help the work of correcting the mailing list is far behind, and some have worked on it that did not understand the work very well, and on this account two papers are being sent to some, and many dates have not been changed. We are working on this now all that we possibly can, and will get that work up as soon as we can. We wish to assure all that we will make good all the time that they miss, if we can but know how much to make up.

We beg the indulgence of all our good brethren and sisters, and all our subscribers. We feel sure that if you could all be with us for a few days and see how things are, that you would not be impatient the very least. And we feel, too, that those who love the paper, and the cause it defends, will try to be patient with us. We do feel to insist that you do not quit taking the paper because it has failed to reach you regularly for the last few months, or because we could not get out the regular size; but that you stay with us and help us to pull through this crisis which is upon us on

account of high prices. One dollar and fifty cents a year does not amount to much to one, but a large number of them will amount to much with us who are trying to keep the paper going the best we can. Many papers have been forced to suspend publication entirely on account of the scarcity of help and the high prices. We do not expect to have to do that, but we will need our subscribers and friends to stay with us through these strenuous times to bring THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST through the strain and still be on a firm footing.

May we count on you staying with us, and having your support? And above all, may we have your prayers-that the good Lord may lead, guide, guard, protect, and keep us in the right way? Many times we do not know what to do, or what way to go.

Lord, help us.

C. H. C.

What Shall Be Done In The Case of Disorderly Elders or Preachers? -

IS IT A PROBLEM?

---February 3, 1920

The following article by Elder G. W. Stewart is copied from the Gospel Messenger for January, 1920. As long as such men are shielded and held in fellowship by the churches, it is no wonder that there is trouble in the camps of Israel and churches are divided and sweet love and fellowship is destroyed. For our part, we would rather be alone than to fellowship some things that are winked at. We recommend a careful reading of the following article.

C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

An elder whom I have known and loved a long time, writing to me about certain disorderly elders or preachers among us in certain sections, says: "When I think of David with the wife of Uriah, and him a man after God's own heart; and of Solomon with his many wives, and he a type of Christ; of Peter denying the Lord profanely right in His presence; of Thomas saying, 'I will not believe it is the Lord till I put my fingers in the nail prints,' and of the woman taken in adultery, whom Christ told to go and sin no more, carrying with it the idea she was guilty, etc., I must admit these are hard problems to solve, and bring me right to the footstool of Sovereign mercy."

Now, some who are inclined to tolerate and uphold disorderly preachers and others, would be ready to construe such language as this into defense of, or palliation of, upholding, winking at and sustaining such characters as those just mentioned; but knowing the brother as I do, I am confident that such is not his purpose for he is too good a man for that; but let us investigate the matter carefully and in the light of the real facts, in the different cases as presented in the Scriptures. Because it is said that David was a man after God's own heart **{((Sam 13:14) (I Samuel 13:14))}** we are not to conclude that God approved of, winked at or condoned David's great sin in connection with Uriah; for while the Lord pardoned David in that sense that He did not take his life, yet God did punish him severely, for by Nathan, the prophet, He told David that because of his sin against Him the sword should never depart from his house and that He would raise up evil against him out of his own house, etc., etc., in fulfillment of which David's own son, Absalom, arose in rebellion against his father, drove him from his wives and from his throne and from Jerusalem into the wilderness, where he became a wanderer, fleeing from his own son in his old age, weeping as he went, and the people fleeing and weeping with him; and to make his punishment more humiliating, there went along over

against him an enemy, a bad man, a son of Belial, who cursed King David as he went. Besides all this, think of the death of his beautiful, beloved and rebellious son, Absalom, and of how David wept over him when informed of his death. "And the king was much moved, and went up to the chamber over the gate, and wept: and as he went, thus he said, O my son Absalom, my son, my son, Absalom! would to God I had died for thee. O, Absalom, my son, my son." This is enough, I think, to show that King David was punished severely for his sin against Uriah, which was against God-a punishment in preference to which many would choose death even in this day. (See an account of the punishment foretold by the prophet, **((Sam 12:7) (II Samuel 12:7-13))**)

Solomon went off after strange gods in old age and was guilty of adultery, on account of which the Lord punished him by rending the kingdom from him, and making one of his servants, Jeroboam, king in his stead over ten tribes of Israel, yet for David, his father's sake, left him two tribes, Judah and Benjamin, which separation or rending occurred soon after Solomon's death.

Hence, we see that God did punish both David and Solomon for their sins-David for his carnality and gross immorality, and Solomon for his idolatry.

Consider what Paul has to say of the sins of Old Testament saints, for he shows that every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, **{(Hebrews 2:2)}** and in his letter to the Corinthians, **((I Corinthians 10:1-12))**, says that the sins and disobedience of God's people after the flesh were written for our example, to the intent that we should not lust after evil things, etc., as they did, hence were not written that we should refer to them or adduce them as examples to justify us in this age in our sins, or in tolerating disorder in the ministry or in the church; for, when we do this we are doing the very opposite of what the apostle exhorts us to do.

Peter-I see no similarity between the lying of Peter and Ananias, for although Peter had been forewarned of his fall, and all the disciples plainly told that Jesus would be betrayed, and crucified, and would then rise from the dead, all the record and circumstances plainly show that they did not understand what was meant by it all. **{See ((3) (Luke 24:13,25))}** So it was under the excitement of fear and of great personal danger that Peter sinned, or lied, a thing which any of us are liable to do even to this day. The scenes and circumstances under which he committed this great sin, never occurred before, and never will again in all history. Nothing in Peter's case to encourage the willful, malicious, cool, deliberate, calculating liar.

As for the adulterous woman of **(John 8:3; 11)**, she was not a disciple of Jesus, nor member of His visible church. Jesus did not condemn her to be stoned to death, because to have done so would have been a violation of the Roman law, and hence would have involved Him in trouble with that power; for it was not lawful for the Jews to put anyone to death. Jesus did not come to take life, but to save it. The blessed Saviour was too wise to be caught by His crafty enemies. The whole lesson is a beautiful example of letting each one attend to his own business in his own sphere. Nothing in this is in conflict with **(Romans 16:17-18)**, and **((Th 3:6) (II Thessalonians 3:6))**. What is said about Peter applies also to doubting Thomases. We find nothing in all these cases in conflict with the law of the Lord concerning the qualifications and character of gospel ministers, as expressed in **(I Timothy 3)**, and **(Titus 1)** in particular, and the 'three letters of Paul to those young ministers and others of the New Testament in general.

It will be seen according to these high and holy laws or rules for the ministry that no man of immoral, bad, doubtful or suspicious character has the right to officiate in the gospel ministry. Let churches and ministers read these rules carefully and

prayerfully, and let us at the same time remember how transgressors were punished under the Old and New Testament dispensations, and ask ourselves in what sense disorderly ministers of today are punished if they are tolerated and fellowshiped by the church. Shall we undertake to explain or interpret the plain rules of the order of the New Testament by types, Old Testament characters or doubtful passages, when these laws concerning the character of ministers are expressed in such simple and plain language without a shadow, without a parable or allegory? Shall we undertake to interpret a plain passage by a doubtful or obscure one? If the sins of either Old or New Testament saints, and our own weakness and unworthiness, cause us to stumble and doubt what we should do in case of a bad or disorderly minister, for the same reasons should we not be in doubt, and hesitate to oppose and non-fellowship the minister that advocates Arminianism, apostasy, non-resurrectionism, or the human religious institutions of the day, such as popular missionism, Sunday and theological schools, etc.? Why in the name of consistency and the Scriptures should we be so prompt and zealous in opposing what we consider false doctrine and so ready to hesitate in opposing immorality in a preacher?

The Scriptures require that the daily life of the minister shall be an encouragement, an inspiration and a defense of the humble believer; hence, it is said that "A good example is the best sermon;" and "better an ounce of good example than a pound of doctrine;" and "He who lives well is the best preacher;" and "preachers can talk but never teach, unless they practice what they preach." The preacher without a blameless character honors God with tongue but obeys the devil with foot; presents a form of doctrine, but denies the power thereof in his walk; professes that he knows God, but in works denies Him; and so it may be truly said of all those preachers or elders that tolerate, fellowship and uphold him and such disorderly elders and all that tolerate him will ere long bring down upon themselves the judgment of the great Head of the Church, who will remove their candlestick and cause them to become a byword and a reproach among the people. Then let us remember that it is in vain that we try to uphold the truth and doctrine of the Lord, while we at the same time are associated with corrupt men in the ministry. I am glad to know that such things are not generally known among us, but in some instances, O shame upon us, they are to be found, to the suffering separation of loved ones, the heart-ache and anguish of soul of some of the noblest and purest among us.

May the Lord help us to be valiant for truth in His holy and blessed name.

G.W.STEWART.

What Next?

---March 2, 1920

We are just in receipt of a letter from a sister in Mississippi stating that some brethren there understood us to be condemning Elder G. W. Stewart in our comment upon the article we published in our issue of February 3, which article was written by him and published in the Gospel Messenger for January, 1920. How anyone could get such an impression is beyond our comprehension. What we said was simply a plain endorsement of the article, and a condemnation of such men as Elder Stewart described and condemned. We simply endorsed the article without any qualification whatever, and recommended a careful reading of the article, and would recommend it again. And we would repeat that as long as such men as Elder Stewart condemns in that article are retained in the church, and are shielded and

protected by the church, it is no wonder that there is strife and confusion in the camps of Israel. No wonder there is coldness and barrenness in the churches. Now, we wonder what will be said next? C. H. C.

PAPER SHORTAGE

---March 9, 1920

Our readers will remember that we said something in our issue of January 13 about the shortage of paper, and that it was hard to get paper at any price. They will call to mind that we said something about what a certain sister wrote us. She still does not seem to understand the matter. She thinks that if the editor of the 30 cent story paper could get his paper out and not make any complaint to the subscribers, that the editor of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST could do the same thing. Well, perhaps so; but the editor of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST is not the only one who has complained about the paper shortage. In the Globe Democrat, of St. Louis, about January 29, the following statement was made:

“Because of the acute white paper situation throughout the United States the publishers of the Weekly Globe Democrat are forced to restrict the size of this edition. An effort is made to print all news of importance. Advertising to the amount of thousands of dollars has been omitted from this issue. It is hoped that the paper situation will be relieved soon.” Notice that they say “an effort is made to print all the news of importance”

-they only make an effort to do so. They had to restrict the size of the paper-why? Because they could not get the paper needed or desired-that is why. The situation is no better yet, but seems to be growing worse. It is just as hard to get paper now as it was a month ago, and the price is no lower. There is no telling what the end will be. Many papers have already been forced to suspend publication. We do not intend for THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST to suspend as long as we can get some paper to print it on, even if the price is so high-just as long as we can get the paper, and can pay our printers, just that long the paper will be published. Paper may get so scarce that we may have to get the paper out only twice a month, but it will continue to be published. We expect to continue to do the best we can with it, and we still ask our subscribers to stay with us. The paper still contends for the same time-honored principles which we have advocated all along the line, and we see no reason yet why we should change.
C.H.C.

WHO IS TO BLAME?

---April 20, 1920

Mr. Bryan is perhaps one of the greatest traveling evangelists of modern times. He traverses the world at such a rate that his enemies call him “a bird of passage,” and he comes nearer speaking to the multitudes twenty-four hours a day than any man living. If men who preach the gospel would do it with the same industry and ability that Mr. Bryan uses in preaching democracy, no adding machine could compute the number of souls that would be saved.

The above statement is copied from the Gospel Advocate of April 8, 1920, published in Nashville, Tenn. It appeared under the heading, “Said in Paragraphs, by James A. Allen.” We suppose that Mr. Allen is the author and that the Advocate endorses the sentiment. The statement that we wish to call attention to is that “If

men who preach the gospel would do it with the same industry and ability that Mr. Bryan uses - in preaching democracy, no adding machine could compute the number of souls that would be saved." According to this, the men who preach the gospel are not as industrious in that work as Mr. Bryan is in his work, or not as industrious as they might be, or as they should be. If they were as industrious as they should be, then a great number of souls would be saved who are not saved. Then, a great number of souls are eternally lost on account of a lack of industry on the part of the men who preach the gospel. They are not sent to hell on account of what they have done, nor on account of what they have not done, but on account of a lack of industry on the part of the preachers. We understand from the Scriptures that God is a God of justice. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne: mercy and truth shall go before thy face. "-((9:14) (Psalms 89:14). "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth:"---(Jeremiah 23:5). These passages teach us that the Lord is a God of justice, and that the Son of God would execute justice in the earth. We cannot understand upon what principle of justice the Lord would send countless numbers to eternal perdition on account of a lack of industry on the part of preachers. It appears to us that this would be sending one class to an eternal hell on account of the neglect of another class. If this be true, we feel sorry for the preachers; for if the Lord executes justice in the earth, then the preachers would be sent to hell as well as the countless numbers who are sent there on account of their neglect. We feel to thank God that this doctrine is not the truth.
C.H.C.

Question of Order

---June 1, 1920

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother-I am now "overboard," and want to ask some questions for information through your valuable paper:

When something in the order of church discipline is introduced and is persisted in till the body of churches become grieved over it, and the association comes together and cuts off the contending churches, according to her rules of decorum, and the churches cut off contend for the identity of the association and calls for a council of elders and the council justifies the excluded churches and preachers, and requires the orderly churches and preachers to remain in the body without any effort to restore peace and fellowship, is that a godly gospel ruling? Tell us all plainly, and "let the chips fall where they may." Because I cannot accept of such ruling, I am without a home in the church of God. After laboring in the ministry fifty-two years, my own church was going to exclude me because I could not agree with the ruling of that council. How could the identity of the church be sustained with such ruling? Now, I just want the Baptists to know that I have withdrawn my membership from my own church and from every church that wants me to submit to such ruling as to force order and disorder to live together.

I would like for the Gospel Messenger and the Landmark to copy your answer to this, so that my brethren can know my situation and gospel standing. As ever, a poor old way-worn sinner in tribulation,

THOS. BELL

Wampee, S. C.

REMARKS

We have long since discovered and decided that no question of order can be answered with a certainty of being correct, unless all the circumstances of the case were surely known. Every individual case must be decided upon its own merits, considering all the facts connected with it. It would appear to us that if the rules of decorum are right, that if a church is dropped according to those rules, then those dropped are not in order. This is the way the matter would appear to us. There is no council which can righteously rule that a church should act contrary to the rules of decorum, if the rules are right. A council has no right to make rules, any way. A body of brethren may be called together to advise and to try to bring about reconciliation between brethren or churches who are at variance, but they have no right to make rules or to control. The church of God is the highest ecclesiastical authority on earth; and the church has no right to enact laws. The only authority which the church has is to execute the laws which her Lawgiver has made. Jesus Christ is the only Lawgiver. It is right for the church to execute those laws; and just as long as a church continues to do that, just that long that church is in order. There is no higher court above the church. From the righteous decision of a church in the disciplining of her own members there is no appeal. Every church has the inalienable right to discipline her own members. When a church has labored with a refractory member, and finally withdrawn fellowship from him, he is excluded from gospel church privileges, and no other church can righteously restore him. The place to find a thing is where it was lost. Taking sides with excluded persons and recognizing them has always been a source of trouble and confusion in the church of God. The only righteous course to pursue when a church has thus dealt with a member, is for all parties to let that person alone, and only advise him to be reconciled to his church where he was dealt with. The only right place for him to get back in, is where he got out.

Submitted in love.

C. H. C.

Malachi 4:2; Isaiah 58:8; Isaiah 30:15

---June 1, 1920

In November, 1918, Sister Mary Saltsman, of Alexander City, Ala., requested us to write on the above passages of Scripture. Often we are requested to write on some portion of Scripture when we have no mind to write on it then. Besides, it is almost impossible to comply with all the requests we get of that kind. We will try to say a few words in connection with these references now.

((2) (Malachi 4:2) reads as follows: "But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall." It is evident, from this, that some fear the Lord. The wise man, Solomon, tells us that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. The reason why a man fears the Lord is because the Lord puts His fear in his heart. "I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me."-(Jeremiah 32:40). The man who fears God is one who has been born of God. He is one who has been made a child of God. This fear is not a slavish fear, but a loving, filial fear. The child of God fears that he will not do those things that are well-pleasing in the sight of God. He does not fear the devil, nor does he fear eternal torment. He fears God. Unto such, "shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings." They have their dark places to pass through. The night follows the day, and the day as surely follows the night. The night may seem to be long and dreary, but the Sun of righteousness will surely arise after awhile. When the day does come, and the Sun of righteousness arises, how glorious is the day! How the heart is made to

rejoice, and joy and gladness fills the soul. The night may be so dark, and seem to be so long, that the child feels, as David, that "the Lord is clean gone forever." His prayer may be, "Lord, restore unto me the joy of thy salvation, and uphold me with thy free Spirit." He may feel that he has surely been deceived in the whole matter, and thus dwell for a time in "doubting castle;" but the Sun of righteousness shall most surely arise with healing in His wings. The bright sunshine of the day will surely come, and the dark clouds will be dispelled, and the heart will be filled again with joy and sweet peace. Then they "shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall." They grow in grace, and in the knowledge of the truth. They are revived again, and rejoice in the sweet assurance that Jesus is their Saviour, their Prophet, their Priest, and their King. The hope is brighter and sweeter and more precious than ever before. Sometimes they can exclaim with the servant Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." How sweet and precious is the promise in this text for the poor little pilgrim here, whose home is beyond this vale of tears.

((8:8) (Isaiah 58:8)) reads: "Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily: and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy reward." In order to understand the meaning of this verse it is necessary to notice some things in the context, or in other verses in the chapter. By reading the preceding verses it will be seen that these people had been engaged in doing things which the Lord had not commanded, and had been leaving undone things which He had commanded. They had been fasting, as though they were humble before the Lord, but leaving off the doing of the things He said for them to do. They were not loosing the bands of wickedness, nor undoing the heavy burdens, nor letting the oppressed go free, nor breaking any grievous yoke; they were not dealing bread to the hungry, nor caring for the poor, nor clothing the naked. These things the Lord had commanded; but they were not doing them. In referring to these things, Isaiah is doing what is commanded in the first verse of the chapter: "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and shew my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." Now, when they do those things which the Lord has commanded, "Then shall thy light break forth." When? Then. Verses 9 and 10 read: "Then shalt thou call, and the Lord shall answer; thou shalt cry, and He shall say, Here I am. If thou take away from the midst of thee the yoke, the putting forth of the finger, and speaking vanity; and if thou draw out thy soul to the hungry; and satisfy the afflicted soul; then shall thy light rise in obscurity, and thy darkness be as the noon day." These commandments were given to Israel; they were not given to any people to observe in order to become Israel. No place in the Bible can a commandment be found given to any person on earth to observe or to obey in order to become an Israelite. But there were many commandments, admonitions, and exhortations given to Israel; and Israel were the Lord's people. He had chosen them; they had not chosen Him. They were His people as a nation. They were a typical people, typifying spiritual Israel. They were required to show forth the Lord's praise by observing His commands; so spiritual Israel today are required to "show forth the praises of Him who hath called them out of darkness into light" by observing His commands. When Israel observed and obeyed the Lord's commands anciently, they enjoyed the blessings which were in the land of Canaan. So, today, when the Lord's little children observe and obey the Lord's commandments, when they do what He says do, and leave undone the things which He has not commanded, they enjoy the blessings which are in the gospel Canaan, which is the Old Baptist Church. See the widespread desolations that exist today! Why, Oh, why are the Lord's people so divided? Why are they so factionized? Why is the glory of Zion departed? Why is there so much strife and

confusion? Are we not failing to observe and keep the commandments of the Master? If all were trying to walk as the Lord commands; and all trying to "bear each other's burdens;" and all looking over each other for good, and not for evil; if all were acting toward each other as from a principle of love, instead of from a principle of envy and strife; if all were willing to suffer wrong rather than do wrong- if all were thus living, would not the Old Baptists be nearer together today? Would they be divided into factions as they are? Would not their light be shining? Would not sweet fellowship and love be more enjoyed by us? Would not we realize more of the glory of the Lord's presence with us? We feel sure that we would enjoy these things more. May the good Lord look in pity and compassion upon us, and help us all to live nearer to Him, is our prayer.

((0:15) (Isaiah 30:15)) reads: "For thus saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel; in returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength: and ye would not." The Lord here graciously told them where their strength was, and where they might find peace and comfort, but they would not. Does this not look very much like the condition of the Lord's people today? But the time will come some day when the Lord will be gracious to His children, and will have them brought together. They may pass through the flames and be tried in persecutions again, as they have been in days gone by. Persecutions will drive them together, and cause them to cease so much striving among themselves. When they were persecuted anciently, they were not so greedy then to destroy each other. Their love for each other was made manifest then. They were glad to see each other, and glad to get to meet together to serve and worship the Lord. They did not spend their time then in quarreling over some minor point which no man can understand, but were glad to spend the time they could be together in talking of the goodness of God, His love and mercy, and in praising His name. Oh, Lord, if it can be thy will, spare thy children from the sore persecutions which many of them have endured, and grant that they may be drawn together in love and sweet fellowship. C. H. C.

Question on Discipline

---June 15, 1920

Elder W. A. Clark, of Delvalle, Texas, asked us in April for our views on a case like this: A church has a number of members living far from the church, and they do not write the church or let the church hear from them, and some of them have been gone for two, three, and four years. Brother Clark wants to know what the rule is in such cases. We believe that the late unwritten rule is to let them alone and retain their names, though the church may never hear from them or know what has become of them. However, we do not think that this is right. If a member moves away from the bounds of the church where his membership is, and is out of reach of that church so he cannot attend the services, he should move his membership to a church of the same faith and order which he can attend, or which is in reach. If there is no church in reach, where he can attend the service, then he should write to the church of his membership. If he does not love the church well enough to write now and then and let the church know how he is getting along, and to express his love for the cause, and to let them know that he has not lost interest, then he does not love the church well enough to have membership there. Such dead material is a dead weight to the church. Let a minister go to such a place, and ask how many members are enrolled, and he be told that there are so many, and he sees only about half that number are in attendance, he will most

likely think that there is something wrong. We certainly think such members should be looked after.
C.H.C.

Remarks To A Letter

---June 15, 1920

Such letters as the above encourage us to press on in the service of the Master and in the publication of THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. Sometimes we feel to be very much cast down and discouraged, and often feel that it would be as well for us to give up in despair. Prospects look dark and gloomy to us in some respects. We feel that the blessed privileges which we now enjoy will not last always. The clouds look dark to us. Unless the good Lord preserves and keeps us by His grace, we will fall. We have always tried to give all the reading matter we could for the money in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. We -have not tried to make money out of the paper, but simply to just make it pay its expense. This being so, as prices are soaring so high, and still going higher, we have had to raise the price of the paper. Our last bill of paper was priced at twelve cents a pound, and it takes twelve hundred pounds of paper for this issue. Somehow we have felt that if the Lord is in the matter the way will be open and all things come out right in the end. We trust that we may still have an interest in your prayers."C. H. C.

Mark 12:31

---June 15, 1920

Mrs. T. L. Kitchens, of Cornwell, S. C., requested us to give our views on **((31) (Mark 12:31)**. Beginning with ((28) (verse 28)we have this language, "And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that He had answered them well, asked Him, Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these." We give verses 28 to 30 so that the reader may have the connection. These were of the ten commandments given to Israel.

The neighbor is not always the one living next door. The neighbor is one who is a friend in need, and a friend in need is a friend in deed. No man in nature, perhaps, has ever loved another as he loved himself. "Self preservation is the first law of nature," is an old saying, which is a true one. If a man loves his neighbor as he loves himself, and has only one dollar in the world, he would as soon his neighbor had the dollar as to keep it. One young man who went to the Saviour claimed that he had kept all the commandments, and expected to get to heaven, or to receive eternal life, on account of the things he had done. The Saviour tried him on his own platform, and manifested the fact that the young man had not loved his neighbor as himself. He was not willing for others to have his possessions. He loved himself more, and did not desire to divide. No man can ever receive eternal life as a result of his own doings. But the one who has the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost loves all those who give him evidence that they have been born from above, and desires to help relieve them in their sufferings and sorrows. His heart goes out in sympathy to them, and he is willing to divide all that he has with them. This is but another evidence of a gracious state. "If we love Him that begat,

we love him also that is begotten of Him." "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." If we love the brethren, as we should, we will not fail to manifest that love. We should show our love. "Love not in word only." It does not amount to much for us to talk a whole lot about how much we love the brethren, and how much we love the cause, and never show that love, or prove it, by the way we do. We have had some to tell us they loved us and esteemed us, and then do what they could for our injury. Such as that is not Christ-like, but is hypocritical. We would much rather a man would never tell us that he loves us, or thinks well of us, than for him to tell us that, and then act differently. We should be faithful and true to our convictions, and true to our trust. We should act in a way that all may be confident that we are sincere, and have no just cause to say that we are not. Let us prove our love for one another.

C.H.C.

Appreciated Gift

---July 1, 1920

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother in the Lord, I Hope-I will write a few lines to show my love and respect to you. I have been reading THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST a long time, and I have enjoyed it very much; but I am getting so I cannot see how to read much now, but I am thankful I can read it a little yet. You will find enclosed fifty cents to carry my paper on this year.

Brother Cayce, I will send you a present, and I hope it will not make you mad or hurt your feelings. I will send you a pair of socks that I knit myself. I finger-picked the cotton, and washed it, and dried it, and carded it, and spun it, all myself, and I will be eighty-eight years old the 11th of July, if I live to see that day. I am the mother of fourteen children, and am the grandmother of ninety children, the great-grandmother of eighty-two children. I have been a member of the church sixty-seven years, and lived a deacon's wife about fifty years, and have lived a widow twenty-two years.

Brother Cayce, I have longed to see you and hear you preach, but I guess I never will. I saw Brother Hanks when he was very young. If I never meet you in this world, thank God, I have a sweet hope that I will meet you beyond this vain world of sorrow where it will be happiness and joy. I would not give that hope in exchange for all this world. Remember me in your prayers. May God bless you and your family and all of your labor. Press on and spread the good news all over the world. Goodbye.

MRS. S. E. WEBB

R. 3, Heflin, Ala.

REMARKS

We cannot find words to express our gratitude for such expressions and manifestations of Christian love and sweet fellowship from this dear and precious old mother in Israel. Tears of gratitude flowed from our eyes as we read the above letter and as we examined the socks this dear old sister sent. We feel like we want to keep them as long as we live in loving remembrance of this dear sister. They are sure a beautiful piece of work; the thread is white and smooth and even, and every stitch is even, and we know that every stitch was taken with thought of Christian love and esteem. May heaven's richest blessings rest upon this dear old sister, is our humble prayer. We would be glad to see her and hear her talk of the wonderful love and mercy and sweet promises of our heavenly Master, and of His faithfulness. We have little hope of ever having this privilege on earth, but we have a sweet

hope of meeting beyond this vale of sorrow. We trust we may have an interest in the prayers of this dear sister, as well as of others." C. H. C.

Judas' Feet Not Washed

---July 1, 1920

A. J. Akers, Dana, Ky., asks if the Saviour washed the feet of Judas when He washed the disciples' feet and if it was at the same supper at which Jesus gave Judas the sop that the disciples' feet were washed. In reply will say that the sacramental supper was instituted at the close of the eating of the last passover supper which Jesus ate with His disciples. In the eating of that last passover supper the Saviour had the conversation as to who should betray Him. That conversation is referred to in the thirteenth chapter of John. It is also referred to by Matthew and Mark. During the eating of that passover Jesus dipped bread in the sop (or gravy) and gave it to Judas, then Judas went immediately out. See John's account of the matter. Then when Judas had gone out, Jesus took the bread and the wine, the substance of the passover supper, and instituted the sacramental supper. Then when the sacramental supper was ended He washed the disciples' feet. Judas was present at neither the sacramental supper nor the washing of the disciples' feet. He had gone out during the eating of the passover supper."C. H. C.

Heresy

---July 1, 1920

Brother John R. Havens, of Santa Anna, Texas, asks us to give our views as to what Bible heresy is, and the Bible characteristics of heretics. Heresy is a fundamental error in doctrine. There may be an error that is not fundamental. There have been differences on minor points of doctrine among brethren all along, and these differences should be borne with, and we should have forbearance with each other on those minor points. The fundamental principles of the doctrine of God our Saviour are election and predestination; that God made choice of His people in Christ before the world began, and predestinated their salvation and final glorification; that these people are sinners of Adam's race; the direct, immediate, and effectual operation of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the sinner in the work of regeneration, and that all the elect of God will surely be regenerated in time; the final preservation of all the saints or children of God by grace to glory; that baptism is by immersion, and true believers are the only proper subjects; that the ordinances of the church are to be administered by those who have been called of God and been set apart for the work by a presbytery authorized by the church; that God is eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, the fountain of truth, the embodiment of justice and mercy; that there are three divine Persons in the Godhead (not three Gods, but one God composed of three), the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one; that the Son of God is equal with the Father in all His divine perfections; that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God, and are the only divinely authorized rule of faith and practice, and are given for the benefit of the Lord's children. These are some of the main points of the fundamental principles of the doctrine believed by the Primitive Baptists and taught in the Scriptures. A doctrine that contradicts these fundamental principles is heresy.

A heretic is one who persistently advocates a doctrine that is in direct opposition to the fundamental principles of the doctrine of the Lord, some of the points of which are mentioned above. We are commanded to reject a heretic after the first and

second admonition. This does not mean to reject him without any admonition. He should be admonished one time, and if he still persists in advocating the heresy, he should be admonished again; then if he persists, he should be rejected. The only way we know of to reject him is to withdraw church fellowship from him. If one advocates a heresy, it is wrong not to admonish him. If it is right to admonish him, as we are taught, then it is wrong not to do so. It may not be a pleasant task, but it is a duty enjoined upon us in God's word, and should be obeyed, no matter how unpleasant it may seem to be.

May the Lord help us to discharge our every duty. We need His guiding hand and His sustaining grace every day." C. H. C.

Desire To Encourage

---July 1, 1920

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear and Precious Brother in the Lord-I greatly desire to say a word of encouragement to you. I know your burdens have been, and are yet, heavy. I feel sure you have done the best you could. Dear brother, let me encourage you to press on, and be as patient with those who are impatient as you can. May the Lord enable you to suffer all the abuse without any complaint. May God be your helper in every time of need.

I feel sure you are wearing yourself out in and for the cause of your Master. You will surely be missed when you are gone. I feel that the Lord has sustained you thus far, and will never leave nor forsake you. We of the Amite Association greatly desire you to visit us, especially this fall at our association. I am sure I speak the mind of all our brethren and sisters. I will send you some subscriptions if I can. The Lord bless you, and all yours and all His everywhere. Pray for us. Yours in hope,
G. W. SANDERS

McComb, Miss.

REMARKS

We feel unworthy of such expressions of Christian love and fellowship as the above letter contains. We are unworthy of the very least of the Lord's great blessings which we feel have been bestowed upon us. The church can get along without us. It existed and got along several hundred years without us, and will still get along without us when we are gone. When we step off the stage of action we will be forgotten in a few short weeks. The world will move on just the same. There may be some few tears of sorrow shed when the news of our death goes out, but the wound will soon be healed, and the people will go on as though we had never lived in the world. We know that we have many good friends-they have proven true; they will be sad, we feel sure, when the news is heard by them that we are gone. Others will be glad; for we know that we have enemies as well as friends. Some have proven that they are enemies. They will rejoice while others may weep. But we are willing to rest our case with the Lord. Our trust is in Him, and He will do as seemeth good in His sight. We would be glad to visit the brethren in the Amite Association again, but do not know when we can do so. We have no idea now that we can attend the session of the association this year. Please remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Debate In Alabama

---July 15, 1920

As announced in our last issue, we have agreed to meet Mr. J. D. Tant in debate at or near Winfield, Ala., to begin on Tuesday, August 3, and continue four days. Four propositions are to be discussed, as follows:

The Scriptures teach that God gives eternal life to dead (alien) sinners without conditions on their part. C. H. Cayce affirms; J. D. Tant denies.

The Scriptures teach that faith, repentance, and water baptism are conditions of pardon, or salvation, to an alien sinner. J. D. Tant affirms; C. H. Cayce denies..

Scriptures teach that in regeneration the Holy Spirit operates directly or immediately in the sinner's heart. C. H. Cayce affirms; J. D. Tant denies.

4. The Scriptures teach that a child of God may so apostatize or fall away as to be eternally lost. J. D. Tant affirms; C. H. Cayce denies.

One day will be devoted to each proposition. The speaking, we presume, is to begin at 10 o'clock each day-at least, this is the usual rule. The number and length of speeches will be agreed on by the speakers after we get there. We hope to meet a great many of the brethren there." C. H. C.

Two-Seed Doctrine

---July 15, 1920

Brother W. A. Beggs, Jacksboro, Texas, has asked us to explain the difference between the eternal Two-Seed doctrine and the doctrine of the Primitive Baptists. We hardly deem it necessary to show the contrast and show what the differences really are, as we suppose the brother understands what the teachings of the Primitive Baptists are and have been on the points which we shall mention.

The eternal Two-Seed doctrine is that God made choice of certain persons from among the human family for His children to dwell in for awhile here in time. Hence, they claim to believe in the doctrine of election; but they do not believe that sinners of Adam's race were chosen to be saved in heaven. They teach, as stated, that God made choice of persons of Adam's race for His children to dwell in for awhile here on earth.

In the work which we call regeneration they teach that there is an eternal spirit or child which comes down from God out of heaven and takes up its abode in the Adam man, and remains in the Adam man and torments him until the Adam man dies; when the Adam man dies, this eternal child goes back to God where it came from and the Adam man goes to the ground where he will always remain.

The eternal Two-Seeder claims that the body of the Adam man is no part of the child of God; that the child of God is on the inside of the Adam man; the child of God is a man on the inside of the man you see. They carry this doctrine to its logical conclusion and deny the resurrection of the body, claiming that the body remains in the dust, and will not be raised again.

The eternal Two-Seeders also hold that God unalterably fixed and decreed all the wickedness that men do, and that wicked men and devils are doing God's will in their nefarious crimes and meanness as much so as is being done by His children rendering gospel service and living a life of righteousness; that the devil does the will of God as much as Jesus Christ did in His perfect life of obedience to the law of God.

These are some of the fundamental principles of the teaching of the eternal Two-Seeders. Primitive Baptists do not teach those things, and never have taught them. Those things are not Primitive Baptist doctrine, and never have been." C. H. C.

Some Questions

---August 1, 1920

Brother George W. Weedman, of Hondale, New Mexico, asks us several questions, and requests that we answer them through THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST. In order to save space we will give his questions in the order which he has presented them, and answer them the best we know how.

1. What is the spiritual meaning of Moses and his death on Mt. Nebo?

Answer: We do not know. If it has any spiritual meaning we do not know it. Some brethren may be able to get something of that kind out of it, but we have not been able to do so yet.

2. What was Judas ordained to?

((4) (Mark 3:14). He was ordained to preach, or to the ministry. Read the text cited. Also read **((7) (Acts 1:17)**, he "had obtained part of this ministry." He was a bad man in the ministry, and there are some bad ones there yet.

3. Did Christ know all things at His birth?

((2) (Luke 2:52). Yes, as God, but not as man. He was both God and man. As man He grew in wisdom. As God He did not grow, for as such He was the embodiment of wisdom.

4. Was Judas lost?

We think so.

5. If the Spirit of Christ from heaven knew all things before being conceived in the womb of Mary, why would He not know all things as soon as He was born?

As man He did not know all things as soon as He was born. As God He knew all things before and as soon as He was born. He was both God and man. He was verily God, and He was verily man. As a man He had a soul, as other men. As God He was perfect in wisdom and knowledge.

6. Does God make each and every individual's spirit and put it in the body before it is born? If so, at what time?

We think not. God made the first man. "Of one blood made He all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Men now come into being through the process of generation and birth, or procreation. Man is a being composed of soul, body, and spirit.

7. Which is the cause of death-the body dies and the spirit leaves, or vice versa?

We think the one is the same as the other. At any rate, they are simultaneous-both at the same time.

8. Do the soul and spirit go to the same place at death?

We think so. No man is able to divide between the soul and spirit. The Lord, who is called the Word of God, can and does divide between them, but we cannot.

Is there any distinction between soul and spirit after death?

Not that we know of. If so, God is the one who can distinguish, and we cannot.

Don't you believe Christ would have been put to death by the Holy Ghost if He had not been crucified, seeing He had to die?

Not necessarily so. The Roman soldiers who crucified Him did not take His life. They may have thought that they did, but they did not. He says, "I lay down my life; no man taketh it from me; I lay it down of mine own self. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again." He could have laid down His life without being crucified; but those wicked men were allowed to carry out their wicked desires to the extent that they crucified Him. Their wicked desire was to kill Him; but they were not allowed to do that; He laid down His life Himself.

11. I don't believe He was ordained to be crucified by wicked hands as He was, do you?

Our answer to the tenth question answers this also.

Did those saints appear in their natural bodies and go back to the grave?
We do not remember that the Scriptures say, but our opinion is that they ascended to glory with the Lord.

13. Did Christ ascend in His natural or spiritual body?

We do not understand that He was raised with another body, other than the body He had before His crucifixion. Neither do we understand that the saints will be raised with another body. The same body that is buried will be raised again. The child of God does not exchange this body for another body; but the body-the same body-shall be changed. The body Jesus had after His resurrection was the same body that was crucified. When the body is raised from the grave it is made a spiritual body-not exchanged for a spiritual body. -

14. He will come next time in His spiritual body, will He not?

We think so. He will come in His glorified state.

15. Is there anything pointing to the end of the world in the near future?

We do not know. We do not know a thing in the world about when this material world will end, and we do not believe any man on earth knows. The signs of the times point to some great radical change in some way; but we cannot say what the change will be. At least, it appears to us that a serious and radical change is in the near future. It is a time of gross idolatry and false worship and false religion, just as it was in the close of the Jewish age or the law dispensation. It looks to us as though we are drawing near the time of the fullness of the Gentiles.

At present this is the best we know how to answer these questions. You may have them for what they are worth.

C. H. C.

Some Questions

---August 1, 1920

The following questions were written by one John J. Oliver, of McEwen, Tenn., and handed to S. E. Hurt, of that place, to be sent to us, with the idea that they would completely tie us up, we suppose.

THE QUESTIONS

1. Are those who believe in time salvation being led by the Spirit of God? If so, why do they claim that it depends on themselves?
2. If God works in you to will and to do, do you do it? If not, is God all powerful?
3. If God saves His people with an eternal salvation, does that include this life? If not, why does God lead them in time?
4. Can a sinner do good when not led by the Spirit of God? If so, why has God said that "there is none that doeth good?"
5. In obedience, does faith control the man? If so, why do some say that it depends on us? "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."
6. Does man follow God as God wills him to? If not, does God work all things after the counsel of His own will?
7. Can man suggest a better path than the one in which God is leading His people?
8. If Paul could not do the things he would like to in this life, would he shine among them who believe in time salvation, seeing he did evil when he would do good?
9. Do those who believe in time salvation receive chastisement? If so, is it for obedience or disobedience?
10. Does the wild olive, when grafted in the tame olive, bear fruit after the graft or root?

Were the wicked good when they were created? If so, what does God mean by saying that He created the wicked for the day of evil?
Did God create the devil? If not, why has He told us that His hand has formed the crooked serpent?

OUR REPLY

In the first place, we wish to say that we are not a stickler for the term "time salvation." In fact, it is a term that we very seldom ever use. We are not so particular about the term that may be used in expressing an opinion; it is what is intended by the term that concerns us. If a brother uses a term which we do not like, or approve of, we wish to know what idea he intends to convey by the use of the term. If the idea is in harmony with the Scriptures, then the term used does not matter so much with us. It is the sentiment intended to be conveyed that we are concerned about. So, we will try to answer the questions by number.

1. We do not know of any who believe in what is called "time salvation" claiming that it depends on themselves. They all feel to thank the Lord for every blessing which comes from His bountiful hand, and for the will, the inclination, and the ability to walk in obedience to His commandments. They do not walk in the commandments of the Lord without receiving the power from Him to do so; neither do they claim it. To charge that they do claim such, is to charge them falsely. If one walks uprightly, walks in obedience to the commands of the Lord, doing so from a principle of love- because he loves the Lord, and loves His service-he is following the leading of the Spirit in so doing. The spirit of the wicked one does not lead one to live that kind of life. In living that way one is living after the Spirit; he is walking in the Spirit. "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh."-(Galatians 5:16). This command, or admonition, was to the church at Galatia. They had the Spirit of God dwelling in them, and by that Spirit they had the ability given them to thus walk; and by so walking, they would not fulfill the lust of the flesh.
2. Yes, God is all powerful. If God does not work in His children to will and to do of His good pleasure, and they fail to do on that account, then they are not blameworthy; and if not blameworthy, then they could not be chastised or punished on account of their disobedience upon any principle of justice. When the Lord chastises His children for their disobedience, it is upon the very strictest principles of justice; and therefore their disobedience cannot be charged to the failure of the Lord to work in them. The Lord has all power; He has the power to work in them, and does so. "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence - only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure.-((2) (Philippians 2:12-13). The text says it is God which worketh IN YOU. God does that. It does not say that God works out, but that He works in; and they are commanded to work out. They are not commanded to do what the Lord says He will do, and the Lord does not say He will do what He has commanded them to do. As the Lord says He works in them, and as He does what He says He will do and what He says He does do, then He gives them the power to work out as He works in. If they fail to work out, it is not because God fails to work in. If it is, then God does not do what He says He does. We may, and do, often fail but God does not fail.
3. God saves His people in time with a salvation that is eternal. If there is not a salvation which is eternal, we wonder why the apostle would speak about eternal salvation. God purposed before time began to save His people in time with a salvation that is eternal; hence, they stay saved. He makes them His by

regeneration-makes them akin to Him-and they remain His children. They are sometimes disobedient children; but they are His children, whether obedient or disobedient. Though they may be disobedient, and may fail to walk as He has commanded, yet He preserves and keeps them, and delivers them from everlasting destruction. "Though he fall seven times, he shall not be utterly cast down; for the Lord upholdeth him with His hand." (**Psalms 37:24**). They need His preserving care here in this world of sin, so He careth for them.

4. The alien sinner is not led by the Spirit of God. The alien sinner does not do good, from a spiritual standpoint. The alien sinner may be a moral man, but morality is not spirituality. The alien sinner cannot please God. This question implies a charge that we teach that the alien sinner can do good from a spiritual standpoint, which is a false charge, and we are of the opinion that the one who makes the charge knows that it is false. It is either a willful misrepresentation or willful ignorance, in many instances.

5. In this question the same charge is repeated that appears in question 1. The expression, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," is to be found in (**Romans 14:23**). In that connection the apostle is treating upon the question of eating meat that is offered to idols. Some could eat the meat thus offered without having respect to the idols, and some who would observe them eating the meat might follow the example of eating, but would do the eating having respect to the idols, and thus led to offend by one who was not thus eating. Some would be grieved at a brother thus eating the meat offered the idols. Beginning with verse 14 we have this language: "I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean. But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." Here the apostle tells them emphatically to "destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." If there is no sense in which one for whom Christ died can be destroyed, we wonder why the apostle used such language. It would be nonsense and meaningless-absurd in the extreme. He continues: "Let not then your good be evil spoken of: for the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of men." If "he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God," then it is true that he that in these things serveth not Christ is not acceptable to God; and these are God's children that the apostle is talking about. Hence, the one who does not thus serve Christ is in some sense not acceptable to God. God does not approve of his manner of living. But - the apostle continues: "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." We wonder if the man who submitted such questions as those above is doing what the Lord here commanded by the apostle? It does not look that way to us very much. Instead of looking for peace, it is looking for confusion and strife. Some people claim to be great lovers of peace, and yet are continually looking for strife, and trying to stir up strife. But let us see what the apostle says further: "For meat destroy not the work of God." It seems from what the apostle says that some had destroyed the work of God. We wonder if the Lord is all powerful if some man had destroyed some of the work of God. We wonder if the Lord wanted them to do that, or if it was as He willed it? If He did want them to do that, why did the apostle tell them not to do it? Would he, by inspiration, tell them not to do what was God's will for them to do? Would he thus tell them to disobey the Lord? If

some man should tell your child not to do what was your will for him to do, how would you like it? Would you want that man in your home? We guess you would not like it, and that you would not want him in your home. You would not think it very good advice to give your children. Neither is it good advice to give to the Lord's children, and the Lord does not approve of such. The guilty man is a wicked rebel against God in his works, no matter how sincere he may be. We know this is plain, but it is the truth, and we care but little who it hits. If you do not want to be hit, stay out of the way. But let us go on with this language of the apostle: "All things indeed are pure; but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence. It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak. Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth. And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." There is absolutely nothing in this about faith controlling the man; yet it is true that one must be in possession of faith in order that his service be acceptable to the Lord. God does not accept the service that might be rendered by one who is not in possession of faith; and that one who is in possession of faith is a child of God. The child of God has faith; one who has faith may render acceptable service to the Lord; therefore, the child of God may render acceptable service to the Lord.

6. Some of God's children do not do according to God's will. If all men do God's will in all things, as the question implies that the querist believes, then all men are mother, brother, and sister to the Saviour. "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same- is my brother, and sister, and mother. "-((0) (Matthew 12:50). If the devil does the will of God, as we presume the querist believes, then the devil is brother, and sister, and mother to the Lord Jesus. "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. "- (Revelation 3:15). This language was to the church at Laodicea. They were neither cold nor hot. God's will was that they be either cold or hot-so He said, and we think He told the truth. They were not doing His will. No matter what our querist may think the consequence is, nor what he may think about it, God says they were not doing His will. Yes, God works all things that He does work after the counsel of His own will; but God does not work what men and the devil work.

7. No, man cannot suggest a better path than the one in which God leads His people; neither can they suggest a better path than the one the Lord commands them to walk in. But we think a better path can be suggested than the one some of them do walk in. Some of God's people are not walking in the old paths. "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, We will not walk therein."-(Jeremiah 6:16). They said they would not walk therein, and they did not. To walk in the old path would have been a better way than the way they went. We suppose, from the question propounded by the querist, that he thinks the Lord leads His people every way they go. If so, He told them to go one way, and then led them another way in this instance; and He would, thereby, be guilty of double dealing. May the good Lord deliver us from believing a doctrine that would charge the Lord with double dealing.

8. Whether Paul shines or does not shine, he taught the doctrine which we are contending for. We presume our querist would rather believe the doctrine of devils than to believe in what he calls time salvation, even though Paul taught it. "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was

steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will?"- (Hebrews 2:1-4). Condemnation is the opposite of salvation. The escaping of eternal condemnation does not depend upon their neglecting or not neglecting their salvation, or anything else that they may do or not do. But the apostle here teaches that by neglecting the salvation under consideration they cannot escape the opposite of that salvation, which is condemnation. If that salvation is eternal, then if they neglect it, they cannot escape eternal condemnation. This would make the eternal salvation of those people depend upon their not neglecting the same. This doctrine we do not believe; and therefore we are sure it was not eternal salvation which they were admonished to not neglect. Not only so, but these people were already children of God and in possession of eternal life. Hence, the apostle would not admonish them to not neglect eternal salvation in order that they might receive eternal life; but he did admonish them to not neglect that salvation under consideration, and taught them that by so doing they would escape the opposite of it. You may call that salvation a time salvation, or what you please-we do not care what you call it-this is the teaching of the apostle, and we believe it. Our querist does not believe it; therefore he does not believe the Bible, and one who does not believe the Bible is an infidel.

9. Yes, those who believe in what you call time salvation receive chastisement, and they receive it for disobedience. But if, according to the belief of our querist, the Lord's children always do according to God's will, then they never do wrong, unless God's will is wrong. If they always go according to the way the Lord leads and directs, then there is no such thing as disobedience; and if they are chastised, it is not for disobedience. If the doctrine of the querist is true, then the Lord is meaner than we believe he is. We do not believe he would chastise his children, if he has any, unless they disobey him. If he chastises them it is for their disobedience, and not for obeying him. He would not be so mean to his children as to chastise them for obeying him. If the Lord does that, then the Lord is meaner to His children than our querist is to his. We do not believe the Lord is meaner to His children than men are to theirs.

10. The grafting which the querist refers to in this question has no reference whatever to regeneration, but to gospel service. You will find the teaching of the apostle on this question in (Romans 11). If it has reference to regeneration and eternal life, then the Jews apostatized. The Jews were the natural branches in the olive tree; but they were broken off because of unbelief, and were, therefore, eternally lost, if eternal life was the thing under consideration. Not only so but the apostle says, in verse 21, "For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest He also spare not thee." Verse 22, "Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in His goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off." This simply has reference to Jews being cut off and the Gentiles grafted in to the gospel service.

11. This question refers to the language recorded in **((4) (Proverbs 16:4)**, "The Lord hath made all things for Himself: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil." We suppose that if God made them wicked, then the devil would be without a job, unless it is the devil's business to make men. We suppose, also, that if God made them wicked, then God made some men proud in heart. Then the very thing that God made is an abomination to Him, for the next verse (verse 5)

says, "Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the Lord." We wonder if the Lord did not know beforehand that they would be as they were, since our querist seems to think they were just as God made them. If He did know, then it must be that He just did the best He could-He would have made them so that they would not be an abomination to Him as they were made if He could! We have but one account of God's creation, which is found in (Genesis 1). After telling of the creation from the first thing to the last thing, (verse 31) says, "And God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good." If one thing God made was wicked and not good, then the Lord inspired this prophet (Moses) to write a lie! "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar."- (Romans 3:4).

12. If you wish to know why God did a thing, when He has not told us why, suppose you ask Him. The first account we have of the devil was in the garden of Eden. We do not know where he came from-we have not looked up the genealogy of your father, Mr. Oliver. So you will please excuse us for not telling you where he came from. C. H. C.

Paper Not Wanted

---August 15, 1920

The following letter was received some time ago. It was dated April 20, 1920:

THE LETTER

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Sir-Enclosed find money order to pay for THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST to the first of May, and then stop it, as I don't like it. I find some good articles in it, but too much that is entirely wrong. I notice an article written by Elder J. S. Newman that appeared in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST in 1906, and had been submitted to twelve other Primitive Baptists for publication, and none of them published it but one. I don't wonder at them not publishing it, for it is a mighty silly article. He talks about a person being a child of God and living in adultery. Anyone ought to have sense enough to know that a child of God, one that has been born again, is not going to live in adultery. That is nonsense to think about. The Bible teaches that we shall know them by their fruit. If a person does not live a righteous life, we know that he has never been changed, and we need not have a doubt about it. The Bible is too plain about that for any possibility of a mistake.

And then I notice that Elder J. R. Wilson, of Danville, Va., gets off his stuff that is just as rotten as can be.

And then, again, you call your paper THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, which is wrong. It is not a Primitive paper, for it does not hold to the Primitive faith, neither the London Confession of Faith nor the Philadelphia Confession, and the London is the oldest that we have any account of since the Reformation; and those Baptists that formed the London Confession got it from the Bible and knew that was what the Bible taught, and every sensible person who is not ruled by the carnal mind knows that is right and what the Bible teaches. Of course that kind of doctrine looks horrible to the carnal mind, but the truth has always looked that way to the world and the carnal mind. Of course the Primitive Baptists are right, but all are not Primitive Baptists who call themselves that. The true children of God are as scarce today in the true church as they were under the prophetic age or the Mosaic law. You will see that I am no scholar and a very "sorry" writer, but the above is the truth. I can understand the Bible just as well as the best scholar in the world. I am sorry to have written you this way, but you will see when the judgment day comes around that I am right.

Yours very truly,
SAMUEL WILSON.

Cosby, Tenn.

REMARKS -

Well, now, did we not get a jolt when we received the above tirade? Brother Wilson would do well to read the article again from Elder Newman which he refers to. It was not submitted to twelve other papers for publication. It was submitted to churches for endorsement. Some refused to endorse it. Why? Because they favored retaining such characters in the church who were separated from their companions without a Scriptural reason and married again. That is why. Elder Newman was writing against that practice. But Brother Wilson says no child of God will live in adultery. Perhaps not. We are not in favor of them doing so; neither are we in favor of the churches retaining such in fellowship; we have no fellowship for it in the church of God. But if none of them ever live in adultery, then David was not a child of God; Solomon was not a child of God. Others mentioned in the Scriptures who did that way were not children of God, either, according to Brother Wilson. David, the inspired prophet of God and king of Israel, was not a child of God, because he lived in adultery. Although he was guilty, yet he was a child of God, and he was sorely punished on account of his wrong doing.

Brother Wilson does not say what Elder J. R. Wilson said that he objects to so much; but no matter whether Brother Wilson believes the sentiment contained in the articles from Elder Wilson or not, the same is true. Brother Wilson seems to think he knows it all, and that settles it.

He says we do not endorse the London or Philadelphia Confession of Faith. We do not know how he found that out. Since he knows, we are wondering what part of it we do not endorse. Wonder if Brother Wilson can inform us on that point also. We would be glad he would do so if he can, seeing we do not know ourselves what part it is.

Perhaps the reason why the doctrine advocated in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST looks so bad to Samuel Wilson is because that doctrine looks so horrible to the carnal mind. Perhaps that is the reason why Brother Wilson does not like it. Since the true children of God are so scarce in the church today, according to Brother Wilson, we wonder if he is one. We wonder if he is one who has crept in, as others, who have no business there.

Yes, we noticed, Brother Wilson, that you are no scholar, and we took the liberty of correcting the language of your letter before allowing it to come before the public gaze. If you have no gratefulness in your heart for anything else, you should be grateful that we did correct it, even if you are so well advanced in knowledge and understanding otherwise. If we have to wait for the judgment day to come around before we find out that Brother Wilson is right, we will have to wait a long time-too long, we fear, for it to be of any benefit to us.

“And if any man think that he knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know.”-(I Corinthians 8:2). C. H. C.

Articles Left Out

During and about the years of 1919 and 1920 we had several articles in the paper concerning the high cost of production, cost of paper, lack of space for some things, small size of the paper, and such like matters, that we do not reproduce in these books, as we do not deem them to be of interest to the present readers, or that would be a benefit to the cause now. C. H. C.

1921

A Misrepresentation

---May 15, 1921

The following statement was sent to us for publication some time ago and was headed as above. A copy of the minutes of the proceedings of the conference was also sent, and which we publish. It will be seen that the notice was sent to us with the request that we publish the same. We grant the request of the church in giving space for the statement and also the minutes of the conference.

THE STATEMENT

ELDER C. H. CAYCE:

Dear Brother-We feel that we, together with Elder J. H. Rawls, our pastor, have been hurtfully misrepresented by Elder R. O. Raulston, who preached at our church (Chapel Hill, Pine Grove, Ark.) on Wednesday after the fourth Sunday in August, 1920, which preaching (or fighting) we did not enjoy. And now Elder Raulston says in an article in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST that he had been informed before he reached Chapel Hill that the preacher in charge was a rotten and strenuous Absoluter. Now the man who informed Elder Raulston that Chapel Hill had a rotten and strenuous Absoluter for her pastor is due Chapel Hill an acknowledgment, as Elder Rawls has been pastor and assistant pastor of Chapel Hill Church for a number of years, and is a peace-loving Baptist.

Now, dear brethren, Primitive Baptists, one and all, and especially preach brethren, we do not consider the terms "absolute predestination" or "conditional time salvation" as being Scriptural terms, and we are taking no stock in preacher fights over these unscriptural terms; and we hold some sacred rights of our own, to invite or reject, as we see fit, those who preach for this church. And we do hereby invite all who want to fight over these unscriptural terms to stay at home.

With much love to all peace-loving Primitive Baptists we submit these few lines. This written by the clerk and adopted by the church at Chapel Hill, and ordered sent to THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST for publication.

Done on Friday before the fifth Sunday in January, 1921.

BROTHER BILLY MARTIN, Moderator pro tem.

J. T. EVERITT, Church Clerk.

THE MINUTE

On Friday before the fifth Sunday in January, 1921, the church met at Chapel Hill for the purpose of considering the resignation of Elder J. H. Rawls as pastor; and when we all have understood each other we all find ourselves one people, and the misunderstanding that had been troubling the church was cleared away. Then the church requested Elder J. H. Rawls to continue as pastor of the church, when Elder Rawls agreed to be with us at our next regular meeting and would then let us know whether his home church would give him liberty to give up the church he is now serving.

The church then agreed that she would not invite any preach brethren to preach for this church who have raised bars to fellowship against the doctrine of the predestination of all things until they withdraw their bars.

No other business, conference closed in order.

BROTHER BILLY MARTIN, Moderator pro tem.

J.T. EVERITT, Church Clerk.

REMARKS

As to the report which Elder Raulston heard, and of which he spoke in the article he had in this paper some time ago, and which is referred to in the foregoing, we suppose is immaterial here. We only wish to call attention to one or two things in this matter. We have been to Chapel Hill a few times, and believe that there are some good Baptists there. We love them, and have fellowship for them. But we did not go there without being asked to do so. But now we understand them to ask us not to go there any more. This is all right with us.

Now as to Elder Rawls we only have this to say, that on the day which Elder Raulston preached at Chapel Hill Elder Rawls said that he had a miserable comforter there that day. He replied to Elder Raulston, as those are aware who were present. In his reply he said that if God predestinated his salvation He also predestinated his sins. This was not a hearsay matter. Now, Chapel Hill Church says that she is taking no stock in this matter, which she calls a preacher fight; but she will not invite those to visit her who declare that they do not believe this doctrine. Some of the churches in this section passed an act several years ago declaring non-fellowship for the doctrine that God predestinated sin and wickedness. If Chapel Hill Church does not believe that doctrine, then no bar to fellowship was put up against her. But by her act it seems to us that she puts up a bar against those who have a bar up against those who do advocate that doctrine. This is the way it looks to us. This is all we care to say in regard to the matter, and we trust this may give satisfaction to the Chapel Hill members. C. H. C.

Guilty of Robbery

---May 15, 1921

Some time ago we received a copy of the Daily Oklahoman which contained a news item from McAlister, Okla., containing the information that Elder L. M. Harkey, of McAlister, had confessed to being a member of a party who robbed the home of a Mrs. Bostella, and that he had paid back \$200 which he claimed was his share of the loot. We are sorry, indeed, that such as this has occurred. It is a shame that one posing as a Primitive Baptist minister will be guilty of such an act as this man has confessed to being guilty of. We make mention of this matter so that our brethren everywhere may be informed in regard to it. We think the brethren should know about it. We wrote to the sheriff of the county and asked if the matter is true, and he replied that it is a fact. Shame! C. H. C.

Suppose You Try It

---September 15, 1921

Some person mailed a card to us from Whitmell, Va., which had no name signed to it, giving us some instructions as to what we should put in the paper and what we should not put in it. The writer complains that we have not printed things that have been sent us within the past year. We are well aware of that fact; but we do say that all our space has been filled. The matter we did put in the paper was sent us with the request to be published. We cannot please all. We would suggest to the writer of the card that if you think you can do a better job editing the paper, you are welcome to try it. Just come on over here and take the place and try it for a few weeks. We are of the opinion you would decide in less than a month that it is not what you thought it to be. Come on and try your hand at it for a while, and when you have done that, then fire in with your faultfinding all you please. We

believe you would have a different viewpoint if you would try it for a few weeks yourself.

We are well aware of the fact that we make mistakes. We know that we are not perfect. We are always glad to listen to any suggestion made by any brother or sister which is made in the right spirit; but we have little patience with this fault-finding spirit manifested by some. To be plain and candid about the matter, we do not care whether such people are pleased with our course or not. We desire to do what appears to us to be the best course to pursue, and then our conscience is clear. May the good Lord help us to follow that course.

C.H.C.

The Sacramental Supper

---October 15, 1921

Elder W. M. Little, of Lawn, Texas, writes us that the church called Pilgrim's Rest, at Dewey, Texas, could not obtain wine for use in the communion service, and that they postponed the communion, or agreed to leave off the communion, until they could get the wine, declining to use any substitute. He asks us to give our views of the matter in THE PRIMITIVE BAPTIST.

We think that if it was impossible for them to get wine for that purpose they did right in deciding not to go into the communion until they can get it. We have no right to substitute anything in the service of the Master. The Saviour instituted the sacramental supper at the time that He ate the last passover supper with His disciples. What the Saviour used in instituting the sacramental supper was the same thing that the Jews used in the passover supper. Wine-the fermented juice of the vine-was what the Jews used in the passover supper. The Jews did not use the unfermented juice of the vine. As the Saviour used the same thing that the Jews did, then He did not use the unfermented juice of the vine. As the Jews used the fermented juice, and the Saviour used the same thing they did, then He used the fermented juice of the vine. It was wine that He used. If something else would do as well, He would have used something else. We have no right to substitute something else.

We would say, make the wine needed for use in the sacramental supper, and do not substitute. C. H. C.

The Service of God

---December 1, 1921

We have been asked if a child of God can serve God and not live in the church. We suppose the querist wishes to know if we think one can serve God as well without being in the church as he can by being in the church. If that is what the querist wishes to know, we would say that one cannot serve God as well out of the church as he can in it. It is true that there are some things which God requires of His children which they can do without being in the church. But there are some things which He requires of them as members of His church, and they cannot do those things without being in the church. There is one thing He requires which they cannot do without going to the church. He commanded the Gadarene, out of whom He had cast a legion of devils, to "go home to your friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee." The friends of the poor child of God are those who are keeping house for the Lord in the home He has prepared for them here.

That is the church. To do this thing which the Lord requires, one must go home to the church.

The Lord requires His children to follow Him in baptism. They must go to the church to do this. The ordinances have been committed to the church for keeping. Baptism is one of the ordinances. Hence, to be baptized, as the Lord requires, one must go to His church. One cannot serve God as well without doing this as by doing it.

“Unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end.” -(Ephesians 3:21). Here the apostle says, “Unto Him be glory in the church”-not out of the church, but in it. This is clear proof that one cannot give the Lord the glory which belongs to Him without being in the church. One cannot serve God as well out of the church as in it. We give glory to the Lord here on earth by serving Him. That glory which belongs to Him is given Him in the church, if at all. No doubt very few of those who are in the church give Him the glory which they should-that is, it is doubtful if more than a very few do this who are in the church-but it is surely not done out of the church. “Unto Him be glory in the church.” May He help us to give Him the glory which we should.

C.H.C.

END OF VOLUME THREE

1922

Beginning with 1922

By Elder C. H. Cayce

Volume IV, 1938, CAYCE PUBLISHING COMPANY THORNTON, ARKANSAS

TO My Beloved Wife who has untiringly labored with me and for me during these many years, and TO My Sainted Father and Mother who cared for me when I could not care for myself, and to My Dear Brethren and Sisters who have been so kind and good to poor me all these years is this and any following volumes Lovingly Dedicated

Preface

PREFACE

We deem it unnecessary to write another preface for this volume. We will, therefore, just copy the same preface we used in Volume III, and give it the present date, on which we are beginning this present volume, Volume IV We have received many words of endorsement of the previous volumes. This volume, and the volumes which may follow, if we are permitted to continue the publication of our editorial writings in this form, will show clearly that we are still endeavoring to maintain the same principles upon which we have stood during all these years. They will also show that our people are still standing where they have always stood. If we know our poor heart our desire in the publication of these volumes is the glory of God and the advancement of His blessed cause, and the benefit of His humble poor. We desire that the Lord's dear children who are blinded by false teachers may be enabled, by the reading of some of these pages, to see where the true church is, and where the truth may be found. May the blessings of our Lord rest upon the reader, is the humble prayer of The Author Thornton, Arkansas, March 9, 1938

Where Are We Drifting?

---January 15, 1922

For some time we have been wondering and asking the question in our mind, over and over, "Where are we drifting?" It seems that vice and immorality is on the increase everywhere. It is not only in matters of state that we find corruption and immorality, but we find it in the different institutions of the world, as well as in the institutions professing to be the church of God -institutions which profess to stand for morality as well as Christian advancement. Not only are such things to be found in all these places, but we find it in the church of Christ-the Old Baptist Church. It is deplorable that vice and immorality is practiced by those holding membership in the church of God, but it is true -and what is worse, it is sometimes "winked at," and the guilty parties retained in the church. Lying, stealing, forgery, adultery, false swearing, truce breaking, and other like crimes are gross sins, and those who are guilty have no place in the church of God. Surely the time foretold by the Apostle Paul is now upon us: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." -(II Timothy 3:1-5). Without us naming the instances of guilt of some of the things here enumerated, we are sure that many of our readers can call to mind some guilty party, and yet we find such retained in the church sometimes. Any church that will retain such in her borders is not worthy of the name church. These things and other such crimes are open and plain violations of the moral law, and of the command of our God, and are not to be tolerated in the church for a moment. Persons who are guilty of such things should be excluded from the membership of the church at the very first conference after the evidence is produced. If the church refuses to hear the evidence, she is no better than the guilty party she thus protects. She is in open rebellion against the King, the only Lawgiver in Zion. She is party to the crime. The party who helps to conceal a crime is guilty, as well as the party who commits the crime. The church is no reformatory. If people are guilty of immoral and wicked practices who are members of the church, they should be excluded, and let them reform on the outside of the church; and not let the church bear the reproach of their guilt. The apostle, in the language quoted above, emphatically instructs, "From such turn away." We have been informed that a certain perjured man has been restored by a certain Old Baptist Church. As for us, we do not propose to fellowship any such. This is plain language, we know; but if there has ever been a time when people need to be plain, it seems to us that it is now. We know that we make mistakes, and that we do wrong; but we do not propose to fellowship such gross immorality in the church of God as some people have been guilty of. The lovers of truth and righteousness need each other; but we do not need immorality in the church. We do not need to retain those in the church who are guilty of any of the things enumerated, as well as some other gross sins that might be mentioned. One thing that caused the division in the church which gave rise to Romanism was the church having those among them who were guilty of gross immorality. Novatian contended against such being retained in the church. Others advocated the reception and retaining in the church those who were guilty of immoral and wicked practices. This brought about a division or separation. As for us, we prefer another separation rather than fellowshiping such practices. Those who are eligible for membership in the church of God are those who are spoken of as being zealous of good works-not zealous of wicked works. If a man's life is such

as to dishonor the cause, he should not have membership in the church. If he is a member, he should be excluded. If he is not a member he should not be received for membership until he has proven that he has reformed. Reformation should be outside of the church, for as we said before, the church is not a reformatory. We do not mean by this that if a church makes a wrong step she cannot or should not reform. Churches do wrong; they make mistakes. It will be that way as long as the church is composed of imperfect men and women. Of course, if the church is composed of sinless spirits, she would not do anything wrong. But the church is composed of men and women who are imperfect beings, and therefore the church sometimes does wrong. When the church does wrong, she should repent-turn from the wrong-reform-and do that way no more. We should profit by the mistakes we make, by not doing the same thing twice. But when a member commits a gross sin, he should be excluded so that the church does not bear the reproach of his wrong doing. When a member has been thus dealt with, all the members should be submissive to the church. We may have one who is near to us by the ties of nature who has been guilty of some gross wrong, and it may grieve us much; but we should submit to the act of the church. We may believe that the guilty one is a child of God; but we should remember that a child of God can so act as to deprive himself of the privileges of the gospel church. He can so act as that he has no right in the kingdom of God here on earth. "If ye live after the flesh ye shall die." "There is a sin unto death. I do not say that ye shall pray for it." The world is watching the Old Baptist Church, and more is expected of them than is expected of any other people on earth. How necessary that the discipline of the church be administered and strictly attended to. It should be done in love and in the fear of God, without malice or prejudice-but should be attended to regardless of fleshly ties. May the good Lord help us all to attend to the business of His kingdom, and to administer the laws of the same, which He has given, without fear or favor, relying upon Him, and knowing that He will not leave or forsake those who walk as He has commanded. C. H. C.

One Hundred Years Old

---February 1, 1922

The church at Briar Fork, Madison County, Ala., is one hundred years old, and met on Friday before the fourth Sunday in October, 1921, to celebrate their hundredth anniversary. They had preaching by Elders L. M. Walker, S. F. Best, and E. J. Joiner. This church has stood firm through the storms of a century, and are yet standing upon the principles of the old-time doctrine. Elder B. G. Stephens is their faithful and humble pastor. They invite all the brethren of the same faith and order to visit them. They sent us a minute of their conference meeting, but we deem this notice to be of the same interest to our readers, and we gladly give space to tell our brethren of them. C. H. C.

That Peace Move

---February 1, 1922

On another page of this paper will be found a letter from Brother J. H. Carroll, of Andalusia, Ala., in which he asks us to speak out on the question under consideration. A few issues back we made just a few remarks concerning this matter following a letter from C. C. Little, of Abbott, Ark. Now, we wish it distinctly understood that we are not opposed to any right and Scriptural method of obtaining peace or a union of the different factions of Primitive Baptists. But we

would have it clearly and distinctly understood that we are opposed to any wholesale coming together of all factions everywhere, and the wholesale reception of all work done by all factions. In our issue of January 15 we plainly told of some things which we have no fellowship for, and stated that we would prefer another division to the retaining in the church those who are guilty of such gross sins and immorality. We have no fellowship for fornicators and adulterers, perjured persons, trucebreakers, and those who are guilty of like criminal conduct. We have no fellowship for such conduct as having a house sold in which others are interested, and then writing one of the partners that no money has been received, when the whole thing had already been paid in cash and was placed in bank to the man's credit. This may be in harmony with the Christian life; but if it is, we confess that we "have not so learned Christ." We have no fellowship for such things as these. A wholesale coming together would mean the fellowshipping of all these things. We may be in fellowship with some of them now, but if we are we do not know it-and will not if we know it. Not only are these things true; but it is also true, as we think we said before, that some in every faction will object to such a move. Some in every faction may approve of it. Suppose those in every faction who do approve of the move should come together, what would be the result? It would simply be that some would come out of all the different factions and unite into one faction-thus making still another faction, and not eliminating a single one. That would be the result of a universal and wholesale movement to come together, or to bring together all the different factions. Then, you may ask, what have we to suggest? We simply have this to suggest-that every case in every locality should be dealt with according to its own individual merits. It is a matter to be dealt with locally, and not universally. In some localities they may be tired of living apart, and they may be essentially one people. In such cases they should come together and live in peace as one people, which they are. In other localities there may be prejudices and no fellowship or love existing. In such cases, no matter what others do, they will not come together. There will be no coming together until the prejudice is overcome. So, we say that it is a matter that can be dealt with in no other way only as the local conditions warrant. This is the way we see the matter; but we do not intend now to raise any fight against the movement until we see that it brings us into fellowship with some such things as we have objected to and that we have no fellowship for. May the good Lord keep us all in the right way and guide our feet in the paths of peace, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Christian Conflicts

---March 1, 1922

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Sir- Tonight I am thinking of my sinful self, and often wonder if such a sinner as I am will ever reach the kingdom of God. This will, no doubt, sound foolish to you, but that is the way I see my poor sinful self tonight. Sometimes I feel lost and downcast in this world, and forever lost in the world to come. I don't know what would become of me if I were called to die. For some cause I have been thinking of writing to you, to see if you ever knew one that got in this condition, and at the same time keep that same old path they had been traveling, and when they would do better they do worse than ever. This is the condition I find myself in every time I examine to see where I am. I don't want to serve the devil all the time, but it looks like that is what I do. I like the Old Baptist Church more than any I have ever seen. I feel like they are right, if I know what right is-but as for myself, I am wrong all the way through. If not asking too much of you, I would like to have your views

on the matter asked about. Please answer through your paper, and excuse me for bothering you. I believe you are a worthy man, and that is the reason I have written you as I have. Yours truly, Anderson B. Boyett. R. 3, Kenly, N. C.
OUR REMARKS

In another place in this paper will be found a letter from Anderson B. Boyett in which he asks us in regard to one desiring to do good and yet doing evil, etc. Desire springs from life. There can be no such thing as desire for natural things without natural life first. There can be no such thing as holy and righteous desires without the righteous life. The life is first. When the Lord gives a poor sinner the divine life He does not take away the natural life. The natural life- the Adamic life- has a nature peculiar to itself. That nature is poisoned and contaminated with sin. Having that nature, sin is mixed with all we do. The divine life which God gives by the direct operation of His Spirit on the spirit of the sinner, has a nature peculiar to itself. It is called the divine nature. From that life, which is a holy life, and which nature is divine, springs all our hatred of sin, and all our desire to live a holy and righteous life. From that life springs the desire to "do good." "When I would do good, evil is present with me," says the eminent apostle to the Gentiles. This shows clearly that he had both natures- the divine nature, by reason of which he "would do good." It was his desire to do good all the time. Though he had such a desire, yet "evil is present with me." This shows that he also had the evil, or sinful, nature- "evil is present." That evil nature remains with us as long as we live in the world. These two natures are contrary to each other. They are not in harmony. They do not work together, but at variance. This is the reason of the warfare within- a continual fighting. There is no cessation of hostilities." I find, then, a law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members," says Paul. Here are two laws, two natures in the one man, in the child of God. He was a child of Adam and a child of God-both at the same time. Being both at the same time, he had both natures at the same time. Having both natures at the same time, there was a continual warfare all the time. "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." -Paul. Here are the two natures again-and they are contrary to each other. One is the opposite of the other. One is holy and divine; the other is depraved, poisoned, and contaminated with sin. One is against the other. There is a continual striving- a continual warfare, "so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." What would you do? You would live above sin; you would live free from sin; you would live without the conflict and warfare here-but" you cannot do the things that ye would." We cannot attain unto such a state of perfection and happiness here-yet it is required of us, and we are encouraged, to press forward; always we should strive for the things that are good. Paul said that he had not attained unto perfection, and did not expect to attain unto it here, yet he says, "I forget those that are behind, and press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ." To "press toward the mark" requires a continual exertion. There is to be no "letup," no quitting. We often make resolutions, and then break them. Still we have the desire, the will, to do good. We remember once, years ago, in our young days, a brother said, "Brother Cayce, you say you desire to do better; you want to do better, and yet you don't do better.. Now, why don't you do better?" We answered, "There may be several reasons why I do not do better. Sometimes it may be for one reason, and sometimes it may be for another reason. Sometimes it is laziness." The brother asked no more questions about it. We gave a Scriptural answer. "Thou wicked and slothful servant." Slothfulness is laziness. We are so often slothful, or lazy, in regard to religious matters. If we were all as slothful and

lazy in our secular affairs as we are in church affairs, many of us would starve to death. No wonder so many of us are starving religiously. No wonder the poverty! No wonder the emaciated condition so many of us are in. We have been slothful, lazy, indolent, careless, unconcerned-"no matter; just any way will do." Just any way will not do. God's way is the only way that will do. "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat." This is God's way, and there is no avoiding it. But we have wandered. Not so much, either, but a little from the original question. We remember one New Year's day a long time ago as we were going to our office to work we met two sisters who were busily engaged in conversation. Now and then they would stop and turn, facing each other. They did not observe us until we were within a few feet of them. One of those good sisters long since "crossed over the river," and we are sure she is resting from all her trials and conflicts here. The other sister is yet living and may remember the circumstance. As we approached the sisters who were thus so busily engaged in conversation, we said, "What in the world are you all talking about? What is it that is so interesting?" They turned to us and said, "Brother Cayce, we were just telling each other of the many good resolutions we have made, especially our New Year resolutions, and how we have broken all of them, and how it seems that we get worse all the time, instead of better, and how we felt that we had as well quit making good resolutions-had as well quit trying. Brother Cayce, how is it with you?" In a second it flashed into our mind to show by a joke the absurdity of such a thing as to quit trying. So we said, "Well, I have just about decided to do as the boy I once heard of who was late at school one morning. That morning the ground was all covered with sleet and ice. When Johnnie arrived, so late, the teacher said, 'Johnnie, what is the matter? Why are you so late today?' Johnnie replied, 'Every step I took, I slipped back two.' Then the teacher said, 'At that rate, I do not see how you got here at all.' Johnnie replied, 'I just happened to think about turning around.' Now, I have been trying, and making resolutions to do better and to live better, and it seems that every step I take, I slip back two. So perhaps it would be better if I would turn around and try to see how mean I can be. Perhaps I may slip back two steps each step I take, and get there that way." We felt that Johnnie's absurd position, or statement, of turning around was a fitting illustration of the necessity of us continuing to try, though the obstacles may seem to be insurmountable. We should endeavor to continually follow that holy and righteous desire to live a Christ-like life. The fact that one has such a longing desire is good evidence of the possession of the righteous life. May the Lord help us to constantly strive to keep the old nature in subjection and to follow the influence and teaching of the new or divine nature. C. H. C.

Should Make Acknowledgment

---May 1, 1922

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother in Christ-I wish to ask a few questions through the columns of The Primitive Baptist, and hope you will answer them.

1. If an elder's application is received by secret orders and he a servant of a church, what should be done? Is he due the church an acknowledgment?
2. If he preaches with other orders, such as Missionaries, Methodists, and Free Will, must he be retained as moderator, or is he not to be retained? Is not an elder called a watchman placed on the walls of Zion, and if he sees the enemy coming is he not to cry aloud and spare not? If he engages in these things is he not bringing the enemy in instead of crying against it?

3. If these things are named in the church and he says he has no acknowledgment to make, and the church is in confusion most all the time in his care, what is best to do? And if the church is partly against these things and part for holding with him, what is best?
4. If he casts reflections on other members is he in the right spirit?
5. Does not the New Testament condemn all this? Hoping you will be blessed to explain all this for the benefit of poor weeping Zion, and with best wishes, I remain, as ever, Your little brother in hope, C. M. Baldwin. Cedar Bluff, Va.

OUR ANSWER

We will try to answer the above questions by number.

1. If an elder, or any other member of the Primitive Baptist Church, sends in his application for membership in a secret order, he should be promptly excluded from the fellowship of the church, unless he promptly makes confession and acknowledgment for his wrong.
2. A man may preach with ministers of other orders under certain conditions or circumstances without bidding them godspeed. It is a general custom of the Primitive Baptists, so far as we know, to engage in funeral services with ministers of other orders when called upon or requested to do so, though we are aware that some brethren refuse to do so. Again, when one of our brethren engages in preaching with a minister of another order, the express and avowed object of which is to disprove the other man's position and to show that his doctrine is wrong, it is not objectionable. The apostle fought with beasts at Ephesus. He most certainly disputed with somebody there on the question of the resurrection. On the other hand, to preach with others, and to affiliate with them, and to take part in their services, is to bid them godspeed and to be partakers of their evil deeds. This is plainly condemned in the New Testament.
3. If the church is not agreed, and they cannot settle the matter among themselves, the rule is to call for help from sister churches, to get them to come and help to settle the matter.
4. If he casts reflections on other members, he is most certainly not in the right spirit.
5. This question is already answered in the answer to the others. C. H. C.

To "One In The Woods"

---May 1, 1922

In our last issue was a letter written to "One in the Office" and signed "One in the Woods." We wish to inform the writer of the letter that we know who he is. He thought he was disguising his hand-writing, but he failed. We know his name, and the number he has in his family, and the name of all his children except one, which is a very young one, and a girl. Now, brother, are you not ashamed that you have stooped so low as to do the thing you have done? Do you not profess to be an honorable, upright man? And do you not profess to be an Old Baptist? Do you think you have acted in a way that is becoming an Old Baptist? Your letter was mailed on the train, and we know the train you mailed it on, and the time the train is due at your place. You should be ashamed of yourself, if you are not. This is all we care to say about the matter just now. C. H. C. Note.-The party referred to above is "in the woods," and has been for some time, before we began publishing these writings in book form. C. H. C.

Parson Crook(ed) Again

---May 15, 1922

Below we give space for another harangue from one Parson" Heady Egotistical" Cook. The reason why we use this expression with reference to this gentleman is because of the language he has used from the beginning in his reference to the Primitive Baptists and the claims he has made for himself. He has pretended that he is so wonderfully versed and has done such great things in overthrowing Brother Copeland's arguments, with reference to language as well as the Scriptures, that we have decided we would publish his letters this time" verbatim et literatim" -just as he wrote them, word for word and letter for letter. We have been spending the time to correct them heretofore; but since he has used the language which he has, we have decided that we will not accommodate him that much this time. Mr. Cook refers frequently to Brother Copeland violating the rules of honorable controversy; but is so careful to observe the rules as to say," I haven't been in but one hole, and that was when I went into it to drag you out into the air and sunshine of God's eternal truth, to get some of the stench of decay off of you, and I almost had to hold my nose while I was doing it." Poor thing! Who ever did, before this, hear of a skunk having to hold his nose? But here are the letters. Note.-We do not think it necessary to up take space in this book with the letters referred to. Below are remarks we made following the letters. Parson Cook must be a hell-sent preacher. He is preaching the same doctrine that Dives preached. Dives argued that his brethren might escape that place of torment though preaching, and Cook advocates the same thing. Note that Cook says to Brother Copeland:" My Lord, and you accuse me of adding to and taking from God's word. When did I ever do such a thing? Point out just one instance, or stand as a false accuser." That is, according to Cook, if Brother Copeland does not show where Cook has added to or taken from the word of God, then Copeland has lied. Brother Copeland, we suppose, overlooked this, and we wish to call the attention of the reader to just one instance in Cook's letter above. He pretends to quote **(II Peter 1:10)**, but cites **(II Peter 1:6)**. He quotes it this way:" Give dilligence to make my peace calling and election sure." He does not add a word by way of explanation, as Brother Copeland did, but writes it as though that is the way it reads in the Book. Here is the way it reads: "Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure." NOW WHO LIED? C. H. C.

Should They Be Retained?

---May 15, 1922

Brother Cayce, should an Old Baptist Church retain a member who plays cards, dances and gets drunk? I would love to see you and hear you talk of Jesus and His love. I wish you would come out through the West sometime. Please pray for me and mine when you have a mind to do so. Your brother, I hope, Oren P. Greathouse. Harrisburg, Nebr. Most assuredly an Old Baptist Church should not retain a member who practices such things as mentioned. A true Old Baptist Church will not do so if they know it. C. H. C.

An Endorsement

---May 15, 1922

We heartily endorse what Brother Davis (Elder J. T. Davis) has said concerning repentance and forgiveness; but there are some things that are not to be forgiven and fellowshiped in the church of God. And some of those very things are connived at, winked at, covered up, fellowshiped, and carried in churches claiming

to be Primitive Baptists. As we said before, so we say again, that we do not, and WILL NOT, fellowship such in the church of God. A man guilty of perjury, or a man guilty of adultery, has no more business in the Old Baptist Church than a hog has in a parlor. And yet they are there! Do you ask us to fellowship that? If so, you ask what we cannot do. Now, we can name some of the churches and guilty parties. Ask us, if you want to. C. H. C.

Baptism In The Name Of The Lord

---May 15, 1922

Quite a while ago we received the following request: What is meant in the last chapter of Daniel, where it says that it shall be for a time, times, and a half; and there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. Also, the nineteenth chapter of Acts, where the people were baptized over when they had been baptized unto John's baptism. Why do the people now baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, when the apostles baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus? I understand it that Jesus was in the name of the Father and the Son, and to Him the Holy Ghost was given. If the apostles had not understood Jesus, it looks like He would have told them while He was here. Please answer these questions, and explain **(Acts 8:16)**. The language of Daniel was prophetic, and a "time" is generally understood to mean a prophetic year, or three hundred sixty years; so a time, a time and a half, would be twelve hundred sixty years, the time the church was hid in the wilderness. In verse 11 the same time is stated in different words, with an addition of thirty years, in which years other things in connection were to occur. It is not a settled fact that those people referred to in **((9:3) (Acts 19:3-5))** were baptized again. John Gill contended that they were not. Verses 3 to 5 read: "And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on Him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." What Paul said is included in the language beginning "John verily baptized," and ending with "When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." That is, Paul said those people who heard John's preaching were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

To be baptized in the name of the Lord was the same as being baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The Saviour commanded the apostles to go teach all nations," baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." If they were not thus baptized they were not baptized in the name of the Lord, or in the name of the Lord Jesus. There were and are three Persons in the one God-that is, God is one composed of three. Hence, to be baptized in the name of the Lord one must be baptized in the name of the three. There is no inconsistency here. C. H. C.

What Do You Say?

---June 1, 1922

Again we feel called upon to call the attention of our readers to the move that is spreading and that is being advocated among our people to recognize and fellowship those who may agree to fellowship each other. Of course a perjured wretch can fellowship any who will fellowship him. We know of a church which has restored a man who was excluded for false swearing. There were other charges besides. Some of the other charges were such that it would be necessary to settle

before being restored, but no effort was made to settle the same. Now, are you willing to fellowship that? The church where he was excluded has restored him. Yet no settlement was made of the trouble for which he was excluded. Therefore, gospel discipline was ignored. Suppose the association retains that church, and the church fails to undo her wicked course? Then will you the fellowship whole thing? Shall the association and the church be fellowshipped, when the church retains such as that in her border, and the association retains the church that does that? We think not. It is true that many times a whole association should not be non-fellowshipped on account of disorder in one church; but if a church has such disorder in it, and the association retains such a church, then the whole association should be non-fellowshipped. If a man is guilty of fornication or adultery, and his church refuses to hear the evidence of his guilt and exonerates and retains him, and the association retains the church, then the whole thing should be non-fellowshipped. Not only the whole association, but just as many churches and associations as recognize and fellowship such should be non-fellowshipped. We wish to say again that we will not fellowship such things as these. Reader, we put the question to you: How do you stand on this? Some of the things that have been sent to us seem to us to indicate that things like this will be fellowshipped. What do you say? What does your church say? May the Lord help us. C. H. C.

An Old Circular Letter

---June 1, 1922

In this issue of The Primitive Baptist we copy an old circular letter. It was written by Elders W. A. Bowden, J. K. Stephens and Wm. Howard, and published in the minutes of the Bethel Association in 1878. The churches of that association were in Southwest Kentucky and Northwest Tennessee. It was endorsed by the Greenfield Association in 1911, and published in their minutes for that year. The Greenfield Association met that year with the church at Shiloh, Weakly County, Tenn. Elder A. B. Ross was the moderator. The following ministers were members of the association at that time: Elders J. C. Ross, A. B. Ross, C. H. Cayce, W. T. Jackson, K. M. Myatt, J. K. Stephens and W. I. Moore. The following are the names of the visiting ministers who were at the association that year: Joshua Cabbage, J. N. Wallace, L. F. Wallace, A. H. Insko, D. Hopper, J. H. Phillips, John Grist, W. C. Freeman, J. B. Halbrook, E. M. Verell, W. L. Murray, J. L. Butler and W. E. Brush. When that circular letter was read before the body at Shiloh there was not a dissenting voice against the adoption of it. Elder Stephens had the old minute of the Bethel Association containing the circular, and it was read by perhaps a large number of brethren before it was read before the body. It was read slowly and carefully and was heartily endorsed. We believed the sentiment then that is contained in that circular, and we believe it yet. We stand today on the same principles that we did then. We have seen no reason why we should change. It is not only true that there was not a dissenting voice against the adoption of the letter in and by the association, but there was never any complaint against it from any quarter when it was published. It contains the main principles for which the Old Baptists have contended all along the line. C. H. C.

Hot Shot Objected To

---June 15, 1922

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-You may be surprised to get this from me. I want this to be published in your paper, The Primitive Baptist. It is my desire to know the real truths of the Scriptures. We cannot change its truths. We may believe them as they really are, or we may believe to the reverse, but that does not change it a particle. We cannot change our destiny by believing the truth or by believing an untruth. I have your "Hot Shot" pamphlet before me and I think it is somewhat hard on some folks, but I think, also, that some questions indicate an opposition to some of the other questions. I may be in error myself but I stand ready to give up any belief that I now have if I am shown by the Scriptures and good logic. I do not expect to take up the questions that I think indicate an opposition to some others in this letter, but may some time if I should ever write again. I want to begin as follows: I understand the Scriptures to teach that God, only, inhabiteth eternity; that God, only, is eternal; that God, only, is immortal. Is this what you believe? Answer yes or no, as the case may be. If this is true, and it certainly is, then at one time, or before time, there was not anything except God. This being true, it certainly follows that whatever God made was made in time or at the beginning of time, and that they are time creatures only. They could not be, or any part of them, eternal, because, to be eternal they would have to be without beginning or without ending. They must be time creatures, mortal, finite; of the earth, therefore earthly. They had a beginning, they will have an ending. Is this what you believe? If so, you believe what I think is unavoidably so. But if you, on the other hand, believe that some part of man is eternal, immortal, as most you hear speak about it believe, then I want to know how he got it. That which is first is Spirit, that which is second is natural. The natural was produced, or made, by the Spirit, or God. Many believe that God, in creating and making all things, made some part of the things eternal and some not eternal. I do not think God could create an eternal thing, as I said above, as an eternal thing cannot have a beginning. If anything is or ever will be eternal it will be a part of God Himself. For a thing to be eternal, it must be a part of God. Eternal life comes directly and immediately from God to whatever has it. It does not come through man, or by man, in any way or form, but it must be transmitted directly from God, and it is God. Natural men and women can beget and give birth to natural children only. By them mortality, only, is transmitted. They cannot transmit both mortality and immortality. If they cannot transmit both mortality and immortality, then how can part of the natural man be mortal and part immortal? If man in nature can transmit both, it undoubtedly uproots every fundamental sentence in the Scriptures. If not so, give me some tangible reason, so that I, by my dull reasoning faculties, may understand. If that can be done, then why cannot fine watermelons and fine pumpkins both grow on the same vine? No, nature produces nature only; God's Spirit produces or puts His Spirit, only, in man; God's Spirit is put in man in the act of regeneration. And when it is put in there it is there to stay. It does not just change man's natural spirit, which is his natural life, but He puts His Spirit in there to bear witness with our spirits. That is the way we learn anything about a change. That is what gives us reasons for our hope, or is what makes us hope. It makes us believe sometimes that we are the children of God. There are but two universal groups of things. First is the great spiritual or eternal group. Second, is the great natural or material group. The first group includes all things that were not created. The second group includes all things that were created, both of animate and inanimate things. The nature that was given any specific thing at the beginning has continued from then until now, and will continue the same as it was when God made it until time shall be no more. When time is no more, there will be no more nature. That will leave nothing but the great spiritual or eternal group. Then all things will have been put under Him who rules all things. If God is a sovereign, which He is, that means that He is the ruler of all things. All

things mean just what He created and made. What He created and made are all the things that are, or ever were, or will ever be.

I must close for this time. I certainly hope, Brother Cayce, you or anyone who feels an interest in me, will show me wherein I am wrong, and give your Bible as well as your logical reasons for it. I hope it is my humble desire to know the truth as is revealed by the word of God and corroborated by His divine Spirit. J. I. Caneer.

3731 South Hope St., Los Angeles, Calif.

OUR REPLY

On another page in this paper will be found a letter from Brother J. I. Caneer, of Los Angeles, Calif., in which he says that he has a copy of our pamphlet called "Hot Shot," and has asked us a few questions, to which we wish to reply, and we desire to do so in a brotherly way. He says that some of our questions in the pamphlet seem to indicate an opposition to some of the other questions, but that he does not expect to take up those questions in this letter. This is the very first thing that Brother Caneer should have done, if he has found objections to the contents of that pamphlet. The very first thing required would have been to show the inconsistencies. Brother Caneer says he understands the Scriptures to teach that God, only, inhabiteth eternity; that God, only, is eternal; that God, only, is immortal. Then asks, "Is this what you believe? Answer yes or no, as the case maybe." To this we say that we believe what Paul said in **(I Timothy 1:17)** "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever." We also believe what Paul said in **(I Timothy 6:15-16)** "Which in His times He shall shew, which is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting." We suppose this answers the question. We do not believe that God only hath immortality; but we do believe that God only "hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto." A distinctive doctrine of the Baptist Church has ever been that man possesses an immortal soul- not immortal in the sense that God is immortal-that is, dwelling in the light-but immortal in the sense that it never ceases to exist, or will never cease to exist. We say that this has ever been a distinctive doctrine of the Baptist Church. We also hold that "Whatever is Baptist is Scriptural." That is, whatever the Baptists have ever taught-whatever has been a distinctive doctrine of the Baptist Church-is Scriptural. If this is not true, then the Baptists have been wrong all along the line; and if they have been wrong all along the line, then the Baptist Church is not the church of Christ. If this be true, then the Primitive Baptists should surrender the claim that they make that the Primitive Baptist Church is the church that Christ established while He was on earth, and that it is therefore the church of Christ. But we are not ready to surrender that claim. The Primitive Baptist Church is the church that Christ established while He was on earth, and it is the church of Christ. This being true, that church is Scriptural in doctrine. As that church is Scriptural in doctrine, then whatever is Baptist is Scriptural. No man can deny this conclusion without denying that the Primitive Baptist Church is the church of Christ. Brother Caneer must admit the one or deny the other. Surely he is not ready to admit that the Primitive Baptist Church is not the church of Christ. As evidence that the Baptists have held that man has an immortal soul, we quote from the London Confession of Faith as follows, Chapter 5, Section 2: "After God had made all other creatures He created **{(Genesis 1:27)}** man, male and female, with **{(Genesis 2:7)}**

reasonable and immortal souls, rendering them fit unto that life to God for which they were created, being {**(9) (Ecclesiastes 7:29); (Genesis 1:26)**} made after the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness and true holiness; having the law of God {**(Romans 2:14-15)**} written in their hearts, and power to fulfill it; and yet under a possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will, which was {**(Genesis 3:6)**} subject to change." This Confession plainly says that man, male and female, God made with reasonable and immortal souls. The Baptists as a body have believed this all along the line. In "Word and Works of God," written by John Gill, is a chapter on the "Creation of Man." This chapter was published in The Primitive Baptist of May 21, 1896 -twenty-six years ago. There was no objection raised against this at that time. We will quote here just a little from that chapter: "These are two, body and soul. They appear at his first formation. The one was made out of the dust, the other was breathed into him; and so at his dissolution, the one returns to the dust from whence it was, and the other to God that gave it. And, indeed, death is only the dissolution, or dis-union, of these two parts: the body without the spirit is dead; the one dies, the other does not." "The soul is * * * * immaterial; and so immortal." "It is better to let this difficulty lie unresolved, than to give up so certain a truth, and of so much importance, as is the doctrine of the immortality of the soul." Buck's Theological Dictionary says: "The immortality of the soul may be argued from its vast capacities, boundless desires, great improvements, dissatisfaction with the present state, and desire of some kind of religion. It is also argued from the consent of all nations; the consciousness that men have of sinning; the sting of conscience; the justice and providence of God. How far these arguments are conclusive I will not say; but the safest, and, in fact, the only sure ground to go upon to prove this doctrine is the word of God, where we at once see it clearly established; **((0:28) (Matthew 10:28); (25:46); (Dan 12:2) (Daniel 12:2); (II Timothy 1:10); (Th 4:17) (I Thessalonians 4:17-18); (John 10:28)**" These references and extracts are enough to show that the Baptists have ever held to this principle. The above also cites Scriptural proof. The reader can turn and read those passages for himself, and it is not necessary to quote all of them here. We will refer to only one or two. **(Matthew 25:46)** reads, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." If "these" do not possess an immortal soul, and have only an existence in time, we do not see how they could go away into everlasting punishment. And remember that the word translated everlasting with reference to the punishment of "these" is the same word that is translated eternal with reference to the life of the righteous. One is of equal duration as the other. Again, **((0:28) (Matthew 10:28)**" And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." If the soul is not immortal, and does not live after the death of the body, then men are able to kill the soul as well as the body. If a man kills the body, and the soul does not continue to live after the death of the body, then he kills the soul also. But the Saviour said that men cannot kill the soul. Therefore, when a man kills the body he does not kill the soul. As he does not kill the soul, then the soul continues to live. If man does not possess an immortal soul, then when a man dies that is the last of him, and there is no such thing as future punishment; there is no such thing as an eternal hell, or a place of eternal punishment. Most articles of faith of Primitive Baptist churches say "we believe that the joys of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked will be eternal." They say that or that "the punishment of the wicked will be everlasting and the joys of the righteous eternal." They mean the same thing. We wonder if these articles of faith have been wrong all the time? We wonder who has advanced so far in learning as to inform the Primitive Baptist Church that they have been wrong all along the line in one of their fundamental

principles? As for us, we are satisfied with what has been the distinctive doctrine of the Primitive Baptist Church all through the ages. We are not yet ready to surrender a single one of her principles. Others may side step, and become wise above what is written, but we are still content with the same old time-honored principles which our fathers loved and advocated. As for the "Hot Shot," we are aware of the fact that some of those questions are rather hard on some things which have been advocated; but we can answer every one of them in perfect harmony with the doctrine of the Bible, and in harmony with the principles upon which we have stood ever since we have had a name among the Primitive Baptists. Brother Caneer says, "If anything is or ever will be eternal it will be a part of God Himself. For a thing to be eternal, it must be a part of God." We wonder when space began to be? We wonder if there was no such thing as space before time was? We wonder if space is a part of God? If so, we wonder what part it is? True, God is as boundless as space, but space is not God, nor is it any part of God. We wonder what kind of god Brother Caneer claims to have, since he has made the statement that he did. He says, too, that God could not make an eternal thing. We suppose he got that from his "think so," as we do not remember the text that says so. The Bible says that God cannot lie, and that He could swear by no greater than Himself. It also teaches us that He cannot do a thing that is contrary to His divine attributes. But we do not remember any of His divine attributes that would forbid His being able to make a thing eternal. The only way we can reach that conclusion is from the simple and finite reasoning that the maker must exist before the thing made. From the same principle of reasoning one might deny that Jesus Christ is, or was, equal with the Father. The reasoning would be that the father must, of necessity, be older than the son; and for this reason the Son is not the eternal Son of God-that He could not be eternal, being the Son, and the son cannot be as old as the father. Such as this would simply be a denial of the Lord Jesus Christ. This shows the fallacy of the reasoning. Brother Caneer also says, "Eternal life comes directly and immediately from God to whatever has it. It does not come through man or by man in any way or form, but it must be transmitted directly from God." To this we agree; but he adds, "and it is God." Now we cannot understand that eternal life is God any more than the natural life which a man has here is man. The man is not the life. If so, what is he when the life has become extinct? How could there be any such thing as a dead man if the life is the man? Life is a state or condition, a conscious or animate condition, an organic condition; the opposite to inorganic or dead condition. God exists in a living condition, and always has existed in that condition, and always will. He has always been just as He is now, and always will be. But the life itself is not God. He possesses life, and always has, and always lives. He is the fountain and source of life. Life comes from Him. And life is always imparted directly and immediately. There is no such thing as a medium in the impartation of life. If the life and the thing living are one and the same thing, then that "which is born of God is God." According to that, when a man is born of God (" whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." -[1 John 5:1](#)), he is then God. We would have an innumerable company of little gods, according to that. This is clearly fallacious, and further argument is unnecessary. Brother Caneer wants a tangible reason so that he can understand. Now we are sure that he believes some things which are true that he cannot understand, and which no man can explain. Surely he believes and is sure that the lily grows; but he cannot explain it. Neither can any other man do so. Surely he believes that Jesus was the son of Mary and the Son of God at the same time. He cannot explain that, for it is above the comprehension of finite mind; it is too wonderful for man to understand and explain it. But it is the truth all the same. And all the hope we have of a better home beyond this vale of tears is based on that great and sublime truth,

though it is far beyond our being able to give tangible reasoning upon it so that we may understand how it can be. It is true, even if we cannot understand it. Yes," the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." -Rom. viii. 16. If that Spirit bears witness to the truth, then those in whom the Spirit of God dwells have been made the children of God. It is not simply something in or about them that is a child of God; but they are children of God. The Spirit does not bear witness to our spirit that our spirit is a child of God; but it bears witness WITH our spirit that WE are children of God. We are not gods, but children of God; that is, those are who have this witness of the Spirit. This cheers us along life's rugged pathway, and gives us hope of a better home beyond. C. H. C.

Blessed Hope

---June 15, 1922

Elder C. H. Cayce:

My Dear Little Brother-I don't feel like saying it, but that is just the way I feel about it. I have known you so long, and all the boosting you have ever got never has made you feel big. Now I will try to explain myself. I have been reading The Primitive Baptist ever since the first issue. I have not been a subscriber all the time, but I always found it among my Baptist friends. If it has changed in all these years I have not got sense enough to see it. I have a box of old papers here by me now. I have just been reading "The Work of The Church," by Elder D. Bartley, copied from the Gospel Messenger and printed in The Primitive Baptist of November 4, 1892. Well, I have been reading again "This Good Old Hymn" (Jesus, lover of my soul), written by dear Sister, Mrs. W. F. Waddell, June 27, 1911. Oh, my dear ones, entreat me not to leave thee, nor to return from following after thee. I can't be here long. My dearest friends are over there. Surely I have drunk of the bitter cup -so many of my family have outstripped me and gone my dear husband and twenty-five little ones, children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Wonderful, indeed! The natural mind cannot comprehend it! Just think one moment how sweet it would be to hear thirteen little girls and twelve little boys all dressed in white singing "Home, sweet home," and dear old grandpa enjoying the music. Now change your mind to heavenly things. Oh, how sweet! Grandpa, Jennie, Newton, and Becca, together with those little ones, all join in singing the song the angels cannot sing. Now that is not all my family -there are here in this world of sorrow nine children, fifty-one grandchildren, thirty-nine great-grandchildren, besides the "in-laws," making 125 living. Now I am old, will soon have to enter the pale nations of the dead. The same hand is leading me that never has failed. I am still trusting with child-like simplicity-just waiting to hear the welcome applaudit, "Child, come home." Oh, my Lord, I may be deceived in it all, but I am not deceived about them that have gone on before -my dear one that left me December 17, 1920. We had lived together fifty-four years, ten months and four days. Three days before he left me the Lord gave me a song and I began to sing "There'll be no sorrow there." I sang three verses and my soul was lifted above the troubles of this world. I commenced shouting and went to him and told him the Lord had promised to keep me. He said, "I know He will do it, Old Woman." The power of the Almighty gave me strength to see him breathe his last breath. I feel so sad and lonely, but I do not wish him back. I thought of your dear mother many times, and dear Sister Rachel. Brother Miller has been at my house. That was not long before he died. He came to Brush Creek, and he was so humble I thought he surely was one of the little ones. Oh, will you, dear beloved sister, just pray for the least one, if one at all? May the Lord bless His people everywhere. S. J. Perry., Dresden, Tenn.

REMARKS

Dear sister, we have read the above with a feeling sense of our unworthiness, yet we trust that we fully appreciate your kind words. We feel that you are prepared to judge as to the course we have pursued, and as to whether we have changed, or whether we are occupying the same ground the paper occupied when it was started by our sainted father the first of January, 1886. You have been through wars in the camps of Israel, as well as the natural wars, and you know what those old servants of God advocated when the writer was a boy-even before he ever claimed a hope, perhaps. Please pray the Lord that we may be enabled to continue in the good old way. We wish we could see you once more. May the good Lord bless and keep you, is our humble prayer. You have our sincere sympathy. We feel to know how to sympathize with those who are in trouble. C. H. C.

A Suggestion

---June 15, 1922

Dear Brethren Webb and Newman:

My Very Dear Brethren-I have been impressed for some time to write you brethren, and I am taking advantage of The Primitive Baptist to reach you both. Very dear brethren, I write you both this short letter to ask you both, for the sake of the dear children of God throughout the state of Texas, won't you both agree to meet each other at some special point in Texas, and also serve notice in the several Baptist papers for as many brethren and sisters as can to meet you both, and become reconciled to each other, forgiving each other, as our Master has commanded, and thereby bring peace and fellowship back home again to God's little ones? Dear brethren, that would be the day of days, if you dear brethren would and could see fit in yourselves to do the great deed of your lives. Won't you, for your own comfort, as for others, do this? Well do I remember twenty-five years back when you were young fellows preaching the same grand truth, going hand in hand, seeing the same great truth together, trying to further the blessed gospel of the dear Saviour. I feel sure the flesh has dominated somewhat in both of you. It would be a happy day in Texas for the Baptists if those differences between you dear brethren could be adjusted. Now, dear Brother Newman, I have got back home. Would love so much for our dear people to get together again. You and Elder Webb and I haven't got many years on earth to do things for each other and our dear people and to please our Master.

So let us be in haste to do the things that make for peace and love and Christian fellowship. Away back down the way, twenty-five years ago, I kept you both in my home all night, and we were all happy. Won't you blot out all the little things that have severed you and be happy again before we die? May God, in His richest mercy, help you both to prayerfully consider this proposition. Cayce Publishing Co., would you, if it isn't asking too much of you, give this letter a place in your paper? And many thanks. J. G. Grant. Hico, Texas.

REMARKS

We feel duty-bound to offer just a few remarks in regard to the above proposition. In the first place we wish to say that it would have been well if Elder Webb and those who joined with him in the unholy war in their accusations against their brethren to have considered the matter of striving for the things that make for peace before they had destroyed the peace and fellowship of the church as they have. A boy can take a timepiece all to pieces, and then not be able to put it together again. He may take a club and break a watch to pieces so that it cannot be mended. If he wants a timepiece, he should consider that matter before he uses

his club. Next, we wish to say that while we do not wish or propose to justify Elder Newman in any wrong which he may have done, yet we wish to say that he has, more than once, stated publicly that he is sorry for every wrong thing that he did in the trouble, and begged all to forgive him. We do not know how much more could be asked of him. Next, we would suggest that if Elders Newman and Webb should get together and settle any personal difference that may exist between them, that would not bring the Baptists of Texas together. Churches and associations are divided and torn asunder. In order for them to get together, it will take more than for these two preachers to get together. This is one trouble now in the church of God-preachers control too much. They are too much like lords and masters, instead of "your servants for Jesus' sake." Next, we wonder if the Baptists of Texas want to fellowship such a thing as that "shady transaction." The idea of a man having a house and lot sold, in which several parties are interested, and the deal being a cash transaction, and several days after the deal was made and the check delivered and the money put on deposit in the bank, then write one of the parties interested that the property has been sold, but no money received yet, and the man who had the deal made letting his son have the money to be paid back in installments! Nice thing for an Old Baptist preacher! Do orderly churches crave to fellowship that? Does a man who loves honest living crave a home in the church where that is fellowshipped? Has that all been wiped out? Again: And again: Well, we might mention several things, but we will "drop the curtain" here for the present. May the good Lord help us, and may He grant that we may keep a clean house. C. H. C.

Where Are We At?

---July 1, 1922

Please read what we here have to say, and then please answer the question above for us, if you can. We moved to this place from Martin, Tennessee, the last week of October, 1919. Elder S. C. Bozarth moved here from Kentucky, in the bounds of the Highland Association, or thereabouts, before we came here. In Kentucky he was a member of Antioch Church. He got a letter of dismissal from them in good standing and full fellowship. Elder J. B. Hardy, who lives in Cleveland County, Ark., had been visiting the churches in Kentucky where Elder Bozarth lived, so that Elder Bozarth was acquainted with him. When he came to this section he put his letter in Elder Hardy's church. He soon discovered that he was not at home, and that these people were not like those he was with in Kentucky. On the second Sunday in April, 1920, Elder Bozarth was at Thornton at meeting there. He had been at several services with our people at different places just before that. At that time he asked Elders T. B. Little, Jno. R. Harris and us what course to pursue to get with our people. He said that he thought Elder Hardy was in line with our people, but that he had found that there was a difference; that he had put his letter in one of Elder Hardy's churches, and did not know how to proceed. We all three advised him to write to Antioch Church in Kentucky and tell them where he had disposed of the letter, or where he had deposited it, and that Elder Hardy's church was identified with the Baptists in this country called "Absoluters," and ask them to grant him another letter or to authorize the clerk to send him a duplicate, so that he could unite with the people who are not identified with that doctrine. Elder Bozarth wrote to the clerk of that church, Antioch, in Kentucky. He received the following reply: Madisonville, Ky., April 18, 1920. Elder S. C. Bozarth: Dear Brother-I received your letter a few days ago. Was glad to hear from you, but sorry to learn you had gotten into trouble. My health is some better. I still have a bad stomach; have to be

careful what I eat. Hope you are all well. Say, brother, what kind of trouble did you get into with the elder? Was it on doctrine? If so, state it, and give me those names you said in your letter-not that I doubt your word; but I guess it would be best, so I can put it before the church. I think they will grant your request. I talked to Brother Pilate and Brother Bud Clayton. They thought it best to get the names of the elders you referred to. They think we can give you another letter. So I want to attend to it next meeting, if I can, 2nd of May. We can say you have always proved to be sound in doctrine and practice, and we can't say anything else. I hope everything will work out all right and you can have a home with the people that advocate the doctrine of old Antioch. So let me hear from you soon. Your unworthy brother in hope, D. F. Siria. P. S. -I can tell any people, or set of people, that you have been, ever since I knew you, sound in doctrine and practice. I am sure the whole association will say the same. You have always preached good sound doctrine, if I know anything about what the Bible teaches. Yours. Now on Saturday before the second Sunday in May, 1920, Antioch Church authorized the clerk to send Elder Bozarth a duplicate of the letter they had granted him before that time. Here is the letter the clerk wrote him in regard to it: Madisonville, Ky., May 10, 1920. Elder S. C. Bozarth:

I will answer your letter and also send you a duplicate of the church letter. We are as well as usual. Hope you are all well. We had communion and feet washing Sunday. Had a good meeting. Wish you could have been with us. Hope you will come out all right in the church affairs. Answer and tell me how you made it when it suits you. Your brother, I hope, D. P. Siria. P. S.-Hope this will be all right. This shows that the duplicate letter was authorized by the church, and that it was sent to Elder Bozarth on the 10th of May, 1920. The duplicate was authorized by the church on Saturday before the second Sunday in May. On the second Sunday in June, or Saturday before, Elder Bozarth was at Thornton again (Cane Creek Church then meeting in Thornton) and presented the letter and was received by the church on the letter. Cane Creek Church is in the New Hope Association. About twelve years ago there was a division in the New Hope Association on the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things. Elder Hardy's church is identified with the side known as the "Absoluters," and the Cane Creek Church is with the side that they call "Conditionalists." There was a division in the Highland Association, in Kentucky, a number of years ago on the same question, and Antioch Church is with the party there that are called "Conditionalists" by the other party. Now, Elder Hardy goes among the people in that section that are thus known in that country, just as Cane Creek, and those with her, are known here. Now, on Thursday before the third Sunday in October, 1920, we organized a church in Fordyce. Elder Bozarth got a letter of dismissal from Cane Creek, in Thornton, and was one of the charter members of our church here. Now, in the Messenger of Zion of July 21, 1920, published by Elder J. D. Shain, in Madisonville, Ky., the following statement may be found on page 2: To All Whom It May Concern:

Whereas, Elder S. C. Bozarth, formerly a member of Antioch Church of Kentucky, and whereas in September, 1919, he was granted a letter in full fellowship and later joined Pine Grove Church in Ark., by this letter. And whereas the said Elder Bozarth did by letter of May, 1920, request our clerk to send him a duplicate of the letter of dismissal which he had received of Antioch Church and saying nothing about the action of Pine Grove Church in excluding him from their fellowship, that Antioch Church did instruct the clerk to send Elder Bozarth a statement certifying that he had been granted a letter in full fellowship. Therefore, we, Antioch Church, desire to make this statement to all whom it may concern that: We do not intend to reinstate Elder Bozarth, nor to repudiate the act of Pine Grove Church in his

exclusion; and be it further known that the certificate sent Elder Bozarth is only to certify that he left us in good standing, and has no bearing on his standing now. We warn all Baptist churches that Elder Bozarth is not a member of Antioch Church, and cannot be received into fellowship of any orderly Baptist Church on that certificate. We make this statement for the sake of peace and for the good of all concerned. Done and signed by order of the church called Antioch while in conference this May 12th, 1920. Elder J. P. Clayton, Moderator. D. F. Siria, Clerk. The reader will note that the clerk sent the duplicate letter on May 10th. Then on May 12 Antioch held conference again and had the above statement made. But on the second Sunday in June, or Saturday before, the duplicate letter authorized by the Antioch Church was received with the bearer in Cane Creek Church in Thornton. Then on July 21 following, the above statement appears in Elder Shain's paper. As already stated, Elder Hardy's church is identified here with the party known as "Absoluters," there having been a division about twelve years ago in the New Hope Association on that question, and Elder Hardy is with that side of the New Hope. Thus it is seen that Elder Shain and his people in Kentucky will not, or do not, recognize the "Absoluters" there, but recognize them here in Arkansas. We wonder if that suits his corresponding editors? And we wonder how it suits the Baptists all over Southwest Kentucky, in Tennessee, and in North Mississippi, and some in Southern Illinois, and in Missouri? Now, it appears a little strange to us that the church would authorize that duplicate letter on the 8th day of May, the clerk forward it on the 10th, and then on the 12th (Wednesday) the church hold another conference and authorize the statement published in the Messenger of Zion of July 21. Elder Bozarth was received on the letter in good faith on June 12th by Cane Creek Church, in Thornton, before the statement was published. Now, our question at the head of this article, "Where are we at?" Can you tell us? It seems to us that we are in the clear. If not, why not? Will those churches in Kentucky recognize the "Absoluters" in Arkansas and refuse to recognize them at home? If so, why? We would be glad if somebody can "untangle the hank" for us. C. H. C.

Secret Order Insurance

---July 1, 1922

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-Please answer these three questions through The Primitive Baptist for the benefit of Brother James C. Flowers:

1. Do the orderly Baptists keep in fellowship members who keep their policy paid up in a secret order?
2. Is it right to keep them in the church if you know it?
3. Would it be wrong to contend against it?

ANSWER

There has been, and we suppose is yet, a difference of opinion in regard to this matter among the brethren. Some brethren think it is wrong to retain a member who has nothing whatever to do with the order but the paying of his insurance dues. Not only is this true, but there are a few who would refuse to fellowship one who carries old line insurance. Our people-the Primitive Baptists-as a body, have held that insurance in an old line company, where there are no secrets and no lodge meetings, is purely a matter of business, and that there is no faith denied in a transaction of that kind. Some brethren, who think this way about it, also think that it is a bad business transaction, and admit that we cannot afford to exclude a brother because he makes a bad trade. If we were to do that, not many of us would be left. While we were living in Martin, Tenn., and our church

was in the Greenfield Association, we had a member in our church who was keeping his insurance paid in a secret order, although he never visited the lodge, nor had anything to do with them, and had not done so since before he united with the church. We knew of other members in the association who were doing the same thing, and we suppose they are doing so yet. We do not know whether they have quit it or not. But we heard of some complaint against our church on account of the matter, though no complaint was ever heard about the others. So the church took the matter up with the brother and he laid his insurance in the order down. We then held that a brother should be willing to lay down even a financial connection with a secret order for the sake of peace in the church, and we think that way yet. This complaint which we mention- was not an official complaint. It was not made by any church, but was some talk among some of the brethren in the association. Now we think that this is a sufficient answer to the above questions-that a brother should be willing to lay down his insurance in a secret order for the sake of the peace of the church. Though he may have no affiliation with the order, he is contributing some of his means to help sustain the order. We think the safe thing to do is to have nothing whatever to do with those things-even if it were permissible, and no objection raised against them. Such insurance is not sound insurance. That is, it is not on a sound financial basis, and they will all fail, unless they work on the old line plan with adequate rates; and few, if any, of them do this. We once had a list of the names of about eighteen hundred assessment insurance companies that failed in twenty years. Many hundreds of poor people lost all they had paid in. Better stay out, is what we think about it. C. H. C.

A Debate

---July 1, 1922

About a year ago we were to have met C. R. Nichol in debate near Lebanon, Mo. We were called by telegram on Saturday before we were to start on Sunday to go to Kentucky. It was on account of a matter of business over which we had no control, that is, which we could not change, so we had to wire them to postpone the debate. Quite a while ago we wrote and set the time for Monday, August 21, for the debate to begin. The Campbellites have written us they want to get another man. We wrote our brethren there that they might get any man they please, just so they take the propositions signed and be ready for the date set, August 21. We had a letter from N. L. Clark wanting to change propositions and to set another date. We wrote him that we agreed for them to get another man provided the propositions and date were accepted. We expect to be on hand on that date to meet any man that they may have there to meet the issue. Trains will be met on Monday, August 21, at Phillipsburg. Write Elder D. F. Coones, R. 2, Lebanon, Mo., if you expect to go, and if you can write him. Be sure to get to Phillipsburg Monday morning. That is nearer to the place of debate than Lebanon. All are invited. C. H. C.

Endorsement

---July 1, 1922

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-It is in much weakness and fear and trembling that I try to write to you concerning the peace move among the Baptists. First, I want to say that I

endorse your firm stand concerning this move. There is but one way to have lasting peace, and that is to have it on Bible principles. Now, little child of God, how did you first have peace with God? Was it not a God-given blessing? So is peace to the church. You remember our Saviour said, "My peace I give unto you." So you see that peace was a gift of our Saviour to His disciples. You remember, too, that He said, "My peace I leave with you." Now since He was so good to us that He gave His peace to us, and then left it with us, how careful we ought to be in trying to keep it. Now, the man or men that broke this peace are the ones to make amends. They should acknowledge their wrongs to the church and ask forgiveness, instead of saying just quit saying anything about it. Suppose I steal a horse, and the owner sees me steal him, and I go home and say nothing about it. What do you guess would be next? Now I could come as near satisfying the owner of the horse by saying nothing as the man can that brings trouble in the church by saying nothing. "Well," says one, "if begging for peace is not the way to it, what must we do?" Just remove the cause of trouble and you have got peace. I believe I love peace as dearly as any man on earth, but I want it on Bible principles; and I believe every sound Old Baptist wants peace just like I do. Now, Brother Hanks, I understand you want peace just like I do, and I do not believe you or any other sound Baptist would say it is gospel order for Old Baptists to ordain a preacher twice; neither do I believe that a man who will tell a willful lie or swear a lie is fit to live in the Old Baptist Church. Now I believe the Primitive Baptists are keeping house for the Lord. Oh, Lord, help them to keep His house in order; keep us all at each other's feet, esteeming others better than ourselves. May we never forget that we should walk as children of light. Dear brethren, don't you think that many of God's dear children are watching you and me, and at the same time wanting a home in the Old Baptist Church? Now if we are backbiting each other and devouring each other, do you think these people would want to come in the Lord's house to live in war? Don't you believe that we, as a people, should keep a clean house? Brethren, have you forgot what our Saviour said about a house that is divided against itself? You know it cannot stand. We all know that the last little stir we have had among us was a shame before the Almighty God. I am not wondering about the coldness in the churches -all of this for the lack of discipline. Did you know that a preacher needs discipline drawn on him sometimes? If this had been done, our Master's cause would not have been bleeding. So, God's dear little children, let us return to our first love, or else He will spue us out of His mouth. Now, a word to the brethren in the West. Is there one among you that is not willing to take just what the Bible says? I don't believe there is. We, here in the East, are going to tell it just like the Bible tells it; and the man or men that don't like it are unsound in the faith. Our people here in the East love what Jesus said to Nicodemus, "A man must be born again, or he cannot see the kingdom of God." Now a word to the Baptists that are divided over this point. Don't you believe it is a shame before God that Baptists would divide over the only thing that prepares men to serve and worship God? Now if any man has said more than Jesus said, he has said too much; and if any man has said less, he lacked some of saying enough. A poor ignorant boy like me that did not get to go to school enough to learn how to read is perfectly satisfied with what the Bible says without fixing one word. I would rather take the testimony of our Lord than all of the men in the world. Where the Bible says "a new creature in Christ Jesus" I have no better sense than to believe it; but do not believe that it makes gods, but children of God. Now, brethren, for God's sake let us all be content with what the Bible says and don't be disturbing the peace of Zion. Now, one more word to the brethren in the West. We Baptists in this country love you all. Brother Ritchie, I have not forgotten the good preaching you did at Rock Spring; and Brother Newman, I have read your writing in The Primitive Baptist, and learned

to love you. Now, you brethren come together and be brethren; and as Brother Claud has said, let each church settle their grievance, taking the Bible for your guide, and let us be one people, and let us keep ourselves unspotted from the world, such as secret orders, and fornicators, adultery, and false witness. Let us always be ready to sacrifice for each other. When I am down at my brethren's feet on my knees I feel like I am nearer at the right place than any other time. Now, when you have prayed for yourself and everybody else, remember me, the least one of all, if one at all. R. L. Perry. Palmersville, Tenn.

REMARKS

While we were in Tennessee there were some preachers over there who had become so far advanced in wisdom as to find out that what the Saviour said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," would not do without some kind of modification. Because we would not say more or less they said we believed the whole man doctrine, whatever that may be. We were satisfied then with it just as the Saviour said it, and we are satisfied with it that way now. Some were not. Brother Perry knows who some of them were. If they are now satisfied with it as the Saviour said it, we are glad of it. Brother Perry, we suppose you are aware that a church in your association has restored a man who was excluded for false swearing, as well as upon other charges? We think the church is in your association. You know about it. Other brethren there know. We think it about time that this thing was seen after. The Baptists around here would not much like to fellowship such as that. How about it in West Tennessee? What about the churches in the surrounding associations? Do they fellowship such as that? We want peace, but we want a clean house, and we cannot have peace without a clean house. Such ungodly things in the church as we know have been winked at have always caused trouble, and they always will. Instead of trying to get everything together, including such ungodliness, let us clean up the house, and then we will have peace. If the cleaning up removes us with the other trash, let us go. The church needs peace and rest more than she needs any man on earth. C. H. C.

Should Be Separate

---July 15, 1922

Sometimes I am impressed to speak out in defense of the cause and truth. I can hardly rest, day or night; but many think you are uncharitable if you do, and set you aside and have no use for you. I hope my one desire is to serve my God and to do His will, regardless of what I may be called to endure for His sake. While charity is the best of all graces, I am impressed that true charity, like Paul had, means not only love, but candor, sincerity, earnestness, firmness. Honesty becomes the professed followers of Christ- men and women who are honest to their Lord; who will not go hand in hand with Babylon, and yet try to pose as being meek and humble and charitable followers of God. Charity-true charity, as Paul possessed-will not sacrifice the blessed truth and principles of Christianity to gain the friendship of the world. "Whosoever, therefore, will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." This is plain language, and forever condemns God's people in affiliating with the world and her societies as others; but it means that God's children should not walk hand in hand with the world and her churches, so-called helps, societies, clubs; and I am thinking we ought also not follow the world's vain pride and her vain amusements which abound on every side. When I meditate on Jesus' life, and Paul's life, and the life of all true Christians who have lived near the cross (to live near the cross is to daily deny self), I feel like falling in the dust. Oh, to be more

Christ-like; to have that charity which will not let us be conformed to the world, but ever seeking to be more like Jesus, and to obey, love and honor Him in our bodies and our spirits which are His. Oh, the selfishness in this old unfriendly world. Many have become rebellious and stiff-necked, desiring to please self and men rather than the Lord; and we find recorded in the Bible that when His children became stubborn, self-willed, and would not receive and obey the word of truth and correction and rebuke and forewarning delivered unto them by God's dear prophets and servants, that God sent His rebuke upon them, and that most severely oft-times, as when His children forsook Him to worship the inventions of men, as the golden calf. Today God's rebuke has already begun, and Zion will never have rest or peace until God cleanses her of the wickedness crept in her borders, the worldliness and carnality. Submitted in love. If one at all, the least of all, Mrs. Lora E. Smith. Greenville, New Mex.

REMARKS

How true the above is, that we will never have rest and peace again in the church until she has been cleansed of some of the wickedness that has been practiced and harbored within her borders. Brethren may cry peace, peace; but that will not bring peace. Brethren may propose to recognize any and all factions, and all their work; but that will not bring peace. It seems to us that the only thing that will bring peace and rest in the church is for her to be cleansed from some of the filthiness that has been brought in. While there are perjured persons, adulterers, traitors, trucebreakers, and such like persons retained in the church, there can be no peace. Put such things out-remove the cause of the troubles-and then there will be peace, and not before. C. H. C.

Questions Of Order

---July 18, 1922

In October, 1920, we received a letter containing the following questions on order, with the request that we give our answers. We were so far behind then that we could not answer many letters that we received, nor could we answer many requests. We simply had to let those things go by without attention, not because we did not wish to comply with the requests of the brethren, or answer their letters, but just because we were compelled to do other things in order that the work of getting the paper out and other work be done. We are now trying to catch up with our work, and trying to answer many things which had not been answered. We will give the questions and then give our answer as best we can and in as few words as possible.

1. Has a church the Scriptural right to hold a sister in their church fellowship who, while a member, marries a man separated from his former wife by divorce without cause of fornication? Answer: We think not- that is, if his former wife was not an adulterer, or a fornicator. The man and wife might be separated before it is found out that she is guilty, and that fact become known later; in which case he is free.
2. Does a brother or sister commit adultery for putting away a wife or husband for the cause of fornication and marrying again? Answer: No.
3. Did Christ ever teach a lesson and afterwards condemn the same lesson? Answer: No.
4. Is a church constituted in disorder for using a preach brother in her constitution whose church held members who were unscripturally married, without the knowledge of members constituted? Answer: No. The fact that a member of the

presbytery who constitutes a church is in disorder does not invalidate the work of the orderly members of the presbytery.

5. Would it cause churches to become in disorder by affiliating with members whose churches held non-feet-washers, secret orders, and unscriptural marriages, without the knowledge of the affiliating church? Answer: We think not.
6. Can a church be justified by the word of God, holding to a disorder knowingly, because other churches are holding to same disorder? Answer: We think not. One church doing a wrong does not justify another church in doing the same wrong. That only adds wrong to wrong, or is simply more wrong doing.
7. How could this church in question (No. 6) be justified by the word of God and live in order? In other words, has she anything to do, and what is it, that she have the approval of God's word? Answer: She should keep herself in order; and as a loving sister, she should labor with her sister church to get her to rid herself of her disorder.
8. In [\(Matthew 19:9\)](#) did Christ have reference to what was done under the law, or what was right under grace? Answer: He had reference to what is right in all time- under the law dispensation as well as under the gospel dispensation. These are the questions, and the best we know how to answer them. This we think has been the view held by the great body of Primitive Baptists all along the line. C. H. C.

Regeneration After Death

---July 15, 1922

In the Illinois Baptist of March 4, 1922, Elder W. P. Throgmorton, the editor, says that "Infants are not regenerated before they die, but immediately after they die, and this in order to fit them for the happy world which Jesus has made sure for them by His death. This part of making it sure for them is just as necessary as is the part of the heavenly messengers who convey them to the goodly place whither they must go." Elder Throgmorton says at the beginning of the article that infants are saved by the atoning death of Christ. The elder did not seem to know so much about this matter in his debate with Elder Daily. And Elder Penick said in his debate with us in 1907 that he did not know how infants are saved. It seems to depend very much upon where some folks are as to what they know, or what they say. But the idea that infants are not regenerated before they die but immediately after, is a stunner! That is another invention of man. God's Book nowhere teaches that one is regenerated after death. But the Saviour says,- **(John 8:21)** "I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins: whither I go, ye cannot come." From this expression it is clear that those who die in their sins cannot "come" to where Jesus is. According to Elder Throgmorton's own statement, infants die in their sins, because they are not regenerated before they die. And he says they must have regeneration to fit them to live with the Lord. But as the Saviour teaches that those who die in their sins cannot come to Him; and, according to Elder Throgmorton, they die in their sins-then according to Elder Throgmorton, they cannot come to where Jesus is-unless Jesus was mistaken in what He said. But Jesus was not mistaken; and Elder Throgmorton does not tell the truth when he says they are not regenerated before they die. This position taken by Elder Throgmorton savors much of the Roman Catholic purgatory. C. H. C.

Tour In Tennessee And Mississippi

---August 15, 1922

We left home on Tuesday night after the first Sunday in July to fill appointments in Tennessee and Mississippi, as published in *The Primitive Baptist* some time ago, and to attend the debate between Elder J. H. Phillips, representing the Primitive Baptists, and Elder West, representing the Missionary Baptists, which was held near Johnson's Cross Roads Church, a few miles from Jack's Creek village, in Henderson County, Tenn. That is, the debate was held in Henderson County. Our first appointment was at Providence (Michie, Tenn.), in McNairy County, Tenn. We went from home to Corinth, Miss., reaching there on Wednesday night. Our companion and babies went with us as far as Corinth, they leaving with us to visit her father (B. B. Lawler) and mother and family, near Brownsboro, Ala. As we missed connection in Memphis, they stopped with us in Corinth, where we spent the night with Brother M. C. George. Next morning wife and babies went on to Brownsboro and we went out to meet the first appointment. Had services at Michie two days, Thursday and Friday. Elders J. W. and N. Hardwick, were at these services, which were pleasant. On Saturday and Sunday we were at Gravel Hill, where there was another pleasant meeting. Elder J. W. Hardwick is the pastor, and was with us there. Sunday afternoon we went to Henderson, Tenn., and found that they had announced an appointment for us there in the Christian (Campbellite) meeting house. A large crowd was in attendance. We spent the night with Brother Bun Griffin. On Monday we went to Jack's Creek, where we were met by Elder J. H. Phillips, and went with him to his home. We made our home with him until the close of his debate. The discussion closed on Friday afternoon. It was a great victory for the truth. Elder Phillips was equal to the occasion, and showed up the fallacy of Elder West's position on the different points involved in the discussion. Everything went off pleasantly during the discussion, but Elder West was so hard pressed on the last day that he made the assertion that some who belonged to the Missionaries had married into Primitive Baptist families and were persuaded to join the "Hardshells." As soon as the service was dismissed a number of those present who had come to our people from the Missionaries went directly to him and told him to his face that he had falsified, or that what he said in regard to that matter was untrue. The Old Baptists were rejoicing and felt good over the discussion. On Saturday morning Elder Phillips went with us to Hurricane Church, where we had a pleasant meeting Saturday and Sunday. On Monday we were conveyed to Turman's Creek by Brother E. V. Hardeman, where we had a pleasant meeting on Monday and Tuesday. Elder J. A. Burcham was with us there. He is the pastor of the church. On Wednesday and Thursday we were with the church at Barren Springs, where we had another pleasant season. Elder D. M. Neisler was with us there. He is the pastor of the church. We spent Wednesday night in his pleasant home. Thursday afternoon we went with Brother Wyatt to the home of Brother J. M. Brantley, near Johnson's Cross Roads, where we spent the night very pleasantly. Friday, Saturday and Sunday we attended the union meeting at Cross Roads. It was a pleasant meeting indeed. A sister Lewis joined the church during the meeting and requested that we baptize her, which was attended to. On Sunday afternoon we went to Henderson, where we boarded the train for Corinth, Miss. Elder Phillips was with us, and went with us the remainder of the tour. The train was late, so we were late getting to Corinth, but went to the home of Brother George. Our wife and babies were there, having come in the evening from Brownsboro. We all went out to Antioch next morning, where we had meeting for two days-Monday and Tuesday. On Wednesday morning our wife and babies boarded the train on the Southern for Memphis to come on home, while we, with Brother Phillips, boarded the train on

the M. & O. for Rienzi to reach the next appointment, which was at Sardis Church, near Rienzi. Then we filled appointments at Sardis, Booneville, Hopewell, New Hope, McKey's Creek, New Providence, Friendship and Little Flock Churches. There were large crowds present at nearly every service. We met Elders J. E. Shackelford, E. W. Shackelford, J. A. Miller, J. W. Hardwick, G. N. Gober and R. W. Owens at some of the churches. We do not remember now whether we met Elders J. D. and J. R. Thomas or not. We did not make a note of the brethren met, and have to write from memory. At Booneville a Sister Burnett, who lives in Rienzi, united with the church and was baptized by Elder Phillips. She certainly had to forsake her kindred in the flesh to follow her Saviour, as her father and relatives were of another persuasion and some of them very much prejudiced. Brother Burnett was overjoyed. The day will be long remembered by him, we are sure. It was a pleasant meeting at this place, as well as at the other places. We met many dear brethren and sisters whom we had never met before, as this was our first visit in this association. We hope the good Lord may open the way for us to visit them again some day. We failed to mention the fact above that a large crowd was in attendance every day at the debate. Several brethren in the ministry were present, and several brethren from a distance. The brethren were kind and good to us all the way on the trip. They were much better to us than we feel to deserve. May the good Lord bless and keep them, is our humble prayer. We trust they may find it in their hearts to pray for us, that we may be sustained and kept by the grace of God, and that we may be found contending for the principles of eternal truth—the principles that were loved and cherished by our fathers. We arrived home Saturday morning before the second Sunday in August and found all as well as usual, for which we trust we are thankful. Saturday and Sunday was our regular meeting time at our little church in Fordyce. We had a very pleasant meeting both days, though our attendance is not large as in some places. We are in peace among ourselves in our little church, as well as in our association, for which we desire to thank the Lord. Peace is much to be desired. A few in peace is better than a multitude in confusion. Our people here are content with the plain and ancient order of God's house, and we desire no new things. We are content with the old paths and desire to continue to walk therein. C. H. C.

Query

---September 1, 1922

Dear Brother Cayce:

Your remarks about insurance were very interesting to me. Brother A goes to a wheel of fortune, lays down a nickle, gives the wheel a turn, and draws thirty-five nickles. (I once knew of a man, not a brother, to make such a deal.) Brother B goes to an old line company, pays fifty dollars on a thousand dollar policy, dies, and his people draw nine hundred and fifty dollars clear. What, if any, is the difference in the two propositions? Please answer in paper. Yours in hope, Wm. L. Phillips. R. 4, Corsicana, Texas.

ANSWER

The difference is simply that there is absolutely no law of nature connected with the wheel of chance. But there is a law of nature that about so many will die every year at a given age. Statistics having been kept over a long term of years, and of a large number of people, shows that about so many will die out of a certain number of a certain age every year. True that sometimes an epidemic, like the flu, a few years ago, will be an exception for that year, but the average remains the same. Hence, the old line companies, having these records and tables, make their rates so as to

meet all necessary expenses and to have enough to meet the claim at the time of the death of the last man. Hence, when the man pays the premium in an old line company, he gets just what he pays for. The premium he pays is enough, with what the others pay that year, to meet all death claims, pay all expenses, and set aside a sufficient amount to meet other claims as they come due. We are not answering this question to defend insurance, but simply to answer the question asked. We haven't time or space to go into details in the matter. We will only add that true old line insurance is based on a fixed law of nature, as is revealed in carefully kept statistics over a long term of years. We care nothing about insurance, and do not care to have any personal quarrel over it-and will not. This ends it, so far as our columns are concerned. C. H. C.

The Debate Near Lebanon, Mo

---September 15, 1922

We left home on Saturday afternoon, August 19, for Little Rock to meet our regular appointment there on the third Sunday. Had meeting on Sunday at the regular place of meeting, the home of Sister Byrd Warren, 814 East Fifteenth Street. The congregation was small, but we had a very pleasant meeting. There are a number of members in Little Rock who hold membership at some place far away. This is not right, we are sure. Time has been when it would have been considered disorder for a person to live so near to an Old Baptist Church and let their membership remain at a church so far away, where they could seldom, if ever, attend. On Sunday evening we left Little Rock for Hoxie, where we changed cars for Springfield. We arrived in Springfield Monday morning and changed cars again for Phillipsburg. Arrived in Phillipsburg at about ten o'clock. Elder C. C. Agee got on the train before we reached Phillipsburg. Elder J. H. White and wife were also on the train. They all went with us on to the debate. Several brethren in the ministry were in attendance, and there was a good crowd present every day. Elder Clark lives in Fort Worth, Texas, who represented the Campbellites. We found him to be a pleasant man, in a general way; but, like most all his brethren, will make incorrect statements concerning the Old Baptist doctrine. But from what we were told in regard to the way C. R. Nichol acted when he was there last year to meet us, when we were unavoidably prevented from going, we are sure that Mr. Clark is a much nicer man than Nichol. The Campbellites got Mr. Clark instead of Nichol on account of the unbecoming manner in which Nichol conducted himself and on account of some small difference between them in regard to teaching in the Sunday school. Any way, we are satisfied with the debate. We trust that it may do good in the community. We have not space to give a synopsis of the discussion. We had a very pleasant time and the brethren and friends were kind and good to us. We hope to see them again some day. C. H. C.

Sugar Creek Association

---September 15, 1922

From the debate with Mr. Clark, near Lebanon, Mo., we went to the Sugar Creek Association, which was held at Providence Church, near Garfield, Ark., beginning on Friday before the fourth Sunday in August. Arrangements had been made to feed the crowd right on the ground all the time during the meeting, so those who were there lost no time in going to and from the place of meeting. Six discourses were delivered each day-two in the morning, two in the afternoon, and two at night. Between times of the preaching service the time was spent in singing and in

conversation. Those who attended to the preparing of the meals seemed to get along with little trouble. Twelve ordained ministers were present. Their names, associations, and post-offices are as follows: Elder R. L. Piles (Salem), Hon, Ark.; Elder J. K. Corley (New Hope, in North Ark.), Paris, Ark.; Elder C. C. Agee (Ozark), R. 5, Springfield, Mo.; Elder M. T. Cockrell (Sugar Creek), Jenkins, Mo.; Elder Gabe Brown (Sugar Creek), Granby, Mo.; Elder C. L. Smith (Center Creek), Cato, Mo.; Elder J. A. Alberty (Center Creek), Sarcoxie, Mo.; Elder D. F. Coones (Ozark), R. 2, Lebanon, Mo.; Elder Wm. Hen-son (Sugar Creek), Jenkins, Mo.; Elder J. G. Taylor (Sugar Creek), Garfield, Ark.; Elder W. A. Barham (New Hope, in North Ark.), Watalula, Ark.; Elder C. H. Cayce (New Hope, in South Ark.), Fordyce, Ark. The preaching was all a oneness. We heard no hobby riding, and all seemed to be satisfied with the goodness of God's house, and with the plain and simple gospel truth, without any speculation on questions that no man can understand. Hungry hearts were fed, and the Lord's presence was manifested. It was an enjoyable meeting. May the good Lord have all the praise. C. H. C.

Mountain Springs Association

---September 15, 1922

On Thursday morning, August 31, Elder John R. Harris, of Thornton, Ark., came to Fordyce in his car, Brother Loyd Bozarth and wife accompanying him. They took us in with them and we all set out for the Mountain Springs Association, held with Salem Church, near Bee Branch, Ark., beginning on Friday before the first Sunday in September. We arrived in Little Rock at a little after eleven o'clock and had dinner with Sister Byrd Warren. About one o'clock we left Little Rock for Wooster, Sister Warren and Brother T. D. Gardner going with us. We arrived safely in Wooster a little after five o'clock and went to the home of Mr. and Sister Patton, who kindly entertained us, and where we spent the night very pleasantly. Sister Patton had announced an appointment for us in a hall for that night. We tried to speak to the people, and Brother Harris also delivered a short discourse. Next morning we went on our journey to the association, and arrived there on time. The introductory discourse was delivered by Elder J. H. O'Neal, who spoke ably and to the comfort and instruction of the Lord's people. Their home ministers present at the meeting were Elders G. A. Jones, Hazen, Ark.; A. Holland, Damascus, Ark.; Marion Russell, Heber Springs, Ark.; J. M. Chastain, Shirley, Ark.; Jacob Sandage, Bee Branch, Ark.; L. G. Montgomery, Bee Branch, Ark.; W. H. Moore, Vilonia, Ark.; J. H. O'Neal, Rupert, Ark. The visiting ministers were Elders C. M. Monk, Salem Association, Abbott, Ark.; John R. Harris, Thornton, and C. H. Cayce, Fordyce, of the New Hope in Southern Arkansas. The preaching was all a unit-not a discordant note was heard in any of the preaching that was done. And those people are good singers, too. They use the Good Old Songs and "sing with the spirit, and with the understanding also." They study the music, and practice what they know. Such singing as they do makes the preacher feel like talking. He feels like they are interested, for in their singing they manifest an interest in the service of God. On Sunday Brother H. C. Brannon, son of Elder A. M. Brannon, deceased, came forward and related a reason of his hope in the Saviour and was received as a candidate for baptism, which was to be attended to at the next regular meeting of the church. Many of the saints rejoiced aloud, and shouts of praise and thanksgiving to the Lord for His manifold blessings went up from thankful hearts. It was a sweet meeting indeed, for surely the Lord's presence was felt and manifested. To Him be glory forever and ever. C. H. C.

Old-Fashioned Church Service To Be Presented

---October 1, 1922

An old-fashioned church service, typical of the mode of worship 40 years ago, will be reproduced at the First Baptist Church of East Point Sunday evening, September 24. The electric lights will be discarded and in their places candles and oil lamps will give the only illumination. The choir will disband for the night and no piano will be used. The minister will have the only song book and will read each line, after which the audience will sing the hymns in the old-fashioned manner. Not even families who attend will be permitted to sit together as the men will sit on one side of the building, while the women will be on the other. A number of elderly women have been asked to wear bonnets, and the men will probably don denim overalls to add to the realism. Dr. J. R. Roop, of Carrollton, will be in charge of the service and will preach an old time gospel sermon, similar to those still preached in some of the most remote rural districts. REMARKS

The above is copied from the Atlanta Constitution of September 17, 1922. Those poor ignorant people seem to have peculiar ideas as to what it takes to constitute an old-fashioned church service. They seem to think that there cannot be an old-fashioned church service engaged in under an electric light, as though the light is a part of the service. They seem to think that the reason why people did not have electric lights where they worshipped forty years ago was because their worship was different from what it might be now. The fact is, there were no electric lights in the smaller towns or rural districts, or even in the cities, until a few years ago. And they seem to think that the women must wear bonnets and the men wear overalls in order to worship in the old-fashioned way, as though the clothing worn was a part of the worship. They do not seem to know that the clothing people generally wore forty years ago was the kind that was in style then. Forty years ago people often walked many miles to attend the service and carried their shoes in their hands, and when they got near the meeting house they would stop and put their shoes on. We wonder if these people who propose to have one day of the old-fashioned worship will do that? Truly the ignorance of some people concerning the worship of God would be amusing if it were not so serious and pitiable. And those people claim to be so much enlightened, too! The fact is, though these people are ignorant of it, that the Lord still has a people on earth who continue to worship Him in the same old-fashioned way that our fathers worshipped. The lights used and the clothing worn are no part of the worship, and have nothing to do with it. They wear clothing to be respectable, like other folks. If they have clothing made in the latest style, that is what they wear to the service. If denim overalls is the best suit the man has, that is what he wears to the service. If the good sister has a new season's hat, that is what she wears. If the old sun bonnet is the best she has, that is what she wears. It is the sweet and delightful service of the Master that engages their mind, and not the clothing, or the outward appearance, just so they are respectable. But the worldly religionists must have the worldly pomp and show. They may engage in an occasional mock of the old-fashioned service-or pretend to-but the service itself is not what they care for. What they really care for is the fashion and show. They cannot go long without the piano and the choir. Those things are a part of their worship, and they will not dispense with them permanently. Such service as is rendered with their instruments and fantastic music is not acceptable service to the Lord. He is not to be worshipped with men's hands, but in spirit and in truth. The truth is not what these modern worshippers want. They do not love the truth, and they do not have it preached. They make their own preachers, so they will preach that which tickles the fancy of the world,

and the world hears them. They pay large salaries, and a high price, for worldly preaching by worldly preachers for worldly churches. But the old church goes on with her old-fashioned service and worship. They have their trials and conflicts; but the Lord preserves her and keeps her through all the trying scenes through which she comes. He has never left Himself without witness. His witnesses are not so numerous as the witnesses of the worldly religion; but there are enough for the truth to be maintained, and always have been and always will be. To Him be glory forever and ever. C. H. C.

Wildcat Whisky

---October 1, 1922

A brother asks us this question: "What do you think of a brother preacher that upholds wildcat whisky and runs in that crowd, to the hurt of good brethren who oppose it?" We certainly think that such a thing is very unbecoming any man, much less a gospel minister. We need men in the ministry whose lives are morally above reproach. A minister should be "of good report of them that are without." His life should be such that all who know him must say that he is an upright man, and that his morals are good. His life should be such that if anything contrary to that is said, it may be a false charge. His life should be an example of truth, piety, godliness, and sobriety. Immorality in any form should not be practiced by one professing to be a gospel minister. He should keep good company. It does not look well for his associates to be running wildcat stills and bootlegging whisky. That is, it does not look well for him. It is wrong. C. H. C.

Position Endorsed

---October 1, 1922

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I have read several articles in The Primitive Baptist concerning a peace' proposition. I read one in the last issue with your comment on same. I sure do endorse you. I would like to offer a few thoughts. I, like you, think if Brother Webb and Brother Newman were to get together and make peace with one another that would not settle the trouble with the Baptists. There is a cause that started the trouble, and if I understand correctly it is the "half man" or the "whole man" doctrine that started it. If Brother Webb still believes the "half man" doctrine and Brother Newman believes the "whole man" doctrine and advocates it, they might make all the peace they could and it would not settle the difference. The wrong party must always see and realize their wrong before they can make lasting peace. I know this by experience. Now if Brother Webb's party commenced advocating the "half man" doctrine before anything was said on the other side, then that side is responsible for the trouble. On the other hand, if Brother Newman's side advocated the "whole man" doctrine, before Brother Webb's side advocated the "half man" doctrine, then Brother Newman's side is responsible for the trouble, because, the Bible is silent on the "half man" or the "whole man" so far as the expression is concerned. Our Saviour never said anywhere in the Book that it is the whole man that is born again, or a part of the man-He just said "ye must be born again," and left off the expression "whole" or "half." Just as long as the Baptists left off these expressions they were not divided on them. Then whichever side led out first on these expressions are responsible for the trouble. Whoever uses an expression that causes trouble is responsible for that trouble. Now I don't think either side has the right to advocate either side when

they see that it causes trouble. When I left Mississippi five years ago I had not heard anyone advocate the doctrine that the "whole man" or that a "part" or the "half man" was born again. Elders Morris and Smith, of Oxford, Elders Neal, Williams, Easley, Verell and others, all always preached that "ye must be born again," with the "whole man" or "half man" left off. Elders J. A. and S. A. Paine, Goodwin and Edwards, of Texas, all preached in the old Hopewell Association, of Mississippi, and all of them just preached "ye must be born again," with the expression of "whole" or "half man" left off. Yes, Brother Cayce, I remember hearing you and your dear father preach in the old Hopewell Association, and you both preached Jesus and Him crucified, and that an alien sinner must be born again, with the expression "whole" or "half man" left off. Now, whoever started this "whole" or "half man" -that is, using the expression whole or half-doctrine is responsible for the trouble; and until both sides quit using the expression "whole" or "half" the division will continue. My honest opinion is that if both sides will agree to stop using those expressions and use the expression just like Jesus and the apostles and like our preachers used to, "ye must be born again," "you hath He quickened," I feel like there will be a gathering together of the dear children of God. Dear brother, I have felt like, for a long time, that I wanted to write on this subject, but feeling my weakness and unworthiness so much I have put it off. If this is printed I do hope that none of the dear brethren and sisters on either side will get offended at me, for if I know my poor heart I love them all, and I do pray that we may all see alike and speak one and the same thing, and that all may be done to the glory of our heavenly Father who knows all things-who is wrong and who is right; who is stubborn and who is not. May it be God's will to give us all a penitent heart and forgiving spirit. Remember me in your prayers. Your brother, I trust, in the Lord, G. W. Anthony. Kemp, Texas.

REMARKS

What this brother says all seems to be very good. But suppose a brother has never used the expressions mentioned, and yet brethren have said he advocated the "whole man" doctrine-what about that? We never did use the expression any other way only the way it is recorded in Holy Writ, and said all the while that no man had the right to add to or to take from that expression. We stand on the same ground yet. The truth of the matter is, though, that the difference and the trouble was not on regeneration. We know that was what was said the trouble was on, but that was not it. But we do not care to revive the matter, or to raise the issue again on the matter that it was said the trouble was over. While there was a division, we were sure then, and we are sure yet, that a large number did not know then, and do not know yet, what they divided over. There were many good Baptists on both sides, and there are yet many good brethren on both sides. The division should have never been. Instead of there being a division the discipline of the church should have been administered, and every disorderly walking person should have been excluded and the body of Baptists remained together. We would be glad now to see all orderly walking Baptists who are agreed on the fundamental principles of the doctrine of the Bible come together and live in peace. But we are opposed to any coming together that brings in false swearers, fornicators, adulterers, liars, and those who are guilty of such like ungodly conduct. C. H. C.

John 13:8

---October 15, 1922

In another place in this paper will be found a letter from Dr. J. E. Anderson in which he asks for our views on the latter clause of **(John 13:8)** "If I wash thee not, thou

hast no part with me." We understand that the Saviour meant by that expression that if He did not wash Peter's feet that Peter would have no part with Him in that service. In the same connection the Saviour said, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." This shows that there is a happiness promised the child of God in doing the things the Lord requires. If the apostle refused for the Saviour to wash his feet, or if the Saviour did not wash his feet, then he would miss the happiness, joy and satisfaction. He would have no part with the Saviour in the matter. The querist also asks us what interpretation people put on this who do not believe feet washing is essential in the worship of God. We confess that we do not know. We have expressed our views several times in the past in regard to feet washing. C. H. C.

Explanation Wanted

---November 1, 1922

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I have some Scriptures on my mind that I have heard people explain, but not to my satisfaction. I want you to explain them. They are these: **((2) (Matthew 12:22-32); ((22) (Mark 3:22-30); (Luke 12:10); (Acts 7:51-52); (I John 5:16-17)**. What is the sin against the Holy Ghost? Is it done by acts or by words? Are the sins mentioned in **(Acts 7:51-52)**, and **(I John 5:16-17)**, the same as in Matthew, Mark and Luke? If not, what is the difference? If they are not the same, what is that sin unto death? Is it a child of God that sins against the Holy Ghost, or the alien sinner? If it is a child of God, then he never can get back, according to **(Hebrews 6:4-6)**. Did those who crucified the Son of God commit the unpardonable sin? If you will explain and harmonize the above Scriptures, you will do me and others a great favor. I have heard it discussed in many ways. Some of it I think I understand, and some I do not. I have about come to the conclusion that I know but very little. Yours in hope, Noah Ellis. Henderson, Texas.

REMARKS

The citations in Matthew, Mark and Luke refer to the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. What gave rise to the expression was that the Jews said that Christ cast out devils by the prince of devils. The sin, or a sin, against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness. There is no remission of sin against the Holy Ghost. The person who sins against the Holy Ghost is in danger of eternal damnation; see **((29) (Mark 3:29)**. The child of God is not in danger of eternal damnation. One for whom the Saviour died is not in danger of eternal damnation. Jesus was surety for His people, and all their sins were charged to His account. Hence, every sin they commit is directly against Him, being laid on Him. No sin committed by a man for whom Jesus did not die is against Him, but every sin such a person commits is against the Father or the Holy Ghost, because not laid on Christ. They are in danger every day of receiving the just sentence for their sins-eternal damnation. This lesson teaches the doctrine of special atonement as plainly to us as any passage in the whole Book, and that is taught as plainly as that salvation is by grace. **(Acts 7:51-52)** says, "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have your fathers not persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers." This is the language of Stephen spoken to the people who stoned him to death. They were doing as their fathers did. They resisted the Holy Ghost in the sense that they resisted His teaching as presented by the prophets, and stoned the prophets the Lord sent. They did not resist the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost, but the

teaching as presented by the prophets and apostles. Neither did such persons believe the teaching of the Saviour when He preached His own gospel. The power of the Holy Ghost in the gospel is one thing, and the power of the Holy Ghost in regeneration is another thing. Life is not given through the medium of teaching, or through any other medium. It is necessarily a direct work. Wicked men who have not the love of God in their hearts have never accepted gospel teaching. They may pretend for a time to do so, but deep down in their hearts they do not believe it. The sinner must be born again in order to receive the gospel, or in order to understand it. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." If he cannot see the kingdom, neither can he see the things that are in and pertain to the kingdom. The gospel pertains to the kingdom. Hence, the man must be born again in order to see the beauty there is in the gospel of the grace of God. The sin unto death, as spoken of in **(I John 5:16-17)**, is a sin a member of the church may commit which is so grievous that the church cannot afford to pass by and retain the member, or even to restore such a one to membership. We might mention several things that a man might do which we are sure would rightfully bar him from membership in the church of God. Suppose a man who has rightfully forfeited his citizenship by perjuring himself-swearing falsely-could he be righteously retained in the church, or restored to membership? We hardly think so. There are other things, too, that a man might be guilty of that would be a reproach for the church to retain him as a member. C. H. C.

Repentance

---November 1, 1922

Elder C. H. Cayce:

I assure you that we enjoy the dear old Primitive Baptist's visits. I do hope sometime to meet you and hear you preach. I found Brother Knighten had visited you and talked with you, and I asked many questions about you. I have read your debate with Elder Penick and I wish I had the chance to read it again. Will you please sometime express briefly your views on what became of Ananias and Sapphira his wife? Were they lost? Not long since I was talking with a good Missionary Baptist and he made the remark that the Primitive Baptists had been preaching repentance only about forty years. Now, I believe and understand that they have preached it ever since they have preached anything. If not asking too much, please give an article on that matter sometime when convenient. Yours in hope of eternal life, Irvin Canady. Eros, La.

REMARKS

We have thought that Ananias and Sapphira were children of God, and had membership in the church. We do not know that there is any positive proof that they were, or that they were not, children of God. They lied to the Holy Ghost, and they died, as a result of their sin. The Primitive Baptists have preached repentance all along the line. They do not preach it, and never have, as the world does, but as the Bible teaches. There is a repentance which is worked by godly sorrow. God grants repentance unto Israel and the forgiveness of sins. Then God's children should repent or turn from any wrong course they may have pursued. Then there is a moral repentance-any person who has been living an immoral life should repent-turn from it-and live a moral life. As we understand it, Old Baptists have always preached it this way. We cannot write at length on the question now. C. H. C.

How To Get Peace

---December 1, 1922

Dear Brethren and Sisters:

I have just read the last number of The Primitive Baptist, and read a letter from Brother G. W. Anthony, in which he calls attention to some peace propositions in regard to a coming together of the Baptists. From what I can gather it seems that Elders Newman and Webb are the bones of contention. I wrote a short letter some months ago, in which I made a proposition to Elders Webb and Newman, asking them to become reconciled to each other if possible, and did not at all mean for either of them to endorse anything that was not in perfect accord with the divine word. I just thought that it might be one step toward bringing about a condition of peace among God's poor and afflicted people that some pastors have caused to err. God has pronounced a woe on such a man, or men, called pastors. I feel sure that good preachers have become carnal in the divisions and have widened the breach instead of healing it. I notice Brother Anthony uses the words half or whole man doctrine often. Of course if any brother preacher uses any such expression, it is out of order, if he is trying to set up some kind of doctrine of his opinion. The Saviour just said to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again." We know that our Master addressed the man in his entirety. To cut the man up into several parts, and find no use for a part of him—we will just say our bodies can't and don't serve God all alone. And that Jesus was addressing a renewed spirit within us, the man, the Adam man, would not be in it at all—and just the renewed spirit that is in the man, then the body is lost and the great doctrine of the blessed resurrection is a farce. But, dear brethren, my hope is built on the resurrection of these mortal bodies. If such expressions as half man or whole man is, or has been, the cause of so much trouble and dividing, I agree with Brother Cayce in the fact that there were, and are yet, good Baptists on both sides of this question. Now Elder Newman has done all that any man could ask to adjust all this matter in its infancy, but many years have passed away, and many of God's little ones have died wondering, no doubt, what it all meant; and I am sure there are many of God's dear people who do not yet know the seat of all this wrangle about words to no profit. We should strive to bring about conditions of peace. In my letter to Elders Newman and Webb I did not have in mind at all for a wholesale coming together. I cannot see at the present time any way for a coming together of any of the factions, only by individually coming to orderly churches, tried and true, in keeping with the faith as has been kept by our fathers. So I feel that when brethren want peace in earnest they will seek for it. May the God of peace guide us in all things that make for peace and whereby we may be strengthened in the faith. If we had that tenderness in our hearts for each other that Jesus had for His dear people, we could look over many faults we might find. When we get willing to pay the price for peace among ourselves we can have it. In conclusion, Elder Newman does not preach, and has not preached, that our flesh is made pure in regeneration, but that the flesh is subjected; but in the resurrection our bodies are made pure, immortal, and ready for eternal glory. May God, in His mercy, bring His dear people together in peace and love. I am, I hope, a poor sinner saved by grace. J. G. Grant. Hico, Texas.

REMARKS

It is true, very true, that but few know the seat of the trouble that brought the division in Texas—or that started there. We are aware that some claim that it was because Elder Newman advocated what some called the whole man doctrine. But that was not the seat, or origin, of the trouble. That which gave rise to it was the question of adultery in the church. A certain preacher had a daughter who married a

man that was separated from more than one woman without a Scriptural cause, and she and her man were received into the church. Some said they were living in adultery, Scripturally. Then the preacher set in to kill and to destroy all who would not say that they were not in adultery. This is and was the start of the whole thing. Something must be "hatched up" to destroy Elder Newman on this account-hence the "hatched up" charge that he was advocating the whole man doctrine. Now, if those parties who "hatched up" such charges want peace, let them "pay the price." There are some of them whose credit is not good. For instance: At the Forked Deer Association, in West Tennessee, in 1917, the ministers present all signed an agreement and settlement. Two weeks later one of those preachers was present at the Pr'edestarian Association, in West Tennessee, at Clark's Creek Church, and stated publicly that the agreement was signed, and that he was glad of it and had been happy over it ever since. In May following he had an article in the Trumpet renouncing the agreement, and in which he said he was sorry of it from the first night after it was done, and slept but little that (first) night on account of it. This same man is pastoring a church that restored a man who was excluded for false swearing and malicious slandering of another, and also another charge, and approves the action and course of the church. What about such as this-and then saying he wants peace? This man had an article in the Gospel Messenger in which he would make it appear that he was willing to do anything in the world for peace. He wrote us a private letter, which we answered and asked him a few questions, but he replied not. Peace in the church? Yes, there will be peace, and all who love order and upright living, can come together and can have peace, if they will have a "spring cleaning" and sweep such ungodly trash out of the Lord's house as fornicators, adulterers, liars, slanderers, perjured persons, moonshiners, bootleggers, trucebreakers, false accusers, traitors, the devil's ministers who have been transformed as ministers of righteousness. Such as these cannot be kept in the church of God without trouble. We want all good and orderly walking brethren to come together in love and peace-but we do not want to come together with such as these. Do you? Say, DO YOU? We mean any of you. We would like to hear from the man who does-if there is one. Perhaps one who loves sin as well as he ever did would like to be with such. Enough at present. We know that by speaking out on these things we bring down upon our heads the curses and condemnation of many-but God requires faithfulness. Some have quit taking the paper, and some have refused to take it, because we have spoken out against some things that have been put forth as a "peace move." But we expect, by the help of God, to warn our people against everything we think is wrong, even if every subscriber we have stops his paper and we never get another subscriber while we live. It is not a matter of subscribers- - but a matter of what is right. Take a certain church in Texas, for instance, that took a preacher in that had been excluded for adultery-and the case had been in court and the church that excluded him would not restore him, but this church took him in. Then they gave him a letter and he went to another state and joined on that letter, we suppose. How is that for order? Do you think such as that will produce peace and order in the house of God? May the good Lord deliver us from the hand of the enemy and keep the city, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

1923

Remarks To Olive Dodd

---January 15, 1923

Dear sister, we feel to appreciate your kind words and expressions of Christian love and fellowship, and your desire to encourage us along life's rugged way. Our pathway has been rough. Many times we have felt that the trials of life were more than we could bear. We trust it is by the grace of God we have come thus far, and our trust and confidence are yet in Him. We feel unworthy the love and esteem of the Lord's dear children. We would deny the faith and forsake the true principles of the gospel if not kept by the grace of God. Were it not for the manifestations of the love and esteem of some of the Lord's dear children, such as your letter, we feel that we would have to give up. May the Lord bless you, dear sister. Please remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Tour In Alabama

---January 15, 1923

We bade our loved ones farewell and left our humble home on Wednesday night, Nov. 1, to fill appointments which had been made for us in north Alabama and Tennessee. We were blessed of the Lord to reach every place where appointments had been made for us. In the Mount Zion Association we visited the following churches: New Clear Creek, Zion Hill, Matthew Moriah, Mt. Joy, Salem, Brown's Creek, Shiloh, Mt. Vernon, Mt. Olive, Dripping Springs, Gum Pond, Harmony, Little Vine, Rocky Mount, Little Branch, Bethlehem and New Hope—all in the order named. We made no note or memorandum of the homes we visited, or who conveyed us from place to place. We do not suppose this is of any interest to the readers anyway, and we think many brethren take too much valuable space in relating such things. There were good congregations at most all these churches, and they seem to enjoy going to meeting and engaging in the service of the Lord. We made no note or memorandum of the ministers we met, but believe we can remember the names of most, if not all, of them. We remember the following: Elders A. Whitworth, M. Sparks, W. A. Childers, F. B. Moon, W. J. Dendy, J. N. Bobo, B. G. Parker, G. E. Graves, J. E. Yancey, and G. W. Heath. These are all in the Mt. Zion Association. Besides these we met Elder Henry Moon, who is a member of Ephesus Church in the Sand Mountain Association. The next appointment was at Ephesus Church. On the way there we visited Elder R. V. Hood, who was confined to his bed with rheumatism. We were glad to meet all these dear brethren, and truly hope Elder Hood may be restored to health again. If we met any other brethren in the ministry we trust they may pardon us for not mentioning their names, as we are writing from memory. We also met several "licensed ministers." It was expected that Elder J. J. Turnipseed would make this trip with us. We received word to that effect just before leaving home, and the news had been circulated at all the places; but he did not meet us until Monday, Nov. 20, at Little Vine. He was with us there and at Rocky Mount and one day at Little Branch, and at Arab on Monday night, where we had consented for an appointment to be made for us. Brother Turnipseed was prevented from making the trip, as he expected, on account of illness of his wife. We were sorry that he did not come sooner, and sorry that he could not stay longer, but glad to be with him the three days. May the good Lord bless his labors, is our humble prayer. If we are not deceived, these are good brethren in the Mount Zion Association, and they have been blessed of the Lord. They have been persecuted, but have been faithful and true in the service and devoted to the cause. Our next appointment was in the Sand Mountain Association. We visited Ephesus, Pleasant Hill, Pilgrim Rest and Macedonia, the four churches of the association. We were at Ephesus two days. The weather was very cold and

disagreeable, so that the congregations were not as large as they would have been, but were very good considering the inclemency of the weather and that the church is small and the membership scattered. At Pleasant Hill the congregations were small both days on account of the fact that many families in the community were down with the flu. Appointments were made for three days at Pilgrim Rest, but nearly every family in the community had flu or other illness-some of them had pneumonia. The two last days were the regular meeting time, but on account of so much sickness among the members it was thought advisable to call in the meeting for Saturday and Sunday and go on to Macedonia and have meeting there four days instead of the two days that had been announced, which was done. The congregation was small at Pilgrim Rest on account of so much sickness, and small at Macedonia on Saturday on account of not having time to get the appointment circulated, but good congregations were present on Sunday, Monday and Tuesday. In this association we met Elders H. D. Leonard, W. L. Garrett, J. T. Roberts, W. J. Ball,-----Durham and J. K. Phillips. On Tuesday night, Dec. 5, and Wednesday, Dec. 6, we filled appointments in Langston. On Wednesday evening we went to Scottsboro and boarded the train for Brownsboro and spent the time with Brother B. B. Lawler and family until Friday morning. Our wife is a daughter of Brother Lawler. On Friday we filled an appointment at Hurricane Church, where there was a small congregation. Elders J. W. Bragg and H. P. Houk were with us at this place. Brother R. L. Tillman, of Decherd, Tenn., was there and went to all our appointments in this association- the Flint River. On Saturday and Sunday we were at Flint Church, the regular meeting time. This is the oldest Baptist Church in the state of Alabama. It was organized Oct. 2, 1808, and the one hundredth anniversary was celebrated Oct. 2, 3, 4, 1908. Elders H. P. and A. J. Houk were with us at Flint. On Monday and Tuesday, Dec. 11,12, we were at Briar Fork. Elders B. G. and G. A. Stephens were with us both days. Elder S. F. Best was present on Monday, but was sick on Tuesday and not able to be there. On Wednesday and Thursday we were at Pleasant Grove. Our wife and children came Monday night, arriving in Huntsville at 2 o'clock, to visit her mother and father and family. She and her mother went with us to Pleasant Grove on Wednesday. We had very pleasant meetings at all these places, though the congregations were not as large as they would have been had not the weather been so bad. On the third Sunday and night we were with Bethel Church in Nashville, Tenn. We tried to serve this church from its organization until we moved to Arkansas in October, 1919. We enjoyed being with them once more. It seemed like coming home to us. Elder Geo. W. Inyart, of Olney, Ill., was with us here, he being on a tour filling appointments in that section. We enjoyed a pleasant meeting with this church. They are a good band of faithful brethren. On Monday morning we went to Decherd, Tenn., where an appointment had been made for us at 1:30 p. m. Here we met Elders Dunaway and Byrom. We enjoyed a very pleasant meeting there. On Thursday and Friday, Dec. 21, 22, we were with Union Church at Woodville, in Mud Creek Association. Only a short time was had to publish the appointments, and there was some sickness in the neighborhood, so the congregations were small, but the meetings were pleasant both days. On Saturday and Sunday we were with Bethel Church, in Mud Creek Association, the regular meeting time. Elder W. T. Flanagan was with us there. Very good congregations were present both days, and we enjoyed a very pleasant meeting. On Tuesday, Dec. 26, we went to Decatur, to fill an appointment that night. The meeting was at the Missionary Baptist Church in East Albany. A good congregation was present and the meeting was a pleasant one. Those people were kind and good to us. The pastor, Elder Stuckey, was present. We returned to Brownsboro on Wednesday morning. Thus the appointments have been filled. Much of the time since the third Sunday until the time of this writing, on Friday,

December 29, we have been at the home of Brother B. B. Lawler. Our wife desired to spend this Christmas time with her mother and family, so we have been here and have been putting in some of the time writing, answering letters and preparing manuscript for The Primitive Baptist. We are expecting to leave here tonight to go to Little Rock to be with the little church there on Sunday, and to go from there home. This has been a very pleasant tour to us, and the brethren have been kind and good to us-much better than we feel to deserve. We often feel that our efforts are poor and worth nothing to the cause, but we are kindly received, and the brethren endorse the principles we try to defend, and this makes us feel that our efforts, though poor, are not altogether in vain. We feel thankful, we trust, to the good Lord for His mercy and loving kindness to us, and to the good brethren for their care of us while among them. May His richest blessings be showered upon them, is our humble prayer. We trust the Lord may spare us to meet many of them again on earth, but if we meet no more in this world, our hope is that we may meet in that world of bliss and glory, where Sabbaths never end and congregations never break up. We desire an interest in the prayers of the Lord's dear children, that He may grant us grace and Christian courage and fortitude to fight the good fight of faith until we come to the end of our pilgrimage and stay on earth. C. H. C.

Debate At Parrish, Alabama

---February 1, 1923

We have agreed, the Lord willing, to meet J. D. Tant (Campbellite) in debate at or near Parrish, Ala., to begin on Tuesday, March 13, and continue four days. The question of church identity will be discussed. We hope as many of the brethren and friends will attend as can. C. H. C.

Remarks On A Council

---February 1, 1923

We feel duty bound to dissent from one paragraph in the foregoing, which says, "We hold that discipline belongs solely to the church, and all investigations and labor must be bestowed by official church authority, and no minister has the right to usurp authority over the church by refusing to affiliate with his brethren in a sister church until the church holding said minister or members are officially labored with and withdrawn from." We do not dissent from the statement that discipline belongs solely to the church; but the idea that a minister usurps authority over the church by refusing to affiliate with a man until the church holding him has been officially labored with is what we think is wrong at least, we do not think this is necessarily correct. Here is a case in point: we know a man who is under a cloud we have been informed of bad reports about him. He moved his place of abode and his membership. His recommendation was signed by one under bad report. The church where his membership was moved to was informed, but no official labor bestowed by sister churches that we know anything about. But we will not affiliate with that man. Neither will the churches of our association do so. If a minister knows that a man is not what he should be, or if any other brother knows it, for that matter, he should not affiliate with him. No man should knowingly affiliate with an adulterer or perjurer, whether his church has been labored with or not, especially if the church has had information furnished. C. H. C.

Pastor Should Quit

---February 1, 1923

The following questions were sent to us with a request that we answer them through The Primitive Baptist:

1. Should a preacher retain the pastoral care of a church when he knows that a number of the members object to him being the pastor? Answer: In most every case where the pastor knows that a number of the members object to him continuing as pastor, he should resign. There may be a few instances when it would be wrong for him to resign, but such instances are rare.
2. Should a preacher persist in going to a church to preach when said church had asked for and received the resignation of said preacher as pastor, and is it becoming of such preacher to open the door of the church at such places? Answer: We do not think the preacher should go to a church where his services are not desired. If he has the cause at heart we do not think he would do so.
3. In case such preacher persists in such course, what course should be pursued? Answer: The church might ask him to desist. The church might make complaint to the church of his membership. C. H. C.

Replies To "Where Are We At?"

---March 15, 1923

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother I notice in July 1st issue of The Primitive Baptist that you ask the question, "Where are we at," in regard to Elder S. C. Bozarth's case. For the information of you and your readers I will explain the matter, so far as Antioch Church is concerned in it. 1st. Elder Bozarth moved to Arkansas sometime in the year 1918. In September, 1919, the church called Antioch granted him a letter of dismissal in good standing. There was no more thought about it until April, 1920, when I received a letter from him asking that we send him a copy of the church letter, or statement showing that he was in good standing when he left us. You will please remember that he did not ask us to reinstate him, but just to give him a statement showing his standing when he left us. He complained that he had got among "Absoluters" and wanted to get out-that he had been fooled in joining where he did. 2nd. We had never heard of Pine Grove Church being in line with the unlimited predestinarians. We knew that Elder J. N. Keith, of Grayson County, Ky., had lived there for sometime, and had helped to organize the church. We have always, and do now, regard Elder Keith as being a sound Baptist. Elder Bozarth having lived there for a year before, and near a year after he called for his letter and joined Pine Grove Church, we thought it a little strange that he would find out this late that they were "Absoluters." From these considerations we thought it best to write Pine Grove Church to know more about the matter. On failing to receive an immediate answer, we thought there was nothing serious, and so I put the matter before Antioch Church on Saturday before the second Sunday in May, and after some discussion pro and con, the church did authorize me to send him (Elder Bozarth) a statement showing that he was in good standing when he left us. This is just what Elder Bozarth asked for, and is just what the church granted him-not a church letter, but only a statement showing that he left us in good standing. The church record shows this. I give here the fifth item of that day's business: "fifth New business; by motion and second the church agreed to give Elder S. C. Bozarth a statement of writing showing his standing when dismissed from us." 3rd. On Monday following the above stated action of Antioch Church I mailed Elder Bozarth the statement the church authorized me to send him. On the same day we received

a letter from Pine Grove Church stating that Elder Bozarth had been excluded from them on a charge of willful and slanderous conduct, and that Elder Bozarth did on first coming to Pine Grove Church want to join them by relation, stating that Antioch Church in Kentucky was in disorder. 4th. On receiving word from Elder Bozarth that Pine Grove Church was "Absolute" in her doctrine, and receiving word from Pine Grove Church that Elder Bogarth had come there wanting to join by relation, denouncing our church as disorderly, and then later excluded from the church on a charge of willful and slanderous conduct, we were puzzled what to do. If Pine Grove Church was identified with "Absoluters" they were not with us, and if the reports on Elder Bozarth were true we would not uphold him in them; we decided that the best course was to have nothing at all to do with the matter. I had mailed the statement to Elder Bozarth when we received word of his conduct and exclusion, and then Elder Bozarth wrote me that he had had trouble with an elder,-----and also stated that he had joined another church on the statement I had sent him. Now in order to show that we would have nothing at all to do in the matter, and to let all concerned know that we did not reinstate Elder Bozarth (he did not even ask to be reinstated) we decided to publish the statement which appeared in Messenger of Zwn July 21st, 1920. We did not rescind the act of granting Elder Bozarth a church letter, for we did not do that. We did not rescind the act of granting him a statement showing his standing when dismissed from us, but simply stated that was what we did. We stated that Elder Bozarth was not then a member of Antioch Church, which he was not. Now if Elder Bozarth presented a letter in church letter form to Thornton Church he presented something he did not obtain from us, for we did not give it. Now a word about the statement. It was adopted by Antioch Church on Saturday before the second Sunday in July, instead of May, as the date in published statement indicates. It was an oversight in Elder Shain in letting it go uncorrected. The church record shows that it was acted upon on that date. And remember that that statement was not a rescinding of any act, but a statement of what it did. Now if Antioch Church did wrong, we fail to see where the wrong was. We feel like we are in the clear. If not, why not? Now a word to you, Brother Cayce. If you are willing to receive and retain Elder Bozarth under these circumstances, we will say that Antioch Church has no complaint to make. As he was not a member of our church we feel that we had no say as to who received him. We did not intend to wrong Elder Bozarth in the statement, and feel that we did not; nor do we feel that we did anyone else any wrong. We hope that this will show you our attitude in this matter. Now we ask that you publish this in August 1st issue of The Primitive Baptist so that your readers will know the truth of this matter, so far as we are concerned in it. We are sorry that the dates in the published statement were wrong, and therefore misleading, but it was an error of Brother Shain, and not ours. Yours in hope, D. F. Siria, Church Clerk. Madisonville, Ky., July 24, 1922.

SECOND REPLY

"Blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called the children of God." - **(Matthew 5:9)**. Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother- The July first issue of your paper has been handed to me by one of your subscribers with a request that I answer your article published under the question, "Where Are We At?" And inasmuch as you so urgently requested someone to answer, I am complying with the request. First. I wish to call attention to the advice put forth in the General Address to the churches by the ministers and brethren at the Fulton council meeting in 1900,

which you and I both concurred on, and which I have faithfully observed to the letter from then until now, in which we said, "We do most solemnly and prayerfully beseech all our churches and people that they raise no bars of fellowship against any Primitive Baptist with whom they are agreed on fundamental principles-such as the eternal salvation of sinners wholly by grace and entirely unconditional on the sinner's part, and who are sound and orderly in the ordinances of the church, administering baptism by immersion to penitent believers only by ministers of the gospel clothed with authority by the gospel church, and administering the Lord's supper to such baptized believers only, and who manifest a willingness to labor for the peace, union and fellowship of the whole body." Fulton Council Proceedings, page 8. We thought then this was good advice, and I think so yet. Don't you think so too? And it is so much like the advice given by the apostles and elders. Hear them: "But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." **(Acts 15:11)**. Also ((28) (Acts 15:28-29)," For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no other burden than those necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye do well. Fare ye well." Nothing is said about keeping themselves from predestination of all things. This must not be necessary. But if some should raise bars of fellowship against their brethren, notwithstanding our advice and the Scriptures to the contrary, then what should we do? We advise that "If the raisers thereof cannot be induced to remove them at once, the only course for those who want to remain in this holy church union is to discard their action and have no connection with them until they withdraw such bars of fellowship." Fulton Council Proceedings, page 9. Don't you think this was spiritually wholesome and godly advice? I am sure it was, and is. And if all who joined in giving it had strenuously observed it, our troubles and divisions would be greatly diminished. But in your article you say, "Elder Hardy's church is identified here with the party known as Absoluters, there having been a division about twelve years ago in the New Hope Association on that question, and Elder Hardy is with that side of the New Hope." Also you say, "There was a division in the Highland Association in Kentucky a number of years ago on that question." Brother Cayce, I am persuaded that you do not really know just what caused the division among the Baptists here or in the Highland Association in Kentucky either, else you would not have made that statement. I came to this country eight years ago and found a division among the Baptists here which occurred about four years before, and not knowing which party was in order, I got Elder John Keith, of Kentucky, to assist me in the constitution of our church here, and discarded both parties until I could investigate. Was that commendable? Was it right? Later I thoroughly investigated their trouble as follows: First. I went to Elder Little and talked with him, and then called both parties together at our church (Pine Grove) and interrogated both parties together. They discussed every mooted question among the Baptists, and, to my surprise, not a statement made by either party was combatted or denied by the other, but both agreed upon every point discussed. And not an accusation was made by either party against any minister of the other party of ever having preached anything that tended to disturb their fellowship. And at the close of the investigation both parties agreed for me to write up a statement of their agreement and that each of them would sign it and then go together to the several churches of each party and ask them to accept it and reunite. But the following morning Elder Little declined without assigning any reason whatever for so doing, notwithstanding he preached with the other party during the meeting, both before and after the investigation. The investigation revealed that one minister, some twenty years before their trouble, preached predestination in a way that would charge God with being the

author of sin, and was excluded from the church for it. He finally returned, confessed his error and was restored, and associated and preached with Elder Little without a complaint against him until his death, which occurred some years before the division. Elder Little stated in the investigation that he never heard any other minister of the New Hope Association preach anything on that subject that he did not endorse, but that some brethren used expressions in private conversation that he thought were not in keeping with the Scriptures. Does this look like a division in the New Hope Association? The investigation further revealed that Elder Little had been moderator of the New Hope Association for some years, but just prior to the division he had been deposed and another chosen, after which he and his brethren raised up and declared non-fellowship for the association, charging predestination as the cause. The brethren begged and plead with them to remain in the association, but to no avail. Therefore, there was nothing left for them to do, according to the advice given at the Pulton council meeting, if they desired to remain in the holy church union, but to discard their actions and have no connection with them, which they observed and which exists now. But when you came to this country you disregarded that advice and accepted their actions and connected yourself with them. Therefore, my dear brother, you are not in the clear, but have erred. However, my love for you is unimpaired, and I have no desire to injure you nor cause you trouble. But my desire and prayer to God is that we may turn from our error and walk sweetly together in love, and labor for the peace and union of our beloved Zion, according to the advice given at Fulton; and our hearts and arms are extended to such and are ever open to receive them. It may be contended that these brethren declared against heresy. Well, in our general address at Fulton we gave an interpretation of heresy as follows: "We take heresy to mean a departure from the teachings of the Scriptures as explained in our acknowledged confession of faith." -Fulton Council Proceedings, page 9. But what is our acknowledged "confession of faith?" In our general address we said, "The London Confession of Faith, adopted over two hundred years ago by thirty-seven of the ablest ministers of England and Wales, representing over one hundred churches, has served one of the most needful services among our people of any document of faith since the days of the apostles, and has stood unquestioned as an expression of the Primitive Baptists' interpretation of the Bible from then till now." -Fulton Council Proceedings, page 15. This shows that we considered nothing to be heresy that was in harmony with the London Confession of Faith. Did they declare against a departure from the London Confession of Faith? They said positively that they "declared non-fellowship for the doctrine that God predestinated all things that come to pass." What does our "acknowledged confession of faith" say? "God hath decreed in Himself from all eternity, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably, all things whatsoever come to pass." -London Confession of Faith, article 3, section 1. This looks very much like they declared non-fellowship for our acknowledged confession of faith, and thereby went into heresy themselves, does it not? Aren't we justified in standing aloof from them as long as they remain where they are? And if we should do otherwise, would we not repudiate the advice given at Pulton? But what caused the division in the Highland Association in Kentucky? In 1898 the association convened at Margaret Hill Church. Elders Boaz, Cleveland, Darnell, Davis, Hardy, Perkins, Turner and Williams were present and the association made no difference between them, but by ballott preached all but Boaz. The next year (1899) the association convened at Flat Creek Church, and Elders Cleveland, Davis, Hardy, Jenkins, J. V and A. M. Kirkland, Perkins, Reeder, Stuckey, Turner, Todd and Wallace were there; and the association, by ballot, preached Cleveland, Davis, Jenkins, Perkins, Reeder and Turner and ignored all the others. Elders J. N. Wallace, J. B. Hardy, J. V Kirkland

and others begged and plead for the association to remain together, just as the brethren did here. The association adjourned in peace and never met together again. Now can you tell what divided them? It was not "Absolutism," for the "Absoluters" were in the majority, as you can see by them preaching the "Absolute" preachers and ignoring the others. But what was the cause of the division? Before the association convened in 1900, Elder Chandler was excluded from Salem Church upon the testimony of seven members for lying. Elders Morgan and Clark came to the church and tried to lord it over her by trying to force his restoration, which resulted in the exclusion of nine others. Then Morgan and Clark gathered the excluded parties together, and all that they could lead from the other churches of that association, and refused to meet at the place appointed for the association to convene, but assembled at another place and declared non-fellowship for all who would not go with them into their disorder. And the "Absoluters" of Kentucky, Tennessee and Illinois, who had raised bars against their brethren, joined with them. And again we had no alternative but to discard their actions and have no connection with them, as advised in the general address of the brethren at Fulton. Were we justified in our course in Kentucky in observing the advice of the brethren at Fulton? If so, we also are justified in our course here in Arkansas in observing their advice. But again you say, "Thus it is seen that Elder Shain and his people in Kentucky will not, or do not, recognize the 'Absoluters' there but recognize them here in Arkansas. We wonder if that suits his corresponding editors?" No, Brother Cayce, this is not a matter of recognizing "Absoluters" either in Kentucky or here in Arkansas; but it is a matter of observing the advice of that large assembly of Baptists which convened at Fulton for the purpose of checkmating the raising of unlawful bars of fellowship among the Primitive Baptists and of recognizing the orderly Baptists according to their advice after such bars had been raised. No doubt this exactly suits Elder Shain's corresponding editors and the Primitive Baptists generally, for many of them sat in this council and joined in giving this advice. Surely observing their advice suits them; if it does not, I would be at a loss to know what would. None of our people teach or believe that God is in any way responsible for sin. But we believe and teach that all sin is dictated by the devil and performed by man entirely without any influence or approval of God whatsoever. In short, we believe and adhere to the doctrine of predestination as set forth in the London Confession of Faith. And if any of our ministers should advocate it stronger than that he would be dealt with as an heretic. Now as to Elder Bozarth, he came to Arkansas as you say, from Kentucky. Soon after coming here he got into trouble with----- (not on doctrine) and then flew to Pine Grove Church for an asylum, pleading that his reason for coming up here to us for membership was because he had known me and some others of the members of Pine Grove Church for eighteen or twenty years. He stated when he came that the trouble between him and----- had been settled. He proposed to join by relation, stating before the church that Antioch Church in Kentucky, where his membership was, had gone into disorder and was tolerating secret orders. Pine Grove Church required him to obtain a letter from Antioch Church, nevertheless, which he did, and it is in the hands of Pine Grove Church now. Soon after Elder Bozarth joined Pine Grove Church we received intelligence from----- church that the trouble had not been settled. Pine Grove Church appointed a committee to accompany Elder Bozarth and sent him to adjust the matter. But instead he only made it worse. Brother and Sister Poole, of the Highland Association in Kentucky, of which Antioch Church is a member, visited Pine Grove Church and informed us that Antioch Church was neither in disorder nor tolerated secret orders, upon which Pine Grove Church excluded Elder Bozarth for lying; and the correspondence you have published in your paper followed. And

when Antioch Church learned the truth of the matter the publication in Elder Shain's paper was the result. You say you have received Bozarth and hold him in your union. Now, my brother, surely you can see "where you are at." If it is disorder in Kentucky to receive and hold in fellowship one excluded from another church for lying, it is also disorder to do so here in Arkansas. And we will not tolerate any such procedure either here or there. Nor will Elder Shain and his people. Why should not they recognize us? We are one people. Now, my brother, justice and truth demand that you give this space in your paper. And if anything that I have written be disputed, all I ask is space and I shall delight to bring forth the proof. May God give us a spirit of love and forbearance, and may we labor for peace among the afflicted people of God. "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God." Yours for truth and order, J. B. Hardy. Rison, Ark.

OUR REPLY TO ABOVE

In our issue of July 1, 1922, we published an article under the heading, "Where are we at?" concerning the matter of Elder S. C. Bozarth being received by the church at Cane Creek, in Thornton, Ark., and then getting a letter of dismissal from that church and now holding membership in our church here in Fordyce; that he came here from the Highland Association in Kentucky-Antioch Church. He united with Pine Grove Church, with Elder J. B. Hardy. Antioch Church said in the article published in Elder Shain's paper that she would respect the act of Pine Grove in excluding Elder Bozarth. That brought us to ask the question, "Where are we at?" Brother D. F. Siria, of Madisonville, Ky., as clerk of Antioch Church sent us a reply to our article, dated July 24, 1922. Soon after we received that we had a letter from Elder J. B. Hardy also in reply to our article. We expected to publish both of them right away, but Elder Hardy came to our office and asked for his article as he wished to revise it. We gave it to him, and he revised the same and sent the revised article to us after some weeks-that is, some weeks after we received the letter from Brother Siria. Then we were so pressed attending to matters that could not be postponed, and having been away from home a great deal, the whole thing has gone until now without appearing in the paper. Now we feel that the letters both require some notice from us. They appear elsewhere in this paper. We have but little to say with reference to what is contained in the letter from Brother Siria. Brother Bozarth presented to Cane Creek Church the certificate that he had been dismissed from Antioch by letter in good standing. Cane Creek did not expect him to present the original letter. They understood what had been done with that. Brother Siria admits that Brother Bozarth informed them that he had got in among the Absoluters. The proper information, then, was given to Antioch Church by Brother Bozarth. As to whether this be true, remember that it is stated by Elder Hardy that Elder Keith, from Kentucky, helped to organize Pine Grove Church. One of the elders in Elder Hardy's own association made a charge against them that the church was not organized in order because they had a "Conditionalist" in the presbytery that organized them. Elder Keith was that "Conditionalist," as he is not identified with those in Kentucky who advocate unlimited predestination. Now, the sum of the matter is that in the article in Elder Shain's paper Antioch Church said that she expected to recognize the act of Elder Hardy's church (Pine Grove) in excluding Elder Bozarth, thus recognizing a church that is in an association here in Arkansas that are recognized as unlimited predestinarians-that is, they are recognized here as "Absoluters," and those who differ from them and reject that doctrine are called "Conditionalists" by them, just as Antioch Church in Kentucky is called that by those who are recognized as "Absoluters" there. If they do that, then they do not recognize here in Arkansas

those who reject the doctrine that God decreed sin, and do recognize those who hold that God did decree sin, or that He predestinated all things that come to pass. Candidly, we think Antioch Church is under obligation to rescind her act of saying she would recognize the act of Pine Grove, or else recognize the "Absoluters" in Kentucky and Tennessee, as well as in Arkansas, and elsewhere. We now notice Elder Hardy's letter. He refers to what was said on pages 8 and 9 of the meeting of ministers in Fulton, Ky., in 1900, but does not begin his quotation with the beginning of the paragraph. They said: "Bars of fellowship set up by our local churches have been the most destructive influences against the growth and progress of the church. Traditions of men and human customs being regarded as authority have often given rise to bars of fellowship and resulted in the destruction of the peace of the churches. Such customs and traditions as have no Bible sanction should never interfere with fellowship. It is painful to note on the pages of history how frequently our people have been divided and their happiness destroyed by foolish and sinful declarations of non-fellowship." Then follows what Elder Hardy quoted from page 8. This shows very clearly that what they protested and advised against was the passing of declarations of non-fellowship concerning matters of local custom and tradition. In our travels among the churches we have seen certain things done one way in one locality and done another way in another locality. It was the same thing done but in a different way in the two places. These two ways of doing the same thing are local customs, about which there should be no declaration of non-fellowship. Elder Hardy quotes a part of what they say. on page 9 concerning heresy. They enumerate some things which are not heresy. They say: "The Bible does not state the day nor the hour upon which members shall be received in the church, nor the Lord's supper administered. It mentions neither hymn-books, associations, formal letter correspondence, nor general handshaking. So upon all such matters liberty should be allowed, provided that everything is done in decency and in order, and the books used are sound in sentiment." This shows just what matters they advised liberty upon, and advised against the raising of bars to fellowship concerning. Elder Hardy quotes from page 10," No doctrine that violates neither the Scripture nor acknowledged confession should be construed as heresy." He also quotes a part of Chapter III, Sec. 1, of the confession to show that the doctrine of the "Absolute predestination of all things" is not "a violation of the acknowledged confession." Here is what he quotes, and he stops just where all do who try to prove by that confession that the absolute predestination of all things is Old Baptist doctrine: "God hath decreed in Himself from all eternity, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably, all things whatsoever come to pass;" -there he stopped-not at a period, or the end of a sentence, but at a semicolon. If Elder Hardy does not believe in the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things, good, bad, and indifferent, why would he thus quote a part of that sentence to prove that doctrine to be according to the confession? But let us go on with the sentence," yet so as thereby is God neither the author of sin, nor hath fellowship with" any therein, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature, nor yet is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established, in which appears His wisdom in disposing all things, and power and faithfulness in accomplishing His decree." The reader will please take particular notice to the word contingency, as used in this section. Contingency is a "quality or state of being contingent." Contingent means "liable, but not certain, to occur; possible. * * * Dependent (upon a preceding event or situation); subject to something else; conditioned or conditional; as, peace contingent upon complying with the proffered terms." So says Webster's International Dictionary, standard authority on the definition of words in the English language. Thus it is clear that the writers of that confession of faith held that God

had predestinated some things upon certain conditions. For instance, the Lord says, "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land." The Lord predestinated that they should eat the good of the land conditioned upon their being willing and obedient. "But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured by the sword." His predestination that they should be devoured by the sword was conditioned upon them refusing and rebelling. We believe that chapter and section of the London confession of faith; but those who deny that there are any conditions in these matters do not believe it. There is an "Appendix" in the back part of that book put out by authority of that Fulton meeting, and on pages 88 and 89 we find this language: "We do not believe that God has unconditionally, unlimitedly, and equally predestinated righteousness and unrighteousness. It is our belief that God has positively and effectually predestinated the eternal salvation of His people which were chosen in Christ before time." On page 101 we find this language: "We believe the Scriptures teach that there is a time salvation received by the heirs of God distinct from eternal salvation, which does depend upon their obedience. The people of God receive their rewards for obedience in this life only. We believe that the ability of the Christian is the unconditional gift of God." Elder Hardy's name is signed to this article which is published as an appendix to what was said by those assembled at Fulton in 1900. Does Elder Hardy believe what is here stated? If so, why did he argue a few years ago that there is nothing gained by obedience and nothing lost by disobedience? On pages 102 and 103 we find this language: "We think these uses of good works Scriptural. We hold that God's government of His people is moral. We hold, too, that conditionality is an essential element of moral government. We distinguish between God's government of mind and His government of matter." Notice that they say that conditionality is an essential element of moral government, and that God's government of His people is moral. Do the people Elder Hardy is identified with hold to the things here quoted, and that are signed by J. B. Hardy? NO. Do they believe that there are blessings which the child of God enjoys here in time upon condition of their obedience? No. As to whether the doctrine that God did from all eternity absolutely and unconditionally predestinate everything that comes to pass, we are willing to let just about two passages from God's word settle the matter. But in the first place we will say, without fear of successful contradiction, that the preaching of the truth, the preaching of the gospel in its purity, has never caused trouble or division in the Old Baptist Church. Advocating the doctrine of the predestination of all things does cause trouble among them. This is enough to prove that it is not the truth. But we call attention to **(Jeremiah 7:8-10)** "Behold, ye trust in lying words that cannot profit. Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and come and stand before me in this house, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations?" Then in (Jeremiah 7:15-16), "And I will cast you out of my sight, as I have cast out all your brethren, even the whole seed of Ephraim. Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to me: for I will not hear thee." Those people were guilty of committing abominations and then claiming that they were delivered to do those things. The idea of their claim is that God determined and fixed that they should do them and that they could not do otherwise. Their claim was wrong, and God said that He would cast them out of His sight. Next we refer to **(Jeremiah 19:5)** "They have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind." In (Jeremiah 7:31) He says, "neither came it into my heart." Now we will give any man until the next day after the Judgment to tell how God did from all eternity absolutely and unconditionally predestinate and fix a thing that never came

into His heart or mind. In The Primitive Baptist of August 29, 1916, on page 8 is a letter signed by Elder J. B. Hardy, written to Mrs. Tom Taylor. Just over that letter we said: "If he wants recognition among orderly Baptists he should get himself straight, and no orderly Baptist should want to recognize him until he does that. We feel it a duty we owe our brethren to let these things be known. We have nothing personal against Elder Hardy, and our only intention and desire is that people be consistent." Here is a little extract from Elder Hardy's letter. It was dated September 8, 1903: "Sister Rogers also informs me that J. S. Newman came to Blum, following me, and told you that I was agreed with him in doctrine, and offered this as a pretext to induce you to unite with his party. My sister, do not suffer yourself to be deceived.. I am not agreed with J. S. Newman, neither in doctrine nor practice. * * * My father and I are perfectly agreed with my brother who was with me at your place, and J. S. Newman is not agreed with either of us; and he should not seek to thus deceive you. I was at the Fulton meeting, but did not endorse all they did there; and they published my name in connection with their work, without my consent." This is enough to show where Elder Hardy stood at that time. Most all know where his brother stands in doctrine, and he says that they stand together. He also says that he objected to some things done at the Fulton meeting. Elder Newman was not at that meeting, but we were. If Elder Hardy raised any public objection to a thing that was done there we have no recollection of it. He may have done so, but if he did we do not remember it. Anyway, as he said he did not endorse it all, he is trying to prove that we are now wrong in our course by a witness that he will not himself receive. Therefore, his whole contention falls. We have sustained all that we have done. As to the personal difference between Elder Bozarth and one of Elder Hardy's brethren, will say that as our people and Elder Hardy's people have no dealings or correspondence with each other, and are not considered to be the same people, that matter was not to be considered by any of our churches. It hardly appears consistent, though, that Elder Bozarth went to Pine Grove for an "asylum," on account of having a personal difference with one of Elder Hardy's brethren. He could have allowed his membership to remain in Antioch Church in Kentucky as an easier way to avoid trouble on that line. Elder Bozarth moved here from Kentucky in 1918. He was granted a letter from Antioch Church in September, 1919. Elder Bozarth knew Elder Hardy, as Elder Hardy has been visiting the country in Kentucky for years where he came from. Elder Bozarth told them at Pine Grove when he joined there that Antioch and Tirza churches had been in the Cypress Creek Association, and had notified that association that they would meet with them no more until they rid themselves of secret orders, but that when he was last at that association, in the fall before he moved to this country in the spring, they still held Antioch on their roll, and asked them how they would want to receive him. Elder Hardy told him they would receive him by relation, which they did, but told him to write back and get a letter, anyway. This he did and turned the letter to them. Before we organized our church here in Fordyce and before Elder Bozarth joined Cane Creek, he met Elder Hardy here in town and Elder Hardy said, "I understand you have gone into an organization of a thing here with Elder Cayce," and that "The Baptists here will not recognize Elder Cayce." Elder Bozarth told him it was not true, but that we were talking of organizing a church, and that if it was done he would be one of them. Elder Hardy replied, "Yes, and we will exclude you, too." Elder Bozarth replied that he did not care. Elder Bozarth had been told that there had been a division in this country some years before, but that the other side (our people) were Conditionalists and advocated conditions in salvation, etc. When we moved here and met Elder Bozarth he found out for certain that these Baptists called "Conditionalists" by those people did not hold that there were conditions to

be performed by the sinner in order to eternal life, but conditions to be performed by the children of God in order to their happiness here on earth, in a great measure. Elder Hardy's church (Pine Grove) did not receive Elder Bozarth on the letter from Antioch Church, but received him on confession of faith. Cane Creek Church received him on the letter, upon certificate from Antioch that such letter had been granted to him dismissing him from her when joined to another church of the same faith and order. Cane Creek was informed that Antioch Church was in the Highland Association, and that the Highland does not hold to the predestination of all things. Cane Creek knew the identity of Pine Grove. We never put our membership in any church in this country until we organized our church here in Fordyce on Thursday before the third Sunday in October, 1920. Elder Hardy says that we put ourselves out of the holy church communion because we aligned ourselves with the party that we did in this country. We attended a church that was in line with him on the third Sunday in November, 1919. They had some visiting brethren present, and we were requested to preach, and tried to do so, the best we could. We have heard that the visitors requested it. We were at the same church again in December, 1919, and they said we should not preach there. This was before we had put our membership with any party here. Then who did the rejecting? Where is your holy church communion? As to what caused the division in this country we have to say that Cane Creek, Mt. Paran and Harmony Churches have all said by their act in conference that the advocating of that doctrine was what caused the division. Elder Hardy makes an attack on Elder Little in his article, and Elder Little is now dead and not here to speak for himself. We knew Elder Little personally, and we know that the division was not on account of some other brother being elected moderator. We talked with him in regard to this trouble or division a number of times while he was living, and he told us more than once that advocating the predestination of all things was the cause of the trouble. Now we are sure that there is a misunderstanding in regard to Elder Bozarth so far as him telling Pine Grove that Antioch was in disorder is concerned. We do not think Elder Bozarth meant to leave such an impression. It is not necessary to make any defense of Elder Bozarth in this article, for he is clear of any guilt, and that matter has nothing to do with the subject we have under discussion, anyway. As already stated, it is simply a matter of whether Antioch Church, in the Highland Association, in Kentucky, Elder J. D. Shain's people, will recognize the Absoluters in this country and reject them at home or not. That is the question. We think that if they do not intend to do that, they should say by their act that they recognize what our people have done in receiving Elder Bozarth from them and do not recognize Pine Grove's act in receiving him on confession of faith and then excluding him. C. H. C.

WHAT ELDER LITTLE SAID

We think justice demands that we here insert a letter written by Elder Little which was published in The Primitive Baptist of May 1, 1923: Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-I notice in the last issue of The Primitive Baptist an article from Elder J. B. Hardy in which he makes an attack on Elder T. B. Little as to what divided Brother Little's association, and as Brother Little is dead and not here to speak for himself, I am sending you a letter that I received from him about three years ago. He stated in his letter what divided his association. Please publish Brother Little's letter in your next issue of The Primitive Baptist if you can. Your little brother, I hope, A. J. Breece. Centerville, Tenn.

THE LETTER

A. J. Breece:

Dear Brother, as I humbly hope-On my return home yesterday I found your good letter of the 24th. The tone of your letter made me hope that we are spiritually

related, but often fear that I am mistaken. I love the doctrine that gives God all the honor and all the glory in the salvation of sinners; but I hate the doctrine of fate. I cannot believe that God predestinated all sin and wickedness. I did not learn it that way in my experience, and if that is the truth we would have nothing to repent of. Yes, brother, the doctrine that "God absolutely predestinated all things that come to pass," including sin and wickedness, caused the division in our association. The "absolute wing" of New Hope Association have been in war among themselves ever since we have been divided, and I often try to thank God that we are out of it, and in peace. Elder Hardy made an effort to get us together three or four years ago, but it failed. The "Absoluters" were willing to unite with us without any acknowledgments, but we could not afford to act so hypocritically. Elder Hardy was so bitterly opposed to what he called "bars" that he never would go behind "bars," unless it was iron "bars." He (Hardy) said in his talk that he believed in "unlimited predestination." Since that time he joined in with those that our association withdrew from ten years ago. We teach and believe the doctrine of election, predestination, and all points of doctrine and practice, just as it is revealed in our Bible, without adding anything. It is good enough for us poor ignorant Baptists. The council you refer to, I only heard something said about it. Of course none of the Old Baptists that I am identified with were in that council. As before stated, it was a war among themselves. It doesn't matter who says that our association did not divide on the question of predestination, it is not the truth. I was a member of the church several years before the contention over predestination arose among us. I was in the unholy war among us until love and fellowship was gone. We could not believe that a just and righteous God predestinated all of our sins and unrighteous acts. All the guns were turned against me, because I was the oldest man among us contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. Some would say, "He will go to the Missionaries; he is tender-footed on predestination; he is a Conditionalist." I have been misrepresented by "Absoluters" -falsely accused-but sometimes I can rejoice in it all. Would be glad to know that I am worthy to suffer such things for Christ's sake. Dear brother, you can tell those brethren, that are confused by Hardy or anyone else, that the unscriptural doctrine that God absolutely predestinated all things that come to pass, including sin, was the cause of the division in our association, and if any says it was not, he makes a false statement, or he doesn't know anything about it. As to what they hold to, they do like they used to most of the time-they preach the old doctrine pretty well, but in their private talk they preach predestination of all things. We can't fellowship a man that will hold back his real view. The Scripture locates them. Dear brother, this letter is scattering. Hope you can understand enough to have some idea whether we belong to the same family. Love to you and yours, and saints everywhere. Remember wife and me in prayer. I am, I hope, a brother in spirit. Write again if you feel like it. T. B. Little. Rison, Ark., ---March 30, 1920.

Call For Meeting

---April 1, 1923

In as much as we, the undersigned, are more thoroughly convinced that in the late controversy over the subject of regeneration there was not sufficient difference to justify confusion and division, and having a great desire for peace and union, we therefore urge all our brethren concerned for the welfare of our bleeding cause to come together at the Greenfield Church, Greenfield, Tenn., on Friday before the fifth Sunday in April (continuing the two days following) for the purpose of general confession; the object of said meeting being not to make any demands nor to bring

in any charges regarding the past, but to make confessions to each other, blotting out the past, and coming together in peace, love and fellowship. All who desire peace and union, we urge that you come. We suggest that each church enable your pastor to attend, by bearing his expenses. Signed: Elders J. C. Ross, A. B. Ross, E. M. Beshear, W. E. Brush, J. N. Wallace, James Duncan, W. P. Russell, W. A. Bishop, J. M. Fuqua, B. P. Simmons, Commodore Brann, J. W. Lomax, S. E. Reid, Henry Ross, J. B. Halbrook, W. L. Murray, J. W. Adams, W. J. Goodrich, J. H. Phillips, J. D. Shain, T. M. Hampton, T. M. Phillips, Allen McCoy, W. R. Rush-ton, H. M. Sanders, Z. Stallings, J. S. Williams, Brother Billie Phillips. We feel to believe and hope that the meeting as above called will be a great meeting, and that lasting good will be accomplished by it. We indeed believe it important that all who desire peace may lay aside all things else and come. We are sure that nothing could be of more importance than our earnest labors for peace. We beg that you come and join in one united effort to this end. We believe that God will bless us in this labor of love. J. C. and A. B. Ross.

LETTER OF APPROVAL

Elder A. B. Ross:

My Dear Brother-I wish to say to you that I, with all my heart, most sincerely endorse the effort now being put forth by you and other brethren for peace. I feel sure that God is our peace, and that He will and has worked in the hearts of many of His ministers and made them willing to say to their God and to each other, "We have done wrong." Brethren, do let us meet in the name of Jesus, and leave self and selfish motives behind.

We have all done wrong, and as a result the children of God are divided and many of our friends, and even our children, are being driven from us. Oh, how our hearts should yearn for peace to be restored in the borders of our beloved Zion. We should be willing and anxious to do all we can that the breach be healed. For this let us meet, labor and pray. J. S. Newman.

Elder C. H. Cayce:

The above is a copy of a letter written by Elder Newman to Elder A. B. Ross. Will you please publish the call for all of our brethren to meet at Greenfield, Tenn., as shown in the call, and please publish the above copy (letter) in connection with it. And, if you can, sign this call with us and come to the meeting. Yours for the peace of Zion, J. C. Ross.

REMARKS

We truly hope that the brethren who join in the above and who may attend the meeting may have the right object in view, and that the good Lord may direct the same to the good of His dear children. Our pleading in the whole time was for peace. We want no war and no trouble, and we do not want it now. If those who have waged the war are tired of it and now want peace they have our hearty approval, although we do not feel like signing the above call. May the Lord bless us all. C. H. C.

A Call For Prayer And For Peace

---April 1, 1923 (From Gospel Messenger by request.)

"If ye bite and devour one another take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." -(Galatians 5:15). We, the undersigned, having the warmest Christian love for each other, and who feel to be called of God to the same holy work of preaching the precious gospel, but who, by reason of bars of non-fellowship and misunderstandings, cannot preach together nor affiliate together as brethren in

Christ, and having groaned under this burden, and knowing also that there are hundreds of other precious ministers and brethren who are also distressed over the disturbed condition of our beloved Zion; and after much study and fervent prayer to the Almighty Father for relief, have mutually decided to bring the matter before our brethren everywhere and to advise with them over present conditions, with the earnest hope that, under the guiding hand of God, we may have peace and fellowship to abound once more with all who truly love His name. We believe with all our hearts that the Primitive Baptists are the only people now upon earth, so far as we are aware, who hold uncompromisingly to the apostolic doctrine of "salvation by grace." And in so far as we are aware, all the many contending factions of Primitive Baptists throughout the land stand united in the doctrine of grace, but are unhappily divided on other matters. It is our firm belief that while there may be some heresies among some few of these factions which we should not fellowship, that by far the greater part are united on the essentials of the Bible, but have allowed minor differences to sever their fellowship. We believe that the present disturbed conditions are very largely the result of misunderstandings which might be corrected if our brethren everywhere could meet together in the Spirit of Christ and discuss their differences face to face. Otherwise, and so long as they are away from each other and not allowed to assemble themselves together, there can be no hope for the betterment of conditions. It is for these reasons that we offer suggestions for the prayerful consideration of brethren everywhere. That a general council, or meeting, be held during the summer or fall of the present year, in the city of Atlanta, or Nashville, or in whatever place is thought to be most convenient to all concerned, in which all various sects and divisions of Primitive Baptists in the United States and Canada shall be invited, and shall be allowed to discuss with equal rights and privileges the questions of differences now existing, with the earnest hope and prayer that God may so sanctify such meeting that all who truly love His precious truth may fall into each other's arms of tender, gospel fellowship. We are now calling upon our ministers especially, and to all who love the peace of Zion throughout the United States and Canada, to indicate to us their desire in this matter. It will be understood that nothing that may be done in such meeting, should it be held, will be considered official or binding, but only for the purpose of discovering to each other, in an educational way, the true conditions as they now seem to exist, whether real or imaginary. The foregoing are only suggestions. We do not profess to know just what is best. Certainly we do not mean to dictate the course to pursue. We know, however, that we as a denomination need to do something. We need not wait for the Lord to do it for us, for we are certain that we have gone away from Him-He did not send us away; and as the prodigal son, if we have "come to ourselves" -if we have suffered enough, let us return to the Father's house and receive the blessings which are there in store for us. It is further requested that should it be thought best that such meeting be held, that the place and time of holding it be named, so that we may be able to compile and announce the wishes of our dear people. We respectfully ask if it would not be desirable, if after the meeting is called, that a committee be appointed representing all the different factions represented in the meeting, so far as they may be able, who may be charged with the duty of naming the various points for discussion, and outlining a program by which the meeting shall be conducted. We request a reproduction of these suggestions in all our denominational papers throughout the United States. Oh, dear brethren, everywhere, humble yourselves before the Lord. Get down on your knees and earnestly inquire His will, and then write us the answer He gives you. Let all answers be addressed to Elder Zack C. Hull. Atlanta National Bank Bldg., Atlanta, Ga., or Elder A. V Simms. P. O. Box 601, Atlanta, Ga.

OUR COMMENTS

On another page of this paper is an article copied from the Gospel Messenger, by request, under the heading, "A Call For Prayer and For Peace." This may be the proper thing to do-hold such a meeting as is suggested or called for in the article, but for the life of us we do not yet see it. We do not remember having read in the Scriptures where the church of God, or her ministers, are directed to have a meeting of that sort. Perhaps the instruction to meet often together and to pray with and for each other covers the case; but if so, it appears to us that our people are rather late in finding it out. Perhaps they have been too slow, anyway. We do not say that such a meeting is unauthorized by the Scriptures, but we do not know what text does authorize it. If our people wish to take part in it, we shall raise no disturbance about it; but we are not prepared now to give it our sanction. It is true that there is something for the Lord's people to do. There is something for the church to do. They should keep themselves unspotted from the world. God's people in ancient times were forbidden to join house to house and field to field with the nations around them," so that there be no place left in all the earth for my people, saith the Lord." When the church of God engages in the things that the world engages in, so that they can scarcely be told from the world by their practices, they cease to be the church of God-there is no place left for the Lord's people. The church of God existed for centuries without any society or institution but the church. The Fuller and Carey move called for the different things that have been invented by their followers. Organs were introduced into churches. Sunday schools were organized. Aid societies were organized. Mission societies were organized. Mite societies were organized. And so on and on. Elder A. V Simms, whose name is signed to the appeal we are writing about, is one of the leading men in the progressive move that divided the Baptists in Georgia and other sections. The Progressives have Sunday schools, or Bible classes-the same thing. The Burnam people introduced that thing years ago and divided the Baptists. The meeting house in Luray, Va., was given to our people on account of the fact that they held to the original principles and practices when Burnam and his party brought the division there by the introduction of those things which were a departure from the original principles and practices of the Baptists. Many of the Progressives have organs in their churches. They have simply departed from the original principles of the Primitive Baptists. This progressive move was started in Elder J. V Kirkland's day, and while the Kirklands, Todd, Hackle-man, Pinkstaff, and others of them were among us. That meeting at Fulton, Ky., in 1900, which we attended, was first called for by Kirkland and those who were aligned with him. They had another (a few of them did) about a year later in St. Louis. Many of our people remember that meeting and what it resulted in. Although we attended the meeting at Fulton, and never raised any objections to it, yet we confess that we never did fully approve of it. We really felt in our heart that something was wrong. The address printed in the proceedings of that meeting we think was mainly gotten up by some of the Kirklands. At that time our people were not, many of them, suspicious of anything wrong; but the moves made afterwards show to us that they were paving the way for the work they had in view. That address lays particular stress on what would now be called a broad fellowship. Our people then did not suspect that such a thing was really intended. But Elder Kirkland was then evidently laying his plans for a uniting of our people with a faction of the Missionaries. Such a meeting savors to us of preacher rule. It savors of preachers being of higher authority. As long as we have preachers ruling, instead of churches ruling, we will have trouble. There is always some preacher who wants his way, and if he is not controlled by his church he will cause trouble. If a church exercises her God-given right, and a preacher begins to make war on the church for that act, his church should stop him at once.

She should call him down immediately, and if he will not cease his war, then deal with him. Where a man loses a thing is the place to find it. There has already been entirely too much of this interference with the churches in their work. We want peace in the church upon the principles of truth and righteousness. We would be glad to see all of God's people united and in peace, practicing just what the Bible commands, and leaving all other things alone. If some people have departed from those principles, is there not a right way to come back to them? So far as we are concerned, we feel that we have not departed from those principles. We have not gone anywhere, and so we feel that there is no coming back for us to do. We do not say it boastfully, but we, trust in all due humility and reverence, but we do say that if any man thinks we have departed from the principles of truth, we stand ready to defend those principles. Put us to the test. The man does not live before whose face we fear to contend for the principles upon which we have stood during all these years. If some people have gone from those principles there is a way for them to get back. The only right and the only Scriptural way is for them to confess their wrongs and turn from them. A confession is worth very little unless one turns from the wrongs. Suppose we suggest now that we call for another meeting also. There are many of those who are identified with the Missionary Baptists who are sound on the doctrine of salvation by grace. We could name some of them who are, if it were necessary, but we presume no one would deny it. Now, suppose we call for a meeting with such persons among them to see if we cannot come to some understanding with them. Why not try to unite with them also? Where shall we draw the line? Where shall we stop? If there are some brethren among the Progressives who want to get right, we would be glad to see them lay down their inventions and get right-come back to the place they went away from. And if there should be some of God's people among the Missionaries, or among others, for that matter, who want to get right, let them come to the old church, which is standing today where she has always stood, and get right. May the good Lord direct us all in the right way, and then give us the Christian courage to walk there, and preserve and keep us all by His own grace and power, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Request Granted

---April 15, 1923

Dear Brother Cayce: Yours to hand, and can't even attempt to tell you the comfort it is to me and will be for years to come, for I placed it in my "Jewel box" among other like precious "gems," and these, with my Bible and song book, are the dearest possessions I have. Often it seems trials and temptations are pressing me down, never to rise again, and then for hours I admire my "Jewels" -for they are direct to poor me and from those whom I esteem highly for the truth's sake, and I am renewed, built up, and can feast and often even praise God, who doeth all things well and can comfort the lonely, the weak and sinful, as well as the strong and the mighty. While I'd never tire of your good letters, Brother Cayce, I am not expecting you should take your valuable time keeping up a correspondence with poor me, but know you have comforted me in time of need, perhaps more than you can ever know. May God's richest blessings rest upon you and yours. Please remember any time you have a thought for this lonely beggar here that a line is much to me-just a crumb to the hungry is more than a laden table to the full. Neither did I ever intend to be so situated as I am; that was the least of my intentions, and by the help and grace of God, it is the least of my intentions to stay so situated. If it is not asking too much, Brother Cayce, please pray that I don't

have to. We are working hard and economizing to pay off mortgages incurred by doctor bills and sickness, and then we hope to manage to get back down South among you precious "feet-washing Baptists" to live and die; for if the mercies of God ever permit me to again enjoy church privileges, you dear people will have to put me out if I am ever again deprived of that, for five hundred doctors telling me I'd die would never scare me out into the cold, cold world again, for I want to die among you, be buried by you, and the last words spoken over this lump of clay to be by you dear humble, poor, God-fearing and God-glorifying followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. Please don't you or anyone draw the idea from my unworthy scribbling that we have not dear humble Baptists here, for there are some of the loveliest Baptists in the world here God bless them -just, come and visit among them and see. A lack of unity in faith and church practice is what deprives many a lonely wretch of a home and makes them an outcast among their own people, which surely is one of the most miserable existences one ever was placed in. My mission in this Northwest is not to try to straighten out churches-that is none of my affair-I have no "finger" in it; that is their own business. Now this is the way I look at that, but it is some of my business, at least, as to whether I come in among them or not; and if I can't be allowed to stay peaceably on the outside, I believe it is not only my business but my duty to show where I stand and try to defend what I firmly believe is the truth. "Offenses will arise, but woe unto him by whom they come." That is one "woe," by the help and grace of God, I am determined not to be guilty of, and this determination caused me to suffer a "knockdown" instead of taking the many "hints" already given; but when I marvel at the strong hand that pushed me up, and that bright light and what it manifested to me, stunning my senses, casting a dark cloud of despair over me and killing the joy of soul that was mine-I can say with you, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him," for I know now He was with me then. Dear Brother Cayce, if you found anything worthy to print in my personal letter all right, and if not a bother, that this might be an explanation to others, please print this, and if I can keep silent for awhile I'll try to do so. Now when I get the dear Primitive Baptist paper usually the first thing I do is to turn through and look for all the C. H. C's. and read all pieces thus signed first, and feeling many others do likewise, and as I find them only too few, am going to enclose your two first letters, and if you do not object I feel sure they would be found far more interesting and instructive than anything of my weak pen. The only request, return them to go back into my "Jewel box." Stamps enclosed for same, and later, if desired, I'll lend this last letter for publication also. Not through reading it yet-there is so much witnessing of the Spirit to me that I marvel and ponder and wonder-comparatively strangers in the flesh, and we have no Sunday schools. Now is there but one way we could have learned these same sweet truths? When the Spirit directed me to write (I believe I know now it was the Spirit) it was in an hour of the deepest need, it seems, I ever suffered, and had you not answered spiritually from your own bountiful storehouse of God-given knowledge, it is a mystery to me yet how I'd lived through it; but a few evenings back suddenly that gloom left me. I arose from my chair and could have shouted aloud for pure joy of soul. I have sung the sweet songs of Zion here all alone and am calm-reconciled to whatsoever God permits to befall me here in this time world, knowing all things are in His hands and He works out His will and pleasure in heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, and no one can stay His hand or say what doest Thou? Oh, if we can only trust Him and farewell in the Lord. Any humble poor who may read this, please pray for this sinned wretch here, whom the tempest blows and seems will capsize her frail bark to never rise again; but God can of these very stones raise up seed to Abraham. Only a little over one year ago I was given the greatest feast of my life at the association here. God was with us then; and happy I

was to even sacrifice as we did in a financial way just to get here among God's dear people, as I then thought to have a church home among them, and now these hopes lie in ashes at my feet, and for months the gloom of despair has been over me; but now it is gone. Oh, bless His holy name. You said there was room for me among you there, dear Brother Cayce, and I am looking forward to the day I can come. Bless your dear sainted mother and the sweet letter she wrote me-a gem, a ruby without price. I often read it and always feel better and can press on. In bonds of like precious faith, humbly, Mrs. S. D. Poore. Morton, Wash.

FIRST LETTER

Mrs. S. D. Poore:

Dear Sister-Yours of Sept. 25th was received several days ago. The name of the brother has been added to our list and the paper will be sent to him. I trust that the same may be a blessing and a comfort 'to him. I thank you for having us send the paper to him. Neither do I have any fight to make on the Baptists out there. In fact I know but little about them. I once thought I would be glad to visit the brethren in the far west, but do not feel such impression of mind that way as I once did. In fact, I do not have the impression to be on the go as much as I once did. I do not know why. Sometimes I feel that it may be that my race is nearly run and the warfare almost over with me. If that be so, the Lord's will be done. I feel much discouraged a great deal of the time, and a sadness pervades my heart at all times. There is not an hour when awake that I do not feel this distressing sadness. I cannot understand it. I desire to be submissive to the Lord's will and to my lot here. I am wonderfully blessed with a good companion and three sweet little children. But still that deep sadness is in my heart, in spite of the sweet association of my lovely family. The sadness is there, whether I am at home or away-no matter where I am, nor what my business may be. But I am willing to risk the principles for which I have fought and contended for a third of a century. I know that doctrine is true, whether I am embraced in it or not. I am willing to risk it that way. May the good Lord bless and sustain you. We would be glad for you to move here. There is room. Please remember me in your prayers. Yours in humble hope, C. H. Cayce.

SECOND LETTER

Mrs. S. D. Poore:

Dear Sister-Your kind letter of the 16th has been received. Was glad to hear from you again. On reading the part of your letter about me being sick I was made to think of what a doctor once said in my presence. He said that several years ago he felt bad all the time, blue and despondent, and that he thought he had religion; but found out that it was only his liver out of order. Perhaps that is what is the matter with me. If it is, I confess that I do not know what I am to do about it. I cannot leave this section, as you suggest, even if I wished to do so. My business is here, and all I have is invested here. I cannot move the business- am not able to do so, financially, no matter how much I might wish to do so. But let that be as it may-the time will come some day for me to lie down in death. It may be soon, or it may be years yet. I do not know. But I do not think that the condition of affairs in the church or nation will have anything to do with that. My father fell in the pulpit preaching the gospel at a time that it seemed we could not possibly do without him. Why should I be spared any more than he was, when he was so badly needed? I do know that" I have endured much for the principles that I hold to, and that I have tried to defend with the ability that the good Lord has seen fit to give me. I am very well aware of that. And no one person knows how much I have endured unless it be my own family-and perhaps they do not know all. The trials have been severe. The battles have been fierce. I have endured hardness. Many hard things have been said. I have been falsely accused. Men professing to be

gospel ministers have sought to injure me in different ways-and they were Old Baptist ministers, too. It all makes me heart sick. It makes me feel cast down and discouraged. It makes me sad-sad all the time. There is a feeling of gloom and sadness that stays with me-no matter how well I may feel physically. I do not feel any physical ailment that is worth mentioning. If I am poisoned with malaria I do not know it, though I may be. Whatever may be the trouble, I am willing to risk the principles I have stood for and advocated during these years. I may not be embraced in them-but they are true just the same. If I am not saved by the grace of God, then I am not saved at all. By his preserving care I have come this far. I am willing to still trust Him. His grace has been sufficient in the sore trials through which I have come, and I am willing to rely on Him for the future. I may never see you again (I think I once knew you), but this is my hope, and my only hope. Yes, I would be glad for you to write me about the trial which you mention. Mother is getting along as well as could be expected. Our little girl, about five years old, is named Florida. Not Flor-i-da, but Flo-ri-da. The little boy is Claudis H., Jr.; the baby is Benjamin Fleming, for his grandfathers. We call him Fleming, for my father. They are sweet children, we think. We try to raise them right. We teach them to speak respectfully and not like many children these days. We realize the great responsibility. Please remember us in your prayers. Would be glad to hear from you any time. May the good Lord bless and keep you. Yours in humble hope, C. H. Cayce.

Matthew 18:8-9, 15-17

---April 15, 1923

We have been asked to give our views on (Matthew 18:8-9,15-16,17). (Matthew 18:8-9) reads: "Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire." It seems to us that this language clearly teaches that it is better for the church to cast an offender off, no matter how important that member may appear to us to be, rather than retain that member to the destruction of the body. And the language has direct reference to such matters as are an offense to the body. It has no reference whatever to matters of personal trespass, one member or person against another. Such crimes as drunkenness, lying, stealing, "bootlegging," false swearing, fornication, adultery, and things of that sort, come under the teaching of the Saviour here, and there is no such thing found as instruction to labor with them in order to save or retain them in the church. The only gospel labor to bestow in such cases, the only dealing we can find in the Scriptures for such cases, is to simply cut them off. The church is no reformatory. Such offenders should be promptly excluded from the fellowship of the church. (Matthew 18:15-16,17) reads: "Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." This language has reference to personal trespasses, one member or person against another; such matters as personal differences between brethren, not public matters, such as are those things mentioned above. It seems to us that the Saviour's instructions here are so plain

and so explicit as to need no comment. We do not know how to make it plainer. But if a brother is hurt with another and he fails and refuses to follow the instruction given here, and feels that he cannot bear it, and talks to others about it, instead of going to the transgressor, he thereby becomes a transgressor himself. It seems to us that many of our churches have become careless and very slack in administering the discipline according to our Saviour's teaching in this chapter. It is better to have a few with strict discipline and be diligent and careful in church matters, than to have a multitude who manifest but little or no care for the service of the Lord and the house of God. C. H. C.

The Debate At Parrish

---April 15, 1923

The debate with Tant at Parrish, Ala., came off as announced. We affirmed for two days-the 13th and 14th of March-that "The church of which I (C. H. Cayce) am a member, known as Primitive Baptists, is Scriptural in origin, doctrine and practice." Then on the 15th and 16th Tant affirmed that "The church of which I (J. D. Tant) am a member, known by my brethren as the Church of Christ, is Scriptural in origin, doctrine and practice." We showed in our affirmative that Jesus established His church, and that there was a succession of them in every age who were a separate and distinct people, advocating and holding to the principles peculiar to the Baptists and differing from Rome. On Tant's proposition we showed that Alexander Campbell was the founder of that order, and that they are Campbellites. We showed this from an abundance of testimony; then we showed from the Scriptures that their doctrine and practice are wrong-contrary to God's word. We introduced fifty-three proof texts against his doctrine and he pretended to notice just four of them-thus forty-nine proof texts and arguments made from them remained unnoticed by him. Our people left there rejoicing.

We are now at the home of Brother H. P. Hamilton. Have enjoyed some good meetings since the debate. We trust the Lord may be with us and enable us to speak such things as may be comforting and encouraging to His humble poor while we are on this tour. We ask an interest in your prayers. C. H. C.

Debate At Watertown, Tenn

---April 15, 1923

We have agreed, the Lord willing, to meet H. B. Taylor, Missionary Baptist, of Murray, Ky., in a four days discussion at Watertown, Tenn., beginning on Tuesday, May 8. One proposition is, "The Scriptures teach that all the elect of God in all nations will be saved independently of or without the gospel as a means." We affirm and Taylor denies. The other proposition is, "Missions as taught and practiced by the Missionary Baptists are authorized by the word of God." Taylor affirms and we deny. Watertown is east of Nashville, Tenn., on the Tennessee Central R. R. We hope many of our brethren may be there. All will be cared for who may go. C. H. C.

Questions On Predestination

---May 1, 1923

We are just in receipt of a few questions on the subject of the absolute predestination of all things, and we will try to answer them to the best of our ability.

Question 1. Did Paul find the word predestination in the Old Testament? Answer: We suppose not, but he found words that express the idea of God's determination to save His people from their sins. Remember, too, that Paul was an inspired man.

Question 2. Do we find the word absolute in the New Testament? Answer: No; it is not found in the whole Bible, and we have no inspired men now. What about adding to? See **(Revelation 22:18)**.

Question 3. Have you or anyone preached for ten minutes without using some words that are not found in the Bible? Answer: If we ever did preach for ten minutes, or any other length of time, and preached something the Bible does not authorize, we then preached something that is not the truth. If any other man ever preached something the Bible does not authorize, he did not preach the truth.

Question 4. Is all the prophecy of the Old and New Testament absolutely true?

Answer: It is all true, and to say it is absolutely true does not make it any more the truth.

Question 5. Is not prophecy of the Old Testament another way of saying predestination? Answer: No; prophecy is not predestination. Prophecy is foretelling an event or events. Predestination is to determine a thing beforehand. A coming event may be foretold without any determination that it shall come to pass on the part of the one foretelling or revealing it.

Question 6. Why turn our back on a man for believing as I do? Answer: If you believe that God did from all eternity absolutely and unconditionally predestinate everything that comes to pass, and your doctrine is the truth, we turn our back on you because God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated from all eternity that we should do it. If your doctrine is not the truth, we turn our back on you because you preach heresy. C. H. C.

Is He An Absoluter?

---May 1, 1923

In our issue of March 15 we showed that Elder J. B. Hardy was advocating the absolute predestination of all things. Last July we stated that he was in line with the Absoluters in this country. Our readers will remember Elder Hardy's article in our issue of March 15, in which he tried to make it appear that the predestination of all things was not the cause of the division in this country, and that he is not in line with that doctrine. We publish below two letters—one from Brother W. A. Womack and one from Elder V R. Harris. Both of these brethren tell in their letter where they stand, and they also tell where Elder Hardy stands. We do not publish these letters for any other purpose only to show where Elder Hardy stands by the testimony of brethren who say, themselves, that they hold to unlimited predestination. Read the letters and judge for yourself. C. H. C.

FROM W. A. WOMACK

A. J. Breece, Centerville, Tenn.

Dear Brother—It has been in my mind for a good while to write you a few lines. I saw a letter that you wrote to Brother Blythe stating that J. B. Hardy was causing trouble among you all. Well, there is only one thing I can say, he sure has caused a lot of trouble over here. Before he came in here we were all in peace one with another. He is a man that wants to rule or ruin. He said here when this trouble started that before he would cause trouble he would get out of the way, but he did not get out of the way. It seems that he worked more (the harder) to carry his point. I suppose that there was a council out there to prove that he was not an "Absoluter." Well, all I know, and that is, he had a council here to prove his standing among the Baptists, and tried to prove that he was not a

"Conditionalist" but believed in absolute predestination of all things; and these men that went over there with him are some of the men that went off with him and helped to cause part of the trouble. That man Glover lives about two or three miles from us. Right here is where the trouble first started. We sure have had a hard time. It sure has caused a lot of pain and tears to be shed, and we had to give up our church. I guess we could have got it by going to law for it, but we had rather let them have it than to go to law, because I don't believe that is Scripture. Well, I may be doing wrong in writing to you about it, but I felt like I would just like to write you a few lines. I like to see a body to be just what they are any and everywhere. He would say and do things, and then when you would get after him and then he would deny it, and that don't look good to me among Old Baptists. If a man is a "Conditionalist," let him be a "Conditionalist;" and if he is an "Absoluter," let him be one, and not just try to be on both sides at once. I hope I believe in predestination of all things. Well I will close. I would like to hear from you. From a poor sinner saved by the grace of God, if saved at all. W. A. Womack. Star City, Ark., April 17, 1921.
FROM ELDER V R. HARRIS
Mr. N. J. Hinson, Kimmins, Tenn.

Dear Brother-Your short letter of inquiry to hand regarding Elder J. B. Hardy and his religious positions. Well, I am quite well acquainted with Brother Hardy-been with and preached with him several times. We understand Elder J. B. Hardy to be what is called an unlimited Predestinarian Baptist-one who believes God was before all things and that by Him all things consist, and that Elder Hardy is no "Conditionalist" whatever. Elder Hardy preaches with what is called the unlimited Predestinarian Baptists, of the old London Confession of Faith type. If Elder J. B. Hardy was what is called a "Conditionalist Baptist" he would not have any fellowship with us, for we stand strictly aloof from all "Con-ditionalists," styling all of them "Arminians." If things are conditional in any way, they might all be. So we think all things were predestinated so as that none come by chance. Well, we will not write further, as you may be a "Conditionalist," and that is strictly your business, if you are, and are honest and see that way, but I don't. With kindest regards to you and all who love our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, I am, your poor unworthy brother, if one,
V R. HARRIS. Fordyce, Ark., Nov. 26, 1920.

Debate With Ben M. Bogard

---May 1, 1923

We have agreed to meet Ben M. Bogard in a discussion at Leedy, Miss., to begin on Tuesday after the third Sunday in July, 1923. Rev. Bogard is the champion of the anti-board faction of the Missionaries, we understand. The identity of the church is what is to be discussed. Leedy is on the I C. Railroad, about fifteen miles from Corinth, Miss., toward Birmingham, Ala. Preparations will be made to care for all who attend the discussion, and we trust many of our brethren and friends may be there. C. H. C.

Apology and Explanation

---May 15, 1923

In our last issue was a letter from Elder A. B. Ross to Elder J. T. Davis with the reply from Elder Davis. This article was in the office several days before the Greenfield meeting and we hardly expected the printer to get to it in time for the

last issue of the paper. But when we got home on Monday morning after the meeting the papers were already printed and being mailed with that article in them. We were too late to keep it out. This explains why it was published. We are sorry that it was published, since we attended that meeting and witnessed what transpired there. But we cannot undo it. All we know to do is to express the fact that we are sorry and to beg all who are concerned to forgive and not think hard of us. Brethren, will' you do this? We wrote Elder Ross at once privately, and we hope he will not think hard of us, and that others will not. So far as we are concerned we hope that the trouble is ended, or that the war is over. May the Lord help us to live in peace. C. H. C.

Peace Meeting At Greenfield

---May 15, 1923

We left Winfield, Ala., on Thursday morning, April 26, for Jackson, Tenn., to spend the night with Elder D. Hopper. We had not then fully decided to go to the meeting at Greenfield. On the way to Jackson we met some brethren who were on their way to Greenfield, and at Jackson we met some others. Elder Hopper was at the train to meet another brother. He was not expecting us. We spent the night with him, and our mind was there made up to go on to Greenfield to attend the meeting. We arrived in Greenfield at about 9 o'clock. Several brethren met the train, and they manifested to us very clearly that they were glad to see us there. Right then we began to feel glad that we went. The full minute of the proceedings may be found in this paper. Every brother in the ministry who was present manifested a penitent heart for having ever been engaged in the recent unholy war that started in Texas, spoken of as the whole man doctrine and the hollow log doctrine, and all confessed freely and publicly that they had said and done things that were wrong, and begged forgiveness of every brother who was hurt with them. All personal wrongs and hurts were forgiven, and the brethren all expressed a desire to live together in peace and fellowship, and that they would do all they could to get all irregularities corrected and to get the brethren and churches together where there had been a division. They all expressed a desire to labor to that end. How much better this is than to labor to destroy, and to labor for a following. It looked to us like the dawning of a better day. Our heart was made glad to see such manifestations and expressions of love as were clearly demonstrated during the entire meeting. Surely the Lord manifested His sweet presence. We know that we said in The Primitive Baptist that we did not see fit to sign the call for the meeting. We felt a dread of the result of it. Perhaps it is best that we did not sign the call; but we are glad that we were there. That is the best way we know how to express the feeling we have in regard to it. We believe that much good will result from this meeting. We would be so glad to see all our good brethren united in love and fellowship and standing together in defense of the truth against our common enemies and for the order of God's house. May the Lord help us all to contend for the things that make for peace and for the things that edify and build up the Lord's little children, and never contend for such things as divide them and destroy their peace and fellowship, and that tend to confuse their minds. We need each other, and we all need to walk in the right way. May the Lord help us all to walk in that way that will honor our profession and glorify His name. We desire an interest in the prayers of all our brethren and sisters, that the Lord may sustain and keep us. Brethren, if you see an error in us, please come to us in kindness and show us the wrong. If we err we want to be right. Show us the right way when we go wrong. That will not make us feel that you are our enemy, but that you are our friend. If we are wrong on some

minor point, and cannot see the wrong, do not treat us as an enemy on that account. If we are not deceived we love the Old Baptist Church and cause. We feel that we would rather give our life for the cause than for the cause to suffer. May the Lord bless you all, dear brethren; and may we never be alienated again in our feelings as we were. Please do remember us in your prayers. We need your help and expressions of love and fellowship. C. H. C.

Greenfield Meeting

---May 15, 1923

In response to the following call sent out and signed by a number of brethren, the following named brethren in the ministry, besides a number of other brethren and sisters, met at the Primitive Baptist meeting house in Greenfield, Tenn., on Friday morning, April 27, 1923: Inasmuch as we, the undersigned, are more thoroughly convinced that in the late controversy over the subject of regeneration there was not sufficient difference to justify confusion and division, and having a great desire for peace and union, we urge all our brethren concerned for the peace and welfare of our bleeding cause to come together at Greenfield Church, at Greenfield, Tenn., on Friday before the fifth Sunday in April, 1923, for the purpose of general confession. The object of said meeting being not to make any demands nor bring in charges regarding the past, but to make confessions to each other, blotting out the past, and come together in peace, love and fellowship. All who desire peace, we urge that you come. We suggest that each church enable their preacher to come by bearing his expenses. The following named ministers were present: Elders J. D. Shain, W. A. Bishop, James Duncan, J. H. Phillips, Z. Stallings, S. E. Reid, C. H. Cayce, N. V. Parker, J. W. Adams, W. P. Russell, J. W. Lomax, John Grist, W. E. Brush, R. L. Perry, Marshall Perry, J. C. Ross, A. B. Ross, Henry Ross, W. J. Goodrich, J. S. Williams, Commodore Brann, J. B. Halbrook, J. R. Scott, J. A. Pope; Licentiates J. C. Phipps, A. C. Ross, G. W. Hardison. Elder S. E. Reid, of the Predestinarian Association, was appointed to preach, which he did after offering prayer. Elder S. E. Reid was chosen as moderator to preside over the meeting. A statement was made as to the purpose of the meeting, which was not to regulate the churches, but especially for the purpose of the brethren in the ministry coming together, and all who feel to do so to confess their faults one to another, as the Lord has commanded in **((6) (James 5:16))** "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that you may be healed." Then nearly every brother (minister) present arose, one by one, and frankly and freely stated that he had done and said things that were wrong, and asked forgiveness of every brother whom he had wronged in any way. A song was sung and the hand of fellowship extended to each other, amidst shouts of praise and tears of joy, in token of forgiveness of all personal wrongs and a desire to labor together to get all irregularities corrected and to get our good brethren together where they have become separated in this unholy war. The moderator, upon unanimous vote of the body, appointed Elders C. H. Cayce, Jas. Duncan, Z. Stallings and J. D. Shain as a committee to draft a statement for presentation on tomorrow. Adjourned to meet tomorrow morning at 10:30.

SATURDAY MORNING Met pursuant to adjournment.

Called the roll. Elder John Grist was absent, having been called home on account of sickness. Elder Henry Ross was absent on account of sickness in his family. Elder J. A. Pope was absent on account of a request to visit his mother. By oversight, no secretary or clerk was appointed on yesterday. By motion and second, which was carried, Elder C. H. Cayce was appointed clerk of this meeting. Called for the report

of the committee appointed on yesterday to draft a statement for presentation today, when they presented and read the following:
STATEMENT

Whereas, There has been recently an unholy war engaged in through this section, as well as other sections, on the question of regeneration, and we having engaged in the war, more or less; and, being fully persuaded in our own minds that there should never have been any war among us on that question; and feeling sure that our brethren with whom we have thus been warring are really and truly Primitive Baptists, we feel a desire in our hearts, and do confess our wrong in engaging in the war and agitating the question; and we are sorry of every wrong we have done, and every wrong and harsh word said and spoken of our brethren, and humbly beg forgiveness of each other, and gladly and freely forgive every personal wrong done us. We desire to live together in peace and fellowship and to stand together in opposition to our common enemies-the enemies to the truth. And we desire, and will use our every energy and strength to get all irregularities resulting from this war corrected and to get all our good brethren together again. We request all our periodicals who desire peace among our people to publish this statement, together with the proceedings of this meeting. Respectfully submitted, C. H. Cayce, Jas. Duncan, Z. Stallings, J. D. Shain, Committee. Upon the second reading the clerk suggested that the following words be added to the statement as originally presented, "together with the proceedings of this meeting." By motion and second and unanimous vote the amendment was adopted. Upon the completion of the third reading the vote was called for upon roll call. The clerk called the roll, and the vote resulted as follows: Ayes-J. D. Shain, W. A. Bishop, James Duncan, J. H. Phillips, Z. Stallings, S. E. Reid, C. H. Cayce, N. V. Parker, J. W. Adams, W. P. Russell, J. W. Lomax, W. E. Brush, R. L. Perry, Marshall Perry, J. C. Ross, A. B. Ross, W. J. Goodrich, J. S. Williams, Commodore Brann, J. B. Halbrook, J. R. Scott; Licentiates J. C. Phipps, A. C. Ross, G. W. Hardison. Nays-None. The statement was, therefore, unanimously adopted. Then, by motion and second, the statement was unanimously approved and indorsed by rising vote of every Primitive Baptist present. The hour for preaching service having arrived, prayer was offered by Elder J. W. Adams, and Elders J. R. Scott, J. D. Shain and W. A. Bishop, in the order of their names, addressed the people, as appointed. Elders C. H. Cayce and W. P. Russell were appointed to preach on tomorrow. Minutes read and approved by unanimous vote. Elder S. E. Reid, Moderator. Elder C. H. Cayce, Clerk.

Tour In Alabama

---May 15, 1923

We returned home Monday morning, April 30, from an extended trip in Alabama. After the debate at Parrish with Mr. Tant we filled appointments as arranged by Elder S. G. Hamilton in the Lost Creek Association, and by Elder H. H. Goodman in the Hillabee Association, and by Elder J. J. Turnipseed in the We-tumpka and Choctawhatchie Associations. On the way back we stopped at Carbon Hill on Monday after the fourth Sunday, as we were rained out at that place in filling the appointments arranged by Elder Hamilton, and we were at Union Church, near Winfield, on Tuesday and Wednesday following. We missed one of the appointments in the Hillabee on account of rain. We believe we filled all the appointments as arranged except as here mentioned. We had a very pleasant and enjoyable trip most all the way. At a few places the congregations were small on account of bad weather, but at most of the places the Congregations were good. We met a number of brethren in the ministry, but as we made no notes of the

names of brethren whom we met we will not attempt to mention the names. We would not want to mention some without making mention of all of them, and we do not believe we can do this from memory. We enjoyed some pleasant meetings, and the brethren were good and kind to us. They were much better to us than we feel to deserve. We met some brethren -whom we had never met before and had a great desire to meet. Some we had met before and had a great desire to meet again. All the brethren whom we heard express themselves heartily endorsed our feeble efforts in proclaiming the unsearchable riches of our Lord and Master. We humbly trust that our visit among them may do none of them any harm. It was our desire to try to speak such things as might have a tendency to bind God's children together in love and fellowship-to speak the truth in love. We shall not soon forget the kindness manifested to us at the places we visited-in the good homes where we were so kindly cared for, as well as at the churches. May the good Lord shower down His rich blessings upon them all, is our humble prayer. We ask that we be kindly remembered in the prayers of those among whom we went, that the Lord may enable us to proclaim the glories of our King to the comfort of His humble poor. We would be glad to give a more extended account of the trip but our space is limited, and there are some other matters that we must give some space to. C. H. C.

Gospel Messenger Sold

---May 15, 1923

Elder Z. C. Hull has sold the Gospel Messenger to Elder R.H. Pittman, of Luray, Va. Elder Pittman was already the editor and publisher of the Zion's Advocate. The paper will now be published under the name of the Advocate and Messenger, with a Southern Department. The former Messenger staff of editors are now on the Southern Department, except Elder Hassell, who has been transferred to the regular staff. The paper will be issued in pamphlet form. We wish Elder Pittman success. C. H. C.

Back On The Staff

---June 1, 1923

On this page will be found an article from Elder J. C. Ross, of Greenfield, Tenn., and one from Elder W. E. Brush, McKenzie, Tenn., consenting for their names to again be placed on our editorial staff. Before the unholy war among our people on regeneration, as it was termed, these brethren, so far as we knew, stood shoulder to shoulder with us. We are glad that all differences have been settled, and we trust that we may ever stand as we once did. We are also glad to have these dear brethren with us again on our editorial staff, and we hope they may write often and that their writings may be blessed to the comfort and benefit of the Lord's dear children and to the unifying of them in love. "Speaking the truth in love," does not divide or confuse the Lord's people. Let us remember this, and let the things alone that confuse them. May the Lord direct us all and keep us in the right way, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Trip In Tennessee

---June 15, 1923

We left home on Tuesday night, May 6, for Watertown, Tenn., to meet Elder H. B. Taylor, of Murray, Ky., in a four days discussion, May 8 to 11. At the meeting in Greenfield, Tenn., the fifth Sunday in April a number of brethren insisted that we employ a stenographer and have the speeches taken and publish the discussion in book form. So we had one employed, Miss Grace Dawson, of Nashville, Tenn., who took our discussion with Mr. Srygley, and she was there and took the speeches as delivered, and the discussion will be published as soon as possible. She told us on the first Sunday night that it will be about six weeks before she can get the speeches transcribed. We have gone into the publication of this work solely for the benefit of our people. We are not really financially able to undertake the work; but a number of the brethren suggested that our people would gladly give enough orders in advance to meet the expense of the stenographer. At present the orders have not amounted to half enough to pay her for the work. We hope our brethren will write us at once and order what books they will take for themselves and dispose of for us. We need the money to enable us to meet the expense of the stenographer. We cannot make an estimate of the cost so low but what we will have to sell them at \$1.50 each. We hope our good brethren will help us out in this. The debate passed off very pleasantly, and as to whether a victory was gained for the truth, the book will speak for itself. After the debate we filled appointments at Testament, Walnut Grove, Friendship, Hickman and Brush Creek, in the Round Lick Association. We failed to get to Testament the first day on account of rain, but had two days there, Sunday and Monday, May 13, 14. Then on Tuesday we failed to get to Walnut Grove on account of rain; but as Thursday was given for a rest day in the arrangements, we were there two days anyway. Elder W. L. Murray, of Nashville, Tenn., is the pastor at Testament. A good interest is manifested there. They have had no pastor at Walnut Grove for some time, but we think arrangements are made now for Elder Murray to go to both churches on the same trip. They are both some distance from the railroad, and we believe this is a good arrangement for them, and we trust the Lord may bless Brother Murray's labors among them. We were at Friendship three days, and enjoyed a good meeting there, as well as at the other places. Elder H. L. Golston is the pastor of this church. Then we were at Hickman and Brush Creek, one day at each place. Elder E. S. Frye is the pastor of both these churches. We were at the home of Elders Golston and Frye. They are both good brethren, and we love them both. We intended to get the names of all the brethren in the ministry who were at the debate, but we failed to get them. We will try to give their names from memory: Elder E. S. Frye, Brush Creek, Tenn., who served us as moderator; Elders J. R. Scott, Murray, Ky.; W. E. Brush, McKenzie, Tenn.; D. Wauford, McMinnville, Tenn.; W. C. McMillon, Newport, Tenn.; J. H. Phillips, Huron, Tenn.; and W. P. Russell, of Arrington, Tenn. There may have been others, but we cannot call them to mind now. If we have overlooked any, it is not intentional. There were also some licentiates present. From Brush Creek we went to Leiper's Fork, Big Harpeth, Enon, Eagleville, and South College Street, Nashville, in the Cumberland Association. Elder M. C. Johnson, of Thompson Sta., Tenn., is the pastor at Leiper's Fork and Eagleville. He was with us at all the churches in this association and at College Street, Nashville. Elder W. P. Russell is the pastor at Big Harpeth and Elder A. L. Graves is pastor at Enon. Elder Russell was with us at Big Harpeth and Enon, and Elder Graves was at Enon. The brethren there were expecting Elder Russell to be there, so they had it understood that they would have service in the morning and afternoon. We had the pleasure of hearing Elder Russell preach in the afternoon. From Enon we went to Eagleville, Elder Johnson with us, where we had meeting Saturday and fourth Sunday in May. This was the regular communion meeting, which service was engaged in on Sunday. A very good congregation was present both days, though there was rain on Sunday. A good

interest was manifested, and the meeting was enjoyed. We agreed to visit them again soon, if the Lord will. On Sunday night we went to Nashville. As first announced the appointment was made for Bethel church; but Elder Murray, the pastor at College Street, was informed that if that church desired it the appointment would be changed and given them instead of Bethel. He said that it was desired, so we went to College Street that night. It was a stormy and rainy night, but a good congregation assembled. Elders Murray and Johnson were present, and it was a very pleasant meeting. We were glad to be with them there again, and to meet some of them whom we had not seen for so long a time. Several of the Bethel members were present. From Nashville we went to Decherd, where there was an appointment for Monday. Our father-in-law, B. B. Lawler, of Brownsboro, Ala., met us there and remained with us at two more places. We were glad to see him, and enjoyed being with him for three days. The congregation at Decherd was small, but the few there seem to be a devoted little band. On Tuesday we were at Crow Creek, near Anderson, Tenn. The congregation- was small there, but we had a very pleasant meeting; were cared for in the home of Sister Hackworth, the widow of Brother Ike Hackworth. Her son is living with her, or she is living with him- we do not know which way that is, but they live at the old home place, and we suppose we may just say that they live together. The young man is not a member of the church, but he takes an interest, and we think he should come on in. On Wednesday we were at Walnut Grove, near Stevenson, Ala. There was a very good congregation at this place. Elder M. A. Hackworth lives in Stephenson, and was with us at the church. We spent Tuesday night in his home. We enjoyed a very pleasant meeting there. Brother J. M. Barker, of South Pittsburg, met us at Walnut Grove and conveyed us to his home and on to Sweeten's Cove on Thursday, where we enjoyed a very pleasant meeting. It had been a long time since we were with them at that place, and we were glad to see them once more. On Friday and Saturday nights we were with the church in North Chattanooga. Elder R. O. Raulston lives in Chattanooga, and was with us there. We enjoyed being in his home and being in his company once more. Elder Z. C. Hull, of Atlanta, Ga., came to Chattanooga to see us and spent a part of the day on Friday with us. Brother Hull, we think, is a good man, and he has no intention of going with the Progressives. He says that Elder Simms has renounced some of the things which the Progressives have gone into. We think now as we did when we wrote our comments some time ago, that when any of them get tired of all those new measures, and will be satisfied with the goodness of the Lord's house, we would be glad to see them come back; but the old church does not need to go anywhere or to make any concessions. She should stand firmly on the plain principles upon which she has stood through the ages past. We were glad to see Brother Hull, and would be glad to be associated with him more. We enjoyed good meetings with the church in Chattanooga. Decherd, Crow Creek, Sweeten's Cove and North Chattanooga are in the Sequachee Valley Association. On Saturday night after the meeting we went to the station and got a berth in a sleeper for Nashville- something we seldom do on account of the high cost- and we went to bed so as to get a night's sleep and rest, as we expected to be up all the next night on the way home, and so we would feel like being awake for the meeting on Sunday and Sunday night at Bethel Church in Nashville. Next morning when we awoke the train was in Wartrace, fifty-five miles from Nashville. There was a freight train wreck between us and Nashville, and we had to wait for the wreck to be cleared so we could go on. We tried to get a call through from there over the telephone to Nashville, so as to get some of the brethren to meet us in Murfreesboro, and we would get a taxi to go that far from Wartrace, and by this means get to Nashville in time for meeting. But we failed to get the call through. It appeared to us that it was

the fault of some operator, as calls were put through for others that were made later. So we did not get to Nashville until about one o'clock, and got to the place of meeting just after services were dismissed and before they were all gone. A large crowd was there, and we were sorry that we failed to get there in time for meeting that day; but we were with them that night and enjoyed a good meeting, and a good crowd was present. Elder Murray had a stenographer present who took the discourse down and he will publish the sermon in his paper, The Gospel Trumpet. Elder Murray began the publication of the little magazine in February, 1923. It is published monthly, and each issue contains one or two sermons delivered by some brother of our faith. It is a good little magazine, and we know of no other that is just like it. The subscription price is \$1.50 a year. If any of our readers wish to subscribe for it, send your subscription to us or to Murray & Campbell, 129 Third Ave. S., Nashville, Tenn. If you wish to see a sample copy, we suppose they would be glad to send you one. During the month of June they are offering to take subscriptions at \$1 a year. Sunday night at eleven o'clock we started from Nashville for home, and arrived home on Monday afternoon at 5:40 and found all well, for which we trust we are thankful. The brethren were good to us, and we enjoyed being with them. Many of them we have often been with in years gone by. We love them, and we love their company and sweet fellowship. Though our home is not now in that country, yet we feel like they are our home folks, and it is like going home to visit them. May the good Lord bless them for all their kindness shown us, is our humble prayer. We ask and trust that we may have an interest in their prayers, as well as an interest in the prayers of all our readers. C. H. C.

Remarks To W. R. Blasingame

---June 15, 1923

We have no inclination to go into a meeting with the Progressives in a church capacity, or any other capacity, with such an object in view as was expressed in that call which was made. They have departed from the Primitive Baptist practice, and they know the way back without having any kind of meeting with them. If any of them are tired of their departures and new measures and desire to come back to the old church, we would not throw a straw in their way. C. H. C.

Remarks To A Letter

---June 15, 1923

We trust that we fully appreciate the above kind words and expressions of endorsement. A great many of the dear brethren whom we have met on our trip in Alabama have expressed themselves face to face with us as heartily endorsing all we said in regard to the matter. It seems to us that for some time there has been a spirit of compromise manifested. If we do not wish to be found "departing from the living God" in our doctrine or practice, it will be well for us to be careful how we compromise with those who have departed. May the Lord preserve and keep some to maintain the principles of truth and righteousness, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

John 9:31

---July 1, 1923

Brother Cayce: I wish to ask you a question. **(John 9:31)** says: "Now we know that God heareth not sinners: but" if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth His will, him He heareth." Who said this? I understand it was the blind man who

said it. My Arminian friends say it was the Jews. Please answer through the paper.
W. T. Pettus. Lexington, Ala.

REMARKS

Your question is plainly answered in the Book. (John 9:30) says, "The man answered and said unto them, Why herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence He is, and yet He hath opened mine eyes." The man continues his statement, and what he said is recorded in (John 9:30-33) inclusive; then in (John 9:34) "they" - the Jews- "answered and said unto him." Any man who knows the meaning of the simplest words can know by reading these verses that it was the man born blind who used the language in (John 9:31). C. H. C.

On Our Staff Again

---July 1, 1923

We are glad to say to our readers that we have again obtained the consent of Elder Lee Hanks to place his name on our editorial staff as one of our corresponding editors. In this paper will be found an article from him under the heading, "A Lovely Greeting." Brother Hanks is a good writer, as our readers know, and we are sure they will be glad that Elder Hanks is again with us and will write for our columns. Elder Hanks calls attention to some things in his article which have caused trouble among the Old Baptists, and which are now causing trouble among them, and which always will do so. There are some who say much about peace and wanting peace, and yet have such things among them, or some of the things, which Elder Hanks names. If they want peace, as they say they do, they should prove it by getting rid of such things. We cannot have peace as long as fornicators, perjurers, liars, and other such like characters are tolerated among us. Ungodly practice tolerated in the church will destroy the church as effectually and as quickly as false doctrine.

The grace of God in the heart teaches us "that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly." If one does not live that way he has no business in the church. We need all God's people in the church who believe the doctrine of God and who walk uprightly; but we do not need those who lead ungodly lives. They are a shame and a reproach upon the cause, and there cannot be true and lasting peace with such retained in the church. We humbly trust that the labors of our dear brother, Elder Lee Hanks, with us in the publication of The Primitive Baptist may be blessed of the Lord to the advancement and good of His cause and people. C. H. C. Elder Hanks' article and the above were written last December, but there was a hitch in the arrangement. Now there has been an understanding and Elder Hanks has written us to put his name on the staff, and we do so with this issue and insert the articles that were written in December. We trust the Lord may bless our efforts and labors for the benefit of His humble poor. C. H. C.

Acts 19:1-3 AND 1 Corinthians 14:34-35

---July 1, 1923

Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother in Christ-I want to ask your views on some Scriptures that a Missionary sister asked me about. * * * * The Scriptures I want your views on are **((9:1) (Acts 19:1-3)** and (I Corinthians 14:34-35). What is meant by the Holy Ghost, spoken of so much in the Bible? I say it is the Spirit. Amos I wrong? What does it mean in so many places speaking of the Holy Ghost

falling on the people? Pray for a poor old sinner saved by grace, if saved at all. Mrs. T. S. Murrie. Avant, Okla.

REMARKS

In a great many places where the New Testament speaks of the Holy Ghost falling on the people it means in a miraculous way—a miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit. It sometimes has reference to the work of the Spirit as a Comforter. Sometimes it has reference to the work of the Spirit as a Teacher to guide into all truth. It seems that there was some kind of special gift of the Spirit which was given by the laying on of the hands of the apostles. This seems to be what was under consideration in **(9:1) (Acts 19:1-3)**. We do not know how to offer any comment on (I Corinthians 14:34-35) to make it any plainer. The apostle there simply forbids women making speeches in the church. For a woman to preach or to make a speech in the church is to simply do what is here plainly and positively forbidden. Language could not make it any plainer than the apostle made it. May the Lord bless you, dear sister, and give you grace and strength for your day and trial. C. H. C.

Debate At Leedy, Miss.

---July 1, 1923

If not providentially prevented we will be on hand to meet Ben M. Bogard, D. D., in debate at, or near, Leedy, Miss., on Tuesday after the third Sunday in July. Leedy is on the I. C. R. R., about thirteen miles from Corinth, Miss., toward Birmingham, Ala. Write Elder Geo. N. Gober, Leedy, Miss., at once, if you intend going on the train. But do not stay away if you fail to write him. We think arrangements will be made to care for all who attend. Dr. Bogard is a Missionary Baptist, with the anti-board faction, or the "Land-markers." The question of church identity is to be discussed. C. H. C.

Remarks To J. T. Jackson

---July 15, 1923

We are of the opinion that some called the expressions harsh because they were arguments which could not be answered. If you make an argument that cannot be refuted some men will then say your words are harsh and ungodly. We do not need the ungodly doctrine that God predestinated the sin and wickedness that is done in the world, and we have no apology to make for saying so. Now let some man or set of men make complaint to our church about this if they want to—but come with the proof of the complaint when you bring it. We will be there, the Lord willing, to defend the eternal truth of God. C. H. C.

Lesson Learned By Experience

---September 1, 1923

"Experience is a great teacher," so we have always heard, and we are sure it is true. When one learns a lesson in his experience, he knows it is true. In the experience of grace the Lord's children are taught a lesson that they never entirely forget. They may be blinded by the gods of this world, and taught false doctrines by false teachers, but they do not entirely forget what they have learned in their experiences, though they may be so blinded by false teachers as to deny what they have been taught in their experiences. When one has been brought to experience the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and made to feel himself to be a sinner, he realizes

that his eternal condemnation is just. He is made to feel just as the poet expressed: If my soul were sent to hell, Thy righteous law approves it well. In this sad feeling, he is made to realize that there is a place of eternal punishment, called hell; and that if justice should be meted out to him that would be his doom. When that burden of sin and condemnation is removed, he feels that he is "snatched as it were a brand from the eternal burning" -he feels to praise the name of the Lord that he is saved from eternal punishment. If there is no such thing as an eternal hell, or an eternal punishment, then the experience of grace is a farce-it is a lie. What poor child of God can afford to say the experience of grace is a lie? The man posing as an Old Baptist preacher who preaches such a doctrine as that simply denies the experience of grace, and has no business in the Old Baptist Church. He should be excluded so quick that he could hardly know how it was done. To deny an experience of grace, and what is learned by experience, is to deny the work of the Lord -or to charge God with teaching His little children a lie, in His leading and teaching them in their experience. The Old Baptists, in our humble judgment, do not need any such teachers among them. The Lord does not teach His children a lesson in their experience that is contrary to what He teaches in His Book. Jesus says," These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." The same word translated everlasting with reference to the punishment of the wicked is the word translated eternal with reference to the life of the righteous. One is just as long as the other. If the punishment of the wicked ceases, the life of the righteous will cease at the same time. When one ends the other ends. If one never ends, then the other never ends. If there is no such thing as an eternal hell, or endless punishment, then Jesus did not save anyone from an endless hell by His suffering and death. Then Jesus did not accomplish anything for poor sinners by His death on the cross. Hence, Universalism denies the atonement of Christ. It is anti-Christ. As for us, we are not ready yet to deny the atonement made by our Lord, nor are we ready to deny the experience of grace. To deny these is to deny the only hope for a poor sinner. C. H. C.

God's Work Not Man's Work - Remarks To C. D. Willis

---September 15, 1923

On another page in this paper is an article from Brother C. D. Willis, of Witt, Va., over which we placed the heading," God's Work Not Man's Work." We feel that some remarks should be made by us concerning some things contained in the article. He seems to think that some brethren do not give God the praise and the honor for the good things done. Brother Willis says, "I understand the Scriptures to teach just one doctrine, and that is by grace and grace alone-not by works of righteousness that anyone has done." So far as regeneration is concerned, or so far as the receiving of eternal life is concerned, or so far as being made a child of God is concerned, or being saved with an everlasting salvation, this is true. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." -(Titus 3:5). This is all of grace, from first to last, and the works of men are all excluded. While this is true, there is another saving spoken of in the Bible which is accomplished by doing what is commanded. "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." -(I Timothy 4:16). Here is a saving that is accomplished by doing something, and doing something is working. The saving is accomplished by doing, what is here commanded. But this saving is not an eternal saving, or becoming a child of God, for Timothy was already a child of God. But by doing what is here commanded he

would save himself and those that hear him from false ways, false doctrines, and many wrong things they may fall into by not taking heed. The word "hear" in this text means to heed. In the saving mentioned in **(Titus 3:5)** there are no conditions and no works of the creature; but in the saving mentioned in **(I Timothy 4:16)** there are works commanded and required. "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." -(Romans 8:13). There is no disputing the fact that there are conditions in this text. No man on earth who knows anything at all about the meaning of words would dare deny this. But there is no condition required or commanded of one in order that he become a child of God. The church of God at Rome was not composed of alien sinners. They were children of God, and it was necessary for them to not live after the flesh, but to mortify the deeds of the body through the Spirit, in order to live in the fellowship and enjoyment of the church state. It was not the Spirit that was to mortify the deeds of the body, but they themselves were to do that through the Spirit. To say that the Spirit does it is a perversion of the text. And to say that there is no condition in the text is a flagrant denial of plain language. Or to say the text requires a work to be performed by alien sinners, is a misrepresentation of the facts. Brother Willis says, "The Scriptures teach that there is no power but of God." That expression is found in **(Romans 13:1)**, There we find this language: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." - (Romans 13:1-4). This shows very clearly that the powers mentioned are magistrates, or rulers, which are for the punishment of evildoers. God has ordained government for the punishment of evildoers, and for the protection of His people, and His moral creatures in right doing. The apostle here teaches that we should be law abiding. Laws and rulers to execute them are ordained of God for the punishment of evildoers and for the protection of those who do right. To resist these powers, and to not be law abiding, is to resist what God has ordained for the protection of those who do right. To say that wicked power comes from, or emanates from, God is a perversion of this text. "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men." -(Titus 3:1-2). Here the apostle plainly commands to be subject to powers and obey magistrates. God's children should be a law-abiding people. Especially should Old Baptists be obedient to the laws of the land, so far as conscience in matters of worship are not interfered with. If there were no probability or possibility for them to do otherwise than obey, then there was no necessity for the apostle to say what he did, and the language would be meaningless. "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." - (Ephesians 6:12). Here the apostle tells us he wrestled against powers, or fought against them. Were they the same kind of powers he admonished obedience to? Certainly not. These powers which he fought against were wicked powers-spiritual wickedness in high places-or heavenly places-the church. Things that are ungodly and that are wrong are sometimes brought into the church, and it is right to fight against them. The man who will not do so is not a good soldier. We do not know of any Old Baptists who are advocating a doctrine that gives man any more power

than belongs to him. No man in an unregenerate state can render gospel service unto the Lord that would be acceptable unto Him. God gives His children the power and the ability to obey Him, but they do not always obey. "But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness." -(**I Corinthians 10:5**). This is a plain and positive statement that God was not well pleased with those people, and they were overthrown in the wilderness for their disobedience. The apostle tells us in (I Corinthians 10:11)," Now all these things happened unto them for examples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." The punishments mentioned came upon them for their wrong doings, and those things are written as warnings to us. If they had no power to do any better than they did, then upon what principle of justice were they punished for their disobedience? And if God's children now cannot render obedience to Him, and have to disobey, what could be the necessity of warning them, or what good could the warning do? Those people who fell in the wilderness did not please God. The apostle plainly says so. Was it because God did not give them the ability? Would a loving and merciful parent require more of his child than a child could do, and then punish the child because he did not do it? To say that God has done such a thing is to charge Him with injustice. Those people disobeyed and they were justly punished for their wrong doings; and, therefore, their sins are not to be charged to the reason that God did not "work in them." God's children are not in the flesh. They can please God. If they cannot please God, they are in no better condition than the unregenerate are. "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." -(Romans 8:8-9). God's children have the Spirit of God dwelling in them, and they are not in the flesh.' To be in the flesh is to be in an unregenerate state. Those who are in an unregenerate state are in the flesh, and cannot please God. Those who have been regenerated are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, and they can please God. This is clearly taught by the apostle, and to deny it is to deny inspiration. It is wicked for a child of God to argue that God's people are in the flesh and cannot please God. It is a denial of what the apostle has here plainly taught. To argue that they cannot please God is to deny the power that God has given them, and is to fail to give Him the honor that belongs to Him. God is the teacher of His people in an experimental sense, but His ministers are teachers. There are some things He is pleased to call and qualify His ministers to teach. To preach is to teach. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." -(Matthew 28:19-20). There is some teaching which these men were commanded to do. To deny this is as bad as to deny that the Lord teaches His people in their regeneration and experience. One of the qualifications of a man in order that he be ordained to the ministry is that he be apt to teach. Why such a qualification if God has no teaching to be done by man? "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and shew my people their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins." -((8:1) (Isaiah 58:1). If God's people never need any one to tell them of their wrongs, why did the Lord tell Isaiah to show them their sins? We do not now remember the article Brother Willis refers to which was written by a sister, nor do we now remember what sister it was, but we do know that Brother Willis does not quote the language correctly. The apostle does not say the Lord works in them the will and the do. What the apostle says is this: "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." -((3) (Philippians 2:13). The apostle says God works in them TO WILL and TO DO-but does not say He works in them the will and the do. We should be careful not to

garble what the Bible says. If our theory is such as to require a garbling of the Scriptures to sustain it, our theory is wrong. The Philippians were commanded to work out. They were not commanded to work in. The Lord has never commanded any people to do what He does Himself, or what He has said He would do. Neither has He ever said He would do what He has commanded others to do. The day of God's power in the sense the prophet meant was when God manifests His power in regeneration, and in that manifestation of God's power He makes His people willing to submit to His will. He makes them willing to be saved by grace, and makes them beg for mercy. The preaching and teaching of these things has never caused any trouble in a true Old Baptist Church; but denying them, and teaching contrary to them, does cause trouble. May the Lord enable us all to rightly consider the teaching of His blessed Book and to mould our lives accordingly. C. H. C.

Bible Conference

---October 1, 1923

We have just received a notice of a meeting to be held at Palmersville, Tenn., October 16 to 18, 1923, and a program of said meeting. The program is headed, "Program Primitive Baptist Bible Conference at Primitive Baptist Church, Palmersville, Tenn., Oct. 16, 17, 18, 1923." The notice received with the program follows: Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-Below is the program of Primitive Baptist Bible Conference to be held here with the Primitive Baptist Church on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, Oct. 16, 17, 18, 1923. We as the committee appointed by the above church are glad of the opportunity of inviting all peace-loving Baptists everywhere to come together at this time and discuss some of the vital things that confront us as the church of the living God. As can be discerned by the above program this is no legislative body, but a meeting where the program will be carried out in toto. Of course questions and discussions will be entertained after each question is discussed. All ministers will note that this meeting takes place just before the convening of the Greenfield Association at Sandy Branch Church, this county, and arrangements will be made for conveyance from the conference to the association. Trains will be met at Dresden, Tenn., and conveyance furnished to the church. Any one desiring to come will communicate with Brother D. A. McWherter, Dresden, Tenn., or any member of the committee. This the 22nd day of Sept., 1923. Signed, J. S. Tyson, Palmersville. Cayce Pentecost. D. A. McWherter. J. M. Rawls.

Dear Brother Cayce: Enclosed is program for our P. B. Bible Conference. Please publish same in the P. B., in the Oct. 1st issue, together with the notice of same. Come if you can. Respt., Committee.

We haven't the space to publish the entire program, but the names on the program who have special subjects assigned to them are W. A. Pinkstaff, M. G. Mitchell, J. E. Stewart, C. G. Byrom, A. N. Towry, and J. J. Kirkland. The whole outfit is of the Georgia Progressive element. Some of these men whose names are on the program we know. J. E. Stewart was regularly excluded by a gospel church in regular conference. Ask B. B. Lawler, Brownsboro, Ala., Elder J. N. Bobo, R. 5, Boaz, Ala., or Elder M. Sparks, R. 1, Union Grove, Ala. We think some of these, or all of these, brethren can tell you whether this be true or not. C. G. Byrom was excluded from the church at Decherd, Tenn. Ask Elder R. O. Raulston, 306 Dodds Ave., Chattanooga, Tenn. We think he can give you the facts in this matter. A. N. Towry was excluded from the church at Pleasant Grove in the Flint River Association in North Alabama. Pleasant Grove Church is on the Tennessee side of the line. Ask B. B. Lawler, Brownsboro, Ala., clerk of the association, or Elder B. G. Stephens, Hazel

Green, Ala., the moderator, or Goodloe Monks, Fayette-ville, Tenn., clerk of the church. The idea of these folks claiming to be Primitive Baptists and following after and engaging in such things as they are engaging in that are so foreign to Primitive Baptist practice is absurd. The idea of a "Primitive Baptist Bible Conference at the Primitive Baptist Church" is a new thing under the sun, and is purely an invention of the so-called Progressives. Where do you find in the Bible any command, precept, or example for a so-called Bible Conference, where they are to discuss such a question as "Church welfare and gospel extension work?" Did the church of God at Rome, or at Corinth, or at Galatia, or at Ephesus, or at Philippi, or at Colosse, or at Thessalonica have any such conference? Did Paul instruct them to do so in his letters to them? Did he instruct Timothy to have the brethren meet in any such conference? Did he so instruct Titus? Did he so instruct Philemon? Did he give any such instruction to the Hebrews? Did James give any such instruction to the twelve tribes scattered abroad? Did Peter give such instruction to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia? Did John give any such instruction in his First, Second or Third General Epistle? Did Jude give any instruction of the kind in his epistle? Was any such instruction given in Revelation to any of the seven churches of Asia? Where, then, is the Bible part of it? There is no Bible authority for any such procedure, and it is foreign to the Primitive Baptist practice and usage. Those who are engaging in such things who were once united with the Primitive Baptists have departed, and are no more Primitive Baptists. Our reason for making mention of this in our columns is that they mention the Greenfield Association in their notice, and we do not know to whom the notices are sent; and therefore did not know but some brethren might think this was being done by orderly Baptists who are in correspondence with different associations in that section of country. We felt that the cause demanded that we tell these facts, so the brethren may not be led to think the Greenfield Association is engaging in this new thing. We thank them for their invitation to "come." But we cannot "come," and would not if we could. C. H. C.

Do Not Care To Publish

---October 1, 1923

We received two copies of a circular requesting us to publish them, in which a call is made for a meeting of some of the churches in that section. It seems that some of those making the call were once in the Bear Creek Association. We are also in receipt of a letter from Brother J. W. Jones, Peachland, N. C, the clerk of the association, which he requests us to publish, in which it is stated that those parties are out of order and not in line with the association, and warns brethren not to have anything to do with the meeting. We do not deem it necessary to publish either the circular or the letter from Brother Jones. We deem this notice to be sufficient. If they have had trouble it is a matter that belongs to them, and they may settle their own troubles. This thing of getting other folks to take part in our troubles is a matter that tends to spread the trouble. If churches or parties have departed from the fellowship of the brethren and churches in their own community, let them be reconciled to their brethren at home. Keep your troubles at home. These things should not be sent to our papers. C. H. C.

Both Sides

---November 1, 1923

About the fifteenth of September we received the following notice for publication in The Primitive Baptist: Schoolfield, Va., September 10, 1923.

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-Please publish in The Primitive Baptist that our regular church conference held at the Primitive Baptist Church at Danville, Va., on Saturday night, Sept. 9, 1923, that because of abusive language used in church conference against the church, the moderator and the Staunton River Association, it became necessary to enter a charge of contempt against him, and he was excluded from the church. This notice is intended to notify the brethren at large that Elder Wilson is no longer associated with the Primitive Baptists. Done by order of the church at Danville, Va. J. F. Spangler, Moderator. W. L. Parker, Church Clerk.

When we received the above we wrote to Elder Wilson and asked him about the matter, asking him to tell us how the matter was. We also wrote to another brother we thought to be in position to know about the matter. We did not wish to do an injustice to Elder Wilson. Neither did we wish to publish him as being excluded if it had not been done by a legal conference in proper proceeding. We wished to know what the cause of the trouble was. We are aware of the fact that the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things was being agitated in that country, for it has been advocated by a few there for several years. Before Elder Wilson had time to receive our letter we received the following from him:

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother I am sending you this little notice for publication...Our association (the Staunton River) met with the church here in Danville this year. I was sick and could not be at the association. I will state, in short, the kind of spirit that was manifested in the association. Most of the delegates that were sent to represent their churches in the association were influenced by "Absoluters" of this association and other associations to change an article of faith and raise bars of fellowship against Elders M. E. Petty and R. H. Pittman and me and others on the doctrine we preach. All the orderly Baptists of this country, together with the churches of my care, with myself, would not endorse the work of the association. That disorder led into our churches and in Danville, where I held my membership. The majority, together with the pastor, lined up in the disorder with the "Absoluters;" and they being in the majority dropped the rest of us out because we did not endorse the disorder of the association. If any one wishes to know my standing in this country as a man, as a preacher, as a citizen, I am in order and fellowship with orderly Baptists. For further information I will refer you to W. A. Chaney, Sutherlin, Va., a deacon of the church where I hold my membership; Tom Ward, Ruffin, N. C.; John Cheshire, Martinsville, Va.; Elder W. F. Pruitt, Ruffin, N. C.; J. W. Jones, Peachland, N. C. and H. M. Baucom, Peachland, N. C. If this is not enough, write to Elder R. H. Pittman, Luray, Va., and others. The "Absoluters" are making war on us and we are trying to defend ourselves. The Staunton River Association has divided and about half of them have lined up with the "Absoluters." Affectionately, J. R. Wilson. In a few days we received the following letter from Elder Wilson in reply to our letter asking about the matter:

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother in Christ Your letter is with me. I was expecting you to get a notice from the "Absoluters" concerning their great work here in this country. I suppose they did not tell you anything else they did. At your request I will try to tell you a few things they did and leave you to judge the matter. Our association (the Staunton River) met here with the church in Danville the second Sunday in August.

I was sick and could not attend. Elders Petty and Pittman were with us, and quite a large bunch of the "Absoluters." The moderator of the association and the moderator of the church and the clerk of the association (that is, one of the clerks), with a few other "Absoluters," put their heads together, went into a private room and examined Elders Petty and Pittman on their doctrine, raised the bars of fellowship against their doctrine and refused to preach them in the association. That is not all, but they changed an article of the faith over the protest of a few churches, one of them being the Mill Church, under my care, and being 153 years old and having 128 members. They found out I was not going to endorse that work because it was all out of order. Then the moderator of this church in Danville, together with others, set out to canvass among the members of this church of my membership to secretly get votes to put me and all that stood with me out of Danville Church. I did not know that until it was all over. The church met in Danville after the association and the moderator of Danville Church got his "Absolute" friends together. You can see what they had in view. They never invited any one to seats; never organized the church for business; but took up a case of a good orderly brother and excluded him without a charge. Then they proceeded with business and started to close the meeting without a report from the association. I asked permission to speak, and the moderator granted it. I called for the report from the association, and they all flew into a mad feeling. The delegates arose and made incorrect statements; said the association was good and all the preaching good. At this time the feeling was getting up in the crowd, especially among the "Absoluters." I was calm in my feeling; never got mad, never used any abusive language. All that report to you is absolutely false, and can be proven by two hundred witnesses. Then I asked those delegates if they voted to change the article of faith of the association; they said they did. I asked them by what authority they did it. The reply from one of them was that he got his authority from an Elder Robert Dodd, who was not even a member of this church, but a strong "Absoluter." The other delegate replied that the doctrine in the article of faith was against the doctrine he believed. He believed in the absolute predestination of all things, and of course the article was in his way. Then the clerk of Danville Church arose and asked me if I could endorse the work or action of the association. I told him I could not. It made him mad. He said, "By that you declare non-fellowship for the action of the association." I told him I did not, from the fact that the declarations of non-fellowship were already made by them at the association, when they changed the articles of faith without authority from the churches or from the Bible, and set in judgment on the doctrine of Elders M. E. Petty and R. H. Pittman and myself, with others who hold with us, and raised bars of fellowship against them and refused to preach them. I said, "I am on the defensive and they are on the offensive side and brought the disorder and confusion and divided our people in this country." Without any charge whatever against us, they being in the majority, moved and seconded to exclude us, and did. Witnesses from my churches were there and saw the action and would not endorse it, but all stood by me because I acted faithful and orderly. All of my churches, together with many other churches and associations, are with me and standing for the doctrine I preach. Now, my dear brother, I have not gone into all details in this matter; but upon my word I have told you the truth as far as I have gone. I am standing on and by the same glorious principles I started with twenty years ago. I have nowhere else to stand. I have nowhere else to go. We are no better than the faithful ones who suffered persecution in the past, for it is said, "He that will live godly in this present world will suffer persecution." Please pray for me, a poor sinner saved by grace, if saved at all. Extend love to all. Yours in love, J. R. Wilson.

P. S.-The Mill Church, being in order, and a church of my care, a few miles from Danville, received me, my wife, and a few others into their fellowship by relation. We are identified with orderly, sound Baptists in this country. J. R. W. In another part of this paper will be found an article by Elder R. H. Pittman, copied from the Advocate and Messenger for September, 1923, in which he tells something about the meeting of the Staunton River Association and how they refused to preach him and Elder Petty on account of their doctrine. In another part of this same paper will be found some resolutions with several names to the same and some resolutions adopted by the Bear Creek Association. All these things go to show that the trouble was caused by the advocating of the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things and making it a hobby. Hobby riding has always caused trouble among Old Baptists and always will do so. We were in North Carolina several years ago, and we felt satisfied they would some day have trouble over this very thing. There were a few then who advocated it, and they were allowed to continue to pursue that course. They should have been stopped right then-or sooner; then much of the trouble that will now result from such a hobby would have been avoided. When any man begins to ride a hobby, on any point, he should be stopped right there. If he will not desist, then exclude him and let him stay out until he can leave off his hobby. This will save much trouble and confusion in the church. Our readers know where we stand-that we do not believe the doctrine that God predestinated our sins and wickedness. May the Lord pity our poor suffering people. C. H. C.

Association Rule

---November 1, 1923

Our readers will remember an article which appeared in our columns some time ago from Elder J. T. Jackson, of Martinsville, Va., on the question of the absolute predestination of all things and there being only one salvation set forth in the Scriptures. Well, some of the Absoluters over there in the East did not seem to digest that article very well, and they proceeded to get after Elder Jackson, under the plea that his language was not becoming, too rough and unbrotherly. Elder Jackson asked forgiveness for any expression that was wrong or for any unbrotherly language. Then it developed that it was not the rough expressions used, if any were used, that brought out the objections, but the doctrine advocated, and the principles contended for in the article. That was what we thought when we heard that objections were raised. We understand that Elder Jackson's church is in the Pig River Association. At the session of that association in the fall they passed this act: The association at its spring session having denounced the subject matter in a certain article or instrument by Elder J. T. Jackson, and the church of his membership, to-wit, the church at Leatherwood, having failed to fully respect the judgment of the association, further denounces Elder J. T. Jackson as a heretic and in disorder as respects the contents of the said communication and its promulgation, advise Leatherwood Church to deal with him as such. If that is not lording it over God's heritage we confess that we never saw it, and would not know it if we were to see it. The very idea of an association sitting in judgment over a church as to such matters! Where is the poor little church to come in and have any say about her own affairs, please tell us! Why should not a church submit to a government of presbyters, or bishops, or a pope, as to an association? Such as this is simply assuming authority that is unknown to God's word. It is unscriptural and unbaptistic. It is assuming authority that belongs to no body of people on earth. The church is the highest ecclesiastical authority on earth. There is no higher court

to which an appeal may be taken. There is no higher court in which a case may be tried.

Elder Jackson's church passed the following act: Martinsville, Va., Aug. 25, 1923. We, the church of Christ at Leatherwood, having received a letter from the Pig River Association denouncing Elder J. T. Jackson as an heretic because of the doctrine as set forth in his article as appeared in the Gospel Messenger (it was also in The Primitive Baptist. Ed.) of Feb. 1st, 1923, and as we accepted Elder Jackson's acknowledgment in regard to said article, and failing to see any heresy in said article, and knowing that the association has no authority over any church; but loving peace and wanting an understanding, we have set Saturday before the fourth Sunday in October, 1923, as the day if any church has a grievance against Elder Jackson to bring their grievance to Leatherwood Church on above date and we will be glad to answer any question as touching our act of conference of May 26, 1923, and Elder Jackson will answer as touching the doctrine as set forth in aforementioned article. Done by the church in conference this the 25th day of August, 1923. Eld. J. P. Via, Mod., W. H. Minter, Clerk. This statement from Leatherwood was sent us some time ago, and should have appeared sooner, but was overlooked. The church is the place for the matter to be tried, and that is the place to present the grievance. But they will have a hard time proving the doctrine to be heresy which was set forth in the article of which they are complaining. We would be glad to hear them try to disprove what was set forth therein. The doctrine contained in that article will stand when this world is on fire. C. H. C.

Names Removed From Staff

---December 1, 1923

Some few weeks ago we received a letter from Elder Samuel McMillon requesting us to remove his name from our editorial staff or to remove the name of Elder J. R. Wilson. We were hoping that none of the brethren would make a request of that kind until there had been ample time for developments and we had ample time to consider the matter from all standpoints. We felt then that there was nothing else for us to do but to remove Brother McMillon's name from the staff, which we did without comment. It was our desire then to investigate the matter further. In all the investigating we have been able to do we confess that we feel now that we know very little about the whole affair, or we mean that taking the affair as a whole we do not know very much about it. Danville Church sent us a notice that Elder Wilson was excluded for using abusive language. Brother Wilson claims that he did not use abusive language, and several have written us that he did not, and some have written us that he did. Now, how can we afford to say that the brethren on either side of this controversy are not truthful? It puts us in a dilemma. We do not know what to do or what to say. We do not wish to do the Danville Church an injustice; neither do we wish to do Brother Wilson an injustice. We do not wish to take any part in the controversy. We have had enough of wars and divisions. We have, we hope, prayerfully and carefully considered the matter as to what we should do under the existing circumstances. The brethren write us conflicting reports, and we have no reason that we can discover to doubt them being sincere in what they say to us. They may be sincere and yet be mistaken. We do not feel like calling their honesty in question. We love the good brethren whom we know on both sides of the matter. A number of letters from brethren on both sides have been sent to us giving their version of the matter with the request that it be published. Now here is one thing we think we know, and that is that we do not wish

a controversy on the matter to be carried on through the columns of The Primitive Baptist. It cannot do any good. It cannot help matters any to be publishing those things in our papers. We also feel sure of the fact that if there is a division in that country now the time will come when many good brethren on both sides will feel that it should never have been. It will be regretted in years to come. It makes our heart bleed to contemplate what it means and what the result will be. In the later years, when the brethren have all had time to cool off, and calmly look back and see the waste and devastation caused by war and division, their hearts will then ache over the sad affair, when it will be too late to mend it. Brethren, it is better to be patient and to bear much, rather than for good brethren to be divided and fellowship be destroyed. Families and communities will be divided. Hatred and variance will take the place of love and sweet communion. For God's sake, brethren, and for your own sake, and for the sake of your children, soften your hearts and be charitable toward each other, and let your eyes shed tears of penitence and grief; go down on your knees in humble prayer to God to keep you and to help you stay in that humble and patient attitude that should characterize His children. Our eyes are filled with tears as we write these lines. Our heart is heavy and sad, and we are grieved over the condition of affairs in that country where we have met with the dear brethren and have joined with them in the delightful service of the Master. Now, brethren, please do not ask us to publish anything about the troubles and divisions in that country, or in any other country. We do not wish to take any part in the division. So we feel like now that the very best thing for us to do, as we have dropped the name of Elder McMillon for no other cause than that stated above, that we should also drop the name of Brother Wilson for the present. This is not done because we are taking sides, but because we are now determined not to take sides if there is anyway to avoid it; and the only way we can see to avoid it is to remove Brother Wilson's name from the staff for the present, at least until further developments. We are not doing this to hurt or to injure Brother Wilson. We love him as a dear servant of the Master and we endorse every sentiment we have ever heard him preach. Neither do we now remember to have ever seen a sentiment from his pen that we did not endorse. Some have written us that Elder Wilson was excluded on account of his doctrine, but the church said it was for abusive language, and some have written us that was the reason. If it was for his doctrine then we are with Elder Wilson in sentiment, unless he has advocated something there that we have not read in his writings or which we have never heard him preach. If it was not for, or on account of, his doctrine, then some good brethren think that the doctrine was at the bottom of the matter. If the doctrine had nothing to do with it, then it seems to us that the matter should be settled and there should be no division. We are in receipt of a letter from Elder W. M. Monsees, in which he says: "According to my best understanding, Elder J. R. Wilson has been excluded from the fellowship of the church at Danville; and this being true, I do not recognize him as a member of the church. Hence if you wish to yet recognize him and keep his name on the editorial staff of The Primitive Baptist, please drop my name. I hope that God will bless Zion, and may all of His believing ones be blessed and feel His love in their hearts. Yours in hope, W. M. Monsees." Brother Monsees may not want this published, but we feel that we should be candid and tell our readers just why we take any step we do concerning the matter in that country. Having received this letter, and having already decided to drop the name of Brother Wilson for the present, at least, and not wanting any controversy over the matter in the paper, we have decided it would not be wrong to grant the request of Brother Monsees, and remove his name from the staff for the present also. During the past few weeks we have received so many letters concerning the affair that we could not possibly answer all of them and attend to

other matters that had to be looked after. Those who wrote the letters may know from this why we have not answered them. We just did not have the time. All our readers know where we stand on doctrine. It is not necessary for us to state our position here on any point of the doctrine. We have always been plain and outspoken. We stand now just where we have stood all along the line, and we see no reason why we should change. May the good Lord have mercy upon His poor bleeding Zion. "When ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed, one of another." We humbly ask our readers to pray the Lord in our behalf, that we may be enabled to conduct The Primitive Baptist in such a way as to comfort and unify His humble poor and not to divide them and destroy their peace and fellowship. C. H. C.

The Mount Olive Association

---December 1, 1923

It seems that there has been trouble and possibly division in the Mount Olive Association in Georgia. We published a notice of that association sometime ago, and then we had a request sent to us to publish that those, people were in disorder. Now we do not know a thing in the world about the matter. It seems that both sides claim that the other side is in disorder. As we say, we do not know a thing in the world about the matter, and for that reason we do not wish to publish anything more about it. It will do no good to publish any more about it. These things should be kept at home and settled and attended to there, anyhow, and not publish them in the papers. What a pity that brethren will bite and devour each other, and thus be consumed one of another. C. H. C.

Elder Hull Restored

---December 15, 1923

We are just in receipt of word from Elder J. J. Turnipseed that Elder W. J. Hull and wife have been restored to the fellowship of the church at Piney Grove, and that the church has authorized an official statement to be sent to us for publication. We are not waiting to receive this official statement to tell our readers about it. We are glad to get the news, and we are sure many of our readers will be glad to hear it. Elder Turnipseed said a number of visiting brethren were present at the meeting, and that they had a good meeting. May the Lord be praised for His goodness. May the Lord bless dear Brother Hull in his declining years, and bless him with sweet peace, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

The Cayce-Bogard Debate

---December 15, 1923

In Ben M. Bogard's paper, the Baptist and Commoner, of Aug. 8, 1923, the "eminent Dr. Bogard" gives what he calls an account of the Cayce -Bogard debate held at Leedy, Miss., last July. In reality the Dr. says about as much concerning other debates he has had in that section of country as he does about this debate. It is very evident that he is trying to smooth things over and call the attention of his people to the wonderful successes he had in the previous debates he had, so as to quiet them and his own disappointed feelings in the matter of such a defeat this time. It just amounts to about this: True, I did not do much this time; but look at the wonderful victories I gained in the debates before this! "Blowhard" says: Cayce

is a disappointment. He can't debate but is very egotistic and high tempered and stays mad most of the time he is trying to debate. He called Bogard about all the mean names he could think of during the debate and in doing so hurt no one but himself. Bogard did not say even one hard thing about Cayce nor his people. * * *

* But it is a fact that the biggest bundle of ignorance we ever saw was wrapped up in the majority of those Hardshells. Does this statement about a big bundle of ignorance look like Bogard did not say one hard thing about Cayce and his people? He said in the debate that all would agree with him who were not so ignorant, and things along that line. He began it, and we fed him out of his own spoon; and that is what we would do next time, we think. We knew his tactics. He "ran over" Elder N. V Parker in the debate with him, and he said he would "clean us up" on the third day, or something of like import, so we were informed. He tried the "run over game" on us, but it failed to work. He did not work his "bluff" this time. Hence, he is hurting. But Bogard says "Cayce is a disappointment." Guess so! Blowhard said right at the beginning of the debate, in his second speech, that he had "measured his man," and that he was not going to let Cayce make a single point, and would not let him take a single point from him. But Cayce is a "disappointment!" Evidently so! for "Blowhard" failed to answer, or to even notice, a great number of arguments Cayce introduced. But Cayce answered every argument Bogard tried to make. In Bogard's Commoner of August 29 he gives the rules that usually govern in debates, and proceeds to give an explanation of the sixth rule. That rule says: "The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them." In that paper Bogard says, "That rule forbids charging the consequences of a doctrine to an opponent unless he expressly avows them. * * * * For instance, in a debate with a Hardshell Baptist he will make the argument that since God foreknows all things-knowing the end from the beginning it follows that He foreknew exactly who would be saved and who would be lost. He will argue that therefore the salvation and the damnation of each individual is fixed unconditional. You have a perfect right to show what the consequences of this argument are. If God's foreknowledge makes salvation and reprobation unconditional, then the foreknowledge of God on everything else makes everything that shall come to pass unconditional. If God's foreknowledge of a thing fixes unconditionally that thing, then since God foreknew every act of man, foreknew all murders and rapes, and foreknew all the work of the devil, it would make God responsible for every wicked thing, and even the devil would be a good boy since he did just exactly what he was foreordained to do." In our debate we made this argument concerning the foreknowledge of God: That God does all his pleasure, because He knew from the beginning everything that would transpire that would have a tendency to militate against or prevent Him doing His pleasure, and yet He declared that "I will do all my pleasure." We made the argument from this text: "Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure." -(9) (Isaiah 46:9-10). In Bogard's reply he said that we argued that everything that comes to pass including such sins and wickedness as he mentions in the above extract from his writings, had to be that way and that God fixed it, and so on. We spoke out and kindly corrected him and told him that we did not say it. He answered, "You did say it." Again we kindly corrected him, and again he affirmed that we did say it. Then the third time we kindly corrected him and told him that was not what we said. The third time he disputed our word and said that we did say it. Then we said, "You are a liar; I never said it." Then Bogard went on with his speech, affirming that we had said that. In our speech, we took the matter up and stated again the argument which we made and called

attention to what Bogard stated that we said, and which statement we had kindly corrected, and Bogard would not accept the correction. Then we said, "Bogard, the best thing we can say is that you are a willful, malicious, pusillanimous liar; you are not even a forty-third cousin to a gentleman." That is just what we said, when he had tried to misrepresent us as to what we had said and argued. In Bogard's same paper of August 8 he charges us with believing and holding that a man has to do everything he does. In a little article concerning the lady from Little Rock who put the crown of ribbon on us, he says, "We suppose she can't help doing the way she does since it was foreordained before the foundation of the world." Now, Bogard knows very well that we never argued any such. He knows that it is false. Bogard also says: "The Missionary Baptists were so well pleased that the brethren from Belmont, Miss., and from Winfield, Ala., challenged Cayce to repeat the debate with us at these places and Cayce and his Hard-shells have not yet accepted the challenge. There is not much prospect that they will. But the Missionary Baptists are keen for it since they heard the recent debate. But here is wishing the Hardshells would secure a gentleman to do their debating hereafter. It is very unpleasant to meet a man who is not a gentleman." Right there on the ground publicly we called for the name of the man who said they wanted the debate repeated at Belmont. No one spoke out that we heard saying they wanted it at Winfield, Ala. One man spoke out and said they wanted it at Belmont. Right there and then we told him to present his proposition to our people at Belmont, and if they wanted us to represent them in a debate there with Bogard we would do so for any number of days they wanted it. The last we heard from that country, which was just a few days ago, they had not presented their proposition to our people at Belmont. If they are so anxious for a debate there, why do they not do that? There is not much prospect that they will. As to the "Hardshells," as Bogard calls us, getting a gentleman to represent them in debate, we do not suppose Bogard has very much on us in that line, seeing we were not fined three dollars and cost for drunkenness in the police court at Hopkinsville, Ky., in January, 1918. In Bogard's paper of Nov. 21, 1923, is a little article signed by one Sidney Gallagher, in which he says: "Well, the debate at Little Flock was a wonderful thing for that part of the country. It opened the eyes of lots of people, I think. Some of the Hardshells got to where they could see, for one member just quit them entirely, and many that said they would have joined, now say they are done with them." We wrote to Elder G. N. Gober, Leedy, Miss., where the debate was held, and asked him who these parties were that this Hon. Mr. Gallagher wrote about. Elder Gober replied under date of Nov. 29: There has not been a member quit the Primitive Baptist Church and joined the Missionaries since the debate in this part of the country. Mrs.-----, who was a member at Little Flock Church joined the Campbellites since the debate, but the debate had nothing to do with her quitting the "Hardshells" (so-called). She married into a Campbellite family, and her excuse was that she wanted to live in the church with her husband. This is no boost to the Bogard Baptists. The Primitive Baptists are perfectly satisfied over the results not one member jostled; and the "highland-ers" are satisfied. There is one man (Jesse Bullard) who was a cross between the Campbellites and Missionaries- sometimes on one side and then on the other, but seemed to hold prejudice against the Old Baptists-who claims this debate convinced him to the Missionaries. I am sure he is the one Mr. Gallagher is quoting as lots of people. I believe we are strengthened here by the-de-bate. I am writing Mr. Gallagher to specify those parties whom he had referred to. I will let you have the information I receive from him; but I am satisfied the parties above mentioned are the ones he has referred to. No, the Missionaries have not presented their proposition to the church at or near Belmont, and I don't think they will. Under date of Dec. 4 Elder Gober wrote us again and said: I have a letter from Mr.

Sidney Gallagher who wrote the article in the Baptist and Commoner who referred to one member quitting the "Hardshells" entirely, and lots of others who believed in them said they would not have anything to do with them now. He referred to the parties I wrote you, Mrs.-----and Jessie Bullard. Mrs.-----went to the Campbellites, not as a result of the debate, and Jessie Bullard was not an Old Baptist believer before the debate. * * * * As ever, your brother, Geo. N. Gober. So there you are. Will you tell us what some of these Fullerites will not tell? There is one thing it seems that some of them will not tell, when they are in a "tight," and that is the truth. C. H. C.

Close of Volume Thirty-Eight

---December 15, 1923

For several years we have not written an article at the close of the volume. For some reason we have not had much of a desire or impression to do so. We have passed through some fiery trials and have been much cast down. We have scarcely had the courage or the feeling to try to do anything. From a religious standpoint, as well as in some other matters, everything has been looking so dark and gloomy to us, and all our labors seemed to have been in vain. It has been by the very hardest effort that we have not fully given up in despair. A few friends have stood by us and have spoken and written words of encouragement, and have stood by us in other ways. Had it not been for these dear friends we feel that we should have given up and surrendered entirely. May the good Lord bless them. We cannot find words to express our appreciation and the gratitude we feel for what they have done. We have traveled many miles, and have never refused to answer a call from our brethren to defend the cause, when it was possible for us to go. We have struggled hard during the war time prices to keep The Primitive Baptist going. We have seen the time we could buy all the white news print paper we wanted at two cents a pound. Although the price is not near so high as it was for some time, yet we now have to pay six cents a pound for the paper this issue is printed on. It costs that delivered to us-perhaps a little more. Labor is high, and all things we use in the office are much higher than before the war. This all being true, brethren, we must have support in order that the paper pay expenses. We must have subscribers if the paper pays the cost of getting it out. It is the cheapest Old Baptist paper published, for it has more reading matter in a year than any other two. We do not say this to the disparagement of any other Old Baptist paper, for they all give as much reading matter as they can afford for the price. Brethren, can't every one of you "put your shoulders to the wheel" and see how many subscribers you can send us during the month of January, 1924? Ask the brethren and friends who are not taking the paper to subscribe for it. Show them that the price is not high, considering the amount of reading matter they get in a year. Nearly all the advertising has been taken out, because some said they did not like for advertising to be in the paper. We should have more subscribers to make up that loss to us. How many will help? We are now behind in sending our paper out. We are expecting to soon catch up and have the paper going out on time. We have a good loyal force of employees, and we believe they will do all they can to get the paper to the subscribers on time. The year 1923 will soon be gone. We are another year nearer to our eternal home. How will it be when we reach the end of the way? Will the prospect be dark and gloomy, or will it be bright? Will we have a clear conscience then of duty done to the best of our ability? We close this year's labors asking the prayers of all our readers. Pray the Lord to lift our head above the dark waves which have surrounded us, and to help us

press on in His service the few remaining days we have yet allotted to us on earth. We need your prayers. C. H. C.

1924

Introduction To Volume Thirty-Nine

---January 1, 1924

With this issue we begin the publication of the thirty-ninth volume of The Primitive Baptist. The first issue of the paper was printed thirty-eight years ago at Fulton, Ky., which was January 1, 1886. In August of that year our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, who was then the owner and publisher of the paper, and who was the founder of it, moved to Martin, Tenn., where this paper was published until the first of November, 1919, when we moved to Fordyce, Ark. All these years the paper has continued under the one management. We have had many trials and difficulties, and sometimes the way has been rough. There have been persecutions and sorrows along the way. As we said in our last issue, we have often felt like we would have to give up; but somehow we have continued on until the present. Many of the brethren and friends have stood by us through all the trials and conflicts of the past. We feel that had it not been for them we would have sunk in despair. We trust we appreciate their kindness to us, and humbly pray the Lord's richest blessings may rest upon them. That we have made mistakes in the past, we are free to admit. If we continue to live, no doubt we will make more mistakes. We realize it is "human to err." We know that we have not reached a state of perfection, and do not expect to reach such a state here in this world. But we are hoping for perfection hereafter. When all the battles and trials of life are over, we are hoping for perfection beyond this vale of tears. That hope has been sweet to us through all these years of trials and conflicts, and is as sweet to us today as it has ever been. We humbly beg all our readers and subscribers to pardon the mistakes we have made, and now help us not to make them again. We need your help and your prayers. We desire to make The Primitive Baptist better, and a medium of good cheer and a help to the Lord's dear children. We desire to conduct the paper in such a way as that it may be a benefit to the cause. We need your help to accomplish this desired end. Any time you see a mistake we make you need not refrain from telling us about it, and trying to show us what would be the right thing for us to do. To watch over one for good is to try to show him what is the right way when he is pursuing a wrong course. Will you, dear reader, put forth a little effort during the year to help us extend the circulation of our paper? Ask the brethren and friends who are not taking the paper to subscribe for it. It would not be much trouble to do that. If every subscriber we have now would renew and send us even one new subscriber during the year the list would be doubled. We would be glad to send the paper out weekly again, but we cannot do so unless the subscription list is considerably increased. Our present subscribers can help us to increase the list by asking others to take the paper. Will you help? Let us all try to do better during the year 1924. Many of us have been asleep concerning our religious duties and affairs. "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." May the Lord help us all to awake to our every duty, and help us to live as we should-to His honor and glory, and to the benefit of one another. C. H. C.

A Servant Is Worthy Of His Hire

---January 1, 1924

We have just received at this writing the Messenger of Zion for Dec. 1, 1923, and in reading the pages we found the following from our brother, Elder A. B. Ross, which appeared under the above heading: As I came from one of my churches a few days ago, having had an excellent meeting-good congregation, with words of appreciation spoken by a number of the brethren at a certain place a Methodist preacher and a Missionary Baptist preacher, who had been to their appointments, and who also live at Martin and are personal friends of mine, boarded the train. In our conversation, having sat down together, the Missionary preacher said, "Yes, we had a fine meeting and my church gave \$17 above my expenses." The Methodist preacher replied, "Well, I beat you; my church gave \$20 above my expenses." They did not question me. So I was saved of the embarrassment of telling them that my church, though stronger than either of theirs, gave me only \$4.65 above my expenses. But maybe that is what they are out for. Anyway, their churches showed their appreciation for them, not in word only, and when they got home they had something for their families. This way is according to God's plan, and it does appear to me that if a church cares no more for her pastor, and has no more interest in the welfare of his family, -they should make a change and get a man who is worthy of being seen after according to God's ordained way. Perhaps this neglect is in a great measure responsible for so many churches being without pastors and whole associations being destitute of a preacher. A church or association trampling God's ministerial office under foot cannot prosper. God will turn His ministry from them.-A. B. R.

When we read the above we thought of more than one thing. We thought of some of the trips we have made at our own expense. We thought of the many hardships. We thought of the many necessities and comforts of life many of God's ministers and their families have gone without. We thought of some of the luxuries enjoyed by some of those whom some of the ministers have labored for in the Master's vineyard. While we were in reverie, and wondering why the Lord's ministers are thus having to spend a life of toil and privations and hardships, we also thought of the following which we recently clipped out of a paper we saw in the office of our family physician here in Fordyce. It was under the heading, "A Cheerful Giver." It reads this way: "Bobby's father had given him a ten-cent piece and a quarter of a dollar, telling him he might put one or the other on the contribution plate. 'Which did you give, Bobby?' his father asked when the boy came home from church. 'Well, father, I thought at first I ought to put in the quarter,' said Bobby. 'But then I remembered 'The Lord loves a cheerful giver,' and I knew I could give the ten-cent piece a great deal more cheerfully, so I put that in.'" Brother Ross, perhaps the members of your congregation are better Scriptorians than the members of the other two congregations mentioned, and they remembered the text that the boy remembered, and then governed themselves accordingly. C. H. C.

Remarks To Elder J. H. Fisher

---January 1, 1924

So far as we are able to see and understand we see no reason why any Primitive Baptist could not endorse the sentiment of this article from Elder Fisher. It is the use of expressions not found in the Bible, and contending for them, that has caused trouble among the Old Baptists. They have never divided over what the Bible says- it is always over what the Bible does not say. Let us quit saying things that the Bible does not say on the mooted questions, and we will have less trouble over them. May the Lord help us to lay down our prejudices and come together and live

in peace, and stand shoulder to shoulder against the common enemies of truth.
"When ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed, one of another." C. H. C.

Pray For Zion

---February 1, 1924

We want to join in with those that want to pray for the welfare of Zion. We tried to encourage a day of fasting and prayer a few years ago, but got little encouragement. Some seemed to almost make a criticism of it. But still I think it a good thing. God forbid that I should discourage His children in prayer. I know we are to do other things besides pray, and we might be down praying for things when we know what ought to be done, and I feel in that we should act, yet we should go in prayer.-J. C. M. in Baptist Trumpet, Jan. 24, 1924.

REMARKS

The above is by Elder J. C. Morgan, the editor of the Trumpet, and we honestly think the suggestion a good thing. We have all, more or less, given ourselves to feasting and noise making instead of giving ourselves to fasting and prayer. If we had all been engaged more in prayer instead of quarreling and fault-finding, we would have been in much better condition today. At least, that is the humble opinion of the poor writer. Why not devote a whole day to fasting and prayer and confessing our faults one to another? How many of us can say that we have no faults to confess? If one of us were to say that, would not that be a fault we would do well to confess? "Confess your faults one to another, and pray with and for one another, that ye may be healed." May we not have the assurance from the Lord's promise that if we should meet according as He has directed, that much of our trouble and disturbed condition might be healed? If we pray for the welfare of Zion, should we not work that way, too? Of course, we could have no assurance that our prayer would be answered if our doing is contrary to the way we pray. Let us pray for the welfare of Zion, and let us labor that way as well. We should strive for the things that make for peace, and for the things wherewith one may edify another. We should do that while praying. If we would, do we not have the assurance that our prayer would be answered? "If you ask anything in my name I will do it," said the Master. He has never failed to do what He has promised.

We have read some along the line of the history of the church. We have found in such reading that the church in former years often set aside a day for fasting and prayer. How often do we hear of a thing like that in these days? We can hear of feasting all right; but when do you hear of a day of fasting? What is the matter with us? Are we not forgetful of the rich blessings the Lord has bestowed upon us, and forgetful of where those blessings come from? It seems that for several years there has been a spirit of unrest, dissatisfaction, war and bloodshed; and now there seems to be a mad rush for the almighty dollar; every fellow for himself-all in a mad rush. We scarcely have time to stop to give a brother a friendly greeting. We have all tried to "keep up with the procession," for fear we would be left entirely behind-have we not? We confess that we have been guilty. But we are tired of it. Our heart aches and longs for freedom from such worldly care, and for the more frequent company and association of the Lord's humble poor. We want them to pray with and for us. We need their company and association. We need their prayers. We need their sweet fellowship and love. We need their kind forbearance. If we have ever wounded one of them, our poor heart bleeds on account of it, and we humbly beg them to forgive every wrong they have ever seen in us. Brother Morgan, we would gladly join you in a day of fasting and prayer; and if you could

condescend to let us be with you in a meeting for that purpose, we would be glad to be there, and confess all our faults and to ask you, if you could condescend to stoop so low, to pray for us, a poor sinner in hope of a better home beyond this world of trouble-all by the free and sovereign and discriminating grace of God. May the Lord's richest blessings be upon us all. C. H. C.

Elder O'Neal's Proposition

---February 1, 1924

In another place in this paper is a letter from our dear brother, Elder J. H. O'Neal, of Rupert, Ark. Brother O'Neal sends four names as subscribers for The Primitive Baptist, three of whom are new ones, and he sends \$5 from each for one year-four names to get the paper one year at \$5 each. Now, this is quite different from the offer we are making in the paper, and that offer was in the very issue that Brother O'Neal refers to which contained our article on the close of the volume. Really the offer we are making is one on which we lose money in the year. We are in need of immediate funds; and some of the new names that are added to the list on this offer will continue to take the paper, so that after a long time we may make back what we lose in getting them started to taking the paper; but it will take a long time. But by making this offer we get a number to renew right away and send in another name, and thus raise the funds that are needed right now, or immediately. This is why we make the offer, and to get the list increased with the hope of many, or some, of them continuing to take the paper. We appreciate, more than we know how to tell, the interest Brother O'Neal has taken in the matter. Such action as this-upon his proposition-is a sure enough real help. That gives us something over the bare small profit we make on a year's subscription. The profit we make on a subscription at \$2 a year is very little. If a thousand names were sent us on Brother O'Neal's proposition it would help indeed. It would enable us to stop paying a whole lot of interest. Brother O'Neal speaks of the burdens we have to bear. We have many of them that he and others do not know. What would you think of an Old Baptist preacher refusing to pay for a year's subscription that he owed, unless you would publish a letter from him in reply to a letter that had been published in the paper? Here is what a preacher wrote us-we leave out the names, but we have the letter on file: "I have a proposition to offer you, and that is this: I see in July first a reply to-----by-----in which he made a charge against-----. If you will publish a reply from me to-----1 will send all that I am behind and to renew." Now, what do you think of that? An Old Baptist preacher proposing to pay what he already owes if we will publish a reply from him to another article! This will give just a little idea of some things we meet up with. Yet, as we said in the article referred to by Brother O'Neal, there are a few who have stood by us and have given us kind words and encouraged us along the way, and have helped us otherwise. We hope that we appreciate it, though we feel unworthy of such kindness. We feel, that if we are a servant of the Lord truly, that we are "but a poor unprofitable servant." We often feel that our little service has been in vain and has been no help to the Lord's dear children. Still, we do not feel that we could afford to give up and forsake the field, and thus be a deserter. We humbly pray the Lord to bless those who have so kindly helped us along the way in so many ways. We cannot thank them enough. We beg an interest in the prayers of the Lord's dear children. We feel to need your prayers. C. H. C.

Another False Report

---February 1, 1924

We are just in receipt of a letter from a brother in Alabama in which he says that "I hear that you and Elder Lee Hanks are Progressive and Absolute Baptists." Now, what do you know about that? It seems to us that for a man to say that, if he has been reading this paper, is no less than a willful and malicious falsehood. We do not know who told the brother this, but we would like to know his name. If he is a member of an orderly Primitive Baptist Church he should be dealt with. We do not think a man could very easily get those who are really "Absoluters" to agree that we are one. Neither would the Progressives agree that we are with them in their practices. Our recent publication about a meeting some of the Progressives had at Palmersville does not look much like we are with them. May the Lord pity such folks. C. H. C.

Special Heresy Issue

---February 1, 1924

The Dr. Ben M. Blowhard has been advertising for sometime that he is going to issue a "Special Heresy Issue" of his paper, the Baptist and Commoner. We see no reason why he should make a specialty of any certain issue along that line, for every issue is a bundle of heresy. C. H. C.

Remarks To James M. Mayer

---February 1, 1924

Yes, all the communications, experiences, obituaries and appointments are published in The Primitive Baptist free of charge. That is not all-the books that are published by our people and put out for the good of the cause that are advertised in our columns are advertised free of charge. We have never charged our brethren for advertising their books that are published for the good of our cause-the cause we all profess to love. And this is still not all. There are now, and have been all along, advertisements run in the paper free of charge for some of our people who are poor and are yet trying to sell something that would be a benefit to suffering-humanity in order to make a support for themselves. We have given away several hundred dollars worth of space this way in the paper. This has all cost us money. But a few years ago we cancelled a contract which we had with a company who sent us advertising, and decided to cut out all advertising that we were getting pay for, and we took no new orders, but filled out the time for the orders we already had. We did this because some said the reason why they did not want to take the paper was because it had advertisements in it. So when we had all those pay advertisements out we expected that they would take the paper; but they did not do so. Our conclusion could be nothing else only that they did not want to take the paper and only used that for an excuse. Whether the reason for not wanting the paper was that they did not believe the doctrine the paper stands for, or loved the money more, we are not proposing to say or to judge. That matter is between them and their God. What we do know is that leaving the advertisements out did not make the list increase. We also know that there have been a few who have loved the principles dearly for which the paper has stood, and have stood by us all along the way. May the good Lord bless every one of them, is our humble prayer. We do not feel worthy of the love and esteem and sweet fellowship of the Lord's dear people; but our desire is to make The Primitive Baptist such a publication as that it may be a great benefit to the Lord's dear people and a blessing to His cause. We ask your prayers and help to that end. C. H. C.

Extracts Published

---February 15, 1924

At the request of Brother Hollingsworth we give space for the above extracts from letters he has received from brethren over the country. We trust that we appreciate the interest brethren are taking in us and in The Primitive Baptist. May the richest blessings of our heavenly Father rest upon every one of them, is our humble prayer. The Old Baptists are the best people in the world-with all their faults. Although they do have troubles among them, they love the principles that have been cherished by our fathers all along the ages, and they love one another. We love them, and our life and our all belongs to them. We love to serve them. It is a service of love. We know they are a good people because they have borne with our imperfections, shortcomings and misgivings all these years. We have been trying to proclaim the principles of the glorious doctrine they stand for now for thirty-four years, and we hope by the grace of God to continue while He spares us to live. We often feel discouraged and cast down and forsaken, but we are not yet ready to surrender the field. Will you, dear brethren, pray the Lord to sustain us and enable us to fight the good fight of faith, and that we may die in the service? We would be glad to publish The Primitive Baptist weekly, as we used to do. That is our desire. But we must have a larger list of subscribers to enable us to do that now. The cost of material and labor are all much higher now than they used to be, and it costs a whole lot more to get the paper out than it used to. If all our brethren will put their shoulder to the wheel and do all they possibly can this year to get new subscribers for the paper, and all will be prompt in renewing, perhaps we can soon be getting the paper out every week. Will you help? C. H. C.

Matthew 24

---February 15, 1924

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-It seems to me that our people are asleep. Their minds are wrapped up in worldly things too much. I am sorry that this is true-that our people are asleep on their spiritual duties. It seems that there are some who would rather spend their money in many other ways than to help a good cause. I am thirty-four years old and have been a reader of The Primitive Baptist fifteen or twenty years, or more-I don't know just how long. My mother was taking the paper before I was married, and we have been taking it since.

I do not know whether I am a Baptist or not. If so, I have been one ever since I can remember, for I have always felt myself to be a sinner in the sight of a just and holy God. I love the doctrine of salvation by grace. If I am not saved on this plan I am forever condemned. Brother Cayce, if not asking too much please give me your views on (Matthew 24) where the disciples asked our blessed Saviour concerning the end of the world and the coming of our blessed Saviour again. I see this different to what some do. I would like to get your views. From your unworthy brother, H. B. Golden. R. 2, East Tallassee, Ala.

REMARKS

We have given our views before in regard to this chapter. We will here only call attention to the fact that in (Matthew 24:34) the Saviour said, "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." As this is true, the end of the world He was talking about was the end of the Jewish world or Jewish age. The desolations and tribulations were to occur at the destruction of Jerusalem, and it

has been literally fulfilled. It was fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem, and that before that generation had passed away. In the destruction of Jerusalem, during the siege of the city by the Roman army, mothers ate the flesh of their own children. Dead bodies were found in the holy place in the temple. There never was such desolation before, and never has been since, and never will be. This all came upon the Jews as a result of their disobedience. We bring troubles and distresses upon ourselves now as a result of our disobedience—God's people do. Our distresses in the church today are the result of our own wrong doings. May the Lord help us to improve our ways. C. H. C.

Debate Near McEwen, Tenn.

---March 15,1924

Some time ago we agreed to meet O. C. Lambert, a Campbellite, in debate at or near McEwen, Tenn. The date was set for Monday, April 7, for the discussion to begin. It will continue four days. We have just received word that it will be held at Shiloh, six miles south of McEwen, on the Bold Spring road, and that all parties coming by R. R. will get off at McEwen, on the N. C. & St. L. R. R., and that conveyance will be furnished to take care of all who go by rail. We do not deem it necessary to take space to give the propositions. We trust the brethren who can will attend, and make their arrangements when they go to stay until the close, unless called away on account of sickness. C. H. C.

Remarks To Elder R. O. Raulston

---March 15,1924

We trust that we appreciate what the dear brethren are doing in our behalf. We have been very much discouraged and cast down, and have felt very much like giving up. For some time during 1919, 1920 and 1921 it looked like every issue of the paper we printed was like pouring money into a sinkhole. The cost was enormous. We have considered very seriously doing what Elder Raulston says Elder Newman did. We have thought much of filling the agreements we have already made to engage in debates, but to make no more engagements for debating. We have engaged in a great many, but never have done so only at the request of an Old Baptist Church. It costs time and money to prepare for them, besides the time and expense to go and engage in the discussions. Often have we gone without our time being made good. Perhaps our expense to get there and back home was met all right; but the time to prepare and the expense of getting things a man would need to use amount to as much, or more, than the time and expense of getting to the place and back home. If a man prepares to meet the enemy he has to spend some money for things he will need. And he will have to devote some time to study the Bible as well as other books. He must study the other fellow's side as well as 'his own. So, we will only add again that we have been seriously considering the matter of engaging in no more debates after filling the promises we have already made. Now, we do so much appreciate what these dear brethren are doing. May the Lord's blessings rest upon them. Just one more word we want to add right here, and that is that we do not owe a penny in the world (except a few dollars for current expenses) for personal comforts or benefits. Nearly every dollar we owe is for the benefit of the cause—the publication of The Primitive Baptist and Old Baptist literature. We say this in connection with what our dear Brother Hollingsworth said regarding that matter. C. H. C.

We Feel So Thankful

---April 1, 1924

In this issue of the paper we are publishing extracts from a number of letters written us concerning the proposition being worked out by our dear brother, W. W. Hollingsworth, of Bessemer, Ala., and the proposition made by our dear brother, Elder J. H. O'Neal, Rupert, Ark., which was published a few issues back. These letters are from brethren and sisters who have sent contributions to us to relieve the indebtedness, a great part of which was incurred as war loss-when prices were so inflated and labor conditions were so bad. Our heart is simply filled with gratitude and thankfulness to these dear children of God who are thus coming to our relief. Somehow we felt all the while that if the good Lord was in the matter we would come out some way, sometime. We felt to trust the matter to Him, though sometimes things have looked so dark and gloomy, and we felt that we surely would have to give up in despair. Yet we tried not to complain, and never asked any of the brethren to contribute anything to our relief. We felt like if the Lord was with us, and it was His will for us to have relief in that way, He would put it into the heart of some brother to take the matter in hand without our request or suggestion. So we said nothing. Imagine our surprise when our dear brother, W. W. Hollingsworth, asked us about our condition and told us he wanted to put on a plan to relieve us, and asked if we would allow him to do so. We feel to thank the Lord and take courage. We also feel so thankful to these good brethren and sisters who have sent contributions to us. We have written personal letters to a number of them trying to express our thanks. But we cannot find the words to tell how thankful we feel. Our heart is simply full of gratitude. Every day the tears of gratitude come into our eyes, and sometimes they flow freely. Such expressions of love and fellowship and such manifestations and such kindness make us feel that surely the Lord is so wonderfully good to us. He surely has put it into your hearts to do what you have done and are doing. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon every one of you. We say, we wrote personal letters to several acknowledging receipt of the letters and trying to express our thankfulness. We are so far behind with our work, and it takes time to write letters, so we felt like the brethren and sisters would accept this as our feeble effort to express our thanks and gratitude without us taking the time to write each one personally. Will you, dear brethren and sisters, not conclude that we do not appreciate your kindness and what you have done? And will you accept the gratitude of our poor heart? And will you please remember us in your prayers? C. H. C.

Enoch Translated

---April 1, 1924

Brother E. E. Huddleston, Rienzi, Miss., asks us to give our views of **(Genesis 5:24)** and **(Hebrews 11:5)**. The first reference says, "And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him." The latter reference says, "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God." Enoch was a servant and a true prophet of God, who walked humbly before the Lord and obeyed His commands. His obedience did not make him a child of God nor a prophet. God made him that. Then he was an obedient, and not a disobedient, child of God. "He walked with God." Then the Lord translated him. He was taken up to heaven without going through the ordeal of death-simply changed

and carried home to glory. That is the same thing as will occur with all the Lord's children who are alive and remain on the earth when He comes again to gather His jewels home. "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." This is our understanding of the references, expressed in as few words as we know how. We haven't the time to write at length, but felt to say just a few words on the matter. We are very much behind with our work and are trying to catch up. C. H. C.

Carey The Father

---April 15, 1924

We have before us a little leaflet with the title, "Some Baptist Whys and Wherefores," by John Jeter Hurt, D. D., published by the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn. On page 11, under the heading (page 10)," What My Membership Means," we find these words: "It means Plodding. William Carey, my Baptist forefather and the father of modern missions, said, 'I can plod; to this I owe everything.'" Who was the father of modern missions, as engaged in and practiced by the Missionary Baptists? The Rev. John Hurt says that William Carey was the father of modern missions. If Carey was the father, then Jesus Christ was not; the eternal God was not; the Holy Spirit was not. God was not the author of the modern mission business. It was an invention of man. Carey was its father. Then the mission business is not of God, but it is of man. God's children do not need the inventions of men in the affairs of religion. "Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (touch not; taste not; handle not; which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men? Which things indeed have a shew of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh." - [\(\(20\) \(Colossians 2:20-23\)](#). C. H. C.

Remarks To Elder J. W. Hoppes

---May 1, 1924

We can never find words to express our thankfulness and gratitude for such expressions and manifestations of Christian love and fellowship as is contained in the above letter. We feel so unworthy of such gifts and expressions of love and fellowship. We just cannot find words to tell how thankful we are and how much we appreciate the same. Dear brother, we remember being at your church and in your home. We have not forgotten the kindness shown to us, and how kindly we were cared for. We shall never forget you, and so much wish that we could see you again and join with you once more in the sweet service of our heavenly King. We do trust that you are enjoying the Lord's rich blessings, and may His blessings be yours to enjoy all along the journey, is our humble prayer. We feel to need your prayers, too. We feel to be so poor and needy. Please do pray for us. Our wife and the little babe are getting along well, for which we trust we feel so thankful to the good Lord. C. H. C.

Remarks To Elder T. W. Lindsey

---May 1, 1924

We are ready to meet with the dear brethren for the purpose of trying to bring peace in our beloved Zion at any time or place that may be agreed upon or suggested, and should be glad to do so. We confess our wrongs, and we are willing

to confess them face to face with the brethren. We have said things that should not have been said. We ask no one to make any confession to us. If any brother has wronged us, we feel that we are willing to bear it as a part of the hardness one is required to bear as a good soldier. If any brother feels that he owes us any acknowledgment we are willing to hear it, but do not ask it. We believe that such a meeting should be held. The brethren in Texas might name the place and time. We hope they will set a time for which we are not already engaged. May the Lord help us all to confess our faults. C. H. C.

Progressives Lose Suit

---May 1, 1924

It seems from reports we have had that some of the members of the church at Delaware, Ohio, have been on the "progressive line" for a while, and that the same caused a division in the church there. The "progressive" party brought suit for the property, but the suit was dismissed and they were taxed with the cost. We have a letter from there which says: The Progressive faction of the Marlboro Primitive Baptist Church failed, in their suit in court here, to prove themselves the church. The court held that the sister churches of the several associations are the proper judge as to who the church is, and what they decided was the church would be the proper owners of the property, and so dismissed the suit, leaving both parties the use of the house pending the decision of the sister churches as to which is the church; and whichever that is are the rightful owners of the property. The court assessed the costs on the complainants. The sister churches had already decided that we (the defendants) are the church in order, and all were present to give their evidence, but of course it was not needed, owing to the reason of their first star witness gave them away by admitting that it is within the power or jurisdiction of the sister churches to decide all questions of doctrine, etc. Our attorney then asked the court to dismiss the case on the grounds that the court could not decide who is the church, and that it all laid in the jurisdiction of the sister churches, and if they found us the church in order we would also own the property. The court at once dismissed the suit, dissolving their injunction, charging all the costs to them. My prayer has been all along that the Lord bless the truth and bless the court with righteousness in judgment. Bless His holy name! How thankful we hope we are to Him-not that we feel exalted, but how merciful the Lord is to us poor weak creatures, sinners, unworthy as we know we are. May the Lord bless you and family, and all the family of the Lord in all the earth, is my prayer, for Christ's sake. It has always seemed strange to us that men would depart from the old principles that our people have always held to and claim to be the original church, and then so often try to obtain the church property. It is bad enough to depart from the original principles, and still worse to do that and then try to get the property. May the Lord's blessings rest upon His humble poor, and lead us all in the right way. C. H. C.

Trouble Among Them

---May 1, 1924

It seems that the Progressive Baptists are having some trouble among them on the question of instrumentalities in regeneration. Some of the preachers are advocating the idea that God sometimes uses the gospel, or the preached word, as an instrument in the work of regeneration. It is the same old Arminian theory that has been advocated in years past by Fuller, Burnam, and others. Some among the

Progressives are advocating this doctrine and some are opposing it. It seems to us that they are only going on a little farther in the way they started when they left the old landmarks and started out with their new measures. When they started out after the new measures which they have they only started away from the old way and from the true service, and the farther they go the farther they get from the truth. C. H. C.

Is It Lawful?

---May 1, 1924

Is it lawful for any member of the Old Baptist Church to moderate a conference where they have no preacher? We have a deacon, but he stays at home to keep from moderating. Then I want to know if some other member could act and hold a lawful conference to attend to church business? Will some dear brother respond through the paper, for some of us at our church want to hold our conference. We want to know, and would love to hear from you, Brother Cayce. I have never seen any act except preachers and deacons, and I was reared by Old Baptists, and I do hope and trust that I am one. I have a name with them, but don't know that I am one-do hope I am. I would love for several of our good brethren to write on this. Answer through the paper as early as you can. D. E. Williams. Delta, Ala.

REMARKS

The church has the right to select whom she pleases to serve as moderator during the sitting of the church in conference, just so they select an Old Baptist who is in order. The church has the right to select any of her own members to serve that she sees proper to select to serve as moderator during conference meeting. We never have heard this called in question. Suppose the church had no minister or deacon-would that deprive her of the right to hold conference? Most certainly not. If the deacon is staying at home to keep from serving the church in any capacity the church may see fit to ask of him, to the best of his ability, he is doing very wrong, in our humble judgment, and is laying himself liable to the censure of the church. But that does not deprive the church of her right to choose another brother and to go ahead with her conference. This is our humble opinion, and we do not believe any brother will dispute it. C. H. C.

The Debate Near McEwen

---May 1, 1924

The debate with Mr. O. C. Lambert was held according to appointment near McEwen, Tenn., beginning on Monday, April 7, and closing on Thursday, April 10. The weather was good most all the time and a large crowd was in attendance, considering the fact that it was at a busy time. Ten of our brethren in the ministry were in attendance, though a few of them were there only a part of the time. They were, Elders J. M. Fuqua, J. W. Lomax, W. R. Rushton, N. J. Hinson, Rob Hinson, W. C. Davis, J. H. Phillips, J. B. Halbrook, W. H. Meredith and J. R. Scott. Elder Phillips served as moderator for us. Brethren W. A. Shutt, S. E. Hurt and Van Hurt, who had been liberated to exercise in public, were also present. Mr. Lambert seems to be a nice gentleman, though he is young and inexperienced as a debater. Mr. F. B. Srygley, with whom we had a discussion in 1912, which was published in book form, served as moderator for Mr. Lambert. They had a stenographer present to take the speeches as delivered, and announced that the debate would be published. The stenographer, however, told us during recess the first day, in the presence of Brother Shutt, that she did not get all we said; but she may have a

fairly good report of the speeches-we are not prepared to say about that. The discussion passed off very pleasantly, and we trust that it may put some folks to reading and studying for themselves. We stayed at the home of Mr. Cayce Fuqua and wife, near by, during the time. Mr. Fuqua is a son of Brother P. J. Fuqua, and is an Old Baptist in belief. His wife is a member of the Methodists. They were kind and good to us; we shall not soon forget them. Good order was maintained throughout and the brethren and friends showed us much kindness. May the Lord's blessings rest upon them all, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

One Suffers On Account Of Others

---May 15, 1924

We wish to kindly call attention to one thing you say, dear sister, concerning the Lord punishing one of His children for the sins of another. Turn and read ((Num 16:1) (Numbers 16) and you will see that some were punished with Dathan and Abiram for the sins of those two men. Their children were destroyed with them. And again, Israel suffered on account of the golden wedge, when only one man knew the wedge was in the camp. God's ministers may sometimes suffer for things they need on account of the neglect of the Lord's people to minister unto them as they should. True, they may sometimes fail to minister as the Lord requires because the minister has failed to teach this duty as he should; but the failure is not always, perhaps, because the minister has failed to teach. There might be such a thing as one being covetous and failing to do his duty on that account. It is also true that the minister might be covetous, and on that account not do his duty, and he might, on that account, think more should be done by the brethren than the Lord really requires. When the minister is not engaged in preaching he should have some labor to perform to help earn a support for himself and family; then when he is spending his time preaching where his services are in demand, the brethren should see that his temporal needs are supplied. This is the Lord's plan, as we understand it; and in following the Lord's plan no one is overburdened, and His blessings are enjoyed.

C. H. C.

Going To California

---May 15, 1924

We expect, the Lord willing, to leave our home on Saturday afternoon, May 31, starting on a trip to California. We will stop at Little Rock and have meeting there Sunday, June 1. We leave Little Rock at 6:40 Sunday afternoon for Oklahoma City, and will go to Edmond, Okla., and will have meeting as may be arranged by Brother W. T. Morrisett on Monday and Tuesday, June 2 and 3. On Wednesday morning we will leave Oklahoma City to fill appointments as may be arranged by Elders J. I Colwell and Ira Hollis until June 12. On the latter date we will leave that section for Tucson, Arizona, and expect to arrive there at 5 p. m., Friday, June 13, and be there until Sunday afternoon, June 15. On Sunday afternoon, June 15, we leave Tucson for Los Angeles, and will stay in California until July 6 or 7, and will fill appointments as may be arranged by Brother J. I Caneer and Sister Geo. E. Darsey. We humbly trust the Lord may be in the matter. We hesitate and dread to start on these journeys, fearing the Lord may not be in the matter. We ask that you pray the Lord to be with us and enable us to present and to speak of such things as will have a tendency to bind His little children together in love and fellowship, and that He will care for our loved ones at home and protect them from all harm in this evil world. C. H. C.

Present For Baby

---May 15, 1924

To the Editor of The Primitive Baptist and His Companion:

I see in my last paper, April 1st, of a new arrival of a baby girl, and I want to offer my congratulations to the happy parents, and hope her stay may be long and bring pleasure every day and be a blessing to them in their old age. One baby can bring more real joy and happiness in a true home than all the wealth of the universe. I want to make my bow to the little queen, seated on her throne, surrounded by her subjects, her maids of honor in waiting to come and go at her beck and call while she reigns supreme; and may she always hold maidenhood and womanhood as the most sacred of all her earthly possessions. I am sending her a tiny gift. It will help to get her something that baby needs. From One Who Loves Babies. April 14, 1924. The above letter did not have the writer's name in it nor on it. We do appreciate the same. May the Lord bless the writer, is our humble prayer. The little girl (Ilene by name) is doing fine. She is a pretty and sweet little one, and is a good baby. We have two girls and two boys. We are trying to train them up in the right way. We realize that this is a problem and a task in these days. We feel that we need the Lord's help that we may be able to train them as they should be. Please remember us in your prayers. C. H. C. and Wife.

Fullerite Lost His Pants

---June 1, 1924

A little clipping was sent us some time ago from the Flag, published at Fulton, Ky., which says: There is rumor of debates on every side; one Claud Cayce, of somewhere, was in this part of the country sometime ago, and said he would take my pants off if he could get hold of me, and I always keep my belt unbuckled and suspenders loose, and am still getting my mail as follows: C. B. Massey, Pleasant Shade, Tenn., and all he would have to do to get a chance at the Captain is to address him in like manner as above. In the first place, we never used any such expression. We would be ashamed to expose such a thing as Massey before an audience of decent people in any such way. In the next place, he wears his "belt unbuckled and his suspenders so loose" that he seems to have lost his pants already in the writing of such a statement as the above. If we wanted to take his pants off we would be without a job. His nakedness is already exposed. Selah. C. H. C.

J. B. Hardy Causing Trouble

--- July 1, 1924

I get where I feel like sometimes I will give up, as you know we have had so much trouble in our (the Buffalo River) association over the Hardy business, and now Hardy is among us most all the time, and our precious brethren have (I think) gone to the extreme on both sides, and I am trying to get the brethren to work for love and fellowship. I don't want to write any more about troubles, but wish I could be with you and talk to you, but I can't do this now. Your brother in hope, W. C. Pope. Pope, Tenn.

It is strange to us that the brethren in that country will let J. B. Hardy divide them and destroy their peace and fellowship, as has been done. He had absolutely no connection with our sort of Baptists in this country, and they are the sort the

Baptists of the Buffalo River were in our young days, when we visited them more frequently. In following Hardy they have gone from where they were in those days. C. H. C.

Trip In California

---July 15, 1924

We left home Sunday evening, June 8, accompanied by Elder John R. Harris, of Thornton, Ark., for our trip in California. We arrived in Oklahoma City Monday morning and were met at the train by Brother W. T. Morrisett, of Edmond, and conveyed to his home. Had meeting in Edmond that night and Tuesday. Elders J. C. Clark, of Crescent, A. D. West, of Wayne, Okla., and Elder Allen, of Oklahoma City, were all with us there. We also had meeting at the home of Elder Allen on Tuesday night, and these brethren were with us there. It was sure an enjoyable and pleasant meeting. Monday night Elder J. I. Colwell, of Mt. View, came in and was with us Tuesday and Tuesday night. We were glad to meet all these good brethren, and they are anxious for peace among our people. Wednesday morning we left Oklahoma City, and arrived at San Simon, Ariz., on Thursday about 1 o'clock and had meeting in and near there that night and Friday night. There are very few Old Baptists there, but we had a very pleasant stay with them. Saturday we left San Simon and arrived at Los Angeles Sunday morning about 7:50. Sister L. A. Cloud, who lives at Casa Grande, Ariz., and who used to live at Kingsland, Ark., and is a member of Mt. Paran Church in our association, met us at San Simon and went with us to California and was at every service in that state. We are in such a rush to get this article in the paper, and the printer is waiting on us, so we cannot give a detailed account of the trip. Suffice to say that we had service in Los Angeles vicinity Sunday and Sunday night. We left there Monday morning for San Jose, and had service there that night and Tuesday and at night. We organized a little band there with the help of Elder Harris, and we had the pleasure of baptizing three. From San Jose we went to Fresno and had meeting one night at the home of an afflicted sister named Miller who had not heard a sermon for a number of years. She has not walked a step for a number of years. From Fresno we went to Lindsay and had meeting near there for two or three days and nights. We organized a little band there and had the pleasure of baptizing five into their fellowship. One night we had meeting in Exeter, a few miles from Lindsay. Then we returned to Los Angeles vicinity and had meeting until and including Sunday night-the fifth Sunday in June. We organized a little band there, with the help of Elder Harris. Brother B. S. Minor, a deacon, also officiated with us in the organization of these churches. A message was sent to us at South Gate, in care of Geo. E. Darsey, for us to come home as mother was sick. We got the message about 2 o'clock that night. We were spending the night with Brother J. I. Caner in Montebello. We got up and went to the station and found that there was no train for us to get home earlier than to leave Los Angeles at 5 p. m. Monday. At that time we left that place and arrived home Thursday evening, July 3, at 6:45, and found mother better than when the message was sent. We are doing this writing on July 11, and feel so thankful that we are able to say mother is still improving, and we hope that she will soon be up again. We had a pleasant trip among the Lord's children in California. They were kind and good to us-much better than we feel to deserve. We desire, if the Lord will, to visit them again some day. We cannot mention the different ones we met, but we want to assure you that you all have a warm place in our heart. May the richest blessings of heaven rest upon every one of you, is our humble prayer.

Please do not forget to remember us in your petitions at the throne of grace. C. H. C.

Time Changed

---July 15, 1924

The time for the debate between us and I. B. Bradley, at Woodville, Ala., has been changed so as to begin on Monday, August 4, instead of Tuesday, August 5. This has been done in order not to conflict with the meeting of the Sequachee Valley Association, which is to be held with the church in North Chattanooga, Tenn., begin-ning on Friday, August 8. We trust a goodly number of brethren will attend the debate, for we are sure it will be a clean discussion. We have met Mr. Bradley in two debates and he conducted himself in a clean manner in both of them. We have just received a letter from Brother Bradley telling us of the death of his companion, which occurred on the 12th of June. He has our sincere and deepest sympathy. C. H. C.

He Got Pinched

---August 15, 1924

In our debate with A. U. Nunnery at Laster school-house, as announced, A. Nunnery, the little editor of the *Missionary Worker*, at Chickasha, Okla., was moderator for A. U. At the opening of the service the "Rev." A. made a little talk cautioning all to keep quiet and to say nothing, and stated that if one should try to put in that it was a sign he was pinched. Before the day was gone the "Rev." A. rose and began to show his madness by ugly words and manifesting a blustery spirit. He was the first man to show that he was pinched. He reported in his paper that the "Hardshells" tried to carry the thing by storm, but he is the fellow who tried that game, as all know who were present. Elder A. U. said in our presence that he was ashamed of the matter-which could refer to nothing else than the way his brother had acted. The wife of the "Rev." A. was there, and after dismissal, when things were in a rather disturbed condition, the "Rev." A. manifesting his madness, she went into the stand where he was and put her arm around him and asked him to hush and be quiet and not act as he was doing. She turned to us and said, "Brother Cayce, you have not been mad, have you?" We answered that we had not been mad and that we had seen nothing to be mad about. She said, "you have too much religion to get mad, haven't you?" We told her that we did not know about that, but that we had seen nothing for us to be mad about. The "Rev." A. is giving, in his paper, some statements that the witnesses present know are not just as the facts were. A. U. Nunnery, the man we debated with, conducted himself in a very nice and gentlemanly way, and manifested that he is really a much better man than his brother. Those who were present know how the matters were, and do not need the testimony of others. What we say will not reach the readers of the *Worker*. May the Lord pity them. C. H. C.

Pamphlet by Elder A. V. Simms

---September 1, 1924

Elder A. V. Simms, Box 601, Atlanta, Ga., has published a pamphlet on the question of secret orders in the church, the title of which is, "Let There be Light." The price of the pamphlet is 25 cents. What is said on the subject of secret orders we think is good and timely, and all our people should take warning. It is a pamphlet well

worth reading. But in the pamphlet Elder Simms has something to say about the trouble and division between his people, the Progressives, and the "Old Liners," and we think that he is somewhat inconsistent. He wrote us a letter concerning the pamphlet, and asked if we would offer them for sale. We wrote to him under date of August 18. After writing and mailing the letter we decided that our readers should have the benefit of seeing what we wrote to the brother, and for that reason decided to publish the letter which follows. C. H. C.

THE LETTER

Elder A. V Simms:

Dear Brother-Yours of July 17 came while I was away from home. The pamphlet has been received and read. What you say concerning the Masonic fraternity I can most heartily endorse; but there is a little in the work which it seems to me is rather inconsistent. Page 43: "For this reason they set up bars of non-fellowship against us because some of our churches wanted instrumental music. * * * This was all wrong. God's law was not violated in either case. Where in the Bible will we find it? And if these things were wrong would not God have said so in His word?" etc. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." -(II Timothy 3:16-17). If Paul was right in this text then everything which the church should have or practice is expressly commanded. If everything we should engage in as a church and in the church is expressly commanded, then it is a violation to engage in or practice a thing that is not expressly commanded. The instrumental music in the church is an invention of Rome, and is not commanded. Therefore, it is a flagrant violation, and is no more to be fellowshiped in the church of God than Masonry. My brother, you cannot escape this difficulty. It is true that instrumental music was used under the law; but it was used in the temple worship where the blood was sprinkled and where the beasts were slain and the blood shed and offerings made. Those offerings typified the offering that Christ should make. When Jesus shed His blood and the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, the temple worship and service was all fulfilled and was no more. Everything connected with it went out. To use now what they used then is to go back to temple worship, and one could as well offer up bullocks, etc., as to use the instrumental music. God gave the instrument which we are required to use in praising Him, and that instrument consists of the vocal organs. To use something else, as instrumental music, is as bad as to do something else for baptism other than what He has commanded. Page 44 you say: "No church has the sovereign right to violate the law of God. And if she does, she cannot expect her sister churches to also violate God's law in order to be in fellowship with her." This being true, then the Progressives had no right to introduce instrumental music in the churches. And if they did, they had no right to expect the sister churches to retain them in fellowship. Page 45: "Let the reader remember what I have said above-that the secret order question has been revived since the division with the Old Liners; and let them remember that those who have revived it and have quietly encouraged it are the ones who are wholly responsible for present conditions." If those who have brought in the secret order question are responsible for present conditions among your people, and are responsible for the division it causes, is it not also a fact that those who brought instrumental music into the churches are responsible for the trouble it caused and are responsible for that division? If not, why not? It was a new thing among Primitive Baptists. " It seems to me that if

those who introduce one new thing are responsible for the division that that causes, then those who introduced another new thing are responsible for the division caused by that. If not, why not? Page 46: "If, therefore, the fellowship of secret orders is more precious to them than the fellowship and peace of the church of God, this is a matter entirely their own, but they cannot expect the rank and file of the Primitive Baptist Churches to follow them into such heresy." It seems to me reasonable that the same thing is just as true regarding instrumental music in the churches. Those who introduced the musical instruments and fellowshipped those who used them preferred them to the fellowship and peace of the whole body. If not, why would they not lay them down? Then why should they expect the rank and file of the Primitive Baptists to follow them? Page 47: "But if it extends to the entire brotherhood (and assuredly it does) does it not follow that when a church commits an act unauthorized by the word of God, knowing at the same time that her sister churches cannot fellowship it, is she not violating this text?" If a church in committing an act unauthorized by the word of God, knowing that her sister churches cannot fellowship it, is violating this text, **{(Hebrews 13:1)}** then the churches which introduced instrumental music violated that text. I have not written this to hurt or to wound your feelings; but to try to show you where you stand. I would be glad for you to see the truth and to renounce that which has caused so much trouble in our beloved Zion. I never met you; but I remember hearing my sainted father speak highly of you. He met you long years ago -before that trouble was ever among the churches. I learned long ago to love you, though I never met you. I would be glad for you to see the error and come back to the old church-the original Primitive ground. May the good Lord bless you in what good you may undertake to do, and enable you to see the right, is my humble prayer. Yours in humble hope, C. H. Cayce.

Trip In Tennessee And Alabama

---September 1, 1924

We left home Sunday night, July 20, for our trip in Tennessee and Alabama, to meet the appointments and engagements as announced, or which had been published. We were met at Huron, Tenn., by Chester Seaton, a son of Brother John Seaton, and conveyed, with others, to the home of Brother Seaton, who lived near where the debate was held with A. U. Nunnery on July 22, 23, 24, 25. The debate was well attended, a large crowd being present every day. The names of the Old Baptist ministers who attended are: Elders J. H. Phillips, J. W. Hardwick, J. B. Halbrook, John Grist, S. E. Reid, A. B. Ross, N. J. Hinson, W. H. Merideth, M. D. Brann, W. C. Davis, W. L. Murray, L. D. Hamilton, C. F. Parker, T. M. Phillips, J. L. Fuller and D. Neisler-sixteen in all. Licensed ministers in attendance were: S. E. Hurt, W. A. Shutt and J. B. Chenault. Primitive Baptists were present from seven different states-Ohio, Kentucky, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi and Missouri, besides the Tennesseans present. The brethren all expressed themselves as being well satisfied with the result of the debate, which went along very pleasantly except a time or two that Elder Nunnery's moderator acted in an ugly manner, and it seemed that he wanted to "raise a rough house." On Saturday, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday we were with the church at Johnson's Cross Roads, near where the discussion was held, and had a very pleasant meeting there. On Saturday a daughter of Brother Seaton came to the church and asked for a home with them. She was baptized on Monday by Elder J. H. Phillips, the pastor of the church. On Tuesday Brother and Sister Maness were received on confession of faith, the church of their former membership having ceased to have any meetings. On Sunday

brethren and sisters were present from thirteen sister churches. Tuesday afternoon we went to Lexington and boarded a train for McEwen, Tenn., and tried to preach in that town that night in the Presbyterian meeting house. A large crowd was present, and we enjoyed a very pleasant meeting. Wednesday we went to Harmony, about twelve miles from McEwen, and had a pleasant meeting there. The congregation was good and a good interest was manifested. This is the old home church of Elder J. J. Fuqua, who went to his reward a number of years ago, and we had not been to this church since we were called there on the occasion of his funeral. We were glad to be with them once more. On Thursday we filled the appointment at Bethel. Quite a crowd was present, although it rained in the early part of the morning. Elder J. M. Fuqua is the efficient pastor, and was present. We spent the night with him in his pleasant home. He was not well at all, and could not go with us to any other appointment. We trust he is much improved before this. Friday we went to Dickson and filled the appointment there. We had a very pleasant meeting at this place, and met several whom we had not seen for quite awhile. Elder W. R. Rushton now lives in Dickson, close to the church. Elder J. A. Pope, who lives at Dickson, was away filling appointments. We were sorry not to meet him again. We spent the night with Brother Rushton and enjoyed his kind hospitality in his pleasant home. Saturday we filled the appointment at Burns. Elder Rushton went with us, and several others from Dickson also went. This was the regular meeting day at Dickson, but they dismissed the meeting on that day to be at Burns. We enjoyed a pleasant meeting there, and felt glad to be with those good people once more. Saturday night we went to Nashville and were met at the train by Brother and Sister Shutt, and spent the night with them in their home. Sunday we filled the appointment made for us with the Bethel Church in Nashville. A large crowd was present, and a good interest was manifested. They have a new meeting house just about completed. It is a real nice and substantial and plain building, and will comfortably seat 500 people, we suppose. This is truly a lovely band of Old Baptists. They know how to make a brother feel at home among them. After service Sunday we started in a car with Brother Shutt and Brother Reid for the home of Brother B. B. Lawler, near Brownsboro, Ala., and arrived there that night at 8:45-just six hours and fifteen minutes on the road. Brother Lawler is the father of our wife. He is deacon of old Flint River Church, the oldest Baptist Church in Alabama. His father before him was also a deacon in that old church for years. Our little girl (Florida) was there on a visit. We were glad to see her, and also glad to see all the family. Monday we went on to Woodville, Ala., in the car, where we met Mr. I. B. Bradley in a four days discussion. Mr. Thompson was moderator for Mr. Bradley, and Elder Turnipseed was our moderator. The moderators really had little to do but to keep time. It was a pleasant discussion all the way through, from first to last. Mr. Bradley is a nice, clean man, and does not misrepresent an opponent. The discussion was held in the auditorium of their new school building, and the room was full every day, and all could not get in the house. The weather was hot, and the people proved that they were interested by getting there early and staying in that hot room and maintaining such remarkably good order during the whole of each session every day. The Old Baptist ministers present were: Elders J. J. Turnipseed, J. W. Lomax, R. O. Raulston, W. D. Rousseau, John Page, A. J. Houk, H. P. Houk, M. Sparks, W. J. Harwood, G. A. Stephens, N. V. Parker, J. N. Dunaway, H. L. Golston, W. T. Flanagan, J. W. Bragg, M. A. Hackworth, H. M. Smith, F. B. Moon and Fred Stewart-nineteen in all. The licensed ministers present were: J. M. Warren, J. M. Walker and W. A. Shutt. The Old Baptists expressed themselves as being well satisfied with the discussion, and well pleased with the way it was conducted. It was a pleasant time. On the last day a message was received for us from home that mother was not doing any good, and that it might be well for us to come home. We went home with

Brother Lawler, and Ben and Claud (his sons) conveyed us to Huntsville that night and we left there at 2 o'clock for home. We arrived home Friday evening and found mother a little improved. Since then she has improved slowly. Our family were all well, for all of which we trust we feel thankful to the good Lord. The brethren, sisters and friends were all good to us on this trip. During the debate with Elder Nunnery we stayed at the good home of Brother John Seaton, and during the debate in Woodville we stayed in the good home of Brother Ernest Thomas. We were well cared for and kindly treated in both of the homes- much better than we feel to deserve. May the good Lord bless all the good brethren and sisters who so kindly cared for us, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Reply From Elder Simms

---October 1, 1924

Elder C. H. Cayce:

My Dear Brother-Your letter containing two lines of endorsement of my little book and two pages of single-spaced criticism pointing out my inconsistency, has been received. I thank you, both for the endorsement and the criticism; for the good Lord knows if I am not right I WANT to be, and any criticism is always welcomed by me, and I try to always weigh it for what it is worth. But, strangely enough, the very Scripture you use (and the only text you quoted in your entire letter) is the one I have always considered a regular knock-out for the unscriptural bars of non-fellowship you have set up; for if to set up bars in this matter was the right thing to do, then there must be some authority in God's word for doing so, or else it follows that the Scriptures do not "thoroughly furnish us to every good work." Has not God's Holy Word condemned every wrong thing? If instrumental music in the churches had been as objectionable to the Lord as it is to some Old Baptists would He not have said so? Would He not have furnished you with the weapon to destroy your brethren with? But you did not quote all my letter bearing on the point. I said "and continued meetings." Wonder why you did not reply to that, and justify your brethren for setting up bars against such meetings? You know very well that they did it. Would you undertake to say that the Scriptures justify you brethren in setting up bars against us on this account? Wonder why you left that off? Was it because you have always held such meetings yourself? Also when these bars were first introduced they included both life and fire insurance. Do the Scriptures "thoroughly furnish" such a law? If you will get a copy of the first resolutions passed by the Phenix City Church, of Alabama, you will see that all these things were included. But when those brethren found out that nearly everybody was carrying some kind of insurance they have never enforced that part of it, so far as it related to insurance. Now, Brother Cayce, listen: If you brethren had put this whole matter as one of expediency, and not one of law, we would never have had any division over the matter. One or two churches in Georgia had had organs in use for twenty-five years before these bars were set up, and your sainted father visited and preached in them without one word of condemnation. It went on so until there was war between Elders Bullard and Bussey at Columbus. It was all of the flesh, and to obtain the mastery. That was all. You express a desire that I might see my inconsistency, "and come back to the old church." I can't come back. I haven't gone anywhere. I can never consent that you had a Scriptural right to set up bars against the things mentioned, for to do so would be to admit that the church may set bars at any time not justified by the Bible, and lay a precedent that work havoc later upon other things. But listen again: If you will acknowledge that you had no right in the Bible, and that it was a mistake made at that time, and take down your

unscriptural bars, then as a matter of good faith, I solemnly promise that I will do all in my power to have our churches everywhere to take out their organs for the sake of peace, and if you and your brethren demand it, we will not have another meeting lasting longer than three days if it can be possibly avoided. Is this not fair? I have never advocated the organ in my churches. I have consistently contended all the while that the fellowship of the brotherhood everywhere was worth infinitely more than an organ. I have always felt, and still feel, that as it was neither commanded nor forbidden in the New Testament Scriptures it was unimportant, so far as gospel law was concerned. But when you brethren make it a law, when I know that God has not done so, you go too far, and for which you will have to give account. Try me. Take down your bars. Acknowledge to the world that you acted without divine authority when you set up bars against music in the churches, continued meetings and insurance, and throw the whole over as a matter of expediency, and so soon as you do this I will bend every energy within me to get my people to conform to the law of expediency and have peace with the brethren everywhere, insofar as it is possible. I can make no promise as to how they will take such a proposition. I feel sure that my church here in Atlanta will only be glad to do so, and I am quite sure that many others will do the same thing, but I would not promise to tear up a church over these things, for this would be doing the same things that you have done -making a law when there is none. Elder Hull told me this morning that you are to be in Atlanta soon. I hope it will be so that I can meet you face to face and discuss the matter with you, and if possible to entertain you in my home.

Will you inform me just when you are to be here? The latter part of the present month I am to be away at some associations. Yours in Jesus, A. V Simms., Atlanta, Ga.

REPLY TO ELDER SIMMS

On another page in this paper will be found a letter from Elder Simms in reply to our letter to him, which was published in our issue of September 1. We feel that we are perfectly willing to let our readers have the benefit of what Elder Simms has had to say in reply to our letter. So we are giving space for that and for our reply to the letter. We believe Elder Simms will have no objection to these letters being in our paper. Of course his people will not see them-at least, not many of them will. We do not care for a lengthy discussion of the matter through the paper. We do feel, however, that it is right for our people to know how the matter stands, in view of the fact that a proposal was once made for a meeting with these brethren to discuss matters of difference, etc. C. H. C.

OUR REPLY

Elder A. V Simms:

Dear Brother-Yours of the 1st to hand. Yes, it is strange that you should use **(II Timothy 3:16-17)** to prove that our people had no right to put up bars against the use of a thing in the church, and as a church, that is not authorized in the word of God! That tells us that the word of God furnishes us with EVERYTHING we should use or practice in the church. If not, then we are not thoroughly furnished by the word of God. If we are thoroughly furnished by it with everything we should practice, then that text itself requires us to put up, or keep up, the bars against everything not expressly commanded in the word of God. No other text was needed, and never will be needed, as authority to exclude from the church of God such inventions of Rome as instrumental music in the church. As to continued meetings, the circumstances of the case, and what may be engaged in the

meetings, have much to do with it. None of our brethren have ever objected to a meeting being continued longer than three days, that I know of, when it was manifestly the Lord's doing that the meeting was continued. Yes, I have preached in meetings that lasted longer than three days; but at the same time I do not believe that the tactics that were sometimes engaged in by the Kirk-lands, when this matter was being agitated among our people, were right or Scriptural. Such things as were sometimes practiced then will get people in the church under excitement and fleshly sympathy, and result in injury to the cause. But when a meeting is continued from day to day, because it is necessary to appoint a meeting to administer baptism to another one of the Lord's little children, it is a different matter. But we have not destroyed our brethren. You destroyed yourselves by introducing in the church things that were foreign to the word of God, and that were new things among Primitive Baptists. If you had not had the things declared against, then the declarations against the same would have never touched you. If, as you insinuate, I have always engaged in holding "protracted meetings," can you explain how it is that I am not out of line with the church in Phenix City? Can you explain why it is that their declaration did not reach me as well as you, if I had been doing the same things you had been doing? The first mission society that was ever organized among the Baptists was a matter of expediency. All their boards and societies have been matters of expediency. The Bible does not say, that I remember of, that you shall not have a missionary board, or a Southern Convention, or a Sunday school, or a Woman's Missionary Union, or a Ladies' Aid Society, or State Convention, or a Mite Society-these and hundreds of other things are engaged in and practiced by the world (including the Missionary Baptists), and they are not mentioned in the Bible that I remember of. If a thing may be practiced just because it is not mentioned in the Bible, then we may as well practice all these things as to have your organ. There is only one place to draw the line against the things not mentioned in the Bible-and that is against the very first thing. You say one or two churches had organs in use for twenty-five years before these bars were set up. Yes, and the Baptists had the Fuller and Carey mission business among them, too, from 1792 until 1832 to 1845. Did that make it right? No, and you know it did not. The mistake the Baptists made in that day was in bearing with their departures so long. And the mistake the Baptists in South Georgia and Alabama made was in bearing with the organ departure so long. I freely confess for them that they made this mistake. The very first church that introduced the organ should have been withdrawn from, instanter, unless they put it out at once. Does this confession help you any? If the organ business was all of the flesh and to obtain the mastery, then it is against God's Book. I agree with you, that it was a fleshly desire that prompted its use. I also agree with you that it was to obtain the mastery-" we will use it, no matter if it is objected to, and offensive to, the great body of Primitive Baptists!" Evidently that is the spirit it was of. We heard some such expressions as that, a similar expression, when we were in that country (south Ga.) in the winter of 1905-06. Yes, you have gone from the practice of the Old Baptists in the use of organs in the church. They were introduced in your own day-it was not before you came into the world-was it? If you do not come back, or labor for a union with our people, until we confess that we should take down bars against what the Bible does not authorize, we are of the opinion that you will never be with us. If we would take down the bars against the practices engaged in by the New School Baptists that are not mentioned in the Bible, we suppose they would willingly unite with us, too. We suppose the Burnamites would do the same thing. When the church of God gives up her right to put up and keep up bars against things that are not authorized by the Bible, she gives up the only thing that will keep her a separate people from all others. This she will never do-at least, she

cannot afford to do it, unless she is ready to surrender everything and cease to be the church of God. If your letter expresses your real sentiment, and I do not mean by this to insinuate that you are not sincere, then I may as well say, candidly, that we will, doubtless, remain apart. If you give up the organ business the bar against that practice would not be against you. If you hold to it, then it is against you. If you want the bar down that is against you, you are the man to get the bar out of the way by laying aside the things that the bar is against. Otherwise, let it alone. You have admitted (in your pamphlet) that our people are having more additions to their churches than yours are. As they are, I think the safe thing for them to do is to continue on in the same old way and leave the result with the good Lord. He has not forsaken them yet, according to your own argument. It seems that He is forsaking your people. Why? Because you have forsaken His way. Is Ephraim still joined to his idols? Yours in humble hope, C. H. Cayce.

Our Mother Gone

---October 15, 1924

In our last issue we stated that mother was gradually growing worse, and that unless there should be a change soon she would not last long, and that just as that paper was going to press she seemed to be just a little better. The seeming turn for the better did not last long. By the time the paper reached the readers she was again sinking. On Monday, October 13, at 12:30 in the day, our dear and precious mother peacefully and quietly fell asleep in Jesus. We carried her to Martin, Tenn., where she was laid to rest by the side of our dear father, on Wednesday, October 15, where she will peacefully sleep until the Lord comes to gather His jewels home. We returned home Thursday morning at 3:24, October 16, in time to put a little notice of mother's passing away in this issue of the paper. Part of the paper has already been printed, and is a little late. A more extended account will be in the next issue. Our hearts are sad. We feel so cast down. It is so hard to give up our dear mother. We miss her, and feel so sad that we can never see her again in our home or in her home. We shall miss her words of caution and advice. We feel so much to need the Lord's care and sustaining grace, and humbly ask the Lord's dear children to pray the Lord in our behalf, that He would sustain us in this sad hour of distress. All our hope is in Him. He was mother's stay and she rejoiced in Him in her last days, and told us she was just going to that blessed home where there is no more suffering or pain, to be with Jesus forever. We are sure she is at rest. We desire to be reconciled to the Lord's will and dealing with us. Brethren, please pray for us. C. H. C.

Call For A Peace Meeting

---October 15, 1924

Dear Brother Cayce:

Enclosed you will find a call for a peace meeting. Please publish in the paper, and be sure and come to it. I believe the time is ripe for such a meeting. May the Lord enable us to do the right thing. Yours in hope, O. Strickland. Munday, Texas.

THE CALL

To the Lord's poor divided and sub-divided children scattered over Texas and elsewhere in all the different factions, who are tired of strife and division and long to see a coming together of all the peace loving, right living, people of God, to confess their faults one to another and to pray one for another, and to try to forgive and be forgiven and pull together, in place of pulling apart-Greetings: We,

the members of Little Flock Church, at Munday, Texas, and also members of the church at Knox City, Texas, desiring a condition whereby we can live together in peace with each other; and not only us, but that God's people elsewhere could see the folly of strife and division and confess their faults one to another and forgive each other and pull together like Pharaoh's horses, hereby invite all the Baptists having like feelings and faults to confess to meet with us at Munday, Texas, on Friday before the fifth Sunday in November, 1924, to sing and pray and hear the different brethren preach, and to confess faults one to another and forgive one another, and see if we can't get closer to each other. J. W. M. Pharr. O. Strickland. This was endorsed by the church at Knox City and the church at Munday. O. Strickland.

REMARKS

If not providentially prevented we expect to be at that meeting, and we now earnestly request every Old Baptist, and more especially every Old Baptist in the ministry, and especially those in Texas, to be at the meeting. We feel just now that we have a few words we would be glad to say to every one of you face to face. Brethren, will you please try to be there? It makes no difference to us which side you are on, or which side you have been on, we want to see you, and we humbly beg you to try to go. May the good Lord lead us all in the right way, and help us by His grace to live and walk as becometh His children, and bless this effort to the good of His dear cause and poor and afflicted people. And, dear brethren, please do pray for us. We feel to be so poor and needy and dependent. C. H. C.

Our Mother Gone

---November 1, 1924

In our last issue we had a short notice of the death of our precious mother, which event occurred on Monday, October 13, at 12:30. This is a hard trial and a sad stroke for us. We just simply cannot write as we would like concerning our dear mother and this sad trial. Mother was confined to her bed four months. When we started on our trip to California in the summer-in June -mother was confined to her bed part of the time. We were called home from that trip a week before the time was up for our return. After we returned home mother seemed to improve, and we went on another trip in Tennessee and Alabama. We expected to go from our debate with Mr. Bradley at Woodville, Ala., to Chattanooga to attend the Sequachee Valley Association. On the last day of the debate, which was August 7, we received a message to come home to mother. Again, after our return she seemed to improve some. A promise had long been made to visit some of the brethren in Alabama and Georgia, the trip to begin on the first Sunday in September at Birmingham. We went to mother and asked her if she thought we should go and try to fill the appointments. She told us she thought we should go, and said, "Go on, son, and be careful what you say, and preach the truth. Lollie and Rachel will look after me all right." The physicians told us they thought it was all right for us to go, and promised that if they should see any turn for the worse they would let us know it at once. So we started on the trip and filled the appointments as far as to Atlanta, Ga., where we were on Tuesday, September 16. Late in the afternoon we received a message to come home. We were not surprised but had been expecting it all day on account of a dream we had during the night. We started for home on the first train and arrived home on Thursday morning, Sept. 18, at 3:24. When we reached mother's bedside and she was told that "Claud is here," she began talking to us, and told us that she was just going home-to that blessed home where there

is no more suffering or pain; to that blessed home where Jesus is, and would be with blessed Jesus forever. She talked so beautifully and sweetly of that blessed home and how she was ready to go. The family and the physician told us of how beautifully she talked the day before. The physician told us that he never heard the like before, and that it was a pity every person in the county could not hear what she said. She talked and praised the Saviour for at least an hour. Mother gradually grew weaker. Occasionally she would seem to rally a little and gain a little strength, but each time it was only temporary, until finally the end came. She quietly and peacefully and calmly fell asleep in the arms of the blessed Redeemer at 12:30 on Monday, October 13. We never saw one pass away more quietly and calmly than she did-without a struggle. It was so hard to see our dear mother breathe her last; but we know that she is at rest. She was born December 3, 1851; the daughter of Elisha and Almeda Beasley. She was of a family of eight girls. Only one of them is now living-Mrs. Allie Spicer, of Clinton, Ky. Mother was married to Elder S. F. Cayce January 11, 1870. Ten children were born to them, six of whom died in infancy. One daughter (Mrs. Turner) died in 1911. Three of the children are yet living-O. F. Cayce, Mrs. Rachel Miller and the writer. Father engaged in the practice of medicine for a number of years, but on the first of the year 1886 he gave up a lucrative practice and began the publication of The Primitive Baptist and devoted his whole time to this paper and to the ministry. Mother was a preacher's wife. She shared all the toils and burdens and conflicts of an Old Baptist minister and the privations of the wife without a murmur or a complaint. Then she shared the burdens with her boy, and encouraged us all that a mother could to go on in the service of the Master. She has stood by us and encouraged us in ways we do not feel like reciting here in years gone by. She continued to encourage us all that a dear mother could to her last days. We bless God's name for the memory now of a dear and precious mother. We did love to say, "Mother, I love you," and then we loved to try to show it by our act. We do not regret a single thing we have ever done for mother's comfort and peace. We only regret that we did not do more. Mother united with the Primitive Baptist Church at Rock Spring, near Crutchfield, Ky., about the year 1872 or 1873-we do not have the exact year-and was baptized by Elder W. A. Bowden. She was a faithful and true and devoted Primitive Baptist. She loved the glorious doctrine of salvation by the free and sovereign and reigning grace of God. Many times we have heard her shout aloud the praises of her glorious Redeemer while sitting under the sound of the glad tidings of salvation by the grace of God. Mother wrote her Christian experience, which was published in The Primitive Baptist of July 15, 1886. It was written to dear old Brother S. Murphree, of Only, Tenn., at his request, and published in the paper. Near the close of the article she said that she might write later and tell why she was an Old Baptist. She never did write that article. We wish she had written it. We publish the experience elsewhere in this paper, and trust it may be a comfort to our readers. Not many of our present readers were taking the paper then. We carried mother's mortal remains to Martin, Tenn., leaving here on Tuesday, October 14, and arriving at Martin on Wednesday morning at 6:55. A short service was held here at the residence of our sister, where mother made her home, by Elder John R. Harris, of Thornton, Ark. Elder Harris and Brother Loyd Bozarth, of near Fordyce, accompanied us to Martin. There another service was held in the Primitive Baptist Church by Elders Harris, J. H. Phillips, J. C. Ross, R. L. Perry, A. B. Ross, Brother J. O. Vincent, and perhaps others. Then she was gently laid to rest in the East Side Cemetery by the side of our dear father, where she will quietly rest until Jesus comes again to gather His jewels home. We miss our dear mother, and realize that we shall continue to miss her. We shall miss her loving counsel and advice, and her tender words of encouragement. We shall miss her fervent prayers. Many times in our younger days

we have known mother to come to our bedside in the dark hours of night, and we could feel the tender touch of mother's loving hands, when she had come to see if all was well with her boy, when she thought we were asleep; and then she would often go down on her knees by our bedside and send up a fervent prayer to the throne of grace in behalf of her boy. We remember it now with tender emotion. The true mother is the child's best friend. No one knows how to sympathize with us, only those who have had the same experience. - We feel so poor and helpless and dependent. Yet we trust that we feel reconciled to the Lord's providential dealings with us. We feel to trust our all with Him. He is our only hope. Our hope in Him has been sweet throughout all the years of trouble and distress which we have passed and endured, and is sweeter as the years swiftly pass. We have the abiding and blessed hope that we shall meet mother and father again, before many more years, where we shall join them in anthems of eternal praise to heaven's King -our blessed and adorable Redeemer. We feel that we need the prayers of the Lord's dear people. We need the Lord's preserving care and sustaining grace. Please pray for us. C. H. C.

Away From Home

---December 1, 1924

At this writing, Nov. 8, we are on the train on our way from Shreveport, La., to Houston, Texas, to fill appointments arranged by Elder J. A. Moore and others. Since Friday, Oct. 31, we have been filling appointments arranged by Elder J. H. Veach, of Logansport. On yesterday, Nov. 7, at Bethel, near Shreveport, Elder C. H. Herriage came to the church confessing wrong steps taken by him and asking for a home with them, which was granted. Elder Herriage was in Mt. Paran Church when it was dissolved some time ago, and his confession more especially concerned steps he had taken since that time. We trust the Lord may guide and direct him in the right way. We received a message this morning from our dear wife dated Nov. 6 stating that her brother, Tom Lawler, had been killed by an auto, and that she was leaving home that night. Tom has been living in New York for a few years, and we judge from the message that he was to be taken to the family home, near Brownsboro, Ala. He is a son of B. B. Lawler, a deacon of Flint River Church. This is a sad and heavy stroke for the family, as it is the first child the parents have lost and the first experience the brothers and sisters have had of that kind, though one of the boys (Ben) has experienced the loss of a companion. Our heart bleeds for our dear companion, and we wish we could be with her to try to comfort her in her deep sorrow. May the Lord sustain all the family by His grace, is our humble prayer. Tom gave evidence in his letters to the family of having a sweet hope in the Lord, and this should be a comfort and consolation to us in this sad hour. Please pray for us and our loved ones. C. H. C.

A Good Meeting

---December 1, 1924

Our regular meeting time for the little church in North Little Rock is the third Sunday in each month. As our association met on the third Sunday in October we did not go to Little Rock at that time, but went on the fourth Sunday. There were two additions to the church by baptism on that day-Sister Rewis and a brother whose name we cannot just now recall. If we remember correctly there was also an addition by relation-or confession of faith. Sister Meek also united with them by letter from the church at Burns, Tenn. It was a sweet meeting and the hearts of the

little band were filled with joy and thankfulness. They are few in number, but it is a little band that is full of life. They have recently lost a brother (M. R. Hopper, a deacon) by death, which was a sad stroke to them. They have their new house completed and a few seats made and are trying to pay it out. If any of our readers feel like helping them, send your contribution to Mrs. R. D. Rewis, 406 W. Fifth St., Argenta, Ark., or to Mrs. Byrd Warren, 814 E. Fifteenth St., Little Rock, Ark. It will be appreciated and rightly applied. C. H. C.

Peace Is Desired

---December 15, 1924

"Unto thee, O Lord, do I lift up my soul." "Show me thy way, O Lord; teach me thy paths." -(Psalms 25:1,4.)These expressions of David are a source of comfort to me when I feel that I can adopt them as my own. I have been so much lifted up and encouraged since my last until I am lifting up my soul unto the Lord in praise and thankfulness. His name is so sweet to me. He has so greatly blessed me in my little effort to speak in His name. Oh, how I do crave to be taught the way of the Lord. In tracing the way of the Lord I find mercy, love and forgiveness. Then if I follow in His paths, I show mercy, as He had mercy. Oh, let me show mercy on my erring brethren. Inasmuch as He has loved us so greatly and manifested it by laying down His life for us, and has shed abroad His love in our hearts, should we not want to love our brethren and be willing to show our love for them? When we are taught that the paths of the Lord are paths of peace, ought we not to strive for peace? Yes, my dear brethren, my soul goes out to the Lord in prayer for peace. Some of you may say that I want, or would be willing, to sacrifice principle for peace. But that is a mistake, for I realize peace could not come that way. I know that peace must come according to the right principles, as the Saviour has taught us in His word, and that is by confessing our faults one to another and in forgiving one another and laboring, as the Lord has directed, to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. I am fearful that some of us are inclined to want to take our brother by the throat and say, "Pay me that thou owest," instead of forgiving them. God, teach me the way of forgiveness, that I may have mercy, as our heavenly Father. And, Oh, give me grace to humbly confess my faults to my dear brethren. But, O Lord, teach us thy way to do all things decently and in order, that we may keep a clean house, one fit for thee to recognize as thy holy temple. O Lord, keep us all from self-conceit, that we may be truly submissive one to another in the fear of thee, our Lord. "Show me thy way, and teach me thy paths." B. M. G.

REMARKS

The above article by Elder B. M. Green, Sulphur, Okla., is copied from the Baptist Trumpet of Dec. 11, 1924. We heartily commend it to our readers for a careful and prayerful reading. We feel that it is timely and full of matter worthy of our consideration. What a blessing it would be to our cause if we would all heed what is expressed therein. The torn and divided and bleeding condition of Zion today has not been brought about by our devotion and service to the cause of the Master, but by wrong doing. We have been biting and devouring one another. We have been fighting one another. We have not been engaged in fighting "the good fight;" but we have been engaged in fighting a bad fight. When we look over our beloved Zion today and see the sad condition of affairs, our poor heart is broken. It is sad; it is deplorable. Brethren, can we not all confess our wrongs in such a course as we have followed, and come together in peace with each other, and all pull together, "as the horses of Pharaoh's chariot," in fighting against the enemies of Israel, and

with an eye single to the glory of God and the advancement of His kingdom? "But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." -(Galatians 4:15). Dear brethren, is it any wonder that we have been consumed? Is it not rather a wonder that we have not been worse consumed than we have? Were it not for the longsuffering, forbearance and mercy of our God, we would have all been consumed; there would not have been a place of true worship left. Is it any wonder that many of our churches have become extinct, and the houses torn down or left for the habitation of the owls and bats? Many places where once the saints met together and engaged together in the sweet service of the Master are now desolate. Why is this so? Is it because the Lord is not faithful? No; that is not the reason. The reason is because we have been wicked and rebellious. May we not all awake to our duty and return to our first love? Surely we should repent and do our first work. We have been engaged too much in some of the works of the flesh. There has been too much hatred, variance, emulations, wrath and strife. Such things as these have destroyed our peace and have brought trouble and sorrow among us. Unless we lay such things aside and follow after better things, what will the end be? Can any tell? In our younger days we would never hear such a question asked of or about a brother as we often hear now-such as, "Who is he in line with?" "To what faction does he belong?" Is it any wonder that many of the Lord's little ones have become confused? Is it any wonder that many of our children have been driven from us? For our part, we are sorry of every thing we have done to bring about or to promote such a state of affairs among our people. Our poor heart bleeds now over the scattered and desolated condition of our beloved Zion, and we write these lines in tears and sadness. "Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people." -(Jeremiah 9:1). We long to see the day that orderly walking and peace loving Old Baptists may come together in humble confession of all wrongs, and forgive each other for every wrong word spoken and deed committed against each other, and humbly beg the Lord's mercy upon us, and be once more a happy and united people, walking together in love and fellowship. We feel sure that the good Lord would pour out His rich blessings upon us. Brethren, let us still labor for peace and for the unity of the Lord's dear children. Be not weary in well doing. "In due season we shall reap, if we faint not." Let us be careful what we sow; the reaping time will come. We may think it is too long until the reaping time comes and become impatient. Let us be patient and continue the sowing and cultivating and the reaping time will come in due season. May the Lord help us and direct us and sustain us all by His grace. Brethren, please pray for us. We need your prayers. We need your love and sweet fellowship. We feel to be so poor and needy and dependent. C. H. C.

Close of Volume Thirty-Nine

---December 15, 1924

This issue closes volume thirty-nine of The Primitive Baptist. The past few years have been strenuous times in many respects. Many have been the sorrows, trials and conflicts; but the Lord's mercy has been extended all along. His mercy never fails. His mercy is from generation to generation. He has continued to shield, protect and care for His little ones in the midst of all the storms of life, and forsakes them not in death. His mercy has preserved and kept us to the present hour. We have tried to conduct the paper in such a way as to be a benefit to the cause. We are well aware that we have made mistakes; and if we still live, no doubt we will make more. All

people make mistakes, if they make anything. But we desire to profit by the mistakes we make, and try not to make the same mistakes again. We ask all our readers to kindly look over and pass by the mistakes we have made. Be as charitable toward us as you can. If you can, please help us to correct our mistakes, as far as it is possible to correct them. We cannot find words to express our appreciation and thankfulness to the dear brethren, sisters and friends who have so kindly come to our relief in a financial way during the year in response to the effort put forth by dear Brother Hollingsworth and the proposition made through the paper by Elder O'Neal. What those brethren did was done without any request from us, or even a hint from us that we desired such a thing to be done. In fact, when Brother Hollingsworth first talked to us about the matter and asked us about our financial condition we objected to any appeal being made for contributions to pay the indebtedness, and finally consented only from the standpoint of being submissive to the wishes of the brethren. Nearly all the indebtedness was incurred as a result of war time prices and to keep the paper going during such time. We appreciate what has been done. May the good Lord bless everyone that has so kindly helped. We would be glad to publish the paper weekly again, but we cannot do so yet. The present size of the subscription list will not justify us in putting the paper out every week. If we were to publish only eight pages every week, just half the present size, the cost would be more. It would take more expense for mailing the papers out, and some other expenses would be more. But we desire to put it out every week as soon as we possibly can. How many of our readers will put their shoulders to the wheel and help us increase the list so we can get the paper out every week? If every subscriber already on the list would just send us one new name that would double the list, and it would not take that many to enable us to make the change. If one-half the subscribers on the list would send two new ones, that would double the list. Perhaps there are not many who could not get one or two new subscribers if they would try just a little. Many could get more than that. How many of you will try, by asking the brethren, sisters and friends to subscribe who are not already taking the paper? Will you see how many you can get during the next thirty days? We believe you will try. Yes, this is personal to you-you that are now reading these lines. We will appreciate the effort you may put forth. Wishing every reader a "Merry Christmas and a happy New Year," we now bid you farewell for the year 1924, and pray God's richest blessings to rest upon everyone of you, and ask that you remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

1925

Introduction to Volume Forty

---January 1, 1925

With this issue we begin the fortieth volume of The Primitive Baptist. Thirty-nine years ago the first copy of the paper was sent out by our sainted father, Elder S. F. Cayce, from Fulton, Ky. In the same year (the latter part of August) he moved to Martin, Tenn., where the paper was published until we moved here in October, 1919. During all these years the effort has been to publish a paper in defense of the principles that have always been dear to the Primitive or Old School Baptists. The desire has been to send out a good clean paper, and to give all the reading matter possible for the money. As to how well we have succeeded in publishing a true Old Baptist paper is for the readers to judge. It is true we have made

mistakes, and have sometimes let things get in the paper that should have been kept out. It is our desire to keep the paper as clear of controversy as possible. If our papers are rightly conducted they are a great blessing to our people; but when used to air out troubles they spread confusion and distress. But the same thing is true with the ministry. The minister who preaches peace by Jesus Christ, who preaches the gospel in its purity, advocating nothing but what the Bible plainly teaches, never causes trouble or confusion among the Lord's humble poor; but his preaching will comfort, instruct, edify and build them up, and have a tendency to bind them together in love and fellowship. The same thing is true concerning what is published through the press. The preaching of the gospel is the publishing of the truth orally, and writing the truth and sending it forth in print is publishing the same truth through the press. Publishing the truth through the press will have the same effect, in a great measure, as publishing the truth from the pulpit. Many of the Lord's dear children tell us that they are comforted and edified by reading The Primitive Baptist. Many of them are deprived of the privilege of hearing preaching. If they were deprived of the privilege of reading Old Baptist papers they would be deprived of the great comfort they have received thereby. Think, if you can, how lonely their condition would be without the papers. It is our desire to make The Primitive Baptist better, if possible, than it has been before. We desire to be watchful and try to avoid mistakes that have been made in the past. We feel that we need the Lord's grace and help. We need the prayers of the Lord's dear children. We need your help and co-operation to make the paper better. In order to help us make the paper better, and more calculated to comfort and edify the Lord's little children, write us about the good things of the kingdom. Tell us about your good meetings. Tell us the things that are pleasant to you. Tell of your hopes, your doubts and fears-not to encourage others in doubting; but when one has those gloomy doubts and fears, it is a comfort to him for another to tell of having the same experience along life's way. If you have church troubles, strife, confusion and divisions, keep that at home. Do not try to publish your brother's wrongs and faults. If you have some trouble in your family-domestic trouble-you do not try to tell it to the world. You do not want that published broadcast. Neither should we try to publish our church troubles broadcast. We are brethren, and if we are in the right spirit we do not desire to publish our brother's wrongs. We should have a spirit of forbearance. Remember that we might do wrong too. If we desire others to bear with us in our imperfections, we should be trying to do that way toward them. Remember the golden rule. That is a rule which works both ways. Let us try more to observe it. The revised "golden rule" is not good. The revised way is, "Try to do the other fellow before he does you." We all know that is wrong, yet some of us have sometimes worked according to it, and then we were doing wrong. We confess that we have been guilty sometimes, but we are sorry of it, and humbly beg everyone whom we have wronged in any way, by word or deed, to forgive us. Let us all confess our faults and pray for each other, instead of abusing each other. We now greet you in the beginning of another volume of The Primitive Baptist. True, the paper is late, but we do hope to soon have the paper going out on time. It is our earnest desire, too, that we may some day have matters and affairs so arranged that we may be able to devote our whole time and attention to the publication of this paper and to our little efforts in a ministerial way. We would also be glad if we could send the paper out every week, but the number of subscribers will not justify us in doing so at the present cost of material and production. If we could add a few thousand names to the list we could make it weekly. If every subscriber would send one new one that would double the list. If one-half the subscribers would send two new ones, that would double the list. If one thousand of them would send five each, that would add five thousand new names to the list,

and we could then make the paper a weekly. How many will try and see what they can do? Will you try? Especially would we ask that the brethren in the ministry make public announcement at your meetings that you would be glad to take subscriptions for the paper. That would not be very much trouble to you, and it would encourage your members to read the paper; and our observation is that those who read the paper are usually more zealous and prompt in their church duties, and they also read the Bible more. We will appreciate all the help our brethren, sisters and friends may lend. May the good Lord shower down His richest blessings upon you, and may this year be one of prosperity, joy and true happiness for you. Please do remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Articles Crowded Out

ARTICLES CROWDED OUT ---January 1, 1925

We have a number of good articles written for The Primitive Baptist which we cannot publish for want of space. We have just simply got so far behind in publishing letters sent for the paper that we have to go through and select what we think are the best and most appropriate and publish them and let the others wait until some other time, and publish them later if we have the space to do so. If your article does not come out in the paper do not conclude that it was because we found fault with the sentiment, for we have many that contain sentiment that is good; but we do not have space for all of them. We just have so much space to fill every issue, and when that space is filled, that is all we can do. We do not want you to quit writing because we make this statement. Just keep on writing, and that will give us a better and larger assortment to select from. We may make mistakes in our selections, but we have no one to do the work for us, and we have to take the responsibility and do the best we can in the matter. We are aware that sometimes brethren become offended because we do not publish their letters, or because we do not publish them as soon as they think we should, but we are trying to do the best we can in the matter. If any brother thinks he can do better, we would be glad to let him try it for a little while. We do not mean by this that we are offended at any brother who feels to offer a suggestion. We are always glad for any brother to offer a suggestion. But when it is offered, we have to decide as to whether we think best to follow the suggestion. The readers of the paper would hold us responsible, and not the brother who might make the suggestion-and therefore we have to decide the matter. We ask all the dear brethren and sisters to bear with us, and look over all our shortcomings and mistakes, which we confess are many. Write for the paper and tell of the goodness and mercy of God, but keep your church troubles to yourself. We simply will not put them in the paper, but will throw them in the waste-basket as soon as we see what it is. If you send a long article (or a short one) for the paper airing your church troubles, you need not write to us later and tell us to return it to you, for if we have seen what it is it will be destroyed before your letter can get to us. This we know is plain and blunt, but we simply want it understood that The Primitive Baptist is not published to scatter strife and confusion. We mean no offense, but we have been very much worried on account of such things having been sent to us. Help us to extend the circulation of the paper, so we can make it a weekly. Will you help? How many new subscribers will you send? And will you remember us in your prayers? C. H. C.

John 6:44-45

---January 1, 1925

We have a question from one Mr. J. I Jones, of Huntsville, Ala., sent us by Brother W. M. Towry, of that place, regarding the teaching of **(John 6:44-45)**. We do not know the object of the brother in asking the question-whether it be for controversy, or if he really is seeking information. However, we will try to offer a few thoughts on the language. The two verses read as follows: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." Mr. Jones wishes to know if it is the outsider that is drawn to the Father, or is it the backslider. It simply means that no man in an unregenerate state can come to the Father. It is not his own work to do the coming. The primary meaning of the word here translated "draw" is to drag. That is in the passive voice. The one, then, who comes to the Saviour is not active, but is passive, in the work. Hence, he is brought to the Saviour; and this is the only way that they can come. It is not the work of men to bring them, but it is the work of the Father. Men have nothing in the wide world to do with that work. The backslider is one who has life, and he can repent - turn from his wrongs, come to a throne of grace, return unto the Lord in service, and is commanded so to do. God's regenerated children can render service unto Him, and they are commanded to do that. No man is commanded to do something in order to be born again, or to be born from above, or to become a child of God-no more than one is commanded to do something in order to be born of his natural parents. In verse 45 the reference is to the language of **((4:13) (Isaiah 54:13))**" And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord." The "they" in **(John 6:45)** are the same as "thy children" in **((4:13) (Isaiah 54:13))**. They belong to Jesus -they are His by choice, by gift and by redemption; and they shall be all taught of God. To be taught of God and to be taught about God are two different things. If one is taught of God, God is the teacher. This is a teaching that is not done by men, but which is done by the Lord alone and by Him only. It is OF the Lord, not ABOUT the Lord. "Every man therefore that hath heard" -heard whom? Heard the Father. It is the Father they hear in this work. It is a work the Father does. "God is a Spirit." It is the office work of the Holy Spirit. They hear the Father and learn of the Father, and all of them come. Many who hear the gospel do not come. Therefore, the teaching in this text is not gospel teaching, or the teaching that is accomplished in the gospel. It is the teaching which the Lord does in the heart by the Holy Spirit. If you have ever realized in your heart that you are a poor sinner, and have been made to hate sin, it is because you have been taught of the Lord. If you have ever been given the sweet assurance in your heart that Jesus is your Saviour, and have had the sweet peace which follows such assurance, it is because you have been taught of the Lord; for that is the teaching which brings peace to the poor soul; and you are a child of God. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon our readers. C. H. C.

On The Warpath

---January 1, 1925

We have received and have seen a few copies of the Glad Tidings, a paper started by Elder W. H. Richards, and now published by N. O. Carter. They seem to be very much on the warpath, and have published several thrusts at us, and in one issue say they do not know whether we desire a getting together with them or not. We feel that it is necessary for us to say just a few words for their information. First: There are some good brethren among them who are orderly walking, and we would be glad to know that they were in peace with all orderly walking Primitive Baptists; but they have some among them that we have no desire or inclination to walk with.

We say this frankly and in all kindness for the information of those who have said something about such a matter, and yet have opposed such a coming together. We have no fellowship for fornication, adultery, and such ungodly practice among the ministry. So you brethren need not be wasting so much space and time and labor in writing against a union of your brethren with us, unless you are willing to forsake some against whom there seems to be so much evidence of immorality. Second: We do not care to enter into any war with any of you. You may say just what you please. Our life has been a public one, and an open book. We do not care to enter into any fight at all with any of you, and especially as unbecoming as some seem to act. You are not hurting us, and you will only hurt yourselves by your unbecoming conduct and unbecoming course. May the good Lord pity you. We do not propose to notice further any of your statements concerning our doctrine or our efforts to labor for peace among the Lord's poor and orderly walking children, who have been so divided and troubled by ungodly wars among them. C. H. C.

Good Evidence

---January 15, 1925

After so long a time Elder J. C. Morgan says, "I did not know the standing of Elder Bragg." He also says he might have made a mistake in publishing appointments for him, and if so he is ready to make acknowledgments for same. And again, he points out some ten years ago, the writer visited the Baptists in the north. He pleads the above excuses to justify what he has done, and I suppose it will give his followers perfect satisfaction. He says, in the same article, when Elder Bragg wrote him two or three years ago he referred him to older brethren. Elder Morgan reminds me of a certain kind of frogs-they change to the color of whatever object they are on. When it suits best he is willing to risk his "older" brethren, and when it suits best then he knows more than all his old brethren and all the churches too. Elder Morgan would shoot a cannon ball at a gnat, but let an elephant appear and he would not use a popgun. He would turn the world upside down to convict a brother preacher who was reported as a fornicator and him denying it, and then take the evidence of a confessed fornicator. But Jesus said, "some would strain at a gnat and swallow a camel." -S. N. R., in Glad Tidings. We do not copy the above to have a thing in the world to say concerning the dispute between Elder Morgan and Elder Redford or any of the Richards crowd. We do not expect to enter into controversy with them. We only wish to call attention to the fornication business mentioned. In the name of the good Lord, how much better evidence could one have of the guilt of such a preacher? Evidently, from the statement of Elder Redford, some woman confessed that she was guilty with the preacher! If she was guilty so was the preacher! We suppose she was excluded on her confession. If she was not guilty she was excluded on a false charge. If she was excluded on a truthful charge, then the preacher was guilty too. Any body of people who love the sanctity of the home, and who love morality (to say nothing of the house of God), should withdraw fellowship from such a preacher under such circumstances-and permit us to say that if they deal honestly and faithfully they will do it. May the good Lord deliver us from such filthy preachers. C. H. C.

Elder Wilson's Confession

---February 1, 1925

In another place in this paper will be found a short statement from Elder J. R. Wilson under the heading, "A Correction and Confession." We are glad to see this

from Brother Wilson, and we trust that the matter between him and Danville Church and Brother Spangler may be healed. Elder Wilson says the charge he made against Elder Spangler that he is an Absoluter is a false charge. We do not understand Brother Wilson to mean that he intentionally made a false charge against Brother Spangler. We might be led to believe that a brother believes a certain thing, and charge him with it, and be sincere in making the charge, and yet be wrong about it. Therefore we should be very careful how we charge a brother with believing a doctrine that is not true. If we charge a brother wrongfully, though we be ever so sincere, we do the brother an injustice. When we have done a brother an injustice, and done him an injury or a wrong, it is right and commendable to acknowledge the wrong and ask forgiveness. Then it is Christ-like to forgive. We all make mistakes, and we all do wrong; and as we desire forgiveness for our wrongs, we should forgive those who wrong us. We do hope that those good brethren will all come together once more in peace and fellowship, forgiving all wrongs that have been committed. Just here we are going to take the liberty to say that we think Brother Wilson did wrong and made a mistake in declaring against Danville Church as he did. Then we think he made a mistake in going to the Mill Church and joining there on confession of faith or by relation; and we think that Mill Church made a mistake and did wrong in thus receiving Brother Wilson and the others. Especially is this so when no "gospel labor" had been bestowed on Danville Church by the Mill Church, or by any other sister church that we are aware of. To do that is very wrong, as all our able writers have contended and pointed out all along the line. We do hope those good brethren may get together now and get all these matters adjusted, and that sweet peace may be restored among them. May the good Lord bless and lead them all in the right way, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

A Question of Order

---February 15, 1925

Since there have been some moves for settlement of troubles existing between some of the different factions among the Primitive Baptists, and efforts being made to get them together, we have seen some suggestions and questions raised concerning some points of order. So far as we know just now every point called in question is discussed and brought out in a little pamphlet called "Church Order." Some years ago the Mount Zion Association, of Alabama, was called in question as to her order, and as to whether church identity had been lost by the churches of that association. The churches of that association called upon Elders G. W. Stewart, C. H. Cayce, J. E. Adams, R. O. Raulston, M. E. Petty, Lee Hanks and J. A. Taylor to sit as a committee to investigate the charges which had been made against them. In summing up the matter and in setting forth their idea concerning some points of order the members of this committee wrote out the contents of that pamphlet for those churches, and the same was published. We would suggest that you order a copy of this pamphlet from our office and study its contents. That will answer the very questions that seem to be a puzzle to the mind of some brethren now. The price of the pamphlet is fifteen cents a copy. But we desire to quote here some of the contents of that work. Quoting from pages 16 and 17 we give this language: The following questions were submitted to us, and we present our answers with the questions: Should churches receive expelled members from other Primitive Baptist Churches without official investigation and labor? No. What constitutes official investigation and labor? Investigation and labor by authority of

the church, and not an association. If a church receives and endorses an excluded person from an orderly church, what attitude does it place the church in that receives the excluded person? In gross disorder unless the act is speedily rectified; and if said church or churches persist in such a course they should be officially labored with and withdrawn from. Such disorder cannot be endorsed by orderly Baptists. Should we receive and baptize members from a sister church, though the church has error in it, until official labor and a withdrawal of fellowship from the erring church? No. We quote the following from page 18: Churches, as churches, may err, be inconsistent and get into gross disorder, and, as churches, they may repent and turn away from such disorder. To illustrate: The Corinthian Church became involved in gross disorder concerning the communion, or Lord's supper, were guilty of gross immorality by sustaining and fellow-shipping fornication among them; were divided among themselves; had heresies among them, for some denied the resurrection; some held to the idea of ministerial regeneration; going to law one with another, and tolerating and following, to some extent, false apostles and ministers of Satan. {see **(I Corinthians 5:1-5); (6:1-11); (11:20-27); (II Corinthians 11:13-16)**} Yet Paul recognized them as churches of Jesus Christ, and labored with them as such; and the very fact that he told them what to do shows, or proves, that he understood and taught that a church in disorder can do orderly things, or acts; and also carries with it the doctrine, or fact, that the wrong acts of churches do not make void their right acts. On page 19 may be found the following: Now, according to this new teaching and logic, which seems to have come newly up in this section of country, those Israelites away back there in those distressing, troublous times should have put away, not only those strange wives and children, but should also have put away all children that were born to any and all Jews or Israelites during the time or prevalence of the disorder that prevailed among them; because of the fact that they were all identified together and were all contaminated with the leaven of disobedience and disorder. But such was not required by the law of the Lord; neither does the law of the Lord require that the illegal acts of churches shall make void their right, or legal, acts. On pages 22 and 23 may be found an article copied from the Gospel Messenger for January, 1890, written by Elder J. R. Respass, who was then the editor of the Messenger. Concerning Elder Respass the committee said on page 22 that "he was considered one of the meekest, wisest and purest and ablest ministers Georgia ever had." Elder Respass said: If the church sins she should not visit her own sins upon the heads of the innocent members baptized by her authority, because that would be a violation of the law of God as laid down in (xxiv. 16 of Deuteronomy), wherein," that the fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children for the fathers, but every man shall be put to death for his own sin." If a church sins, to be purged of it, she must confess it with penitence, not by force, ask forgiveness and do it no more, and that is the end of the gospel law. As said before, such things as she can, righteously, she should and will undo, and she will know by the spirit what they are, and there will be peace. We think the church erred in expelling those members baptized by her authority and re-baptizing them. They were as lawfully baptized the first time as they were the second time. If the church authorized an improper person to do it, that was her sin, and could not attain the innocent members baptized by her authorized agent. From page 24 we quote the following from the pen of Elder Respass again, in the Gospel Messenger for June, 1891: If we recognize a body as a church at all, even if its disorder is as gross as the disorders of the seven churches of Asia-and their disorder was very great-if it is a church it can repent as a church, and if it can repent as a church, it can do any other church act. The seven churches were admonished to repent, which shows that the Spirit recognized them as churches. If, then, a church repents

as a church, we may receive them as a church cleansed of their sins. But they are required to repent only of their sins; they are not required to repent of their right acts, their baptisms, communions, preaching and charities. The church at Corinth was disorderly as holding a member who had his own father's wife, and she was required to repent of it, and she did and withdrew from him; but she was not required to repent for her baptisms-to undo them and do them over. If a church is not a church, she can neither repent as a church nor do any other church act; but if she is a church, her right acts as a church are valid and not to be repented of. The Superior Court may make a wrong decision, but its wrong decision does not invalidate its right decisions, because it holds commission to act from the supreme law of the state, and that law sustains its right decisions and reverses its wrong ones. So it is with the church of Christ as holding authority to act in the name of the Lord; its wrong acts are set aside by the Lord, who, at the same time, sustains its right ones. On pages 28 and 29 is a letter written by Elder T. S. Dalton under date of August 4, 1913. Elder Dalton at that time lived at McLean, Va. He once lived in Texas. He now lives in Baltimore, Md. He said: * * * If we were to go back to the apostolic days and undertake to straighten all the crooks and mistakes the church has made, we would have more than a lifetime job. Even the seven churches of Asia made their mistakes, and God commanded them to "hold fast and repent." The church at Corinth got wrong and out of line, but they did not reorganize them, but accepted them when they repented, or turned from their errors. The church at Galatia imbibed the wrong doctrine, but they were not unchurched for it; but they repented, or turned from their errors. * * * My brother, we have too many Baptist regulators among us who think they know it all; and many of them (I fear) know nothing as they ought to know it. May God pity our people in their scattered and torn up condition, and humble us all under a feeling sense of His great love, and our nothingness, and bring us to each other's feet and keep us in the way everlasting. And may He ever pity those who are continually striving to keep up a row among us. I am old now, and desire so much to see our people united in the bonds of love and union before I go hence. Much more could be quoted along this same line from this pamphlet, but this is sufficient to show very clearly, we think, what that committee, as well as other brethren, thought concerning the very question which has been raised by some brethren in regard to the baptisms which have been administered since the troubles began among the brethren. Dear Brother Dalton said he was old when he wrote that letter in 1913-eleven years last August-and so much desired to see our people united in the bonds of love and union before he goes hence. Dear brethren, how much do you suppose it would rejoice the heart of that old servant now in his old age if he could hear the glad news that our dear people in Texas and other places were once more all united? Remembering that this dear brother labored much among our people years ago in Texas, Tennessee and other sections of this country, we know he would rejoice to hear that peace has been restored and that our dear brethren had come together, forgiving all wrongs, and are once more united in love and fellowship. We were present several years ago at the meeting of the one hundredth anniversary of the White Water Association in Indiana. That association had been divided for a number of years, and for years two associations had been held in the same territory, each claiming to be the White Water Association. The session we speak of that we attended, on the one hundredth anniversary, the two bodies came together and met again as one association-the first time for years. If any of them were ever required to baptize again all who had been received and baptized during the time they were separated we never heard of it. Some might say that upon this principle we could accept the Missionaries the same way. Not so, for they have lost the marks of church identity. They have departed from Baptist principles in doctrine

and practice. There are very few things, if any, which the world has but what they have. They have lost all marks of identity of the true church. They are not a church, and therefore do not have the ordinances. They are not real Baptist Churches; they only claim the name. May the good Lord pity us in our distressed condition and enable us all to confess our wrongs to each other, and to be a united band in His service, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 16:1-2

---March 1, 1925

E. A. Wyatt, R. 3, Jackson, Tenn., requests us to give our views on **(I Corinthians 16:1-2)**, and asks us to write a good explanation of it. It reads as follows: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, even so do you. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." We do not see how that this language needs much explanation. It seems to us that it is as plain as it could very well be made. This laying by in store was for the poor saints at Jerusalem, and was to be sent there for the express purpose of relieving the poor saints at that place, as the next verse plainly shows. It just simply means that the churches, or the members composing the church, are required to lay by in store on the first day of the week, according as God has prospered them, for the benefit of the poor saints. What we know about the matter is that a great many churches are very remiss in this matter. If we give, do we give as God has prospered us? And do we lay by in store on the first day of the week? That laying by in store to be for the relief of the poor saints? Perhaps we lay by in store for ourselves, by way of laying up worldly possessions. Are we alive to our duty in this matter as we should be? C. H. C.

Remarks to Mrs. C. N. Brown

---March 15, 1925

We would admonish you to discharge your duty-do what you feel the Lord requires of you. If you want more evidence, do what He has impressed you to do. How much more do you want than what He has done? Suppose you do feel little. Are not the Lord's people called little children? Did not Paul say, "Unto me who am less than the least, is this grace given?" Can you feel any less than that? Of course you are not worthy, in and of yourself, but the Lord says, "Their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord." If you want peace, there is just one way to get it-and that is to do what you feel to be your duty. Offer yourself to the church and follow your Saviour in baptism, and then endeavor to walk in His precepts and examples. The fitness the Lord requires is to feel your need of Him. C. H. C.

God's People in the Flood

---March 15, 1925

We have a letter from Elder G. S. Schuler and Joel Vines, at Farrell, Miss., in which they tell of a good meeting and an ordination, and state that they had a question up and ask us if God had any people to get lost in the flood. In answer to their query we would say that the destruction of those who were out of the ark, being destroyed by water, was not an eternal destruction, but a temporal one. Their temporal or natural life was destroyed. Noah was a child of God, and an obedient one. He obeyed the Lord, and was saved from the old world to the new, with his

family. "When once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing; wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us," etc.-Peter. That was a figure, and baptism is a figure like that. Baptism does not save with an everlasting or eternal salvation; and as it is a figure like the other, then the other did not save with an eternal salvation. It saved from the old world to the new; and baptism now saves the obedient child of God from out in the world into the church of Christ. No one dare say that all who were drowned in the flood went to hell. To say that would be to preach infant damnation by the wholesale. In our discussions with men who have argued that baptism in water was necessary in order to a home in heaven we have often asked if all who were drowned in the flood went to hell. Not one of them would ever say yes. It was a temporal or timely matter, and had no reference to eternal life at all. C. H. C.

Remarks to Mrs. W. M. Hopson, Jr.

---April 1, 1925

Dear sister, we truly believe that you have an experience of grace and that you are one of the Lord's dear little children. We feel to rejoice with you that you have been enabled by the mercy and grace of God to realize, understand and know the truth, in part at least. Your expression of feeling so little is just the way Paul expressed himself, "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." Paul felt that he was less than the least of all saints. He was a child of God. So that is the feeling of a child of God. This is a good evidence that you are the Lord's child. You do not want to be a hypocrite. A hypocrite is one who pretends that he is something that he knows he is not. If you have been enabled to see that the Primitive Baptist doctrine is the truth, you could never be acting, the hypocrite to unite with them. If you believe the Old Baptist doctrine to be the truth, and feel like the Old Baptist Church would be a home for you, we would advise you to offer yourself to them. Follow your blessed Lord, walk in His commandments, and you will find the peace and rest that you are so much longing for. May His blessings rest upon you. C. H. C.

A New Thing Under The Sun

---April 15, 1925

To All Whom it May Concern:

We, the Church of Christ, of Five Mile, Hale County, Alabama, known as Primitive Baptist, in conference assembled, do hereby declare and affirm our belief concerning some points of church order, or discipline, as follows:

I We believe that each local church is sovereign and independent of all other churches or persons in receiving, disciplining and excluding her members.

II We believe that the church is the only disciplinary body known or authorized in the Scriptures.

III We believe that when a church withdraws fellowship from a sister church for reasons satisfactory to herself, the church that is withdrawn from has no legal right nor authority to appoint a committee to visit the church which withdrew from her with any sort of complaint or grievance.

IV We believe that no minister or preacher, whatever, upon any plea whatsoever, has a right to ignore or disregard the act of the withdrawing church.

V We believe that the church withdrawn from has no legal right to call upon sister churches to go with her or aid her in her complaint against the withdrawing church and that churches granting her request would involve themselves in the same disorder as the dropped and disorderly church.

VI We believe that if a church becomes offended with a sister church on account of some act, doctrine or practice, she has a legal right to labor with her offending sister church for satisfaction; and should she fail to obtain satisfaction she may ask a near-by sister church to aid her in such labor; but in such labor it would be illegal and unscriptural for her to call upon and procure the labor of more than one or two such churches. **(Matthew 18:16)**.

VII We believe that in such labor it would be inconsistent and out of order to call upon distant churches, and churches, too, which have no direct knowledge of or personal concern in the matter- churches which are strange and unacquainted with the church to be labored with, especially when there are sister churches nearer by and which understand the nature of the reported grievance or trouble.

VIII We believe that when distant and strange churches are thus called upon to the neglect of near by churches which are acquainted with the trouble in dispute and with all concerned, it is a true sign and token of lack of knowledge or of willful intent to do wrong, or to deceive or oppress.

IX We believe that much of the trouble, confusion and disorder among Primitive Baptists in various parts of our country today is to be ascribed to certain ministers, or spirits, **{(I John 4:4)}** who, in going hither and thither, from section to section, or state to state, are ready to pry into local church troubles and intrude their advice, verbally or in writing, as to how such troubles should be settled or disposed of, and in this manner, in the name of love and peace, actually widen the breach and intensify the confusion and disorder. (Be sure to read **((7) (Proverbs 26:17); ((Th 4:11) (I Thessalonians 4:11); ((Pet 4:15) (I Peter 4:15))**) Hence we believe the time has come when churches and true ministers and servants of God should regard with distrust and grave suspicion all traveling spirits who come among them proposing to aid them and advise them in their church troubles.

X In conclusion, we desire to confess our weakness and un-worthiness before the Lord and His believing and afflicted people, with the request that they bear with us, and should they find us in error in the principles of church order or discipline herein expressed, we hope they will kindly show unto us the way of the Lord more perfectly, for we know we are liable to err. Five Mile is now in her one hundred and fifth year of age and, if not deceived in ourselves, we desire to be in harmony with the Scriptures of truth. Hence we are open to investigation, and our church records are open to the scrutiny of our brethren everywhere. G. W. Stewart, Moderator. W. M. Martin, Church Clerk. Akron, Ala., December 13, 1924.

REMARKS

We verily believe that the foregoing is the worst thing we have seen for years along that line. It is worse than the proposed form for a federal government put out by Elder Kirkland some years ago. In all kindness and sincerity we wish to examine the foregoing statement of belief just a little. It is not necessary to examine all the points contained therein-just a few will be enough for any fair-minded Baptist, we are sure.

1. If each local church is a sovereign and independent of all other churches or persons in receiving, disciplining and excluding her members, then, pray, what right under high heaven did Five Mile have to receive on confession of faith two members that had been excluded by Hopewell Church-and that, too, without

bestowing a moment's labor upon Hopewell? We freely grant that any church which is standing faithful on the doctrine and order of God's house, keeping the ordinances as delivered to the church, has the God-given right to refuse membership to any person in her body that she sees fit, and no other person or church on earth has any right to disregard the act of the church in that matter. This being so, just as long as Hopewell Church maintains the doctrine and ordinances of the church as given in the New Testament, no church on earth has any right to receive the members on confession that she excluded. On the other hand, if Hopewell, Five Mile, or any other church, should be holding a member whose conduct is a disgrace and detrimental to the cause, a sister church has the right to make complaint to her in regard to her disorderly member and to ask her to deal with such a member as the circumstances demand. Sister churches have that right, for the simple reason that such a member being held is detrimental to the cause in general, and for that reason other churches are concerned. No church esteeming the order of God's house as she should can afford to refuse to hear such a complaint and to listen to the proof and to deal with the case as the circumstances may demand. If she will not do that, then sister churches have the right to withdraw fellowship from her, and they should do so, after such labor is had. To receive a member on confession of faith that has been excluded from another Old Baptist Church that maintains the doctrine and ordinances of God's house, and the identity of that church still remains, is GROSS DISORDER. It always has caused trouble, and always will. 3, 4 and 5. If these three items be correct, we have the very principles of popery. According to that, a church may withdraw from another, the reason may be absolutely groundless, yet satisfactory to herself, and if others think she has erred and dare to so express themselves, they immediately become involved in the same disorder and loss of identity as the church that has been withdrawn from—thus the church that does the first withdrawing becomes high pope, supreme ruler, independent disposer, the only potentate, the one executive and the only vicegerent of Christ on earth! If that is Old Baptist doctrine, may the good Lord pity us, for we never heard it on that fashion before. We confess that we have read some of the confessions of churches, both ancient and modern, and have read some little church history, but we never saw anything like this before. Pray by whose authority does a church become so highly exalted just because she sees proper, perhaps to gratify her own personal ambition, or the ambition of some preacher, to declare non-fellowship for some sister church? She sees proper to do so! She has reasons that are satisfactory to herself! And, forsooth, that ends it! According to these items, if one church withdraws from a sister church, the church withdrawn from does not even so much as have the right to ask the reason why! If that does not give supreme authority and power to one church, under certain conditions, we do not understand the reason why; and it destroys the very idea of there being any such thing as a sister church. The term sister church signifies equality.

6. We never heard before that **(Matthew 18:16)** limited the number to one or two. We had always understood it to mean, and have always heard Old Baptists claim that it meant, that as many as one or two should be taken, so that there might be witnesses, for that is what the text says, "that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word maybe established." The idea is that it is necessary to have witnesses, but we never knew before that it was necessary to limit the number of witnesses. If that be true, and a man can prove his contention or charge by more than two witnesses besides his own testimony, he would lose his case, but it would be sustained if proven by himself and no more than two others. This is too absurd to even favor the truth.

7 and 8. We pass these by as of minor importance, though the matter may be a technical one. That is, the contention therein may not always be correct.

9. This is simply a direct thrust at what we now call a traveling preacher. In olden times they were called evangelists. But it seems to us that Elder Stewart might have taken some of his own medicine a few years ago when he went over into Mississippi and was in a meeting that declared a part of a church to be the church who preached a man who was in line with the people not recognized by the Ramah council, which council he had sat in as a member of the same-and that man preached over the protest of some of the members of the church. If it is such a crime, and such a preacher is of the world, who will go away from home and advise the brethren in regard to their troubles, then it seems to us Elder Stewart was involved when he was at the meeting in Mississippi. If this item be correct, it dawns on us that the Apostle Paul was a transgressor and a violator when he told the Corinthians how to do and what to do concerning some disorders they had among them. Paul was a traveling preacher, and according to this item, he had no right to advise that church as to what would be right for her to do, and the church and other preachers should have regarded him with grave suspicion. We would not make mention of these things in our columns but the above statement has been sent out in print broadcast, and we feel that the cause demands that the inconsistency and fallacy of them should be brought to the attention of our people. As long as such things are practiced and persisted in, just that long will there be troubles and divisions among us. It is no good omen for us to have such an opinion of self as to think that we have a right to do a thing and no other party has a right to call it in question. May the good Lord help us all to rightly consider His teaching as to how we should treat each other and observe the order of His house, and enable us always to so consider ourselves that we may be willing to listen to the counsel and advice of our brethren and sister churches. C. H. C.

“ Murder Will Out”

---April 15, 1925

“Murder will out” is an old saying which is generally accepted as true. A saying in Holy Writ very much like it is, “Be sure your sin will find you out.” When trouble develops, the true cause may not be known just at the time, but in time it will become known what the real trouble is-or what was the real cause. So it now seems to develop just what the cause of the trouble is in Virginia and North Carolina. It seems that Danville Church claimed that the doctrine had nothing to do with the exclusion of Elder J. R. Wilson. Elder Wilson is and has been all along in perfect accord with Elder J. T. Jackson, Elder Pruitt, and other brethren. The majority of the church at Martinsville and at Leatherwood were agreed with Elder Jackson in doctrine. Most of our readers will remember an article written by him and which we published, which was headed “Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth.” Some of the elders in the Pig River Association and elsewhere in that country would not accept the doctrine set forth in that article, and denounced Elder Jackson as a heretic. The Pig River Association preferred charges against him on the doctrine, or denounced him. Elder Jackson's church invited any and all who had charges against him to present them to her. This none of them would do, or did do. The church of his membership endorsed the doctrine he set forth and exonerated him. The majority at both Martinsville and Leatherwood stood with him. We do not now remember where Elder Jackson has membership, but believe it is at one of

these two churches. A minority at both these places rebelled against the action of the church, and after due labor they were excluded. The Pig River Association recognized the excluded factions of these churches. They brought suit for the church property. A report of the court decision says that the decision is expected to "finally end the controversy which arose many months ago when a large number of the congregations in the Leatherwood and Martinsville Church sided with Elder Jackson in his contention that under the doctrines of the church two plans of salvation were allowed." This shows very clearly that those who oppose Elder Wilson, Elder Jackson, and those who believe and teach as they do, are opposing them on account of their doctrine. One of these leading preachers in North Carolina, we have been informed, said publicly that Cayce is an Arminian. These things show that the doctrine is at the root of the trouble. When we published the article referred to above from Elder Jackson we said then that the doctrine set forth therein will stand when the world is on fire, and we still say the same. Not one of those preachers in North Carolina and Virginia, or any other place, can ever overthrow that doctrine. If they think they can, will they try it? They will not try it in public where their contention can be examined in public before the people. When we were in North Carolina a few years ago we tried to preach at an association, we think at Coats, from this text: "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee" -(I Timothy 4:16). In that discourse we remember that we showed that Timothy was already a child of God, and that one is made a child of God without any works performed by him; and that it was, therefore, too late for Timothy to save himself in that sense by taking heed unto himself and unto the doctrine. Neither would he by thus doing be the means of any other person becoming a child of God. But he would save himself in some sense by doing what the apostle here instructed him to do, and others would be saved in the very same sense in which he himself would be saved. Elder Gold, we remember very well, was present and endorsed the discourse. No one objected to it that we ever heard of. At another association in that state we argued that the material universe is governed by physical law, and that there is no such thing as disobedience to that law, nor is there any such thing as active obedience to it. The sun, moon, stars, and the earth, all passively remain in their respective places by reason of physical law. We also argued that God saw fit to control His moral or rational creature, man, by moral law, and that there is activity in obeying the moral law or disobeying it, and that there is such a thing as disobedience to moral law. We also argued that God saw fit to govern His people, His children, by parental law, and that there is disobedience to parental law; and that in obedience and disobedience to that law there is activity. These positions we took when we were in North Carolina then were the principles held to by Old Baptists then, and they hold to them yet. These things are not new. The man who denies them is the man who has some new thing. We are sorry that the brethren in North Carolina and Virginia are having a war over this position; but it seems that the ones who do not accept this doctrine are the ones who are pushing the fight. Elder Wilson went before Danville Church more than once and confessed his wrong in using any harsh words, and the church which had received him on confession of faith without official investigation also confessed her wrong and begged forgiveness, and Lawyer Spring confessed her wrong for continuing to use him as pastor; but Danville saw fit, after saying in one conference that she would forgive, in the next conference to dismiss the matter and said she would have no more to do with it and would not forgive. If what they claimed as the reason for excluding was the true reason, and there was nothing else at the bottom of the matter, it is very evident to our mind that they would have forgiven the brother and the churches. But this they have refused to do. Now they should

just come right out and make their fight in the open on the doctrine for which they propose to stand. We have written the foregoing for the plain and simple reason that we feel like justice demands that our readers know just the true status of affairs in that country, as it appears to us. We are sorry that these matters exist as they do, and we were very hopeful that it would all be settled. But it seems that Danville Church and some of the preachers in that country are determined not to have any settlement. May the Lord pity us. C. H. C.

What They Desire

---May 1, 1925

We have received a clipping from the Park City News, Bowling Green, Ky., a news item sent in from Glasgow, Ky., Dec. 27, stating that Elder L. R. Chaney had died at his home in Allen County, Ky., and that he was the last surviving minister of the Primitive Baptist Church. The item says, "There are now six churches of this belief in the state, but so far as known, there is no minister of that faith living in the state." We have heard something about a zone of ignorance, and evidently the correspondent of the News at Glasgow is a member of the know nothing clan, evidently in the zone of darkest ignorance, and the news editor of the News is about as ignorant as his correspondent. We do not know how many Primitive Baptist Churches and associations there are in Kentucky, nor do we know how many Primitive Baptist ministers are living in the state; but there are more Primitive Baptist Churches in what is known as the Kentucky Purchase than this paper says there are in the entire state. Only a very small percent of the Primitive Baptist ministers in Kentucky, possibly, are subscribers for our paper, but we are sending The Primitive Baptist to twelve of our ministers in the state of Kentucky. If the correspondent and editor of the Park City News get no nearer to heaven than they have of telling the truth in that item, the devil will have the delightful pleasure of watching them sizzle in hell to all eternity. C. H. C.

Peace Meeting Called

---May 1, 1925

In another place in this paper will be found a call for a peace meeting to be held at Jamestown, La., beginning on Friday night before the fifth Sunday in May. We trust our brethren will all try to attend that meeting. We very much desire to be there, and if the Lord will, and we can arrange so as to go, we will try to be present. We pray the good Lord may lead and direct in the meeting, and that much good may be accomplished in His great name, and that our poor divided people may be united again in love and sweet fellowship. May the Lord help us all. C. H. C.

Private Letters

---May 15, 1925

We frequently get letters from brethren saying they would be glad to get a letter from us. Now, we do not at all doubt what they say about it, but we just do not have time to write as many private letters as we would like to. The duties devolving upon us are so many and so pressing that we just cannot write any more private letters than it seems to us to be absolutely necessary. We do not wish any brother or sister to feel, though, that we do not appreciate their letters, for we do. They encourage us much along the way. We often feel cast down and discouraged and some letter comes to us that revives us again, and makes us feel like pressing on in

the service of the Master. All our readers hear from us in nearly every issue of the paper, as we try to write something for nearly every issue, and would write something for every issue if we could. Write to us when you feel like doing so, and remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Matthew 8:11-12

---May 15, 1925

Brother A. H. Middleton, Reagan, Tenn., requests us to give our views on **(Matthew 8:11-12)**, which reads: "And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." We do not have space to comment at length, and must be brief. Those to come from the east and west were the Gentiles who were to come into the gospel service, and the children of the kingdom who were to be cast out were the Jews. They were called the children of the kingdom, as the oracles of God were committed unto them. Because of unbelief they were cut off from the privileges of gospel worship and service and were cast out into outer darkness, and they are in darkness to this good day. But it looks to us as though the fullness of the Gentiles is just about come in. We find as much darkness, or almost as much, among the Gentiles now as was among the Jews in the days of the apostles. It seems to us that we are living in perilous times, and it behooves us to awake from our slumbers. May the good Lord help us so to do. C. H. C.

Some Questions

---May 15, 1925

We have received a letter from Curtice Conwill, Fulton, Miss., in which he says: "I am enclosing a few questions which I do not understand very well. Will you please explain them for me? I am not after an argument, but the truth, and the whole truth." We will give the questions as he has them and answer them as briefly as possible.

1. (John 13:8) "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." The Saviour simply meant that if He did not wash Peter's feet he had no part with Him in that service and the enjoyment of it.

2. ((0:16) (Matthew 20:16) "So the last shall be first, and the first last; for many be called, but few chosen." **(Matthew 22:14)** "For many are called, but few are chosen." Many are called to eternal life; many are called out of darkness into the marvelous light and liberty of the children of God; but there are few chosen as witnesses for and to the truth. God has a few of His chosen and called children whom He has chosen as witnesses for His truth.

3. Does **(John 3:5)** mean water baptism? No. Baptism is no place in the Bible represented as a birth. It is a burial and resurrection.

4. A person once said to me, "If I could get my heart right while the big meeting is going on, I'd join." We suppose you will have to get the party to explain this who said it.

5. Who can keep the commandments? The living child of God can keep the gospel commandments, and all people can keep the moral commandments to live honestly and uprightly.

6. Do the non-elect die in infancy? No.

7. Is every person, when an infant, a child of God? No. C. H. C.

Filling Appointments

---May 15, 1925

We left home on Thursday, March 26, and arrived in Huntsville, Ala., at 2 o'clock Friday morning, and were met at the train by our father-in-law, Brother B. B. Lawler, and son, Claud. We filled the appointment that day at Flint Church, and had a very pleasant meeting. Elder H. P. Houk was with us there. Saturday we filled the appointment at Union Church, near Woodville, Ala. A large crowd was present, and we enjoyed a sweet meeting at this place. Elders Andrew Houk, Tom Flanagan and John Page were with us there. Saturday evening we left Woodville for Chattanooga, and were met at the train by Brother Mack (D. M.) Raulston. We enjoyed a sweet meeting at this place Sunday and Sunday night. An appointment was published for us and also for Elder J. W. Bragg for Sunday, and we preached together. Brother Bragg was present at night also. Monday morning we left Chattanooga for Knoxville, arriving there at 10 o'clock. Elder J. E. Hurst and some other brethren met us at the train and we went at once to the church. A good crowd soon gathered, and we had a sweet meeting at this place. Besides Elder Hurst, Elders W. C. McMillon and W. A. Gregory were with us here. Other ministers may have been present, but if so we do not now recall their names. That evening we went to Bristol where we spent the remainder of the night. Tuesday morning at 6:30 we left Bristol for Marion, Va., where we changed cars for Trout Dale. At Chilhowie Elder C. N. Tilson and Brother W. A. Bailey boarded the train and went with us to Trout Dale. At this place we had meeting Tuesday night at the home of Elder B. H. Blevins, near Trout Dale, and in Trout Dale Wednesday, Wednesday night, Thursday, Thursday night and Friday. It was a pleasant meeting indeed. Elders B. H. Blevins, C. N. Tilson, J. A. Cave, H. B. Miller and S. J. Heath were with us during the meeting. On Wednesday a sister was received into the fellowship of the church as a candidate for, baptism. This seems to be a good live church. On Friday afternoon we were conveyed from there to the home of Elder Ed Davis, about twenty-five miles, into the neighborhood of Pond Mountain Church, Elder Tilson coming with us. We spent the night with Elder Davis, and today had meeting at the Pond Mountain Church, and enjoyed a very sweet service. Elders J. A. Church and R. A. May, besides Elders Davis and Tilson, were with us. We are now at the home of Elder Ed Davis, on Saturday evening, April 4. We feel to hope the good Lord has graciously blessed us to speak in His great name since we left our loved ones at home, and our trust and hope is in Him, that He will continue to bless us with liberty of speech, and that He will care for and keep our loved ones while we are away from them. Please pray for us and our dear ones at home and that the Lord may be with them in their lonely hours. C. H. C.

Church Discipline

---May 15, 1925

We have had quite a number of requests to write an article on the subject of church discipline. This is a great subject and cannot be treated in full in any short article, or in a long one, for that matter. Some write and tell us of members who never attend church nor even write to the church-some perhaps near the church and yet do not attend; some have united with other orders, and yet their names remain on our church books as members; some say they have not had the rules-read for a long time, and such like things. It seems to us that where such conditions exist it is

high time for them to awake from their slumbers. Any member of the church has the right to ask for the rules to be read in any conference. But they do not have the right for all to wait for some one else to ask for something to be done that should be attended to. Where each one is just waiting for somebody else to make the suggestion for that to be done that needs to be done, they are all, evidently, "asleep on the job." Wake up, and get busy. If a member never goes to his church, where he is in reach of the church, and never lets the church hear from him when he is not in reach, he is not worth anything to the church, and he is a dead load for the church to carry. Dead folks should be buried and put out of sight. If you have some dead folks in your church you should get busy and bury them, for if they are not buried they will likely begin to smell so bad after awhile that live folks cannot stay around. You know that live folks cannot stay very long where dead folks remain unburied. Most church rules of decorum say. that if a member fails to attend about three meetings it is the duty of the church to inquire the reason. The object of this is not to find something to bring as a charge against the absent member, but to find if there is something in the way that might be removed by a little effort on the part of the church. The member might be sick or in need. It is the duty of the church to find out. There might be some good reason for staying away which could, and should, be removed. If there is no good reason, and the member cannot be reclaimed, then a charge should be preferred and the person dealt with. Where some member has joined some other order the church should appoint a committee to labor with such a member. Who knows but what the member might be reclaimed? We have known such to be the case. Such a thing might be done by a member in a moment of darkness and discouragement, and if the brethren would try to reclaim him he might feel assured that the church loves him, when he might have been feeling that he was forsaken and that the members of the church did not care for him. If, upon investigation, it is found that the member thus acting does not really believe the Old Baptist doctrine and cannot be reclaimed, then he should be dealt with. Sometimes we may become careless and neglectful of each other. We should visit each other more and associate together more. They used to do that more in our younger days than we do now. If we would do that we would be a great help to each other, and that would be a great help to the church. It seems, though, in this fast age, that we hardly have time to speak to each other when we meet, and seldom have time to visit each other in our homes. We are neglecting the most important matters and are going in a mad rush after the world and the things of the world. Another thing that is grossly wrong is for a member to live right in the community of an orderly Old Baptist Church and have his membership at another church at a distance from him where he cannot attend regularly. In our young days this was considered gross disorder; and yet we know brethren who will, and do, ask such members to let their membership stay in that case. This is very wrong, and you who have done so should be ashamed of it; and you should at once ask the member thus advised and requested to do to forgive you for the wrong advice and advise him to go ahead and do the right thing. If all members were to hold their membership thus at a distant church, there would be no Old Baptist Churches kept up to attend. If it is wrong for all to do that, then it is wrong for any to do so. May the good Lord help us all to awake to our duty, and give us grace whereby we may serve Him acceptably and with godly fear. C. H. C.

Remarks Concerning J. T. M'Rae

---June 1, 1925

Brother Petty, do you not know that these forked-tongued blatherskites would not tell the truth on the Old Baptists, even if they were paid to do so? They preach for

hire and divine for money. One of their brethren betrayed the Lord for thirty pieces of silver, and they would do you and me as bad for a penny. If this little saphead wants a discussion with you, Brother Petty, through our columns, we are willing for him to have it if he will get space in one of their papers for the same discussion. We will not take up our valuable space for such vituperations from the devil's emissaries as is hurled by such fellows, unless they will give space in one of their papers for our side of the question. C. H. C.

Another Name On Our Staff

---June 15, 1925

Since the peace meeting at Munday, Texas, is leading to reconciliation between our people and Elder J. H. Fisher and many of his brethren, so it seems, we felt inclined to place Elder Fisher's name on our editorial staff, and so wrote him requesting the same, and he has granted the request. Elder Fisher is an able minister and a good writer, and we hold him in high esteem. We are so glad to see our poor, distressed and divided people getting together. These unholy wars are distressing, and we should not strive about words to no profit. Those who love the cause of the Master should be striving to see how near we can be together, instead of striving to see how far apart we can get. May the good Lord help us to strive for peace and the things that make for peace. We desire to continue striving in that way, and disregard the hard things which may be said of us on account of pursuing that course. C. H. C.

Our Trip in Virginia and North Carolina

---June 15, 1926

We fully intended to write an account of the remainder of our trip in Virginia and North Carolina for the last issue of the paper or for this one, but we have not had the time to write it. We have a whole lot more matter on hand now for the paper than we will ever have room to publish-much of it is real good, too. We wish we had room for all the good letters we get for the paper, but we do not. On this account, for these reasons just stated, we will have to content ourselves with saying that we met all the appointments that were made and enjoyed some pleasant meetings. True, some of the churches visited were in a cold state, but most of them seemed to be alive. There were some additions to some of the churches we visited, and at those places the churches seemed to be revived and rejoiced to see the Lord's little children coming home. We attended the spring session of the Bear Creek Association. A number of ministers were in attendance. The meeting was an enjoyable one and the preaching was harmonious all the way through. They are a good band of brethren and have no use for Arminianism on the one hand or Antinomianism on the other hand. We were kindly treated all the way along the trip and enjoyed our tour among those good Baptists, and do not feel that we will ever forget the many deeds of kindness shown us. May the good Lord bless them and lead them in the right way, and give them the Christian courage to press on in the sweet service of the Master. We trust that they may all remember us in their prayers, and take this as a personal letter to each one. We would be glad to write more and tell the places visited and the ministers we met, but time and space will not allow, this time. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon you. C. H. C.

Letter from D. V. Spangler

---July 1, 1925

When we returned home from our recent trip in Virginia and North Carolina we found a letter here waiting for us written by one D. V Spangler. He takes us to task for what we said concerning Elder Wilson and the Danville Church, etc. He says: "Are you sure you have been rightly informed about these matters? Are you all trying to force a division among the Baptists of this country on the doctrine?" We stated that the cause of the trouble was doctrine. Were we wrongly informed about that? If that was not the truth, then why was the court decision so rendered? Why does the report of that say that it started over doctrine? And why did Danville put out a leaflet, a part of which was signed by W. R. Dodd as moderator and W. L. Parker as clerk, and by Elder C. T. Evans as moderator and R. L. Dodson as clerk of the Staunton River Association, the very first paragraph of which says, "For several years there seemed to have existed a difference among the elders and members on some points of doctrine," etc.? Why did you say this if there was no doctrinal difference? Then on the second page this same leaflet says, "Now, we wish to say if they will turn over our property or loan it to us, so we can relieve our clerk by furnishing the Baptists with minutes, as is our custom, Wilson and his crowd may go on with their doctrine of many salvations and conditional stuff to their heart's delight and satisfaction," etc. You fellows have repeatedly denied that there was a doctrinal difference, and here you emphatically declare that there is, and virtually say you have no fellowship for the doctrine Elder Wilson advocates, and a great majority of the Baptists have always advocated the same doctrine. Then since you say here that there is a difference, and have at other times said the doctrine was not the difference, pray tell us when you told the truth? Did you tell it both times? How could your folks have told the truth in both statements, seeing that the statements are diametrically opposed to each other -just the opposite to each other? In this leaflet your crowd deny there being more than one salvation spoken of or taught in the Bible. If there is only one, we will give you and your whole gang until the next day after the judgment to reconcile just these two statements from Holy Writ: "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." -(II Timothy 1:9). Here the apostle most emphatically declares that we are saved, and that not according to our works, either good or bad. The works done by us have nothing whatever to do with this saving. The inspired apostle most emphatically so declares in this text. But the same writer says: "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." -(I Timothy 4:16). Here the same inspired man says to Timothy that "IN DOING THIS thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." This was a saving that was to be accomplished by DOING, and doing is working. The whole conglomerated mess of you one Salvationists cannot harmonize these two expressions from the same inspired writer from now until the next day after the judgment. Suppose some of you try your hand at it? Will you? Not much, we guess. Your stuff is new among Baptists, and you have departed from the faith. Your crowd have proven that they are wrong all the way through by refusing to forgive an erring brother and erring churches when they humbly begged forgiveness. If you loved the Saviour and His blessed truth as you should, you would forgive. May the good Lord pity the poor deluded brethren who are being led astray by designing men. C. H. C.

Another Editor Added

---July 1, 1925

At the conclusion of the peace meeting at Jamestown, La., we asked Elder T. L. Webb if he was willing for us to put his name on our editorial staff. He said he would consider the matter, and his "Salutatory," to be found elsewhere in this paper, is the result. Elder T. L. Webb is a good writer and a good preacher, and we believe he is a good man, and we are glad that we can now stand together in laboring for peace among our poor and afflicted people. At the meeting in Jamestown Elder Webb made full and complete confession for all the part he took in the late trouble and division among our people. He manifested such an humble spirit that we felt to be drawn closer to him than we had ever been before. May the good Lord abundantly bless him, is our humble prayer. We are glad to have his name on our editorial staff, and trust he may feel a desire to write for our columns, for we are sure all our readers will enjoy his writings. And we humbly pray the good Lord to enable us and all our editors to continue to labor for the peace of Zion and for the unifying of our poor divided people. C. H. C.

Bear Creek Association

---July 1, 1925

We had the pleasure of attending the Bear Creek Association in North Carolina the first Sunday in May and Saturday before and Monday following. A large crowd was in attendance, and the meeting was a pleasant one from first to last. The preaching was all a unit, not a jar or discord was heard. The ministers present from other associations and from other states were: Elders J. A. Cave, John S. Lewis, W. F. Pruitt, H. M. Williams, R. H. Pittman, Joel T. Lewis, M. L. Riner, J. R. Wilson, Lee Hanks, C. B. Kilby, W. C. McMillon, Wm. Cribbs, J. M. Royal, S. G. Caudill and C. H. Cayce. Their home ministers present were: Elders J. M. Bagwell, W. C. Edwards, B. L. Treece, J. Eudy and Robert Helms. Elder Edwards is the efficient moderator and is an able and humble gift. He preached the introductory sermon and at the close of the meeting made some very pointed and appropriate remarks. May the good Lord bless this noble band of Baptists. C. H. C.

Law of God on Baptism

---July 15, 1925

We have before us a little pamphlet with the above title, published by one John A. May, member of the North Alabama Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South (of God), which is about as great a perversion of truth as we have seen recently in so small a space. The pamphlet contains thirty-two pages. We do not have the space to take up different things the author has stated, but will pay some respect to just one or two. On page 10 may be found the following question and answer: "In the Old Testament, what is the law of God on the Bible mode of Bible baptism? Answer: The law of God is recorded in **((25) (Ezekiel 36:25-28)**: 'And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God.' " If this is the law of God on the Bible mode of Bible baptism, then it is also the law of God as to how one is to be cleansed from his sins, for there is a cleansing performed in this work. In it the one operated upon receives a new heart and a new spirit. This little Methodist (South of God) evidently

believes, then, that no one can be saved without being baptized according to his plan-it not only denies salvation to those who are without baptism, but it denies salvation to all who are not baptized by sprinkling. The truth of the matter is that this text has no reference whatever to baptism. The next thing we wish to notice is his contention that Philip baptized the eunuch by sprinkling. He quotes **(Acts 8:26-40)**, in which may be found the statement: "And they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." He argues that the eunuch was a colored man. The gentleman certainly knows that a colored man is a Gentile; and he certainly knows that no Gentiles went to Jerusalem to worship. The Jews were the only people who went to Jerusalem to worship. The eunuch, therefore, was a Jew who held a position of trust under Candace, queen of Ethiopia; he had charge of all her treasure. The Jews were always a money making people, and that queen knew it; so she had this Jew in her employ and gave him charge over all her treasure. He had been to Jerusalem to worship-a thing which no Gentile ever did. Cornelius was the first Gentile to ever hear a gospel sermon, and that by the mouth of Peter, who said, in **((7) (Acts 15:7)** "Ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." If the Rev. Mr. May is correct then Peter was wrong, and they did not know what he said they knew, for Peter did not go to the house of Cornelius and preach there until after Philip had baptized the eunuch. Peter took some of his brethren with him when he went to Cornelius in answer to the call for him to go, for he yet, as other Jews, considered it unlawful for the Jews to keep company with the Gentiles. The gentleman's contention is, therefore, wrong. But let us notice his text: "They both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." It does no violence to language nor to God's word if we take a word out of a sentence and put the true meaning of that word in place of it. What does the word sprinkle mean? The Standard Dictionary, published by Funk & Wagnalls, says: "Sprinkle, to scatter in drops or small particles." Now let us read the text, "And they went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he scattered him about in drops or small particles." Dear reader, do you sincerely believe any such thing as that was done? Do you believe Philip scattered the eunuch about in small drops or in small particles? What sane, or reasonable, person would believe any such foolishness or tommyrot as that? Such men as the Rev. (?) Mr. May and his dupes may believe it-but excuse us, please. The inspired Apostle Paul tells us most emphatically in **(Romans 6:4)** that "we are buried with him by baptism into death." If we are buried by baptism, as the inspired apostle says, then baptism is a burial; and as sprinkling is not a burial, then it is not baptism. Let us read the text again: "And they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he buried him." That is the truth of the matter, and no man can deny it without denying the plain language of the word of God; but we suppose a Methodist Reverend South of God may not mind doing a thing like that. There are quite a number of other things in this little pamphlet that are foreign to truth, but this is enough. C. H. C.

Lost in the Flood - Remarks

---July 15, 1925

Certainly, some of the Lord's people were drowned in the flood. The destruction by the flood was only a temporal destruction. Infants, as well as old people, were destroyed by the flood, but all who die in infancy are saved in heaven. It was a temporal or timely destruction of those who were drowned in the flood, and many of God's people are punished for their rebellion, for their wickedness. They are

punished now for their disobedience, and die to the enjoyment of gospel life and peace as a result of their wrong doing. C. H. C.

Appointments Called In

---August 1, 1925

We are sorry that it seems most impossible for us to fill the appointments that were arranged by Elder P. H. Byrd and others for us in South Georgia, but unforeseen circumstances have made it necessary for us to postpone the trip. We wrote Elder Byrd some days ago that we would try to fall in with the list of appointments at Vidalia on Aug. 5th and fill the appointments from there on, but since then matters have developed and things have taken such a turn that makes it so we cannot well go on the trip now. We are truly sorry, and trust the brethren will pardon us. We never like to fail to meet appointments that are made for us, but this is one of the few times that we will have to fail. If the brethren desire, and the Lord wills, we can make the trip in November, and can possibly spend a little more time than we could have done at this time. If it is desired that we make the trip in November, the brethren will please let us know as soon as possible, so we will not have other promises out. Please remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Would Not Hear Them

---August 1, 1925

In the trouble a few years ago, and in the unholy war and division among our people, there was a division in New Ramah Church, then in the Louisiana Association. The brethren on our side of the question have been holding their meetings since that time at a schoolhouse a few miles from the old meetinghouse until a few months ago, when arrangements were made with the Methodists at Mt. Pisgah for them to have the use of the house for helping to repair it and keeping it up. Our brethren worshiping at this place are tired of war and deplore the sad state of affairs. So on the first Sunday in July they adopted the following letter and appointed messengers to present it to the brethren worshiping at the old meetinghouse:

THE LETTER

We, the Primitive Baptists at New Raman, worshiping at Mt. Pisgah, to our brethren and sisters called New Ramah, worshiping at the old New Ramah meetinghouse: Dear Brethren-Feeling grieved in our poor hearts over the divided and distressed condition of our beloved Zion, and for the purpose of endeavoring to obtain peace and reconciliation between us, we feel constrained to come to you as unto brethren in the Lord in an effort to restore peace and try to obtain and bring about reconciliation, that we may once more be a happy and united people, as we were before the unholy war among us. We beseech you to hear us patiently, and that you prayerfully consider what we say. Dear brethren, we feel sure that in the unholy war among our people which brought confusion, division, distress and sorrow of heart among us, that wrong was done on both sides-things were said and done on both sides which should not have been said and done; and feeling that it is right to do as the Lord has commanded, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray with and for each other, that ye may be healed," we come to you in love for the cause of the Master to ask if you will agree for us to meet together to mutually forgive each other of all wrongs committed, and bury the past, and come together in peace and love as one band of brethren in the Lord, and let us henceforth endeavor to forget the things that are behind and strive for the things that make

for peace, and the things whereby we may edify one another. We are ready to make peace with all our brethren and sisters who want peace. We send this by the hands of our beloved brethren, E. F. Evers and E. B. Meeks. Will you, brethren, please hear us for the sake of the cause of the Master, and let us have your kind reply? Done and signed by order of the band of brethren called New Ramah, worshipping at Mt. Pisgah, on Sunday, July 5, 1925. Elder G. P. Woodall, Moderator. E. B. Meeks, Clerk pro tern. The above letter was delivered on Saturday before the second Sunday in July, at their regular meeting time. It will be seen that Brother E. B. Meeks, of Haynesville, La., was one of the messengers appointed to bear the letter. Under date of July 13 he wrote us as follows: Elder C. H. Cayce: Very Dear Brother-According to promise I delivered the resolution adopted by our brethren to the brethren in Louisiana, but they ignored it and would not have it read. I understand that there was quite a bit of sentiment against them for not having read it. I don't know just what would be best, but I feel like it should be made known to the brethren just how they stand. I was there Saturday and Sunday. Elder N. L. Martin was their preacher. He delivered able discourses both days. I could not help but have a prayer for a man that could preach so ably and be so blind to duty. May God speed the day when Israel can live in peace. Dear brother, may the Lord's richest blessings be with you and family; and if not asking too much for one so unworthy as I, when at a throne of God's rich grace please remember me. Your unworthy brother in bonds of peace and love, if one at all, E. B. Meeks. Haynesville, La.

We regret that those brethren would not hear the pleading for peace and for the privilege of confessing wrongs and faults to one another, as the inspired Book commands. It seems to us that when brethren will not hear their brethren pleading for an opportunity to confess wrongs and for brethren to live together in peace, that something must be radically wrong. "If you forgive not men their trespasses, how shall your heavenly Father forgive you your trespasses?" We publish the above so that our brethren everywhere may know what our brethren have done, and the effort they have made to obtain reconciliation. The peace meeting at Jamestown has accomplished great good, we are sure; but there are just a few yet who seemingly do not want peace or reconciliation with their brethren. We trust the good Lord may yet show them the error of their way and put it into their hearts to labor for peace with their brethren. C. H. C.

Woe Because of Immoral Preachers by Price Billingsby

---August 15, 1925

The following article by the name above and under the above heading is copied from the Gospel Advocate, published in Nashville, Tenn., by the McQuiddy Printing Company. It is a Christian (or Campbellite) paper. The article is so timely and so full of truth that we feel like giving it to our readers. Although our space is so limited, and we have so much more matter on hand than we have room for, yet we think the matter about which this article is written is so important that we are glad to give it space. Read it and ponder it well. No wonder there is so much trouble, unrest, distress and disturbance. No wonder so many are looking upon Christianity as a failure. No wonder so many look upon the church as being a bundle of hypocrisy. It is the imperative requirement of Holy Writ that the minister must be of good report of them that are without. It is not required that those without believe the doctrine the minister preaches, but it is required that he be esteemed as an honorable and an upright man. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

Woe when we have preachers, some widely known, who are liars, cheats, and unchaste, whose sins are white-washed and hushed up, allowed station and honor almost without a break, or their gross offenses not becoming known at all save through whispers, or, if for various rascalities they are withdrawn from at one place, they, through the collusion of silence, go elsewhere, unrepentant and abetted, to prey upon an innocent brotherhood! I say woe! Our leaders and those who publish our papers, who are under special obligation freely enough betimes speak out against this and that offender. But is the divine rule for public rebuke in these matters often invoked? See I **#Cor 5:5; Galatians 2:11; I Timothy 1:20; 5:20; II Timothy 2:17; Leviticus 5:1; 19:17; Proverbs 29:24; Romans 1:32**]. Do you say nothing can be done, however badly needed? But why not? Is it not being increasingly taken for granted that the divine order can be treated with impunity? Cheaters, liars, and apostates need to be shown; it is owed both to the world at large and to the church to be understood that nobody, least of all a gospel preacher, shall defy and flaunt the moral code and the proprieties, and lightly get off with it. When Israel's leaders fell into immoralities, God terribly rebuked and cursed them; and when some of our preachers grossly err and wantonly bring the Lord's cause into disgrace, and the outrages be hidden or winked at, the Lord will again terribly destroy. The guilty should be rebuked and humiliated by being published and their offenses named; the offense and the offender should be chastised in the open. Only so will the claims of justice be somewhat satisfied, the loose and unruly warned, and an outraged public sentiment vindicated. The Lord's irrevocable decree is that sin must be paid for in full. Even divine pardon cannot save from many of its evil consequences. They that stand high have many blasts to shake them, and when they fall they are dashed to pieces. The church puts a man to the fore. But when he falls, he forfeits the right to honor and place bestowed upon him, nor can he rightly complain at severe measures of correction. He has made his bed, and lie on it he must; he must pay the penalty, even as a guard and warning to others. He has brought the church into deep odium, and many now suffer innocently on his account. Let him stoop down and kiss the rod that smites him, else Jehovah will utterly destroy him. He is a bird with a broken pinion, never to soar so high again, forever a wounded creature, often to be reminded of his shame, and only through long years of unwavering purity can he hope by so much as one jot to outlive and put down the ill fame of his fall. But let him rejoice that in coming to God with all his soul he will be lifted up to pardon and some usefulness. It is ever a mournful thing, working general havoc, when those who sit in high places fall into disgrace. Disaster overtakes the masses when their leaders lapse in conduct. Yea, life for the many is surer made when public offenders are brought to account, exposed and denounced, let this be ever so painful and disturbing. Nothing could be more destructive of the public weal than that sins be let alone. Uprighted wrong dare not be hushed up and forgotten. God cancels sin when the full price of repentance is paid, else it eats the soul to eternal damnation. Then, in these days of falling away, let the rising tide of departure be stemmed or stayed by plain truth being spoken.

Work Legal

---August 15, 1925

We have been asked to state through our columns our views as to the legality of the work of the committee from the different churches in their labor with Danville (Va.) Church. We are free to state that the work of that committee is legal. They were acting under church authority. When Danville Church rejected all labor by the

sister churches, there was no other course to pursue but the course pursued by that committee. There is no question but what the doctrine was at the bottom of the matter, and the Lone Pilgrim is now making a plain and bold fight on that doctrine- they are openly advocating it now (unlimited predestination) in the last issue, and are on the warpath in dead earnest. It has come to a "show down" now- recognize Elder Wilson and those who stand on the true doctrine with him, or recognize such stuff as those fellows are advocating, as well as some other matters that might be mentioned. C. H. C.

Don't Want the Paper

---September 1, 1925

A few days ago we received the following letter:

Mr. Cayce: I have written you twice to stop my Primitive, or Mrs. R. M. Abbott did, and she sent in my subscription-. I did that in March, when it was out. I see you keep sending one just once in a while, when Wilson has some of his letters in it. I never get one unless there is some remark from him or some of his followers; and I do not want to read anything he has to print. I have already learned more of him and his than I care to hear. I think if you had been here at the start and all along and knew all as we do, you would not be so fresh yourself. So please do not send me any more of the Primitive copies, for I do not want them. Very respectfully, Mrs. W. W. Terrell. 1209 Claiborne St., Danville, Va. You can put this letter in your paper if you wish to do so.

REMARKS The above name was marked off our list as directed. The printer is a long time behind in correcting the mailing list that is in type, and from which the papers are mailed out, and on this account every issue of the paper has been sent to the above address. When papers are thus sent on because of the printers being behind with the work there is no charge made for the papers, for the name no longer appears on the book as a subscriber. We suppose if the doctrine the above party has lined up with is the truth, then God unchangeably decreed and fixed from all eternity that Elder Wilson should contend against that doctrine; and He also unchangeably fixed it that some others should advocate it.. If the doctrine is the truth, then those who advocate it could not help doing so, and Elder Wilson could not help fighting it; for God unchangeably fixed and forged it that they should do and say just what they did do and say. Therefore, when the good sister arrays herself against Elder Wilson, she arrays herself against what God has predestinated, fixed and unchangeably decreed from all eternity. But if that doctrine be the truth we must conclude that God did also unchangeably and unalterably predestinate, fix and decree that she should thus array herself against what He had unchangeably and unalterably fixed and decreed from eternity. If their doctrine is the truth, then God did, from all eternity, absolutely, unconditionally, unalterably and unchangeably predestinate, fix and decree that we should not be there at the start and all along, and that we should not know as they do, and that we should, therefore, "be so fresh" as we are. Now, if your doctrine is the truth, we have only been carrying out God's absolute and unalterable and unchangeable predestination, and we could not do otherwise. So, why are you raising such a howl with us about it? If the matter does not suit you, why do you not raise a row with the Lord about it, for thus fixing, predestinating and unalterably decreeing the thing the way He did? It seems to us that if the thing does not suit you that the eternal God is the one for you folks to raise a row with; for if your doctrine is the truth, He is the one that is responsible for the matter being as it is. May the good Lord pity the poor deluded mortals who will advocate such a doctrine. C. H. C.

Acts 10:36-39

---September 1, 1925

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother in Christ, I Hope-I see your reply in The Primitive Baptist to one John May on baptism in July 15, and I see that you say Cornelius was the first Gentile to hear the gospel and believe, which I believe. A question: Had the Gentiles ever heard the gospel before that time? **((0:36) (Acts 10:36)**. What word is this that God sent to the children of Israel? ((0:37) (Acts 10:37), "That word, I say, ye know." Does "ye" here refer to Cornelius or to the six brethren that went with Peter down there? If this does not mean the six brethren who went with him, you make it strong. I know it won't take you long to look this up for me. ((0:39) (Acts 10:39): Does Peter mean the apostles or the six that were with him? I have thought he had reference to the six, and if I am wrong make it strong. You know I have to be cited and knocked around a whole lot before I give up. If I am wrong knock both feet from under me. If you just knock out one foot at a time it will take longer to get me down. I don't love to differ from anyone, and more especially my brethren. I know you don't have time to fool with me, but I want to know whether that word in ((0:37) (Acts 10:37) means the life giving word or the preached word. I have been having some good meetings. Had some additions to the churches while I was in the West Tennessee Association. Amos just out of a four days meeting at Brush Creek. At Mt. Zion, in my association, had no additions, but good interest. If Brother John R. Harris, at Thornton, Ark., ever learns what to say to get them to come in, I want him to tell us through The Primitive Baptist and then I will go back to Mt. Zion and say it and get those old "highlanders" to come in and take up their abode with us. I said all I knew to say. They seemed to enjoy the preaching, but we did not get them to come in. If we could tell the secret of fellowship I believe we could get them to come; but the Old Baptists have a secret they can't tell, and the Masons have a secret they are not allowed to tell. "A good understanding have all they that do His commandments." May the Lord help us to live in a way that the little children may be encouraged to turn in with us. I did not think of writing as I have. Please answer my question through The Primitive Baptist when you have time. May the Lord bless you and yours. Pray for me. I am, I hope, your little brother in Christ, J. W. Lomax. 719 S. Third St., Paducah, Ky.

REMARKS

If the Gentiles had ever before heard the gospel we have no record of it. The brethren in Judea heard of the visit of Peter and the brethren to the house of Cornelius, and at the same time they also heard that the Gentiles had received the word of God. See **(Acts 11:1)**. Did they hear the truth? Yes. Then this was when the Gentiles received the word of God. See **((7) (Acts 15:7)** "Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe." It was by the mouth of Peter that the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel. This was God's choice. As this was God's choice, this was the first gospel sermon the Gentiles had ever heard. The word that the Gentiles heard was the same word that the Jews had previously heard, and the word which the Jews already knew. Peter was addressing the brethren who accompanied him when he said, "That word, I say, ye know." The first thing the apostle said in his discourse at the house of Cornelius was addressed to the brethren who went with him. He had previously thought the Lord's people were confined to the Jews; but he had been convinced of the fact that the Lord had a people among the Gentiles, so he said, "Of a truth I perceive that

God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him." He found a man among the Gentiles who was a devout man; one that feared God, and prayed to God always. In the vision before he went to the house of Cornelius the voice had said, "What God hath cleansed." God had already done the work of cleansing, which is done by the Spirit. When Peter and his brethren got there he found that it was so, that God had a people among the Gentiles, and he so informed the brethren with him; and told them that they knew the word which had been spoken by the apostles. God regenerates the sinner without the preacher, and he had been preaching that doctrine, and so had the other apostles, and those brethren knew it; and now here is evidence of the truthfulness of that doctrine right before your eyes. Now, Brother Lomax, if you can get any consolation from what we have written, we are glad of it. We are glad to hear of your good meetings. May the Lord's blessing continue with you. Our brethren want you to visit them in Arkansas again. Remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

The Infant Question

---September 1, 1926

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-On page 8 of The Primitive Baptist of May 15, 1925, under the heading, "Some Questions," I want to say a few words and ask two or three questions, and hope you will give me the desired information. Fifth question: "Who can keep the commandments?" Your answer is, "The living children of God can keep the gospel commandments; and all people can keep the moral commandments to live honestly and uprightly." Do you believe God's children who do not know the commandments can keep them? Do you believe either God's people or those who are not God's people can keep the commandments, of either gospel or moral class, without the will power to do so? No question as to whether or not all have physical power to do either of the commandments, but the mind is the supreme court of all living beings, and without the consent of the mind the body is powerless to act rationally, and if not rationally it would be worthless. Referring to questions 6 and 7 you say the nonelect do not die in infancy. How do you know, or what Scriptures do you rely upon to sustain what you say? I have not been able to find any Scripture that sustains your answer, according to my knowledge and belief. Seventh answer is all right, I think. Please answer in your paper, so all can learn. In sincerity, J. I. Caneer. Montebello, Calif.

REMARKS

In our answers to the questions above referred to of course it was understood that the child of God who knows the commandments is the one who can keep them. All people know that it is right to live moral lives, and they can do so. If they cannot, then they are not responsible and are not blameworthy. No blame rests upon a man for doing what he cannot help doing; and if a man cannot live morally, then he cannot help living immorally. If he cannot help living immorally, and yet is punished for it, then the punishment is not just. The servant that knows not the Master's will, nor does it, is beaten with few stripes. No doubt it is frequently the case that some are willfully ignorant. They do not investigate as they should. They may neglect to study, and on account of that neglect, they may fail to know the Master's will. God's people have a will for holiness and righteousness, though they may sometimes act in such a way as to cause others to doubt them. While they have that will for holiness and righteousness, which springs from the divine life which God has given them, yet they still have the old nature that is poisoned with sin,

and have that old nature to contend with. Now, with reference to the infant, we will refer to **(0:15) (Mark 10:15)** "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." Now, **(Luke 18:17)** "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." In Mark's description he uses the term little child, which word in the original is used sometimes with reference to children in youth; but Luke uses the word translated infants in (Luke 18:15), which is not used in referring to older children, but the original word is used with reference to small children, and sometimes used with reference to the child in the mother's womb, even before the natural birth. We call attention to this to show that it does not refer to old people young in Christ. It refers to babes in the mother's arms. The Master does not say, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as this little child," referring to some special or particular child, but "as a little child." (Luke 18:17) He uses the indefinite article-a "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God AS a little child," etc. If an adult receives the kingdom of God as a little child, then a little child does not miss it. If a little child misses the kingdom, and you receive it as a little child, then you miss it, too. Therefore, if a little child misses the kingdom, it will be a universal damnation for all the adult race of Adam. If one of the adult family of Adam is saved, or receives the kingdom, then a little child does not miss it. From our understanding of the matter, no other Scripture is necessary to prove our position. May the Lord bless these few words to the good of the reader. C. H. C.

Mountain Springs Association

---September 15, 1925

We have just attended the Mountain Springs Association, which met with Fullers Chapel Church in North Little Rock. A good crowd was present each day- Friday, Saturday and first Sunday in September. The ministers present were Elders J. H. Fisher, Newcastle, Texas; C. J. Holcomb, Ft. Worth, Texas; P. E. Whitwell, Poplar Bluff, Mo.; A. D. Cencibaugh, Donaldson, Ark.; T. P. McCain, Gumlog, Ark.; J. D. Elkins, Blevins, Ark.; J. J. Brown, Clarksville, Ark.; C. M. Monk, Abbott, Ark.; F. H. Inman, Roselle, Mo.; J. Sandage, Donaldson, Ark.; H. J. Woodruff, Sardis, Tenn.; E. W. Hargett, Donaldson, Ark.; and C. H. Cayce, besides their home ministers. Elder J. H. O'Neal was moderator and Brother J. N. O'Neal was clerk. There was not a discordant note sounded in the preaching. No hobby riding. All preached peace by Jesus Christ, and peace and love abounded. All seemed glad to be there and to meet each other, and rejoiced in the good things of the kingdom. The Lord's presence was felt and manifested, and it was a good meeting. The next session of the association is appointed to be held with Bethlehem Church, at Bee Branch, Ark. C. H. C.

Elder W. S. Broom

---September 15, 1925

We should have made this announcement before now, but having so many things to look after and attend to we just overlooked it. At our regular meeting in Fordyce in July (we think it was July) Elder W. S. Broom was present and offered himself for membership in our church, and was gladly received. He joined by relation, or on confession of faith, as it is sometimes termed. His membership has been at Tioga, Texas. He had just been down in Louisiana in the section where they had the Jamestown peace meeting, and having seen the good effect of that meeting, and being tired of war and confusion, he desired a home with those who are laboring for

peace, and so asked for a home with us, which was gladly granted him. He left immediately after the meeting for Mississippi, and he is still visiting among the brethren. May the Lord bless his labors for the benefit of His dear children. C. H. C.

Another Move For Peace

---October 15, 1925

For quite awhile there has been a difference between the Salem and the First Oklahoma Associations, growing out of some matters at Little Flock Church. During our recent trip in that section of country, in Arkansas, we were at Little Flock Church on September 15th. Elders A. D. West, B. M. Green and J. M. Newman were present. These brethren presented the following resolution as a basis upon which the differences existing might be done away and the trouble all settled between the two bodies. The resolutions were unanimously adopted by Little Flock Church, and those brethren said they believed their churches would adopt the same. If they do, then the differences between these churches and associations will all be settled. We were so glad to see this done and to see such steps taken. Fellowship Church, at Hon, also adopted the same resolutions on the 16th or 17th, the day we were there, as that church was also involved in the trouble. We were so glad to see them so ready and willing to settle any trouble or differences that might exist. The only way to really settle trouble is to confess our wrongs and ask forgiveness, and to forgive those whom we think have wronged us. When we are in the spirit to confess our own wrongs it requires but little effort to settle troubles. May the good Lord help us all to confess our wrongs, and may peace and prosperity be restored to our bleeding and beloved Zion. C. H. C.

THE RESOLUTIONS

Forasmuch as conditions in our beloved Zion are such as the hearts of many of the saints of God are torn and bleeding over our distressed condition on account of differences between some of the churches in the Salem Association and the First Primitive Baptist Association of Oklahoma, and inasmuch as we realize that we are all poor, finite, fallible beings, depending alone on the merits of a crucified Lord, and believing it to be to the glory of God, and desiring peace, union, love and sweet fellowship to be restored, be it, therefore, Resolved, That we, Little Flock Church, confess our wrongs, errors, mistakes and sins, of whatsoever nature they may be, to any and all of our dear sister churches in particular, and to all our dear brethren and sisters in general, and ask their forgiveness, assuring them by these presents and this, our official act, we freely forgive all. Be it further, Resolved, That we reaffirm our faith in the principles upon which we, as a church, were constituted. Be it further Resolved, That we will endeavor to keep the unity of the faith in the bonds of peace. Be it further Resolved, That where members have been excluded at any place and received by another church, that this mutual confession shall be accepted and all wrongs forgiven, which shall mean a restoration of excluded brethren and sisters to our fellowship and a transfer of their membership to the places where they are now. Done and signed by order of Little Flock Church while in conference on September 16, 1926. Elder C. M. Monk, Moderator. J. D. Caudle, Clerk.

Heresy and Heretics

---October 15, 1925

On another page in this paper will be found an article from Brother John R. Havens, of Santa Anna, Texas, under the above heading. Brother Havens takes us and our contributors to task on account of the use of the word heresy, and this has caused us to look diligently for the meaning of that word in the original language, as well as in English. We have never met Brother Havens, though we would be glad to do so. We have learned to love him from his writings. It is not our intention to wound his feelings, nor do we wish to wound the feelings of any. We feel sure that many of God's dear children are wrong, both in doctrine and in practice-some are wrong in one, and some are wrong in the other, and some are wrong in both. We may be wrong ourselves. But if we are, we desire to know the truth. There is no real or lasting comfort or joy in believing a false doctrine; and real and true happiness comes from practicing the truth. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." We desire to know the truth and then to live in harmony with it. We are free to confess and to say that many of us- and most of us -have been too bitter and have engaged too much in war with our brethren. Many times when we have differed we have magnified the difference, instead of trying to minimize the difference and endeavoring to stay together. We feel sure that this is wrong; and it is no wonder that our people are divided into so many factions. We should labor and strive for the things that make for peace, and the things wherewith we may edify one another, instead of laboring to divide and to destroy one another. If a brother makes a hobby of any point, and thus stirs up strife and confusion, and will not desist, or quit it, if the church would simply withdraw from him and let him remain out until he is willing to cease such hobby riding, it would save much trouble in our ranks. It would have saved some of the divisions that have taken place in our day. This principle is the same, no matter what the hobby might be. But we desire to say just a few things concerning the matter of heresy. In **(Galatians 5:19-20,21)**, we have this language: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." After investigation we sincerely believe that Brother Havens is mistaken in his view that heresy is not false doctrine. Let us reason a little on the matter before we look at the definition of the word. Idolatry is here mentioned as one of the works of the flesh; but yet what is it? It is "the worship of idols; the paying of divine homage to false gods or images; also adoration of created or imaginary beings or natural objects or forces; inordinate love or admiration to; fervent devotion." We may safely say, then, that idolatry is a false worship, a wrong worship. One may be ever so sincere and honest in the matter, and yet be an idolater. Now, if idolatry is this kind of worship, and yet it is one of the works of the flesh, why may not heresy be a false doctrine and still be one of the works of the flesh? False doctrine does not come from the Lord, any more than false worship comes from Him. If they do not come from the Lord, do they not come from the flesh? The word heresy in the text is defined by Webster thus: "Religious opinion opposed to the authorized doctrinal standards of any particular church, especially when held by a person holding to the same general faith, and tending to promote schism or separation; lack of orthodox or sound belief; rejection of, or erroneous belief in regard to, some fundamental religious doctrine or truth: heterodoxy. An opinion held in opposition to the established or commonly received doctrine, and tending to promote division or dissension. A characteristic opinion held by a person or a party; a particular body or style of doctrine; a sect." Webster defines a heretic thus: "One who holds to a heresy; especially one who, having made a profession of Christian belief, deliberately and

pertinaciously upholds a doctrine varying from that of the church, or rejects one prescribed by his church." If one holds a view contrary to the Catholic doctrine, in the eye of the Catholic, or from the Catholic standpoint, such a one is a heretic. So if one holds a doctrine contrary to Campbellism, such a one is a heretic from the Campbellite standpoint. In like manner, if one holds a doctrine that is not Primitive Baptist doctrine, or that is contrary to it, then such a one is a heretic, from the Primitive Baptist standpoint. Such a person may be orderly walking, and may be a lover of the truth in every point except that one point. If he holds to that one false doctrine or principle, then from that standpoint he is a heretic. This does not necessarily say, at all, that such a person is a bad man at heart. A man may be a good man in heart and yet be a worshiper of an idol. So a man may be a good man in heart and practice, and yet believe a doctrine which is one of the works of the flesh, or that came from the flesh and not from the Lord. Many of God's dear children, we are sure, are deceived and led to believe some false doctrine. Liddell and Scott, the highest authority on the Greek language, define the word translated heresies in **(Galatians 5:20)** thus: "A philosophic principle or set of principles, or those who profess such principles, a sect, a school; a religious party or sect, such as the Essenes, the Sadducees and Pharisees, by them used of the Christians, and by orthodox Christians of those who dissented; especially also of their doctrine, heresy." Thayer defines the word thus: "That which is chosen, a chosen course of thought and action; hence, one's chosen opinion, tenet; according to the context, an opinion varying from the true exposition of the Christian faith (heresy). A body of men separating themselves from others and following their own tenets (a sect or party), as the Sadducees; the Pharisees; the Christians; dissensions arising from diversity of opinions and aims; **(Galatians 5:20); (I Corinthians 11:19)**" We believe that these definitions given of the word are sufficient. We trust that Brother Havens will take what we say here in kindness. We regard him as a child of God, and trust we have due respect for his feelings and for his position in the matter. May the good Lord bless and keep and sustain him in all his trials and conflicts, is our humble prayer. We should all try to be careful in our expressions and try not to unnecessarily wound the feelings of any of the Lord's dear children. We would be glad to see all our people once more united, who are standing together upon the fundamental principles of the gospel, and all striving for the things that make for peace, and leaving those things alone that cause strife and confusion. May the good Lord help us all. C. H. C.

Isaiah 5:8

---December 1, 1925

Brother A. Dodson, of Plains, Ga., asks us to give our views through the paper on **((8) (Isaiah 5:8)**, and asks if it applies to anything being built now. The text reads, "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth." In the marginal reference the word ye appears for the word they, so that the sense is this, "that ye may be placed alone in the midst of the earth." There is sufficient in this text for a long article, but we do not have time to write at length upon the subject. The language was to national Israel, and they were typical of spiritual Israel. In some sense that text belongs to the church today, and is to be applied to the church. There is some building going on today. Some may be building of wood, hay, stubble; and some may be building of gold, silver, precious stones. **{(I Corinthians 3:12-13)}** There may be some working in the Lord's vineyard, though they may be doing very little. As they labor, they may join in with others, join house to house and field to field.

When the church of God joins house to house, or field to field, with the nations around, then there is no place left for them in all the earth. The Lord's church or kingdom is not to be like any other, nor is it like any other. To join house to house or field to field with other folks is to be like others. When they are like others, they are not like the Lord's kingdom or church. There cannot be two things that are alike, and those things be different. The Lord's kingdom was to be different from all other kingdoms. If they do just as other folks, and practice the same things that other folks do, they would not be different from others; then there would be no place left for them in all the earth. Israel were a peculiar people, unlike any other nation. So the Lord's church is peculiar, and to be unlike any other church or kingdom. Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Others are of this world. If the church uses and practices the same things that the world uses and practices, then they would be just like the others- of the world. When one of the Lord's churches goes into the practice of the things of the world, the inventions of men, she finally loses her identity or becomes extinct. To join in with the world in their worship and service is to join house to house and field to field. The secret orders of the day have their prayers and ritual services. They have their forms of worship. To join in with them is to join house to house and field to field, and to do so is to bring distress and final destruction. The Lord pronounced the woe. We may think it necessary to do as others do, and to allow what they allow, and to join in with them in order that we prosper. If we think that way, we think wrong. God's way is better than our way. His ways are higher than our ways, and His thoughts higher than our thoughts. We think wrong many times; but God's thoughts are always right. He did not promise a blessing upon Israel when they join house to house, or field to field, with the nations around, but He pronounced a woe upon them that thus do. The same thing applies to His church today, for Israel were a typical people, representing spiritual Israel today. Suppose the Old Baptists were to engage in and practice the many things that other orders engage in and practice today. Where would the Old Baptists be? Would there be any Old Baptists? Certainly not. They are different, and must remain different in order to retain and maintain their identity. These are just a few of our thoughts in connection with the text. If any other brother feels like writing some more we will appreciate it; but we do not have time to write more now. May the Lord bless the same to the good of our readers. C. H. C.

1926

Introduction to Volume 41

---January 1, 1926

This issue begins the forty-first volume of The Primitive Baptist. The time seems to be short since the first issue of the paper was sent out from Fulton, Ky., January 1, 1886, just forty years ago, by our sainted father, Elder S. F. Cayce. He continued to edit the paper until he fell asleep, while actively engaged in the service, on the fourth Sunday in August, 1905, while preaching the closing discourse at the Collins River Association in Tennessee, near McMinnville. Thus he was editor of the paper almost twenty years. Since that time we have been trying, as best we could, to fill the place as editor of the paper, now a little more than twenty years. As to how well that has been done, is for others to say. We are very well aware of the fact that we have made mistakes, and if we continue to live, no doubt we will make

more. There is just one kind of man who makes no mistakes, and that is a dead one. "The man who never made a mistake, never made anything." This is true, as far as human beings are concerned. We cannot promise our readers now, in the beginning of this volume, that we will make no mistakes. Yet we do not desire to make them, and when we do make them, and find that we have done so, it is our desire to correct them, as far as possible. We believe the same doctrine now that was set forth in the first issue of the paper, and which has been maintained in the columns of the paper since that time. We have found no reason for any change along that line. Those principles have been loved and cherished by the humble followers of the Master in all ages, and they are just as true now as they have ever been. There have been many changes along the line during the past forty years, as well as along the line before, but principles have not changed. Principles are eternal and never change. Whatever is a principle of truth today has ever been a principle of truth. Truth continues to live, and cannot be destroyed. It may be "crushed to earth, but it will rise again." We desire that the same principles of eternal truth may still be maintained in the columns of The Primitive Baptist that have characterized the Primitive Baptists as being a separate and distinct people from the world in the years and ages past. If the good Lord spares our life so that we may live through the coming year our humble desire is to labor for the peace of Zion, and to try to unify the Lord's dear children. The purpose of the gospel of the grace of God-or one purpose of it-is that the Lord's people may "come into the unity of the faith." The plain and simple truth of the gospel does not divide and confuse the Lord's little children. But when we fail to "avoid foolish and unlearned questions, which do gender strife," then strife and confusion comes as a result. Let us all try to avoid such, and let us all endeavor to strive together for the peace of the gospel and for the peace of our beloved Zion, The circulation of The Primitive Baptist has increased some during the past year, but it is not yet what it was before the war and before the "slump" came a few years ago. We trust that our corresponding editors and all our brethren in the ministry and all our readers will put forth a special effort this year to increase the circulation of the paper. We very much desire to make the paper a weekly again, but the circulation is not yet enough to enable us to do that. Will you, each one, try this year and see how many new subscribers you can send in? Insist on the brethren, sisters or friends subscribing for the paper. Ask them to do so, and then ask them again, if they do not subscribe at once. Send us their names so we can send them a copy of the paper occasionally, so they can see what kind of articles the paper contains in these trying times, and then ask them again to let you send in their subscription. You can help much in this way, and not be much expense to you. Will you try it? We are now, at this writing, in Hohenwald, Tenn. Have been in this section, in the bounds of the Buffalo River Association, for several days. By oversight, on account of being from home, we failed to write an article for last issue on the close of volume forty. Besides, we had so much to do, and manuscript to prepare for the paper, and letters to answer, we did not take the time to think about what was needed along that line. We hope soon to have our affairs so arranged that we can keep up with these matters better and also do more writing for the paper. Some of our corresponding editors have taken an active part during the past year in writing for the paper and also in sending subscribers. We appreciate that, and trust they will continue to do that, and we also trust the others may be stirred up to a little more activity along these lines. Brethren, let us all awake. The times look brighter to us, the prospects look better to us, for our people, now than they have for years. Many of the Lord's children are tired of war and confusion, and peace is being restored in so many places where they have had trouble and confusion. Truly it seems that the winter is almost over and that the time of spring is about here and the voice of the

turtle will once more be heard in the land, and the time of rejoicing is coming—really, it is already begun. We have seen so many of the Lord's dear children rejoice during the past year over the restoration of peace. May the Lord be praised, and may He help us to live more devoted to Him and closer to each other. Brethren and sisters, will you please pray the Lord to help us live to His honor and conduct The Primitive Baptist in a way that will benefit His humble poor and be a blessing to His cause? C. H. C.

More Editorial Help

---January 1, 1926

After considering the matter for sometime we requested Elder W. A. Bishop, of Jackson, Tenn., to allow us to place his name on our editorial staff as one of our corresponding editors, and he has granted our request. In another column of this paper will be found an article from him granting this request.. Brother Bishop is moderator of the old Mississippi River Association. In our young days we were frequently in attendance at the sessions of that association and frequently visited the churches in the bounds of the same. That is the old home association of that great man of God, Elder W. W. Sammons, who filled up the measure of his days some years ago and was "gathered to his fathers." The memory of that old servant of God is sweet to us yet. Many happy seasons have we spent with the dear people in years gone by where Elder Bishop is now identified—that is, in that association. We are glad to have Brother Bishop take a place on our editorial staff. We trust he may be impressed of the Lord to write frequently for our columns, and we pray the Lord to bless his efforts to the good of His people and to the good of the cause. We love Brother Bishop, and we trust that our labors together in the Lord's vineyard may be blessed of the Lord, and that we may still be drawn more closely together in love and sweet fellowship. Brother Bishop, please pray for us, and may the Lord direct you and keep you, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Peace Restored

---January 1, 1926

We were requested some weeks ago to be at Enon Church, in the bounds of the Buffalo River Association, in Middle Tennessee, to meet with that church and sit in a committee with Elders J. M. Fuqua, of Dickson, Tenn., W. A. Bishop, of Jackson, Tenn., and Lee Hanks, of Atlanta, Ga., in an investigation of a trouble that had existed in the bounds of that association, the meeting to be held on the first Sunday in December and Friday and Saturday before. The trouble there seemed to have arisen on account of Elder J. B. Hardy being recognized by two of the churches, when his standing and order among the Baptists was called in question. The trouble had been existing and growing worse for quite awhile, and had resulted in a division in the association. We left home on Tuesday night, December 1, and arrived in Jackson, Tenn., at about 3:17 Wednesday afternoon. Elder Bishop met us at the train and conveyed us to his home. We filled an appointment at his church that night, where there was a good crowd assembled. We enjoyed a pleasant meeting with those dear brethren and sisters. This seems to be a lively band of Old Baptists. We spent the night with Brother Bishop in his home. Thursday morning we took the train for Perryville, Tenn., Elder Bishop accompanying us, he having been requested to serve on the committee mentioned above. We had to lie over at Lexington nearly, or about, three hours. A few minutes after we arrived there Brother J. M. Brantley came to the depot looking for us, and took us all to his

home, where we enjoyed a few hours wait and had a good dinner. Brother Billie Pope, brother of Elder W. C. Pope, had joined us at Luray. We arrived at Perryville, Tenn., on time and were met by a son of Elder W. C. Pope and conveyed to Brother Pope's home at Pope, Tenn. Brother Pope had published an appointment for service that night at the schoolhouse near his home. Brother Bishop preached first and delivered a good discourse, which we and others enjoyed, then we tried to talk for a short while. A good crowd was present and gave good attention. Friday morning the weather was bad and the rain was coming down, but Brother Pope took us all in his car and we started for Union. We arrived there about on time, and quite a crowd had already gathered. Most of the churches in the association were represented there. After preaching service the church was called into conference by Elder W. C. Pope, the pastor of the church, and the church was asked if they were satisfied with the committee who had come at the request of the brethren in that section to help them to settle the trouble that existed among the brethren of their association and among the churches. They voted unanimously that they were satisfied with the committee. Then all the Baptists present were asked if they were satisfied with the committee, and they voted unanimously that they were satisfied, Elder Hardy being among the number. After some other preliminary and miscellaneous matters being attended to, the service was dismissed and the committee went to the home of a Brother Lane near by, and the announcement made as to where the committee would be, and that witnesses would be called or sent for as they might be needed, and that those who knew they would be wanted, or expected to be wanted, should come to Brother Lane's home as soon as they could, so that the committee might proceed with their work and get through as soon as possible. All the evidence was placed before the committee that night that both sides said they desired to introduce, and both sides said they did not wish to introduce any further evidence. Saturday morning the congregation was again assembled at the meetinghouse, and the committee said they were ready to make their report at the hour appointed for service. The brethren all decided to hear the report of the committee before proceeding with further service, which report was read, and which follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE We, your committee, having been requested by you to come and investigate the trouble existing among your churches, having heard the evidence that both sides said they desired to introduce, beg leave to make the following report: We find that mistakes, errors, and wrongs have been done on both sides. We do not deem it advisable or necessary to itemize those wrongs or errors in this writing, but, if necessary, will point them out orally. Now, we wish to submit the following recommendations: First: That the brethren and churches on both sides mutually confess your faults and your wrongs to each other and ask forgiveness for all wrongs done, and come together, forgiving each other, and live together in peace and fellowship, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. We further recommend that the brethren ' and sisters of Coon Creek Church confess wrongs to each other and forgive each other of all wrongs done, and come back together as one band of brethren and sisters in the Lord, and thus be a re-united band; forgiving each other of all wrongs and errors committed. We further recommend that all official work that has been done on both sides since the trouble began to be received and recognized and accepted. This may be done upon the principle of Christian charity, and should be done upon that ground, if for no other reason. We further recommend that this mutual forgiveness of all wrongs, and mutual confession of wrongs, should include and mean a restoration to fellowship of all those who have been excluded or withdrawn from on account of this trouble; and also a transfer of membership of those who may have joined

another church on confession of faith, so that their membership may remain where they are now. As this trouble seems to have arisen on account of the standing and order of Elder J. B. Hardy being called in question, and as Brother Hardy says that he is willing to do what this committee says in order that his standing and recognition among our people may be unquestioned, we therefore recommend that Brother Hardy go before one of our churches whose standing among our people is unquestioned and lay his case before that church. If that church receives him into her fellowship we are sure that the sister churches would all then recognize Brother Hardy. We further recommend that all our people leave off the use of expressions that confuse the minds of our dear brethren which are not found in the Bible, and adopt the use of Bible expressions as much as possible on controverted points. Let us all try to labor to unify our dear people, and strive for the things that make for peace and for the things whereby we may edify one another. Signed: Elder Lee Hanks. Elder J. M. Fuqua. Elder C. H. Cayce. Elder W. A. Bishop. The foregoing report of the committee was read carefully three times, and then it was adopted by unanimous vote of the Baptists present. Then the brethren began to sing and to extend the hand of fellowship to each other. Thus all confessed their wrongs and mutually forgave each other for all wrongs done. Shouts of praise and thanksgiving to God went up from the mouths and hearts of many of those present as they extended the hand to each other, and many embraced each other in their arms. Many lovers of the cause of the Master, not members of the church, were present and freely shed tears of joy upon seeing the happy settlement of the trouble which had caused so many heartaches and so much distress among the churches. We cannot fully describe the happy scene. How any lover of peace among the Lord's people and in His churches can object to such meetings and such settlement of troubles is more than we can understand. On Saturday afternoon Elder Bishop left the meeting to return home to have service there on Sunday or Sunday night, perhaps both. Elder Hardy went with him. Since that time we received the following letter from Elder Bishop, dated December 7:
Elder C. H. Cayce:

It is with pleasure that I write to you that we had a fine meeting yesterday at our church in Jackson. Brother J. B. Hardy preached us a fine discourse. He also united with our church by relation. I hope the Lord is still blessing you with good meetings. Your brother in hope, W. A. Bishop. May the good Lord bless all these dear people and help us to live in peace and to live in such a way as to have the love and confidence of each other, is our humble prayer. The meeting at Enon Church on Sunday was a sweet meeting. The presence, of the Lord was felt in the midst. Elders H. M. Sanders and W. C. Davis were present at the meeting from the West Tennessee Association. We filled the appointments made for us at Liberty and New Hope Churches. Elder Fuqua was with us at Liberty during the three days there and one day at New Hope. Elder Sanders was with us two days at Liberty. Elder W. C. Campbell conveyed us and was with us at both places, where very pleasant meetings were enjoyed. Elder Fuqua did some of the preaching, which was enjoyed very much. From New Hope we came to Hohenwald, where we had service Friday night. A large crowd was present and we had good attention. Saturday morning we were conveyed by Dr. (Elder) J. H. Pickard to County Line Church, Giles County, Tenn. This is the old home church of Elder J. M. Johnson, who will be remembered by many of our readers. Seventeen years ago last August we tried to preach the funeral of Elder Johnson and his mother and brother at that place. Several of the sisters are yet living and have membership there. We were glad to meet the dear brethren, sisters and friends at this old church once more. A large crowd was present, especially on Sunday, and the good Lord blessed us with His sweet

presence on both days, and the meeting was an enjoyable and a happy one. Elder Cromwell, who lives near the church, Elder Pickard, who lives in Hohenwald, and Elder Miller, from Albany, Ala., were all present. Today (Monday, Dec. 14) we were to have been at Salem Church, about eighteen miles from Hohenwald. They have been recently building a road between here and that place, and it rained nearly all last night, and those who are acquainted with the roads said they felt sure it was useless to try to get there today. So we had to miss that appointment, and remained here and have been writing all day, writing some for the paper and writing some letters. Tomorrow, the Lord willing, we expect to go to Goshen Church, and then try to fill the remainder of the appointments that have been published for this trip. We trust the dear brethren and sisters will remember us in humble prayer, and also remember our dear ones at home. C. H. C.

Another Unprofitable and Deplorable Strife of Words

---January 15, 1926

Under the above heading is an article from the pen of Elder S. Hassell written a number of years ago and published again in the pamphlet, "Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth," by Elder R. H. Pittman. For the satisfaction of the brethren in the Buffalo River Association in particular, and our brethren elsewhere in general, at the meeting in the Buffalo River Association on Friday and Saturday, December 4 and 5, in adjusting the trouble there, Elder J. B. Hardy submitted the following statement and the article, which we are glad to publish for the benefit of all our brethren. Notice Brother Hardy's endorsement, and notice carefully the sentiment and doctrine set forth in the article. C. H. C.

ELDER HARDY'S STATEMENT

For the satisfaction of the little people of God, and to prevent further confusion and misunderstanding among them as to my position and teaching on predestination and what is termed conditional time salvation, I wish to state that the following article by Elder Sylvester Hassell fully sets forth my views, and I heartily endorse it. J. B. Hardy.

THE ARTICLE

(I Timothy 6:3-5); (II Timothy 2:14). I have earnestly labored for years (I hope not without success, which I gladly confess is due entirely to the Lord,) to show that the contention, among Primitive Baptists, in regard to the extension of predestination is, when properly understood, a mere unprofitable and unwholesome strife of words. Every true Baptist believes that God foreknows and controls all things; and no true Baptist believes that God influences or compels His creatures to sin. Thus God's foreknowledge or predestination of sin is not of a causative or compulsive, but of a permissive, directive, restrictive and overruling character. So far as I am aware, the war, among the most of our brethren, on the extent of predestination seems to have about ended-the vexed question being finally settled on this immutable basis of Scriptural and eternal truth. Another equally unnecessary and unprofitable verbal contention among a few Primitive Baptists is one similar to, if not connected with, the controversy on predestination. It is the question concerning what is called "the conditionality of time salvation," and, connected with this, the question as to the ability of the child of God to obey the commandments of his heavenly Father. All Primitive Baptists are agreed upon the unconditionality of our eternal salvation, and the inability of those who are dead in sin to render spiritual obedience to the law of God. Instead of repentance and faith being conditions prerequisite to salvation, we understand that they are the work of

the Holy Spirit in the renewed heart, and are thus essential parts of salvation; and, until this spiritual renewal, the fallen child of Adam will love sin and hate holiness and continue in rebellion against God. But there is an apparent disagreement in two or three of our associations, among worthy and lovely brethren, who would be heartily fellowshiped and gladly welcomed by other Primitive Baptists everywhere, as to whether our time salvation, that is, our deliverance from spiritual darkness, coldness, distress, and chastisement during the present life is conditioned or dependent upon our obedience to God, and as to whether the child of God is able to obey God or not. Now, even the authors of dictionaries have no right to manufacture or change the meanings of words; their business is simply to ascertain and state the meanings which words actually and already have in the language of which they treat. It would be deceptive to use words in a different sense from that which they generally have, unless we explain the sense which we mean. The most of controversies are strifes of words; and when words are properly defined, and their correct meaning is accepted by both parties, the controversy ends. A "condition" is defined by the best of English dictionaries to be "an event, object, fact, or being that is necessary to the occurrence or existence of some other, though not its cause; a prerequisite; that which must exist as the occasion or concomitance of something else; that which is requisite in order that something else should take effect; an essential qualification." And these dictionaries say that the word "if" is "the typical conditional particle, and is nearly always used to introduce the subordinate clause of a conditional sentence," and means "on the supposition that; provided, or on condition that; in case that, granting, allowing, or supposing that." There are 1,422 "ifs" in the Bible-830 in the Old Testament, and 592 in the New Testament; and these conditional sentences make up about one-fiftieth part of the Bible. Thus forty-nine fiftieths of the Scriptures are unconditional, and one fiftieth is conditional. All reverent minds must admit that this conditional part of the Scriptures, though comparatively small, has a real and true meaning. It cannot be denied by any informed and honest man that such Scriptures as the following are conditional: "If His children forsake my law, I will visit their transgression with the rod, nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from Him." **{((9:30) (Psalms 89:30-33))}** "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." **{((9) (Isaiah 1:19-20))}** "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." **{(John 13:17)}** "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." **{(Romans 8:13)}** "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" **{(Hebrews 2:3)}** "If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin." **{(I John 1:7)}** See, also such Scriptures as (Leviticus 26); (Deuteronomy 4:29-31); ((2) (7:12-26); (11:13-32); (28); ((8:1) (Ezekiel 18); (33). Not only is it certain that these Scriptures are conditional, but it is equally certain that the condition, introduced by "if," necessarily precedes the conclusion, which would not take place unless the condition took place first. If the conclusion in these sentences means eternal punishment, then Arminianism is true; but either the text itself, or the context and other Scriptures, prove that the punishment or chastisement threatened in case of disobedience, is temporal and corrective, and not eternal and destructive, for God gives His children eternal life, and they shall never perish, and though their voluntary sins separate them from His face, nothing present or future can ever separate them from His love. **{(John 10:28-30); (Hebrews 12); ((9:2) (Isaiah 59:2); (Romans 8:28-39))}** The conditionality of time salvation is just as certain as the truth of the eternal word of God. Baptists have always heretofore understood it so; nearly all Baptists understand it so now;

and this truth is in perfect accordance with Christian experience. And if the living child of God, having the indwelling of the Spirit of life and grace, which makes him alive, is not able to obey heartily and sincerely, though imperfectly, the commandments of his heavenly Father, his real state does not differ from that of those who are dead in sin. Of course he can do nothing spiritual or acceptable to God except by that Spirit of grace; but that Spirit dwells in him; **{(John 14:16-17); (Romans 8:9-17); (II Corinthians 6:16); (Ephesians 2:22)}** and he "can do all things through Christ, who strengthens him;" **{((3) (Philippians 4:13))}** and he well knows and loves to confess that he has nothing good which he did not receive from God, and that without Christ he can do nothing, and that, by the grace of God, he is what he is-a poor, hell-deserving sinner, saved by grace-a brand plucked from the eternal burning. **{(I Corinthians 4:7); (James 1:17); (John 15:5); (I Corinthians 15:10); (I Timothy 1:15); ((2) (Zechariah 3:2))}** And he knows just as well, both from the Scriptures and his own experience, that, in willful disobedience to God, he does not enjoy that spiritual comfort which he has in obedience. All the children of God are as assured of these truths as they are of their own existence; and bitter contention over them is wholly unnecessary, unprofitable, unwholesome, and subverting. The entire Scriptural truth about any matter unites, comforts, and edifies the children of God; while a contention for a part of the truth for the whole truth divides, distresses, and overthrows them. Truth is spherical; we must look at it on all sides to understand it at all aright. Extremes are dangerous; let us avoid them as we would the verge of a fatal precipice. "Let our moderation be known unto all men-the Lord is at hand." **{((5) (Philippians 4:5))}** God is the only independent and absolute Being in the universe; not for one instant does any other being cease to be, both naturally and spiritually, dependent upon Him. All our sins come from ourselves alone, and with confusion of face we must take all the shame for them, and not charge them in any way upon our holy Creator-upon His foreknowledge, or predestination, or the partial withdrawal of His Spirit of grace, for well do we know that such a blasphemous imputation would be the grossest of sins; while all our salvation from sin and its consequences comes from God, who deserves and will receive every particle of the glory of it. While fear and hope are in the conditional Scriptures, recognized and addressed as strong motives to human action, pure, selfdenying love is set forth, in the Scriptures, as the highest and strongest motive that can actuate any being; the motive which assimilates us most to the character of the Three-One God, who is Love, and who saves His people because of His eternal and infinite love of them. Without this divine motive in our hearts, our services cannot be acceptable to God, and we can never enter that "heaven above, where all is love," or, if we could enter the home of eternal love, we could not enjoy its holy delights. Man is not an unthinking, involuntary, irresponsible machine. He can and should be moral-it will be better for him in this world; but it is far better for him to be spiritual, and to be thus prepared for heaven. I believe that all right-minded Primitive Baptists will accept these Scriptural truths. Such acceptance would put an end to the useless and ruinous strife of words on this subject. S. H.

Appointments Called In

---January 15, 1926

In the last issue of the The Primitive Baptist some appointments were published for us, as arranged by Elder M. E. Petty. We have received a letter or two from others that they did not think it best for us to make the trip at the present time. For this reason we call in the appointments and will not now make the trip. We trust this

will cause no serious disappointment, and that no one will think hard of us for taking this step. We are informed that the peace meeting is appointed to be held with the church at New Hope, in Grady County, Ga., on Friday, Saturday and fifth Sunday in January. We are also informed that some do not approve of the meeting. Of course we do not know what is expected to be done at the meeting, more than to try to get the brethren together who are divided in that country. It appears to us that an effort to reconcile brethren who are separated is commendable and according to the Scriptures. Certainly the Lord does require His children to live together in peace, and to walk in love. We have a letter or two telling us that they did not think best for us to visit that section or those churches at this time. We also have letters insisting that we attend the peace meeting. For this reason we have called in the appointments. We expect, the Lord willing, to attend the peace meeting, but will fill no appointments before the meeting, and will not fill any after the meeting, unless it is desired by the brethren. C. H. C.

Remarks to Elder Lee Hanks

---February 1, 1926

We do not object, at all, to the sentiment expressed in the above from Brother Hanks, but we think that he is mistaken as to the time of the conversation which took place as to who should betray the Saviour. Matthew and Mark both show very clearly that this conversation took place while they were eating the passover supper. And while that conversation was taking place Jesus gave a sop, or what we now call gravy, to Judas, and John tells us that Judas went immediately out. Immediately means at once. He did not stay there longer. As this took place while they were eating the passover, then Judas went out while they were eating the passover. After that Jesus took the bread and wine, which is the substance of the passover supper, and instituted the sacramental supper, and then He washed the disciples' feet. We do not suppose that this matter is of vital importance, but felt that it would be right for us to state, in connection with the article from Brother Hanks, how we understand the matter as to the order of these occurrences-that is, the order in which they occurred. C. H. C.

Judas and the Sacramental Supper

---February 15, 1926

A sister asks us if Judas was in the sacramental supper, and she says, "I do not think the Lord set up His church here on earth with a devil in it. I may be wrong; if I am, I sure do want someone to enlighten me on this." To this sister we would say, that Judas was in the church, and was sent out by the Saviour with the other eleven to preach. Thus have we an example and the lesson that some bad folks get in the church, and even occupy the pulpit. But Judas was not in the sacramental supper. The Saviour instituted the sacramental supper at the time He ate the last passover supper with His disciples. Now get your Bible and turn to (Matthew 26:17-25) read verses 17 to 25 inclusive. Then turn to ((2) (Mark 14:12-21) and read verses 12 to 21 inclusive. These records show very clearly that while they were eating the passover supper the conversation was engaged in as to who should betray the Saviour. Now turn to (John 13:18-32). In these verses John tells of the same conversation recorded by Matthew and Mark as to who should betray the Saviour, and remember that this conversation was engaged in while they were eating the passover supper. John has it recorded that Jesus told who it was that should betray Him by saying, "He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have

dipped it. And when He had dipped the sop, He gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon." - **(John 13:26)**. There is no sop in the sacramental supper, but there was sop in the passover supper. Then in verse 30 John says, "He then having received the sop went immediately out: and it was night." This makes the matter very clear that Judas left or went out while they were eating the passover supper. Then Jesus took the bread and wine, the substance of the Jewish pass-over supper, and instituted the sacramental supper. Read now **(Matthew 26:26-29); ((22) (Mark 14:22-25)**. Now go again to (John 13:1-17) and you will find the account of what the Saviour did, which account was omitted by the other writers. After giving the account of what the Saviour did, John goes back and relates the conversation which took place, corroborating what the other writers had said concerning that conversation, which took place while they were eating the passover. C. H. C.

Ordered Name Dropped

---February 15, 1926

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-Please discontinue my subscription for The Primitive Baptist. I do not think you are keeping your word to me, that you would not print anything from either side, the Wilson faction and the Danville Church. You have kept your word as to the Danville brethren, but you have printed all the music you could get from Mr. Wilson. I did not think you would go off after an excluded faction, but you have. It's all over here in N. C. Every association has cut correspondence with the Bear Creek except one (Silver Creek, I believe), and the brethren and sisters who are tired and sick of their trouble over Wilson are declaring non-fellowship for J. R. Wilson and his followers and coming out from among them. I do hope that the Lord will help His bleeding Zion to overcome their trial here, and at last take them home where there will be no leading sharks to molest them, or make them afraid. Respty., C. B. Owen. Salisbury, N. C.

REMARKS

Now, don't you know we will have to quit and go out of business since Brother Owen has ordered us to discontinue his subscription? And is not the above a "stunner?" How does he know what "music" we have received that we did not publish, since we have not told him about it? There used to be some folks who were "wise in their own conceits." Perhaps there are some more of them in the present age. Suppose we have gone off, as Brother Owen says we have. According to the doctrine of the leaders of the crowd he is in line with, the eternal God, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinated, unalterably fixed and decreed that we should do just what we have done, and we could not, by any sort of means, do otherwise. The things we have done were in the chain of events which the eternal God molded in eternity, even before time, and they could not possibly be otherwise than the way they were. The Lord molded and welded and fixed the chain of events, and they had to be just that way. So, why are you raising a complaint with us about it? We only carried out God's will and His absolute predestination. So did Elder Wilson, according to the doctrine of the leaders you are following and are in line with. You fellows are trying to tear up God's predestination. But we suppose, if your heathenish doctrine is the truth, God absolutely predestinated that you should try to tear up His absolute predestination. May the good Lord pity the poor dupes who will be deceived by such blasphemous, God-dishonoring, devil-inspiring doctrine. C. H. C.

The Word Shall

---**March 1, 1926**

Dear Brother Cayce: I am writing to let you know to discontinue my paper, as I believe it is best to do without the paper than to read something I do not believe. I learned to love you years ago through your paper before this unholy war began between the dear children of God. And to think you would depart so far from the truth as to even publish such a piece as J. R. Wilson's in the Jan. 1st issue of your paper; rating the holy word of your Lord and Master as a little phrase was enough to offend any Old Baptist. Don't you believe every will and shall between the lids of that holy Book will be fulfilled in His own good time? For He has said, "Surely, as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand." If He is a God that changes not, how can we ever change one degree of His word? While we do not, of a certainty, believe He causes us to sin, or is the author of confusion and strife, yet if He saw the end from the beginning, He saw our evil deeds as well as our good ones, and they are just as sure to come. Yet I believe He will give us all a desiring heart to do good, and will enable us to plant our foot on every temptation we should shun. We are told that by Him all things are created. If He created all things then surely He didn't leave out one. And how can we read **((7) (Isaiah 45:7)** "I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things," and believe otherwise? Or are you like Elder Fisher in his book of why he left the New School Baptists, trying to reform the Old Baptists? I pray the Lord He may show you, as He did him, that you will get drowned. I do hate about the trouble, for I believe it is more over words, than anything else; and I truly hope this winter season between our dear people may cease. Your sister in hope, Mrs. W. G. Carson. Low Gap, N. C.
REMARKS

Now, please read the above letter again carefully, and let us examine it for a few moments. Of course we stop the paper. Of course the good sister does not read things she does not believe. But she says we have departed from the truth. We do not see how that can be. We never knew of a person departing from a place they have never been. If that Mohammedan doctrine of the absolute and unconditional predestination of all things that come to pass is the truth, then we never departed from that, for we never did believe it; and one has never departed from a belief he never had. Did he, Sister Carson? Sister Carson, Elder Wilson never said that the word of our Lord and Master was a little phrase. He said the word "shall" is a little phrase, meaning a small word. Is it not strange that some people will get so full of prejudice that they cannot even correctly read or quote what a brother says? Sister Carson asks if we do not believe that every will and shall between the lids of the holy Book will be fulfilled. Sister Carson, suppose we ask you to read your own question, and allow us to ask you if you believe every shall in the Bible will be fulfilled? Do you? Let us read: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it." -(Genesis 2:16-17). The words "thou shalt not," mean the same as "you shall not." In our present day English now, Sister Carson, the Lord said, "You shall not." Do you believe that the man did not, or do you believe that he did? If you say you believe he did not, then you admit you do not believe the Bible, for it testifies that he did. If you say you believe that he did, then you admit that at least one shall is not fulfilled. Which horn of the dilemma will you take? Now let us notice the text quoted: "Surely as I have thought, so shall it stand." Is that all of the sentence? No; but it continues, "That I will break the Assyrian in my land, and upon my mountains tread him under

foot." Does that prove that God purposed all things that come to pass? Not by a whole lot. It only proves that God purposed to punish the Assyrians for their wickedness, and that He will surely bring that punishment upon them. Sister Carson, let us read ((Num 14:23) (Numbers 14:23,34): "Surely they shall not see the land which I swore unto their fathers, neither shall any of them that provoked me see it:" "After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year, shall ye bear your iniquities, even forty years and ye shall know my breach of promise." Can you harmonize this with your doctrine that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated everything that comes to pass, and that everything has to be just as it is? Let us kindly ask some questions: Did not the Lord swear unto their fathers that He would give them the land of Canaan? Did He not promise them the land? Did the Lord intend, when He made the promise and swore to it, that these people should have the land of Canaan? Did He swear a lie? If He did not, then He meant what He promised, did He not? Did He not determine that they should not do what He swore they would do? Did He not say they shall not see the land? Did He not promise it to them-the promise being made to their fathers? Did He not say, "Ye shall know my breach of promise?" The marginal reference to. "breach of promise" says, "altering of my purpose." Was there a change in His purpose in any way? If not, how could there be an altering of His purpose? Was there a breach of His promise? If not, how could they "know my breach of promise?" Did not the Lord say they "shall" know it? Here is something that no person in all this wide world can harmonize with the doctrine that God did from all eternity absolutely and unconditionally predestinate, fix and decree, all things that come to pass in the world. Will one of them try it? We would like to see him make the effort. Sister Carson says," I believe He will give us all a desiring heart to do good, and will enable us to plant our foot on every temptation we should shun." Then according to this, we should yield to every temptation we do yield to. David had Uriah put in the front of the battle so he would be killed so he could have Uriah's wife. David had committed adultery with Uriah's wife. According to the doctrine Sister Carson says she believes, David did right in committing adultery with Uriah's wife, and did right in having Uriah killed, because the Lord did not, according to Sister Carson, enable David to put his foot on those temptations, and she says the Lord enables them to put their foot on every temptation they should shun. Therefore, David should not have shunned those temptations; and, as he should not have shunned them, he should have yielded to them; and, as he should have yielded to them, it was right for him to do those things; and, if it was right for David to do those things, it is also right for us to do those things now. If not, why not? If that doctrine is true, it is right to do wrong. How could there be any such thing as wrong, if that doctrine be true? Sister Carson refers to **((7) (Isaiah 45:7)** "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace and create evil: I the Lord do all these things." If the evil in this text is sin and wickedness, then no man under heaven can escape the conclusion that God is the author and the instigator of it. Is He not the author of all things that He created? Why say you do not believe that God is the author of sin and wickedness, and then quote this text to prove that God creates it? If one believes that God creates the sin and wickedness, then he believes that God is the author of it. He could not believe otherwise. Then when he says he does not believe God is the author of it, he does not tell the truth. The evil mentioned in that text is not sin and wickedness, but it is punishment for sin and wickedness. It has reference to the same thing as Amos, iii. 6, "Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?" Verse 2 of the same chapter shows very clearly that the evil is punishment for their wickedness. It says, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all

your iniquities." According to the doctrine Sister Carson advocates, as well as those other Absoluters who are fighting Elder Wilson, the Lord in eternity forged and welded the chain of events just as they come to pass; He absolutely and unconditionally predestinated, unalterably fixed and decreed every event just as it comes to pass, so that it could not possibly be any other way. If that doctrine be true, we had to do everything we have done, and Elder Wilson had to do everything he has done. God fixed it that you should have the war in your ranks in that country. It is according to God's will and pleasure, according to your doctrine. God fixed it that way. So your doctrine says. If He fixed it that way, and it is according to His will and pleasure, why do you mourn on account of it? Do you object to God's will and pleasure being done? If it is not according to His will and pleasure, and yet He fixed it that way, why did He do so? Could He not have just as easily fixed it so it would be according to His will and pleasure as to fix it the way it was and is? No, we are not trying to reform the Old Baptists. The heathenish, blasphemous, devil-invented doctrine that God did from all eternity absolutely and unconditionally predestinate, unalterably fix and decree, everything that comes to pass; molded and fixed every link in the chain of events, so that everything must come to pass just as it does, which some folks among the Old Baptists advocate, is not Old Baptist doctrine, and never has been, and never will be. The man who advocates such a blasphemous heresy gives evidence that he needs something—either regeneration or reformation. We rather stay away from such blasphemous heretics, rather than try to reform them. The Old Baptists do not believe such rot and need no such reformation. May the good Lord deliver His humble poor from being deceived by such a devil-invented doctrine. C. H. C.

What Elder Newman Said

---April 1, 1926

In the Glad Tidings of March 12 we read the following from the pen of Elder H. G. Ball, of Tioga, Texas, who is on the editorial staff of that paper, with the Richards faction: I see in the Banner Herald, a Georgia paper, some are advocating gospel instrumentality in the work of regeneration (and calling themselves Primitive Baptists). I see, too, there is a book written on the subject. I think its author is a Georgia minister, and some are endorsing his writing with highest praise, and among them is the well known Elder J. S. Newman, who has wrought his part of the havoc of the Baptists of Texas on the subject of regeneration in Texas, and now he has found another string to pull, and I presume he is yet a good puller, especially if someone else is in the lead. He says gospel instrumentality is orthodox Primitive Baptist doctrine. I guess the Missionary Baptists would claim that, too. Elder Newman also claims they were the orthodox Baptist church in doctrine and practice. With my stay with the Primitive Baptists I have never heard one admit that he believed the gospel had any part in the quickening of dead alien sinners, and I don't believe such a doctrine is Primitive Baptist doctrine, if Elder Newman does say it is the orthodox doctrine of Primitive Baptists. If Elder Newman said that gospel instrumentality is orthodox Primitive Baptist doctrine, where and when did he say it? Can Elder Ball produce the writing? We urgently demand it, and insist that he produce it. If he will produce the statement from Elder Newman's pen, wherein he advocates the doctrine of gospel preaching being instrumental in regeneration—or any other instrument being used in regeneration, outside of the direct and immediate work of the Holy Spirit, we pledge ourselves that we will present a charge against him for heresy before his church, and we believe the church would deal with him upon the charge. Can Elder Ball produce it? NO. But

what did Elder Newman say? On page ten of The Primitive Baptist of February 15, 1926, Elder Newman says: Gospel instrumentality in the eternal salvation of dead, alien, sinners IS WRONG. * * * This view of the gospel ministry (that it is instrumental in regeneration) is nothing but dehorned Catholicism, for the reason that it places the ministry between God and the eternal salvation of the dead, alien, sinner. It is not necessary to quote farther from Elder Newman on this line, though he went on and argued farther along the same line. This is sufficient to show that Elder Ball simply misrepresented the fact. The representation was either intentional or unintentional. Elder Ball has the privilege of saying which way it was. If unintentional, he will correct it and make apology. If it was intentional, what did he do? You may name it. The facts are that there are about two, perhaps more, but two leading men among the Progressives in Georgia who are advocating the idea that the gospel is used as a means in the work of regeneration. Those two leading men are Elders W. B. Screws and T. E. Sikes. They are Georgia preachers. The advocating of that doctrine among the Progressives has caused a disturbance among them, and some of their able men are contending against it. Elder W. H. Crouse, of Statesboro, Ga., wrote a book condemning that doctrine, and Elder Newman is one of the men among our people who has endorsed that book. We call your attention to the fact that Ball says that Elder Newman endorsed this book in the highest of terms. The book condemns the doctrine of instrumentality in regeneration, and Elder Newman endorsed it; which fact is stated by Elder Ball. Then why does Elder Ball say Elder Newman advocates the doctrine of instrumentality in regeneration? It is a pity that our brethren will resort to such things just to injure a brother against whom they have prejudice. We have read Elder Crouse's book and it is an able defense of the doctrine of the direct and immediate work of the Holy Spirit in the work of regeneration, independent of and without any means, agency, or instrumentality whatever. We would be glad for all our people, as well as every seeker after truth, to read that book. The arguments are plain, clear and forcible. C. H. C.

Predestination

---April 15, 1926

The following article appeared in the Zion's Landmark of March 1st, and is so timely and full of truth that we feel like copying it for the benefit of our readers who do not take the Landmark. If all our brethren would take heed to what Brother Rowe says on this line there would be no more trouble among our people on this question. The cause of so much trouble on this question among our people has been the use of words and phrases in connection with it that are not to be found in the Bible. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

This form of the word is not found in the Bible. In **((9) (Romans 8:29))** Paul tells us that those whom the Lord foreknew He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son; and in the 30th verse he says that whom He did predestinate, them He also called. In the epistle of the same apostle to the Ephesians, ((Ephesians 1:5)) , he says, "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will." (Ephesians 1:11), he says, "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will." These are the only places in the sacred Scriptures where these terms are used; and it is quite clear that in each case the apostle uses them in direct reference to the salvation of the chosen, or the predestinated way

He leads His people, and no one is at liberty to use them in any other way than the God of our salvation is a sovereign ruler of the universe. No one of my capacity believes stronger than I that He most assuredly overrules all evil intentions of men and devils and gets the victory to Himself, and that for His people. But until I can explain how God can predestinate a thing and yet not be the author of it, I will not say that the wicked acts of men were predestinated by Him. It is the nature of men to sin. But salvation from sin could be accomplished only by God's predestinating it. Whatever is said of the purposes of God, or of His overruling power, save in the places referred to, the apostles have seen fit to use other words than predestination; and if, as we believe, they wrote as the Holy Ghost dictated, the words they used were chosen by the Holy Ghost, and we cannot improve upon them. When we use words not found in the Bible in an effort to make our position stronger, we weaken it instead. The strongest position is the Bible position, and its use of words the very best form. I do wish our brethren would stop using their own words and use those which the Holy Ghost gave to the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. These are intended for the instruction and edification of His humble poor, and do this better than any form of words that men can devise. We all believe that our God is a sovereign; that the salvation of sinners is by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, and that we are dependent upon Him for the grace that we daily need; and for all that we receive and enjoy, we desire to give Him the praise. We merit nothing but His judgments. But His mercy endureth forever. Our wrongs are in no sense chargeable to God. By man came sin, and sin is the transgression of the law, and hence contrary to the will of God. Joshua T. Rowe.

Peace Desired

---April 15, 1926

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-After reading of the many good peace meetings published in The Primitive Baptist I thought I would write and tell you that it has done me so much good to hear of our poor divided people coming together in peace. I fully endorse the report of the committee at the meeting in Tennessee just published. Dear brother, will you try to help us work up just such a meeting here in South Mississippi? I feel like you could have good influence with a lot of the brethren here. I do not believe in fellow-shiping any and everything; but where we are all of the same faith, and contend for the same order, but only practice discipline in a different manner, I feel we ought to come together and forgive each other; and I know the Baptists here in the Good Hope, South Mississippi and Amite Associations are one in faith and generally the same in practice, as I have been associated with all of them. They are, as you know, in the main, one people; and, as I feel about it, they ought to be together. Now if you think favorably of a peace move here, will you please help us that want peace to bring it about? As you know a good deal about the condition here I would be glad if you would suggest a plan by which we might all get together, or visit this section and help work it up. I know I am ready and willing to ask forgiveness and to forgive all concerned and shaTce hands with them in peace and love, and my home church is highly in favor of it. I feel sure mistakes have been made by most all of us, and we should forgive. May God help us to come together. Pray for us, and let me hear from you if you can. Yours in humble hope and desire for peace, C. L. Clark. Harriston, Miss.

REMARKS

When we received the above letter we wrote Elder Clark asking permission to publish the same in The Primitive Baptist. We have received his consent. We told

him we would be glad for the brethren to come together in that section in peace and fellowship, as we felt sure they were all one people, and that we were willing to do anything reasonable that we could to that end. Since receiving the above letter we have received a card from Elder Lee Hanks written at Laurel, Miss., and dated Feb. 24th. Elder Hanks was on a trip in that section. He says: I am glad to tell you that I consider the trouble settled now between the Good Hope and South Mississippi Associations. New Zion accepted the proposition and all settled Feb. 22, 1926. Providence unanimously accepted terms of peace and came together Feb. 23, 1926. So Providence and New Zion are together, which virtually settled the trouble between the two associations. Elders Alderman, C. N. Ware, J. A. Ford, Blackledge, and all present, cheerfully and unanimously settled their differences. They are all rejoiced greatly now. I am to be at Palestine tomorrow. I am sure they will accept it, which eliminates everything here. Brother Alderman is greatly rejoiced. I don't think there will be any hitch now anywhere. The Good Hope brethren said if Providence would accept it that would satisfy all. They are heartily in it. In love, Lee Hanks. From this it seems that the matter is practically settled in the Southeast part of the state, and we believe that will eliminate any difficulty in the way of a settlement by any others involved. We trust they may now all come together again and live in peace and sweet fellowship. They should have never been divided, we are sure. May the good Lord bless the lawful efforts that are made for the restoration of peace. C. H. C.

Roger Williams

---April 15, 1926

We have received a letter from a brother in which he says, "H. B. Taylor, of Murray Ky., says the Hardshells originated with Roger Williams in 1835. I wish you would answer this falsehood, and also get him to tell about the Welsh Tract Church, of Delaware." If the brother writing the letter made no mistake in the date, and H. B. Taylor made such a statement, he certainly did display ignorance. Roger Williams was born in 1599 and died in 1683. Then how he could have originated a church in 1835, when he died in 1683, is beyond us, and beyond the ability of H. B. Taylor to explain, even as great as he thinks he is. Roger Williams established the colony of Rhode Island in 1636 and established his church there in 1639. That church was founded upon the principle of religious freedom, or liberty of conscience, but never was identified with the Baptists, though founded upon Baptist principles. The first Baptist Church founded in America was by John Clark at Newport, Rhode Island, in 1638. If Roger Williams was the founder of the Baptist Church, or the "Hardshells," as Taylor calls our people, then they are older than the Fullerites. The people Taylor is identified with were never heard of before the days of Fuller and Carey. Welsh Tract Church, in Delaware, was organized in Wales in the spring of 1701, and in June of the same year they came to America as an organized church. They first settled near Philadelphia and then moved to their present location, where they still continue upon the same principles upon which they were constituted in Wales 225 years ago. Concerning this church and the doings of the Missionary Baptists when in debate with a Campbellite or a Methodist J. H. Grimes said, in the Baptist Flag of April 11, 1907: When a Campbellite or a Methodist assails Baptist succession, or tries to cram the Roger Williams ruse down their throats, they fly to old Welsh Tract Church, and through her, link themselves on to the Welsh Baptists, through which we have clear sailing to the days of the apostles. In my imagination I see a Baptist debater in a tussle with a belligerent Campbellite; the Campbellite attacks the succession of Baptist Churches, when the Baptist, as with a flashlight, throws old Welsh Tract Church out before the audience, and with

a triumphant air defies the onslaughts of his bombastic opponent. He takes the pains to inform his opponent that this old Welsh Tract Church, which was constituted in Europe more than 200 years ago, is still in existence, coming down to us from Wales without change. All these things are facts. But there is still another fact which he does not tell. This Welsh Tract Church is a Hardshell Church. This old church was organized long before the Full-erite sprout, with which H. B. Taylor is identified, was born. C. H. C.

The Meeting at New Hope

---April 15, 1926

The reason of our delay in publishing the account of the meeting at New Hope Church, Grady County, Ga., the fifth Sunday in January, and Saturday before, as found elsewhere in this paper is because we failed to get a copy of the suggestions as put out by the brethren at the home of Brother Blackshear in November. After we returned home we sold the office building we were occupying and had to erect another building and move. While we were engaged in that we had to let all other matters rest, or wait. There were six churches in Elder Petty's association not represented in the meeting-Union, Olive Grove, Trinity, Pisgah and Piedmont. While the information was given that Mt. Olive had agreed to represent, some thought this was a mistake. If they did appoint messengers, then seven of the churches in that association had appointed messengers to the meeting. This being the fact in the case, it seems to us that the object was not accomplished. If we understood the matter, the object was to try to get the two bodies together. There were two bodies, each holding their meetings as the Flint River Association. They were once together. They are one people, we are sure, in doctrine, and we do not believe there is any vital difference between them. We feel sure they should be united; and we yet believe it can be done. We trust that they may yet all get together and be a re-united band. Brethren, on both sides, do you wish to be re-united on gospel principles? If you do, write to us and tell us your desire and feelings in the matter. We would like to know how the brethren feel in regard to the matter. C. H. C.

Questions and Answers

---April 15, 1926

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother in Hope-I have been reading the glad news of the peace meetings in your part of the country. May God bless all that labor for peace on. gospel grounds. We, Providence Primitive Baptist Church, have talked a lot about peace, but just how far to go is a mystery. Some say one thing, and some another, and the question has been asked," What shall we do?" We, Providence Church, would love for you to publish this and give answers to the questions as follows:

Question 1. Can we fellowship an article of faith that reads something like this:" We believe the foreknowledge and predestination of God are the same to the extent of time; therefore God foreordained and predestinated all things that come to pass," and stay on Bible grounds?

Question 2. Can we fellowship secret orders and adultery and stay on Bible grounds? A poor sinner saved by grace, if saved, W. B. Howard. Freewater, Ore.
OUR ANSWER

In answer to question 1 will say no. We do not think the Bible teaches that God foreordained or predestinated all things that come to pass. If His foreknowledge and predestination are the same as to length of time, that would not prove that He

predestinated all things that come to pass. He does, or did, foreknow all things; but that is no evidence that He predestinated all things. His predestination may be as old as His foreknowledge, and that would be no proof that He predestinated all things. His foreknowledge is one thing and His predestination is another. Wisdom and knowledge are attributes of Jehovah, and His predestination is the act of His mind.

In answer to question 2 we say no. We are aware that our people in some sections do hold members that affiliate with secret orders, but we think no Old Baptist should affiliate with such orders. We might bear with that under protest, and not fellowship it really-that is, not have fellowship for that, and yet bear with it. There is no excuse to even bear with adultery. If there is, we do not know what that excuse is. C. H. C.

Dancing and Such Like Things

---April 15, 1926

Dear Brother Cayce:

I want to ask a question for you to answer in The Primitive Baptist. What has been the attitude of the Primitive-Baptists in regard to the modern evils of the day, and how should we deal with members that either go to dances or allow them in their homes? I claim we have always stood against such things. And haven't we always affirmed that the Bible is true? Your brother in hope, J. A. Jackson. Farmington, Ark.

OUR ANSWER

The Primitive Baptists are now and always have been opposed to the modern evils of the day. Modern evils are such evils as are lately invented and practiced or engaged in. The little book we have printed and for sale, price 30 cents, containing articles written by John Brine more than 200 years ago, shows that the Baptists were opposed to the evils of that day. True Primitive Baptists are still opposed to the evils of the day, whether ancient or modern. The Primitive Baptists should promptly exclude members for attending dances or taking part with them, either by allowing them in their home or encouraging them by their presence. It has always been against the practice of Primitive Baptists for their members to attend dances or to give them in their homes. We have served as moderator in church conference when exclusions occurred for dancing. Most assuredly the Primitive Baptists have always contended that the Bible is true. Most all their articles of faith contain an article reading about like this: "We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are of divine authority, and the only rule of faith and practice." C. H. C.

Makes Acknowledgment

---May 1, 1926

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Through the courtesy of someone I have the last few days received one of your papers (we sent the paper to you.-C. H. C.) in which you have given me quite a thrashing, all of which I, no doubt, deserved, however unintentional the wrong was committed; and will assure you that your article was too late to show me my errors; but was not too late to speed me up in writing Elders Newman and Crouse to acknowledge my wrong and ask forgiveness. Now let me assure you that your very sharp rebukes never made me mad, but I never obtained the information from

The Primitive Baptist, and without further evidence than Elder Newman's article in Banner Herald I wrote my little squib in Glad Tidings; and where I blame myself is for writing the article without knowing what Elder Crouse's views were. Had I known that then as I did very soon after, I should not have made the accusation at all. And again let me assure you I would not intentionally misrepresent Elder Newman or any other man, though we are divided. I regard myself more of a man than that, to say nothing of a Christian spirit. While he and I are divided, as you and I, yet I am just as sorry for the injustice done him as if it had been an injustice done Elder W. H. Richards, with whom you rightly say I am standing; and many others in the east would be where I and many others are if they would but impartially investigate for themselves, is my humble opinion. I have written Elder Newman a personal letter asking forgiveness for all wrong done him, and this also, if you see fit, so that your readers may see that while I stand with the Richards faction I intend to do the right thing, and that's what we stand for in Texas, and hope we may never come to the time we are not willing to confess our wrongs and ask for forgiveness from those wronged. In humble hope, H. G. Ball. P. S.-Since you wrote me up in The Primitive Baptist, will you not kindly publish my acknowledgments as I am enclosing to you from Glad Tidings of April 16, 1926? If you publish the article will you be so kind as to mail me a copy of the paper? H. G. B.

The Acknowledgment

THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT Floresville, Texas, Jan. 20, 1926.

Elder Wm. H. Crouse:

My Dear Brother-Received your book on Regeneration. I have carefully read it and am sure your positions on the various texts relied on to prove gospel instrumentality in the work of regeneration are the views of our people now as well as in all past ages. I wish it could go into every Old Baptist home in the United States. (Elder) J. S. Newman. After the above article appeared in Banner Herald, Feb. 15th, I wrote an article in Glad Tidings of March 12th, accusing Elder Newman of endorsing gospel instrumentality in the quickening of dead, alien, sinners; but since writing the article to Glad Tidings I have procured a copy of Elder Crouse's book on Regeneration, and after reading it and learning its true teachings, I have gone back and re-read Elder Newman's endorsement and find I have misconstrued his article. He (Elder Newman) is not endorsing gospel instrumentality, as my first conclusion was, but is endorsing Elder Crouse's position on the text's that are used (by those who teach gospel instrumentality in the regeneration of dead, alien, sinners). Elder Crouse DOES NOT teach that in his book; therefore I find it my duty to acknowledge the wrong done Elders J. S. Newman and Wm. H. Crouse in the article I wrote in Glad Tidings of March 12, and ask them to forgive me for the wrong done them, for I did it not for envy or to wrong anyone, but because I was sure I saw a departure from the faith in it. Now I see it was a failure on my part. Elder Crouse's book is worthy of the consideration of truth-seekers everywhere. In bonds, H. G. B.

REMARKS

We willingly and cheerfully give space for the above confession of wrong from Brother Ball. This should be a lesson to him and to all of us that a brother may be accused of a thing of which he is not guilty, and the person be sincere in making the accusation. In the trouble and division in Texas, no doubt, many wrong accusations have been made, or were made, and perhaps some of them may still be made. We should certainly call a halt along that line. We should quit such a course -and stop making accusations. Brother Ball says that many others would stand where he does and others do-with Elder Richards-if they would impartially

investigate for themselves. Perhaps so. Did not some investigate who do not stand with him? Brother Ball, will you help us investigate? Will you begin helping us by furnishing us a copy of the evidence submitted before the council that met in regard to this matter? We do not propose to open our columns for a discussion of this matter, and would not refer to it here had not Elder Ball made the statement he did in regard to the matter. We do not call Elder Ball's sincerity in question in regard to the matter; but sincerity does not make a thing right. Paul verily thought he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, but that did not make it right for him to do those things which he did. He thought he was doing God's service when he persecuted the saints; but he was not. Perhaps some of you good brethren in Texas thought you were doing God's service when you raised such a war among each other in that country and had a division; but you were not. Why not cease biting and devouring one another and being consumed one of another? May the Lord help us all to try to mend our ways. C. H. C.

Oneness for Twenty-Four Years

---June 1, 1926

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Precious Brother-Have read and re-read your editorial, "Introduction to Volume Forty-one," in The Primitive Baptist. May peace and prosperity accompany it through the year, is my only desire. I have read every copy of this paper for nearly twenty-five years. Was taking it when your sainted father was editor. Every copy that you have sent out I have carefully noticed. Have utterly failed to see a single change in the principles, as you contend for them, during all these years. This much could not be said about all the editors. "These things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works." This is one command you have carefully kept. I take some other Primitive Baptist papers, but not any of them like the one you send out. When the wolf is in the camp you give the alarm. When false doctrines are breaking in, you build fortifications against them. When invaders are giving trouble, you give the watchword. When opportunity opens up for peace among alienated brethren upon a sound basis, you will work at it as long as there is hope of peace being restored. You can defend the doctrine for which the paper contends. I know whereof I speak. I have seen it tried out face to face with the enemy. One thing I am extremely glad of, when you deal with a subject of practice, that you know how to do it as the Bible directs. God bless you for speaking out on so many things that need mending, and that right soon. You have proved yourself amply able to edit the paper your father started and worked so hard to circulate in spreading the truth of the Master. But that does not prove that the brethren have stood by and cared for you as they should. Their slackness has made your work too burdensome. You have turned over the hill now. Soon your work on earth must wind to a close. You then can go on to enjoy your eternal reward. Dear Claud, God will take care of you over there. But I shudder when I look for the man to step in and carry the good work on. When all around were wrapt in silent slumber last night I could not sleep for thinking of you and your noble work as preacher and editor. In tears I finally went to sleep, begging God to bless, direct and keep you. Your brother, H. L. Golston. North Alexandria, Tenn.

REMARKS

The above was received last January. We could not keep back the silent tears as we read it. We feel so unworthy of such expressions of love and sweet fellowship from one of the Lord's faithful servants. We are very well aware of the fact that we have

made mistakes and have done wrong things; but our desire has been to be faithful to the Master and to His blessed cause. Yes, we have crossed the top of the hill, and are now going down the western side, and we realize that it will not be long until we shall reach the end of the journey. The way has been rough and rugged. There have been many thorns along the way. Sometimes the clouds have been dark and lowering; but in the midst of all the storms, dark places and rough roads, the day-star of hope has seemed to beckon us onward. "The Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." -Acts xx. 23, 24. Many of the Lord's dear children whom we have met we know we shall never meet again in this life. So we might read on, "And now, behold, I know that you all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more. Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." -**(0:25) (Acts 20:25-27)**. This has been our sincere desire. We are sorry for all the wrongs and mistakes we have made. When we reach the end, which may be soon, we desire to die in peace and in fellowship with the Lord's dear children. Please pray for us. C. H. C.

A Statement

---June 1, 1926

In the account of the meeting at New Hope Church in Georgia we stated in the record of the meeting that information was given that Mt. Olive had agreed to represent and had appointed messengers, and in our remarks we stated that some thought this was a mistake. The brother who made the statement in the meeting that he had a letter to the effect that they had agreed to represent has sent us a letter from the clerk of the church, Brother A. I Brunson, Sneads, Fla., in which Brother Brunson says that the church did agree to represent and appointed messengers to the meeting, but that later they decided to wait and see, or to just stand still for awhile. This letter makes it clear that the brother who made the statement in the meeting had a correct statement and was not mistaken. In what we said about the matter we did not mean to leave the impression that the brother had misrepresented the matter. We trust this statement will be satisfactory to all parties concerned. C. H. C.

Imposed Upon

---June 15, 1926

Several months ago we published an appeal for help from one A. McClinton, Trenton, Ga. A widowed sister sent him help, we think, and had two or three letters from him. She sent a check to the sheriff of the county at Trenton, Ga., and asked him to give the same to McClinton if he is in need and is worthy. The sheriff returned the check to her and wrote her that McClinton gets his living by that means-writing to people of different denominations and getting contributions from them. He says McClinton bought a Ford car from him and paid for it. He says McClinton has a daughter and son-in-law living in the house with him, and has a son large enough to support him and his wife. We are sorry that we have been imposed upon by this man. Occasionally we receive requests to make appeals for help through the paper. Such as this has brought us to the decision that it is better not to make such appeals through the paper. At least, we must be assured that the

person is worthy, and must have some evidence to satisfy us, before we publish such appeals in the future. Please do not ask it of us. Anyway, we doubt the propriety of making such appeals through our papers, except in unusual cases. C. H. C.

Some Good Meetings

---June 15, 1926

We were with the church at Donaldson, Ark., on Saturday night before the third Sunday in May, and enjoyed a very pleasant meeting with those good people. Elder Fairchild was there, and had preached for them Friday or Friday night, when Brother Ceph Tucker had offered himself for membership and was received by the church into their fellowship. His baptism was to be attended to on Sunday, which was done. Sunday morning we drove to Little Rock, Elder Fair-child with us. Elder C. M. Monk had just begun preaching when we arrived at the church. We were a little late, as we had been delayed some on the road. Elder J. R. Harris and family were also there from Thornton. Elder A. Woodall, who is a member there, was also present. This was a good and pleasant meeting. Three were received on confession of faith- Brother A. S. Herndon and wife and a Sister Woodall. Brother Herndon and wife had held membership in Texas in a church that had been in so much confusion, and they were tired of it and wanted a home with those who are laboring for peace. The church where Sister Woodall had been a member had gone down and ceased to have meetings. This was the regular communion time at this church, which service was attended to. On the fourth Sunday and Saturday before we were with the little church at Hampton. Brother Ira Cenci-baugh, whose home is at McFarland, Calif., and Brother I B. Fuller and Elder A. D. Cencibaugh, of Donaldson, Ark., came to our home Friday afternoon and spent the night with us in our humble home. Saturday morning Elder John R. Harris came by on his way to his regular appointment at Harmony Church, Bradley County, and persuaded Elder Cencibaugh to go there with him. Brother Ira Cencibaugh and Brother Fuller went with us to Hampton. Elders J. N. and G. A. Jones, who now live near Hampton, were there. Services were held at the church Saturday afternoon, night and Sunday. Brother Cencibaugh made two short talks that were enjoyed by the brethren. Brother G. W. McWhirter and wife united with the church on Sunday by letter from the Forks of Buttahatchie Church in Alabama. It was a pleasant meeting and much enjoyed by all the brethren and sisters present. C. H. C.

Immortality of the Soul

---July 1, 1926

Some of our readers may remember a few years ago some questions sent to us by Brother J. I. Caneer, of Montebello, Calif., and our answers to the same. Brother Caneer wrote the following letter in answer, which was received in 1922. We had filed it away in our desk, and it had been almost forgotten. Recently we received a letter from him calling our attention to it and asking that it be published. You will find our comments on the editorial page-page 8. C. H. C.

THE LETTER

Dear Brother Cayce: I have read your reply to the few words I wrote last winter. If I wrote what I should not have written first, I am sorry. I wanted to get the foundation of what you believe first. I will refer to the questions, that I think are out of harmony, in this writing. First, I want to say that I never heard of there being two kinds of immortality before I read your reply. I must say that I do not

believe there are two kinds of immortality. I humbly admit that my believing there is only one kind of immortality does not make it that way. **(I Timothy 1:17)** -no, it is (I Timothy 6:15-16), "Which in His times He shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see." There is a comma after immortality; a semi-colon after approach unto; a colon after nor can see. So they are all separate statements and none of them qualify the word immortality. All those phrases qualify the word God, or the King of kings and Lord of lords. It certainly does not qualify the word immortality, immortal life, eternal life and everlasting life; all three mean exactly the same thing. The word everlasting, when applied to inanimate things, does not mean the same as immortality or eternal. Certainly God dwells in the light. He is light. Yes, I believe everything Paul said, but I may not understand just what he means. Brother Cayce, I did not ask you, what did Paul say, nor what any Primitive Baptist says, nor what they did say in the past. That is not what I want to know. I want to know what you say. I can read the Scriptures, or history, as I see fit; that is not what I want. Brother Cayce, do you believe that children are born into this world with both mortality and immortality? I do not see how it can be. Does not that idea contradict the very fundamental teaching of the Scriptures and the very laws of nature? Do not the Scriptures, as well as nature, teach that no tree, plant, fowl, animal or human being can bring forth two different kinds of seed? For myself, I feel sure it does so teach. We all know that a fig tree cannot bear good peaches; neither can a peach tree bear crab apples; neither can a human being bear two kinds of lives. If he can, trot out the chapter and the verse so that I may read it for myself. Why did you not give me some Scriptures and other reasons for the belief that human beings do transmit both mortality and immortality? That is the way to convert me. What other men say does not prove anything on this line to me. If you cannot prove a question to me by the Scriptures and logic then you cannot prove it to me. Brother Cayce, do you believe the members of the Primitive Baptist Church are perfect in their belief and practice? Do you believe there are any now, or that there ever was any church, perfect in its belief? I fully believe that the fundamental principles of salvation as are taught by most all Primitive Baptists are in harmony with the Scriptures and with the very experience of God's children, who have minds sufficient to understand God's workings with them. I do not believe the teaching that natural human beings are raised immortal from the grave and are sent to the place, as is usually believed by the great majority of unthinking men and women, where they will consciously and eternally be, is doctrine. If it is doctrine, I cannot see where the man of God gets any reproof, any instruction in righteousness, any correction or any comfort out of it. The doctrine of salvation is a comfort to God's people. They get reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, and are thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Were not the apostolic churches, most of them, if not all, in error? I think they were. If they were, did that cause them to cease to be the church of Christ? No, it did not. Take it for granted that its organization was perfect, it did not stay that way, but became imperfect and was chastised. Is that not so? If there is a perfect church anywhere today, let me know where it is; I want to see it. God Himself said when He breathed the breath of life into Adam that man became a living soul. Not that He gave him a soul, but that man has a soul. Every living thing is a soul, or has a soul. So every living human, animal, fowl, or insect, is a soul, or has a soul, as the case may be. They are all natural creatures. If the word soul means immortality, then why are not all souls immortal? I think these are pertinent questions. The word soul is almost invariably used to mean the person speaking, the person spoken to, or the person spoken about; as "my soul draweth near the grave;" to "deliver their soul from

death." There are many places where the soul is similarly spoken of. If the natural soul is immortal, it will not need to be delivered from death; neither would it draw near the grave. Human beings have always been called souls. That is what God called them. He said Adam became a living soul. The words, "living soul," mean the same thing as the words, "living man." I think man is composed of soul, body and spirit, and these three are one. The soul is the leading part (mind); the spirit is the life, and the flesh or body is the thing that is alive. Nothing else is alive except the body. The mind leads the body. If he had no mind he would go at random, not knowing where he goeth. The spirit is the life of man; so when a man dies he has no spirit. So, you see, it is very necessary for all three parts to be together in order to have a living man, or a living soul, that would be of any use. If you kill the body, there is no life or spirit, neither is there any mind or soul. The mind emanates from the brain, the life from the heart. If you stop the heart, you stop it all. Some think life lives on when the body is dead. I would believe the life was living before there was a body, if I knew it lives after the body is dead. I mean the natural life. There is no life without something is alive. If a body is dead life is extinct. If a life lives on, without something being alive, why were not these lives living before the body was in existence? If a man has been born again, born of a higher life; if he has been born of God, then he has something in there that does not die. It is God's Spirit in there. I still say, Brother Cayce, that God's Spirit is God. Please tell me what you think it is? God is nothing but Spirit. "God is a Spirit; they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and truth." God's Spirit must be in the man or the man cannot worship Him. They that are led by the Spirit of God are the sons of God. They are then the sons of man and also the sons of God, are they not? If they are sons of God, why not call them little gods as well as to call a human baby a little man? What would be the difference? They are akin to man, and also to God. He has two fathers now. He has two masters now. He can serve one awhile and then he can serve the other awhile, but he cannot serve both at the same time. Why? Just because the two are the exact opposite to each other. If there is a personal devil any more than man himself is, he is no more contrary or opposite to God than man himself is. If so, I cannot conceive of it. Man is all that does wrong things. He cannot blame anything else for what he does. He cannot say the devil is to blame. Do you think he can? Do you feel some other thing other than yourself is to blame for the wrongs you do? If so, you have a different feeling from the one I have. See in your question book under the heading "Two-Seeders and Soul Sleepers." In question 17 you ask, "Are not these three Persons (the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost) one in purpose, one in power, one in glory, and one in essence?" This indicates to me that you believe they are. I believe they are. Well, now, these things being so, there certainly can be no difference. Can you see any difference, Brother Cayce? If so, what is it? To my mind there is no difference. The official difference is all there is, except that Jesus came in the flesh, and that was only God manifest in the flesh. Ques. 26: "Is He not able to divide between the soul and the spirit?" Does Brother Cayce believe He is? Ques. 27: "Did not Paul pray God your whole soul, and spirit, and body, be preserved blameless," and so on? 28: "Then soul and spirit are not the same, are they?" 29: "Does not the apostle teach that man is composed of soul, body, and spirit, and that it takes the three to constitute a man?" Brother Cayce, if it takes all three to make a man, what would you have left if you take away either one of the parts? Would there be a man left? A man may lose his mind and still live. He cannot lose his life and live. You cannot kill a man's mind nor his life, so the only thing that man can kill is the body. You cannot kill a hog's mind or life, but you can kill its body, and then eat it. Then that part of the hog would be transformed to the life of man, would it not? If any one of the parts are more the man than any other part, which one is it? The body is the

frame-work, or wall. The mind, or soul, and the life, or spirit, are the finishings of the man. If a man is not finished there is not much man there, is there? If you build the frame or walls of a house and do no more, you would not have much of a house, would you? No. It would not be finished, would it? No. The finishings of a house are similar to the finishing of a man-one must be completed to be a man; the other must be completed to be a house. All the parts of man are natural, fleshly; they are terrestrial. Brother Cayce, in your questions 26, 27, 28, 29 you claim that soul and spirit are not the same, do you not? Then why do you change it in questions 35 and 36? In both those questions you say soul or spirit, making them the same thing or same condition. I do not believe the soul or the spirit is either one a thing. Do you believe they are things? A thing is something material, is it not? If you say soul and spirit are the same, why not say all three parts are the same? Let it be like Him (God) of whom man is the image. If the three composing the Godhead are the same in purpose, power, glory and essence, why not the three parts composing man be the same in purpose, power, glory and essence? Can you give me any good reason why they are not? Brother Cayce, how many kinds of souls do you think there are? Do you think some souls cannot cease to exist and some souls cannot keep from ceasing to exist? All living creatures are souls, or have souls, as the case may be. They must all be immortal or else all are mortal, else some are immortal and some mortal. Which way do you think it is? You claim there are two kinds of immortality; so if you are correct in that idea, there will have to be at least two kinds of souls, or else no living creature, including man, has an immortal soul, while in a state of nature only. If a man is born again he then has two lives, one that will cease and one that will not cease. I think so; you may not. If man has immortality from his natural birth, and later on is born of God, and by this God-birth receives another life, as you, Brother Cayce, admit, then does he not have two immortal lives? He is bound to have, because he receives, in the new birth or regeneration, a life that he did not have before. We know that life is eternal. If this is true, Brother Cayce, what are you going to do with those two lives when the body is in the dust? I would like to know. I cannot figure it out., When the body dies the spirit returns to God who gave it. But where does the other life, that does not cease, go? This same spirit that God gives man in regeneration is the same spirit by which the body that is in dust will be raised in the resurrection morn. The Adamic man is the one for whom Christ died. It is the Adamic man that sinned; it is the Adamic man that has been born once. The man that has been born once is the only man that can be born again. Brother Cayce, when you claim the soul of a natural man, unre-generated, lives on after the body is in dust, do you not virtually claim that that same soul was living before there was any body for it to live in? If you do not, tell me why not. Question 101: "When the Lord spoke to Saul as he was on his way to Damascus, did He not impart life to him?" Question 102: "Saul had natural life before that time, did he not?" Q. 103: "Then the Lord gave him a higher order of life, did He not?" Q. 104: "If Saul had natural life before that, and the Lord gave him a higher order of life when He spoke to him at the time referred to, then Saul had two kinds of life, did he not?" Q. 106: "Does not everything partake of the nature of that from which it springs?" Q. 108: "When Saul was born of the natural parentage, did he not partake of the nature of that parentage?" Q. 109: "When the Lord spoke to him as he was on his way to Damascus, and thus gave him a higher order of life, was he not then born of God, or born of the heavenly parentage?" Q. 110: "Then was he not a partaker of the divine nature?" Q. 111: "Is it not a fact that Saul had two natures?" Brother Cayce, you are right on those questions, 101 to 111 inclusive, but I do not know what you are going to do with both the lives Saul had after he had been given the higher order of life. Will both lives go to God, or will the higher order of life, only, go to the God who gave

it? I would like to know where they both go, if indeed the natural life still lives on when the body is in dust. Now, Brother Cayce, I want you to tell me what you can on the questions I am asking you. Do not go off telling what someone else believes. According to your argument, both of those lives will live on. I do not believe the Scriptures teach anything of the kind. So I am asking for the Scripture that so teaches and would like to have your logical reasoning as well, so that I may have all the information possible. I am not writing this just for fun or for argument; but I want to know, if possible, the real truths of God's word. The best way out, according to my judgment, would be to admit that man in a state of nature, only, returns to dust and that there are no lives without something is alive; that all there is about a man who is untouched by the finger of God returns to dust as God said it would," for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." God did not say that a part of man should return to dust and another part live on. No, He did not say it. I have written this along at intervals, and so I may have repeated when it was not necessary; I hope you will look over my mistakes, as I have not time to write it over. Brother Cayce, if you cannot tell what kind of a God I worship, from my writing, I will try to tell you some time in a special letter on that line. I have made a copy of this and will send the copy to you, as the original is rather dim; think it will be better. It is plain enough except where I have made blunders. Brother Cayce, space is not a thing. It is only an opening between two material things. There would be no space if there were no material objects. The distance from one material object to another material object is space. I wonder if all Primitive Baptists love the doctrine that human beings, probably in almost innumerable throngs, will go to a burning and yawning hell, or place that is commonly called hell, there to consciously and feelingly burn just as though you were burning here in this life, and that to last while the years of eternity roll. If they do love that doctrine I cannot understand it. Brother Cayce, do you love to know that such is in store for billions of human beings, helpless as they are? Brother Cayce, do you think God can make an eternal thing, without it is His own offspring? That would not be making them. It would be His begotten children. I know the Bible says God cannot lie. God never has said He could make an eternal thing, either, has He? If so, where are the words? Yes, it is contrary to God's attributes for Him to make an eternal thing. When man's life has become extinct there is no more man, or he is not a man any more. How do you like it? Brother Cayce, is life not a part of man? Would you call the dead body of a human being a man? If God's life transmitted to man is not God, Brother Cayce, then tell me what it is. Now do not pass my questions up. I want to know. Brother Cayce, is not the natural life and the natural spirit the same? I think it is; what do you think? My words "are Spirit and life." Now what is the difference in the three-His words, Spirit, life? Tell me if you think there is any difference. I will now close. J. I Caneer. Montebello, Calif.

REPLY TO BROTHER CANEER

On another page in this paper is a letter from Brother J. I Caneer, the same being written in reply to an article which we wrote and was published in our issue of June 15, 1922, in answer to a letter he wrote us that was in the same issue of this paper. In that first letter Brother Caneer said," I think that some questions indicate an opposition to some of the other questions." In that letter he failed to show any question in opposition to each other. One question does not contradict another. This was written in regard to our pamphlet called Hot Shot. We will now pay some respect to this last letter; but we will first say that we shall not continue a controversy on this question. If a brother will not accept a plain and positive statement of Holy Writ there is no necessity of continuing a discussion on the matter. In this letter Brother Caneer flatly denies that the soul has an existence

after the body, and that the soul lives after the death of the body. In our former article we quoted the language of the Saviour in **((0:28) (Matthew 10:28)** "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Brother Caneer says, "If you kill the body, there is no life or spirit, neither is there any mind or soul." If that is true, then when a man kills another man's body, he also destroys the soul, or has also killed the soul. This is a flat contradiction of the plain statement of the Son of God, who cannot lie. Again, if the soul and body are the same, then the all wise Son of God' used a meaningless word in the text when he said "both." There could be no such thing as "both" if they are the same. It is true that the word soul is often used in the sense of man, or a living man, but it is not used in that sense in **((0:28) (Matthew 10:28)**, as well as in many other places which could be cited. But if a man will not believe it in this one place he would not believe it if it were produced in a thousand more places. Brother Caneer says that he does not believe it is doctrine that human beings will be resurrected and sent to a place where they will consciously and eternally be. In other words, he does not believe there is any such place as an eternal hell or place of eternal punishment. He says if this is doctrine he cannot see where the man of God can get any comfort out of it. If Brother Caneer, according to this, is a man of God, he gets no comfort out of the thought or out of the fact that he is saved from an eternal hell. According to his position, there is no such place; then Jesus Christ did not save anyone from an eternal hell, for there was, and is, no such place for them to be saved from. According to that, Jesus Christ did not save anyone from anything under heaven- His death was a useless thing. Their sins could not send them to an eternal hell-for, according to Brother Caneer, there was, and is, no such place. Such a doctrine denies the necessity and the efficacy of the death of the Son of God. In our former article we also quoted **(Matthew 25:46)** "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." It is the same word translated everlasting with reference to the punishment of "these" that is translated eternal with reference to the life of the righteous. If the punishment of "these" is not eternal, then the life of the righteous is not eternal. One is of equal duration as the other. It is the very same word. It is the same word used in **(I Timothy 1:17)** "Now, unto the King eternal," etc. If the punishment of "these" ever ceases, then the King eternal will cease. The word simply means never ceasing. To deny this is to deny the plain statement of the Son of God-that is, to deny the never-ending punishment of "these" is to deny the plain statement of the Son of God. It is the truth whether a man can reason it out or not. Brother Caneer says he wants to know what I say, not what Paul says. Well, we have given Bible for what we say. Is not that better than for us to say and not give Bible for it? Brother Caneer says, "If they are sons of God, why not call them little gods as well as to call a human baby a little man?" We must infer that Brother Caneer means, either that one who is born of God is a little god, or else the human infant is not a little man! The human race is simply Adam multiplied, but the children of God are not God multiplied. If they are God multiplied, then we have an innumerable number of gods, as we have an innumerable number of human beings-Adam persons. Yes, it is still a fact that the Word of God (Jesus) is able to divide between soul and spirit. Yes, we claim that the soul and the spirit are not the same, and we do not change that in questions 35 and 36 by saying soul or spirit. Man cannot separate or divide between them, but Jesus can. They are not the same, though we may not be able to tell just what the difference is. Brother Caneer says the spirit is the life. God says, **(Deuteronomy 12:23)** "Only be sure that thou eat not the blood: for the blood is the life; and thou mayest not eat the life with the flesh." God says, by the prophet, that the blood is the life. Brother Caneer wants to know what about the

life when the body dies. When the spirit leaves the body the body dies. The physical life ends. The blood ceases to flow through the veins. That is the end of the natural or physical life, or the end of living existence here in this world. God says concerning man that his spirit goes upward; goes to God who gave it; and that the spirit of the beast goes downward. The spirit of one does not cease to exist, though the physical life ends, and the spirit of the other does cease to exist. If the soul of man is the same as the body then the following language of the prophet is absolutely without meaning: "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" -(Micah 6:7). In this the prophet plainly makes a distinction between the soul and the body. Brother Caneer says, "I do not believe the soul or spirit is either one a thing. Do you believe they are things? A thing is something material, is it not?" Yes, we believe they are things. The word soul is a noun. The word spirit is a noun. A noun is an object or thing, whether visible or invisible, whether material or immaterial. "While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." -**(II Corinthians 4:18)**. Paul here calls things not seen things. Objects not seen are things: Things is "whatever exists, or is conceived to exist, as a separate entity, or as a distinct and individual quality, a fact, or idea; any separate or distinguishable object of thought." -Webster. The soul is a separate or distinguishable object of thought; so it is a thing. The soul is one thing; the spirit is another thing; the body is another thing; these three things together constitute a living man. When the Lord made the first man, Adam, and placed him in the garden of Eden, He gave him a law; and that law had a penalty attached to it," For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Genesis 2:17)-or, "dying thou shalt die." This signifies continuing to die, or continually dying, always dying. The impartation of divine life changes from a state of always dying to a state of always living. No, we do not claim that the soul lived before there was any body to live in. Why? Just because we do not. The fact that it continues to exist after the death of the body is no proof or evidence that it lived before the body. "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness." -(Romans 8:10). In our modern or present day English, giving a strictly literal translation of the Greek language in this text, we would necessarily have it read, "And if Christ be in you, though the body dies on account of sin, yet the spirit lives on account of righteousness." In this text the apostle most emphatically contradicts the position of every soul sleeper under heaven, and forever brands that position as eternally false. While the Saviour was here on earth in person He went up on a mount with Peter, James and John, and was transfigured before them, and talked with Moses and Elias. Moses had been dead for several hundred years, and God buried him. Jesus did not talk with his body. If the soul or spirit of Moses did not continue to exist after the death of his body, and talk with the Son of God on the mount, then Jesus Christ was an impostor. If He was an impostor, then the Bible is false, and there is no God. Brother Caneer says, "Space is not a thing. It is only an opening between two material things. There would be no space if there were no material objects. The distance from one material object to another material object is space." The word space is a noun, and a noun is a thing. Webster tells us that space is "boundlessness, and indefinite divisibility; the subject of determinations of position and direction." He says, "The question whether space is real apart from space-filling objects, that is, whether it is a receptacle for things or an attribute of them, dates from early times. ---** Aristotle (" Physics," Book IV) held the view commonly accepted in modern times of space as the logical condition of the existence of bodies; space being 'that without which bodies could not exist,

but itself, (space) continuing to exist when bodies cease to exist;' space possesses magnitude or extension, though itself is not a body- 'for in case it were a body then two bodies would exist in the same place.' He argued that inclosed places may be contained and moved in large including places-a ball in a box, the box in a house, the house in a town, the town on the earth, etc.; but all places are in one continuous space, an ultimate environment, peras (the Greek word), which contains all movable things and is not movable itself." This is very clear, that space is boundless, and contains all objects; that is, all objects are in space; and space exists whether there are any objects or not. Space was before any objects were made; and when God made the worlds He hung them out in space. It seems to us that if it is reasonable and right to say that the spiritual life which God imparts in regeneration is God, we can just as reasonably say that the natural life is God, for both came from God, or do come from Him. He is the Giver of the natural life as well as the Giver of spiritual life. It is true that in regeneration God takes up His abode in the heart of the sinner by His Spirit, and thereby imparts something else besides Himself, which is spiritual life. In the work of regeneration the Spirit of God operates on the spirit of man. It is an internal work. The heart is the seat of affection. At the death of the body, or at the end of this mode of existence, the soul or spirit (remember that we cannot divide between them, but the Lord can) leaves the body (then the body is dead, and that is the end of this physical life) and goes to God with that spiritual life which was given in regeneration. When the spirit of man that is unregenerated leaves his body, then his body is dead; that is the end of this physical life; but the spirit continues dying; it never ceases to die; it just keeps on dying-" dying thou shalt die." Brother Caneer, we have had our say. We have been plain, or tried to be. We have not meant to be harsh, and if our language sounds harsh, remember that we have not meant it to be with any harsh feeling. It seems to us that the questions in Hot Shot rather upset some theory held to by Brother Caneer, rather than that the questions themselves were inconsistent or contradictory. We still say that "whatever is Baptistic is Scriptural." We do not say, nor have we said, that the church makes. no mistakes. If some new or false idea is injected into the church and is advocated for a time, that thing is not Baptistic, but is a departure from that which is Baptistic. That which is Baptistic is that which has been advocated by the Baptists all along the line-not some new departure. And that which has been advocated by the Baptists, as a denomination, all along the line is Scriptural. If not, then the Baptist Church is not the church of Christ. Perhaps the Baptists have been an "unthinking people" all along the line until recently, when a few "thinking" ones have come up to deny what the Saviour said, that "these shall go away into everlasting punishment" -into endless punishment; for the original word means endless, never ceasing. C. H. C.

An Endorsement

---July 1, 1926

Dear Brother Cayce: The beautiful snow is falling, which has deprived me of the privilege of going to church today. I saw our dear brother, Elder Lancaster, a few days ago, who was laid in his grave yesterday. I mourn his loss. We preached together forty-five years. I see in the Lone Pilgrim the courts have tried the case between J. R. Wilson and others. The Scriptures forbid brother going to law with brother. What right has an unbelieving jury to try a church trouble? I can't endorse this unscriptural rule. But what interested me was what Elder Hutchens said concerning you, dear brother, and Brethren Pittman and Hanks. I know nothing of their troubles. I don't know what you brethren did or said; but Elder Hutchens says "all Primitive Baptists who know the facts in the case and hold the doctrine,

practice, faith, rules and order of the church dear have already marked and will avoid Hanks, Pitt-man and Cayce and all others who have followed Wilson." I am not following man, but I had the pleasure of hearing you preach twice at the association at Coats. I heard Brother Hanks twice at Durham; and I heartily endorse the glorious doctrine you preached, which was, and is, the doctrine preached by Gold, Hassell, the Woodses, and all of God's called ministers. I have been contending for this doctrine for forty-six years; and if God lets me live on, as long as I do live and He gives me strength I expect to hold up this blessed doctrine-salvation by grace. During forty-eight years I have lived with the Old Baptists we have not been disturbed with the stuff of absolutism, and I pray God we never will, and ask the household of faith not to allow it to come in our churches. We are all in peace here in Wayne and adjoining counties, as to the doctrine; and have not, and will not, give over that a just, true and holy God predestinated a man to murder or purposed us to sin. God forbid. If we all could see and feel the spirit that man of God, dear Brother Copeland, manifested, and many others, we would be walking in the sunshine of God's everlasting love. Brethren, let your light shine. My dear brother, I am so fearful, and so little, so ignorant, I dread to write. I am not writing this for publication, but just to let you know how I am and our brethren stand; but if you see fit, and think it will help and strengthen any of God's little ones, you do as you will. I am your dear brother, I hope, in Christ. God bless you. May God enable you to live and wield the sword of God, who doeth all things well. Love to you. J. W. Gardner. R. 1, Goldsboro, N. C.

REMARKS

We appreciate the above very much. May the good Lord bless you, dear brother. The church trial reported in the Lone Pilgrim, referred to above, was reversed by the higher court in both cases, and the property was given to those with whom Elder Wilson is identified. The opposers of Elder Wilson were the ones who took the matter into court. They were the violators of the plain Scriptural injunction and instruction, The reason why they propose to avoid us is for no other reason than that we call the doctrine they teach in question, and deny that it is the teaching of God's blessed book. We do not believe that the monstrous crimes, nor any of the crimes, committed are links in the chain of events, all of which were forged and welded by the eternal sovereign God, who is the great fountain and source of truth and righteousness. He is "a God of truth and without iniquity." -(Deuteronomy 32:4). As He is without iniquity, it does not proceed from Him, either directly or indirectly. Without His predestination there would have been no salvation. That being true, salvation follows as a result of God's predestination. His predestination is one of the causes without which there would be no salvation. Upon the same principle, if God predestinated the sin and wickedness that is committed in the world, it would not have been without that predestination; and that being true, iniquity is from Him. But iniquity is not from God. But what God predestinated is from Him. Therefore, He did not predestinate iniquity. Salvation is from the Lord; it is of the Lord. He predestinated to save. He predestinated some to be conformed to the image of His Son; and that salvation is of the Lord; it is from Him. We have often been brought to the place where we are willing to try to pray to the Lord; but we never did feel like trying to pray this way: "Lord, be merciful to me, for I have done what thou didst unalterably predestinate and decree that I should. Lord, be merciful to me, for I have always done thy will and pleasure-just what was thy will for me to do; and, therefore, O Lord, I beg of thee to have mercy upon me." No, we have never felt to pray that way-but that prayer would be according to the doctrine taught in the Lone Pilgrim. C. H. C.

Words of Encouragement

---July 15, 1926

In The Primitive Baptist of November 18, 1892, we find the following letter from Elder Spencer F. Moore, then of Boston, Mo., but now at Maud, Texas. We feel like, perhaps, the letter and what Brother Moore endorsed would be of some benefit to our people now. Hence we give space for the same. C. H. C.
The letter:

Elder S. F. Cayce: My loving brother in Christ, if it is right for such a great sinner, ignorant and weak minded as I am to call you brother-I have just read the last Primitive Baptist, and when I read your remarks under Brother P. J. Howard's article, my poor soul was filled with love and sweet fellowship for you. Oh, Brother Cayce, I believe that the Lord is with you, and my great desire is that our darling Saviour will bless you for the good that I feel you are doing for the cause of Christ. It seems to me, my brother, that you never make a mistake; all your writings seem so smooth; every word seems to be exactly in its place; and I noticed in your sermons when you were here that every word meant something; and above all I rejoice to claim you as a true brother. Somehow you seem like a dear father to me; I suppose it is because I am weak and you are so strong. Oh, my dear brother, you don't realize how sad I was when I felt that I could see your face no more. But still I yet hope to see you on earth again. How glad I am that our blessed Jesus went to prepare a place for His loved ones up in heaven. There's where I hope to be, with all of God's dear little ones. I don't feel fit to be with them here, but when I am made like lovely Jesus, O then, dear brother, I won't feel cast down any more, but will sing praises to our blessed heavenly Father, with all the redeemed forever and ever more. It seems to me if I could do all you are doing for the Lord, I would know that He (God) was with me, and that He was my strength. Don't you ever get tired, dear brother? Oh, you have so much to bear! There is so much responsibility laid upon you. I think the dear brethren and sisters ought to help you, by not writing things that would bother you, and I suppose I am the worst of all; but I want you to forgive me, ' dear brother. I just feel like I want to tell you how I hope that I love you and all of God's dear people. And, dear brother, I hope your loved ones at home will not get lonely while you are gone to cheer and encourage the Lord's little flocks scattered here and there. Oh, how the souls of God's little ones rejoice when they hear that one is coming that they can put full confidence in to feed them on the sincere milk of the word, or the plain unmystified gospel of God our Saviour, Christ and Him crucified, and salvation by the grace of God. They like something that explains their experience and binds up their broken hearts. Oh, be faithful, dear Brother Cayce. Surely there is balm in Gilead; blessed Jesus said He would send the Comforter. Press on, dear brother; be instant both in and out of season. But Oh, I catch myself turning my letter into advice to you when I need your advice. I had better quit, hadn't I? Cheer up, Brother Cayce. Goodbye. S. F. Moore. Boston, Mo., Oct. 11, 1892.

THE REMARKS ENDORSED

We don't think it advisable to publish anything here on the subject, "What is it that is born again?" Some of the brethren understand that it is the whole man, others understand that it is only the soul or spirit of man, but they all agree that it is the (Adam) man, the child of Adam, or sinner, that needs to be, and is, born again in regeneration, and that this birth makes us (manifestly) heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. None of them, however, believe that this birth of the Spirit purifies the flesh nor enables us to live without committing any sin; but they all agree that

those who are thus born of God will, in the resurrection, be raised in the image of Jesus, that this corruptible will then have put on incorruption, this mortal will have put on immortality, and that we will then be free from sin, pain, sorrow and death. Hence we all agree that Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost, and that sinners are, therefore, saved, and will enjoy the benefits of salvation in that heaven of eternal rest that awaits the redeemed of the Lord. As we all agree in these glorious truths let us not devote any more space in discussing our fine-spun theories, but let us write and talk about the goodness and tender mercy, the power and sustaining grace of God, and such other things as make for our peace, and such things as tend to bind and unite us more firmly together in bonds of Christian love. This being our greatest desire, we shall decline publishing anything further on the mooted question above (what is it that is born again?), but we will be glad to hear from our dear brethren on subjects that pertain to the welfare of Zion and that we think will be comforting and beneficial to the dear saints of God.-C. in Primitive Baptist of Oct. 7, 1892.

REMARKS

If the brethren in 1892 did not all see just alike on this question and could, and did, live together in love and sweet fellowship, why can they not do so now? Did our father pursue the right course then? Was it right for the brethren to leave off their fine-spun theories and live in peace? We think it was right. If it was right for them to do that then, why would it not be right now? Verily, we think it would be right for all to confess their wrongs in engaging in the unholy war, forgive each other and live together in sweet peace and fellowship. May the Lord humble us all under a feeling sense of His goodness and make us willing to confess our wrongs and willing to forgive, as He taught us. C. H. C.

Church Act

---July 15, 1926

Whereas, a call for a general meeting in Dallas, Texas, Tuesday, August 24, 1926, of representative men from all the different factions of Primitive Baptists has been sent out, which meeting is called for the purpose of formulating a plan by which all Primitive Baptists who are agreed in doctrine may unite in their church worship; now, therefore, be it Resolved, by the Primitive Baptist Church of Dallas, Texas, while in conference on June 27, 1926, that we heartily endorse this move, and hereby offer our co-operation in the furtherance of the same. And that we wish to join with those whose signature appeared on the original call. W. W. Fowler, Moderator. J. T. Watson, Clerk.

REMARKS

The above is copied from the Glad Tidings of July 2nd. This church is what is called the Richards or Glad Tidings faction. We do not know whether the church identified with what is called the Newman faction has taken any action in the matter or not. The above action makes it appear to us that those brethren really want peace; but of course the final result is yet unknown to us or to the people. We trust many of our brethren will be there, and that they will go as messengers from their churches. C. H. C.

God's Determinate Counsel

---July 15, 1926

The following was written as a private letter to a brother whose name we withhold. He wrote us a good and kind letter, which we appreciated very much. After we

wrote the letter we decided to put it in the paper and let our readers see what we think about the matter. We omit a few lines of apology and explanation in the first of the letter. C. H. C.

The letter:

Dear Brother: * * * * I appreciate your kind admonition, and will try to be careful as to how I conduct myself. I, like you, wish the brethren would quit agitating the question of the predestination of all things. If God did predestinate my sins and wickedness it is no comfort to me to know it. If He did predestinate that I should be conformed to the image of His Son, it would be a great comfort and consolation to me to have the certain assurance of it. Paul says we are predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son. I hope-only hope-I am included in that number. Like you, that is the great question that concerns me. I just notice especially the text you called attention to-" Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." Counsel, as here used, means "deliberate purpose; design; intent; scheme; plan." Determinate means "having defined limits; not uncertain or arbitrary; fixed, as by a rule or some specific and more or less constant cause; conclusive; decisive; positive." He was delivered by the determinate counsel of God the Father. That was God's deliberate purpose; design; His counsel; and it was determinate; it was fixed as by a rule or by some specific and more or less constant cause. That was the cause of Him being delivered. He voluntarily delivered Himself into the hands of the wicked Jews, and it was caused by that determinate counsel. What they did by wicked hands was not what was the determinate counsel of God; but Him being delivered was by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, then they by wicked hands took Him and crucified Him. What the Lord did was determined by Him-not what the wicked Jews did. The wicked Jews desired to take His life, and had tried to do so from the time of His birth. Though they had tried to take His life, and though He was delivered into their hands, yet they did not take His life. The Lord had determined that they should not take it, and they did not. Jesus said, "I lay down my life; no man taketh it from me. I lay it down of mine own self. This commandment have I received of my Father." When He was on the cross we read that He cried, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit; and bowed His head and gave up the ghost." When the Roman soldiers came to Him, He was dead already, so they brake not His legs. The thieves were not dead, so they brake their legs. I would be glad to see you. I trust your son * * * is doing well. I would be glad to see him. I appreciate your Christian love and sweet fellowship more than I am able to tell. The first effort I ever made to speak in the name of the Master was a little more than thirty-six years ago-Saturday, Jan. 4, 1890-thirty-six years last January. I have had many trials and sore conflicts along the way. Have had some severe trials and persecutions. Many times I have felt like I was almost ready to despair, and to give up the battle. "By the grace of God I am what I am." By His grace I continue to this day. I am now going down the western side of the hill, and am sure that it is not far to the end of the journey now. I am now a little older than my precious father was when the good Lord called him up higher. I now find myself, sometimes, looking forward to the other side of the river for joys and pleasures. I trust I feel so thankful that the good Lord has given me a dear and loving companion for my domestic happiness in my last days, and a precious family; and they all love me dearly-I know they do. From that standpoint the latter part of my life is a blessed state-but from a church standpoint there is. so much strife and confusion I sometimes long for a discharge from the warfare, and long for sweet rest. My precious brother, as I said above, I would be so glad to see you; but I have very little idea that we will ever meet again in this low ground of sorrow. If not, I hope we shall meet in a better country. May the good Lord shower

down His richest blessings upon you, is my humble prayer. Please pray for poor me. I feel to be so poor and needy. I need your prayers. Yours in love and fellowship, C. H. Cayce.

Luke 16:19-23

---July 15, 1926

"We have received a letter from Brother Melvin Hall, Banner, Ky., asking our views on the above Scripture. He asks: Was the rich man eternally saved? Was the death spoken of a corporeal death? Is there any Scripture that teaches that the children of God will suffer in hell after death? Were all the Jews saved, or will they be eternally saved? We wrote a short article on this same subject which was published in *The Primitive Baptist* of Feb. 7, 1911, and another that was published in the issue of May 25, 1915. Those two articles have all the above questions answered except the third, but the fourth is answered indirectly. In the article in the issue of Feb. 7, 1911, we quoted a part of a text, "the children of the promise are counted for the seed." The entire text reads: "They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." -Rom. ix. 8. Verse 6 says, "For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel." These verses plainly show that some of the Jews were not God's spiritual children. The Jews were His people as a nation; but His redeemed and saved children are OUT OF every nation, and not all of any nation. We here copy what we said in the issues of the paper mentioned above, omitting a part of the introductory. *As these two articles referred to have already appeared in previous volumes, it is not necessary to take up space to insert them here.*-Editor.

THE THIRD QUESTION In answer to the third question we most emphatically say that there is no such Scripture. The Scriptures know of no place where people go after death but to heaven and to hell, and it is most plainly taught that God's children go to heaven after death. The only hell they suffer is here in time, and at the second coming of the Lord they will be raised to a state of life and glory, and the others will be raised to a state of damnation {(**John 5:28-29**)} or everlasting punishment. {(**Matthew 25:46**)} C. H. C.

Can They Disobey?

---August 1, 1926

We are in receipt of a letter from a brother in which he asks us a number of questions and requests that we answer them as soon as possible through the paper. To save space we will just give his questions and our answers as follows: "Can the natural man keep the moral law? That is, can he tell the natural truth, pay his just and honest debts, attend to his own business, refrain from profanity, from intoxication, fornication, adultery; and, in short, live a clean moral life?" Most assuredly men in nature, the unregenerate, can live a clean moral life. Men do not have to get drunk. If a man gets drunk, goes home and breaks his wife's dishes and furniture, and raises a general disturbance-if every man in the world were to tell us he could not help it, that he could do no better than that, we would not believe it. We know he could do better; and, if he does not do better without, he should be made to do better. A man does not have to steal, lie and cheat. He does not have to take the name of the Lord in vain. He can and should live a moral life. If all would do that we would have a much better world to live in. "Are those of the

Lord's people who have been renewed by the Spirit a live, active people; or are they just as dead and inactive spiritually as before? If the latter, where is the distinction between them and the unregenerate?" Most certainly there would be no distinction if God's people are as inactive after regeneration as before. There could be no distinction unless there is a difference. Those who have been born from above are living characters; they have been raised up out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ. "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." -((Pet 2:5) (I Peter 2:5). They are not dead stones, or lifeless; but they are "lively stones," living characters; and they are, therefore, capacitated to act in a realm that the unregenerated are not capacitated to act in. They are capacitated to render spiritual service to God, to offer up spiritual sacrifices. This text teaches that they are, as lively stones, built up a spiritual house to offer up spiritual sacrifices; and if they cannot offer up these sacrifices, then the work of God is not sufficient for that for which He designed it. "What is meant by the expression 'Everything is fixed?' Isn't it a fact that when a Baptist preacher uses this expression that he is to be understood to mean to include all the wicked acts of men and devils; and they, the wicked acts of men, as well as all other events, were fixed by God, and could not be otherwise?" As to what is meant by the expression, "Everything is fixed," we do not know what a man might mean by it when he uses it. If he does not mean what the words imply, then he should not use it. If he does not desire to stir up strife, he most certainly would not use it, if he does not mean what the words imply. The words would most certainly imply, to our limited understanding, that the same power that fixed one event fixed all other events. There is nothing in the expression to signify otherwise. If we were to say that God fixed one event, or one thing, and then add, "Everything is fixed," meaning every event by the use of the word everything, the expression would certainly imply that we meant that God fixed every event just as He fixed the one event. The Bible certainly teaches that God fixed the eternal salvation of His people from their sins; He fixed that they should be conformed to the image of His Son; and all the powers of darkness and the demons of the under world, and all men combined, cannot hinder or prevent one of them being conformed to the image of Jesus. Why? Because God fixed it, and it cannot, and will not, be prevented or hindered. The reason why it cannot be hindered or prevented is because God fixed it. Did He also fix every act they do and every sin they commit? Did He fix all the rape, lying, stealing, murders, robberies, assassinations, and all the dastardly crimes that are committed? All the preachers that live on God's earth could not make us believe such as that." If the above be true, how could there be any violation of God's law by His creatures, seeing that they are doing just what He wanted and intended?" If it is true, then there could be no such thing as a violation of God's will, and His law would not be an expression of His will. But His will is expressed in His law. If His will is not expressed in His law, then the eternal God is guilty of double dealing. As He is not guilty of double dealing, then His will is expressed in His law. His people transgress His law." Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law." -(**I John 3:4**). From these facts we have the following: God's will is expressed in His law. Sin is the transgression of the law. God's people sin. Therefore God's people often fail to do God's will. It was not His will for them to transgress. If they were doing His will in transgressing, then He would be well pleased with them transgressing, or else He is not well pleased with His own will. If He is well pleased with His own will, then they do not please Him when they transgress His law, and it is not His will for them to transgress." And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ. But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were

overthrown in the wilderness." -(I Corinthians 10:4-5). They did not do God's will, and He was not well pleased with them, and they were overthrown in the wilderness." Would not the theory that God has, from all eternity, predestinated, decreed and foreordained that we should do just what we do forever destroy all admonition to duty? In fact, could it be truthfully said that there would be any duties for us to perform, unless our wicked and sinful acts are duties, as well as any others; and would we not be serving God in our sinful acts just as much so as in our good ones? This is the way it appears to me, if this be true." If that theory be true, there would be no need of admonition; there would be no place for it. The only reason that could be assigned for admonition to duty, in case that theory be true, would be that God foreordained and decreed that one should give the admonition which he does give. If that doctrine be true, then it forever destroys all accountability of man. No sort of reasoning can make it appear otherwise. If it is unalterably fixed from eternity that a man should do just as he does do, then he is neither responsible nor accountable for so doing. It was unalterably fixed from eternity that certain persons should be conformed to the image of Jesus, and they are not responsible or accountable for being thus conformed to His image. The one who does the fixing is the one responsible for the thing being done that was so fixed. To predestinate, decree, or foreordain is to fix beforehand." If the natural man can live a clean, moral life, could less be expected of those who profess to have been born of the Spirit of God?" It seems that Paul expected more of the children of God at Rome than he did of un-regenerate people." And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another." - **(Romans 15:14)**. Paul was fully persuaded that they were able to admonish one another, and expected them to do that, evidently." If God's people cannot do anything by way of keeping the commandments, why are they told to do so many things in the Scriptures?" This is a question we cannot answer. If they cannot do anything there would be no necessity of telling them to do anything, that we can see. If that question can be answered by any sort of logical reasoning we would be glad to see the answer." If they cannot do anything, why does John say, (I John 5:21) "Little children, keep yourselves from idols?" Why did Peter say, 'Save yourselves from this untoward generation?' ((0) (Acts 2:40) Why did the apostle say, 'If one be overtaken in a fault, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness?' (Galatians 6:1) Sure enough, if they cannot do anything, why did John say what he did? Why did Peter say what he did? Why did Paul say what he did? Why? WHY?" Why did Paul tell the jailer to do something, if he could not do anything?" Yes, why did he? There is no why!" When Paul says, 'I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision,' etc., is it not implied that he could have been, or that some of the Lord's people were, disobedient?" That language most assuredly shows very clearly that there is such a thing as being disobedient. If there is no such thing as being disobedient, then there was no necessity for him to say that he was not disobedient. But God's people do not all of them obey." But they have not all obeyed the gospel." - (Romans 10:16)." But thou shalt say unto them, This is a nation that obeyeth not the voice of the Lord their God, nor receiveth correction: truth is perished, and is cut off from their mouth." -(Jeremiah 7:28)." Is it not a fact that God's people do disobey the commands? Then why do some of our preachers say, 'When God commands us we always obey,' or that we are just bound to do it?" To the first part we say it is a fact that God's people do disobey, as we have shown in answer to the previous question. The latter part of the question-or, rather, the latter question, we cannot answer. We might give an apparent reason, and impugn the motives of some. We might judge that some say this as an excuse for their wrong doing. Then we might possibly be judging them wrong. We cannot see why one

would say such a thing. We are sure there is no Bible ground for saying such." Is it God's will for His people to sin in doing all the wickedness that they are guilty of? If so, why does He punish them for doing His will?" God does not punish His children for doing His will. He punishes them for disobeying Him, and their disobedience does not please Him. This we have already shown above." With many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness."-(I Corinthians 10:4-5). "Would a natural father be so brutal as to whip his child for doing what he was willing for it to do!" A loving father would certainly not punish his child for doing his will. If God's children are doing God's will when they disobey, or when they fail to obey, and He chastises or punishes them, for the same, then He is meaner to His children, and is less just to them, than a loving natural father would be to his children. "Why do some preachers use such expressions as 'Everything that ever I did was God's will?'" We do not know why they use such expressions, unless it be because they have "forgotten that they were purged from their old sins." They have certainly forgotten their experience, for the time being, at least. They certainly never did try to pray, "Lord be merciful to me, for everything that ever I did was thy will." When under conviction for sin, they certainly felt and confessed that they had done contrary to God's will. We wonder if they do not, even now, in prayer say, "Lord, we have done many things that we should not have done, and have left undone many things that we should have done; we have often run counter to thy will." We wonder if they do not confess that in prayer? If they do, and confess the truth in so doing, then when they say, "Everything that ever I did was God's will," they do not tell the truth-they are simply mistaken about it; and they should not say it again. "What is the church's duty when her pastor uses such expressions? Is it the deacon's duty to see that the pastor preaches sound doctrine?" It is the duty of every member of the church to see that the pastor preaches sound doctrine-and especially is it the duty of the deacon, as an officer of the church. If a preacher uses such expressions he should be kindly admonished. If he will not desist, but persists in such a course, to the destruction of the peace of the church, then he should be dealt with as an offender. He should, at least, be silenced. If he stubbornly rebels, he may be dealt with for rebellion. If all the churches had thus faithfully dealt with the ministers much of the strife, confusion and divisions that have come among us could and would have been avoided. The preachers belong to the churches, and the churches do not belong to the preachers. If all our people would get that well into their mind and act accordingly, they would stop much of the confusion among us. We have tried to answer your questions, dear brother, the best we know how, and have tried to do so in a spirit of love for the truth and in love to all our brethren. C. H. C.

1 Timothy 4:10

---August 1, 1926

Brother J. L. Harbour, of Dekalb, Miss., asks us to write our views on this text. The text reads: "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe." We will endeavor to make just a few remarks in connection with the text. We suppose the latter part of the text is that upon which the brother wishes our views. It is a text-the latter part of it-which is frequently quoted by some people in endeavoring to prove that the Lord desires the final salvation and glorification of the entire human family. Hence they emphasize the expression, "who is the Saviour of all men." If the text belongs where they put it, and the right application is as they make it, to the final or eternal salvation and final glorification of human beings in

heaven; and if the term all men includes and embraces the entire human family; and if some of the human family are finally lost and are not finally glorified, then the text contradicts itself. A saviour is one who saves. If one is a saviour of a man, then that man is saved. If one man of the race of Adam is not saved, or is finally lost, then the Lord is not that man's Saviour in that sense. If, therefore, some of the race of Adam are finally lost, not finally saved, not saved with an eternal salvation, then the Lord is not the Saviour of all men in that sense. In whatever sense the saving may be used, the Lord is not the Saviour of a man not saved in that sense. If the word Saviour as used in this text has reference to a preserving in a natural sense, then in that sense the Lord is the Saviour, or preserver, of all the race. He is also the preserver of the beast creation. "O Lord, thou preservest man and beast." -((6) (Psalms 36:6). If this fact makes salvation in heaven possible for a human being, or for a man, it would do the same thing for the beast. The Lord does preserve and uphold all His works in creation, and bestows His natural blessings in the natural realm; and the natural man enjoys them. But there are spiritual blessings which no one can enjoy unless one has the spiritual life. So there is a special blessing, or saving, or preserving, for His people that is not had or enjoyed by any others. The term all men may be used in a generic or restricted sense, as that term is often used in Scripture. Used in that sense it would and should be applied to all the Lord's children, all who are born from above. He is their Saviour, their Preserver. He saves them, and will finally deliver them from this present evil world, and they shall finally be conformed to the image of Jesus, though many of them do not here in this world believe in Jesus as the Messiah, as the King in Zion; they do not believe His teaching or doctrine. Some of His people do thus believe; and the Lord is a special Saviour of those who do thus believe. (I Timothy 4:10) There is a special saving enjoyed by the Lord's people here in this world who thus believe in Him that others do not and cannot enjoy. "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief." ((9:24) (Mark 9:24) C. H. C.

Deuteronomy 11:26; 30:15

---August 15, 1926

Brother H. T. Tucker, Star, N. C, asked us to give our views through the paper of (Deuteronomy 11:26); ((0:15) (30:15). (Deuteronomy 11:26-27,28)reads as follows: "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day: and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known." It seems to us that this language is as plain as language could make it that the Lord here promised the children of Israel a blessing if they would render that obedience unto Him which He required of them. The blessing which He promised depended upon their doing what He commanded. Here were blessings that they were to enjoy upon the ground of rendering obedience, and upon that ground only. He did not promise these blessings whether they rendered obedience or not, or unconditionally. On the other hand, He promised a curse if they did not render that obedience unto Him, but if they should turn aside and serve other gods. Here is punishment promised upon their disobedience. **((0:15) (Deuteronomy 30:15-20)** reads: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in His ways, and to keep His commandments and His statutes and His judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not

hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live: that thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey His voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto Him: for He is thy life, and the length of thy days: that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob to give them." It seems to us that this language, too, is as plain as it can be made. He did not set life and death before the Gentiles, or the world of the ungodly; but He set them before Israel, His people, and required obedience of them, and promised the blessing if they rendered the obedience required. On the other hand, rebellion and disobedience would bring death and destruction upon them. The life nor the death were neither of them eternal, but the life was to be enjoyed in the land of Canaan, which the Lord promised to give to Abraham and to his seed after him. The land, therefore, belonged to the Israelites. It was theirs by gift and by birth. They were not required to render obedience to the Lord in order that the land be theirs; but they were required to render obedience unto Him in order that they continue in the land and enjoy the blessings in the land. National Israel were a typical people; they were a type of spiritual Israel. As national Israel were required to render obedience unto the Lord in order that they enter the land of Canaan and enjoy the blessings of that land, even so the Lord's Israel today-spiritual Israel-must obey the Lord, or render service unto Him, in order that they enter the church-the antitype of the land of Canaan, the gospel Canaan-and enjoy the blessings in the church. The blessings here promised were to be enjoyed only when they rendered the service unto the Lord which He required, and could not be had or enjoyed any other way. The Lord made the enjoyment of these blessings to depend upon the obedience rendered by them unto Him. As the Lord put it that way, no man could or can change it and make it some other way. Here the Lord commanded them to choose life. It would be folly to command one to choose life who had no life. Choice is something that pertains to and belongs to life. One must have life in order to choose. Hence those people were not alien sinners, or destitute of life. They were to prolong their life in Canaan by doing what the Lord commanded. They would escape punishment, sorrow, distress, captivity, and destruction by the sword by doing what the Lord required. This belongs today to the Lord's people. If all would only awake to duty and each one of us be found at our post doing what the Lord requires of us, how much better it would be. May the Lord help us so to do. C. H. C.

Union of Separate and Regular Baptists

---August 15, 1926

We have seen that the claim has been made that in the union of the Separate and Regular Baptists in North Carolina they had regard for what some are termed to call gospel order. The Regular Baptists in Virginia and North Carolina had baptized some into their churches who were in a state of unbelief, or were unregenerate, and the Separates, for a time, urged this as an objection to a union. Finally the Regulars corrected this error and ceased the practice of administering baptism to any only those who gave evidence of regeneration. This was in the Kehukee Association in North Carolina and may be seen by reference to Hassell's History, pp. 697, 698, 699. But here the question comes up: Where did the Separate Baptists come from? Where did they originate? Here is the answer: In 1740, or thereabout,

George Whitfield, an Episcopalian, came to New England from England and engaged in holding revival meetings. Some of the Baptists were favorable to those revivals, and some were not. The pastor of the church in Boston, Mass., opposed the revival, but some of the members of that church favored it, and they withdrew from the church in 1742. The next year they were constituted into a church and were called Separate Baptists, the old party remaining as before and began to be denominated Regular Baptists. From this split off faction sprang the Separate Baptists. According to the contention of some of our brethren they have no gospel baptism themselves. If the Regulars were a disorderly party on account of having some unregenerated persons among them who had been immersed, and the Separates started from this excluded faction, then none of the Baptists had gospel baptism, according to the way some brethren seem to view matters. If the Regulars did have gospel baptism, when they united with the Separates they lost all their gospel order, according to the argument some brethren make. So it makes no difference which horn of the dilemma they take, the Baptists have no gospel baptism now. Brethren, let us try to be consistent. For our authority as to the origin of the Separate Baptists see Spencer's History of the Kentucky Baptists, Vol. 1, pp. 104, 105. In Kentucky the Regulars and Separates united in 1801. The two bodies appointed a committee to meet and formulate a plan and terms of agreement. They met at Howard's Creek (Old Providence meetinghouse), in Clark County, on the second Saturday in October, 1801. "The terms of union were unanimously approved by the convention, and were recommended to the churches for their adoption. It appears to have met with no opposition from any quarter." -Spencer, Vol. 1, p. 545. None of them were required to do their official work over. C. H. C.

Who Owns The Child?

---August 15, 1926

We have seen a number of articles from different brethren concerning the child claimed by two women when Solomon was king over Israel. It seems that each brother who has written on this holds out the idea that his faction of the Baptists has the child. We would like to call attention of the brethren to this point and to this fact: If that child represents the Primitive Baptist Church, as the brethren generally seem to present it, as the child was not divided, or any of its members severed, then the Primitive Baptist Church remains one and the same, notwithstanding the different factions-these different factions still compose the child. Another thing we would like to kindly call attention to is this: When Solomon called for a sword to divide the child, the woman who was not the true mother was willing for the child to be divided, but the true mother was not willing. Now, if that child represented the Primitive Baptist Church today, will you please tell us who that church belongs to-those who are willing for a division or those who are pleading and working for a union? A hint to the wise is sufficient. C. H. C.

The Dallas Meeting

---September 15, 1926

The meeting called for to be held in Dallas on August 24 and 25 met according to the call published. A large crowd assembled in the city hall on the morning of the 24th, and the meeting was held there that day. As the people could hardly hear what was said by the speakers on the stand, the place of meeting was changed to the Y. W. C. A. building. When the meeting had been organized by electing two moderators, one to represent what was called the Richards faction and one to

represent what was called the Newman faction, and the election of two clerks, then a committee of 19 were appointed to draft a statement of principles of doctrine and practice, or discipline, to be presented to the meeting for consideration. The committee assembled in another room and worked hard, yet patiently and with brotherly love and forbearance, and finished the work and presented the following in open meeting. Every item in the following was unanimously agreed to and adopted by the committee, and when read in open meeting was unanimously adopted by the Baptists assembled on both sides. There was not a dissenting vote. After the report was read, and adopted by the meeting, there was a general confession of wrongs by brethren on both sides; hearts were softened, brethren who had been at variance forgave each other and embraced each other; then there were songs sung and the hand of love and fellowship extended to each other amid shouts of praise to the Lord. We believe that much and lasting good will result from this meeting. Surely the good Lord manifested His blessed and sweet presence, and it was good to be there. May His name be praised. C. H. C. Note.-As the proceedings of this meeting were published in pamphlet form, we do not deem it necessary to insert the same here.-Editor.

Another Trouble Settled

---September 15, 1926

About twenty-five years ago there was a division in the Flint River Association, in South Georgia. The meeting which was held at New Hope, Grady County, Georgia, last January was for the purpose of trying to get those churches together again. When the division occurred one party went on as the Flint River Association, and some of the churches met at Trinity in 1905 and adjusted their differences and carried on their association under the name of the Original Flint River Association. Some of the churches in both factions were represented in the New Hope meeting last January and came together; but there was a division in Tired Creek Church, in the Original Flint River, resulting from the call and the holding of the New Hope meeting. We were at the New Hope meeting, and felt then that these brethren should all be together, and that they were one people. So we left on Tuesday night, July 27, and arrived in Thomasville, Ga., on Thursday to fill appointments in that section, our object being to present an article to the different churches, which we called the "Gospel Terms of Peace," that the churches might come together upon the terms therein expressed. We visited the following named churches: Prosperity, Union (Mitchell), Live Oak, New Hope, Providence, Zion Hill, Hartsfield, Poplar Springs, Mizpah, Hopewell, Shady Grove, Union (Miller), Pisgah, Piedmont, Trinity and Tired Creek. There were some other churches which we did not have the time to visit, but a copy of the article was sent to them, and they have all endorsed and adopted the same. The trouble was also settled at Tired Creek, an account of which is given in another article in this paper. We feel to hope that the Lord blessed our feeble efforts for peace among these good brethren. The following is a copy of the article we presented to the churches and a copy of their endorsements. C. H. C. Note.-We do not deem it necessary to take up space here to insert the article.-Editor.

On The War Path

---September 15, 1926

We see in one of our exchanges that some of the editors and writers seem to take great delight in their efforts to expose us and to say some very harsh things

concerning us and the doctrine we try, in our weakness, to set forth in the columns of this paper. If such a course is any satisfaction to them, and they get any satisfaction out of it, they are welcome to all the joy they get from such. "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." -(Matthew 5:11-12). "Finally, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous: not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing: but contrariwise blessing; knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing. For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile: let him eschew evil, and do good; let him seek peace, and ensue it. For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and His ears are open unto their prayers: but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil." -((Pet 3:8) (I Peter 3:8-12). C. H. C.

Tired Creek Church Settlement

---September 15, 1926

On our recent trip in Georgia our last appointment was at Tired Creek, which church had divided. This is in the Flint River Association. The appointment at Tired Creek was Monday, August 16. After service we presented the following to them for consideration, which was endorsed and adopted by thirty-nine of the members' of that church, including both factions. There were forty-two present. We trust the three who did not then accept the settlement will do so. When they thus voted to come together, we asked for a rising vote of all the Baptists present who approved of the same, and the vote of approval was almost unanimous. Then they all joined in singing and extending to each other the hand of fellowship. It was an enjoyable meeting; and the Lord's presence was surely manifested and felt. May His name be praised. We trust those good brethren have truly buried their differences and that sweet peace may reign among them. C. H. C.

THE SETTLEMENT

Whereas, There has been discord, strife and confusion, resulting in a division of the members of Tired Creek Church, both sides or both parties claiming to be the church, and feeling and realizing that this is a sad state of affairs, having brought sorrow and distress to ourselves, as well as to our brethren and to sister churches; and Whereas, We desire that peace and union be restored among ourselves, as well as among and between all our sister churches; Therefore, we, the members on both sides hereby confess that we have been prompted by a wrong spirit in our contentions with each other, and desire to, and do, hereby mutually confess all our mistakes, errors and wrongs, and mutually forgive each other of all mistakes, errors and wrongs committed, and agree to bury the past in oblivion and to come together in peace, desiring to live together as brethren in the Lord, and to strive for the things that make for peace and the things wherewith one may edify another, praying the Lord to help us to live in such a way as to honor and glorify His holy name. We are aware and all agree that efforts have been heretofore made to unite all the churches once composing the Flint River Association, and we greatly desire and humbly hope that they will all be brought together in peace, love, union and sweet fellowship.

Big Sandy Association

---September 15, 1926

We have just attended the session of the Big Sandy Association, which met with the church at West Plains, near Milan, Tenn. A large crowd was present each day, especially on Sunday, and the meeting closed on Sunday, September 5. The following brethren in the ministry were present during the meeting: Elders J. L. Fuller, who was chosen moderator, T. M. Hampton, who was chosen clerk, L. D. Hamilton, J. C. Ross, J. B. Halbrook, J. R. Scott, J. H. Phillips, John Grist, J. W. Adams, T. L. Webb, M. J. Perry, A. W. DeBerry, D. Hopper, W. C. Davis, J. N. Wallace, W. A. Bishop, D. Neisler, T. M. Phillips, J. S. Clayton, C. F. Parker, and the writer, making twenty-one in all. It was a great meeting; the preaching was all a unit, and peace, love and fellowship abounded. Not a discordant note was sounded. All seemed to labor for the peace and union of the Lord's children. The Lord's presence was surely manifested, and the meeting was an enjoyable one. On Monday following, which was yesterday, we were at New Hope, near Milan. Elder Webb is making this trip with us, and will be with us, the Lord willing, until after the third Sunday, if no longer. Elders L. D. Hamilton and J. W. Adams were with us yesterday. We tried to preach and then Brother Webb followed and preached a comforting discourse, and the meeting was enjoyed by those present, and a good crowd was there for a Monday meeting. We are glad to have Brother Webb with us on this trip. Please remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

A Trouble Maker

---October 1, 1926

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother in Christ-I am reading with great interest the peace move that is being advocated in your paper, but at the same time with much sorrow, knowing that we cannot have peace at the present as I would like to have peace. On the second Sunday in June, 1922, the church at Bethel was organized by Elders M. D. Brann, D. E. Burris and C. L. Clark, the church being examined and found orthodox in doctrine and practice. The church remained in peace until the fall of 1923, when there arose a little difference between some of the members. At the same time a man by the name of Valentine began to visit the church and preach; teaching that the Scriptures teach only one salvation, and demanding that all the church work be done over, when the writer with two others objected to his doctrine and to the church work being done over. We remained in this condition until the fourth Sunday in June of this year, when they organized another church and called Valentine for their pastor. While this was taking place it pleased the Lord for us to have with us Elders J. E. Alderman and M. D. Brann. We also had two deacons from Elder Alderman's church, Good Hope, all volunteering to come, not knowing what was expected to be done on that day. When they saw what was taking place all acted very quiet and said nothing for or against their organization. Elders Alderman and Brann are men that I consider sound in doctrine and practice. Elder Alderman has done us the favor of volunteering to be our pastor for the present, he being the moderator of the association that the members belonged to when they went into the first organization and the one who baptized some of the members. He said he felt it to be his duty to try to save them from their error. I have written this in love, seeking to know the truth as it is in Christ Jesus our Lord. At this time I have no fellowship for this teaching, because, in my judgment, it links together the chain of events in eternity, and they must come as they do. It puts the disobedient and the obedient child on equal terms, and makes a child of God as passive in obedience as in regeneration, and I do not understand this to be the teaching of the Scriptures.

If this is printed, I will be glad to hear from any who have a mind to write to me, as I am just a young man and need instruction. Brother Cayce, if it be your mind and the Lord's will I would be glad for you to visit us. It is not so very far from Fordyce to where we live. We are about twenty miles south of Eudora, Ark., and we meet on Saturday before the third Sunday in each month. I am sure that you and Elder Alderman are one in doctrine and practice, and I have hope that you might have some influence to save some who are being carried off in this false teaching. If I am wrong I pray to be corrected. J. M. Bukch. Oak Grove, La. REMARKS When men pursue such a course as this man Valentine has, and teach such a doctrine, it is clearly evident that they are trouble makers, and the church and the Lord's little children are better off without their visits. Such efforts to tear a church to pieces cannot be prompted by the Spirit of the Lord. It is a pity that some men will do that way. God is not the author of confusion, but of peace; and when a man brings confusion he is acting from a wrong principle. If there is only one salvation set forth in the Bible, then no man in this wide world can harmonize it. We would be glad to visit you some time, if the good Lord opens the way and we have the opportunity. C. H. C.

Flint River Association

---October 1, 1926

For a number of years there has existed a division in the Flint River Association in South East Georgia. An effort was made to get them all together in a meeting at New Hope, Grady County, Ga., last January, but some of the churches did not represent in the meeting, and the desired object was not accomplished. Recently we made a trip in that country for the purpose of trying to get them all together. We visited most all the churches of both factions, and they all endorsed and adopted the article which we presented to them, as has been stated in our columns already, or in another place. Both sides, or the two associations, are to hold meetings this year, as they had already been appointed, the one called the Original Flint River to meet with the church at Sharon, Donaldsonville, Ga., on the first Sunday in October, the regular time; the other is to meet with the church at New Hope, Grady County, Ga., the first Sunday in November, their regular time. All brethren are invited to attend both meetings, and we hope that matters may then be finally adjusted so as to have but the one meeting of the association in the future-that is, for them to all meet in one body in the future. We are glad that they are all together now, and trust the Lord's blessings may rest upon them. C. H. C.

History Suggested

---October 15, 1926

Brother Odell, I would like to make a suggestion, either to Elder C. H. Cayce or Elder J. S. Newman, that they have one of those old church histories re-published, so all of our younger brethren could have a chance to purchase one and read it. I would be glad if every one of my children had a good church history to read after I am gone. It is true, the Bible is the greatest of all books, but if the order of our people is according to the Scriptures, and I believe with all my heart that it is, then I think it very necessary that we keep up with our history also. If this appeals to any one else, let us have an expression from you. It would take a great many of us to buy enough of them to justify either of them to have a history of that size re-published. If we all knew more about what our forefathers did, we would have a better idea what we could do.- A. J. Webb, in Glad Tidings of Oct. 8, 1926.

REMARKS

For our part we hardly know what old history would be best to re-publish just at this time, or which one would give the most information on some points that seem to most concern our people just at this time. Burkett and Reid History of the Kehukee Association shows that two factions came together in the early day of that association, the two known as Regulars and Separates. Other histories show the same thing in other sections. Griffin's History of the Mississippi Baptists is a good work, and ought to be re-published, but it does not show what Burkett and Reid show in regard to the Kehukee. The first Baptists in Mississippi were the Regulars. Owen's Church History is also a very good work, and we would be glad to see it re-published. But we do not think it gives the information contained in the History of the Kehukee. That information is contained in Hassell's History, but that is now out of print, and is a very large book. It would cost a lot to re-publish that work, or to publish another edition of it. The Hanks History is a very good work and contains a lot of valuable information, but it is very brief and much condensed. For a number of years we tried to gather a good library, especially church histories, and we think we met with good success along that line. We have thought that a good history of our people was much needed-one that is brief, and yet not too brief, but not too much detail, and for a long time we had that in view in gathering our library. But a few years ago we just about gave up the idea of ever trying to publish such a work. We fear that it would be done at a loss, and we are not able to bear a loss-at least not much of a loss. If we had some assurance that our people would purchase such a history we might undertake such a task, though it would require much time, labor and expense. It seems that our people generally are slow to buy books, even though the books be valuable. The book called "Fifty Years Among the Baptists," written by David Benedict, is a very valuable work to our people. It shows very clearly when the new things were introduced that caused the division between our people and the Missionaries, and clearly shows their departures. That book was re-published several years ago by Elder J. S. Newman. He still has a number of them for sale, and we have several hundred that we bought from him. The book sells for one dollar and is well worth twice that amount. It ought to be in every Old Baptist home, and it would be good for every Missionary to read it, as well as for every searcher after truth. We would be glad for our people to wake up and read more good literature and inform themselves along historical lines, as well as along doctrinal and practical lines. C. H. C.

A Confession

---October 15, 1926

I just feel like I have said and written things about Brethren Newman, Collings and Cayce that I should not have done. If I should try to enumerate them I am sure I would fail to think of each one. So I want to ask them to forgive me of all I have said or done that may have hurt their feelings. I often act and speak on the impulse of the moment, which is the wrong time to act.-J. A. Webb, in Glad Tidings, Oct. 8, 1926.

REMARKS

Dear brother, we do not hold a single thing against you, and have not done so. If you have ever said anything or written anything that hurt our feelings we have already forgotten it. Let nothing on that line ever bother you in the least, so far as we are concerned. May the good Lord bless and keep and sustain you by His grace, is our humble prayer. If we have ever hurt your feelings in any way, please forgive us, and remember us in your prayers. We feel to be so poor and needy and to need

the prayers of the Lord's dear children. We do humbly pray that peace and fellowship may be restored among the dear Old Baptists before we are called hence. C. H. C.

Not A New Doctrine

---October 15, 1926

We see an article in the Lone (some) Pilgrim from the pen of one Elder C. M. Weaver in which he endeavors to show the doctrine that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated all things that come to pass, good, bad and indifferent, and the one salvation theory were the principles held to by the Primitive Baptists in Southern Illinois when he joined them. He says he joined them in 1888, and that Elder R. Fuikerson delivered the charge when he was ordained. Elder Weaver says Elder Fuikerson told him that he (Weaver) was preaching the same doctrine that he (Fuikerson) had been preaching for fifty years. If we are not mistaken our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, was one of the presbytery in the ordination of Elder Weaver, and we know he never advocated the one salvation theory. Proof of this is clearly shown in the files of The Primitive Baptist. Elder S. F. Cayce and Elder Richard Fuikerson were agreed in doctrine. If they ever disagreed we never heard of it, and we remember Elder Fuikerson being at father's home. It follows, then, that if Elder Weaver was then preaching the same doctrine Elder Fuikerson had been preaching for fifty years, Elder Weaver was not then preaching the one salvation theory. We have before us at this moment a copy of "A Brief History of the Regular Baptists, Principally of Southern Illinois, by Achilles Coffey. To which an Appendix is Added by Thomas J. Carr." This book was published in 1877-just eleven years before Elder Weaver united with the Primitive Baptists. In this book is a "Biography of Elder A. Coffey," written by Elder R. Fulker-son, and dated January 1, 1877. Elder Fulker-son says: "Having examined his manuscript, I, with all my heart, recommend his little volume to the Regular Baptists, and to all enquirers after truth. There is no man that stands higher among the Regular Baptists than does Elder Coffey, not only among them, but he is a man of good report with them that are without. Having labored to the best of my ability in the same gospel field for the last thirty years, I know whereof I speak." This is a plain and unvarnished endorsement of the doctrine and principles set forth in this history, and a plain statement that Elder Fulker-son advocated the same doctrine set forth in the book. In the "Appendix" written by Thomas J. Carr, we find the contention that there is a salvation that is not eternal. We give the following extended extract from this appendix, beginning on page 170: Paul says, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." -(II Timothy 3:16-17). This is plain, positive testimony. Then if all Scripture is for the purpose of thoroughly furnishing the man of God unto all good works, where is any of it given for any other purpose? Nowhere. Then why should one search the Bible to find a Scripture to overthrow Paul's testimony? He would not have written this to Timothy had it not been the truth. Paul, in writing to the Romans, says: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." -(Romans 1:16). Some contend that this Scripture is applicable to the unbeliever. One or two things is true of this. Either the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, or else it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that does not believe it. Well, which is it? Paul says, "to every one that believeth." Jesus says, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." -(John 6:47). Again Jesus says, "He that

heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." -(John 5:24). Hence "every one that believeth" is passed from death unto life, and, as a matter of course, is a "man of God," and the Scripture is for the purpose of thoroughly furnishing him unto all good works. Here, then, is a perfect harmony seen between the two quotations from Paul. But how can the gospel be the power of God unto salvation to one who is saved already? Timothy was one of the "saved already" when Paul was writing to him, yet he says, "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." -(I Timothy 4:16). This cannot have reference to eternal salvation from two considerations; first, Timothy was at that time a young preacher of the gospel; second, if he was to save himself and them that heard him, there would have been no necessity for Jesus Christ, since Timothy, in this case would not only be his own saviour, but the saviour of them that heard him, be they many or few. Paul tells how Timothy and himself were saved; that is how their eternal salvation was accomplished: "Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." -(II Timothy 1:9). From the above quotation we see his eternal salvation did not depend upon, nor was it "according to our works." But the salvation that Paul was writing to Timothy concerning did depend upon "in doing this." Paul, in giving his charge to the elders at Ephesus, says: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock," etc.; "for I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." -(0:28) (Acts 20:28-30). And again, "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." -(Ephesians 4:14). "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies," etc., "and many shall follow their pernicious ways." -(II Peter 2:1-2). By Timothy taking "heed" to himself and to the doctrine he saved himself and them that heard him (the flock) from "grievous wolves;" saved from being drawn away by men speaking "perverse things;" saved from being "carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive;" saved from those "damnable heresies" privily brought in by false teachers; saved from following "their pernicious ways;" in short, they were saved from every false way. This is sufficient to show the doctrine then taught by Thomas Carr, Elders Coffey and Fulkerson. If Elder Fulkerson had been preaching the same doctrine all the time up to the time of the ordination of Elder Weaver, and if Elder Weaver was then preaching the same doctrine that Elder Fulkerson preached, then Elder Weaver is not preaching the same doctrine now that he was preaching then. He must be one of the number who has brought in some of the "damnable heresies" referred to by the apostle and quoted by Thomas Carr. If God's people would take heed, they might save themselves from such teaching as is promulgated by some. C. H. C.

Thinking of Mother

---November 1, 1926

Today is October 13, 1926. Two years ago today we saw our precious mother fall asleep in Jesus. She had suffered much-no mortal knows how much. She was ready

and willing and anxious to go home and be with the blessed Saviour whom she loved and delighted to serve. We have been thinking today much about that dear mother, who cared for us in our infant and childhood days. We have been thinking of her great love and tender care for us, notwithstanding our many wrongs, mistakes, failures and shortcomings. Mother's love was so great that she was always ready to forgive and to make excuses for our mistakes and wrongs. She cared for us when we could not care for ourselves. She loved her children with all the fondness of a mother's love. When we grew up, her love was still as strong and as fond as when we were in infancy and childhood. Mother rejoiced when she knew we had received a blessed hope in Jesus. She rejoiced when we finally went to the church and asked for a home there-at Greenfield, Tenn., on the second Sunday in August, 1889. When we met with sorrows and reverses, it was mother who wept and grieved with us. When we began to try to speak in the name of the Master, mother tried to encourage us, and would assure us that the Lord would bless us and care for us and would not forsake us, and that we should be true to Him and His cause. It was mother who would often tell us how our feeble efforts to speak in the name of the Lord, and our efforts to proclaim the sweet story of salvation by grace, had comforted her and encouraged her along life's rugged pathway. Mother! Mother! How sweet is that word! We so often went to mother for counsel and advice. It was mother who would often say, when we started away from home on a preaching tour, "Son, be careful what you say, and be careful how you say it. Do not be too quick to speak. And do not say hard things." What good advice! What a pity we do not all heed such good counsel and advice. May the good Lord help us to remember it and heed it. We have been thinking today of our thirty-seventh birthday, June 1st, 1908. On that day we had been toiling hard until the afternoon. We were tired and worn out and so much cast down and discouraged. Mother came into the office and sat down near us and laid a package on our desk, and said, "Here is a present for you." We thanked her for it, and felt so glad that mother remembered us. She said, "Open it and see what it is." We turned and unwrapped the bundle, and there we saw a beautiful old-fashioned pound cake, made by mother's own dear and loving hands. On the cake was a little note, nicely folded and a pin stuck through it into the cake. We took the note and unfolded it and read these words, "Thirty-seven years ago today I was the proud mother of a sweet baby boy. Today I am the proud mother of an able Primitive Baptist minister. Mother." This was written with her own dear hand. We could not keep back the tears. They flowed freely, and we could not keep from embracing her in our arms. That sweet and tender and loving note lies before us on our desk now. We carry it with us where we go. We have been carrying it now these eighteen years and more. We expect to keep it as long as we live in this old world. We feel today to thank God for such a mother. Many times she has come to our bedside in the dark hours of the night, and we could feel the tender touch of mother's loving hands, when she had come to see if all was well with her boy, when all others were asleep; and then she would often go down on her knees and send up a prayer to a throne of God's rich grace for her boy when she thought we were asleep. It was mother who never became weary or too tired to minister to us in our afflictions. It was mother who would sit up with us through the dark watches of the night and give us the medicine on time. It was mother's dear hands that would soothe our aching head. It was mother who toiled on for her child as long as she was able to toil. But now she is resting from all her labors, and we are sure that in spirit she is now in the presence of the blessed Saviour. We miss her so much. God bless her memory. We hope to see her again some day, and somehow we feel that it will not be long- and it will not be long, even if we live to a ripe old age. Lord, help us to honor the name of our blessed mother! When we were in Martin, Tenn., recently-Monday

morning, September 20—we visited father's and mother's grave. There we silently wept and prayed the good Lord to care for us and to help us to live in such a way as to honor their memory, and never bring reproach upon the cause they so dearly loved. Lord, help us to serve Thee better and to love Thee more while we stay upon earth. Help us to rear our children in a way that father and mother would approve, that they may be an honor to their parents and grandparents. Help us to rear them to respect Thy church and people; and, if it be Thy will, give them a good hope in Jesus, and spare us to see some of them follow the Lord in the ordinances of His house. Lord, help us. C. H. C.

Our Trip to Tennessee

---November 1, 1926

In our issue of September 15 we gave an account of the meeting of the Big Sandy Association, which was held at West Plains Church, near Milan, Tenn., on Friday, Saturday and first Sunday in September, and of our visit to New Hope Church on Monday following. We were at New Hope again on Tuesday and enjoyed a very pleasant meeting. On Wednesday and Thursday we were at Old Gibson Church. Only a small congregation present. On Friday, Saturday and second Sunday we were at the Forked Deer Association, which was held with Mill Creek Church, near Bells, Tenn. A good crowd was present every day. The following named ministers were in attendance: Elders J. W. Adams, W. C. Davis, John Grist, A. W. DeBerry, R. L. Perry, T. M. Hampton, L. D. Hamilton, T. L. Webb, J. A. Robinson, C. H. Cayce, Cayce Pentecost, A. B. Sides, C. F. Parker. The preaching was all harmonious, and not a discord was heard. There were several additions to the church, and the meeting was much enjoyed. Sunday afternoon we went with Brother Perry to Union City, where there was an appointment made for that night. Had meeting there that night, Monday and Monday night, and it was a pleasant meeting with good congregations at each service. Brother Webb went down to Rutherford Monday evening to fill an appointment there that night. Tuesday morning we went down there and went out to Flowers Chapel, where we had meeting Tuesday and Wednesday. Thursday we filled the appointment at Rutherford Fork Church. Friday, Saturday and third Sunday we attended the Greenfield Association, which was held with Greenfield Church, in Greenfield, Tenn. They had service every day and night, besides service at two or three other places at night. Twenty-four ministers were in attendance, whose names were: Elders J. C. Ross, A. B. Ross, Henry Ross, R. L. Perry, Z. Stallings, John Grist, Cayce Pentecost, Commodore Brann, L. D. Hamilton, S. E. Reid, T. L. Webb, T. M. Phillips, B. P. Simmons, W. L. Murray, J. B. Hardy, J. W. Hardwick, C. F. Parker, J. E. Shackelford, J. B. Halbrook, J. S. Clayton, M. D. Brann, J. S. Williams, M. J. Perry and C. H. Cayce. Large crowds were in attendance and the meeting was an enjoyable one. All was peace and harmony. From Greenfield Brother Webb turned back toward home. He had been with us all along during the trip to this time. We were sorry to separate from him and that he could not go with us the remainder of the trip. We enjoyed traveling with him very much. He is a pleasant traveling companion. We pray the Lord to bless him in his labors at every place he may go. From this association we filled appointments as follows: Martin, our old home, Sunday night; Blooming Grove, Monday and Tuesday. This is a church with about 140 members, and a church we served years ago. A very good crowd was present each day. Wednesday we were at Matheny Grove. A very good congregation was present, and we had a very pleasant meeting there. We had never been to that church before, as they were organized since we left Tennessee. On Thursday we were at Little Zion. We think this church has a membership of

between sixty and seventy, and there was one male member present at the service, and a few of the sisters. Elder J. B. Halbrook was with us, and we returned to his home with him, and he conveyed us on to the next place. Friday, Saturday and fourth Sunday we were at the Obion Association, which was held with the church at Union, near McKenzie, Tenn. A good crowd was at this meeting on Sunday, though not a very large crowd on Friday and Saturday. The following brethren in the ministry were in attendance: Elders J. B. Hardy, J. N. Wallace, J. W. Hardwick, C. F. Parker, J. W. Lomax, J. B. Halbrook, J. S. Clayton, W. G. Davis, W. R. Rushton, J. R. Scott, H. N. Oliver, Z. Stallings and C. H. Cayce. The preaching was all harmonious, and no hobby riding was indulged in. It was a sweet meeting. We filled the appointment Sunday night at McKenzie which had been made for us there, but having received a telephone message that day to go to Bradford Monday to attend a funeral service, the appointment for Monday was called in. Early Monday morning we took the train for Milan, where we changed cars for Bradford, Tenn. Having about two hours to wait at Milan we went to the home of Elder J. W. Adams and spent the time with him and Sister Adams. We arrived at Bradford on time and learned that we were wanted to conduct the funeral of Brother John Brasfield, whose home was in that place. We did the best we could to speak words of comfort to the bereaved companion and relatives, and were assisted in the service by Rev. Baker, Rev. Davis and Rev. Ralph. Rev. Davis is pastor of the Missionary Baptist Church there; Rev. Baker is the pastor of the Methodist Church, and Rev. Ralph was the former pastor of the Methodist Church there, and was a good friend to the family. A large crowd attended the service, which attested the high esteem in which Brother Brasfield was held in the community. On Tuesday and Wednesday we were at Harmony Church, near Bradford. Only a small crowd present. Wednesday night we were with the church in Jackson. Elders A. B. Ross and S. E. Reid came in unexpectedly and were with us there. A good crowd turned out and the meeting was a very pleasant one. Thursday we were with the church at Brown's Creek, near Brownsville, and had a very pleasant meeting with them. Friday, Saturday and first Sunday in October we attended the Mississippi River Association, which was held with the church at Mt. Tabor, near Whiteville, Tenn. The following brethren in the ministry were present: Elders D. Hopper, James Duncan, A. B. Ross, W. A. Bishop, J. T. Davis, S. E. Reid, J. W. Adams, J. S. Gaugh, T. E. Bishop and C. H. Cayce. The preaching was all of one piece; all preaching peace by Jesus Christ. There were two additions to the church on Saturday and two on Sunday. It was a time of great rejoicing. May the Lord be praised for His wonderful mercy to the children of men. On Monday we were with the church at Mt. Pisgah, near Somerville, Tenn. It was a very pleasant meeting, though a small crowd present. This is the home church of Elder J. T. Davis, who was with us there. After service Monday we boarded the train at Somerville for home, and arrived home Tuesday morning at 4:27. Our wife and little girl and boy (Florida and Claudis, Jr.) met us at the train. We found all well at home, for which we felt to be so thankful to the good Lord, and felt glad to once more see our dear loved ones at home. The section we visited is the section where we lived for so long, and we were glad to meet so many dear brethren and sisters with whom we once associated so much. We trust they may be enabled by the Lord's grace to continue in the good old way, and that they may be found walking in the path of obedience and be truly devoted to the cause of the Master. May the Lord bless them for their kindness to us. If we meet no more in this world of sorrow and sadness, we hope we shall meet in that better home on high. Remember us, please, in your petitions at the throne of grace. C. H. C.

Is It Of The Devil?

---November 15, 1926

In the Lone (some) Pilgrim for September, 1926, under the heading, "Close of Volume Four," and over the signature of H. F. H., we find the following language: Conditional time salvation is not Primitive Baptist doctrine, never has been, and never will be. It is not taught in the experience of God's children, neither is it taught in the Bible, by the Lord or by any of His prophets. Satan preached it to our mother Eve in the garden of Eden, when he said, if you will do something right here in time you will better your condition, and be as wise as God. This was the origin of conditional time salvation. The above is not exact quotation but carries the meaning. Satan also preached this doctrine in Job's day, and every time it has been preached from that -day to this, it has come from the same source. Bildad preached it to poor old Job, but it was no comfort to him, and it has never been any comfort to God's people, and never will be, because it is not the truth. Any one who can fellowship this doctrine of the devil, or those who preach it, has no business in the Old Baptist Church. We copy the above without any correction in punctuation or language. Notice that this editor says this doctrine is not taught in the Bible by the Lord or by any of His prophets. What a wonder! "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." --(9) (Isaiah 1:19-20). Here is something promised to the Israelites on condition that they be willing and obedient, which is that they shall eat the good of the land. On the other hand, if they refuse and rebel the sentence is that they shall be devoured with the sword. Here was a blessing on condition of obedience and punishment on condition of disobedience. Isaiah was a prophet of God, and he said it. He also said that "the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." But the learned and wonderful editor of the Lone (some) Pilgrim says the Lord never taught such a doctrine, and neither did any of His prophets. If the Lord did not teach it, then Isaiah lied; and if he lied about this matter, then he was not a prophet of God. Did Isaiah tell a falsehood? No. Was he a true prophet? Yes. Then, who told the truth-Isaiah or this great modern editor? Then this editor says that Satan preached that doctrine in the garden of Eden, and then claims he gave the meaning of what Satan said. Instead of giving the meaning of the conversation and the substance of what was said, he actually garbled the whole thing. Satan never said you will "be as wise as God." He said, "Ye shall not surely die, for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." - (Genesis 3:4-5). God "had said, "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." -(Genesis 2:17). Here God in His law threatened death, punishment, on condition of disobedience, or transgression of His law. The devil said, "ye shall not surely die." The editor of the Lone-(some) Pilgrim says there is not any such thing as punishment or joys on conditions of disobedience or obedience-the same doctrine the devil taught. Right there God promised punishment as a result of transgression of His law. The editor denies that doctrine and teaching. We kindly ask, Who is it that is teaching the doctrine of the devil-that editor, or the people he brazenly assails? Again, he says the doctrine he assails is not taught in the experience of God's children. We suppose he means by this expression that he has never experienced any such thing. Perhaps he has not experienced it; but we venture to say that when the Lord's children came home to the church-those who have done so-and followed the Saviour in baptism, that they received an ease of mind and peace of conscience they never enjoyed before. They enjoyed a saving that they never enjoyed before. They left a burden that they have never had since.

Thus the Lord's children learn by experience the truth of that doctrine. "Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." -((Pet 3:20) (I Peter 3:20-21). Here the inspired apostle declares that eight souls were saved in the ark by water. The editor of the Lone (some) Pilgrim denies that there is any more than one saving, and teaches that that saving is eternal. If he is right in his teaching then Noah and his family were saved with an eternal saving by water. And the inspired apostle says baptism is a figure like that, hence, it is like that. Then if Noah and his family were saved with an eternal salvation by water, then baptism now saves with an eternal salvation. Let the great editor escape this conclusion if he can! Remember that the inspired apostle emphatically declares that baptism does now save us! Does it? It either does, or it does not. The editor says there is no such thing as a saving on condition of doing something; but the inspired apostle says we are saved by baptism. And we are saved by it as Noah and his family were saved by water. Noah was a child of God before the flood came. Hence he was not saved in eternity, or with an eternal salvation, by water. As the saving by baptism is like that, then we are not saved with an eternal salvation by baptism. But we are saved by baptism, for the apostle said so. Will the kind (?) editor please condescend to tell us what kind of saving it is? "For if ye live after the flesh ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." -(Romans 8:13). This language was addressed by the inspired apostle to the church of God at Rome. No living man on earth, who knows the meaning of simple English words, can deny that there are conditions in this text. The conditions are not to the unregenerate, as the Arminian world teaches; but they are to the children of God, those who have been born of God. This is the doctrine that Primitive Baptists have taught all along in contending against the Arminian world, and we are inclined to believe the editor knows it. Perhaps he does not. He may take either horn of the dilemma he chooses. Note that the editor says that those who can fellowship this doctrine or those who preach it have no business in the Old Baptist Church. They were in the Old Baptist Church before he was born. But the editor here declares non-fellowship for those who do not see as he does, and would read them out of the denomination. What a pity he is not the ruler! But we would judge that if his doctrine is the truth, and there are some in the Primitive Baptist Church who do not believe his doctrine, it is because God unconditionally predestinated and decreed from all eternity that they should be there; and when he is kicking about them being there, and raising objection to it, he is only kicking against God's predestination and objecting to it. We wonder if his objection will have such weight as to bring about a change in that predestination? We suppose not, since he says that everything that transpires is a link in the chain of events which God welded in eternity. If the spirit the editor manifests is of the Lord, and if his doctrine is the doctrine of God, the Lord did not tell us about it in His Book. Poor fellow. He is apparently striking at everything in sight and out of sight. It reminds us of some blind reptiles in dog days. May the Lord continue to deliver His poor and afflicted people from such unreasonable men. C. H. C.

Do Not Pay Him

---November 16,1926

In the Lone Pilgrim for September, 1926, the editor complains that some of his brethren do not pay him what they owe him on subscription. He says, "The

majority of these people who owe us have membership in the Primitive Baptist Church, and claim to be honest. Why they will not pay we are unable to tell." Why, brother, if your doctrine is the truth, the problem seems to us to be one very easy of solution. It is simply this: The reason why they do not pay you is because God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate that they should not pay you. That is bound to be the solution of the matter, because you teach that God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally predestinate everything that comes to pass, and they all have to be just that way. But, say, does it not seem as though, if his charge against his brethren be true, he has a lot of dishonest brethren? And he says he took 700 names off his list, and some of them over two years in arrears, and he sent them notices and less than 10 per cent of them paid. They must be a bad lot, according to what the editor says about them. But, according to his doctrine, they have to be that way. C. H. C.

A Society

---November 15, 1926

We have received a request from a sister to give our views in regard to some kind of a society being formed wherein the sisters meet once a week at some home and read the Bible and sing, and each one contribute what she is able, so they may have funds on hand when needed. The sister asks if this is Scriptural. If there is anything like this in the Bible, we do not remember it. The deacons of the church are the ones who should have in charge the financial affairs of the church. That is what they were first appointed for. The contributions should be put in the hands of the deacons, and not in the hands of some society. What is done, should be done in the name of the church, and not in the name of a number of sisters meeting at each other's homes. There is no Scriptural example for it, and we are furnished in the Scriptures with everything we should practice religiously. It is just as much wrong to practice something not commanded as it is to leave undone what the Scriptures expressly command. There is no command in the Scriptures for any sort of society beside the church. C. H. C.

1927

Introduction to Volume Forty-Two

---January 1, 1927

This issue begins volume forty-two of The Primitive Baptist. We should have written an article for the last issue on the close of volume forty-one, but we were away from home on a tour in South Georgia when the manuscript was prepared for that issue of the paper, and we overlooked it. We beg our readers to pardon the oversight. We have been trying to make The Primitive Baptist an Old Baptist paper. As to how well we have succeeded in doing this we leave the readers to judge. We are well aware of the fact that we cannot please all. If the brethren or churches are in trouble in some section, and they call on us to go among them to help them adjust their differences and settle their troubles, and we do not go (let the reason be what it may), then we are severely criticised and found fault with because we do not go. If we answer the call and go to them and do the very best we can to get

them together, then some find fault with us because we go among them and try to help them. Sometimes the criticism is very severe and rough. Sometimes we publish an article containing some sentiment that some person does not like. Perhaps he writes an article criticising the sentiment or expression of the other brother. To publish the article would put us under obligation to give the other brother space for a reply, and that would open our columns to a controversy. These controversies over points upon which we should have forbearance, and upon which differences of opinion should be allowed, are the things that frequently cause troubles that are uncalled for. Under such circumstances we must refuse publication. When we do that we usually incur the displeasure of the writer, and sometimes we get a "good dressing up." These are only a few of the things we have to meet with and encounter along the way. We are sure that if the Lord spares our life and we continue the publication of The Primitive Baptist there will be trials and conflicts during the year 1927, as well as all along through the years we may yet live. Still, we find no place to turn back or to be a deserter. We do not wish to be a "slacker." It is our desire to do our whole duty, as best we can, and to serve the Lord with reverence and with godly fear, and to serve His people with the ability He may see fit to give us.

These are trying times in many respects. We are living in a fast age, and all seem to be in a mad rush- no time for serious and weighty matters which should be of more concern to us than all the things of this world. The slump in the price of cotton makes us all think we must begin to curtail on our expenditures and cut down expenses at once. When we think of that, many of us begin to cut out expenditures at once toward church or religious things. Perhaps about the first thing we think of is to do without our church paper- not absolutely the first,' but about the first thing we think of may be this. So we write to the editor to stop our paper. Perhaps we continue taking the newspaper, which contains much reading matter our homes would be better off without. Perhaps we spend many times more than the price of the paper for gasoline for joy riding-and perhaps our children would be much better off if the joy riding were cut out. These are just a few things some of us might do well to think about. Many of the Lord's dear children are in isolated places and are deprived of the blessing and privilege of hearing the gospel preached. Many of them write us that all the preaching they get is what they get through The Primitive Baptist. If the paper is supported it thus carries a blessing and a joy to so many of the Lord's dear children who are deprived of the privilege many of us enjoy. If you are blessed with the privilege of attending the public service of the Lord and of meeting with His children, and you continue as a subscriber to the paper, you thus help to carry the blessing to those who are deprived of the privilege. Have you ever thought about how you are thus helping to carry such a blessing to so many of the Lord's dear children when you pay a year's subscription to The Primitive Baptist? The paper could not exist upon the subscriptions of those, only, who are in such an isolated condition. Others besides those in that condition must take the paper if it continues to exist. Are you not willing to help the small amount of the subscription price of the paper in such a work for the benefit of the Lord's little children who are thus deprived of the blessing you enjoy? Our readers know of the clubbing proposition which has been published in every issue of the paper for several months-to take clubs of new subscribers at a reduced rate for the purpose of trying to increase the list of subscribers to where we could get the paper out weekly instead of twice a month. Some have thought this was not fair to the old subscribers. If a sufficient number of new subscribers could have been added to the list to justify us in sending the paper out weekly, the old subscribers would get the benefit of the increase without

extra cost to them. Yet some have thought we should accept renewals at the same rate we offered for new subscribers. The truth of the matter is that if we were to reduce the price of the paper to that which we offered for these clubs of new names we would soon have to go out of business, for that price to all subscribers would not pay the actual cost of sending the paper out. Since the issue of April 1st, 1926, was sent out there has been a net gain of just 240 names to the list. This lacks a large number of being enough to justify us in making the change to a weekly. We are now discontinuing these club offers. We appreciate what the brethren have done in getting new subscribers. Several of the brethren have done good work in that way, but not enough have taken an interest in it to increase the list to where we could make the change to a weekly. If all would put forth an extra effort for the next few months to send in new subscribers perhaps we could make the change soon. Will you try and do your best along that line during this month? Ask the brethren and friends to try the paper one year at the regular rate. It is our desire to continue to try to make The Primitive Baptist an Old Baptist paper. It is our great desire to improve, and to try to make the paper a benefit to the cause of the Master. We desire to "strive for the things that make for peace, and the things wherewith one may edify another." We desire to conduct the paper in such a way as to promote the peace and happiness of the Lord's dear children. We are well aware that trials and conflicts and afflictions await us along the way, "but none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." -Acts xx. 24. We would be glad if our corresponding editors would take a little more interest in the paper than some of them have. Some of them never even so much as write us a line. We hope they will try to help us out a little more this year by writing and soliciting subscribers. Brethren, will you do this? We desire an interest in the prayers of all who love the cause we are trying to promote and who love our Lord Jesus. C. H. C.

Lordship Among the Ministry

---January 1, 1927

The following article was read in the meeting at Jackson, Tenn., which began on Friday before the fifth Sunday in October, 1926:

Brethren, you have assigned to me a hard subject, "The baneful effect of the spirit of lordship among the ministry," and I have had very little time to study the subject. We need to be warned against such a spirit, and we need to watch ourselves, that we do not allow ourselves to be governed by it. I understand a spirit of lordship to be a spirit of mastery; a spirit to rule, to control, to have things our way, or not at all. The very word minister conveys a meaning that is the opposite of lordship or master. It really means to serve, a servant. Jesus said, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many!" - ((0:25) (Matthew 20:25-28). To exercise lordship is to exercise dominion, to rule and to control, to exercise authority. Jesus says "it shall not be so among you." Hence it is very clear and manifest that such a spirit is not to prevail-and should not be indulged in by the ministry of the church of Christ. This text also shows very clearly that the minister is to be a servant, and not a lord or master; that he is not to exercise authority or dominion. Jesus our Saviour came to minister, to serve. The spirit of service is of the Lord, and the spirit of lordship is

from beneath; it is a bad spirit. It brings trouble, sorrow and distress to the hearts of the Lord's dear children. It divides families, homes, neighborhoods and churches. But here the question may be asked, "Are not ministers to be overseers of the flock, and has not the Lord appointed them as such?" Yes, that is true. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." - (0:28) (Acts 20:28). This is the language of the eminent Apostle Paul to the elders of the church at Ephesus when he had sent for them to show what should be done, and how it should be done. An overseer is not a master or lord; that is, from a Scriptural standpoint. And an overseer, according to Paul's instruction here, is one that is to feed, not to rule or control, or to exercise dominion. The inspired Apostle Peter also gives us some instruction along the same line: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." - (Pet 5:1) (I Peter 5:1-3). From this we see that for a minister to take the oversight of the flock, to be an overseer of the flock, is not for him to be a lord or a ruler over them, but to be an ensample to them. It is his work and his business to set right examples before them, so as to show by precept and example how the Lord would have His children live and walk and to conduct themselves here in this world. "Neither as being lords over God's heritage." The marginal reference says, "overruling." That is, not ruling over. The minister, or the elder, is positively forbidden to rule over God's heritage, or His people, or His church. He is to serve them and not to rule over them. As he is to serve them, they are to have authority over him, rather than for him to have authority over them. For him to assume authority to be a ruler and to assume lordship, is akin to the sin of presumption. "But the soul that doeth aught presumptuously, whether he be born in the land, or a stranger, the same reproacheth the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people." - ((Num 15:30) (Numbers 15:30). For one of God's ministers to be governed by, or to manifest, the spirit of lordship is for him to presume to be what the Lord has not made him, which is presumption, or to act presumptuously; and he who acts presumptuously reproaches the Lord, and God says that "soul shall be cut off from among his people." In **(4) (Ezekiel 34:4)** the Lord tells the shepherds of Israel that "with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them." The "them" were the children of Israel. By reading this chapter we will find that the children of Israel suffered as a result of the cruelty and the ruling of the shepherds. National Israel were a type of spiritual Israel. Surely no Primitive Baptist will deny this. As they were a type of spiritual Israel, and such a spirit among the shepherds in that day brought trouble, sorrow and distress, it will bring the same in this day among spiritual Israel. Perhaps it may not be amiss to call attention to the fact also that the Lord pronounced a curse upon the shepherds, and said, "Behold, I am against the shepherds, and I will require my flock at their hand."

This entire chapter might be good reading for us, that we may be warned and get a lesson there from that might do us some good. Let me quote at some length from this chapter, beginning with the first verse: And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, prophesy against the shepherds of Israel, prophesy, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God unto the shepherds; Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves! should not the shepherds feed the flocks? Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool, ye kill them that are fed: but ye feed not the flock. The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye

healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost; but with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them. And they were scattered, because there is no shepherd: and they became meat to all the beasts of the field, when they were scattered. My sheep wandered through all the mountains, and upon every high hill: yea, my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them. Therefore, ye shepherds, hear the word of the Lord; As I live, saith the Lord God, surely because my flock became a prey, and my flock became meat to every beast of the field, because there was no shepherd, neither did my shepherds search for my flock, but the shepherds fed themselves, and fed not my flock; therefore, O ye shepherds, hear the word of the Lord; Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I am against the shepherds; and I will require my flock at their hand, and cause them to cease from feeding the flock; neither shall the shepherds feed themselves any more; for I will deliver my flock from their mouth, that they may not be meat for them." -(Ezekiel 34:1-10). When the minister of the Lord is being controlled by a spirit of lordship, of master or ruler, the diseased are not strengthened, the sick are not healed, that which is broken is not bound up, that which is driven away is not brought again, and those who are lost are not found; the Lord's little children are scattered, and they wander in the desert hungry and crying for food, and are devoured by their adversaries. What a deplorable state and condition! Language fails me to describe the sorrows, distresses, sore afflictions and heartaches resulting from such a spirit! And such a great woe pronounced against the shepherds or ministers possessing such a spirit! Brethren, have we ever been possessed of it? Have any of us been "weighed in the balance and found wanting" along this line? If so, let us humble ourselves in dust and ashes; let us humble ourselves under the mighty hand of our God; let us humbly beg Him to forgive our folly and our wrongs, and that His fierce anger may be turned away from us, and that He may restore unto us the joys of His salvation and pour out a blessing upon us; that He may bring our children and neighbors and their children into His blessed fold, and that He would help us to feed them upon the pure and sincere milk of the word. If we have been acting under this bad and evil spirit, let us begin now, if we have not already done so, to endeavor, the best we possibly can, to make amends for our wrongs. We need to devote our time to the service the Lord requires of us. The minister is not to be a lord or master, but a servant. "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." -(II Corinthians 4:5). Let me digress long enough to say the apostle did not mean by the expression, "We preach not ourselves," that it is not us doing the preaching-that the Lord is preaching through us-but he meant that we do not preach our own power or authority, but that it is Christ Jesus the Lord, and His power, that we preach, and not ourselves; but 'ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." The true minister is a servant of the Lord and a servant of the church-your servants. This fact that we are your servants is for Jesus' sake. The Lord calls His ministers and lays the obligation upon them. They are under obligation to the Lord and to the church. A servant is under obligation to the master, and the apostle says, "ourselves your servants" - not your lords or rulers. The master is the boss. When a servant gets the idea that he is the boss, and that the business cannot be conducted without him, he is then in such a condition that the business would get along better without him than with him. A true servant is willing to endure afflictions. "Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." -(II Timothy 2:10). Paul also instructs Timothy to be a partaker of the afflictions of the gospel. {(II Timothy 1:8)} We may rest assured that if we are the Lord's true ministers, and if we fill the place of servants to Him and His people, there are

afflictions for us to endure. The fields are white unto harvest. The harvest is great, and the laborers are few. Are we praying the Lord of the harvest to send laborers into the harvest? How often do you hear a prayer to the Lord to send laborers in these days? We need them. We need faithful men. We need men that are true. We need men who love the cause of the Master. We need men who desire the welfare of the Lord's little children. May the Lord give us such men. C. H. Cayce.

Church Evidence

---January 15, 1927

A brother writes us as follows: "Will you please answer, through the columns of your paper, this question: What should a church do when a slanderous report is circulated on one of her members and the church believes the report, but has no church evidence to prove it?" Of course we understand the brother desires to know what course we think a church should pursue under such circumstances. We give our opinion, though we are well aware of the fact that we may be wrong. In the first place we would say that it is detrimental to the member as well as detrimental to the church for a slanderous report to be in circulation on the member. This being true, it seems evident to us that if the member is innocent he would want an investigation to be made by the church, so that the church could exonerate him from any guilt. So, from this standpoint, for the good and benefit and welfare of her member, who may have a slanderous report circulated against him, the church should thoroughly investigate the report. If it is found to be without foundation, then the church can and should exonerate the member. This would be for the good of the member and for the good of the church. On the other hand, if the member is guilty, the church should know it. The way for the church to know it is by investigating the matter thoroughly. If a member is guilty of some grave charge, and the matter is in general circulation, it is detrimental to the church to not investigate the matter and deal with the member according to the seriousness of the crime. As to the matter of church evidence, we only have to say that there may be matters which could never be proven by the testimony of a member of the church. A member of the church is not supposed to engage in many ungodly things the world engages in, or to visit many places men of the world visit. If a member of the church engages in some such practice, or visits some such places, he may do so and no other member ever be a witness to the fact. Under such circumstances, if it is necessary to have the testimony of another church member, nothing could be done. Another member being a witness would prove that he himself had been engaged in something or been to some place, perhaps, where he had no business. Testimony of a credible witness, one who has a reputation for truth and veracity, should be accepted by the church when she has no evidence within her own borders. Of course all the circumstances in such a case should be weighed carefully and calmly. The church should be well assured that prejudice does not weigh in the matter of the testimony, and other matters concerning the affair. How important it is that the members of the church should live above reproach and above suspicion. They should live in such a way as to never bring reproach upon the cause of our blessed Master. May He help us to live in such a way as to honor and glorify His name. C. H. C.

Elder Petty's Name Dropped

---February 1, 1927

We are very sorry, indeed, that it has become necessary to drop Elder M. E. Petty's name from our staff of corresponding editors. This will, perhaps, be a surprise to many of our readers, while many others are, no doubt, wondering already why we have not done so. We feel it is due to our readers and to Elder Petty that we here give some of our reasons for doing this. Our readers will remember that a peace meeting was called to be held at New Hope Church, in the Flint River Association, in Georgia, the fifth Sunday in last January, and that the meeting was held according to appointment. There were two Flint River Associations, or rather the Flint River Association had been divided for a number of years. It will be remembered that several of the churches in what is known as the Original Flint River Association did not represent in that meeting. The Original Flint River Association was the home association of Elder Petty. He was moderator of it. That meeting caused a disruption and division in Tired Creek Church. At Elder Petty's request we visited that section in the summer, or early fall, and went to as many of the churches on each side as we had the time to visit, for the purpose of making an effort to get the churches all together. We presented a proposition to each church which we termed "Gospel Terms of Peace," and every church endorsed it except Elder Petty's home church. When we got to Tired Creek we presented a proposition upon which that church could and did come together. Elder Petty stoutly refused to recognize the coming together of Tired Creek Church. When the Original Flint River Association met at Donaldsonville, according to previous arrangement and understanding, Elder Petty's church did not represent, though they had been in that association all the while; but it was understood that any of the churches which had endorsed the settlement might represent in either body they pleased. When the Little Flint River (we use this term only in order to designate or distinguish them from the others) met on Friday before the first Sunday in November at New Hope, Elder Petty's church had a letter and messengers there to represent in that body. But some of the churches of the Original Flint River had a grievance against that church, and had sent messengers with complaint and were ignored. So the Little Flint River refused to receive and seat the messengers from that church, and gave as their reason that some of the churches of the Original Flint River had a grievance against them, and advised them that if they would adjust their differences they might then be received. To have received them, the way matters stood, would have been to set aside all the adjustment of the trouble that had existed so long and destroyed all the work of settlement that had been done. Elder Petty has written us some very ugly letters since that association, and we have not made any reply. He also wrote some very ugly letters to Elder Turnip-seed. In a letter to Elder Turnipseed dated Nov. 29, 1926, Elder Petty says, "It is strange that Brother * * * who told me and wrote me letters (I have the letters yet) * * * and later he worked around through you and Elders Cayce, Bartlett and others and got in with some of the disorderly churches that he found out that I wasn't willing to take into the peace meeting without a correction of their disorder, and made a trade with Elders * * * that you all would swallow the whole thing with all the disorder of four churches if they would combine with you to destroy me and church." Remember that Elder Petty claimed that the object of the peace meeting was to unite the two associations, or the two parties of the Flint River, and to get them all together. Here he says there were four churches he was not willing should be taken into the peace meeting. Those four churches were not in what we will designate as the Davis side, for he was there from his church to represent with them, as stated above. Where, then, were those four churches? Evidently they were four churches that were in the Original Flint River Association. Now what is the necessary conclusion? It cannot be otherwise than that he was engineering a plan to divide his own association. This statement from the brother in that letter plainly discloses

this fact. We are sorry this is true, but we are not responsible for it. We begged and plead with Brother Petty when we were there visiting those churches, but our pleadings did no good. There can be no course, then, for us to pursue only to remove his name from our staff of corresponding editors. We truly hope he may see the error of his way and confess his wrongs and become reconciled to the brethren. C. H. C.

Back on the Staff

---February 1, 1927

For several years the name of Elder H. B. Wilkinson, of Claxton, Ga., was on our staff of corresponding editors. In some way, and we do not know how, his name was dropped off the staff. While we were on our tour in South Georgia in November we were with Elder Wilkinson and talked with him in regard to this matter, and he consented for us to put his name back on the staff. We are glad to do this, for we esteem him very highly, and do not know how his name came to be left off. On the trip mentioned we visited Brother Wilkinson's home church, and other churches of his care, and enjoyed our stay with those good brethren. We were with a number of other brethren in the ministry for several days, and enjoyed their company, among them being Elder Bowen. We would have been glad to have written a short account of the trip, but other matters interfered so that we could not do so. We enjoyed the trip, and appreciate the kindness shown us, though we feel unworthy of it. May the Lord bless them, every one of them, we met and showed us such kindness. We hope we may meet them again some day-if not in this world of troubles and sorrows, then in a better world beyond. We ask each one of you to remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Should Report Them

---February 1, 1927

We are in receipt of a letter containing the following statement and question: "I live in a neighborhood where they are making and selling whisky all the time. I have young boys, and they give my boys the whisky to drink. Will it be wrong for anyone to tell the officers and let them catch them-or just let it be, and have our boys and girls ruined?" To us it seems that there can be but one answer-and that is, report them, if you know who to report. We would try, too, to teach our children the great wrong in having anything to do with such traffic, how it will bring shame and ruin upon them. But we certainly would report people who would give the stuff to our children; and we would certainly try to help the officers to catch them. And we would be much grieved to live in such a community, especially if we could find no other sort there for our children to associate with. It seems to us that our country is getting in a mighty bad way morally and otherwise. May the good Lord help us. C. H. C.

Claim They Are Not Excluded

---February 15, 1927

In our issue of January 1 is an article stating that C. Z. Hanks and others were excluded from South Fork Church in Texas. We have received an article in reply to that, in which they claim they are not excluded and that the church is divided, etc. Now, there we are. One side tells us they are excluded, and the other side tells us they are not excluded, and that it is a divided church over a question of order, and

so on. Now, then, the thing that worries us is this: What do brethren want to bother us with such things for? If a church is divided why will they send an article to us for publication stating it is an act of the church, and thus involve us with other brethren when such things are published-and such things as we have no way of knowing the true status of affairs? Why send us something for the paper that lugs into our columns your local troubles? It is unjust and unfair to us and unjust to the cause. If you love the cause more than you do your own personal ambition, keep these things at home, and do not send such things to us for publication as will call for a reply and endless trouble and confusion and disputes. C. H. C.

The Thing in the Way

---February 15, 1927

If Elders Newman and Fisher will agree to give up their works the last obstacle will have been removed, and lasting peace will be had, as far as the present issue is concerned. We could receive each one of their members upon their personal acknowledgments, and the union would then be peaceably effected. Otherwise there can never be had lasting peace between us.-E. C. M., in Glad Tidings, Jan. 28, 1927. From this it is to be clearly seen that Elder Mahurin's contention is that all the baptisms and ordinations that have been done by Elder Newman and the people he is in line with since they became separated from Elder Mahurin and those in line with him must be done over in order to a union with him and his people. Not only so, but each member in line with Elder Newman must make personal acknowledgments to them-to Elder Mahurin's churches. If that would not give somebody an endless job and an impossible task, we would like to know the reason why. It would extend from ocean to ocean and from the lakes to the gulf-that all must be baptized by the few who are in line with Elder Mahurin who have been baptized by any others except them since they separated from those in line with Elder Newman. We wonder if Elder Mahurin would like to have the job of looking up all those who have been baptized during these few years by others than those who are in line with him. We know that Elder Newman has been in Alabama, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, North Carolina and other states since the division in Texas. No doubt he has baptized some in some of these states. We have been in California and baptized some there and helped to organize some churches out there. Does Elder Mahurin want to go out there and get the consent of those people to re-organize those churches and to baptize those people again? If so, how would they know the work would be good after Elder Mahurin gets through with it? Elder Morgan would not accept it after Elder Mahurin does the work. We have also visited churches in Georgia-all the way to the Atlantic coast. We have been in meetings with some from Florida. We have also visited and preached for churches in Alabama, and we are in line with churches from the north to the south lines of the state. We have also been with brethren in Tennessee, and are in line with the churches in that state from the Mississippi River on the west to North Carolina on the east. The same in Kentucky. We are in direct correspondence with the Mountain Springs Association in Arkansas. The Mountain Springs is in correspondence with the Salem. These are in correspondence with others. Are they all in disorder? And will all of them have to find all the people they have baptized since Elder Mahurin and his people were separated from us and baptize them again? No, it would not do for us to do the work again, for that would not make it good. We would have to get Elder Mahurin to do the work for us. Then Elder Morgan would not accept it. When would we ever get the work done? And how could we know, or how could the

parties know, when they have valid baptism? Who shall we appoint as supreme judges over this matter who shall sit in judgment and tell us when the work has been well done, and from whose decision there can be no appeal? According to the contention of Elder Mahurin and those who hold his view, there is not a Baptist in the South or Southwest who has orderly baptism-no not in the whole United States. There is not a church in the South or Southwest but what descended from the old Kehukee Association in North Carolina. Trace the line and see where these churches all came from, and you will find this statement true. That association was formed of Regular and Separate Baptists. The Separate Baptists started as a split off from the Baptist Church in Boston, the Separates being favorable to the revival by Whitfield, an Episcopalian from England. About a year after they split off from the Baptist Church there they were formed into a church, and called themselves Separate Baptists to distinguish them from the others who stood as they were before the Whitfield revival. That is where the Separates started. When the proposition was made for a union of the Regulars and Separates in North Carolina to form the Kehukee Association, the Separates objected to the union on the ground that the Regulars had baptized some in unbelief, or some who were not regenerated. If the fact that the Separates were split off in the start from the regular church in Boston made baptism administered by them invalid, then they had no valid baptism and could not administer it. If the fact that the Regulars had baptized or immersed some who were unregenerate put them in such a state of disorder that the baptism administered by them would not be good, then they could not administer valid baptism to those who had been immersed before regeneration. So those people were without valid baptism- and who could give it to them? According to the contention of some brethren now, valid baptism was ended right then and there, and none of us have it now! But some might say that the Regulars cleaned up and put away that work. Yes; but if they did put it away, and immerse again those who had been immersed before regeneration, then the wrong work done did not make all the other work invalid. They did not re-immersing the others they had baptized during that time. Therefore, what they did in immersing people who were not regenerated did not make baptism invalid that was administered by them. But the Regulars and Separates united and formed the Kehukee Association. Now, Elder Mahurin contends that Elder Newman and those in line with him are an excluded party, a split off faction, and that he (Elder Mahurin) and those in line with him are the true church and in true order, and have the only right to administer valid baptism; and he also contends that if they unite with Elder Newman's party, then all would be in gross disorder and none of them would have the right to, or could, administer gospel baptism. If his contention be true, then when the Regulars united with the Separates and formed the Kehukee Association, they all lost their identity and all lost their right and authority to administer gospel baptism. As that is where all our churches in the South and Southwest sprang from, then none of us have any valid baptism. Now, pray tell us, how much will Elder Mahurin, or any other man, be benefitted by quarreling over something which he does not have, and which no man in the whole country has? In Virginia and perhaps in other sections there was a division years ago, and one faction is known as Clark Baptists and another as Beebe Baptists. The Beebe Baptists are classed as Absoluters. Elder Mahurin contends that their baptism is not valid. Those Baptists designated as Beebe Baptists have frequently visited and preached in the Kehukee and other associations in North Carolina, as well as in other states. So have the brethren who are classed as Clark Baptists visited the brethren in North Carolina and other states and preached among them. The Beebe Baptists are as far north as Maine. According to Elder Mahurin's contention they do not have valid baptism-so he cannot get valid baptism there. Then come on west through all the Northern states

and you will find where those churches came from. According to the contention of Elder Mahurin the "gates of hell" have prevailed, and the church of God is extinct- at least in the United States- and we wonder where he will find the church of God today. Brother Mahurin, where is the church? Tell us the country where you will find it, please. When you do this, please tell us upon what ground you say such is the church. Tell us, also, please, where they got their baptism; and please show by the proof that it is valid baptism, and not contaminated with what you are claiming is gross disorder. "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." -Rom. ii. 1. "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven: give, and it shall be given unto you: good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again." -[\(Luke 6:37-38\)](#).
C. H. C.

The Dallas Meeting

---March 1, 1927

We left home Monday afternoon, Feb. 21, at 6 o'clock, for Dallas, Texas, arriving there Tuesday morning at 5:42. Elder John R. Harris got on the train at Thornton, Ark., and went with us. We were met at the station by Dr. W. W. Fowler, the editor of the Glad Tidings, who conveyed us to his home, where we remained until time to go to the place of meeting. A large number of brethren and sisters were in attendance at the meeting, which continued two days, Tuesday and Wednesday, Feb. 22, 23, and closed Wednesday night- that is, the preaching part of it closed then, the business part having closed that afternoon. Several discourses were delivered during the meeting. We did not get to hear all the preaching, as we were appointed with other brethren to serve on a committee appointed to draw up recommendations for the divided factions to endeavor to come together on. Twelve were appointed to serve on this committee. The following was drawn up by the committee and unanimously adopted by them for recommendation to the divided brethren and churches:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE We, your committee, realizing and recognizing the fact that in the unholy war which brought about the present condition of affairs and division among us, both in and between churches and associations, that there were irregularities, hasty actions taken, and wrong things done and said on both sides; and in view of the fact that it has been the practice of our people all along in the past in cases of divisions, for them to mutually confess their wrongs and to come together in peace- we therefore recommend that in this present division, either in churches or associations, those of them who desire peace and union to be restored, mutually confess all errors, wrongs and mistakes, and mutually forgive each other, and agree to bury the past in oblivion, and come together in peace and fellowship, recognizing each other's official work and endeavor to strive for the things that make for peace. Further, we recommend that if some churches are divided and they cannot agree to come together on the foregoing recommendation without special and particular investigation of their local condition, then we recommend that the two factions agree between themselves to call for a committee of brethren from outside the state, and who are not direct parties to the division in the state, to come and hear the evidence on both sides and recommend to them how they may adjust their differences and get together.

We further recommend that where parties have been excluded for immoral practice and received on confession of faith, that such parties should be required to go back to the church where they were withdrawn from and make satisfaction there for restoration. But a reconciliation of our people and their coming together is necessary first in order to an adjustment of irregularities of this kind. How-beit, nothing contained herein shall be construed as recommending the recognition of the official work of a church which has officially departed from a fundamental point of doctrine or practice and has been Scripturally dropped by orderly churches therefor.

Respectfully submitted,

Elders J. W. Herriage, H. G. Richards, S. B. KUYKENDALL, R. E. Wilson, J. A. Moore, J. S. Newman, Marion West, L. J. McCarty, Leon H. Clevenger, Jno. R. Harris, T. L. Webb, C. H. Cayce, Committee.

After the foregoing recommendations were unanimously voted for by the committee the same was read in open meeting and approved by all who voted. There were a few who did not vote, but not a messenger from a church voted against the approval, and no one seated in the meeting voted in opposition. Then a good old song was sung and the right hand extended amid shouts of praise to the Lord, brethren embracing each other, and tears of joy were shed. It was a wonderful meeting, and we believe much good will result. We feel that the brethren will now begin coming together and affiliating with each other. If they will visit this country we will gladly make appointments for them, and we are sure our churches will gladly receive them—we mean those who were at that meeting and endorse those recommendations and who will conform to the same. May the good Lord continue to work in the hearts of His dear people to labor for peace and for the union of our poor and divided people. We do not deem it necessary to publish the minutes of the entire meeting. The whole thing, including all that was said in the meeting, is to be published in pamphlet form, as a stenographer was employed to take all that was said. If any reader feels like helping to pay some of the expense of that stenographer, send your contribution to Dr. W. W. Fowler, 503 Medical Arts Building, Dallas, Tex., or to Elder J. L. Collings, Glen Rose, Texas, or to us, and we will send it to them. Or, if you will take some of the pamphlets when they are printed, write to either of the names given and say how many you will take. It is not known yet what the price will be, but a price will be put on them to just cover the cost if all are sold. We trust our readers will get some of them and circulate them among the brethren generally. C. H. C.

Wild Gourds

---March 15, 1927

Dear Brother Cayce:

I want to get your views on two verses of Scripture- (Jeremiah 26:3); (36:3). They both reveal to my understanding the purpose of God is not predestination. I will quote it: "If so be they will hearken, and turn every man from his evil way, that I may repent me of the evil which I purpose to do unto them, because of the evil of their doings." - (Jeremiah 26:3). "It may be that the house of Judah will hear all the evil which I purpose to do unto them, that they may return every man from his evil way, that I may forgive their iniquity and their sin." - (Jeremiah 36:3). It was the purpose of God to destroy Nineveh in forty days (Jonah). I know it says, in **((24) (Isaiah 14:24)** "The Lord of hosts hath sworn, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand." Summing these Scriptures I have called, the purpose of God is not predestination.

That word is not in the Bible. Predestinated is in there two times-(Ephesians 1:5,11). The word predestinate is in there two times-((9) (Romans 8:29-30). The word predestination is an English word. The predestination of God is the righteousness of God, by grace in Jesus Christ for His people. "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."-(II Timothy 1:9). Predestination of God has no reference to sin and wickedness whatever. Absolute predestination of all things is not Bible doctrine; but it is wild gourds from a wild vine of wickedness -not from the fruitful vine of righteousness, which is Jesus Christ. If this is not published in your paper it will not hurt my feelings, but write me your views on these Scriptures. From your unworthy brother in Christ, Elder J. B. Johnson. Sword's Creek, Va.

As we understand the meaning of the words there is little difference between purpose and predestination. To purpose to do a thing is to determine to do that thing before it is done. To predestinate a thing is to pre-determine that thing, or to determine the thing beforehand. So we see but little difference. In the Scriptures cited God purposed to punish those people for their wickedness. In **(Jeremiah 26:12,15)**, we have this language," The Lord sent me to prophesy against this house and against this city all the words that ye have heard. Therefore now amend your ways and your doings, and obey the voice of the Lord your God; and the Lord will repent Him of the evil that He hath pronounced against you." He continues in (Jeremiah 26:14-15), "As for me, behold, I am in your hand: do with me as seemeth good and meet unto you. But know ye for certain, that if ye put me to death, ye shall surely bring innocent blood upon yourselves, and upon this city, and upon the inhabitants thereof: for of a truth the Lord hath sent me unto you to speak all these words in your ears." Some of the priests and some of the Israelites did not believe what the prophet had spoken, and they threatened his life because he thus prophesied unto them. His prophecy was that the Lord had purposed to punish them for their wickedness and for their transgressions, but that if they would repent and turn from their transgressions and sins the Lord would not visit that punishment upon them. This was the teaching of the Prophet Jeremiah unto Israel, and national Israel was a type of spiritual Israel. Just as some of the priests and people of Israel then would put the prophet to death for thus prophesying, so some preachers and people today would put the Lord's true ministers to death for preaching the same doctrine. Those blessings and punishments for national Israel were natural or temporal. To spiritual Israel those blessings and punishments are spiritual and are experienced by them here in this life, or in the gospel Canaan, which is the church. This does not make God changeable, for it is His law. His law promises blessings in obedience and punishment for disobedience. God has so purposed, and He brings it to pass. He has purposed to chastise His children for their transgressions and disobedience. In **((9:26) (Psalms 89:26-36)** David tells something of the Lord's promise concerning Christ and His children. He says, "He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make Him my firstborn, higher than the kings of earth. My mercy will I keep for Him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with Him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and His throne as the days of heaven. If His children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from Him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David (which is Christ). His seed shall endure forever, and His throne

as the sun before me." Here is the declaration of the purpose of God to chastise His children if, they transgress His law; yet He has sworn to His Son that they-His children-shall endure, or live, forever. As He has sworn that they shall live forever, then the chastisement or punishment is not eternal, but is to be visited upon them here in this life, or in this world, and not in the next world. In this connection read the entire ((8:1) (Ezekiel 18). This doctrine that the Lord's people may enjoy blessings in obedience that they do not enjoy in disobedience, and are punished and chastised here in this life for their wrong doing, is a doctrine that God Himself has set forth, no matter how much it may be despised by some of the emissaries of Satan. C. H. C.

A Correction

---March 15, 1927

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother in Hope-I read in your last paper, The Primitive Baptist, a piece written by Elder N. J. Hinson, telling of his tour in Virginia and North Carolina. He says they are passing through a great war with the Absoluters. He also says it is useless for anyone to claim that the trouble in that country is the result of the so-called disorder of Elder Wilson. Elder Hinson only visited five churches out of twenty-six here in the Bear Creek Association. Surely it is unreasonable for him to know the sentiment of the people in our association-I suppose twenty-one churches here that he never visited. I have been living in this association most sixteen years. I have never heard one of our members, much less our preachers, advocate such doctrine. Our people have been accused of it, but it is untrue. Our association passed an act several years ago not to allow the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things preached in our stand, and they have never departed from that act. If any man or preacher comes to our association advocating the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things, or any other new doctrine, I have no idea they would be seated. Our preachers are all sound in doctrine. We have never had any trouble in this association from our people preaching or believing any new doctrine, neither do they use any of those extreme expressions. No use for anyone to misrepresent us. Most of the brethren in our association want peace, like we once had, and are striving to that end. May the Lord continue to bless us in our efforts for peace, and may our good brethren here ever be found contending for the true principles as taught in the Bible, and that we may be careful always to tell the truth and never misrepresent any of God's little children. Brother Cayce, pray for us, that we may have sweet union among us again, and soon get rid of so much disorder and misrepresenting one another. That is no way for God's little children to live. Mrs. W. C. Edwards. Please publish this in The Primitive Baptist so that the people may see that some of us here have been misrepresented.

REMARKS

If our readers will get the paper for January 1st and read the article again from Elder Hinson they will see very clearly that what he said about the trouble in Virginia and North Carolina was not said with direct reference to any division or trouble in the Bear Creek Association, but that he was speaking about the trouble there in a general way and what gave rise to it. The trouble around Danville did originate over doctrine, and the Danville people said so themselves, as has already been published. In fact, they so published in a statement they sent out. What about Elder T. M. Stanley, who was once in the Bear Creek Association? Did he not advocate the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things? Is not this same

Elder Stanley now in line with the party of Danville Church who claim they excluded Elder Wilson? Are they not all in line with the Lone Pilgrim and the doctrine advocated in that paper? If some of the Bear Creek Association do not believe that doctrine, will they line up with it? Will you stand with such a doctrine, when you do not believe it? We are sure there are good Baptists in the Bear Creek Association who do not believe that doctrine, and we hope they will not line up with it. C. H. C.

Paying the Preacher

---May 1, 1927

It seems to us that Sister Hester fails to understand one point mentioned in her letter above-in regard to paying the preacher, "then who shall pay the members who go a distance?" Whether the members are near to the church or far from it, they call the preacher to serve them. They desire the preacher "to go a warfare" for them. They want him to fight for the truth for them; to fight for the principles of doctrine they hold to. The apostle asks the question, "Who goeth a warfare at his own charges?" When our boys went across the waters to fight the German army, they had to forsake all they had and go. But they did not go at their own charges. The government furnished them food and clothing, and some provisions have been made for those dependent upon them. The apostle uses this to show us how we should care for our soldiers who fight for us under the banner of Prince Immanuel. It was God's way under the law that the Israelites should care for, take care of, the prophets whom the Lord sent to them and for them. They did not always do it. At one time Elijah had to flee for his life; but God sent him food by the ravens. If the prophet had been cared for as God commanded, the food would have been supplied by Israel instead of the ravens. We need men in the ministry who are willing to make sacrifices and who are willing to endure hardness; and then we need members in the church who are willing to care for them as the Lord directs. May the Lord help us all to discharge our every duty. C. H. C.

John's Baptism and the Communion

---June 15, 1927

We received from Friend Tom Dyer, Dresden, Tenn., a request for our views on a question put this way by him: "When John was baptizing before Christ came, what was that baptizing for? The reason I ask is that John baptized before Christ came, and we baptize after we have received the gift of God." He also asks for Bible reason for close communion. John baptized to make ready a people prepared for the Lord. John did not prepare the people, but made them ready. He baptized none only those who gave evidence of a true repentance. Some demanded baptism of him who did not give such evidence and he refused to baptize them. He made the people ready by baptizing them. They were ready for the gospel kingdom, or the church. The Lord established His church after He had also been baptized by John. He established the church of persons John had baptized. John baptized people who had been born of God, and so do we. The church is composed of baptized believers, and that is the kind of material the Lord used in establishing His church. As to the communion. That is an ordinance in the church-not out of it. To have a right at the Lord's table in His kingdom, one must first come into that kingdom. He must first become a member of the church and first be baptized, in order to have a right to the Lord's table. For the baptism to be true baptism it must be administered by the authority of a true gospel church, for the ordinances were delivered to the church by the apostles for her keeping. Those who had been

baptized were the ones who broke bread, in the days of the apostles. See **((2) (Acts 2:42))**. If the Primitive Baptist Church is the church of Christ (and it is) then other orders do not have the authority to administer baptism. As those people have not been baptized, then they have no right to the Lord's table, which is in His kingdom-the Old Baptist Church-and we have no right to take it outside and give it to them. We make these few brief remarks trusting they may be some benefit to the brother making the request. C. H. C.

Missionaries Do Harm in China

---June 15, 1927

Those who are engaging so much in the foreign missionary enterprise, claiming that if they only had money enough they would soon be able to take the world for Christ, have put out a lot of glowing reports of the great work they have accomplished in China. They have also occasionally made great reports of wonderful accomplishments in other countries. If we were to judge from some of the things they have written we would think that China was ready to come bodily over from their heathen doctrines and to embrace Christianity, or right on the verge of doing so. Somebody gets a good fat "rake-off" in this mission business, and deludes the people, and thereby gets gain. Occasionally some person tells the truth about these missionary operations. Such persons are those who have no ax to grind and no financial loss to sustain by telling the truth-and so they "let the cat out of the bag." In Martin, Tenn., the town where we formerly lived, is published a newspaper called the Weakley County Press. We get the paper. In the issue of that paper of May 6, 1927, is a letter from Lieutenant John Ford Luten, a former Martin boy, and whom we knew in his boyhood days. He is with the Medical Corps of the U. S. Marines, and is on active duty in the war zone in China. On March 23 he wrote a letter to his grandfather and grandmother, Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Hutcherson, of Martin. This letter is published in the Press. Lieutenant Luten says that the missionaries actually do harm in China instead of good. For the benefit of our readers we copy the letter from the Press in full. Read it, and get some of the missionary fanatics to read it too, if you can. It may do some of the poor deluded people some good. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE AND LETTER

The following letter was written by Lieutenant John Ford Luten, a former Martin boy, to his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Hutcherson, of Martin. Lieutenant Luten is connected with the Medical Corps of the Marines and is on active duty in the Chinese war zone. The letter will give an insight to real conditions as they now exist in China: Ichang, China, March 23, 1927.

Dear Grandpa and Grandma:

I am sorry to hear that you have not been receiving any communication from me but I have been writing more or less consistently. You must stop and realize that I am over one thousand miles inland on the Yangtze River, that a state of war exists, and that most of our mail is brought by gunboats, which are few and far between. People in America cannot fully appreciate the terrible state of affairs at the present time, and cannot understand the insults and abuses the white race are forced to endure from these Chinese swine. They are the most dirty, filthy, contemptible, lying form of animal ever put in the form of man. I cannot understand why an intelligent and educated race would spend their money and exhaust their efforts in trying to convert Chinese to our way of thinking, when the money could far better be spent at home for moral uplift and welfare of our own nation. The missionaries out here have not reported the truth to the American public, which is laboring

under the greatest of all delusions. They have not accomplished one bit of good; in fact, have made matters worse. An oriental mind works exactly opposite from the occidental mind. They take what they can gain by western ideas and use it for their own gain, then they turn like a rattlesnake and strike the helping hand. A Chinaman is the most unappreciative person in the world. He thinks that kindness merely shows weakness, and he takes advantage of it. I will refer you to two books which will give you an insight into conditions in China and Chinese character, one by Rodney Gilbert, "What's Wrong With China," the other by Jay Denby, "Letters of a Shanghai Griffin." It's high time that the American public should be accurately and truthfully informed about existing conditions in China, and retaliate for the insults to American citizens and our flag. We should be feared and respected, rather than looked upon as a weak and cringing race, as the Chinese see us. Enough for the China question, but get these two books and tell your friends the truth as I have told you. My wife could hardly write, as she has been forced to evacuate Ichang and is at present in Shanghai, which is over one thousand miles away. We are forced to live aboard ship and cannot get down river until the water rises, as our ship draws too much water. We are expecting the balloon to go up any minute and will eventually have to fight our way down. Only a few weeks ago I was on my way to the hospital ashore to treat some of these down-trodden Chinese (down-trodden-hell!) and I was attacked by a mob of Chinese coolies just for the simple reason that I was a foreigner. I stood my ground and fought, but little chance did I have. It ended by an armed guard from the ship attacking and driving back the mob with bayonets after my uniform had been almost completely torn off and I was bruised and cut. After the commanding officer threatened to shell the city an official apology was sent over by the Chinese authorities with regret. Anyone can write apologies every day. This is only one of the numerous incidents that have occurred and always followed by an apology, the officials themselves instigating and ordering the coolies to make open attacks on foreigners. If the people in the United States could only know the truth of the whole situation. Lieut. Jno. Ford Lutten, M. C. U. S. S. El Cano.

Jesus and His Friends

---August 1, 1927

We received a copy of a Sunday school leaflet, "Beginners' Bible Stories," published by the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, the title of the story in this leaflet being "Jesus and His Friends." In order that the reader may see for himself just what these money-hunters and proselyters will resort to we copy the story in full: Jesus and some of His friends were going to eat supper together. Two of His friends, Peter and John, had gone ahead of the others to see that everything was ready. The supper was to be in a large room upstairs. Everything was just as it ought to be—a large table with seats all around it. There was nice, cool water for bathing their feet, for the streets were so dusty. They always liked to take off their sandals and bathe their tired feet before eating. Peter and John heard the others coming up the stairs, step-step-step. When they entered the room, Jesus looked around. No one offered to bathe their feet, and there was no servant there to do it. Jesus' feet were so tired, and He wanted the dust washed off of them. He was sorry His friends had not thought of showing their love by doing it. They had the nicest seat of all for Jesus. Jesus sat down, but His friends all wanted the seats next to Him. They quarreled about it. One said: "I'm older than you, and I think I ought to sit next to Jesus." Another one said: "Well, I've known Jesus longer than you have, so I think

I ought to sit by Him." Jesus was so sorry they were quarreling about sitting next to Him at the table. He wanted to teach them the best way to show their love. He got up, took off His coat, and put a towel around His waist. Then He poured some cool water in a basin and commenced bathing the feet of His friends. They looked at each other—they were so sorry they had not thought to wash each other's feet. How they wished they had bathed Jesus' tired feet, instead of trying to sit by Him! Peter felt ashamed, and said: "Jesus, you must not do this for me." But Jesus looked at him and said, "It is because I love you, that I want to show you how to help." So Jesus went around the table, and bathed their feet, and wiped them with the towel He had put around Him. When He had finished, He put away the basin of water and the towel, and put on His coat and sat down at the table. Then He looked at His friends and said, "The way to show your love is by helping people." Jesus' friends never forgot how He showed them how to help, and after that they tried to show their love to people by helping them. We confess that we do not remember to have ever read more falsehood and a more glaring, bold, bald-faced misrepresentation of facts than is contained in the foregoing. And that, too, under the pretext of teaching the children how to be Christians, how to follow the Lord, and how to attain to the glory world. This Sunday school leaflet of falsehoods sets forth the idea that Jesus washed the feet of His friends before the eating of the supper, and John plainly says that "supper being ended." The leaflet says that seats were all around the table. How do they know that? How do they know Peter and John heard the others coming up the stairs? How do they know the disciples quarreled about who should sit next to Jesus? Not a word that we remember about that in the Book. It is only a falsehood of the whole cloth of their own making. And what they say some of the disciples said, "I am older than you," and "I have known Him longer than you have." This is simply manufactured by these bigots and drawn from their own vain imagination. And "they were so sorry they had not thought to wash each other's feet." How did the writer find that out? Peter did not know what the Lord was doing— did not know why He washed their feet; did not know the meaning of it. If it had been because their feet were dusty and they usually washed their feet before eating supper, Peter would have known—or else he was an idiot. Was he an idiot? No. Hence it was not as this set of humbugs teach in this little Sunday school leaflet. "Peter felt ashamed, and said: 'Jesus, you must not do this for me.'" No such thing was said, and these publishers and the writers knew better. None of the things these folks say were said can be found in the Book. It is simply a plain case of garbling, misrepresenting, and telling of falsehoods in order to get the lesson they propose to teach, and to evade and deny what is plainly put down in God's word. And such as this carried on in the name of Christianity and under the hypocritical pretext of helping to save souls. May the good Lord deliver us from such a blasphemous set of pretenders. C. H. C.

Whale Swallowed Jonah

---August 15, 1927

The idea which men have advanced that a whale could not swallow a man is a mistake. Perhaps many of them could not. But when we were in California we saw the skeleton of a whale at Long Beach, which we are sure could have swallowed a man. That whale came ashore at the foot of Almatos Ave., May 20, 1897, and was captured there. It was a species of the Giant Blue, and was sixty-four feet long and weighed sixty tons-120,000 pounds. Its collar bone was nearly four feet across, and the swallow was between six and eight inches in diameter, without stretching. There is still another species of whale that has a still larger swallow than this, and

yet this one had a swallow large enough to take a man in. Yet, it is true the Bible says, "The Lord prepared a great fish." Jonah learned a lesson in that whale which many of the Lord's people have to learn-especially those the Lord puts in the ministry. Many of them take a course in "whale college," and learn the lesson Jonah learned. Then sometimes they go back to that college and take a "post graduate" course. It seems they have to learn the lesson over and over, sometimes. C. H. C.

Published by Request

---August 15, 1927

Dear Brother Cayce: I think that your mind to refrain from strife and contention so far as in you lieth is good, for it is not contending earnestly for the faith delivered once to the saints. So you are right in suppressing all matters which in your judgment lack the word "earnestly." I appreciate the good brotherly spirit in which you have written, although some of it has not as yet been shown me in what I hope is a Christian experience, as you present it. However, if we can enjoy the same spirit, I hope we may not fall out over the diversity of operations. I do not believe that the children of God while here in the flesh on earth will, any two of them or more, ever see wholly or entirely eye to eye, for to such charity or forbearance would mean nothing. I had such a severe trial being rid of the law and my own works, which I once trusted in as good enough to secure salvation for me, that I may have gone to an extreme in crying "grace, grace unto it." I feel like your letter is worth a place in The Primitive Baptist and return it for your disposal. I am, I hope, yours in the things that make for peace and the things wherewith one may edify another. Yours in hope of eternal life, Everett R. Kinney.

THE LETTER

E. R. Kinney:

Dear Brother-Pressure of important letters, preparing manuscript for the paper, filling appointments, and such things have kept me from answering your appreciated letter of March 16 until now. I would be glad to see you and talk with you face to face, or that I had time to write a long letter, but will content myself as best I can with what little I may have the time to write hurriedly just now. I presume the debates you mention reading-at least one of them-is a debate which I was engaged in. Permit me to say, though, that I have quit debating, and may never have another. But I never engaged in one except by request of an Old Baptist Church, such requests having been made by the church in conference. It is not the expectation to reach or to benefit the man we debate with, but some hearer who may be an honest seeker after truth. He hears the truth preached that way, in comparison with the error, and thus the truth shines the brighter. I have seen persons come to the church and ask for a home who said they were convinced by hearing debates. It is true, though, that men sometimes do not conduct such debates in the right spirit. But there is one thing in which I think you do not rightly understand our people who hold to what is termed by some as conditional or time salvation. I gather from your letter you think they have an idea that they direct their own steps. I think you do not understand them on this. They do not think it is in them to direct their own steps. "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." The parent directs the steps of the child, but the child does not always follow the direction. The Lord directs the steps of His children, but His children sometimes rebel and do not walk as the Lord directs. Apply this to your own experience, and I am sure that you will confess that you have sometimes felt remorse of conscience that you did not do what you felt the Lord had directed you

to do. In fact, you have said just that much in telling me you had said things unkindly, or about that-retaliating in kind, following the fleshly inclinations. It is the man that does the walking. If he walks as God directs, he walks right, does right. If he walks after the flesh, the fleshly lusts, he walks wrong. When those churches "fit and fit until they fit themselves out," it was on account of their wrong doing that they went out-the result of their own wrongs. Of course if they had not "fit and fit" they would not have "fit themselves out," and would have continued to exist and to enjoy the smiles of the Lord. Their destruction was the result of their own wrongs; as you rightly say, too, this is always the case, whether "absoluters" or "limited predestinarians." Strife among brethren results in death and desolation in the church.' What a pity that brethren will engage in such. For myself I would that they would cease. I prefer that these unholy discussions be kept out of my paper. It is hard to do that. If I allow something to slip in that favors what some do not like, it is likely to bring a reply, and some will think hard of me if I do not allow the reply in the paper, and if I do allow it, then some on the other side think I have not treated them right-and so there it goes. After calling this fact to mind, and carefully thinking over the matter, and I trust, trying to pray over it, I have thought it might not be best for the cause to publish the letters I wrote to ask your permission to publish, which Brother Parker sent to me. I feel sure that the unholy war they are having now in Virginia and North Carolina is wrong, and I believe the time will come when the brethren will be sorry for it-perhaps after many who are leaders in it are gone. The coming generation will see the evil of it and the devastation wrought by it. They may have some of the kind of meetings we have been having in some portions of the south and west called peace meetings, in which the brethren are trying to get together who were divided years ago. In some of those wars I was a helper, and I am sorry of it now. I want to try to get out of such work if possible and do nothing to help in a strife. Have I come to the right conclusion that it is best to publish no more than what seems absolutely necessary in regard to the war they are having over in Virginia and North Carolina? Be candid with me. (Yes, indeed I think so.-Kinney.)

Now in regard to visiting this country. We have a little church in North Little Rock. They hold the unworthy writer as pastor. When I am not away on a tour I try to be with them on the third Sunday in the month and Saturday afternoon before. They are few in number, but they love the truth as we understand the Bible to teach, and they rejoice in and love the glorious doctrine of salvation by grace, and that we should honor the Lord by a godly walk and pious conversation-that we should honor Him who has called us out of darkness into light. We also have a little band here in Fordyce. The regular meeting time is the second Sunday and Saturday before in each month. My humble little home is on an adjoining lot to the church. We would gladly welcome you to our home and at our church here in Fordyce or at Little Rock. Assuring you of the fact that you have my Christian love and fellowship, and asking an interest in your prayers, I remain, Yours in humble hope, C. H. Cayce.

Wine Used in Sacrament

---August 15, 1927

Brother Thomas J. Braswell, Winter Garden, Fla., asks us if the Lord used wine in the institution of the sacramental supper, or did He use grape juice. When the element that is used to represent the blood of the Saviour is mentioned in the New Testament it is called the fruit of the vine. It should be remembered that the Lord instituted the sacramental supper at the time of the eating of the last passover supper with His disciples. Grape juice was not used in the passover supper. Wine

was used in that supper. Wine is the fermented juice of the grape. Grape juice has to be adulterated to keep it from fermenting. It is a flagrant violation to use adulterated things in any service of God. Unfermented juice cannot, in any way, typify the agony of the Lord. Fermented juice would fittingly typify His agony. In the passover unleavened bread and wine were used. These things were the substance of the passover. Without them the passover supper was worthless. Other articles might be omitted from that supper without question, but if the bread or the wine were omitted, the supper was valueless. The Lord took the substance of the supper-the unleavened bread and the wine-and instituted the sacramental supper. * As these things were the articles He used, it would be the height of presumption to substitute something else. We simply would not administer the communion when grape juice is used instead of wine, nor would we engage in that service when such substitute is used. C. H. C.

Romans 9:13

---August 15, 1927

Brother H. D. S. Helton, Valeria, Ky., requests our views of **(Romans 9:13)**, which reads, "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." In order to see what led up to this statement by the apostle in quoting from the language of prophecy it is necessary to read a few verses, beginning with verse 7, "Neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. For this is the word of promise. At this time will I come and Sarah shall have a son. And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even, by our father Isaac; (for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth:) it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." We find in **(Genesis 25:23)** that before Jacob and Esau were born the Lord said to Rebecca concerning them, "The elder shall serve the younger." This only shows God's choice of them before they were born, and the choice could not, therefore, have been made because of any good done by Jacob or evil done by Esau. God's choice manifests His love. Hence, God loved Jacob and hated Esau before they were born, and made choice of one (Jacob) and bestowed the blessing upon him, and passed Esau by. Paul explains this in verse 11, "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth." For this reason it was said unto Rebecca, "The elder shall serve the younger." Why should the elder serve the younger? Because God had made choice of Jacob. Why did God make choice of Jacob? Because He loved him. God's choice of a poor sinner is a manifestation of His everlasting love. His love is everlasting. It is unchangeable. It is always the same. Nothing can separate one from it. There is much in this, but we do not have time now to write more. May the Lord bless this to the good of the readers. C. H. C.

Trip in Alabama

---September 15, 1927

May 26th we (Elder Cayce, the children and I) started to Alabama in our car. We arrived at Vina, Ala., Friday night at eight thirty. We went to the home of Sister Josie Duckett. She did not know we were coming, but made us feel welcome. We

enjoyed being in her home. Saturday we went to Brownsboro, Ala., to my parents, B. B. Lawler's. Monday night Elder J. J. Turnipseed came to go with us. Monday night Elder H. P. Houk and daughter came over. Before they left, papa called us around the family altar, and after singing and prayer, Brother Turnipseed talked a few minutes. 'Twas good to be at dear old home. Papa, mama, many of my sisters, brothers and their families were around the family altar one more time. I thank God for such noble, dear Old Baptist parents. Tuesday, we left the children with mama, and Elder Turnipseed, Claudis, the baby (William Hartsel), and I went to Decatur, Ala. Had services there Tuesday and Wednesday nights. One dear sister joined by experience Wednesday night. Thursday morning we went to Birmingham to the home of Elder Turnipseed. Many Baptists came in and we had an enjoyable evening. Friday morning Elder and Sister Turnipseed went with us to Ozark, Ala., to the home of Brother Byrd, a good Old Baptist home. We spent two weeks among the Baptists in that section. I failed to keep a record of the homes we visited, and do not remember the names of all. I am still feasting on the good time I had while with those dear people. They were all strangers to me when I left home, but when I met them I felt that we belonged to the same family. Elder Turnipseed and Claudis did some wonderful preaching. I felt that it was indeed good to be there. We left Ozark June 12th for Montgomery. Spent Sunday night with Brother Turnipseed's son in town. Monday we went to Birmingham to the home of Brother Turnipseed. Tuesday morning Brother Turnipseed was called to the bedside of Brother Harden. We were with Sister Turnipseed until Thursday evening. Thursday night we stayed with Elder Parker. Friday morning Elder Parker went with us into the Mount Zion Association. We visited in this association until June 22nd. Elder Yancey's daughter joined while we were there. Claudis baptized her the first Sunday in July. From here we went to Woodville, Ala., and were at old Union Church June 23rd and 24th. Then we went back to Brownsboro to mama's and to our children. Words fail to express my feelings. If I could only tell what I felt and how I felt on this trip, I would. I shall never forget the heavenly feasts and the noble Baptists that we met. Sister Turnipseed is a fine traveling companion and a wonderful Baptist. I enjoyed being with her so much. Many asked that I write them when I got home. You see from this that I can't, but I trust that you will cast the mantle of charity over my many imperfections, and that each one will take this as a personal note to you. I desire to be remembered in your prayers. I feel to need the prayers of the righteous. May the good Lord graciously bless each one, is my prayer. Yours in hope, Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

Our Trip in Texas

---October 15, 1927

We left home on Wednesday afternoon at 6 o'clock, August 3, to fill the appointments which had been arranged for us in Texas by Elders J. H. Fisher, L. J. McCarty and others. We arrived in Abilene Thursday afternoon at 4, and filled the first appointment there that night. Several brethren met us at the train, one of them being Elder Fisher. From there we went to the West Providence Association, which convened on Friday about sixteen miles from Abilene. It was a great meeting. The home ministers of the association are Elders J. F. Richardson, Robert Lee, Texas, who is the good and highly esteemed moderator; J. W. West, J. B. Owens, W. L. Barrett, R. B. Hester and J. J. Edwards. They were all present. Brother J. W. Hendrickson, McCauley, Texas, is the efficient clerk. The following visiting ministers were present: Elders J. H. Fisher, Newcastle; J. N. Hudson,

Houston; C. J. L. Bolinger, Cone; Joel Meece, Kirkland; L. N. Barrow, Houston; O. Strickland, Munday; J. H. Alldridge, Lubbock; J. G. Grant, Hico; J. L. Collings, Glen Rose; L. J. McCarty, Hart; J. C. Foster, Atwell; Licentiate W. L. Jackson, Burkett; all of Texas; and C. H. Cayce, of Fordyce, Ark. There were eighteen additions to the church during the meeting, and we think sixteen of them were by experience and baptism. We could not find language to express the sweetness and the joy of the meeting. It will be long remembered by many who were there. From the West Providence Association filled appointments at the following places: Anson, Sunday night; White Pond, Monday night; Roby, Tuesday; Snyder, Wednesday and Thursday; Crosbyton, Saturday and Sunday; Lakeview, Monday; Cottonwood, Tuesday; Grow, Tuesday night; Little Flock, near Munday, Wednesday; Mt. Zion, near Graham, Thursday. Good congregations were present at each place, and the meetings were all pleasant, and good interest seemed to be manifested at every meeting. From Mt. Zion Church we went to Dublin, in company with Elder Fisher and Elder McCarty and wife, to attend the Duffau Association, Friday, Saturday and Sunday. The following named ministers were present: Elders L. J. McCarty, J. R. Richardson, W. R. Blackmon, Martin Stone, J. H. Fisher, W. F. Baker, J. S. Newman, J. N. Hudson, C. J. Holcomb, J. L. Collings, J. M. Dowell, M. Hardwick, J. G. Grant, B. J. Driver, A. B. Chambers, W. J. Chambers, J. E. Senter, J. J. Edwards, J. E. Roberts, J. F. Perkins, W. Y. Norman, J. C. Foster and the writer. If we remember correctly, Elder J. J. Edwards is the able moderator and A. H. Roden is the efficient clerk. There were five additions to the church during this meeting. This was another enjoyable association, and a large crowd in attendance. It will be long remembered by many who were there. At this meeting we met some brethren and sisters whom we knew in old Mississippi when we were just a boy. It was a great pleasure to us to meet them once more. After the Duffau Association we filled appointments at Tuscola, Loraine and Coahoma. There were good, congregations and good interest at each place. Then we went to the West Texas Association at Tahoka, Friday, Saturday and fourth Sunday in August. The following ministers were present: Elders J. S. Newman, J. H. Fisher, O. Strickland, J. B. Owens, J. W. West, L. N. Barrow, J. C. Lewis, J. N. Hudson, Franklin Baker, L. J. McCarty, J. C. Foster, F. M. Griffin, J. I. Colwell, R. B. Hester, C. H. Cayce, C. J. L. Bolinger; Licentiates W. L. Jackson, G. C. Miller, S. J. Ellis, Harrell Boyce, Oscar Moyers, W. C. Cleveland, Otis Richardson, W. L. Bolinger and J. W. Huey. During this meeting there were twenty-six additions to the church, twenty-two of them by experience and baptism. To say that it was a good meeting does not fittingly describe it. It was all of that, and more. We cannot find words to describe the joy of it. We do not think we shall forget it while memory lasts. On Monday and Tuesday following we filled appointments at Tulia, where we had another sweet meeting. There were three additions to this church by experience and baptism. Elder L. J. McCarty is the able pastor of this church, as well as at Tahoka, and he is loved and held in high esteem by his brethren. He is also the moderator of the association, and Elder Bolinger is the clerk. Elder McCarty was with us from the Duffau Association, and conveyed us all the way around. It was delightful to us to be in company with him. The more we were with him the more we loved him, and we so much hated to part when the time came for us to leave Tulia. We left there Tuesday evening and went to Amarillo, where we had to lie over until 4:30 Wednesday morning. We left there at about that time and arrived in Little Rock Thursday morning at 2:35, where we were met by our wife and children, who drove up there Wednesday afternoon. We went to the home of Mr. and Sister Rewis and got a little rest. Elder Jacob Sandage met us there Thursday morning, and we all drove to Rushing and attended the Mountain Springs Association. We failed to get a list of the ministers present. It was a good meeting, and the good Lord surely was in the place. After the Mountain

Springs Association closed on Sunday we drove back to Little Rock and Elder Sandage preached there that night. Monday we returned home, with our family. We were sure glad to meet them on Thursday morning at Little Rock, having been gone from them so long, and we were all glad to get home once more on Monday evening. Then on Thursday evening before the second Sunday in September we drove over to Donaldson with our family and spent part of the night with Brother W. H. Fuller, and on Friday morning early we drove from there to the Salem Association, about eighteen miles west of Danville, Ark., in company with Brother and Sister Fuller and Sister Ragan, of Donaldson. We failed to get a list of the ministers in attendance at this meeting; but there we had the pleasure of once more meeting the following aged ministers who have been in the service from forty to fifty years: Elders W. A. Bar-ham, R. L. Piles and M. J. Ryan. These are able ministers of the New Testament and dearly loved by their brethren in their section, as well as by the brethren elsewhere who know them. Brother Joel Loyd, of Blue Mountain, is the efficient clerk of this association, and is highly esteemed by the brethren. This was another great meeting. After the meeting closed Sunday we drove home that night, arriving home at 11:25, tired and worn out. We were glad to get home and to be here a few days, though we do not get much rest, as work has "piled up" while we were away. But it is a change, and that gives us a little rest.

The brethren were all good and kind to us-far better than we feel to deserve, from the first of the trip in Texas on, all the way through until our home coming. We shall never forget their great kindness to us. May the good Lord shower down His richest blessings upon them. The Lord is surely blessing His people in Texas now, and where they have come together and quit their warring with each other, they are a happy people, and fellowship abounds and love flows freely from breast to breast, and the Lord's little children are coming home. May the good work go on. The few wh6 are opposing the coming together of the Lord's people cannot stop it. The Lord's time has come to favor Zion, and He is bringing His people together. To Him be praise forever more. We ask an interest in the prayers of the Lord's children. Pray Him to help us to strive for the things that make for peace, and the things wherewith we may edify one another. C. H. C.

Elder Petty Gone Progressive

ELDER PETTY GONE PROGRESSIVE ---October 15, 1927

We have received the information that Elder M. E. Petty, who has been worrying the brethren so much for the past year or more in Southeast Georgia, has gone to the Progressives. Our information is that his church had him under a charge and that on Friday or Friday night before the meeting time of his church on Saturday he joined the Progressives, which was Friday before the first Sunday in September. As a number of brethren have asked us as to what Elder Petty is doing we make this statement as a matter of information for them. We are sorry Elder Petty has pursued such a course as he has. "God is not mocked. Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." We trust that he may yet some day see the error of his way and be brought to repentance. C. H. C.

END OF VOLUME FOUR

1928

Editorial Writings From The Primitive Baptist
Beginning with 1928

By Elder C. H. Cayce

Volume V 1939

CAYCE PUBLISHING COMPANY THORNTON, ARKANSAS

TO

My Beloved Wife who has untiringly labored with me and for me during these many years, and TO My Dear Children who are so attentive to their poor old father, and TO My Sainted Father and Mother who cared for me when I could not care for myself, and TO My Dear Brethren and Sisters who have been so kind and good to poor me all these years is this and any following volumes Lovingly Dedicated

PREFACE

We have received many words of endorsement of the previous volumes of our Editorial Writings. We have also had some words of criticism. Every reader has not endorsed everything that each volume contained. We could hardly expect that they should. But we are trying to faithfully reproduce what we said in our editorial writings in The Primitive Baptist during the years since we began the work of trying to edit the paper. Our dear companion insisted for several years that we undertake this work, before we could "muster up the courage" to undertake it. Her opinion was that it would be of benefit to the cause of the Master. This volume, with the previous volumes, together with the volumes which may follow, if we are permitted to continue the work until the same shall have been brought up to date, will show that our people-the Primitive Baptists-are still standing where they have always stood. They will also show, conclusively, that we have occupied the same ground during all our public life. Some things herein will be of value, from a historical standpoint, in the years to come. If we know our poor heart our desire in the publication of these volumes is the glory of God and the advancement of His blessed cause, and the benefit of His humble poor. The price we have been selling the books for is clear proof of the fact that the making of money is not the object in view. We desire that the Lord's dear children who are blinded by false teachers may be enabled, by the reading of some of these pages, to see where the true church is, and where the truth may be found. May the blessings of our Lord rest upon the reader, is the humble prayer of The Author Thornton, Arkansas, August 2, 1938

Introduction to Volume 43

---January 1, 1928

This issue begins the forty-third volume of The Primitive Baptist. Forty-two volumes have been completed. Forty-two years ago the first issue of the paper made its appearance at Fulton, Ky. Many trials and conflicts have been endured, and many difficulties have been encountered-yet the paper still lives. It was published by our dear father and edited by him until he "fell at his post" in August, 1905, since which time we have been trying, as best we could, to send the paper out under the same banner and contending for the same principles of eternal truth. We have seen no cause to make any change, so far as doctrinal principles are concerned. On that line we make no promise of any change for the present volume. If we ever make any change in that line we will have to be first convinced that we have the wrong Bible and the wrong experience. It is our desire to humbly and faithfully contend for the same principles of eternal truth that the paper has contended for through all these forty-two years. We are aware of the fact that we have made mistakes-and we are sorry of every mistake and every wrong and every uncouth expression we have made- but we are not sorry of standing for, or contending for, any of the

principles we have contended for all these years. We hoped that we would be able to begin publishing the paper weekly again on the first of this year, but we cannot do so. If all our corresponding editors, our brethren in the ministry, and our subscribers will all "put their shoulder to the wheel," and all help all they can, they can increase our list of subscribers enough this year to enable us to send it out weekly-perhaps before the year is out. Brethren, will you help? If each subscriber would only send one new one, that would double the list. We are aware that some of the readers cannot do this, but others can send two, some can send more. Ask the brethren and friends to subscribe for the paper. It will not hurt you to do this, and it will harm no one. How many of you will try it? During the past year some have helped much in this way and we trust that we appreciate all that has been done. Some of our corresponding editors have seemed to be asleep, as far as The Primitive Baptist is concerned, for a long time. We would be glad if they would wake up and let us hear from them occasionally. "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." We are glad that so many of the brethren and sisters have had a mind to write for the paper, and trust they will continue. True, we have not been able to publish all the articles that have been sent to us, on account of a lack of space. We have just so much space to fill, and we cannot publish any more articles than we have space for. We trust that no one will think hard of us for not publishing any article they may have written. We feel that we should try to select such matter as we think will be best for the cause in a general way. We may make mistakes in our judgment, but we cannot shift the responsibility off on another. All that we can promise on this line is that we shall continue to try to do the best we can under the circumstances. As we have often requested before, we now request again, that you will please keep your church troubles at home. Please do not send them to us for publication in the paper. Again we say, PLEASE DO NOT SEND THEM TO US. Such things are of no comfort or consolation to the Lord's dear children, and we desire to publish such things as will have a tendency to build up, and not tear down or destroy. You can be of much help to us along this line. Write us about your good meetings, and tell your hopes and fears, and of the Lord's sweet and sure promises to His children. Let us "provoke one another unto love and good works." Let us all try to serve the Lord better and more devotedly than we have in the past. Let us try to "be helpers, one of another." Let us try to lend each other a helping hand, and try to help each other along in the sweet and delightful service of the Master. "Let brotherly love continue." Let us all try to improve our ways. Will you try to help us to try to improve, and remember us in your prayers? C. H. C.

Another Name Added

---January 15, 1928

Elder J. H. Chance, R. 4, Cochran, Ga., has consented for us to add his name to our editorial staff. We are glad to have this dear brother associated with us. He promises to write for the paper, and to do what he can to increase the circulation. We trust that his labors may be blessed of the Lord to the good of His dear children and to the upbuilding of the cause. We trust that others of our corresponding editors will try to get up a little more zeal and put forth a little more effort during this year than they have for some time past. Some of our corresponding editors are awake along this line, and we appreciate their labors and their help. We trust that our labors together may be blessed of the Lord to the good of the cause. C. H. C.

Remarks to John R. Whitfield

---January 15, 1928

Permit us, dear brother, to make a few remarks concerning the matter of conditions as mentioned in your good article. The expression, "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured by the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it," plainly implies conditions. The very meaning of the language is that in order for them to eat the good of the land, and enjoy the blessings in the land, they must be willing and obedient. Their being permitted to do the eating depended upon that. On the other hand, if they refused and rebelled, they should be devoured by the sword. Being devoured by the sword depended upon their refusing and rebelling. One followed as a result of the other. Their eating the good of the land followed as a result of being willing and obedient. Their being devoured by the sword followed as a result of their refusing and rebelling. This language was addressed to Israel; and blessings were promised them on condition of being willing and obedient. Their eating the good of the land was contingent upon them being willing and obedient. The same thing is true today with spiritual Israel. Jesus said, "If ye know these things, happy are ye, if ye do them." Here is a happiness promised as a result of doing these things. It is necessary to know them first, and then do them. One must be a child of God first, in order to know these things. Then when the child of God knows these things, and does them, a happiness follows as a result—a happiness contingent upon the doing of these things. You have realized the truthfulness of this matter by experience. These remarks are made in love to you and the cause. C. H. C.

At Oxford, Mississippi

---February 1, 1928

We had a request to be with the church in Oxford, Miss., for a three days meeting embracing the first Sunday in this month (January, 1928). We left home at 1:45 on Thursday night before the first Sunday and arrived at Oxford at 10:28 Friday morning. Brother R. L. Bell met us at the train. We went to his home for a few moments and then to the church. Had meeting there Friday, Friday night, Saturday, Saturday night, and Sunday. There had been much rain in that section and the roads were bad, so the congregations were small at each service; but the services were all sweet and pleasant. We felt that the Lord was good to us and enabled us to speak to the comfort of the saints. On Sunday morning Elder W. L. Smith, who is the beloved pastor of the church, the writer and Deacons Smith and Waldrip, at the request of the church, formed ourselves into a presbytery for the purpose of ordaining Brother J. R. Heard to the full work of the gospel ministry and Brother R. L. Bell to the office of deacon. After examination of the brethren the ordination was proceeded with by prayer and the laying on of hands. We left Oxford at 3 o'clock Sunday afternoon and arrived home at 4:15 Monday morning and found all as well as when we left, for which we trust we felt thankful. While in Oxford we visited dear Sister Morris, the widow of Elder A. B. Morris, as she was not well and not able to be at the meeting. We also visited Sister Murray, who is also old and feeble, and was not able to be at the meeting. We also visited Sister Henrietta Goodwin, whom we have known from childhood. Sister Goodwin was able to be at meeting only on Sunday. We spent one night in the good home of Brother Heard and Sister McCharen. Sister McCharen is a daughter of Elder and Sister Morris. The good brethren and sisters were good to us—much better than we feel to deserve, and we enjoyed the stay with them, and feel that we want to go there again before this year is gone, if the Lord will. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon them. We have been visiting that church occasionally for many years. We

were with them when the church first moved to Oxford, and preached the first sermon in the house there. Many changes have come since then, but the Lord is still with them. We trust that they may continue faithful and true to the Master, and we are sure He will continue to bless them, though they pass through trials along the way. We shall not forget their many acts of kindness to us, not only on this trip, but at other times when we were with them, and the words of encouragement and comfort they have spoken to us. May the good Lord bless them abundantly, is our humble prayer. We trust they will remember us in prayer to the Lord. C. H. C.

Meeting at Little Rock

---April 1, 1928

At our last meeting in Little Rock (third Sunday in February) a brother, Edwin E. Fulks, of Vilonia, Ark., offered himself for membership with the church, and was gladly received. He requested that we administer the ordinance of baptism, and that it be attended to at the next meeting. We are expecting, the Lord willing, to go to Little Rock tomorrow and be with them at the regular service this month (March). We beg the Lord to be with us and to help us to attend to the duties that may be ours in His service, and that the dear brother may obtain the sweet rest that the Lord's little children find in the path of obedience. Brother Fulks came from the Missionaries, and has served them for a number of years as Sunday school superintendent, but got his eyes open to the truth by reading Old Baptist papers, books, and his Bible. After writing the above we received a telephone message that Brother H. C. Bryant, of Warren, Ark., had passed away and we were wanted to attend the funeral with Elder Jno. R. Harris at 2 o'clock on Sunday. So we could not go to Little Rock this time. Another good man is gone. May the Lord bless his bereaved ones. C. H. C.

Elder Fisher's Name Dropped

---May 15, 1928

In another place in this paper will be found an article from Elder J. H. Fisher in which he makes some announcement regarding the Glad Tidings. Brother Fisher's name has been on the editorial staff of The Primitive Baptist for some time. When he bought the Glad Tidings he wrote us to remove his name from our staff, as he had bought that paper. We have hesitated to remove his name, and thought best to wait awhile. We regret to give him up from our staff; but of course we could not refuse to grant his request. We hope he will still write occasionally for The Primitive Baptist. And we trust the good Lord may bless his efforts in laboring for the peace and unity of our people in the publication of the Glad Tidings, as well as in his efforts in traveling and preaching the glorious gospel of the grace of God. We are glad to labor with him in any way we can for the good of Zion and for the glory of our heavenly Master. ' May the Lord grant to bless the dear brother in every way that seemeth good to Him. C. H. C.

Moving to Thornton

---July 1, 1928

For some time we have been at work erecting a new office building and a dwelling at Thornton, Ark., preparatory to moving to that place. The house our wife earned in the contest two years ago, which most of our readers know about, was cashed in

by the company who awarded it to her. They paid her a good price in cash, at her request, instead of shipping the house to her. We had the opportunity of buying a large hotel building at Thornton with a few acres of ground at what we thought was a bargain price. So we made the purchase and had the building torn down, and used the lumber and material in erecting a dwelling and office building, and they are just about completed at this writing. We ' are expecting, therefore, to move to Thornton in a few days, and it is probable that this issue of the paper will be mailed from that place. For a little more than two years we have had this paper printed by the Advocate Publishing Company, to whom we sold our printing plant nearly three years ago. We have placed an order for a new press and type, which we expect to have installed within a few weeks, and then we will print the paper ourselves in our new office at Thornton. When we get moved we will be glad for all our readers and friends to call on us-visit us and see us and see our new office and machinery. It is our intention now to change the paper to a weekly on the first of next year. That is our intention and desire, and will do so if it is possible. From now on our address will be Thornton, Ark. As soon as we get moved and matters all straightened out we hope to be able to do more writing for the paper than we have been doing. C. H. C.

Obey God or Man?

---August 15, 1928

In another place in this paper is a reply to an article which appeared in our columns some time ago from Elder J. A. Monsees. We do not care to notice anything especially in the article more than one expression, which is this-: "Whom should we obey, God or man? I might do about like Elders Cayce and Newman did- obey men rather than God." In this expression Elder Ross accuses us and Elder Newman of obeying men and not obeying God. Perhaps Brother Ross can tell how he learned that we did not obey God because we did not visit the churches of the Progressives. If we had any special impression of mind to visit the Progressives we never found it out. We did have an inclination to go to South Georgia and to make some enquiry to try to find out if the indications were for an adjustment of differences between our people and the Progressives. We tried to follow that impression, and so made the trip. We did not find the conditions such as to make us believe it would be prudent or right to undertake an effort to get the two parties together. We are well aware of the fact that when people are at variance and are not "ripe" for a settlement it is far better to let them alone. To do otherwise is to make bad matters worse. That we were right in our conclusion is clearly proven and manifest in an article in the Banner-Herald of August 1, 1928. In that paper is an article headed, "A Basis for Lasting Peace," by the editor. In that article we find the following paragraphs: We think it highly commendable for any church, using an instrument in their song service, to forbear such use in deference to the feelings of brethren who oppose such practice; and we think it equally commendable for those brethren who oppose such practice to manifest charity toward those who see no evil in it and are not willing to discard their brethren by making such a bar to fellowship. The use of an instrument in song service in the church does not affect the doctrine or ordinances of the church and is a matter which must at last be left to each sovereign church to decide for herself. To our mind this is evidence that those brethren are not ready to discard or put away the organs from their churches. They preferred the organ to the fellowship of the great body of Primitive Baptists, and they still have them and are not willing to dispense with them. Our people have spoken on this question-they did so several years ago-and we stand with the great

body of Baptists on this question, and have stood there all the while. To attempt to revive that question now, and to attempt to get our people to reverse themselves on the question, would be to simply raise another war in our own ranks-and we here speak plainly but kindly-we are not going to do it. God does not require it, and to do so we would be obeying men rather than God. That matter is something which belongs to the Baptists in that country (South Georgia and Alabama) more than others. For us or others to go there and meddle with that matter, unless they ask us to come and help them get matters settled and adjusted, would be simply to meddle where we feel we have no business. Perhaps meddling where we have no business has had something to do in causing trouble in days gone by. We feel like it may be about time to do so no more. We feel like we are obeying God in pursuing that course-perhaps not, though, if we obeyed men in doing that way. We are ready to help brethren labor for peace and union with any of the brethren in any faction who are orderly in their walk and live godly lives, provided they are ready to lay down the thing that causes trouble. The introduction of organs in our churches has always caused trouble among us, and it always will. To unite with those who have them after having separated from them years ago, would simply be to unite with more trouble. Let them show that they want to unite with our people in peace by putting those things out, and then we may be ready to labor for a union, and thus obey God in laboring for union and not for trouble and confusion. The same principle prevails in laboring for union with those who have advocated and gone with the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things. Advocating that doctrine among us has always caused trouble, and always will. Let those who advocate it, and who are not willing to lay it aside, stay among themselves and not bother us. If any are willing to lay that down, and to labor for peace and union with our people, then we are willing to help labor to that end. But we are not willing to help to labor for union with them unless they are willing to lay that aside, for to unite with them and for them to preach and advocate that doctrine among us would only cause us trouble again. We have had enough trouble in our ranks, and we do not care to help bring something among us that we are well aware would cause more trouble. Perhaps one church of God does not have the right or the authority to declare non-fellowship for another church of God. One sister in a family may go wrong and bring shame and disgrace on the family and on the other sisters and the brothers in that family. The other brothers and sisters cannot disinherit or put the wayward sister out of relationship; but they can refuse to associate with and keep company with that wayward sister until she mends her ways-and they should do it. Churches bear a sisterly relationship with each other. When a sister church walks disorderly and brings shame on the family the other sisters can and should refuse to keep company and associate with her until she mends her ways. If all would do that instead of so many trying to uphold her in her wrongs, it would have a greater influence to bring them to the right path. A church has the right to withdraw fellowship from a member, and no other church has the right to interfere; but no church has the right to hold a member in fellowship who is a disgrace to the cause, and who brings shame on sister churches by a wrong and ungodly life. A church is not a sovereign to do as she pleases; but is a sovereign to execute the laws of the King, and no farther. She is not a sovereign to do that which brings grief and sorrow to her sister churches who are satisfied to have, to do, to believe, and to practice what is in the Book, and nothing else. May the Lord help us to follow the path marked out in His Word. C. H. C.

Remarks to (Miss) Inez Vaughn

---September 15, 1928

It will be observed that the above letter was not written for publication, but we trust the sister will not think hard of us for putting it in the paper. It was written some time ago. Our readers will remember that we stated in our issue of July 1 that we had a great many letters which we had not been able to answer on account of being so busy building and moving when at home. The above is one of the letters we had on hand. We note that the sister states she was away from home at school. This being true, we do not know whether she is now at home or still in Roanoke, and we do not know her home address. The only way we know, then, to reach her is through the paper. It seems to us that the good Lord has shown her a great lesson and a great truth in the dream she relates. Worldly religionists do not know the Saviour in their service and worship. They are yet like the builders in ancient times. The builders anciently rejected the stone which has become the head of the corner. They did not understand, or know, where the place and work of that stone was, and they do not know yet. It is true that the ministry is a gift from the Lord to the church, but preachers are just men. The apostle said, "I also am a man." They should set right examples before others; but they make mistakes and do wrong, as well as other folks. They are to be esteemed for their work's sake, and not because they are better than others. May the good Lord bless you, dear sister, and enable you to walk in His ways and to show forth His praise by an orderly walk and godly conversation. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 15:22-23

---October 1, 1928

For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming.- (I Corinthians 15:22-23). We have been requested to give our views on this text, especially the clause, "But every man in his own order." In this chapter the apostle is treating directly and especially upon the subject of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints. The idea of a general resurrection, both of the just and the unjust, is taught in other parts of the Bible; but in this chapter the apostle is not treating upon the resurrection of the unjust, but of the Lord's children. Keeping in mind that he is treating upon this subject, then we know what people he is talking about when he says, "For as in Adam all die." All whom? All the Lord's children, those of whom he is writing. They all die. They are dying every day. He does not say here "for as in Adam all died" -but "all die" -in the present tense. All Adam's race died in him when he transgressed the law in Eden; but here' the apostle says they (God's children) "all die." He could not, then, in this language refer to the fall in Eden, but refers to the natural or physical death. God's people die that way, the same as other folks do. But though they do die in Adam, as natural beings, yet "in Christ shall all be made alive." They shall be made alive in Christ. When the body dies, the spirit does not die, but goes to God who gave it. The soul does not die. "Though the body dies on account of sin, yet the spirit lives on account of righteousness.." The same thing shall be made alive that dies. It is the body that dies; hence it is the body that shall be made alive. This shall be done at the time of which the apostle is writing in this chapter, which is the resurrection from the dead. "But every man in his own order." What every man? Every man of whom he is writing. Of whom is he writing? God's children. Hence, the bodies of all God's children shall be raised and made alive in Christ. They are to be both raised and made alive in Christ. "Christ the firstfruits." Under the law it was required that the first ripe fruit of the harvest should be offered unto the Lord, and if the offering was

accepted by the Lord, this made sure the entire crop. This first ripe fruit was the first fruit of the crop. Christ became the first fruit of them that slept. As the first fruit He was raised when He had offered Himself as a spotless offering unto the Lord. The Father accepted the offering which He made, and "this made sure the entire crop being harvested. The resurrection of the saints is just as sure, then, as it is sure that Christ was raised. When will they be raised? "At His coming." When He comes back to earth again to gather His jewels home, they will all be raised and made alive in Christ. All those who are His will then be raised and made spiritual. "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." Then will God's predestination concerning them be fully accomplished. "For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified." -((9) (Romans 8:29-30). Amidst all the sorrows, trials and conflicts that are incident to this life, we are trusting and hoping, confidently (sometimes) looking forward to that time, for that blessed home beyond. May the sweet assurance of this comfort your hearts in all your trials. C. H. C.

Elder Hassell Dead

---October 1, 1928

We were made sad on learning of the death of Elder Sylvester Hassell, which occurred on August 18, 1928. Elder Hassell was truly a great and wonderful man. He was a man of great talent and learning, and was truly great in true humility and devotion to the cause of the Master. The following from the pen of Elder R. H. Pittman, editor of the Advocate and Messenger, better expresses what we desire should be said in our columns concerning this dear brother than we have words to express: Brother Hassell is dead! These sad words were first heard by me as they were whispered in my ear during the morning service at the Kettocton Association Sunday, August 19, 1928, and as the news spread many hearts were saddened and tears of sorrow shed. And upon reaching home Sunday night I found a telegram from Charles Hassell awaiting me, and regret very much that I could not attend the funeral services of this dear man of God. He was very near and dear to me. For thirty-five years we have been very close friends, and during the last years of his life we were closely and intimately connected. His editorial service on the Advocate and Messenger was a blessing to thousands and an inspiration to his co-workers, with whom he was in perfect harmony. The writer was last with him in January in a meeting in which he labored for reconciliation of estranged brethren; and on July 16th -his last letter to me-he said "I would be glad to see you again." But no more shall we meet in this life. He has been called up higher; and heaven to me is a little dearer, because of his going. He was ready to be offered, and the time of his departure was at hand. He fought a good fight, finished his course, and kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for him a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give him at that day; and not to him only, but to all them also that love His appearing. "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying; neither shall there be any more pain." Elder Sylvester Hassell, of Williamston, N. C, minister, historian, teacher, was doubtless the best authority on church history in North Carolina, and possibly in this age. He stood among the foremost thinkers and writers of the United States. His ancestors came from England to North Carolina in the Eighteenth

Century. His parents were Elder C. B. Hassell and his first wife, Mary Davis. He was born in Williamston, N. C., July 28, 1842, and died there Aug. 18, 1928, having reached the ripe age of 86 years and 20 days. He was educated at the Williamston Academy and the University of North Carolina, taking a high stand at both, and graduating with honors. He was proficient in several languages; was principal of a school for young men in Wilson, N. C., and professor of languages in a northern college for some years. He published, in 1886, the Church History, the most complete work of its kind ever published by our people, and a monument more lasting than granite to him and to his father, who began the work. In 1892 he became associate editor of the Gospel Messenger, and in 1896, its proprietor and managing editor, which position he retained nearly twenty years, when the paper was sold to Elder Z. C. Hull, of Atlanta, Ga., from whom it was purchased by the writer in 1923, and all this time Elder Hassell has been on the editorial staff. -----

** Truly he was a prince in Israel. As I am able to judge, it has not been my privilege to know one who bore more marks of real greatness. In manners, humble and retiring as a little child; in general information, he has been called "a walking encyclopedia;" in service, untiring and unselfish; in character, irreproachable and unstained; in deportment, gentle, kind, tender. More than any man I ever knew he suffered long and remained kind; envied not; was not puffed up; did not behave himself unseemly; sought not his own; was not easily provoked; thought no evil; rejoiced not in iniquity, but rejoiced in the truth. His motto as historian, editor, preacher and teacher was "Speaking the truth in love;" and this he did uncompromisingly with error in friend or foe. Neither the tie of blood nor the bond of fellowship was sufficiently strong to draw him from the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. And the Bible was, to him, God's literal, spiritual and eternal truth, and he defended its truths with tongue and pen possibly more valiantly and ably than any man in this age. Spurgeon is reported to have said that Hassell's History contained less error than any book he ever read. A professor of language in Wake Forest College recently said that all of us shall have to go to Hassell's History of the Church for authoritative information on this subject. And thus it is true that "though dead he yet speak-eth," and will continue to speak (certainly among the people called Baptists) so long as there is love for principles and practices upon which the Apostolic Church was founded. God does not raise up many such men; "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called." But He does call some, and our precious Brother Hassell, who has gone home to glory, was one of them. We shall miss him; his churches will miss his loving service; the Kehukee Association, which he has for thirty-five years served as moderator, will miss his wise counsel; and thousands of readers will miss his timely, instructive and spiritual editorials. Worldly wisdom and human efforts can never fill his place; only God can prepare and send another such servant to labor in His vineyard. May we all pray that this He will do. The funeral services were conducted by Elder J. C. Moore, of Whitakers, N. C., a son of the late Elder Andrew J. Moore, who was a lifelong friend and associate of Elder Hassell. It was his wish that this son of his nearest friend in life perform the simple rites for the dead when his day of rest had come. Elder Moore was visibly moved by the solemnity of the burden laid upon him, but after reading the 103rd Psalm he feelingly and beautifully spoke of the deceased and of their love and fellowship. Other ministers who spoke briefly included Elder N. S. Harrison, of Washington County, Elder S. B. Denny, of Wilson, and Elder A. B. Denson, of Rocky Mount. Two hymns, both favorites of Elder Hassell, were used; "Rock of Ages" at the beginning of the services and "How Firm a Foundation" at the conclusion. Almost every Primitive Baptist minister in eastern North Carolina attended the services; also Congressmen Lindsay Warren, a lifelong admirer and personal friend of Elder Hassell; Josephus

Daniels, whose youthful schooling was had at his hands and whose admiration and affection for him began from that day and has never ended; R. O. Everett, of Durham, John D. Gold, of Wilson; and scores of others from over the entire eastern end of the state were there. Three sons of Elder Hassell -Frank, Charles and Calvin- all of prominence, are left of his immediate family to mourn the loss of a loving father. The casket was borne through the throng of sorrowing friends to the waiting hearse. The long walk from the house to the street was lined on either side with flowers. The march to the grave was begun, and there, with simple rites, the casket was lowered into the grave. "For this corruption must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. * * * * Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." The above beautiful tribute is copied from the Advocate and Messenger. We mourn the loss of this great man in Israel. May the Lord help us all to be submissive to His holy will and sustain us by His grace. C. H. C.

Requests Name Dropped

---October 1, 1928

A few days ago (in September) we received the following note from Elder W. E. Brush: Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-Will you please drop my name from the editorial staff of The Primitive Baptist, and oblige, your brother, I hope, W. E. Brush. In compliance with Brother Brush's request we have dropped his name from the staff. We do not know why he made the request, but we comply with it with no ill will whatever. C. H. C.

Our Association

---October 15, 1928

Our association (the South Arkansas) met with our church (Cane Creek) here in Thornton, beginning on Friday before the third Sunday in September. We had ten visiting preachers with us: Elders J. W. West, Crosbyton, Texas; S. N. Redford, Harlingen, Texas; W. W. Fowler, Dallas, Texas; B. Isaacs, Rosebud, Ark.; W. A. Barham, Watalula, Ark.; G. W. Reed, Harvey, Ark.; R. L. Piles, Hon, Ark.; G. A. Jones, Prescott, Ark.; P. E. Whitwell, Little Rock, Ark.; C. M. Monk, Jonesboro, La. The home ministers present during the meeting were Elders John R. Harris, Thornton, Ark.; J. P. Baker, Wilmar, Ark.; A. D. Cencibaugh, Donaldson, Ark.; W. E. Hargett, El Dorado, Ark.; J. W. Guest, Lono, Ark.; G. P. Woodall, Athens, La.; and C. H. Cayce, Thornton, Ark. A good crowd was in attendance each day, and the Lord blessed the ministers with a fruitful mind at each service, and they preached the gospel in its sweetness to the comfort and benefit of the Lord's humble poor. Two willing souls were encouraged to take up their cross during the meeting and come home to their friends, telling what great things the Lord had done for them. They were baptized on Sunday morning by Elder John R. Harris. May the Lord bless them and help them to show forth the praise of the Lord while they live in the world, is our prayer. This was a wonderful meeting to us. Love and sweet fellowship reigned throughout the whole meeting. There was not a jar of any kind nor a discordant note sounded. The Lord's divine presence was sweetly manifested, and we were all loth to leave the place, and yet glad we had enjoyed the great privilege and blessing of meeting together in this great assembly. May the Lord be praised, and may He grant us more such great blessings. C. H. C.

Remarks to Elder D. M. Vail

---October 15, 1928

We do not feel that we have any special light on the text, {(Romans 7:24)} but think the apostle was writing concerning his experience along life's way. He still had the same old sinful nature to contend with that he always had, and this sinful nature and disposition which he had gave him much trouble and concern. He longed to be free from sin, and to live above and without it. Sin in his members, with which he had to contend, is called a body of death. He felt and realized that he could not deliver himself from it. Evidently his only hope was in the Lord. It appears to us that this is the experience and hope of the Lord's dear children in this present age as well as then; and if this describes your feeling and experience, it is an evidence that you are a child of grace. C. H. C.

Flint River Association

---November 1, 1928

We had the pleasure of attending the Flint River Association in North Alabama on Friday, Saturday and first Sunday in October, 1928. It was held with old Flint River Church, near Brownsboro, Ala., the oldest Baptist Church in the state. That church was constituted on the second day of October, 1808, which was the first Sunday. The centennial of the constitution of that church was celebrated there on the first Sunday in October, 1908, and Friday and Saturday before, and we had the pleasure of attending that meeting. That was twenty years ago. There have been many changes during those years, but the principles of truth remain the same. This was a glorious meeting. If we are not mistaken there were about sixteen ministers in attendance, and the preaching was all harmonious. Two dear sisters came forward on Sunday and asked for a home in this old church. They were gladly received, and the time of their baptism was set for the second Sunday, the regular meeting time of the church there. May the good Lord be praised for His goodness and mercy. Let us try to serve Him more and better what short time we have left for us to stay here in this old world. C. H. C.

Remarks to Elder J. W. West

---December 1, 1928

We appreciate the above good letter. We appreciated having you at our association, and also in our humble home. We appreciated having all the dear brethren and sisters in our home who came to see us, though we do not feel worthy to have them under our roof. We cannot treat them as well as we desire to, but they are welcome, and we want them to feel that way. May the Lord bless and keep you, dear brother, and lead you on in the good old way. We are glad you are still having good meetings out there, and that the Lord's rich blessings are still being showered down upon the good brethren and sisters. "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land." This is just as true now as it was when it was written. The Lord has not changed. Yes, we want to visit Texas again. Perhaps we can take the good wife and children and make a trip out there next summer. We will try to do so, if it seems that the Lord so directs. Pray for us. In love, C. H. C.

Brother Hollingsworth's Letter

---December 15, 1928

Elsewhere in this issue is a letter from Brother W. W. Hollingsworth, of Bessemer, Ala., urging the readers to try to get some new subscribers for The Primitive Baptist. We trust you will all read his letter, and then put forth your best efforts to carry out his suggestions, and send us a lot of new subscribers by the first of the year. Brother Hollingsworth intended for his letter to be in our issue for December 1st, but it got to the office just a little too late for that issue. It has been our desire to change the paper back to a weekly from the first of the year 1929, but we just cannot do that. There has not been enough increase in the subscription list the past year to justify us in making the change to a weekly, and involving the necessary additional expense. It would cost more to get the paper out weekly-considerably more. It will be necessary to have a lot more subscribers to justify us in making the change. We cannot afford to try to get the paper out at a loss. It must be made to pay its cost or we cannot continue to send it out. Unless we have enough subscribers for it to pay its cost to send it out weekly we just cannot send it out that often. If every reader of the paper who is in a position to do so would put forth some effort, by asking others to subscribe for the paper, no doubt enough new subscribers could be sent in to enable us to make the change in a very short time. Some of those who are isolated and not living near other Primitive Baptists could write to some person they know and ask them to subscribe for the paper. This would do good and would help. If we know our poor heart our sincere desire in publishing The Primitive Baptist is to try to comfort, instruct, and benefit the Lord's dear children, and to build up and promote the cause of the Master-the cause we all love so well. If it were a matter of financial choice there are other things we could engage in that would be much more remunerative. Much more money could be made by us in engaging in other things. We have felt to make a sacrifice in this respect all these years since we have been connected with the paper, even before the death of our dear father. It has been our desire all along, and it is yet, to give all the reading matter possible for the money. For these reasons it is our sincere desire to have enough subscribers to enable us to send the paper out weekly. To this end we need the assistance and help of our readers. We are giving our whole time to the work of the Master in publishing His truth from the pulpit and the press to the very best of our ability. Is it asking too much to ask you to help us what you can in getting new subscribers for the paper? Will you help? C. H. C.

Close of Volume 43

---December 15, 1928

This issue closes the forty-third volume of The Primitive Baptist. For forty-three years this paper has been published under practically the same management, it having been established by our sainted father on January 1, 1886, and published by him until August, 1905, when he fell in the service of the Master. Since that time it has been our lot to continue the editing and publishing of the paper to the present time. Sometimes the road has been rough and steep, in more ways than one. We have met with difficulties along the way; but the Lord has brought us thus far, and in Him is our trust and confidence. Sometimes it seemed that our way was all hedged in, and we could see no way to press on farther; but in a way not expected the way would be opened up so that we were enabled to go forward again. The same doctrine and principles that the paper stood for from the beginning are the same that have been contended for all along to the present. We have seen no reason for any change along this line. Principles are eternal and never change. What was a principle of truth forty-three years ago is a principle of truth today. Truth needs no amendments or

additions or subtractions. Yes, we have made mistakes. We are very well aware of that fact, and we are sorry of every mistake we have ever made. It is our sincere desire to not make the same mistake twice. It is our desire to try to profit by the mistakes we have made in trying to avoid them for the future. We have tried to conduct The Primitive Baptist in such a way as to comfort, instruct, edify and build up the Lord's dear children, and in defense of the Primitive or Old School Baptist cause. We have tried to publish an Old Baptist paper. How well we have succeeded is for the brotherhood to say. Our circulation signifies that many are pleased along this line. Still, the circulation is not what we would like for it to be. We had hoped that we would have a circulation large enough by this time to justify us in going back to a weekly on the first of the incoming year, but we are disappointed in this. We yet hope that the circulation may increase enough to enable us to change to a weekly before the year 1929 is gone. How many of you will help us to reach this by sending in new subscribers right away? If any of our brethren and sisters, or any of our readers, have been hurt with us, and felt that we have not done as we should in any particular, we beg your forgiveness. It is not our desire to wound the feelings of any of the Lord's dear children, not even the least one. Please throw the mantle of charity over our many imperfections, and pardon what you may see amiss in us. Help us all you can in the spread of the truth. Pray the Lord to direct us in the right way and to sustain us by His grace. Until the first of the New Year we now bid all our readers adieu, humbly praying the Lord's richest blessings may rest upon all. C. H. C.

1929

Introduction to Volume 44

---January 1, 1929

With this issue we begin the forty-fourth volume of The Primitive Baptist. For forty-three years this paper has gone forth on its mission of endeavor to "contend earnestly for the faith that was once delivered to the saints." Now another year is ushering in, and we desire to begin the toils and conflicts with renewed energy and vigor, inspired by the good hope, which we trust has been given us by the Lord through grace, and quietly trusting in His glorious and precious promises and His power and faithfulness to perform the same. We feel to be encouraged when we think of some of the things that have transpired during the last year or two. Many of our people, where they have been separated and divided for years, have been adjusting their little differences, forgiving each other, as the Lord has admonished and directed, and have been coming together in peace and love. This gives us renewed hope of a better day for our dear people. On the other hand, when we see the great lethargy and indifference which seems to exist in some places; when we see the war and strife among the brethren going on in some sections, it makes us feel cast down and discouraged. In olden times when Israel engaged in warfare among themselves, the Lord's chastening hand fell heavily upon them; and we fear like troubles or distresses will befall us today. "When ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." We so much deplore such conditions existing among our dear people at any place. May the Lord have mercy upon us. "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm

constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men." -Paul. It is our sincere desire to endeavor to encourage the Lord's little children to be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable. The good works are those things the Lord has commanded in His word. The things He has not commanded are not good works. It is profitable to engage in those good works. The inspired apostle so teaches in this text, and we are disposed to believe it. There is something gained in that which is profitable. If nothing is gained by engaging in or doing a thing, then that thing is unprofitable.

It is unprofitable for the Lord's dear children to be engaged in doing the things the Lord has not commanded, and especially in doing the things He has expressly forbidden. Something is to be gained by them in doing the things He has commanded, for those things are profitable unto men. We do not believe one can do these good works in and of himself. We are sure that no one can do these good works without the Lord's help. Though this is true, yet we need not try to make excuse for ourselves for not doing them by saying the Lord did not help us. Jesus said to His disciples, "Without me ye can do nothing." We should always remember from whence all our strength and help comes. It all comes from the Lord, and He has told us that He is a very present help in every time of trouble, or in every time of need. Then if we fail to do these things and engage in things we should not engage in, it is not because we were without the Lord or that He failed to be present as a help that we needed. The fault lies with us, and we are the blameworthy characters, and we are the ones who will be sure to suffer the penalty. If we have a good hope, a sweet hope, a precious hope, it is because the good Lord gave it to us by His glorious, unmerited, rich and discriminating grace. Having done so much for us, sure He is worthy of our service and all our praise. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness." "Let the dead bury their dead; but go thou and preach the kingdom of God." We should not let father, mother, brother, sister, wife, children, houses or lands, or any earthly tie or pleasure come between us and the service of our blessed and glorious Redeemer. The service of God should be first, and other things (earthly things) be secondary. Both cannot be first with us. "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." -Jesus. "He is the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." He does not light every man that cometh into this natural world. The natural sun lighteth every man that cometh into this natural world. "The Lord God is a sun and shield." He is the spiritual light, the spiritual sun. He lighteth every man that cometh into the spiritual realm. We come into that realm by being born into it, just as we came into the natural realm by being born into it. If we follow Jesus we must have our faces turned toward Him, and He is before us and goes before us then. If we are not following Him we have our faces turned from Him, and we are walking away from Him. As we walk away from Him, and are not following Him, we walk in our own shadow-in the dark; and we then cannot see just where we are going. Hence we stumble and fall. "He that doeth these things shall never fall." With our faces turned toward Him, and in following Him, we have our faces turned toward the light; we walk in the light; we can see where we are placing our feet; "there is none occasion of stumbling in him." The remainder of our days, whether many or few, we desire should be devoted to His praise and to His service and to the service of His humble poor. The Lord's people are a poor and afflicted people. We feel to be the poorest of them all-" less than the least of all saints." We have no righteousness to plead. All our hope and trust and confidence is in the Lord. We need the prayers, the help and encouragement of the Lord's dear children. We desire to be granted an humble place with them what few remaining days we have here in this world of trouble, sorrows, distresses,

disappointments and sad bereavements. There is no other place we can go. There is no other home for us. The dear Old Baptists, notwithstanding all their faults, their mistakes, their shortcomings, their wars and quarrels among themselves, are our people. They are the dearest people on earth to us. We are not espousing the cause of any faction among them. We desire to press forward in the "strait" path the Lord has directed His children to walk in, and try to labor for unity and peace among this best people in the world. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon them, and may He help us to live more devoted to Him and to serve Him better. Will each of you pray for us and help us along the way? Is this asking too much of you? C. H. C.

Enjoys the Paper

---January 1, 1929

Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-Yes, I read The Primitive Baptist, and really enjoy reading it, for it is full of good articles that are food for a hungry child of God. According to my estimation each and every copy has at least one article that, alone, is worth the price of the paper for a whole year. As I seldom hear any gospel preaching I enjoy reading the good paper to the fullest extent. I can truthfully say I find no fault to the paper. Some articles are good; others better; and if, perchance, I did find something a little out of line with my reasoning I would not try to find fault-only would think they or I were a little out of line, and try as best I can to keep myself in line; and if they are out of line, it is only an error of the mind and not of the heart, hoping and believing that in due time they may be set right. I am not a good hand to solicit subscribers, but I will endeavor to send you one or two names in the near future. Realizing, as I do, that there are so many of God's dear little children who are hungering for the nourishment that The Primitive Baptist would afford them, but who are not financially able to pay the subscription price; and often hearing Arminian preachers, while taking up a collection, quote "it is more blessed to give than to receive," makes me wonder why those who want to build up the circulation of the beloved paper in order to make it a weekly (and I presume we all do) pay subscription two, three, and five years in advance, having no assurance that we will live that long to enjoy the reading; besides, if we all paid five years in advance it would be a great benefit to the editor now, but where would be the income for the next four years? Would it not be more enjoyable to those whom the Lord has prospered with this world's goods to pay subscription for one or more of these poor and afflicted children of God, who are so hungry for the very kind of food The Primitive Baptist will supply. Now, brother, please throw the mantle of charity over me. A sinner saved by grace, if saved, J. B. F. Lasater. Clarksville, Ark.

REMARKS

We appreciate the above kind letter, which was written in March, 1928, but we could not get to it very well any sooner. However, it is just as good now as when it was written. Many of the Lord's dear children, we are sure, would enjoy reading The Primitive Baptist who are not really able to pay for it. We do not want one dear child of God to be deprived of that joy and comfort on account of their poverty in the goods of this world. We are already sending the paper to many who are not able to pay for it, and are ready to send it to others who are in like condition. Many have sent contributions to help send the paper to such persons. When anyone sends one dollar for that purpose, we send the paper a whole year to some poor person for that amount. In other words, we give a dollar for that purpose every time we get a dollar contributed for that object. When you send us one dollar to

help pay for the paper for the poor and unfortunate, someone gets the paper a whole year for that dollar. As to some paying for the paper for several years, we suggest that if one hundred do that this year, and one hundred do the same thing next year, and another hundred do the same thing the next year, and another hundred the next, and so on, all along, the income would not be cut down in any one year, but we would have a little less work to pay for in keeping the accounts with the subscribers. Both the above things help the editor to some extent, and the first suggestion helps to send comfort to the Lord's dear children who are poor and afflicted. When one subscribes for the paper for himself, he thereby helps to support the paper and to keep it going, and thus helps to provide a way to comfort those who are poor and destitute and who are deprived of the privilege of hearing preaching. Let us all put forth a little more effort and see if we can be more help along this line. C. H. C.

Remarks to Elder W. P. Merrell

---January 1, 1929

We feel unworthy of such expressions of love and confidence and sweet fellowship from any of the Lord's dear children, especially one of His dear humble servants. We often feel that our labors are and have been all in vain, and were it not for such expressions of encouragement as the above which we sometimes receive, we feel that we would have gone down in despair. But such as this encourages us to press on again, trusting alone in Israel's God. But it seems that we cannot long remember these encouraging things, for there are so many things encountered to discourage us and to cause us to feel sad and cast down. Our dear companion has been a wonderful help to us to press on in the service. Pray for us. C. H. C.

Thirty-Nine Years Ago

---January 15, 1929

On Saturday night, January 4, 1890, we made our first effort to speak in the name of the Master. It was at the home of a Brother Morris, in Wayne County, Tenn., between Waynesboro and Savannah. Our dear sainted father, Elder S. F. Cayce, Elder J. P. Pilkington and Elder M. L. Rhodes were present. There may have been other ministers present, but we do not remember them. It was just after a discussion at Waynesboro between our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, and J. A. Harding, who represented the Campbellites. We attended the debate. After the debate some of us went to the home of the Brother Morris, and there that night we were prevailed upon to make our first attempt to speak. We remember well with what great fear and trembling we arose to make the effort. We also remember well that in trying to introduce the service we tried to line and the congregation sang that good old song which has been one of our favorites all these years, Amazing grace! how sweet the sound! That saved a wretch like me. When we had tried, in our poor stammering way, to offer a few words in prayer, we read **(Ephesians 2:8-9)** "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast." We tried to talk for a few moments in connection with that language. Then we took our seat, feeling ashamed of the poor effort, and buried our face in father's lap and wept like a child. Yet we remember how father and others wept and tried to encourage and console us, and how they told us that what little we had said was gospel truth. On Friday, Dec. 28, 1928, we were passing along the road from Waynesboro to Savannah, our family

with us. We stopped at the old place, and we and our wife got out of the car and viewed the place. We went in and took a look at the room where we stood, and could see in our memory the faces of some who were there on that occasion thirty-nine years ago, so memorable to us. Our poor heart was filled with gratitude and thankfulness to God for His mercies extended to us all these years, in bringing us safely through the many dangers, toils and snares which we have encountered. We called to mind the reading and the singing of that good old hymn mentioned, and the lines, Through many dangers, toils and snares, I have already come; 'Tis grace has brought me safe thus far, And grace will lead me home. We thought of how we loved the sweet doctrine of grace then, and of how it has been "our meat and drink" until now; and how it is still our sweet hope that grace will lead us home. Well, we just cannot tell you all about how we felt, and the thoughts and meditations which passed through our mind. On Saturday and first Sunday in this month was our regular meeting time here in Thornton. On Sunday we felt deeply impressed with what we have here been telling you about, and so we tried to tell something about these things, and lined the same good old hymn and the congregation sang it. Then we tried to talk awhile from the same text. When we had concluded Elder John R. Harris made a sweet talk. Though there were not very many present, on account of so much sickness, so many having flu, and the inclemency of the weather, yet we had a sweet and pleasant service. May the Lord be praised for His goodness, and may He help us all to press on in His delightful service, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Brother Fairchild in Mississippi

---February 15, 1929

We see that Elder J. W. Fairchild is now located at Stringer, Miss. We note, also, that his name now appears on the editorial staff of the Banner-Herald, of which Elder Wm. H. Crouse is editor and manager. The paper is published in Georgia. The paper has some good articles appearing in its columns from time to time. It is a Progressive paper. C. H. C.

Deacons and Preachers

---February 15, 1929

Since so many have been having something to say about the deacons and preachers we feel just now that we desire to say a few words. Much has been said about the duty of deacons. We feel like saying several things about the duty of preachers, but cannot say just now what we would like to say on that line. Perhaps we can say something on that line later on, at some time in the future, if the Lord will. Let us kindly call attention, just here, that Paul has told us that even so "hath the Lord ordained that they that preach the gospel should live of the gospel." He also calls our attention to the fact that he had the power or authority to lead about a wife as well as the other apostles and other brethren. He had that same right. But he also tells us that he had not used the authority or power which he rightly had, that he might preach the gospel, the glad tidings, freely. He says "I am debtor * * * so, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also." It seems to us that the mind of the apostle was to make sacrifices and to endure whatever might befall him, that none of these things should interfere with his labor in preaching the glorious gospel of the Son of God. He would preach, whether the brethren contributed to his necessities or not. And he does not tell us

the Lord ordained that a man should live of the gospel who is not engaged in preaching it. In other words, he does not teach in this that the Lord has ordained that a man should preach one day in a week or month and live seven days a week or the whole month of the gospel. If a man spends only one or two days in the week in preaching, it is not right or Scriptural that he and his family should live in idleness the rest of the time by the liberalities of the brethren. We feel sure that if a man will devote such time to the ministry as the Lord requires of him that a way will be provided for the support of himself and those dependent on him. The Lord will put it into the heart of somebody to see after their needs-not their wants. The Lord's way was for Israel to care for the prophets He sent unto them. They failed to care for Elijah, and he had to flee for his life; but the Lord sent food to him by the ravens. He is able to do that yet; and He is faithful. We need men in the ministry who are willing to endure hardness and privations and toils and afflictions, as good soldiers; who are ready to stand with their faces like flint toward the enemies of truth and righteousness, and who will not shun to teach any part of what the Bible teaches, but who will teach it all in the spirit of love and meekness, without fear of man. May the Lord grant to send such men forth to labor in His vineyard. The laborers are few and the harvest is great. Our humble opinion is that if a man who occupies the pulpit as a preacher who is faithful to declare the whole counsel of God, doing this in the right spirit, and is conservative, and is called upon to devote his whole time to this work, that he and his family will be cared for to the extent of their real needs. If he is not cared for, we feel like he could justly conclude that he is either in the wrong field of labor or that there has been something wrong with his work or teaching. We freely confess, with other brethren, that our people have not always cared for their pastor as we think the Bible teaches they should. Yet we also say that where this duty has been taught in the right way they are free and liberal and care for their ministers. We know they have been far better to us than we feel to deserve. They have been so good to us that we simply feel like we belong to them, and that they have a right to all our labor and efforts. We can never repay what they have done for us. Thank God for the privilege of living with a people who have been so good to us. We do not mean to say or to leave the impression that we have never made a trip at our own expense, for we have done that a number of times. Yet we feel like the Lord has put it into the heart of others to make it up, and those who failed to do what the Lord has taught in His word they should do are the losers. They have failed to enjoy the blessings the Lord bestows upon His obedient children. Hence the apostle let the brethren know that it was for their good and not for his own benefit that he taught them this duty. A man who teaches this truth just for his own advantage, that he may get a contribution from the brethren, is in the wrong, we think. The preacher should have something for his children to do, as well as something for himself to do when not engaged in preaching. It is not right that his children be brought up in idleness and taught to depend upon others for a support. It is no dishonor for one to labor with his hands. Our father spent much time in the ministry. For a number of years his whole life was devoted to publishing the truth by tongue and pen. When at home he worked hard. He schooled his children the best he could in the public schools, but he also taught them to labor with their hands. We remember one winter we walked two miles to school, and during that winter we cut wood from the stump, and got it to the house, to run two fireplaces. Circumstances made it necessary to have both fires night and morning. This was before he began publishing The Primitive Baptist. After he began publishing the paper we worked in the office and went to school very little any more. His other children worked, too. We remember that one Christmas we worked all Christmas eve night to get to lay off on Christmas day, and then had to work till noon that day. We are not relating these things for

sympathy, but to emphasize the fact that it is right for the minister's family to work. Referring to the minister mentioned by Brother Blackshear in his article in another place in this paper who had thirty-two children. Surely all those children were not dependent at one time upon that preacher for a support. If so, we wonder how he ever supplied them. Sure the deacons would have had a time getting up clothing, food, and all other things such a family might use-especially if it had been as times are now, with such luxuries as many people think they must have. Wonder if the brethren bought cars for all that family to ride in! Laying aside levity, we will say that though we do not know that preacher, or who he was, yet we are of the opinion that if he was faithful to his calling, and reared his children as the Lord directs, his and their needs were supplied. No doubt, though, that they lacked many of the luxuries that many people enjoyed. Most of the Lord's ministers are poor in the goods of this world, and it has ever been so. No doubt one reason the Lord has it so is that the temptations of riches are great and have a tendency to draw them away from the service of God and His humble poor. They must be poor themselves in order to know how to sympathize with the poor. Paul knew what it was to be poor. The Saviour had not where to lay His head. Would it not be a good thing for some of us preachers to try to investigate the good Book a little more to try to learn what our duty is, and then try to do it? Let us try to learn there just what to teach, and how to teach it. Let us try to learn there if it is not our duty to be ready and willing to make sacrifices, as well as for the brotherhood to make them. Then let us be conservative, and not try to teach that the whole burden should be placed on others, and none on ourselves. For ourselves we feel like sharing the burdens with our precious brethren, and for them, and not requiring them to bear all the burdens and us go free. We want to be down, or up, with them. We are sure it is a mistake to ordain a man to the ministry who does not have the qualifications inspiration has given. And it is also a mistake to ordain a man to the office of deacon who does not possess the qualifications. Ordination will not make a man a preacher. Neither will ordination make a man a deacon. When a man is ordained for a deacon, when he is not a deacon, he is simply put into a place where he does not belong. He does not fit there, and he will not be a blessing to the church in that place. "Consider what I say, and the Lord give thee understanding in all things." -Paul. Let us consider all these things. May the good Lord help us to do as He would have us do, and to honor Him in all our doings. C. H. C.

From the Gospel Standard

---February 15, 1929

It seems that some of the same conditions exist among the Particular Baptists of England that exist among our people in the United States. We have read with interest the leading article in the Gospel Standard for January, 1929, by Mr. J. K. Popham, the editor of that magazine. We wish we had space to copy the whole article, but it is so long that we do not have space for it all. But we will copy one paragraph from it, and suggest a careful reading and study of it. C. H. C.

THE PARAGRAPH

The next thing to notice is our practice. If it is found faulty, it will undoubtedly be the fruit of the loss of a proper sense of the paramount importance of doctrine, and a consequent neglect of it in our ministry, with a more or less shallow experience in our hearts of God and His glorious gospel. But practice is a tender point. We may allow a defect in judgment and experience, but an accusation against our conduct is intolerable. But are we clean? Is church discipline understood, known, and attended

to? Is it not a fact that a member of a church may leave it, or be withdrawn from as a disorderly person, and be received by another church of the same faith and order among us without any reference to the first church, and in utter disregard of (Matthew 18:17)? Yea, and he may go forth and preach, and be received and encouraged by some of our ministers. Ought this to be? Again, have not some of our churches departed from the ancient simplicity of public worship? We have now our trained choirs, and in some of our chapels we find organs. Probably we shall yet have the choirs curtailed off from the congregations. It is not denied that harmonious singing to the accompaniment of a well played organ is most pleasing to a musical ear, but let it not be forgotten that that sound is confined within the walls of the building, while an unmusical voice, harsh and unpleasing may all the while be one sound which expresses melody and grace in the heart. **{(Ephesians 5:19); ((6) (Colossians 3:16)}** I have known causes where the people could not sing in their services, the hymns being read, and the Lord was present, as His mighty works among the people proved. But that was many years ago. Once more, are we not grievously worldly? Women and girls among us have their hair cut off, and their dresses made after the fashion of the day. And they are to be seen in our choirs, and worse, some of them are members of churches, and, while openly violating the Spirit's teaching, **{ (I Corinthians 9:13-16)}** dare to go to the Lord's table, and are permitted. Paul could say, "But if any than seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God" (verse 16). Alas! we of the "Gospel Standard" denomination cannot so speak. All our ancient landmarks are in danger of being removed, our standards are low, even moral standards.

God Was There First

---March 1, 1929

In some notes sent us from the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, of some talks made by different speakers there during the "Founder's Week Conference," was the following concerning an address delivered by J. Alexander Clark. Mr. Clark tells that God was with the natives in Central Africa long before he was there. This is plain and irrefutable evidence of the truthfulness of the doctrine advocated by the Primitive Baptists-that God is not dependent upon Bibles, preachers, churches, Sunday schools, leagues, societies, or the efforts of men to regenerate sinners-that in the work of regenerating sinners God does not use the gospel. He regenerates sinners as He pleases, whether the preacher is there or not. The tale the modern preachers tell that the Africans and other so-called heathen are dying and going to hell daily by the multiplied thousands for the lack of money and preachers is a hoax-a plain and palpable falsehood. It is told to get the hard-earned dollars from the people. They are simply making merchandise of the people. C. H. C. Mr. J. Alexander Clarke, from nearly thirty years of service in the Katanga highlands of Central Africa, held profound attention while telling of the victories of divine grace among the people whose language he has reduced to writing, and into which he has translated the New Testament. "Let me tell you of some of the amazing discoveries we made concerning that African people," said Mr. Clarke. "We found them a peaceable folk, extending a hearty welcome to all white men who went into that land. I had the privilege of going north into the Lubaland, one of the districts of Kotanga, and there I found a people never before visited by the white man, and this is the discovery that I made: Long before I set foot in Lubaland, God had been there. God had been there silently, yet eloquently testifying of His own power and deity, for all Africans of that tribe believe in God. In my study of the language and research work connected with the translation of the Holy Scriptures I found many names for God-the Father of Creation, the Ancient of many days, the breasted One

(One who plays the part of mother to us). So God is known there. Then you say, 'Why go to them?' Not only did I find this great belief in God, but also a consciousness of sin. They fear 'Bulang,' the Forger of the eternal hills. And so we find them every new moon coming with reeking blood and pouring it out at the family altar and crying out to God. Here we have this people with the knowledge of God but no joy, no happiness, only foreboding, fear and distress. And that is why we go to them with the evangel of God's great love, for in the evangel we have the final and full revelation of God."

Unreasonable Demand

---March 1, 1929

We received a letter a few days ago from a sister in which she said, "I want a little advice from you. My husband and I are Missionary Baptists, and he objects to me taking your paper, but I hate to part with it. Do you think it right for me to take it anyway?" This is a question which is embarrassing to answer, but we will try to comply with it. Our religious preferences and privileges are personal and individual matters, and no person on earth has any right to object or interfere with the same. Such a spirit is not that of Protestantism, in its originality. It is not the spirit of liberty or freedom. It is a spirit of tyranny and domination. It is the same spirit manifested by Rome in the days of the inquisition and persecution. If the husband is taking a paper that he likes to read, the wife has the same right to object to his taking such paper as he has to object to her taking the religious paper of her choice. The avowed and declared Baptist principles have always been for freedom-freedom of thought, freedom of worship, and freedom of service according to the dictates of our own conscience. If a man claims to be a Baptist-either a Missionary or Primitive-he must stand for freedom if he stands for what he claims to be. We do not advise the sister to continue taking the paper of her choice against the wishes of her husband; neither do we advise her to quit. We simply state these plain facts as above, and leave her to exercise her own choice and pleasure in the matter without any suggestion from us as to what course she should pursue. It is a matter between her and her Saviour. C. H. C.

An Anonymous Letter

---March 15, 1929

We received a letter which did not have the writer's name signed to it asking about a statement made in the last issue of The Primitive Baptist by Elder Lee Hanks in his article. We will say for the information of the writer, if he does not already know it, that no attention is paid to an unsigned letter. If a person wants the editor to answer his letter he must give his name, though the name will not be published if the writer asks that his name be withheld from publication. If the writer wishes his question answered he must let the editor know who he is. C. H. C.

Change Made

---March 15, 1929

For several months we have been trying to prayerfully consider the matter of having so many corresponding editors on the editorial staff of The Primitive Baptist and of continuing the Signal Department. We have tried to consider the matter

from every standpoint we could think of. Our conclusion was that it is frequently the case that so many corresponding editors are carried on the staff for the prestige it is supposed to give the paper. Perhaps that was one thing which influenced us in soliciting the brethren to allow their names to be put on our staff as corresponding editors. We do not say this is what influenced us, but it may have had its weight. We have been made to wonder, in our considering the matter, if The Primitive Baptist is kept up and supported mainly on account of the names of the corresponding editors which appeared on the staff. In considering the matter and trying to pray over it we were made to feel that if this is the reason why the paper is kept up, then it ought to fail and go out of existence. In other words, if the paper itself is not worthy of support from the brotherhood, then it is not worthy of support at all, and should fail. This brought us to the conclusion that it might be best to drop the names of all the brethren from the editorial staff, and let the paper be tried out on its own merits. According to this feeling in the matter we wrote a letter to each brother whose name was on the editorial staff and asked his opinion in regard to the matter of dropping all the names from the staff and discontinuing the Signal Department. We heard from all but three. Some of them may have written us, but if they did we failed to get the letter. We enclosed an addressed and stamped envelope for a reply. One brother wrote: "I have for some time seen this as you do, but thought it a matter that rests entirely with you." Another brother said: "You are no doubt right in dropping all the associate editors and the Signal Department as you suggest, and I do not see how any could feel hurt with you for doing such. Too many associate editors are worse than none, because no one feels that he should exercise any particular interest in the paper, or that it is necessary for him to write for publication." Another brother said, among other things, "I really feel that your impressions along this line are not at all bad." Another brother wrote: "Will give you my thoughts on the subject. First. The Primitive Baptist is yours, owned and managed by yourself, and I have no desire to complain at you for the manner in which you handle it. Second. It is our paper, published in the interest of the Old Baptists, and every Old Baptist ought to do all he can to uphold it and support it. I have thought it was profitable for the paper to have corresponding editors to act as agents, soliciting subscriptions and writing for the paper, but I am sure that most, if not all, who are on your staff have gone to 'sleep.' I scarcely ever see anything in the paper from the most of them. I am guilty." This brother wrote more that we want to quote farther on in this article. But what we have quoted above from these brethren mainly expresses what they all wrote us in reply to our letter. Now there is another matter we wish to mention here which we did not mention in our letter to the brethren. That is this: Sometimes some local trouble comes up in the section where one of the editors live, and this places us in an embarrassing position, for we may be called on to take some part in that local trouble. We do not say such exists now, but we have had some experience in trouble coming up where some corresponding editor was involved, either directly or indirectly. When such things come up it is hard to steer clear of the trouble, and harder still to keep some from thinking we are taking sides. To try to avoid this in the future we have felt it would be best to drop all the names from the staff. Having received the letters we did from the brethren in reply to our letter, we have decided that perhaps the best course to pursue now would be to drop the names of the corresponding editors from the staff and to discontinue the Signal Department. This step is approved by Brother Collings and all the brethren on his staff-so they all expressed themselves in reply to our letter. We are taking this step in all good feeling toward every brother whose name was on the staff, and humbly beg that none of them feel hurt toward us. We sincerely believe it is the best thing to do, considering all things pertaining thereto. Referring to the

statement above from one dear brother," I have thought it was profitable for the paper to have corresponding editors to act as agents," etc. Perhaps it is sometimes profitable for the paper, but that brings in the financial side of the matter, and brings us right back to what we before said. That may be partly, at least, what influences in getting names on the editorial staff. We have come to the conclusion that if the financial part of it has had such influence it was the wrong influence. We mean to say that the interest and the good of the cause is the influence that we have been made to feel is what should prompt and govern in the matter. It is true that the paper cannot exist without financial support, but the financial part of the matter should not be the first incentive. Certainly no one can feel that we are taking the step we are here taking on account of financial interest. As we stated in our letter to the brethren, we desire that they write for the paper when they feel so impressed, and we also desire that they do all they can consistently to help extend the circulation of the paper. We desire them to do this only and solely on the merits of the paper and the benefit they may feel that the paper is to the cause of the Master. If they honestly believe and feel that the paper is not worth the price to the Lord's dear children, then we do not ask or expect them to do a single thing toward helping to extend the circulation. If the paper is not worthy of support on its merit, without prestige of the brethren's names, then let it go down. We do not wish to "ride on the reputation" of others. They have burdens enough of their own without having to lend us their names and reputation to "ride on" to succeed with the paper. Above, we said a brother wrote more which we wished to quote farther on. He said: "I think if you would drop such fellows as me, and perhaps some others, and give the others a 'jacking up,' and have them write often enough to keep a good supply of good interesting editorials on hand for you to put in the paper-and let me suggest that you write more, too; then I think, again, that it would be best to cut out the personal correspondence that is not of much interest except to those who are personally concerned; and further that you insist that all who contribute to the paper be short and pointed in their writing-then I think we would have a better paper. I know quite well that you can't do all this; you can only publish what is sent in." Much of what this dear brother has here said is good; very good. We admit our shortcoming in not writing more for the paper ourselves. We could render many reasons and excuses as to why we have not written more, but they would do no good now. The best we know along that line is to try to resolve to try to do better from now on. We will only say that some things which we have had to pass through and endure have had some effect in regard to our writing. But we will try again to do better along this line. Pray the Lord to help us. Another thing-that personal correspondence. It is sent to us with the request or expectation of it being published; yet we have not published near all such matter as has been sent. But when we do not, then perhaps some think we have not treated them right. But we have so much more matter sent us for the paper than we have room for that we could not publish all if we desired to do so, and if we thought it would be best for the cause. The paper will only hold so much in each issue and no more-and we cannot stand the expense of printing and sending out more issues. So what are we to do? The only course we know is to try to select from what we have such as we feel is best and insert that and let the rest wait. We are behind now from last November. But please remember that the more we have on hand the more we have to select from. So do not quit writing on this account. We do sincerely wish that all would try to be short and pointed in their writing. Do not try to cover too much ground in one article. Better write two or three short articles, each one complete, on the same subject, than to have one long article. Long articles are tedious and frequently become tiresome. Reader interest is lost in continued articles. Please be brief. We especially insist that the writers of obituaries be brief and leave out all

poetry. Another thing: Please do not try to compose or write poetry, unless you know something about poetical feet, and something about rythm. Simply finding words that rhyme and putting them at the end of the lines is not writing poetry. We have been very much embarrassed with productions along this line by good meaning brethren and sisters. Pleadingly, we ask, please don't. We will, the Lord willing, have an important change to announce in the paper soon. But we have had to give up the idea of making the paper a weekly now. Perhaps, if it is the Lord's will, we can do that some day, but not now. There are not subscribers enough to justify it. But we have a change to announce very soon that we believe will please all our readers. Please pray the Lord to help us publish the paper with no other end in view than the comfort, benefit, consolation, encouragement, and instruction of His humble poor, the advancement of His blessed cause and truth, and the glory of His adorable name. C. H. C.

No Sin, No Salvation

---April 1, 1929

The Absoluters have been charged by our people with believing and advocating the idea that sin was necessary in order to salvation, and occasionally one has denied it, when it seemed evident it was to their advantage to deny it. But it has come out in print, in clear cold type, on page 17 of the Lone Pilgrim for January, 1929, published at Selma, N. C., by Elder H. F. Hutchens, editor and proprietor. The article is headed "Predestination," by Elder J. R. Hatcher, and is a letter written by him dated Lyles, Tenn., May 12, 1927, and addressed to Elder James W. Linn, Hammond, W. Va. Of course Elder Hutchens endorses the sentiment in the article, as he published it without criticism. If he does not endorse it, and will say so in plain English, we will be glad to tell our readers so. Here is what Elder Hatcher says: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." They ate and they did die, and God executed His judgment on them, and they did die. This death was in the purpose and foreknowledge of God, and God meant it for good; for if they had not eaten thereof how could we poor sinners have been saved? There you have it, in plain terms! Of course the contention is that without sin there could have been no salvation-not one of all the race of Adam could ever possibly enter the glory world had they not committed this sin! This does not make salvation in heaven depend upon good works performed by a member of Adam's family-no, not on that! But upon what does such salvation depend? According to this article it depends upon sin-disobedience to the just and holy law of the infinitely just Creator! If no one could have been saved without this, then salvation depends upon this. If salvation depends upon sin, then does not sin make salvation certain? If not, why not? If sin does not make salvation certain, then salvation does not depend upon sin, as Elder Hatcher says it does. If salvation depends upon sin, as Elder Hatcher says, then it necessarily follows that the more sin one commits the more certain his salvation would be. Do some of these fellows want to commit more sin in order to make their salvation more certain? The original Arminian theory is that the eternal salvation of the sinner depends upon the good deeds that he performs. But we suppose these Absoluters have a new and improved patent on the original Arminian theory. If eternal salvation depends upon the good deeds one performs, of course the more good deeds one does the more certain his salvation would be. Hence the idea taught by the Arminian world has been this: Perform a great many good and commendable deeds, and thereby be certain of entering the glory world at and after death. To say the least of it, the old Arminian theory might encourage to right

moral living, if it could do no more, when presented in this light. But this new invention of conditional salvation makes sin and wickedness the condition instead of right living and good deeds. It bids a premium on sin and wickedness. According to this theory if a man desires to make his eternal salvation sure, then he should lie, steal, kill, commit adultery, rape, swear, rob, murder-and if any other sin can be conceived of, do that also! Why? Because Elder Hatcher says eternal salvation depends upon sin! O Lord God, how merciful thou art, to spare men to enjoy life and health who will thus blaspheme thy holy and righteous and matchless name! "And not rather, (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say,) Let us do. evil, that good may come?" -(Romans 3:8). Here the eminent Apostle Paul informs us that some reported, or told, that he advocated the idea of doing evil that good may come, but that such a report on him was a slanderous one. If anyone should tell that Elder Hatcher advocates the doctrine of doing evil that good may come, and that such a doctrine is maintained in the Lone Pilgrim (Lone Pilgrinder, as Brother Copeland calls it), it would not be a slanderous report, but would be the truth told on them. As Paul denied advocating such a doctrine, and as it is advocated in that paper by Elder Hatcher, then they do not advocate the same doctrine Paul did. Did Paul advocate the true doctrine? or do these modern teachers advocate it? We are inclined to think these modern teachers are wrong and that Paul was right. But let us go back and examine some other things said in the article from Elder Hatcher. On page 4 we find this paragraph: Right HERE His compass stands, perfectly levelled by the power of the Eternal Jehovah, and right HERE is where the truth existed, and where the Fountain was, and our God was, is, and will always be the FIRST great CAUSE of ALL THINGS, and upon IT, ALL worlds, creatures and things must depend. The emphasis is his. Note that he says that God "was, is, and will always be the first great cause of all things." Is it not passingly strange that some will advocate such a theory as this, and then some of their brethren will deny that they believe that God is the author of sin, or that sin comes from God as the great fountain from whence all things emanate? Let us try this just a little: Who caused Adam to violate God's law in the Garden? The answer would be, Eve. Then, who caused Eve to cause Adam to transgress? The answer would be, Satan. Then, who caused Satan to cause Eve to cause Adam to transgress? The answer would necessarily be, God caused Satan to cause Eve to cause Adam to transgress. Then, where did that sin come from? Where did it originate? No man under heaven can escape the inevitable conclusion that it came from God. Does sin come from God? Did it ever come from Him? No! a thousand times NO! "A God of truth and without iniquity."-Deut. xxxii. 4. He was without iniquity when Moses penned this language; and as He changes not, He has always been without it. As He has always been without it, then it never came from Him, and He is not now and never has been the first great cause of sin. As He is not the first great cause of sin, then He is not the first great cause of all things." Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be." - James iii. 10. If God is the first great cause of all things, then He is the first great cause of some things that ought not so to be, or else James was mistaken. Was James mistaken? If so, how did you find it out? Was he an inspired man? and did he pen this language by inspiration? Did God inspire him to say "these things ought not so to be," when He was the first great cause of them being? Is God thus guilty of double dealing? Let us have another expression from Elder Hatcher in that article: "To my mind, God either predestinated ALL things, or else He predestinated NOTHING!" (Emphasis is his.) Paul tells us that God predestinated us unto the adoption of children, but tells us nothing about God predestinating the sins and devilment and murder, theft, robbery, rape, and such crimes as are committed by wicked men and devils; but the Lone Pilgrinder and the correspondents, or some of

them, do not believe God predestinated what Paul says he did, unless He also predestinated all those abominable things which Paul does not say He predestinated. But let us have another expression from this great source of wisdom: HERE is the Supreme God at the helm of the entire universe holding in HIS grasp ALL events of time in the chain of His divine providence, so definitely FIXED, determined, and APPOINTED so that neither man nor devils can break a single link in this chain of events, which were so minutely and precisely determined beforehand by this high and lofty KING! (Emphasis is his.) Here it is! God has so definitely fixed, determined and appointed all events of time so that neither man nor devils can break a single link in this chain of events. If that be so, then the eternal God, in the ancients of eternity, so definitely fixed, determined, and appointed that we should write just what we are now writing that neither men nor devils can break this link in the chain of events. Yet these Absoluters try to tear up what we write! Thus they try to destroy what they say neither man nor devils can destroy! They try to tear up and destroy God's predestination-if it is true, as they claim, that God did absolutely and unconditionally predestinate every event that transpires! Now, watch 'em vent their wrath and spleen on us. If their doctrine is true we could not do otherwise than write what we do write. It is one of the events that God has so unalterably fixed in the chain of events that neither men nor devils could destroy the little link. If that be so, why not raise the "racket" with the Almighty God for fixing it that way, if you do not like it? Some time ago a brutal negro in Little Rock, Ark., enticed a young girl into a church building there and brutally murdered her and hid her body in the tower in the building. According to these Absoluters this was one link in the chain of events that was so minutely and precisely determined, so definitely fixed, determined, and appointed by the infinitely just and holy God that neither men nor devils could prevent or change it! The negro could not change it! He could not have done otherwise than the way he did-according to these Absoluters! God fixed it that he should do that way! On page 13 of that paper the elder says, "The most wicked acts of men, or even devils, were in the predestination of God." "They cannot be otherwise, for God has sworn to them, and HE cannot lie." There you are! God swore that this brutal negro should murder the girl; the negro could not help it; he could not do otherwise! Good Lord! if this doctrine is not worse than the accusation that Jesus cast out devils by the prince of devils then words are meaningless and convey no ideas at all. God's humble poor who have been made, by the light of His Holy Spirit, to hate and abhor sin, should forsake, turn from, and spurn from them such teaching and such teachers. They should have no fellowship for such "unfruitful works of darkness." We frankly confess that we have no desire to "tie up" with such a doctrine, for we have no fellowship for it. May God help us all to forsake every false way, and to humbly seek for the truth and then to walk in the good old way, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Change of Form

---April 15, 1929

In our issue of March 15 we said: "We will, the Lord willing, have an important change to announce in the paper soon. But we have had to give up the idea of making the paper a weekly now. Perhaps, if it is the Lord's will, we can do that some day, but not now. There are not subscribers enough to justify it. But we have a change to announce very soon that we believe will please all our readers." Well, the change has been made, and The Primitive Baptist comes to you this time in

magazine form, containing sixteen pages. For some time, you know, we have been sending the paper out on the first and fifteenth of each month. This gave our subscribers twenty-four issues of the paper each year. But from now on The Primitive Baptist will be published every other week. After this issue the paper will be dated on every other Thursday. This issue is dated April 15, 1929, and makes the two issues for this month. The next issue will be dated Thursday, May 2, and then you will get the paper every other week from then on. This will give our subscribers two more issues of the paper in a whole year than we have been getting out heretofore. However, for the year 1929 there will be just twenty-five issues in all. Another change we announce in this issue is a slight change in the subscription price. The regular price heretofore has been \$2 a year, and to ministers and widows \$1.75 a year. From now on the price will be only \$1.75 a year, 90 cents for six months, or 50 cents for three months. The price will be the same to all alike. Outside the United States the price will be \$2.50 a year, on account of the extra postage it costs us, and extra cost of separating them from the other mail. Years ago the "Abstract of Principles," or Articles of Faith, were published in each issue of the paper, showing the principles the paper stands for. These have been left out for a long time. You will find them appearing again elsewhere in this issue, and it is our intention to keep them in the paper all the time, so that any person into whose hands the paper may fall may see at once what principles of doctrine and practice the paper stands for. In the present size and make up, or form of the paper, it will be much more convenient to file away and keep and to make a book of them at the end of the year. For several years we have not printed an index at the end of the year, or at the end of the volume. The pages have been numbered from 1 to 16 through the paper each issue. If you will notice the number of the pages in this issue, and the issues already printed this year, except January 15, you will see that they are numbered from the beginning of the year. At the end of the year we expect to print an index for the year. This will make it much easier and much more convenient for you to find any article later that has been published in the paper. We believe our subscribers will all like these changes. Of course we do not know they will, but we have made them, believing it would please all. We would be glad to have an expression from each and every one as to how you are pleased with the changes. Be free to express yourself. But another thing we want to call attention to, and that is this: We are now using a better grade of paper than we have been using heretofore. The paper this issue is printed on, and which we will use now is stronger and will last better than that we have been using. Another thing: From now on our editorials will begin on the first page, if we have any. We will try to write something for every issue of the paper, although sometimes we have felt very little like writing. Perhaps if we try to write more we may get to feeling more like writing. We do not know, but this may be a little like trying to preach. When one does not try often he gets so he does not feel much like trying. But when he tries more often he gets so he feels more like trying. We may not know anything about it, but this has been our experience. It is our desire to continue to try to conduct The Primitive Baptist in such a way as to benefit the Lord's humble poor, and to advocate and maintain the great principles of truth that have been handed down to us from our forefathers, and that were dear to their hearts, and which we love, and were given to the church by the Lord Himself. We desire to still be just simply a plain old-fashioned Old Baptist. It is the church our Lord established while He was here on earth, and it needs no annexes, no additions, and no subtractions. The practice He has laid down in His word, and the principles of doctrine therein expressly taught are enough. If they are not enough, then He did not know what would be needed in these times. What He gave was, and is, sufficient for all time. It is as much a violation of His law to practice or

teach what His word does not command or teach as it is to leave off what He has expressly commanded or taught. Now we ask you to please remember us in your prayers. Pray the Lord to give us wisdom and courage and strength to publish His blessed truth, both from the pulpit and from the press. And pray for our loved ones, especially our dear companion who does all she can to help us and to encourage us to go on in the discharge of every duty the Lord requires of us. She spends many lonely and lonesome hours by day and by night when we are away, and has the whole care of our dear children. Her burdens are many and heavy, but she bears them all bravely and lovingly and cheerfully. Again we say, pray for us.
C. H. C.

Evolution Disproved

---April 15, 1929

We have received from the author, Rev. William A. Williams, 1202 Atlantic Ave., Camden, N. J., a book called "Evolution Disproved." In this book the author makes fifty arguments, each of which clearly disproves the doctrine or theory of evolution. Mr. Williams shows from a number of mathematical calculations, problems in simple arithmetic, that evolution cannot be true. It is true there are a few statements in the book, but not on evolution, which we cannot accept, and on which we do not agree with the author. But that does not prevent us recommending the careful reading and studying of the same. Evolution is simply infidelity under another name, and it is being taught in our schools. It denies the work of God in creation; it denies the virgin birth of our Saviour; it denies any future state or existence of man after the death of the body. Get a copy of this book and read it and study it, and encourage your children to read and study it. It is good clear print, on good paper, and well and neatly bound in cloth. Price \$1 a single copy. Send your order to us or to the author at the address given above. Just here we want to copy a few lines from the work. On page 122, under the heading, "Five Tremendous Facts," paragraph 1 says: Jesus, a peasant, is hailed today as King by people speaking 750 languages and dialects, in all climes, and of all classes. People of every color raise to Him the song of praise and crown Him "Lord of all." There is nothing like this in all history. No other has ever approached this degree of sovereignty. His kingdom pervades the world. It is a fact that challenges thought. No world conqueror has ever had such an empire. Beside this the royalty of men like Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, Napoleon, and more modern aspirants is shadowy and ghostlike. His is an abiding and spiritual dominion. Beginning again on page 124, under the heading, "The Meaning of the Facts," we read: What shall we say of this Man? He accepted Peter's tribute. He allowed Jews to take up stones to stone Him for claiming to be the Son of God. He was conscious of being divine. He forgave sins, which is God's prerogative. He promised rest to the weary soul, which the Old Testament set forth as God's own gift. He said that He came to give life eternal, although God is the giver of life. He said that none could know the Father except through Him. He spoke to God of the glory which they shared together before the world was. Just in proportion as men have acknowledged His claims in their hearts have they found peace with God and conquest over sin and fear of worldly evil. As we consider all these things we are led to repeat Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," for God the Father's face shines upon us through Him and heaven is opened to us as we look upon Him. In the heart of this the purest of men was the clear, constant consciousness that He was divine. He always spoke and acted consistently with this consciousness. Unique in character, He made claims that would have stamped any other man as an

impostor. Humility and majesty dwell together in Him. He could say, "I am meek and lowly in heart," and also "I and my Father are one." He would call men His "brethren" and yet accept from them the words, "My Lord and my God." This wonderful character came of a race that had for ages looked for the coming of a Messiah, and whose prophetic literature was burdened with this hope. After His death His disciples who were heartbroken and cowed became inspired with a heroism that cheerfully faced martyrdom. All these facts are shining lights that point to the truth which Peter confessed. That truth is enshrined in the triumphant words of the Te Deum, "Thou art the King of glory, O Christ. Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father." And the Christ of history, the exalted Son of God, is a living Presence with us today. Not remote but ever near, He walks by our side in all life's experiences. Not only enthroned in heavenly glory "But warm, sweet, tender, even yet A present help is He, And faith has still its Olivet And love its Galilee." Such is our wonderful Saviour, a Friend with human heart of sympathy who has trod our pathway and is touched with the feeling of our infirmities; a Shepherd who gave His life for the sheep in an all-atoning sacrifice; an Advocate who represents us with all-prevailing power before the throne of the Judge Eternal; a Champion who can break the power of canceled sin and set the prisoner free; a Victor who can smite death's threatening wave before us; a Lord in whom we see the beauty and glory of the face of God. We are called upon to confess Him with lip and life. To us to live is Christ. Knowing Him we have eternal life. We have all the soul needs in Jesus. There is no substitute for Him. None can share His throne in our hearts. The Kingdom is His who is the Christ-the anointed King. Our joy is in Him, where all fullness dwells. We can say with Charles Wesley, "Thou, O Christ, art all I want," and our daily life should be one of close, constant communion with Christ. The foregoing copied from Evolution Disproved, is good reading to us. Is it not good to you? What wonderful and precious truths contained therein! We believe and feel that Rev. Williams has an experimental knowledge of the Lord, and has been brought into divine relationship with Him. C. H. C.

Organs in Churches

---May 2, 1929

In The Primitive Baptist of November 16, 1909, we made the following statement: If a church in our association (the Greenfield) should introduce an organ into her service, the sister churches would at once labor with her to get her to remove it. If she failed to do so, she would certainly be dropped from our union. This is what we would do. But your question has in it, "Should they do so?" We most emphatically, yet kindly, say yes. Law worship and law service has been closed out, and have no place in the gospel church. We could as consistently admit into our churches and fellowship the whole brood of Arminian law worship, service and practice, as we could admit the organ part of it. As for our part we want none of it. We do not know what the sentiment of the Greenfield Association is now, as we have been away from that part of the country since the latter part of October, 1919; ten years after the above was written we left that state, and it has now been more than nineteen years since it was written. We knew the sentiment of that association then. Our sentiment is the same now that it was then. We believe the sentiment of a large part, or nearly all, of that association is the same now. The above has been the sentiment of a large body of the Primitive Baptists all along the ages. The organ has never been an appendage in the service in the church of God. True, organs have occasionally been introduced among them in some localities, but as a people they have always rejected them. It may be that they have, all along, kicked about

organ Baptists and swallowed a key fork. They have, all along, objected to the use of organs in their churches, whether they swallowed key forks or not. On September 26, 1698, the Episcopalians sent a letter to the Baptists in Philadelphia, Pa., asking their reasons why they could not unite in communion with them. The Baptists gave an answer in a letter dated March 11, 1699. The Baptists demanded that the Episcopalians give Scripture authority "that instruments of musick are to be used in God's worship, under the New Testament; that infant baptism is a duty; that pouring or sprinkling water is the right manner of baptizing; that your manner of administering the sacraments, and signing with the sign of the cross in baptism are of divine appointment; that godfathers and godmothers are of divine appointment. These are some of the things we desire you to prove and make plain to us by the holy Scriptures." See Benedict's History of the Baptists, page 492, Volume 2, edition of 1813. Another thing which those Baptists then demanded was, "That you will give us clear and infallible proof from God's holy word, * * * that our Lord Jesus Christ hath given power and authority to any man, men, convocation, or synod, to make, constitute, and set up any other laws, orders, officers, rites and ceremonies, in His church, besides those which He hath appointed in His holy word; or to alter or change those, which He hath therein appointed, according as may, from time to time, to them seem convenient; and that we are bound in conscience towards God, by the authority of His word, to yield obedience thereunto; or whether it will not rather be a sore reflection upon the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, and a high defamation of the kingly and prophetic offices of Jesus Christ, to suppose such a thing." It is clearly seen from the above quotation that the Baptists formerly rejected the use of organs in their churches-that they would not allow instrumental music in their assemblies. In 1859, after the division in the Baptist family on account of the introduction of the new things adopted by those who went with the modern Missionary element, David Benedict wrote his book called "Fifty Years Among the Baptists." Remember that Benedict went with the modern Missionaries in the division. In this book he says, concerning the introduction of the organ among the Baptists: This instrument, which from time immemorial has been associated with cathedral pomp and prelatical power, and has always been the peculiar favorite of great national churches, at length found its way into Baptist sanctuaries, and the first one ever employed by the denomination in this country, and probably in any other, might have been seen standing in the singing gallery of the old Baptist meeting house in Pawtucket, about forty years ago, where I then officiated as pastor; and in process of time, this dernier resort in church music was adopted by many of our societies which had formerly been distinguished for their primitive and conventicle plainness. The changes which have been experienced in the feelings of a large portion of our people has often surprised me. Staunch old Baptists in former times would as soon have tolerated the Pope of Rome in their pulpits as an organ in their galleries, and yet the instrument has gradually found its way among them, and their successors in church management, with nothing like the jars and difficulties which arose of old concerning the bass viol and smaller instruments of music. Benedict then goes on to tell how these instruments were gradually introduced into the churches. We quote the above to show that it was a new thing among the Baptists, and those who favored this new thing also favored the other new things that were invented by Fuller, Carey and others, which new things finally brought on the division among the Baptists, and from which sprang the people now called Missionary Baptists. Organs in churches were first used by the Catholics. Benedict tells us that the old staunch Baptists "would as soon have tolerated the Pope of Rome in their pulpits as an organ in their galleries," or churches. This was a principle of the old Baptists, of the staunch Baptists. If that was a principle of a staunch Baptist then, how about the man

called a Baptist that now favors the toleration of such in his church? Is he a staunch Baptist, according to this witness? As for us, we just wish to say, in conclusion, that it is still our desire to be just simply a plain old-fashioned Old Baptist. May the Lord help us all to take the Bible as the man of our counsel, and do just what it says do, and leave everything else alone. C. H. C.

Secret Orders

---May 2, 1929

We have received the following request: "Write your views on Masonry and publish the same in The Primitive Baptist as soon as you can, giving your best text in condemnation of Masonry and secret orders." We do not have the time right now to write an article on this question, but feel like it would be just as well, or better, to give our readers an article on this subject from the pen of the late Elder John R. Daily which was published in The Primitive Baptist of August 23, 1910, under the heading, "The False Religious Principles of Secret Orders." Elder Daily was an able man and an able writer, and in this article he gives good and unanswerable arguments and reasons why Primitive Baptists should not affiliate with secret orders. We will just say here that there is one command in God's word which no man can obey and be a lodge member and a member of the Primitive Baptist Church at the same time. If A belongs to the lodge, his first duty as a lodge member is to his brother in the lodge. Suppose A and B are both members of the same lodge, and A and C are members of the Primitive Baptist Church. As a member of the lodge A's first duty is to his brother B; as a member of the church his first duty is to his brother C. Both of them cannot be first. For proof that his first duty is to his brother C as a church member we give you this text: "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." -(Galatians 6:10). If there were no other reason this is reason enough why no Primitive Baptist should be a lodge member. But we will here give the article by Elder Daily. Read it, and profit by it. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

I have been opposed to secret, oath bound fraternities ever since I became old enough to observe and know of their nature and operations. As I have studied their principles and operations I have become fully convinced that, in many respects, they are a curse rather than a blessing to society. A number of reasons can be given why no one should belong to them, but it is my purpose now to show why no Primitive Baptist ought to affiliate with them. While I am opposed to them from a social, moral and financial standpoint, it is from a religious standpoint that my greatest objections arise. It is objected, of course, that my not being a member of any secret order disqualifies me to judge of their nature. To this I will reply that I am glad indeed that I have never been enticed to those worldly institutions; as to my opportunities to become acquainted with their nature and operations, I beg leave to say that I have been able to learn all that needs to be known unless one wishes to become a member, which is amply sufficient for my present purpose and sufficient to keep me out of them all of my life. With the information I possess of secret orders I would not belong to one of them even if I did not profess the religion of Jesus. Without entering any lodge I have been able to learn much by observing their public exercises of a religious character, also from their published literature, and from expositions that have been made by seceders. Many of their secrets have "leaked out," enough to utterly disgust me with them, and, besides, it is claimed by them that the chief use of their secrets is for the purpose of

recognition. If that be true, one does not have to become a member, does not have to know their "secrets" to be able to discover their fallacious nature. Secret orders are, in general, religious orders. Who can read the prayers offered in the Freemason and Odd Fellow lodges and say conscientiously that they are not religious organizations? There is no disputing it. Take, for instance, the prayer offered at the initiation of a candidate to the degree of Entered Apprentice in a Freemason Lodge, as given on pages 26 and 27 of the "Craftsman and Freemason's Guide:" "O thou supreme Author of our being and lover of our souls;-thou art everywhere present, and knowest the thoughts and intentions of our hearts; bless us we pray thee, in our endeavors to do good, and spread peace and concord and unity among our fellow men. May this, our friend, who is now to become our brother, devote his life to thy service and his talents to thy glory. May he be endowed with wisdom to direct him in all his ways, strength to support him in all his difficulties, and the beauty of morality to adorn his life. May he set thee constantly before his eyes, and seek thy approbation as his greatest treasure. May he become enlightened in the knowledge of divine things, and be induced to love thee from thy manifest love to him. And may he and we regulate our actions by the light of revealed truth, and to construct our spiritual edifice, that when done laboring as apprentices in this lower temple, we may be raised to the sublime enjoyments of the upper sanctuary-in that temple not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, whose maker and builder is God. Amen." This shows Freemasonry to be religious and to hold to the unscriptural theory that they can so construct their own "spiritual edifice" as to "be raised to the enjoyment of the upper sanctuary." Is it possible that any Primitive Baptist can have fraternal relations with such a religious sect as that? It seems unreasonable. Take, as another specimen, the prayer at the close of a lodge meeting of Odd Fellows, as found on pages 99 and 100 of the "Odd Fellow's Textbook:" "We bless thee, O Lord, that we have been permitted to enjoy this, another lodge meeting. Pardon what thou hast seen amiss in us; and now, as we are about to depart, let thy blessings be with us, and with our brethren throughout the globe. May brotherly love prevail, and every moral and social virtue adorn our lives, while members of the Lodge below, and at last be admitted to the joys of a better world: and thine be the glory, forever and ever. Amen." "The lodge below" is suggestive of the idea of a "lodge above." The idea is held forth in many prayers they offer that there is to be a transition from the "Lodge below" to the "Lodge above." How can any Primitive Baptist endure such blasphemy, comparing the lodge, the secret oath bound lodge, in which wicked people mingle with them and call them "Brother," comparing that lodge to heaven and immortal glory? Echo answers, "How!" It is a religious order, but what kind of religion does it promulgate? The following petition, suggested for the funeral service of Freemasons, is given on page 199 of the "Freemason's Guide:'And at last, Great Parent of the Universe, when our journey shall be near its end, when the silver cord shall be loosed, and the golden bowl broken; oh, in that moment of mortal extremity, may the 'lamp of thy love' dispel the gloom of the dark valley; and may we be enabled to 'work an entrance' into the Celestial Lodge above, and in thy glorious presence, amidst the ineffable mysteries, enjoy a union with the souls of our departed friends, perfect as the happiness of heaven, and durable as the eternity of God. Amen. So mote it be." Is the institution not a religious one? Are the members not taught that they can "work an entrance into the Celestial Lodge above?" Such Deistical, Arminian teaching! How can a Primitive Baptist ever endure it? In the "Ancient Constitutions" of Freemasonry, which are said to be "obligatory as fundamental regulations, in all parts of the world, "and are declared to be "absolutely requisite in all who aspire to partake" of the sublime honors of those who are duly initiated into the mysteries and instructed in the art of "ancient

Masonry," there is found the following significant statement in Chap. I, Sec. First: "Whoever, from love of knowledge, interest or curiosity, desires to be a Mason, is to know that, as his foundation and great corner stone, he is firmly to believe in the eternal God, and to pay that worship to Him which is due to Him as the great Architect of the Universe." As it requires all who desire to become Masons, not only to believe in the eternal God, but to pay that worship to Him which is due, it is undeniable that Freemasonry is a religious order. Its religion is purely Deism. I am so glad that I have never aspired "to partake of the sublime honors of those who are duly initiated into the mysteries of ancient Masonry!" Indeed I am! In the Odd Fellows' nine "Chapters of Counsel," Chap. IV, Sec. 4, the following declaration is made: "Our infinite Creator, who is the Soul of all true friendship, and source of all Good; who is abundantly worthy of our love; and who may rightfully command our obedience-is the only proper object of our worship." Here is the doctrine of Deism again. The order would not dare to associate the name, the sweet name of Jesus, with the Father. That would be contrary to its doctrine. So Odd Fellowship is a worshiping or religious institution, but save us from its doctrine. I could multiply proofs of this kind, for I have an abundance at my hand, but I conclude a sufficiency of evidence has been adduced to show that secret orders are of a religious character. I am giving attention to the orders of Freemasonry and Odd Fellowship, because these are the chief ones after which all others have principally patterned. The public ceremonies at the laying of corner stones, the religious performances at the burial of the dead, etc., show that these fraternal orders are religious. Having shown that secret societies are religious, I now propose to present a few facts to prove that the religious principles upon which they are founded are absolutely false. I say a few facts, for my limited space forbids my giving anything like all that I could give along this line. We have already seen that the doctrine of such societies is Deism, a kind of belief in a God, but not of the God in Christ or Christ in God. Though there are many religious prayers and ceremonies, the sweet name of our adorable Jesus is not once allowed to be used. In orders where all possible religious beliefs are blended, it is absolutely necessary to accommodate all with religious principles which do not conflict with their beliefs, except it be the belief of the true child of God. His faith, if it is what it ought to be, comes in conflict with every principle of doctrine upon which such societies are founded. It could not be expected that the religious doctrine of secret orders would be correct, for they are all of the world, and the world is never right in religion. On page 34, "Masonic Jurisprudence," we find this declaration of principles: "Masonry does not attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious faith of its disciples, except so far as relates to the belief in the existence of God, and what necessarily results from that belief." In a footnote on the same page is the following: "On the subject of the religious, or rather the doctrinal, requirements of Masonry, the Old Charges utter the following explicit language: 'Though in ancient times, Masons were charged in every country to be of the religion of that country or nation, whatever it was; yet it is now thought expedient only to oblige them to that religion in which all men agree, leaving their particular opinions to themselves.' " According to this all Masons are obliged to some kind of religion, and that kind is the one in which all men agree. We will see what kind it is to which all the members are obliged by the order, the one in which all men agree, as they say. Odd Fellowship, Freemasonry, and all other secret orders, are founded upon the false religious dogma of Universalism-the dogma of the Universal Fatherhood of God and the Universal Brotherhood of man. In the Odd Fellows' Textbook, page 127, this false doctrine is predicated as the corner stone, the solid basis, on which the whole superstructure rests. "Man is a constituent of one universal Brotherhood, having come from the hand of a common Parent. * * * By it all nations, tongues, and creeds, may be

brought to comprehend the motive for Fraternity. FRATERNITY. This is our corner stone. Upon its solid basis rests our superstructure. It teaches us to regard the great family of mankind as our brethren; children of one heavenly Father, the great Author of our existence." Think of it! The great corner stone of Odd Fellowship is the greatest falsehood, the greatest religious error that was ever propagated. If we are children of one heavenly Father, as Universalists and Odd Fellows teach, then we are all heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus (though Odd Fellows discard Jesus from all their religious service), and Universalism is unquestionably true. How can a Primitive Baptist belong to a religious, secret order, the corner stone of which is such a monstrous heresy? For the life of me I cannot see how. The doctrine of Freemasonry is the same. A statement is given in one of the twenty-five Landmarks of Freemasonry, which declares this in plain terms," But the doctrine of Masonic equality implies that, as children of one great Father, we meet in the Lodge upon the same level-that on that level we are all traveling to one predestined goal." They say they are all traveling to one predestined goal, being all children of one great Father, though many of them are profane prostitutes. Predestination is made to play an important part in this doctrine of Masonry. What God has predestinated must come to pass. Then all, wicked wretches as well as various followers of God, will reach the one predestined goal- heaven-as children of the one great Father, according to the doctrine of this secret, oath bound, heretical order. Again," Craftsman and Freemason's Guide," page 35: "By the exercise of brotherly love we are taught to regard the whole human species as one family, the high and the low, the rich and the poor, who, as created by one Almighty Parent, and inhabitants of the same planet, are to aid, support, and protect each other." So they believe that not only members of the order are children of God, but the whole human species. That God is our Father because He created us is the chief corner stone of Universalism, as false as any falsehood could be. This sets aside any necessity of the new birth in order to see and enter into the kingdom of heaven. In the doctrine of these secret orders no such necessity is recognized. Christ Himself is not a necessity in the religious principles of secret orders. It is a common thing to hear members of secret orders say, "There is good enough religion in the lodge for me." They say if one lives up to the requirements of the lodge he will get to heaven. There may be good enough religion in the lodges for the world, for their religious heresies suit the world, but how a child of God, one who wants to know and practice the truth, can stand such religious heresies, I am wholly unable to see. On the other hand, some who want to make an excuse for belonging to them, say," Oh, they are not religious institutions at all; they make no pretensions to religion." We have already seen how unfounded such a statement is. The very foundation of them is religious heresy, and their ceremonies are of a religious character of the most disgusting kind, seeing they are not only false, but that the most irreligious and profane engage in them as a vain show. Having shown that the religious doctrine of secret orders is Deism and Universalism combined, I now propose to show that it is Arminian. The doctrine of salvation as taught by the religious writings, prayers and ceremonies of secret orders is conditional, as it holds forth the idea that man can by his own efforts prepare himself for the "Lodge above," as they term heaven. Though this conflicts somewhat with the Universal platform upon which these heretical institutions are predicated, yet such is the doctrine, contradictory though it is. In the Odd Fellows' Textbook, page 154, is found this statement of religious doctrine: "Virtue alone is happiness. It gives joy which none but he who practices it can understand. Its influence is felt and acknowledged even by the bad. It will be the crown of age, the honor of manhood, the guardian of youth: it will be our guide in prosperity, and solace in affliction. It will give us here on earth the truest happiness (this is well enough so far, but notice), and prepare

us for the future state to which we are hastening." Suppose I should preach in the pulpit that what we do in the way of practicing virtue prepares us for the happiness of heaven. All would unite in crying me down as an Arminian. Yet this abominable heresy is the doctrine of Odd Fellowship. This heretical teaching is given as inducement to practice virtue. There is no need of being born again, no need of a Saviour, to prepare us for the glory world; just practice virtue and you'll get there. Such is the doctrine of this oath bound order, such is its religious teaching. How about Freemasonry? Let us see. "The lamb has, in all ages, been deemed an emblem of innocency; he, therefore, who wears the lambskin of Masonry, is thereby continually reminded of that purity of life and conduct, which is essentially necessary to his admission into the Celestial Lodge above, where the Supreme Architect of the Universe presides." -Freemason's Guide, page 29. A member of the Primitive Baptist Church would surely feel strange in wearing the lambskin to be reminded thereby that his entering heaven, which he is taught to regard as "the Celestial Lodge above," is conditioned upon what he does himself, Christ and the new birth cutting no figure in the matter of his salvation at all. In this he is professing to believe two contradictory doctrines, the doctrine of the Bible and the doctrine of Freemasonry. How can he ever endure to wear the lambskin under such teaching as that, with conflicting faith revolving in his mind? Odd Fellows believe that we are brought at last to a peaceful and pleasant abode by continuous struggles of our own, notwithstanding their conflicting faith that we are all the children of God and bound to the "Celestial Lodge above." The religious doctrine of the world has never been known to be consistent even with itself, and is always wrong in general principles. Notice what is given in the last Nine Chapters of Counsel: "But we must struggle on, though beset with danger, toil, and strife, through the wilderness of this world to our destiny. Let us therefore be stout of heart, and determine, through faith and energy, to overcome the obstacles that lie in our path. Let not fear or discouragement cause us to turn back after we shall have once entered upon our journey. Let us take honesty for our guide; however rough or uncouth he may seem, or whatever abuse may be heaped upon him by those who love him not, if we cling to him and follow him, he will assuredly bring us at last to a peaceful and pleasant abode." Now, who does the Odd Fellow expect to bring him to that final peaceful and pleasant abode? "Honesty." How is "honesty" to do this? By our following him and clinging to him. It all depends upon us, then, according to the religious doctrine of Odd Fellowship, whether we reach the peaceful and pleasant abode in heaven. No depending upon Christ, for He has nothing whatever to do with the system. Again see what is asserted in the third Section of the same Chapter: "It may be, even, that in following it (the journey to heaven) poverty and want shall beset thee: but keep up thy spirit; look not at present ease, which is but for a moment, but rather at future rest, which shall be everlasting." In the fifth Section this strong language is given: "Brother! cheer thee! Thou hast done well; thou art far on thy toilsome way. * * * In that glorious Rest, thou shalt behold the innumerable hosts who have traveled this path before thee. Thou shalt join 'the Patriarchs of the infant world,' and mingle thy voice with theirs in the music of the angels. Thou shalt dwell in the presence of the Most High, whose smile is heaven. Throughout the eternal ages of Jehovah thou shalt be the associate of angels and just men made perfect, in a land where, far more than this, Faith and Truth are lovely and divine." This needs no comment. The "Faith and Truth" referred to I suppose to be the heretical doctrine of Uni-versalism, Deism, and Arminianism, as a mingled mess of falsehoods, which are found here in the religious teaching of this and other secret orders. In the Charge upon the installation of a Master of a Lodge of Masons is the following instructions: "In short, by a diligent observance of the Bylaws of your Lodge, the Constitutions of Masonry,

and, above all, the Holy Scriptures, which are given us as a rule and guide to your faith and practice, you will be enabled to acquit yourself with honor and reputation; and lay up a crown of rejoicing, which shall continue when time shall be no more." That will do for that. How does it suit a Primitive Baptist who professes to believe that Christ will give the crown to all His elect people when He comes to gather them as His own jewels? I write this in love for the dear cause of Christ, the cause most dear to me. I know it is argued that the lodge is beneficial for the purpose of assuring ourselves that we will be cared for if we get sick, and that if we die a sum will be due our families. One man who had been excluded from the Baptist Church, and then joined a secret order, said to me that when he was once sick no one came to see him. Now he said he belonged to a lodge and could depend upon that to take care of him. He was well able to hire nurses if he needed them. Besides it was a reflection upon himself to say he was no more thought of by his neighbors and brethren and sisters. If I live in such a way that no one will care for me if I should get sick, I will surely have too much good sense to complain. Purchased love and help is not to be appreciated like that which comes from the hearts of those we love and who love us. I confess that the charity that once prevailed has largely died out. But what is the cause of it? It is due to secret societies more than to any other one thing. Now, it is the general feeling that the order will attend to the needs of the needy, and so that former sociability, hospitality and charity have died away. What a pity this is! One thing is sure, I can trust Him who has said, "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, or maketh flesh his arm," and who said, "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is." If I die in the poorhouse, or lie upon a bed of affliction and suffering without human aid, I can still say, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust Him." When I am called from this world of sin I expect to leave my loved ones, if any survive me, in the hands of a better support than any human institution of this wicked world. I expect to leave them all in the hands of Him who is the Father of the fatherless and the Husband of the widow. Away with the folly of looking to heretical, secret, oath bound societies for aid!
Dear brethren, beloved of the Lord,

"Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness." "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you." These things are said to us by our dear Lord, and we ought to obey Him rather than man. I am sure we ought. Oh, listen to His word and obey it! I love His dear people who have been caught in the whirlpool of these unscriptural societies, the religious doctrine of which is directly antagonistic to the truth as it is in Jesus, and contrary to the experience of every child of God. You do not need the aid of such at all. I have never needed it and never shall. All I need is Jesus, the sinner's Friend. You may have all this world, give me Jesus. Yours in hope of heaven, John R. Daily.

Matthew 16:18-19

---May 16, 1929

We have been requested to give our views on (Matthew 16:18-19), and will try to write just a few lines. The text reads: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever

thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." The word Peter is translated from a word that means a piece of rock, a particle of rock, or of the rock family. The word rock is translated from a word which means the bed rock, the foundation rock, or foundation stone. **(Deuteronomy 32:4)** "He is the Rock, His work is perfect." Here again we have the foundation stone, the bed rock. **(I Corinthians 10:4)** "And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." This word Rock, in this text is from the same word as that in **(Matthew 16:18)**. The church is built upon Christ as the foundation upon which it rests. "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone." -(Ephesians 2:19-20). The apostle here tells us plainly that Jesus Christ Himself is the chief corner stone-the stone, the rock, the foundation upon which the church rests. This is a sure foundation, which shall never be moved. "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." The keys are used to lock and unlock the doors of a building. Up to this time the door of the kingdom of heaven, the church, had not been opened to the Gentiles. All those whom the Saviour had sent out up to this time had been forbidden to go among the Gentiles. After His resurrection He told His apostles to "go ye into all the world." -(Mark 16:15). Their field of labor was now enlarged. Peter was the one who preached the first gospel sermon to the Gentiles. "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." -((7) (Acts 15:7). The time the apostle referred to was when he went to the house of Cornelius and preached the first gospel sermon to the Gentiles; and that was when the door of the church was opened to the Gentiles. God had made choice among the apostles that Peter should, by his preaching, open the door of the kingdom to the Gentiles, and they should be admitted into the blessings and privileges of gospel worship and service. These gospel privileges are yet granted to the Gentiles, though they may be taken from us on account of our disobedience and rebellion, as they were taken from the Jews for the same reason. If we do not wish to be deprived of these blessings and privileges we should awake from our lethargy, and "seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." The Jews were cut off from these blessings because of unbelief; and the apostle warns us that "if God spared not the natural branches that sinned, take heed lest He also spare not thee." May the Lord help us to awake to a full discharge of our each and every duty. C. H. C.

Contradicted Himself

---May 16, 1929

A clipping from some newspaper has been sent to us containing an account of a discourse delivered in Dallas, Texas, by Dr. Lewis S. Chafer at the Schofield Memorial Church, of which he was then the pastor. We do not have space for the whole clipping, but we wish to copy two paragraphs from the report. He was preaching on the security of the believer. He said: God the Father has made an unconditional new covenant which cannot be broken. This is illustrated in every promise of salvation under grace. No human merit is recognized. **{(John 5:24)}** God the Son has, by His sacrifice, taken away all sin. It is sin alone that might separate from God, but Christ has died. **{(Romans 8:34)}** Men are now condemned for not accepting the provided Saviour. **{(John 3:18)}** Thus the only condemnation is removed from the one who accepts Christ. Notice that the Doctor says that God has made an unconditional new covenant, and yet the Doctor makes

it depend upon the sinner accepting Christ. If it depends upon the sinner accepting Christ in order to it being fulfilled, then it is not an unconditional covenant. An unconditional covenant is one in which the principal party of the covenant agrees, or promises, to do a certain thing, or certain things, named in the covenant, and that promise or agreement is not hinged upon anything to be done, performed, or complied with by the party to whom the promise is made, or by the parties embraced in the promise. A covenant cannot be unconditional if there are any stipulations laid down therein for the other party to comply with in order to the fulfillment of the covenant. The Doctor says that sin alone may separate from God. Is it a sin for one to refuse to accept? If it is not a sin, then it cannot separate one from God, if sin alone may do that. If it is a sin for one to refuse to accept, then Christ has taken away that sin, as the Doctor says that "God the Son has, by His sacrifice, taken away all sin." According to the Doctor nothing but sin can condemn one of the race, and Christ has taken all sin away. If He did that for all the race, then what can condemn one of the race? If refusing to accept is not sin, it cannot condemn one, according to the Doctor. But the Doctor says Christ has taken away all sin and nothing but sin can condemn, and yet one is condemned for not accepting the provided Saviour! If these modern theologians do not "jumble" things up we do not know how one could go about doing so. Wonderful, wonderful, logic the Doctor has given us! C. H. C.

In Mississippi

---May 30, 1929

At the present writing (May 11, 1929) we are filling appointments in Mississippi, as arranged for us by Elder J. C. Huddleston, of Caledonia, Miss. When Brother Huddleston made the appointments and we received word from him telling us when and where they began we had but little time to make any arrangements to be from home. We had to leave without making much arrangement. We received the word from him on Monday, April 22, that the first appointment was at New Salem, near Walnut, Miss., on Friday, April 26. We left home on Thursday at noon and arrived at Middleton, Tenn., that night at 10 o'clock. Elder J. T. Davis met us at the train, and we spent the remainder of the night with him at his home. Friday morning he went with us to Walnut, Miss., where we were met at the train and conveyed out to the church. The congregation was not large there, as they told us the appointment was not very well circulated, but we enjoyed a very pleasant meeting. Saturday and Sunday we were at Little Hope Church. A very good congregation present both days, and a pleasant meeting. Elder Geo. W. Durbin lives near the church, and we enjoyed being with him. Elder Coy Wallis is pastor of this church and was with us. He continued with us until Friday following. On Monday and Tuesday we were with the Pleasant Hill Church. On account of bad roads near the church the services were held at the home of Brother Nance. A good congregation present both days, and the meeting was an enjoyable one both days. On Wednesday we were conveyed across the country, over some very rough roads, to Antioch Church. A very small crowd present. We were informed that not a male member was present, and just three sisters. A few "outsiders" were present. On Thursday and Friday we were at New Prospect, near New Albany, Elder Wallis still with us. He is pastor at Little Hope, Antioch and Pleasant Hill. Elder Jas. Duncan, of Memphis, Tenn., is the pastor at New Prospect. Elder W. L. Smith, of Oxford, was with us here on Friday. The congregation was not large either day, but the service was sweet and enjoyable. On Saturday morning we went to Tupelo on the train, where we were

met by Friend Green and conveyed to his home and then to Union Church for service that afternoon. Had service there also on Sunday. A large crowd was present on both days. On Sunday a sister, whose name we think is Carden, came forward and asked for a home in the church. She was gladly received, her baptism to be attended to at the next regular meeting of the church. This church is in the Tombigbee Association. The others are in the Regular Baptist Association. On Monday and Tuesday we were at Pleasant Hill Church. Elder D. F. Hankins lives near the church, and is their pastor. A large crowd was present both days, and we enjoyed the service. The meetings were pleasant indeed. On Wednesday morning Elder Hankins conveyed us to New Hope Church, Hatley, where we had service Wednesday and Thursday. Elder J. C. Huddleston is the pastor of this church, and they think a lot of him. A large crowd was present both days, and they were sweet meetings. On Thursday, just as the service was about to be dismissed, a Brother Speed and wife came forward asking for a home with the church. He said he felt like he could not go away again without asking for a home with them. They were gladly received, and their baptism is to be attended to at the next regular meeting time. This is a lovely band of brethren and sisters, as well as other places we have visited on this tour. We spent one night at the home of Dr. Tubb, in Smithville, with his father who was sick and not able to be at the meeting. Brother Tubb is eighty-five years old and has been a faithful member of the church for many years. We trust that he may be restored to health again and once more blessed with the sweet privilege and pleasure of assembling with the brethren and sisters at the church. On Friday we were with the church at Bigbee, Elder Huddleston going with us. Elder Carter was also present with us, and he was also at Union the Sunday before, as was also Elder Conwill. This was another pleasant meeting, and we enjoyed our short stay with those brethren and sisters. A number of members of New Hope were there. The New Hope Association is to convene with them on Friday before the second Sunday in September. We would be glad to attend that meeting, but do not now think we can very well do so. Now, today, May 11, we were with Sulphur Spring Church. Elder Huddleston is pastor of this church, and his membership is here. The service was pleasant and delightful today, though not so large a crowd as some of the brethren seemed to expect, though we thought that did very well for Saturday. Brother W. M. Ford and wife, of Taylorsville, Miss., were present, with a daughter and son-in-law. We were pleasantly surprised to meet them here. We have been at Brother Ford's home several years ago. We are now at the home of a Brother Walters, who is blind, and where Elder Huddleston is making his home. We do not think it necessary to make mention of the names of all the brethren who conveyed us from place to place, and whose homes we visited. We have enjoyed the trip so far, and have been kindly received and well treated-much better than we feel to deserve. We appreciate every kindness that has been shown us, and pray that the Lord's richest blessings may rest upon them. The appointments close May 21, and then we expect to return to our humble little home, where we know our loved ones will be looking for us and longing for our coming. We are getting anxious for the time to come to start home. We desire an interest in the prayers of the Lord's dear children. Pray the good Lord to direct us in the right way, and to enable us to speak such things as will have a tendency to draw His children more closely together in love and sweet fellowship. If we know our poor heart, we trust we may never advocate a thing that would tend to cause confusion among them. C. H. C.

Christ's Birthday

---May 30, 1929

We have received the following question: "Please give me your views on when Christ was born. Most people think and claim that Christmas day is His birthday. I want to know what you think about it." As we have stated in our columns before, we so state again, that no man on earth knows the day the Saviour was born. But it is evident that He was not born in December, or any other winter month. On the night of His birth shepherds were keeping watch over their flocks by night. The flocks were in the open field, and the shepherds were keeping watch over them. That country is a colder country than the states in the Union where sheep raising is engaged in; and those who know anything about the matter of sheep raising know that in cold weather the sheep are not turned out in the pastures to graze, but are kept under shelter. This is enough to prove that He was not born in winter. The observing of December 25 as the birthday of the Saviour is nothing more nor less than an invention and institution of Roman Catholicism. C. H. C.

Another Change

---June 13, 1929

Before our dear brother, Elder J. J. Turnipseed, was called away arrangements had been made between him and Elder J. H. Phillips, of Huron, Tenn., to soon begin the publication of a new paper to be called The Primitive Paths. A prospectus had been printed and mailed out, making announcement of the proposed new paper. Arrangements were made for us to do the printing of the paper for them and to mail it out from this office. Since the sad death of our dear brother, Brother Phillips does not feel like going ahead with the undertaking. He does not feel like shouldering the responsibility alone. So the publication of The Primitive Paths had to be abandoned. There was just about enough type set for the first issue, and the expectation was for it to be mailed on the sixth day of June. Those articles are all in this issue of the paper. This sad, sudden and unexpected turn of affairs reminds us very forcibly that "man proposes, but God disposes." Our times are in His hand. How often our plans are all upset and overthrown! But still all our hope and trust and confidence are in a God who is never disappointed and whose plans are never overthrown. Since this sad stroke has befallen us, we have been trying again to beg the Lord to direct us as to what course we should pursue with The Primitive Baptist. Our readers know that we have been wanting to make it a weekly for some time; but we have been afraid to risk taking the step. We were afraid to risk following the impression without more subscribers (or a larger list) first. It seems that we have been afraid to "walk by faith" on this proposition. Now, we have fully decided to step right out and follow this impression, or desire, to publish The Primitive Baptist weekly. We feel to hope that if the Lord is in the matter the paper will be sustained. We trust our readers will put forth a double effort to double the circulation. Remember that the paper will come to you twice as often as every other week, and Christmas week will be the only week we expect to miss. This change will be made the first of July. The first issue of the weekly will be dated July 4, 1929. Please bear in mind that the support of the paper comes from the subscriptions. The few advertisements we publish do not support the paper-they only help to bear a very small part of the expense. They do not even pay the salary of one of the clerks we have to keep employed in the office. We use more than we receive from that source in sending the paper to poor saints who are not able to pay for it. We feel sure that those who are able to pay for the paper are willing for us to receive this fund which is used in this way. The price of the paper will now have to be made \$2 a year, to all alike. This is as low as it can possibly be made. But until July first you can renew at \$1.75 a year. Your renewal must be mailed not later than June 30 to

get the benefit of this price. Pay for as many years as you wish to at this price until that time. How do you like this size type? Write a card and tell us. If enough of our readers tell us they want us to do so, we will set a part of the paper in this type when we change to the weekly. Please let us hear from you. Feel free to tell us how you feel about these things. We can't all have all things as we prefer them; but we desire to try to please the greatest number of the subscribers in those matters wherein we should try to please. Remember us in your prayers. Pray the Lord to direct us in the right way and to help us to "enquire for the old paths, where is the good way," and give us courage to "walk therein." C. H. C.

Trip in Mississippi

---June 27, 1929

In our issue of May 30 we gave an account of our trip in Mississippi up to the eleventh of May. The article was written on Saturday, May 11. We were at Sulphur Spring Church, the home church of Elder J. C. Huddleston, near Caledonia, Miss., on that day and also on Sunday, May 12. A large crowd was present on Sunday, and the meeting was enjoyed. On Sunday afternoon Elder Huddleston went with us to Columbus, where we tried to preach that night in the home of a Brother Daugherty. Several people were present and we had a very pleasant little service. Monday morning Brother Huddleston conveyed us to Enon Church, near Houston, the home church of Elder E. M. Verell, deceased. The crowd was not large. While we were trying to speak to them in the name of the Master a friend came to the church and informed us that we were wanted at the telephone at a home nearby. He told us there was a long distance call for us from Fordyce, Ark. When we got to the telephone we were informed by our wife that she had a message for us from Birmingham to come there at once, as Elder Turnipseed was not expected to live through the day. We left at once, being conveyed by Brother Huddleston to Aberdeen, where we met Friend Bourland from Amory, who took us in his car to that place. We went to the home of a Brother Pennington, who kindly had us try to sleep some, and who called us at the proper time. Sister Pennington had prepared us a lunch, and then Brother Pennington conveyed us to the train. We left there at 1:25 for Birmingham, where we arrived at 5:30 Tuesday morning, May 14, and found that our dear brother, Elder Turnipseed, had passed away at 4 o'clock the afternoon before. Account of the funeral has already been given. We felt sure that word had gone out that we had been called away from the appointments, and we did not know how to reach them again. So we decided it would be best to come on home and try to visit those churches some time in the future which we failed to reach. We left Birmingham on Wednesday at 12:30, and arrived in Fordyce Thursday morning at 3:44 and were met at the train by our wife and children. We were glad to get home again, and felt to thank the Lord that we found all well. We were sorry not to visit those churches we failed to reach, and hope that we may be able to visit them some day, if the Lord will. Elder Turnipseed had made a promise to be at Winfield, Ala., on the fourth Sunday in May to preach a commencement sermon for the high school there. Some Old Baptist friends had obtained this promise from him. When they learned of Brother Turnipseed's illness they wanted us to go and fill the promise. Sister Turnipseed earnestly requested us to do so. Accordingly, after we returned home and tried to consider the matter, we wired them we would be there, the Lord willing. So we went, arriving there on Saturday before the fourth Sunday, and tried to preach that night in the Landmark Missionary Baptist meeting house. On Sunday we did the best we could in trying to preach the commencement sermon for them in the auditorium of the high school

building. A large crowd was present-more than could obtain seats or a place in the room. We enjoyed a very pleasant service. If we remember correctly, there were forty-three graduates. After the service we had lunch with Friend Wade, who conveyed us to Carbon Hill, where we could meet a fast train for Memphis. We arrived home Monday morning again, and found all well. Our agent here in Thornton for the Cotton Belt Railroad got permission for the fast train to stop for us Friday night and take us on and also to stop Monday night and let us off. This was kind and accommodating on their part. The Cotton Belt is a "Railroad of Courtesy." Those people in Winfield were good to us, and so they were at the places we visited on the trip in Mississippi. May the blessings of the Lord rest upon them all, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Billy Sunday

---June 27, 1929

The great humbug of the day, Billy Sunday, the so-called evangelist, has been preaching recently at Corpus Christi, Texas. One of his great sayings in his sermons is this: Nothing makes the devil more angry than to see great throngs coming to this tabernacle. Billy was just mistaken in the sign he saw in the countenance of his daddy. His daddy perhaps looked mad to him, but he was not mad. He was never more delighted with anything than with Billy's sham religion and so-called preaching. The devil is always delighted with humbug work done and carried on in the name of Christianity, and that is all Billy Sunday is doing. He would not know a real gospel sermon if he should see it printed in box car letters, or if he should hear it delivered by an inspired apostle of the Lord of glory. If one of them could be sent back to this world and he should preach an inspired gospel sermon in Billy Sunday's presence, Billy would not know what it was. Billy does know what he is out for-and he gets a good supply of it-and that is the "filthy lucre." He just makes merchandise of the people, and gets the money, and that is all he cares for. If you want to get some information concerning Billy Sunday, send 25 cents to The Rail Splitter, Milan, Ill., for a copy of a pamphlet they are publishing, the title of which is "Billy Sunday Unmasked," and they will send it to you as soon as they are ready to mail out, which we judge will not be long. Or you may send the 25 cents to us and we will order the book for you. C. H. C.

An Appreciated Letter

---June 27, 1929

To Claudis, Florida, Fleming, Ilene and William Hartsel Cayce:

My Dear Little Friends-Your good daddy has just come and gone, and I was so glad to hear him preach and have him in my home that I told him I would send you children a nice lot of peanuts as a present. He showed me your pictures and told me that you liked peanuts. I have a lot of them and want you all to have a big time eating some of them. I have a little boy seven years old and a little girl five years old, and I am preacher, too, and sometimes leave them at home and go away. And I know they want to see daddy come back home, just like you do. And so I think of you, and want you to be good children and help mama while daddy is away. Daddy loves you all, but his dear Saviour and your Saviour won't let him stay at home with you all the time, so he has to leave you and go and preach to the Lord's people. So you children have to let daddy go and wait for his return. Jesus will be with you and your dear mama while daddy is gone, and He will bring him back safe to you. Dear Sister Cayce, Brother Claud showed us your picture with the children

and it made us desire so much to see you all. Brother Claud has been doing some wonderful preaching for us. I hope that you may feel the presence of the dear Saviour while he is out preaching for the Lord's humble poor and realize in your good heart that you are a true handmaid of the Lord. You are worth so much to Brother Claud, and your sweet influence and the influence of your loving children has so enriched his life and filled his soul that his gift is magnified and his field of usefulness greatly enlarged. You are doing much good in the kingdom of your blessed Saviour, and I want you to know that some of us, at least, appreciate the sacrifices that you, the children, and Brother Cayce are making for us. Could each one of us wholly give ourselves into the hands of our God and be willing to do His bidding in all things, I am sure our precious cause would blossom as the rose. May the Lord bless you and the little children while your loved one is away preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ, is my prayer, for Jesus' sake. Pray for us when you have a mind to pray for the poorest of the poor and the weakest of the weak. In hope, G. W. Durbin. Falkner, Miss. REMARKS Language fails to express how much the above good letter is appreciated. So few of the good brethren and sisters think of writing to our loved ones who are so often left at home and who spend so many lonely and lonesome hours. May the good Lord bless you, dear brother, for your act of kindness and your good and kind words. It was all appreciated by the children as well as by us and our dear companion, who cheerfully toils on and encourages us to go in discharge of duty. Do not forget to remember us all in your prayers. C. H. C.

Now A Weekly

---July 4, 1929

In our issue of June 13, 1929, we made the announcement that The Primitive Baptist would be changed to a weekly beginning about the first of July. According to that announcement, we now begin as a weekly, with this issue, of July 4, 1929. We might say very well that the weekly publication began with the last issue, which was June 27-just a week ago. We also made the statement in the same issue (June 13) that we would put a part of the paper in this size type, if our subscribers preferred it. A number have written us that they prefer this type, and that they are well pleased with it. Of course there are a great many that we have not heard from. But as so many have written us that they like this type we will use it for our editorials. We do not have enough of it to use for the whole paper, and cannot afford the expense of buying enough for that now. All our type is new, and we cannot afford to throw it away. We believe our readers will all like these changes, and we greatly desire to please all in all things wherein it is right for us to try to please the brethren. In the matter of doctrine and the practice taught in God's word, we believe it is right to try to please the Lord, regardless of what any man or set of men might say or do. But we believe the Lord will always have some faithful followers who will be pleased with the truth. We trust our brethren will try to get more subscribers for the paper now, and help us all they can in extending the circulation. Remember that we are depending on the subscriptions to support the paper. As we have previously said, the small amount of advertising which we have in the paper will not even pay the salary of one of the clerks. in the office. We use more than we get for advertising to help pay for sending the paper to poor saints who enjoy reading it but are not able to pay for it. Who would object to us running the advertising and using the income in that way which we receive from the same? Would one of the objectors be willing to contribute the same amount toward sending the paper to the poor? If one would do that we would willingly leave all the

advertising out. The price of the paper will now have to be made \$2 a year, or \$1 for six months. The price will be the same to all. If any are not able to pay the price they do not have to be deprived of the privilege of reading it on that account. If you are owing for the paper, and cannot pay the full price, or the full amount that you owe, send what you can, and write us your condition. Be frank with us; but do not refuse to tell us something. That is not treating the editor right-no matter if it is our paper or some other. If you owe a debt and are not in a position to pay it, don't treat your creditor with silent contempt. That is not the way you would want to be treated. Remember the "golden rule," and try to practice that. We already have a lot of articles set in the smaller type which we have been using, and will publish them as we get to them, and will set all our editorials in this larger type after that. We believe all our readers will like the size and form of the paper better as they become accustomed to it and get used to it. You will have a weekly paper' in a convenient size to keep and to make up in books. Keep your papers. At the end of the year an index will be published, and then you can make the whole year's papers up in a book and have an index at the end of it. It will be valuable to have in later years. Some time ago we offered to give a whole year's subscription for one copy of The Primitive Baptist of January 1, 1886. No one sent us a copy of that issue. Look over your old papers, and ask others who have been taking the paper, and see if you can find one. We will gladly give a year's subscription for the paper of that date. It is our desire to keep the paper free from controversy. It seems to us that there are some who are not satisfied, and who would like to have some quarrel with us, judging from some things we get; but we are not going to quarrel with them. If they want to "fuss" they may look for someone who is of the same mind with themselves, and then they may "fuss" to their heart's content. We desire to publish the truth, and to contend for the old paths and the ancient landmarks which our fathers have set; and to contend for nothing but the truth in the spirit of love and kindness to all. We feel sure that if the Lord is in the matter the paper will be supported and maintained. We feel willing to leave the matter in His hands and in the hands of the brethren, the lovers of truth. We need the prayers of the Lord's dear children, that the Lord would lead us in the right way, and give us courage to walk in the old paths, where is the good way. We have no use for the various institutions and inventions of men. The good Book tells us of the only kingdom our Lord established here in the world, and that is His church. He organized no aid societies, Sunday schools, leagues, unions, boards, conventions, or any other such society or institution. They are nothing better than the inventions of men. If there would ever be any need of any of those things the Lord would have instituted them, or would have told us about the need of them. With the Book we are thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Being thoroughly furnished therein and therewith, not a thing is needed which is not contained therein. It is a flagrant violation to practice what the Book does not teach, either by command, precept or example. We should let everything alone which we do not find in the Book. And we should do all that the Book commands, to the best of our ability. May the Lord help us all so to do. C. H. C.

Matthew 10:6 AND Matthew 28:19

---July 4, 1929

Brother Albert Waid, Oneonta, Ala., asks our views on ((0:6) (Matthew 10:6); (28:19). In ((0:5) (Matthew 10:5-6,7)we find this language: "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and

into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Here we have it that Jesus sent the twelve out to preach, and He commanded them not to go among the Gentiles or the Samaritans. This was before His crucifixion. If gospel preaching was necessary in order that sinners receive eternal life, Jesus here forbade the necessary thing thereto being preached among the Samaritans or the Gentiles. Their work in preaching at that time was confined to the Jews-to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." They (the twelve) were to preach among the Jews and were to proclaim the fact in their preaching that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The time was then present-the time had come-that law worship and service was to be done away, and gospel worship and service was being brought in. This was to be proclaimed then to the Jews. In (Matthew 28:16-20) we have this language: "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw Him, they worshipped Him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." This was after the Saviour was crucified, buried and raised again. He appeared unto the eleven. Judas had already hanged himself, so there were then eleven of the apostles. Now, since the Saviour had died and was raised again, He gave the apostles a command different from the one recorded in **(0:6) (Matthew 10:6)**. In the first command to preach their labors were to be confined to the Jews; now they were to go among the nations-among the Gentiles; they were to teach all nations. They were not to teach the unteachable, but to teach the teachable among the Gentiles, as well as among the Jews. Their field of labor was enlarged. Their labors were no longer to be confined to the Jews-"the lost sheep of the house of Israel." In order to teach, the teacher must have a teachable subject. One cannot teach natural things to one who is not a teachable subject. For one to be a teachable subject in the natural realm, he must have natural life and a natural mind. He must have natural comprehension. The same thing is true in the spiritual realm. For one to be able to teach spiritual things, he must have a teachable subject. For one to be a teachable subject in the spiritual realm, he must have spiritual life and a spiritual mind. He must have spiritual comprehension. As they were commanded to teach, of course they were to teach natural things, or else they were to teach spiritual things. We suppose no one would say they were to teach natural things, but were to teach spiritual things. They were to preach the gospel. The gospel is something which pertains to spiritual things, the spiritual realm. Certainly no one would say they were to teach the unteachable. Hence, they were to teach the teachable among the Gentiles as well as among the Jews. This is evidence of the fact that the Lord had a people among the Gentiles who were in need of being taught spiritual things, and the Gentiles were to have the blessings and privileges of the gospel. This command was given to the eleven. Jesus said, "Go ye." The antecedent of the pronoun "ye" is the eleven. The apostles were chosen witnesses who were with the Lord and witnessed His work and personally saw Him. They were chosen, called and sent out by the Saviour Himself, the second Person in the Trinity, and no others could fill the apostolic office, and no others ever did, or ever will, fill that office, only those whom He called and put into that office. The apostles were not put into that office by the office work of the Holy Spirit, but by the Son. But it is the office work of the Holy Spirit to call and put into the ministry those who are sent out by the Lord for that work, who are not in the apostolic office-who are not apostles. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to

all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." -((0:28) (Acts 20:28). This shows that the Holy Ghost now calls men and makes them overseers of the flock-puts them into the ministry. "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He will send forth labourers into His harvest." -(Matthew 9:37-38). "The harvest truly is great, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth labourers into His harvest." -((0:2) (Luke 10:2). These few thoughts are offered for the consideration of all our readers. C. H. C.

Can We Not Withdraw?

---July 11, 1929

The following article written by Elder J. C. Ross was published in The Primitive Baptist of May 7, 1907. We think the article good, and thought it might be profitable for our readers now, so we decided to give space for it again, although we have many articles on hand that are good which have not yet been published. It is our desire to select and publish what we think will be for the best interest of the cause. Read the article and study it and profit by it. C. H. C.
THE ARTICLE

Has a church or an association of churches the right to withdraw fellowship from a faulty or a disorderly church? If not, then a disorderly church may be guilty of any kind of doctrine or practice, and remain in fellowship with the orderly body. If there is no precept, example nor principle given us in the Scriptures, then we have no right to withdraw under any circumstances. When I am convinced that we should fellowship Arminianism, modern mission-ism with all her brood of institutions, I will be ready to join the Missionaries. This is a serious question with me. No man nor set of men can induce me to so depart from the sacred and holy Scriptures of divine inspiration, and it is so strange and distressing that some precious brethren will suffer themselves to be deceived "by good words and fair speeches." I want to ask just a few plain and simple questions, in the spirit of meekness and sincerity; and I hope you will prayerfully answer in your own heart and before that One who knows the secrets of our hearts. First: Do you believe the Primitive Baptists should fellowship the doctrine that the eternal salvation of poor sinners is conditional on the part of the sinner? Second: That we should fellowship the modern board and convention system-membership in the convention depending upon the payment of a certain amount of money? Third: That one hundred thousand heathens are dying and going to hell daily for the want of money and means, as Carey expressed it when he wrote to the sisters of America to pull off their jewelry and hang them on the cross of Christ to keep souls out of hell-thus ignoring the cross of our adorable Redeemer? Fourth: Do you believe that the Primitive Baptists should receive baptism from a people that have such heresies as the above? Fifth: Do you believe that a person who is contending for such things is a friend to the dear old church? I mean contending that we should fellowship such as the above. The above are only a few of the many things that are being advocated in these days. Dear brother or sister, may God help you to prayerfully consider these things. Have you suffered yourselves to be led away from your first love? Do you love the church as you once did? If not, why not? Has she changed since you joined her? If not, and your love and zeal for her has subsided, is it not evident that you have changed and not the church? I wish now to call your attention to some historical and Scriptural evidence. It has been argued by some that the Black Rock convention led the way in this unholy course, as it is called by some. I wish first to call attention to minutes of the

Philadelphia Association, p. 55, "Contenting ourselves in the general satisfaction our churches have expressed in their letters of the comfort, edification, establishment, and consolation, they acknowledge to have received from our last letter, we desire and entreat you to weigh and deeply consider that we are in the last days, the dregs and worst of times, of which we have been warned by the inspired writers, of scoffers, walking after their own lusts, **{(II Peter 3:3)}** of perilous days. **{(II Timothy 3:1)}** We are to mark those which cause divisions and offenses, contrary to the doctrine we have received, and avoid them, who, by good words and fair speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple, **{(Romans 16:17-18)}** that of your own selves should men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. **{((0:1) (Acts 20)}** Therefore, it concerns all who would be spiritually dressed and beautifully adorned, to meet and be approved of the heavenly bridegroom; to be very careful how and with whom they walk; avoiding, both in principle and practice, in heart and life, in the church and in the world, in the family and in the field, whatever may cause us to contract filth or foulness on our beautiful garments; as Christ's virgins, look often in the glass of the gospel, espying and brushing away every spot of dust, keeping clean and neat for His everlasting embraces. Precious souls, suffer the word of exhortation, and be well established in gospel truths, in these shaking times. Look well that you be built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Himself being your chief cornerstone. Take heed that you build not on wood, hay, and stubble of men's inventions." I have given you this lengthy quotation to show that these brethren held in 1747 the same view of this matter that we do. They make it very plain that they believe it Scriptural to not only withdraw from persons that are immoral, but also from those who depart from the doctrine of the inspired word; and that we should mark all such and avoid them. I next call attention to p. 58 of the same book, "Queries from the church at Horse-neck, in New England: First, Whether to deny the foreknowledge of the eternal God, concerning all future evil as well as good, be not a fundamental error? Answer: We look upon such an opinion to be directly repugnant to Scripture; therefore exceeding erroneous and pernicious. 1. Because it supposes God imperfect, and so no God. **{((7:5) (Psalms 147:5); (Hebrews 4:13)}** Secondly: If so, there would be no room for the Divine Being to make provision for the redemption of mankind before the fall of man, which is contrary to express Scripture testimony. **{(Proverbs 8:28,35); (II Timothy 1:9)}** Thirdly: It is an error, which, in its nature and consequences, doth oppose and tend to overthrow the whole Christian religion. **{((23) (Acts 2:23); ((28) (4:28); (Titus 3:10)}** 2. Whether a member of the church holding such an opinion, endeavors to propagate it, and obstinately persists in it, is not worthy of the highest censure, notwithstanding he pleads matter of conscience? Answer: We judge such worthy of the highest censure; because a church is to proceed against a person who is erroneous in judgment, as well as against one vicious in practice, notwithstanding they may plead conscience in the affair." **{(Titus 3:10); ((Th 3:14) (II Thessalonians 3:14)}** This quotation is so plain that it needs no comment. From this quotation we are taught that it matters not how conscientious a brother may be, this is no excuse for the church not to proceed against him. In this we have a principle handed down to us, not only by the Scriptures but by the Baptists in 1748. I next call attention to some things found in an essay in the same book which was published in the year 1749, and adopted by the association. This comes directly to the point heading this article, "Does an association of churches or a church have the right to withdraw from a defective church?" Let these brethren answer: "That an association is not a superior judicature, having such superior power over the churches concerned; but that each particular church hath a complete power and authority from Jesus Christ, to administer all gospel

ordinances, provided they have a sufficiency of officers duly qualified, or that they be supplied by the officers of another sister church or churches, as baptism, and the Lord's supper, etc.; and to receive in and cast out, and also to try and ordain their own officers, and to exercise every part of gospel discipline and church government, independent of any other church or assembly whatever. And that several such independent churches, where providence gives them their situation convenient, may, and ought, for their mutual strength, counsel, and other valuable advantages, by their voluntary and free consent, to enter into an agreement and confederation, as is hinted in our printed narrative of discipline, pages 59, 60, 61. Such churches there must be agreeing in doctrine and practice, and independent in their authority and church power, before they can enter into a confederation, as aforesaid, and choose delegates or representatives, to associate together; and thus the several independent churches being the constituents, the association, council or assembly of their delegates, when assembled, is not to be deemed a superior judicature, as having a superintendency over the churches, but subservient to the churches, in what may concern all the churches in general, or any one church in particular; and, though no power can regularly arise above its fountain from where it rises, yet we are of the opinion, that an association of the delegates of associate churches have a very considerable power in their hands, respecting those churches in their confederation; for if the agreement of several distinct churches, in sound doctrine and regular practice, be the first motive, ground, and foundation or basis of their confederation, then it must naturally follow, that a defection in doctrine or practice in any church, in such confederation, or any party in any such church, is ground sufficient for an association to withdraw from such a church or party so deviating or making defection, and to exclude such from them in some formal manner, and to advertise all the churches in confederation thereof, in order that every church in confederation may withdraw from such in all acts of church communion, to the end they may be ashamed, and that all the churches may discountenance such, and bear testimony against the defection. Such withdrawing from a defective or disorderly church, or that ought to be towards a delinquent church, is such as ariseth from their voluntary confederation aforesaid, and not only from the general duty that is incumbent on all orthodox persons, and churches to do, where no such confederation is entered into, as **(II Corinthians 6:16-17)**. Now, from that general duty to withdraw from defective persons or churches, there can no more be done, than to desist from such acts of fellowship as subsisted before the withdrawing, which is merely negative, and in no wise anything positive. Churches, as they are pillars of truth, may, and ought to endeavor to promote truth among others also; which endeavors, if they prove fruitless, as they are but mystico modo, they may be withdrawn; the withdrawing, therefore, must be accordingly; which is only to cease from future endeavors, leaving the objects as they were or are. But if there be a confederation an incorporation, by mutual and voluntary consent, as the association of churches must and ought to be, then something positive may and ought to be done; and, though an association ought not to assume a power to excommunicate or deliver a defective or disorderly church to Satan, as some do claim, yet it is a power sufficient to exclude the delegates of a defective or disorderly church from an association, and to refuse their presence at their consultations, and to advise all of the churches in confederation to do so too. A godly man may, and ought to withdraw, not only from a heathen, but from such as have the form of godliness, if they appear to want the power of it; **{(II Timothy 3:5)}** by the same parity of reason the saints, in what capacity soever they may be considered, may withdraw from defective or disorderly churches or persons; but excommunicate they cannot, there being no institution to authorize them so to do. But in the capacity of a congregational church, dealing

with her own members, an association, then, of the delegates of associate churches, may exclude and withdraw from defective and unsound or disorderly churches or persons, in manner above said; and this will appear regular and justifiable by the light and law of nature, as is apparent in the conduct and practice of all regular civil and political corporations and confederations whatsoever; who all of them have certain rules to exclude delinquents from their societies, as well as for others to accede thereunto. We judge those things in (Acts 15) to be imitable by an association, namely: first, their disowning of the erroneous and Judaizing teachers, saying, to whom we gave no such commandment, **((24) (Acts 15:24))**; secondly, the sending delegated persons of their own number, with Paul and Barnabas, to support their sentence in the place where the debate sprung up, ((25) (Acts 15:25)); and a third thing followed in consequence thereof, namely, a delivering of the decrees to the other churches, to be observed, as well as the church of Antioch, ((4) (Acts 16:4)). Consistent therewith, the practice of after ages is found to be; when, because they had no council, synod, or association to convene, of course they called a council, in order to make head against any error or disorders, when in any particular church, such things grew too big for a particular church peaceably to determine, as the case about circumcision was at Antioch. In such cases all the churches were looked upon as one church, and all the bishops as universal, because of the unity of the faith and conformity of practice which ought to be in the churches of Christ; though in all other cases, the several distinct churches acted independent of each other, as Cyprian relates the practice of his time, namely: that the bishops were so united in one body, that if any one of the body broached any heresy, or began to waste and tear the flock of Christ, all the rest came immediately to its rescue. Cyprian, cited by Bingham, book 2, page 101. And the same author observes, that they disowned the faulty, and advertised all the churches of the same." I shall not comment at length on this quotation from this essay, as space will not permit at this time, but call attention to the fact that they argue that a church, or association of churches, not only have the right to declare against a faulty or disorderly church, but that it is their duty to do so. They also show that it was the practice in Cyprian's day. I quote again from the same essay, page 63: "And Mr. Crosby relates, that an association in London did disown a certain disorderly church in London, and did caution all the churches they were related to, not to countenance them in any way, nor to suffer their members to frequent their meetings; and thus an association may disown and withdraw from a defective or disorderly church, and advise the churches related to them to withdraw from, and to discountenance such as aforesaid, without exceeding the bounds of their power. And further, that an association of the delegates of confederate churches may doctrinally declare any person or party in a church, who are defective in principles or disorderly in practice, to be censurable, when the affair comes under their cognizance, and without exceeding the bounds of their power and duty, to advise the church that such belong unto, how to deal with such, according to the rule of gospel discipline; and also to strengthen such a church, and assist her, if need be, by sending able men of their own number to help the church in executing the power vested in her by the ordinance of Jesus Christ, and to stand by her, and to defend her against the insults of such offending persons or parties." Dear reader, I have given most all this essay that you may judge for yourself as to where they stood on the subject of fellowship and declarations of non-fellowship; also where the Baptists stood in Cyprian's day on the same subject; also the course of an association in London. I am sure you can discern between their position and the modern idea of fellowshiping everything. This is the very position that has been denounced by some as mob law, unholy course, and many other such expressions. Dear reader, I ask you to turn and carefully read the Scripture citations that they

give, and you will see that they held the same views of them that our people do today. It matters not what this association did after this, this shows where they stood before they went into Arminianism and the modern board system. Had they been faithful to these holy principles, Arminianism could never have entered into her sacred and holy precincts and brought ruin and devastation to many churches. I know that many precious brethren have had many hard sayings to bear because they have been faithful in speaking out against some things that have of late been introduced among the Old Baptists, but I am sure that the servant who remains steadfast and unmovable, who faithfully but kindly admonishes God's people against every false way, will receive the smiles of his God, which is worth more than all else in this world, yea, more than all the applause of men. The applause of men may feed carnality, but this is of little benefit to the soul. Good brethren are sometimes led off from the church and as a result bring sorrow and discontent to their own hearts. Oh, that God would save His people from every false way, that they may walk in the good old way and find sweet rest to their weary souls. It is so discouraging to see good, precious brethren lend their influence to the enemy, and thereby weaken their influence in the church and for the church. How much better to labor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, that our hearts may be cemented, as it were, in bonds of sweet fellowship. How much more inviting it is to God's little children to come into the fold and find a sweet resting place. May the good Lord keep us humble and at each other's feet. Yours for the cause of Christ, J. C. Ross. Greenfield, Tenn.

Reply to H. L. Whitehouse

---July 18, 1929

In another place in this paper will be found a letter from H. L. Whitehouse, who is identified with what is known as the Landmark Missionary Baptists. He speaks of three things upon which he says we may disagree- mission work, prayer meetings, and Sunday schools. Perhaps he does not fully understand our position on these questions and practices, and may not know our reason for such position. We thought it might not be out of place to say a few words to the brother concerning these things. However, before that we wish to make a few remarks concerning his impressions and as to why he became satisfied. Concerning what he heard when he went to the pasture will say that the leading man and champion of the anti-board faction of the Missionary Baptists makes sport of such things as that. We know he does, for we have seen it more than once in his paper. Another thing we want to suggest is that we do not think it would have been right for him to have united with the Primitive Baptists because his father and mother belonged to them, nor because he was prejudiced against the Missionaries. Such motives for joining any church would be wrong motives. If what the brother heard served to remove that thought and that idea, it served a good and right purpose. Now as to mission work. Primitive Baptists do not object to gospel preaching. What we object to is the modern system which men have invented and introduced in the name of Christianity for the professed object of having the gospel preached, and that under the pretext that it is necessary for it to be preached in order that sinners reach heaven. This makes the eternal salvation of sinners in every age and country and clime dependent on the liberalities of the people in sending the gospel by those who have it to those who have it not. It makes the eternal salvation of the heathen depend on the liberalities of the people in those countries where they have the gospel. If the heathen fail to have the gospel preached to them, then they are sent

to hell on account of our neglect. This is the foundation upon which the whole modern mission system rests, and it is unknown to the Bible and was unknown to the Baptist Church until the days of Andrew Fuller and William Carey. They organized the first missionary society among the Baptists in 1792. The Philadelphia Association was organized in 1707- long before the birth of the mission system. On pages 426 to 433 of the minutes of that association may be found a circular letter put forth by that body in the session held in 1806, when the association was ninety-nine years old. In this circular letter they give the principles which they say gave rise to modern missions, and on page 429 they say, "It is, however, a very remarkable circumstance, that in modern missions Papal Rome has led the way." John the Baptist did not lead the way; Jesus Christ did not lead the way; the apostles did not lead the way; no inspired man led the way-but Papal Rome led the way. Those who engage in the modern mission work, then, are not following Christ, or the inspired apostles, or the teaching of God's blessed Book; but they are following Papal Rome. This is the cool and calm and plain statement of that body who had just a short time before imbibed the false doctrine of the mission advocates and system. The division in the Baptist family on account of the introduction of the new doctrines and practices advocated by Puller and Carey began in 1832, after the Baptists had borne with the new doctrines and measures and protested against them for years. In November, 1910, a debate was held between I N. Penick and Ben M. Bogard in Crockett County, Tenn. Penick affirmed that "The Bible teaches that Baptist churches and individual Baptists have the liberty and right to use such agencies as the missionary state bodies of Tennessee and Kentucky and the Southern Baptist Convention, with committees or Boards in carrying forward mission work under our Lord's commission." Bogard denied the proposition. On page 54 of that debate Bogard said: He (Penick) said nobody raised the question until the Hardshells raised it about a hundred years ago. The reason they didn't was because there was nothing like that to object to until the Convention fellows came in, and then the Hardshell split came. I lay that split to the charge of Conventionism, and while the Hardshells went to the extreme and repudiated missionary work, the Con-ventionites were the ones to drive the wedge. On page 136 he says: My sixty-fourth objection is that the convention system produces discord and division among the churches. If it hadn't been for Conventionism and Boards, there never would have been a split. For seventeen hundred years the churches had been preaching to sinners. Hardshells went wrong because they quit preaching to sinners. When the controversy came up one went wrong in one direction and one in the other. One took unscriptural means, and one denied all means entirely. Landmark Baptists stand on middle ground, and we believe in using means as opposed to the Hard-shells, and using only Scriptural means as opposed to the Conventionites. You caused the Hardshell split and you are going to cause another split. Bogard, the leading Landmarker, lays the split between our people, whom he calls Hardshells, and the Missionaries to Conventionism-it was the Mission system. He says that the Conventionites were the ones to drive the wedge. That being true, the question naturally arises, Which party retained the ordinances in that division? If the ordinances were with the Baptists before that division, then one of the parties retained them when the division came. If the Conventionites retained the ordinances in that division, they have them yet, and the Landmarkers do not. If those who opposed the boards and conventions retained the ordinances in that division, then we have them yet, and neither the Con-ventionites nor the Landmarkers have them. Note in the last quotation above that Bogard says the Con-ventionites are going to cause another split. This was in 1910. They were all Missionaries then, and were not fully divided. The Landmarkers are younger than the Conventionites as a body of people. The original Missionary

Baptist body were Conventionites. They were that when they separated from the Primitives on account of the introduction of their new measures. Hence the Conventionites are the original Missionary Baptists-though they are not the original Baptists, for the Baptists had existed without their new means and measures from the time the Lord organized His church until the days of Fuller and Carey. Next, as to prayer meetings. The Primitive Baptists do not object to the brethren meeting together and praying with and for each other, either in their homes or at the meeting houses. They have never objected to this. We know Primitive Baptist churches that have met together and engaged in prayer service for many years. At our own church here in Thornton, on our regular meeting time, we meet on Sunday morning at about ten o'clock and devote about an hour to song and prayer service before the hour for preaching to begin. If you have understood the Primitive Baptists object to prayer, or meeting together to engage in prayer with and for each other, you have not understood right. Next, as to Sunday schools. Our people do object to them. We do not object to teaching our children morality and right living as citizens, but we object to Sunday schools. They are unknown in the Scriptures. There is no Bible authority for them, either by command, precept or example. We also object to the professed object of the Sunday school. They are for the avowed object of teaching the children in such a way as to make them children of God; or to teach them so they may accept the Lord and be saved, become children of God. This is contrary to the truth. In The Primitive Baptist of May 31, 1910, we had a short article concerning Sunday schools, which was as follows: As we stated in The Primitive Baptist of May 1, 1906, the Sunday school was instituted by Robert Raikes, in Gloucester, England, in the eighteenth century. It is, therefore, an institution of man, and is not in the Scriptures. It is too young to be found there. It was first instituted for the object of teaching poor children to read and write. It was to teach literature, not religion. It has been adopted by worldly religionists, and the expressed object changed by them. It does not belong to the Bible nor to the church of Christ. In The Primitive Baptist of April 13, 1915, we copied an article from the News and Truths, of March 31, 1915, a Missionary Baptist paper published by H. B. Taylor, Murray, Ky., and commented on the same. Below we give the article and our comments: Mayor Roberts and some of his machine, of Terre Haute, Ind., are having a good deal of trouble in Uncle Sam's court for using repeaters in elections and other election frauds. If fraudulent, dishonest and criminal for a man to vote in one precinct in a city and then be rushed in an automobile to another city precinct and voted, is it any less reprehensible or any more honest for a church or Sunday school to use repeaters, who have already been counted in one Sunday school in a city, and are almost bodily pulled into another in order to be counted and to make a show? Up in Pike County, Ky., men have been tried and convicted recently for selling their votes for \$1 and the rise, in a recent Kentucky election. Is a church or Sunday school any the less reprehensible, that pays Sunday school pupils cigars or free shaves to get them to attend on a given Sunday, when they want to make a big show? Does the fact that it is done in the name of religion and on Sunday make such methods any more honest or honorable than when done on a week day in a state or national election? The above appeared in the News and Truths of March 31, 1915, which paper is edited by H. B. Taylor, at Murray, Ky. Here we have a plain admission that the Sunday schools practice such frauds as that men are prosecuted for by the courts of the land, when practiced in state affairs. And this, too, by an institution which claims for its object the bringing of souls to Christ! Oh, shame, where is thy blush! What honest, well-informed person can believe that such a thing as this can have for its real object the salvation of souls? Such practice as this only educates the young and rising generation to engage in deceptive practices, and to even engage in swindling schemes for worldly

gain. No wonder the jails and penitentiaries are crowded. No wonder that murder, theft, robbery, lying, cheating, and all kinds of immorality are increasing so rapidly. The Lord only knows what the end will be. And in the face of all such things as these, some Old Baptists allow their children to go to Sunday school. If you love your children, for the Lord's sake keep them away from such schools. We copy the above from those old issues of the paper that our good Missionary brother may see our objections to such things. Yes, a missionary is one who is sent. We do not deny, but earnestly believe, that the Lord's ministers are sent. So are the devil's ministers sent. But they are not sent by the same power or authority. The Lord sends His ministers, and He assigns to them their field of labor. The eminent Apostle Paul says, "But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace, to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days, but other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother." -(Galatians 1:15-19). Turn and read the remainder of the chapter, and the next. Neither the Conventionites nor Landmarkers follow this way. The Convention and Board preachers apply to the Board for a place to preach, and the Board accepts or rejects. If the Board accepts the applicant, then the Board assigns him to his field of labor. The Landmarker applies to the association or committee, and the committee accepts or rejects. If the committee accepts the applicant, then the committee assigns him to his field of labor. The difference between them is simply a question of who has the authority to accept or reject the applicant and as to who shall handle the funds. "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." - (Romans 10:1-2). The people for whom Paul here says he prayed, that they might be saved, were a people who had a zeal of God. He does not say they had a zeal for God, but of God. They were, therefore, children of God. The Lord's children need to be saved from the darkness of ignorance. This may be accomplished by teaching, and is to be accomplished that way. They are saved from the darkness of death by the direct work of the Holy Spirit in the impartation of life. Then they need teaching, and the Lord calls and sends His preachers for that purpose. "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." - (Romans 10:13-17). We quote all these verses that we may have the 'connection, the verses just before and just after the expression, "How shall they preach, except they be sent?" Remember that the Lord does the sending of His preachers. "Delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee." -((7) (Acts 26:17). This shows that the saving which God's people need which is mentioned in the first part of the chapter, is accomplished through preaching. It is not the saving that brings alien sinners into divine relationship with God. One must be brought out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ before he can hear, or understand, gospel preaching. "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." -(John 8:43). "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." -(Romans 10:17). The word here is the speech of God. God speaks to the sinner who is dead in sins, and by the

power of that speech the sinner is made alive in Christ, made alive from the dead. This gives the ability to hear His word, the ability to hear gospel preaching. Gospel preaching does not give life, but the giving of life by the power of God's speech- "the voice of the Son of God" -gives one the ability to hear the gospel. Then by gospel preaching they may be delivered from the darkness of ignorance. They may be saved from false doctrines and false ways. May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of our readers. C. H. C.

Meetings in Little Rock

---August 1, 1929

We met our regular appointment at Fuller's Chapel, in North Little Rock, on the third Sunday in June and Saturday afternoon before. In the conference on Saturday afternoon the church made choice of Brother G. L. Pilkington for the office of deacon, and called for a presbytery to attend to the ordination at the next meeting. On Sunday a Sister Arnold came to the church, asking for a home with them. She related the reason of her hope in the Saviour and was received amidst much rejoicing. The ordinance of baptism was attended to that afternoon by the unworthy writer, who tries to serve the little band there as pastor. They have meeting every Sunday, and we try to be with them on each third Sunday and Saturday afternoon before, when we are not away on a tour. They have refused to release us from the pastoral care of the church, allowing us to be absent from their meetings when we are on a tour. We were with them again at the regular meeting the third Sunday in this month (July) and Saturday afternoon before. It was agreed in conference that the ordination of Brother Pilkington to the office of deacon should be attended to on Sunday morning, and that the charge should be delivered in the discourse to be preached just after the ordination. Elder A. Woodall, who has membership there, was present, and so was Brother A. H. Garner, who is an ordained deacon. His membership is in that association, but we do not now recall the name of the church. Elder P. E. Whitwell was expected, the meeting before, to be present and to take part in the ordination; but he was earnestly solicited to go to Donaldson, and obtained the consent of Brother Pilkington to go to that place. On Sunday morning when the church assembled Elder Woodall and the writer and Brother Garner formed ourselves into a presbytery and proceeded to ordain Brother Pilkington to the office of deacon. Elder Wood-all offered the ordination prayer. Then Brother Woodall made a short but very appropriate talk, and then we tried to preach to the people, and in doing that we tried to deliver the charge to Brother Pilkington and to the church. We enjoyed speaking to them, and it seemed that those present also enjoyed it. At the close of the discourse an open door of the church was proclaimed, when Brother Caudle and wife (Elder C. M. Monk's daughter), who live in Little Rock, came forward with a letter of dismissal from Little Flock Church, near Abbott, Ark., in the Salem Association, and were gladly received by the church. Also Sister Emma Gardner and Sister Myrtle Baker came forward and gave a reason of their hope in the Saviour, telling of their love for the Lord and His people, and asking for a home with the church. They were received gladly and with much rejoicing. They were all so overjoyed that they broke down in singing. It was agreed that the ordinance of baptism be attended to as soon as we could go to the water. Accordingly the service was dismissed and all went to the water, and the unworthy writer administered the ordinance in burying the dear sisters in the liquid grave with their Lord and Master to arise to walk in newness of life. It was a glorious meeting, and one which we believe will long be remembered. This is a lovely little band, and we love them, and we believe they love us, though we feel to

be so unworthy of their great love and sweet fellowship. May the good Lord bless and sustain and care for and preserve them from all harm, not only while we are away from them-as we expect to be now for some time on a tour and attending associations-but also after we return, if the Lord may see fit to allow us to return to them again. We trust they will remember us in prayer while we are so far away from them. Elder John R. Harris has written an article about our meeting here in Thornton, which may be found in this issue. We ask all the dear brethren to remember us in their prayers. We expect to be far away from home when this issue of the paper is mailed out to our readers. Will you pray the Lord to bless us to speak to the comfort and benefit of His children, and pray Him to bless and keep our dear ones in our absence who are left in sadness at home? C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 5:9-13

---August 8, 1929

We have been requested to give our views on **(I Corinthians 5:9-13)**. These verses read as follows: I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators: yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat. For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from yourselves that wicked person. It seems very clear and plain to us that the apostle here positively forbids certain persons being allowed to remain in the fellowship of the church. The expression, "yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world * * * for then ye must needs go out of the world," shows that he has no reference to worldly matters, or things that pertain to worldly affairs. He calls attention, in this expression, to the fact that they were not forbidden to have dealings with fornicators in worldly affairs. If they were, then they would have to go out of the world. But they were forbidden to have dealings with fornicators, or a covetous person, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, in church affairs or religious matters. This fornication mentioned here does not specially refer to joining some institution other than the church, either, although we think that is forbidden. It seems to us that if one is a member of the church he is thereby married to Christ, and if he unites with some other institution which has its religious rites and ceremonies and services, he is thereby committing spiritual adultery or fornication. But this is not what the apostle is here specially referring to, as may be seen from the language contained in (I Corinthians 5:1-5). Those verses read as follows: It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife. And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. This shows very clearly the kind of fornication or adultery he has under consideration, and which is not to be fellowshiped by the church. Persons guilty of such are not to be retained in the fellowship of the church. In connection with this we here call attention to

(Matthew 19:9), the language of the Saviour: And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. This shows very clearly that there is just one cause for which a man may put away his wife and marry another; and that is for the cause of fornication. Gill says that this expression includes adultery, incest, or any unlawful copulation. If one is guilty of such conduct, then the companion may righteously put such a one away. It is not wrong for them to put such a one away. If it is not wrong to put such a one away, then it is wrong not to do so. It is, therefore, right to put away one guilty of such conduct. Such conduct breaks the marriage vow, and frees the innocent party, and the innocent party should leave the guilty and put them away, and is free to marry again, and is no adulterer in doing so. This is the only thing that gives one the right to marry again. That is, one who puts away his wife for any other cause and marries again commits adultery in doing so. Then the teaching of the apostle in the text about which our opinion is asked is that the adulterer should not be allowed to remain in the church. The church should put such person from among themselves. They should withdraw fellowship from him. This is a sin unto death, for the party committing it thereby becomes dead to their companion. Covetousness, idolatry, railing, extortioning, are sins that are here classed with adultery. In fact, covetousness is idolatry. "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry." -(Colossians 3:5). The covetous person thinks more of money and worldly riches than he does of the service of God. The things of the world, the goods of the world, are of more value to him than the service of God. He will make the seeking after the things of the world of first importance and first consideration, instead of the kingdom of God and His righteousness. He becomes an idolater. He idolizes the goods of this world. Railing is the using of insolent and reproachful language; to utter reproach, to scoff. Such conduct is so unbecoming and so unchristian like that the guilty person should not be retained in the fellowship of the church. A drunkard is one who habitually drinks strong liquors immoderately; one whose habit it is to get drunk. We do not know how many times one must get drunk for it to be called a habit. Any way, it is very plain that drunkenness is a sin for which the church should withdraw fellowship. The guilty person should not be retained in the church. Extortion is the "act or practice of taking or obtaining anything from a person by illegal use or fear, whether by force, threats, or any other undue exercise of power; undue exaction; specifically, an oppression by color of right." -Webster. It is synonymous with oppression, rapacity, exaction, overcharge. An extortioner has no right to membership in the church, and the church is here required to withdraw fellowship from any who may be guilty. It may be of some profit to our readers for us to give here what Gill has to say concerning this chapter in a general way from his commentaries. It may help to give some light on the teaching of the apostle in this chapter. May the Lord help us to live as He commands, and help us to "keep a clean house." C. H. C.

GILL'S COMMENTS

In this chapter the apostle blames the Corinthians for conniving at a sin committed by one of their members; declares what he was determined to do, and what should be done by them in this case; and in general advises to shun conversation with wicked men; in (I Corinthians 5:1); mention is made of the sin committed by one among themselves, and which was publicly known, and commonly talked of; and which in general was fornication, and particularly incest, a man lying with his father's wife; and which is aggravated by its being what was not named, or could

not be named among any virtuous persons among the Gentiles without offense; and yet the members of this church, at least the majority of them, were unconcerned at it, and were so far from mourning over it, and taking any step to remove the person from them that had done it, that they were swelled with pride, and gloried on account of their gifts, and perhaps on account of this man, who had committed the iniquity, (I Corinthians 5:2). This affair being related to the apostle, though at a distance; and he well knowing all things concerning it, as though he was present, resolved what should be done in this case by himself, (I Corinthians 5:3); and that was to deliver the man to Satan, in the name, and with the power and authority of Christ, when the members of this church were gathered together, and his spirit with them; the end of which was for the destruction of the man's body, and the salvation of his soul, (I Corinthians 5:4-5); and then the apostle returns to blame them for their glorying in men, and in external gifts, and pleading these as a reason why the man should be continued, and not removed from them; not considering the danger they were exposed to, and which he illustrates by the simile of leaven, a little of which affects the whole lump; suggesting thereby the danger they were in by continuing such a wicked person among them, (I Corinthians 5:6); wherefore pursuing the same metaphor taken from the Jewish passover, he exhorts to remove from them the man that had sinned, as the Jews at the passover removed the leaven out of their houses; that so they might appear to be a church renewed, and purged, and clear of leaven, keeping the true and spiritual pass-over, which they were under obligations to do, since Christ, the Antitype of the passover, was sacrificed for them, (I Corinthians 5:7); wherefore it became them to keep the feast of the Lord's supper; and indeed, to have the whole course of their conversation so ordered, as to avoid sin and sinners, and to behave in truth and uprightness, (I Corinthians 5:8); when the apostle goes on to put them in mind of what he had formerly written unto them, as suitable to the present case, which was, that they should not keep company with wicked men, particularly with fornicators, such as this man, though in a more heinous manner, (I Corinthians 5:9); and explains what was his meaning; not that they were to have no manner of conversation with persons of such a character, and of such-like evil characters, in things of a civil nature, for then there would be no living in the world, (I Corinthians 5:10). But his sense was, that they should keep no company with persons guilty of the sins mentioned, who bore the name of Christian brethren, and were members of the same church-state with them, from whose communion they ought to be removed; and indeed, so much familiarity with them should not be indulged, as even to eat with them, (I Corinthians 5:11). The reason of this difference, which he made between wicked men, who were not members of the church, and those that were, is because he had nothing to do, nor they neither, with them that were without the church, as it was their business only to take cognizance of them that were within, (I Corinthians 5:12); but neither of them had anything to do, to judge and censure those that did not belong to the church, but should leave them to God, the righteous Judge; and then closes all, (I Corinthians 5:13), with what he had chiefly in view throughout the whole chapter, and that is, that they would remove from their communion the wicked person who had been guilty of the sin first mentioned.

Ephesians 5:5,23,33

---August 15, 1929

We have been requested to give our views on (Ephesians 5:5,23,33). (Ephesians 5:5) reads, "For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor

covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." We believe that what we said in our last issue in connection with (**I Corinthians 5:9-13**) will apply to the language of this text just as well. The apostle here teaches that such persons as mentioned have no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ. That is, there is no place in the church for them, and there is nothing there for them. They should be withdrawn from. They have no right in the church. (Ephesians 5:23) says, "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and He is the saviour of the body." He is the Saviour of His church, His people. The redeemed are frequently designated as the church-that is, the term church sometimes is used in reference to the whole family of the redeemed. It is so used in this chapter, especially in (Ephesians 5:25). Christ is the head of the church in the same sense that the man is head of the wife, or the man is the head of the wife in the same sense as Christ is the head of the church. We are aware that this is not in harmony with modern teaching and practice. It seems to us that frequently the order is reversed in these latter days, and it seems that often the woman is the head of the man; and sometimes it seems that some have an idea, judging from their practice, that Christ is not the head of the church; for they disregard His laws and His teachings. He is the Head and Lawgiver of His kingdom. Verse 33 says, "Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband." This teaches how the man should love his wife. Jesus loved His people so well that He gave Himself for them, even when they were enemies. He gave Himself for the church, that He might redeem it; see (Ephesians 5:25). A man who loves his wife as he should would be willing to die for her in order that her life might be spared. He should love his wife as he loves himself, for they are one. Then the wife should reverence her husband. She should have regard for his wishes and for his happiness. She should be ready to help him in his undertakings-and she will be, if she is a true wife. So will the true and devoted church of Christ be ready and willing and glad to reverence the Lord, and to do that which is pleasing to Him. They will be glad to know and to do His will. They will be ready to every good work. They will be glad to assemble in His name, and to praise Him for His mercies. They will take delight in His service. C. H. C.

Dan River Association

---August 22, 1929

We left our humble home in Thornton on Thursday, July 25, for a trip in North Carolina and Virginia. We arrived in Salisbury, N. C., on Saturday morning, July 27, at 5 o'clock, and were met at the train by Brother A. L. Owen and conveyed to his home near town, where a good breakfast was prepared. Then we were conveyed by him and his wife to High Point, N. C, where the Daniel River Association convened that morning and continued over Sunday and Monday. The brethren and sisters began to assemble early, and it was delightful to see them coming together and greeting each other with a pleasant smile and hearty handshake. It was so plain to be seen that love and fellowship abounded, and that sweet peace reigned in the midst. Their very countenances showed this. When they had assembled and engaged in song service for awhile, they said that we should preach the introductory sermon for them. Reluctantly we undertook the task, though we felt so much wearied from the long and tiresome journey, having been on the road for two nights, and since Thursday at noon, on account of the fact that we had missed connection in Atlanta, and thus delayed several hours in reaching Salisbury. We used (**Hebrews 6:1-3**) as a foundation for our remarks. The brethren all heartily endorsed our feeble effort in trying to speak to them concerning the principles of

the doctrine of Christ and of how we should go on and continue to press forward in His sweet and delightful service. The following elders were present during the meeting: R. H. Pittman, editor of the Advocate and Messenger, R. O. Raulston, C. H. Ferrel, P. W. Williard, W. F. Pruitt, C. H. White, Oscar Mullis, F. F. Eggleton, Bird Pruitt, J. R. Wilson, Joel T. Lewis, W. H. Oakes, and the writer, and Licentiate James Jones. They had preaching during the day and at night, and it was all harmonious, from first to last. Not a discordant note was sounded; not a single jar; it was all a unit. The Lord graciously blessed the servants to speak with freedom and liberty, and the brethren and sisters rejoiced at the sound of the truth, for the truth was preached all the way through. The glorious gospel was preached in its fullness and simplicity. When the gospel is preached that way in love, it does not divide the Lord's little children, but brings them together in love and sweet fellowship; and that was the effect manifested during this meeting. It was a great meeting, and one long to be remembered. These people have had a hard fight with the Absoluters, who have tried to establish tyrannical and associational rule over the Lord's dear children in this country; but the Lord is blessing them now with His divine presence and approval since they are clear of that black heresy that God absolutely predestinated the sin and wickedness and the black crimes that are committed in the world, and His sweet presence is manifested and felt in their meetings, and their meetings are now heavenly places here in this world. May His blessings continue with them, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Good Meetings

---August 22, 1929

On Tuesday, July 30, we were at Union Grove, in the Original Bear Creek Association, in North Carolina, and had meeting at 11 o'clock in the day and at night. A large crowd was present at both services, and both were sweet services. Rain came up late in the afternoon, but that did not hinder many from going to the meeting. Elders J. R. Wilson and F. F. Eggleton were with us there. On Wednesday, July 31, we were at Watson Church. Elders J. R. Wilson, F. F. Eggleton, P. J. Washburn and Oscar Mullis were with us there. It was a sweet meeting. Sister Alice Baucum came before the church and related a sweet experience of grace and asked for a home. She was gladly received by the church. Her baptism is to be attended to Saturday morning by Elder J. R. Wilson. In the afternoon we had service at the home of Sister Etta Helms, who is afflicted and not able to go to the meeting house. The same ministers were with us there. At this service Brother David Helms and Sister Lizzie Helms, son and daughter of the afflicted sister, asked for a home in the church. They were gladly received. There was much rejoicing at this service, and it was good to be there. May the Lord be praised for His goodness to the children of men.

We feel to believe that the Lord has graciously been with us so far on this trip, and we humbly trust that our trip in this country may do the Lord's little children no harm. We trust that we may have the prayers of the dear brethren and sisters, that the Lord may bless our labors among His dear children, and that He may be with and bless our dear loved ones at home in our absence from them. We received such a sweet letter from our little nine year old boy, Claudis, Jr., in which he said: "Daddy, I hope God will give you liberty to preach good, and the people will be glad to hear you, and will treat you good, give you a good bed to sleep on, and give you good things to eat and to drink. I hope God will bless you and us." This made our poor heart glad. Surely the Lord is good. Bless His holy name forever. C. H. C.

More Good Meetings

---August 29, 1929

Since writing our last little article about some of the meetings we have been in while in North Carolina, we have filled other appointments as arranged for us in North Carolina and Virginia. The last appointment in Elder J. R. Wilson's section was at the Old Mill Church, near Danville, on Saturday and second Sunday in August. We have enjoyed good meetings all the way, and have had good congregations at most every place. The day we were at Sugar Tree (if we have the name of the place correct) there had been rain during the night and raining some that morning. The church is located off the highway or good roads, and the roads to the church were muddy and slick, so that people could hardly get there. On this account the congregation there was small. At the meeting at High Hill one sister was restored to the fellowship of the church. She went away from the church a number of years ago, but came back on the day we were there and confessed her error. She was gladly and joyfully restored to the fellowship and privileges of the church. At the meeting at Lawyer Springs, which was on Saturday afternoon and first Sunday in August, a Sister Stegall came to the church and asked for a home with them. She was joyfully received and is to be baptized at a later date by Elder Wilson, the pastor. There was a large crowd at this meeting. On Sunday afternoon the church went into the communion service and engaged in washing each other's feet. It was a great meeting. Several brethren in the ministry were present. At the meeting at the Old Mill a Sister Puckett came to the church, asking for a home with them. She was gladly and joyfully received. They had meeting on Saturday and an all day meeting on Sunday-the second Sunday in August. A large crowd was present, and an orderly one, too. They had five sermons on Sunday. In the morning the stand was occupied by Elders Oakes, Lewis and Eggleton, and in the afternoon by the writer, followed by Elder J. R. Wilson. It was a great meeting. Several brethren were there from another section, from a distance, some of them being sent there to behold the order of these people and to see what doctrine they contend for. All of them that we heard speak expressed themselves as being satisfied with the principles contended for by those brethren. At every place we went we were kindly received and the brethren were all good and kind to us-so much better than we feel to deserve. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon them, is our humble prayer. We trust they may find it in their hearts to remember us in their prayers to the Lord. Many of them we do not expect to see again in this world of trouble, but we hope, by the grace of God, to meet them in that blessed home beyond, where sorrows, troubles and separations never come. C. H. C.

Romans 6:3-4

---August 29, 1929

Dear Elder Cayce: I am very glad to know we are to receive The Primitive Baptist weekly. I would be glad to have your views on **(Romans 6:3-4)**. Is this water baptism? Can anyone be baptized into Christ's death by water baptism? Come to see us sometime. Please remember us. With best wishes, I remain, your friend, J. E. Tate. Rutherford, Tenn.

OUR ANSWER

(Romans 6:1-4) reads as follows: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live

any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." In the first verse the apostle asks a question, "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?" Then he answers the question, "God forbid." Then he asks, "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" This question answers itself. It is simply a stronger way of saying that those who are dead to sin cannot live any longer therein. Then he argues and proves this from what they know by experience, "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death?" To baptize is to plunge, dip, immerse, bury. To be plunged into Christ, or immersed into Christ, is not to be immersed or plunged into the water. To be baptized into Christ is to be baptized into the benefits of His death-or into His death and the benefits of the same. This is not done by the preacher, or in the water. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." -(I Corinthians 12:13). This is a very plain, clear, and positive statement that the baptism into Christ, or into that body, is by one Spirit. The Spirit is the administrator. It is the work of the Spirit. It is not the work of the preacher. In the next verse, verse 4, the apostle says, "Therefore;" this being true; because of this; because this is true-now, "therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death." Verse 3 says baptized into Christ, and verse 4 says "we are buried with Him by baptism." To be baptized with Christ and to be baptized into Him are two different things-they cannot possibly be the same thing. But we are buried with Him by baptism, therefore, for the reason, that we have been baptized into Him. It is absurd to say that one must be baptized with Christ in order to get into Him. If one is baptized with Christ he must of necessity be in possession of Christ before the baptism. He must be in Christ before the baptism in order to be baptized with Him. Those who have been put into Christ and into the benefits of His death should be buried with Him by baptism into death. Such a person has been killed to the love of sin, has been killed to sin, is dead to sin, and for this reason should be buried with Him by baptism into death. "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." The person thus baptized, or thus buried with Christ by baptism, is raised to walk in newness of life. There is a new joy and delight and pleasure which he cannot attain to in any other way. Friend Tate should take up his cross and be buried with his blessed Saviour in baptism and rise to walk in newness of life. May the Lord bless these thoughts to your good. C. H. C.

Tour Ended in East

---September 19, 1929

In our issue of August 29 we told about some of the meetings we had attended in North Carolina and Virginia, the last being at Old Mill Church, near Danville, Va., on the second Sunday in August. On Monday, August 12, we left Danville for Manassas, Va., and filled an appointment at that place that night. Had a very pleasant little meeting there. Spent some time in the good home of Brother W. S. Athey, who treated us very kindly. On Tuesday we went to Washington City, and filled an appointment there that night. This is the old home church of Elder C. H. Waters, deceased. On Wednesday night we filled an appointment at Bethel Church, near the city. On Thursday night we attended an appointment in the city for Elder L. V. Hite, of Morral, Ohio, and heard him preach a good discourse, much to the

comfort of his hearers. Elder C. W. Miller, Rosslyn, Va., near Washington, was with us at our appointments at Bethel and in the city. On Thursday Elder A. A. Garrett, of Arlington, Ga., came to the city, and we were sure glad to see him. He and Elders R. H. Pittman, C. W. Miller and A. J. Garland were at the meeting Thursday night. We spent the time in the home of Brother Henry L. Lee while in the city. On Wednesday Elder Miller got a young brother whose name we cannot now recall to take him with us over the city to visit some of the points of interest. On Thursday we went with Sister Lee to the station to meet Elder Garrett. Then Sister Lee took us with Elder Garrett to visit points of interest. Among the places we visited while in the city were the Capitol building, the Old Soldiers' Home, Library of Congress, Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial, Memorial Bridge being built, National Cemetery, Arlington Amphitheater, Unknown Soldier's Grave, Robert E. Lee's old home, Mount Vernon, and the White House. In the Library we saw the Bible on which Lincoln took the oath of office as president on March 4, 1861, and the family Bible which he gave to his wife. At Mt. Vernon we saw the tomb of George and Martha Washington. While there and while at the grave of the Unknown Soldier we had a feeling of solemnity. We could but have a feeling of reverence as we stood by the open vault and looked upon the marble caskets holding the remains of the Father of our country and his wife, Martha Washington. Then when standing by the tomb of the Unknown Soldier, we could but have a feeling of sadness. The identity of this man was lost, when he had made the supreme sacrifice, laid down his life for his country. His relatives know not where he is buried, and the officials of the Government do not know who he was. In some way his identity was lost. Our blessed Saviour laid down His life, but His identity was not lost, and not one will be lost for whom He laid down His life. Though the relatives of this soldier do not know where he is buried, and though the Government for whom he laid down his life, lost his identity, and does not know who he was, yet how great and precious is the truth that our Lord knows. The Lord knows where all His loved ones are buried, and He knows who they are. A soldier is kept on guard duty over this grave all the time, and that tomb is held sacred. Peace be to the ashes of the dead hero, as well as to all the others. On Friday morning we went to Seneca Church, in Maryland, to attend the session of the Kettocton Association, which was the one hundred and sixty-third annual session. The elders present were T. S. Dalton, Baltimore, Md.; A. L. Harrison, Front Royal, Va.; C. L. Funk, Needmore, Pa.; J. T. Power, Martinsburg, W. Va.; R. H. Pittman, Luray, Va.; A. J. Garland, Washington, D. C.; W. J. Green, Gray, Ga.; A. A. Garrett, Arlington, Ga.; C. W. Miller, Rosslyn, Va.; L. V. Hite, Morral, Ohio; J. E. L. Alderton, Washington, D. C.; T. W. Alderton, Fredericksburg, Va.; J. B. Jenkins, Luray, Va.; J. A. Frazier, Marshall, Va.; E. J. Devane, Plant City, Fla., and the writer. Elder Dalton preached the introductory discourse, using the latter part of the forty-eighth Psalm. He preached an able discourse, and we were glad to hear this dear old servant of God once more. He is now about eighty-four years old, we believe, but is still strong in the faith. May the good Lord spare him yet many years, is our prayer. The meeting was good and the preaching a unit. Not a discordant note was sounded in the whole meeting. After the association we filled appointments in Front Royal, Va., on Monday night; Tuesday at Mill Creek, near Luray; Tuesday night at Mt. Carmel, in Luray, and Wednesday at Hawksbill, near Luray. A brother had joined at Hawksbill at a previous meeting, to be baptized on that Wednesday, which was attended to by Elder Pittman, who is the pastor. At the service that day another brother offered himself for membership and was gladly received. He went home to get a change of clothing, and his wife with him. She also brought a change of clothing for herself and offered herself for membership at the water. She was gladly received and was baptized with her husband and the other brother. We have forgotten the names of these parties. All these meetings

were pleasant, and the brethren were all good to us-much better than we feel we deserve. Wednesday afternoon Elder Pittman conveyed us to New Market, where we got on a bus and went to Staunton that afternoon. At Staunton we got on a train at 7:27 p. m. for Mt. Sterling, Ky., arriving there at 7:02 Thursday morning. We were met at the train by Sister Florence Chaney and her father. He is not a member, but we think he should be. Then we attended the North District Association, which was held on Friday, Saturday and Sunday at Liberty Church, near Winchester, Ky. Deacon A. H. Rupert was moderator of this association for a long time. He passed away since the associational meeting in 1928. We had a great desire to meet him once more, but will be deprived of that privilege in this life. We hope to meet him in a better association over yonder. Brother W. R. Rupert was chosen moderator. The elders in attendance were J. W. Anderson, Irvine, Ky.; W. L. Kash, Jackson, Ky.; E. W. Harlan, Connorsville, Ind.; R. H. Wilcox, An-netta, Ky., and the writer. Elder Anderson is pastor of the church there, and was appointed to preach the introductory sermon, which he did very acceptably. This was another good meeting, and the preaching was all a unit. Many of them insisted that we attend the next session, which is to be held with Goshen Church. If it seems that the way is open we may try to comply with their request. On Sunday afternoon we left Winchester for home, and arrived home on Monday afternoon, August 26, at 6:20, and found all well. Our wife and all five of the children met us at the station, and we were glad beyond expression to see them once more. Again we say that the brethren were good to us- much better than we feel we deserve. We never made a trip in life that we felt to enjoy more, and on which we were more heartily received and our poor efforts more heartily endorsed; and we humbly trust that no harm will ever result from the visit and from our efforts to speak in the name of the Master. It is our humble desire to preach peace by Jesus Christ; to try to tell what the good Lord has done for His children, and what He is doing for them, and what He has promised to do for them, and how they should live here in the world to honor and glorify His name and to be mutual helpers of each other here. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon all whom we met and who were so kind and good to us, is our humble prayer; and we trust you will all remember us in your prayers. Pray the Lord to direct us in the right way, and to give us courage and strength to walk therein. And pray the Lord to direct and preserve and keep our dear companion, who is left in loneliness and sadness so much of the time, and who has all the home cares while we are away, and yet who never complains or murmurs, but encourages us to go in discharge of every duty. And pray for our dear children, who are left so much of the time without a father's care and protection. C. H. C.

Matthew 20:16 AND Matthew 22:14

---September 19, 1929

Dear Brother: I have some Scripture on my mind I would like for you to give me your views on, if you have a mind to do so. The Scripture is ((0:16) (Matthew 20:16); (22:14). Wife and I enjoy reading your paper very much indeed. Wishing the good Lord to bless you and yours with His most choice blessing, is our prayer. Please pray for us when you have a mind to do so. Your friends in hope of a better world to come, Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Nowell. Headland, Ala.

REMARKS

((0:16) (Matthew 20:16) reads, "So the last shall be first, and the first shall be last: for many be called, but few chosen." **(Matthew 22:14)** reads, "For many are called, but few are chosen." We suppose the expression, "Many be called, but few chosen," is what the brother wants our views on. To our mind the language simply

teaches that there are many who are called out of nature's night and darkness into the marvelous light and liberty of the children of God-many are called unto or into eternal life; but few are chosen as special witnesses of God's blessed truth. The Lord has some few chosen witnesses for His blessed truth whom he will not suffer to be deceived by the false and judaizing teachers of the world. "If it were possible they would deceive the very elect" -but it is not possible. God has a very elect, the few chosen witnesses for His truth, that He will not suffer to be deceived. This is our view of the matter. May the Lord bless you. C. H. C.

Associations Attended

---October 3, 1929

We left home on Friday, August 30, in company with Brother W. J. Peterson, to attend the meeting of the Ozark Association to be held with the church at Louisburg, Mo. We had some car trouble, so did not get to Louisburg until Saturday morning. They had preaching Friday night, but the associational meeting began on Saturday morning. The introductory sermon was delivered by Elder D. F. Coones, and he preached a good discourse. The following named ministers were in attendance during the meeting: Elder C. C. Agee, Springfield, Mo.; D. F. Coones, Lebanon, Mo.; D. W. Witt and J. C. Haskins, Combs, Ark.; L. H. Clevenger, Excelsior Springs, Mo.; J. V. Martin, M. T. Cockrel, J. A. Al-berty, Sarcoxie, Mo.; J. G. Taylor, Garfield, Ark.; Walter Cash, St. Joseph, Mo.; W. B. Howard, Freewater, Ore.; Jasper O'Dell, Springfield, Mo.; J. A. Ford, Louisburg, Mo.; M. M. Shumate, Kansas City, Mo.; D. B. Nowells, Winona, Mo.; O. Irwin, Greencastle, Ind., and C. H. Cayce, Thornton, Ark., and Licentiates Arthur Alexander, Marshfield, Mo., and Thos. Crist, Rogers, Ark. They had service each morning, afternoon and night. The preaching was all harmonious, and the Lord graciously blessed the meeting. There were three or four additions to the church by experience and two were restored. It was a good meeting, if we are any judge. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon them. We hope to visit them again some day. We had a little more car trouble returning home, so did not reach home until Tuesday afternoon, September 3. That night we were taken sick, and we were not able to get out of the house again until Saturday afternoon, and not able to get about much for several days. We had expected to attend the Salem Association at Blue Mountain, Ark., but the sickness kept us from it. Our wife wrote them, or the clerk, Brother Joel Loyd, at Blue Mountain, that we were sick and could not be present. Brother Loyd read the letter to the association, and they instructed him to write to us. This made us feel our littleness and insignificance so much, to be so kindly remembered by them. May the good Lord bless them. The association was held on Friday, Saturday and second Sunday in September, and we learn they had a good meeting. The South Arkansas Association was held with the church at Harmony, in Donaldson, Ark., on Friday, Saturday and third Sunday in September, the 13th, 14th and 15th. The visiting ministers in attendance were Elders P. E. Whitwell, A. Woodall, W. H. Lee, B. Isaacs, L. G. Montgomery, R. L. Piles, W. W. Fowler, J. B. Halbrook and W. T. Alderman. The home ministers in attendance were Elders J. W. Guest, A. D. Cencibaugh, E. W. Hargett, John R. Harris and C. H. Cayce. Elder Guest preached a good discourse in the introductory. The Lord graciously blessed the ministers to speak with liberty to the comfort of His humble poor. There were four additions to the church by experience, and the ordinance of baptism was appointed to be attended to on Sunday afternoon by Elder Guest. At the water two more presented themselves for membership and were gladly received. It was a glorious meeting all the way through. On Saturday afternoon, after the regular service was through,

there were two colored brethren present- Elders M. W. Thrower and R. M. Lovett. So many expressed themselves as having a desire to hear them preach that they were requested to do so. They went to the stand to comply with the request, and the Lord blessed them to preach wonderfully. They could and did proclaim the riches of God's grace in the salvation of poor sinners with power and in demonstration of the Spirit. May the Lord bless them and keep them in the right and good old way. We left home again on Thursday, September 19, to attend the Predestinarian Association, which was held with Forked Deer Church, in Finger, Tenn., on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, September 20, 21, 22. We arrived there Friday morning. The introductory sermon was ably preached by Elder D. Hopper. The ministers in attendance were Elders D. Hopper, Jackson, Tenn.; S. E. Reid, Henderson, Tenn.; J. A. Burcham, Bath Springs, Tenn.; D. M. Neisler, Lexington, Tenn.; A. W. DeBerry, Corinth, Miss.; John Grist, Dyer, Tenn.; Commodore Brann, Dresden, Tenn.; J. H. Phillips, Huron, Tenn.; B. D. Bryant, Tiptonville, Tenn.; Harvey Smith, Rutherford, Tenn.; J. L. Fuller, Wildersville, Tenn.; L. D. Hamilton, Humboldt, Tenn.; N. V. Parker, Walnut, Miss., and C. H. Cayce, Thornton, Ark. It was a good meeting and seemed to be enjoyed by all present. Brother Jim Brantley took us home with him (Lexington, Tenn.) Sunday afternoon, where we had supper and then got a train at 6:27 for Memphis. We arrived home Monday morning at 4 o'clock, and found all well, the whole family being at the depot to meet us. We felt thankful to the good Lord for His mercies and blessings. May the good Lord bless the good people who were so kind to us at all these meetings. We trust they may remember us in their prayers. C. H. C.

Matthew 22:30,32

---October 10, 1929

Brother J. T. Payne, Ariton, Ala., asks our views concerning the two verses as above. (Matthew 22:30)reads: For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. What gave rise to this expression may be seen by reading the verses preceding, beginning with (Matthew 22:23). The Sadducees denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and went to the Saviour with a question which they thought would overthrow that doctrine. They presented a case wherein one woman had had seven brothers for husbands, and after they had all died then the woman died. They asked whose wife she would be in the resurrection. They did not understand or know that in the resurrection earthly ties and relationships are done away. In ((9) (Matthew 22:29) the Saviour said: Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. Then follows (Matthew 22:30), as quoted above, "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage." Fleshly ties and relationships are done away. The Saviour here clearly teaches the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. (Matthew 22:31-32) read. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. It is true that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had passed out of this earthly mode of existence, yet in spirit they were resting in the presence of God in the better world, with the promise of the resurrection of their bodies from the grave, or from the dead. Mark relates the same circumstance, and we find this language in **((26) (Mark 12:26):** And as touching the dead, that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spoke unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? Luke also gives his account of the same matter. In **((0:34) (Luke 20:34-38)** we have this language: And

Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For He is not a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto Him. To our mind this all teaches the truth of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, or the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead, and that in the resurrection fleshly ties and relationships will be done away. If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ was not raised. If Christ was not raised, then He was an impostor. If He was an impostor, then the Bible is not true. If the Bible is not true, then there is no God, and we do not know where we came from or where we are going. We are at sea without chart or compass. But Jesus was raised a living man. Therefore, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is established, and what Moses taught concerning the same is proven true. Then Jesus was not an impostor, and the Bible is true. The Bible being true, then God is, and is the God the Bible describes. All this being true, then God's children will all be raised in the likeness and in the image of the glorified Redeemer, and heaven is their home, and all that it contains will be theirs to enjoy-and that to all eternity, for they cannot die any more. May this be the happy lot of our readers, according to the will of God, is our humble prayer. Sometimes we feel a desire to leave this world of persecution and distress and to cross over the dark river and enter into the joys beyond. We do not know-how it will be when we reach the end of the way, but we feel that we are willing to risk our case in the hands of a merciful and loving Saviour. C. H. C.

Too Much of the World

---October 31, 1929

The following is copied from an article by James A. Allen in the Gospel Advocate, of Nashville, Tenn., of Oct. 17, 1929. Of course what he has said has reference to his own people, but it appears to us that the following is true with reference to the true church to a great extent, or in a great measure. It is deplorable to see the great degree of worldliness among the professed followers of the Lord in this present age. It is distressing and deplorable. We can but wonder what the result will be. May the good Lord help and pity us. C. H. C. There is too much of the world in the churches. The members seek the approval and commendation of the enemies of the truth, instead of forgetting everything else in a single desire to do and preach God's will, as it is revealed in the Bible. Business men, who are making filthy lucre out of the world, want to squash everything in the church that antagonizes the world; and, with the exception of the faithful few, the great majority of the church are so much like the world that outsiders cannot tell the difference. Their religion is little more than a mere form and consists wholly in "going to church" for a few minutes on Sunday morning. As far as other services of the church, or the general work of the church, is concerned, they do not exist. They do not read a line in the Bible for months at a time nor do they regularly and daily engage in those prayers and thanksgivings to God, without which no man can have the strength to resist the world and to do his duty as a Christian. They lay by scarcely anything upon the first day of the week, much less a tenth, or more, as every true disciple finds an inestimable happiness in doing. They do not teach the word of God to their children nor bring their children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Their sons and daughters take degrees in colleges, but they are worth little or nothing to the cause

of the Lord. The family altar is never raised in their homes nor do their children know the meaning of family prayers. But, in saying this, am I a "knocker?" Is it the truth? And can reformation be brought about without telling the truth? Is it not a fact that there is so much world in the church that some of its greatest efforts almost bray of "social service," instead of having the old Jerusalem ring of old-time gospel preaching? Truth must be told, come what may. The church can never successfully do the work that God has given it to do as long as its members have a divided allegiance. As long as its members are so worldly-minded as to think they must keep up with the world, and that they must conform to the standards of the world, so long will they be a liability, not an asset, to the cause of the lowly Jesus and to the church, which He purchased with His own blood.

Bible Conference

---October 31, 1929

In the Banner Herald of Sept. 15, 1929, appears the program of the Progressive "Primitive Baptist Bible Conference," which is to be held at Tifton Church October 29, 30, 31, 1929. On the program for Wednesday morning we find that they are to have a discussion, or article, on "The Covenant of Grace and the Relation which the Atonement, Regeneration and the Resurrection Sustain to it," by Elder J. B. Hardy, Hohenwald, Tennessee. Other names on the program at other times are, besides the address of welcome and response: Elders Wm. H. Grouse, T. E. Sikes, S. C. Davis, W. B. Screws, J. Walter Hendrix, W. F. Mims, W. B. Godard, W. W. Childs, D. O. Lewis, J. W. Crane, J. J. Johnston, J. M. Thomas, V F. Agan, S. H. Whatley, Geo. D. Godard, R. H. Jennings and Dr. T. J. McArthur. C. H. C.

A Good Meeting

---October 31, 1929

In the Banner Herald, edited by Elder Wm. H. Crouse, the organ of the Progressives, for October 1, 1929, and in which appears the names of Elders Geo. D. Godard, J. W. Fairchild, J. W. Crane, and W. C. Kick-lighter as associate editors, we have read the following account of a meeting held at Providence Church, near Stringer, Miss. C. H. C. THE ARTICLE We had a splendid meeting at Providence Church, near Stringer, Miss., the week before and including the first Sunday in August. Elder J. B. Hardy did the preaching and every sermon was with love and power. The congregations were large and attentive. They just feasted on the glorious gospel as Elder Hardy so clearly presented it. Ten united with the church-seven by baptism, two by letter and one by relation. The entire country seemed interested, and the interest continues. At our September meeting three joined and were baptized Sunday morning. Also two by letter- one had been received but did not have his letter till this meeting. Elder J. A. Ford was with us and did the preaching Sunday to the comfort of those who are hungering and thirsting after righteousness. After preaching we took the Lord's supper and washed one another's feet. Meeting closed with a song and handshake of love and fellowship. It was good to be there because God's presence was there. J. W. Fairchild.

Call An Old Man

---October 31, 1929

Brother Cayce, do you think that the Lord would call a man to preach in his old days? and me being very unlearned in the Scriptures, and have a poor education,

and very poor in this world's goods and a large family to care for? When you pray for yourself and all of God's dear children, please pray for me and mine. May God's richest blessings rest upon you and yours, is my prayer, for Jesus' sake. I am, I hope, your brother in hope of rest after this life is over, F. M. Akers. Dana, Ky.

REMARKS

We only feel a desire to call attention to one or two passages of Holy Writ in commenting on what this dear brother has said. **(I Corinthians 1:26-29)** "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in His presence." **(James 2:5)** "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him?" **((3) (Acts 4:13)** "Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men, they marvelled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus." We do not know how old the apostles were, nor how old any of the seventy were, when the Lord put them into the ministry. He is as able to call an old man to the work of the ministry as a young man. If one feels an impression of mind in this work we think the best thing for him to do is to try, the best he can, to discharge what he feels to be his duty, and try to labor in the field he feels the Lord has assigned him. May the Lord bless you. C. H. C.

Absolute Powers of Pope Reveled Legislation and Administration of Vatican City Laws Rest With Pontiff

---November 7, 1929

In the Arkansas Gazette, Little Rock, Ark., of Sunday, September 8, 1929, under the above heading the following article, by the Associated Press, appeared on page 10. The claim that Catholics and others made not so long ago that the Pope and the Catholic Church only claim to have rule or control over spiritual matters is now proven to be a false claim. The territory of the Vatican City is turned over to the Pope, and he is the supreme ruler and king in all matters, both state and spiritual. He is the absolute and undisputed master in that territory. The Pope has the absolute power to grant "pardon, amnesty, indults and condonements." The pardoning power is in the Pope alone. All the powers confirmed to the Pope more than 300 years ago in the Canon Law Code of 1607 are reserved. "The power to make particular regulations to cover specific codes may be entrusted by the Pope to the governor of the Vatican state;" "but the governor is responsible to the Pope and no one else, and receives his orders directly from the Pontiff." In judicial matters there are three different courts to exercise power; but the Pope has the privilege of appointing the judges, and he also has the right to remove judges at will. "The Supreme Pontiff, sovereign of the State of Vatican City, has the fullness of the legislative, executive and judicial powers." The Pope designates himself alone as the fountain head of power and the source of law within the new political entity. If all this does not prove, beyond question and without a doubt, that Rome is a menace to our free government, we do not know what they would have to do to prove it. It is high time our people were awake to the dangers that are lurking near, and be on guard and awake to their duty. These things prove clearly that a

true Catholic is a subject of a foreign government and power, the supreme head of which is the Pope. What right does a man have to retain allegiance to France, Germany, Spain, Italy, or any other foreign power, and at the same time have the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States? In order to have the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States one must renounce allegiance to the French or German governments, if he is a Frenchman or German. They have as much right to claim citizenship under our government as the subject of any other foreign power. There are many good people in the Catholic Church, but we are afraid of the rulers over them and of their claims. Read the following article carefully, and then do not forget what it says. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

Vatican City, Sept. 7.-The absolute power of the Pope in church affairs is further emphasized by the Fundamental Laws of twenty-one articles promulgated for Vatican City following the ratification of the Lateran Treaties with Italy. By the Fundamental Laws the legislation and administration of Vatican City, together with all judicial powers therein, are made to depend directly and only upon the Pontiff. Pius XI designates himself alone as the fountain head of power and the source of law within the new political entity. Thus the laws with reference to Vatican City bear out the teaching of Canon Law, which holds that the Pope is the Supreme Head of the Church, subject to no control from outside. The College of Cardinals comes into play only in Consistories which approves new cardinals, in the Conclave which elects a new Pope, in councils wherein the Pope proclaims a new doctrine, and in Committees and Congregations appointed for specific duties. Canon Law says that the Pope is infallible when, in conjunction with the College of Cardinals, he proclaims a dogma of faith or morals. The Fundamental Laws start off by saying: "The Supreme Pontiff, Sovereign of the State of Vatican City, has the fullness of the legislative, executive and judicial powers." Should the throne of St. Peter be vacant, the College of Cardinals has power to make laws only during that vacancy; and even then those laws will not continue valid unless confirmed by the succeeding Pontiff. All those powers confirmed to the Pope more than 300 years ago in the Canon Law Code of 1607 are carefully reserved. The powers delegated to other dignitaries are circumscribed and made to hang on the pleasure of the Holy Father. For instance, the power to make particular regulations to cover specific codes may be entrusted by the Pope to the governor of the Vatican state-Commendatore Serafini. But the governor is responsible to the Pope and no one else, and receives his orders directly from the Pontiff. The judicial power is more specifically delegated to other bodies, but even here the Pope retains the upper hand. In civil cases, the judicial power within the Vatican City will be exercised by three courts-a tribunal of first instance, the Roman Rota sitting as a court of appeal, and the Supreme Tribunal as a court of last resort. The privilege of appointing judges of these courts rests solely with the Pontiff. He has also the right to remove judges at will. The pardoning power resides also in the Pope alone. The Fundamental Laws declare that there remain reserved to the Pontiff "the faculty of granting pardon, amnesty, indults and condonements." The Fundamental Laws are another step in the centuries old contest of power between the Papacy and the Cardinals. This contest was aired in several Councils of the Church, wherein the Cardinals sought to circumscribe the supreme power of the Pope, and make it depend upon them. In some cases Kings and Emperors, irritated by the vigorous stand of the Pope, sided with the Cardinals. But today the Pope is undisputed master.

1 Timothy 5:9-11

---November 7, 1929

We have been requested to give our views on the Scripture recorded in **(I Timothy 5:9-11)**. You can get your Bible and read it. We do not feel that it is necessary to say more than just a few words concerning the language recorded in the citation given. The apostle is there giving direction as to the poor widow who should be taken under the care of the church and provided for by the church. The qualifications are there laid down. She should be three score years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works, etc. This is all we can get out of the language-that it simply gives the qualifications of the widow who is to be cared for by the church. C. H. C.

Hebrews 6:1-6

---November 14, 1929

Brother L. F. Guy, of Bienville, La., has requested our views of **(Hebrews 6:1-6)**. The verses read as follows: Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. And this will we do, if God permit. For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame. By the term, or the word, "leaving" in verse 1 the apostle does not mean to "forsake," but not to continue along that particular line all the time. The principles of the doctrine are not to be lost sight of, but there is something else to consider in addition to that. We should go on in the service of God, and contend for the true and right service of the Lord, and not be along the line of the defense of the doctrine all the time. In order that God be honored and His name glorified by us here in the world it is necessary that we go on in His service, doing the things He has commanded, as well as to remember and contend for the principles of His doctrine. The fundamental principles of the doctrine of God are as a foundation; they serve as a foundation. All true and acceptable service to God must rest upon those fundamental principles of doctrine. But we are not to continue working at the laying of the foundation all the time. Lay the foundation, and then go to work in building on that foundation. The only foundation worth building upon is the doctrine of God our Saviour-and we are not to forget any of the fundamental principles of that doctrine. The blood of Christ applied to the conscience by the Spirit of God is that which purges the conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

See **(Hebrews 9:13-14)**. This is the work of God, and is not to be lost sight of. It is an independent work-that is, it is done independently of the work of the sinner or any human being. This is a part of the foundation, but we are not to talk of that all the time. It should be impressed, and advocated, a part of the time, but not all the time. It is one of the things necessary to be done in order that we be able to go on. The same is true in all the fundamental principles of the doctrine of God our Saviour. It is not necessary here to refer to, or to take up, all the fundamental principles of that doctrine. Suffice to say that five fundamental points of that doctrine, more especially, are, election-God's sovereign choice of sinners of Adam's race to be heirs of glory; predestination (He predestinated His chosen ones to be

conformed to the image of His Son); effectual calling (the Holy Spirit effectually calls those chosen ones out of nature's night and darkness and translates them into the marvelous light and liberty of the children of God); final preservation of the saints (they are preserved in Jesus Christ); and, finally, the resurrection of the dead; the bodies of the saints to be changed and made spiritual and to be glorified and made like Jesus, and the bodies of the unjust to be raised to condemnation. **{(John 5:25,28-29)}** These principles of the doctrine of Christ, or of the doctrine of God, are the foundation upon which true service must be built and upon which the same must rest. Let us not continue to work on this foundation all the time-that is, do not continue all the time in laying the foundation; but let us lay this foundation, and then go on upon that foundation unto perfection. Does he mean to go on unto a state of sinless perfection? No; but to a state of Christian perfection. Sinless perfection is one thing and Christian perfection is another thing. The Scriptures are given" that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." **{(II Timothy 3:16)}** By building on this foundation- going on in doing the things the Scriptures teach, and leaving undone everything the Scriptures do not teach, we may attain to that state of perfection in the service of God which He requires." Let us go on unto perfection. " It seems to us that the apostle uses this expression as an encouragement to the Lord's little children to strive to this end. Evidently this is not a state of sinless perfection, because He says in **(Galatians 5:17)** "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." What would you do? Sure you would live above and without and free from sin, but you cannot do that. There is a warfare continually in the child of God as long as he lives in this world of sorrow and trouble, and he cannot attain to a state of sinless perfection in this life. But though this be true, we should "go on unto perfection" -a state of Christian perfection, or state of perfection in service. Let us strive to that end. Let us not be weary in well doing. These things to do in order to that end are the things the Lord has commanded, the things the Scriptures teach, and to leave undone and to let alone all the inventions and commandments of men. "And this will we do, if God permit." Here is a promise of the Lord's help. Let us go on in His service, relying upon Him, trusting Him. Let us not wait to see if men will approve or whether they will condemn. The Lord is a very present help in time of need. The certainty and the infallibility of the work of God is an encouragement here presented for God's little children. "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened * * * * if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame." Jesus died for them to redeem them from all iniquity and to bring them to God, that they might live with Him in eternal glory. If one of them should fall away from that divine relationship with Him, then the work of Christ would prove a failure in that case, and He would be put to an open shame. It would become necessary for Him to leave His home in glory and come into this world and die again. He is alive forevermore, and will never die again. His work is perfect. **{(Deuteronomy 32:4)}** Therefore these persons shall never fall away and be finally lost. This should encourage the Lord's little children to press on in His service and to honor and glorify His blessed name while they live in the world. Let us go on in His blessed and sweet and delightful service. We have here given just a few thoughts in connection with the language recorded in the passage referred to. May the Lord bless the same to the good of our readers. Much more could be said, but we must stop for this time. Pray the Lord to help us to press on in the "good old way." C. H. C.

Jeremiah 23:1-2

---November 21, 1929

Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-Please give your views through the paper on **(Jeremiah 23:1-2)**. Should pastors treat members so cold that they feel it is better to stay at home than it is to go to church? Hope you will give your views on the above Scripture. May God bless you with every needed blessing while you make your stay in this unfriendly world, to enable you to stand for the great cause you are so nobly standing for. I feel from reading after you that you are one of our blessed Father's under shepherds. May our heavenly Father uphold you, is my prayer. When you have remembered all others, please remember poor little me, the weakest of the weak; but when I am weak, He is strong. I am so glad that I, a poor little one, am permitted sometimes to rejoice in His love. Your poor little sister, I hope, Miss Louise Killey. Alvord, Texas.

OUR REPLY

The text referred to above reads as follows: Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture! saith the Lord. Therefore thus saith the Lord God of Israel against the pastors that feed my people; Ye have scattered my flock, and driven them away, and have not visited them: behold I will visit upon you the evil of your doings, saith the Lord.-(Jeremiah 23:1-2). We hardly know how to even begin to write an article on the above text. The very language itself shows very clearly that there is such a thing as the pastors destroying and scattering the sheep of the Lord's pasture. Because they do this the Lord pronounces a woe upon them. It is a serious and deplorable thing for the pastors thus to do. It has often been said that the preachers are responsible for all, or nearly all, the trouble that arises in the church of God. No doubt this is partly true. Sometimes a preacher advances an idea which another preacher does not endorse, so he takes issue and tries to overthrow the other brother's idea. Then the other brother tries to defend his position, and thus the war begins. Hence they are responsible for the war being begun. If the churches would stop them right then and there, and not let them preach any more until they agree to stop their warfare, then the destruction of the churches and the scattering of the Lord's children would be prevented. Do not stop one and let the other one continue on, but stop them both, and thus show no partiality. Usually such wars begin over trifles, and differences, or seeming differences, are magnified, and they get farther apart instead of getting together. This is a deplorable thing and a bad state of affairs, and the Lord has pronounced a woe upon the pastors or preachers who thus do. Sometimes a preacher may get jealous of his brother in the ministry. For instance, a preacher may come along, who is new in the vicinity. "A new broom sweeps clean," you know. He may present the same truths which have been set forth and advocated there all the time, but he does so in a different way from that which the people have been accustomed to, and they enjoy the preaching. Perhaps they will (some of them) tell the brother how they enjoyed his preaching. This is all right for them to do that. But some of them may say something like this: "If we had such preaching as this our church would grow and prosper." This may be wrong. Perhaps the pastor hears that statement and it may cause him to have a bad feeling toward his brother in the ministry. True, it should not cause him to have such a feeling, but it may do so. If he has a bad feeling toward anyone on account of such as this, it should be toward the one making such a statement, or saying such things. But he should not have a bad feeling toward even that one on account of a thing of this kind. True, it would make him feel discouraged, and that he was not appreciated-and he could not help such a feeling as that. But he should not have ill will toward his brother in the ministry on account of it. And the congregation of brethren and sisters may

come up and tell the visiting preacher how much they enjoyed his preaching, and not think to speak to the pastor, and he may be made to feel that he is neglected, and this may arouse in him a dislike for the visiting preacher. It is wrong, however. He may even harbor a little feeling of spite toward his brother in the ministry, and may have a little feeling in his heart that "I wish they would praise me a little, too." Unless he watches himself very closely, and overcomes it, there will be jealousy in his heart, and then matters are in a good condition for a disturbance to begin. Woe unto that man who lets jealousy rule in his heart. Sometimes a preacher may decide that the best way to have room for his own gift is to get another preacher out of the way; and so he may begin to watch for an opportunity to destroy the brother he thinks is in his way. The truth of the matter is that when the Lord's servants labor in the field the Lord assigns to them, and where they should labor, there is not another of the Lord's ministers in his way. There is room for all the gifts from the Lord. "A man's gift maketh room for him, and bringeth him before great men." -((8:16) (Proverbs 18:16). We should all remember this, and not try to make room for ourselves by destroying our brother. When we try to make room for ourselves by destroying another, it brings destruction and scatters the Lord's little ones, and the Lord has pronounced a woe upon us. How careful the Lord's ministers should be to set right examples before the people. He should never say, "Don't do as I do, but do as I tell you to do." Paul never left on record such a statement for our learning. He said, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." -(I Corinthians 11:1). "For yourselves know how ye ought to follow us: for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you." -(Th 3:7) (II Thessalonians 3:7). The preacher who does not take heed to himself to set right examples before the brethren and before the world may, and doubtless will, cause coldness and distress among the Lord's children. The sheep will be scattered. Then woe to that preacher. He loses his influence, and his preaching will not have the influence for right living that it will have if he sets the right examples. Now, a word about the pastor treating a member with coldness. Sometimes a member may think that the pastor has done such a thing when he had no such idea or intention. We should not expect too much of the pastor. One might be feeling cast down and not go to the pastor, and the pastor might feel that the member has treated him with coldness. We should not be too ready to think thus about each other. Remember that "charity thinketh no evil." Let us all try to excuse rather than accuse each other. There are so many things which might be said along these lines that we may have left unsaid the very things which should have been said, but we must stop here. May the good Lord help us all to live in such a way that peace and sweet fellowship may abound among the Lord's dear children. If we would all live as we should, the church would be made an inviting place for the Lord's little ones, and we would see them coming home to the church and asking for a shelter from the world and a place with us in the sweet and delightful service of our heavenly Master. May the good Lord pity us and help us so to live, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Ill Health Prevents Going

---November 28, 1929

We have been requested to attend a meeting of investigation near Smithville, N. C, but we cannot go on account of a failure in our health. Our family physician has said we must not take any more long trips now. We do not know whether we can be restored to health or not, but it is our desire to do all we can to that end. Our physician discovered our condition on October 30, in examining us. Since that time we have been trying to follow his instructions, and have been under his treatment.

For the first week our condition seemed to grow worse, then seemed to improve. We are to go to him again in a few days for another examination. We desire that no one think hard of us for not making any long trips now, and we sincerely ask an interest in the prayers of all the Lord's humble poor. Pray that we may be restored to health, if it can be the Lord's will; and pray that we may be reconciled to our lot and to His will, and that He may bless our dear loved ones. C. H. C.

Health Broken

---December 19, 1929

A few weeks ago we stated that we could not go to North Carolina in answer to a call from some brethren there on account of a failure in our health. A number of good brethren have written good and encouraging letters to us, and expressed much sympathy, and the hope that we might be improving. Well, we cannot say that we are any better. Some days we feel fairly well, and then perhaps the next day we feel very badly. Our physician forbids us making any long trips. He says we should not travel all day- go only what may be called a short distance. He has required that we do no more than half what we have been doing heretofore. He also tells us we must not worry, and that we must take things easy. He does not give us much encouragement as to recovery. If we can do as he tells us we may live for some years yet. Otherwise, we realize our stay here is short, and that we are liable to drop off the stage of action at any time. Now we have been frank to tell you our condition, as we understand it, and from what our physician has told us, as well as from what other physicians have told us concerning the trouble we have. We feel that we want to get well, if it can be the good Lord's will, so that we may go on in His service, as we have tried to do for the past forty years. If this is not His will, we desire to be reconciled to His will, whatever that may be. Please pray for us and our dear family. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 44

---December 19, 1929

This issue of The Primitive Baptist is the close of the forty-fourth volume. For forty-four years this paper has been published without change of ownership. The only change in that respect is that the paper was established by our father, Elder S. F. Cayce, the first of January, 1886, who continued as editor until his death in August, 1905, since which time we have been trying to fill the place as editor. Just before father's death he had a long talk with us, in which he told us he felt that his labors were about done, and that he wanted us to take up the editing of the paper and to carry it on after his death. This we have tried to do with what ability we possessed. At that time the circulation of the paper was about 5,000. The circulation is larger now than it was then, but not as large as it has been at some of the times since. Our experience is the same as that of our brethren who are engaged in editing Primitive Baptist papers, we are sure-and that is that it is a whole lot harder now to keep the circulation of a paper from going down than it used to be. We are sure other brethren have realized this, as well as we have. How well we have succeeded in keeping the paper up to a right standard in publishing and maintaining the truth, and setting forth the true principles of the doctrine that has characterized the true church in all ages is for the brethren and our readers to judge. We are free to confess that we have made mistakes; but we have tried to do our best to publish a paper for the advancement of the Primitive Baptist cause and the advancement of truth. In all

these years it has been our desire and our aim to follow the right and to do what was right, and to publish such things as would be for the good of the cause, regardless of what the result might be from a financial standpoint. Sometimes we have been told that unless we would publish certain things, or do certain things, that subscribers would quit taking the paper. We have said that we would try to follow the course which we felt was right, if every subscriber we had should quit on account of it. The primary consideration has not been a matter of financial returns, or whether we would have subscribers for the paper, but to do the right thing, regardless of the result from a financial standpoint. Now, at this time, we are not sorry we have pursued this course. We now feel a peaceful conscience that we have done this, though we are sure that we might have gained financially, at times, by pursuing a different course. We trust that our readers are better pleased now than some of them were when we first changed to a weekly. You will remember that we did not promise to get out a paper during Christmas week, and that is the only week in the year that we expect to miss hereafter. If we live through next year we expect to send the paper out every week during the year, except Christmas week, and that will be fifty-one issues for the whole year. There have not been that many issues this year, because the paper was published only twice a month until June 27. This issue makes thirty-eight for this year. We have given a total of 584 pages of reading matter, and some of the pages extra large. The same amount of reading matter supplied to you in book form would cost you not less than five dollars, perhaps more. Though many have complained that the price is too high, yet we know by long years of experience and from our knowledge of the cost of books and other printed matter, that we have given more reading matter of the kind than could have been had any other place for the price. We believe we would be safe in saying that no other religious publication in the United States gives more reading matter for the money than we do in The Primitive Baptist. It is true that trashy story papers charge a very low price for their papers, but they spend all they get for subscriptions in order to get more names on their list. They want, and must have, a large list-hundreds of thousands-in order to get the large volume of advertising at a high price-and that is the way they make their money. Religious papers do not get the high price for the advertising-what little they do-because they do not have the large list the story papers have. So they have to depend on the subscription receipts to pay the cost of publication. Now, we bid you all farewell for the year 1929. The next issue of the paper will be dated January 2, 1930. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon every one of our readers, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

1930

Introduction to Volume 45

---January 2, 1930

With this issue we begin the forty-fifth volume of The Primitive Baptist. Forty-four years the paper has been published, without any intermission. There have been some rough places and some trials and conflicts along the way, but the Lord has been good to us. We still confess that mistakes have been made. But we desire to forget "the things that are behind, and press forward toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." We desire to not only keep up the

standard the paper has attained to, but we desire to make every improvement possible. We do not mean to convey the idea in this statement that we desire to improve on the doctrine which has been maintained in this paper since the first issue, January 1, 1886. The same old principles of doctrine and practice which have characterized the true church in all ages past are still good enough for us. There can be no improvement on true principles, or the principles of truth. Principles are eternal and never change. Recently we received a suggestion from a sister, which we will here state for our readers, and we would be glad to hear from them as to what they think about it. We receive a great deal more matter for the paper than we have room for. We have on file now a large number of good letters sent us for the paper which we do not have room for. Many of them are good, and we would like to publish them; but, as stated, we do not have room. Of course it is also true that we receive a number of letters that we do not think prudent, or best for the cause, for them to be published. We also receive a great many private letters, sent from one person to another, which are sent to us with a request to publish, that are of interest to the parties directly concerned, but not of general interest. Of course the paper is for the general interest of the readers, and frequently we have to lay such letters aside. Now, this brings us to the sister's suggestion, which is this: Have what she calls an honor roll, or give it some other name, in which we publish a list of writers whose articles could not be used. The idea of the one making the suggestion was that the writer and all the readers could know we received an article from the person named on the list, and that thereby some might get in communication with parties they would be glad to get in touch with. Now, write us what you think about this. If a sufficient number would be glad to have a list occasionally we think we could try to give it to you. Another suggestion, made by a brother, was that we publish obituaries of none only ministers. We are frank to say that we do not really believe the brother's suggestion would be the best. It is true that obituaries of some may be published that are not of interest to all our readers, and especially is it true that they are sometimes made too long, but we would not say to leave them out of the paper entirely. Some of our subscribers love to read the obituaries, and get comfort therefrom. We are glad to publish the obituaries for the benefit and consolation of those who are bereaved, and they all have our sincere sympathy. But we would appreciate it if they would make them as short as they well can, and not try to write poetry in them. We think it is seldom necessary to even use poetry in an obituary, much less try to write poetry. Poetry is really more than writing so as to have a rhyme. We confess we do not know much about poetry, but we do know that a lot of matter called poetry is not really poetry at all, as it is written without regard to what is called poetical feet. Now, it is not necessary to try to explain about poetical feet, for it would take too much space, and we do not know enough about it to explain it all, anyway. What we mean above about rhyme is that simply a rhyme is not poetry. Now, we want to make a suggestion ourselves about obituaries, which is this: We do not think it best to publish obituaries of persons who have been dead such a long time. Sometimes we have received obituaries of persons who had been dead several years. We have sometimes given space for them when we really thought it best not to do so. It awakens old sorrows, and brings new pangs to the hearts of some, or else it freshens the old pangs, and causes the old sorrows to revive. It makes the old wounds to become fresh. In some rare instances and under certain circumstances it is all right to make some mention of some who passed away in the years gone by, and some may be made to receive comfort by so doing. But publishing an obituary of one who died some years ago seldom brings such comfort. Let us try to be considerate along this line, as well as along all other lines. We expect, if not providentially prevented, to send out fifty-one issues of the paper during the year

1930. This will give our subscribers 816 pages of reading matter during the next year at a cost of only \$2. Do you think you could get a book of 816 pages, the size pages of The Primitive Baptist, for near that price? A book of that many pages, of that size, would cost a great deal more than that. In the present form you can easily preserve your papers and sew them together, and have a good book at the end of the year. Keep all your papers. They will be valuable some day. We are trying to get arrangements made for binders to furnish our subscribers at a very low price, so they can make the papers into books that will be easily preserved, and be very valuable in future years. If we can make the arrangements mentioned, announcement will be made in the paper. We are glad for the brethren and sisters to write for the paper. We trust they will continue to do that, as they may feel impressed of the Lord. If we cannot publish all we get, it will give us a larger supply to select from. We need a variety in the paper, just as we need a variety in preaching. If a man preaches along one line all the time, his congregation would not get the proper variety of nourishment. They would not get "a balanced ration." The result would be that they would be weak along some lines. So we need to give "a balanced ration" in the paper. Since our health is not good, and we cannot go from home on preaching tours now, as we have been doing for all these years, perhaps we can write more for the paper ourselves. We now make the promise that we will try. It is true that several issues during the latter part of 1929 we had no article in the paper. When our health failed we were very far behind with our work of answering letters, and other work. Our wife turned in and helped us out, but we were not physically able to do more, and were trying to catch up with the work first. Thanks for her help, our work along that line is nearer up than it has been for a long time. She will still help us along as she can. Then if our health will admit we hope to do more writing for the paper this year than we did last, and we did more last year than we did the year before, or for several years before. Another thing, now. Unless our health improves we cannot get out among the brethren, as we have been doing. This being true, we will need the help of our brethren to keep up the circulation of the paper. Will you do all you can to get the brethren and sisters and friends to take the paper? Will you help us in this way? Or, will you neglect it, and forget us in our poor health? We have confidence in you to believe you will help us all you can to get subscribers for the paper. We desire to publish such things in the paper as will benefit, comfort and instruct the Lord's dear children, and that will promote the cause of the Master. Newfangled ways and notions will not do that. Efforts to reform and revolutionize the old church will not promote peace and fellowship among the brethren. We do not need any progressive measures. To progress is to leave the old landmarks. But we should be aggressive in the service of our God. Aggression is one thing and progression is another. The matter of progression was fought out in the ranks years ago. We cannot now afford to go back on the stand our people took then. To do so would be to confess that we all did wrong in standing for the old and original principles then. "Woe unto them that go down to Egypt for help." The church of Christ is a separate institution from the world, and is not of the world. We cannot raise the world up to the church by adopting and practicing things in the church that are invented by the world. To endeavor to do so would only bring the church down to the world instead of raising the world up to the church. Let us faithfully and humbly stand upon the same old principles which have characterized the true church in all the ages past. May the Lord help us all to do that, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

2 Timothy 2; 4:22

---January 9, 1930

Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.-(II Timothy 2:15). We desire to write just a few lines on this text. It contains more than we can write about in one little article, but we desire to call attention to just a few thoughts contained in the same. Paul was here writing to a young preacher, and giving instruction to him as to how he should live, as well as how he should preach. We are sure that the instruction here given to this preacher would be good for all the Lord's preachers in this present day, as well as in all time to come. He first says, here, to "study." It is necessary for the preacher, as well as others, to study the Bible in order to know what it teaches. He is to "study to shew thyself approved" -not unto men, but "unto God." Unless he lives as he should, he is not approved unto God; that is, God does not approve of his conduct. This is sufficient to show the necessity of the preacher living an honorable and upright life. His character should be above reproach. His life should be such that people have confidence in him as a man. He "must be of good report of them that are without." He must study to show himself approved unto God, "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." We have known some who should be ashamed, if they are not, for the way they have lived. The preacher is to be an overseer. An overseer is one who is to show others how to do. Then the preacher should show others of the Lord's people how to do-not simply tell them, but show them by living right himself. Thus he sets the right example. And the preacher is to be an ensample to the flock. That is, he is to set the right example before them. He should study to do this, and to thus be approved unto God, and not to be ashamed. Next, the apostle says, "rightly dividing the word of truth." Notice that he uses the word rightly. This shows that there may be such a thing as wrongly dividing the word of truth. This does not mean to divide truth from error. But to rightly divide the word of truth will expose error. It is a universal fact that this is so. The word divide here means especially to apply -to make the right application. In order to show the necessity of rightly dividing the word of truth, suppose we here call attention to two different passages of Holy Writ. The first we call attention to is **(II Timothy 1:9)**, which reads, "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." The next passage we call attention to is **(I Timothy 4:16)** "Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine: continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." In the first text the apostle emphatically declares that our being saved is not according to our works. In this all our works, whether good or bad, are excluded from the work of salvation. In the other text the same apostle says that "in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." Doing is working. To do a thing one must work at it. Here the apostle plainly declares that there is a saving which comes as a result of "doing this" -doing what is here commanded. There is no man on earth who can harmonize these two passages without rightly dividing the word of truth-making the right application of each text. This also plainly shows that there is more than one kind of saving spoken of, or else the two passages cannot be harmonized-or, rather, that harmony cannot be shown any other way. In the first text the apostle is telling how one is saved from his sins, brought into divine relationship with God, brought out of nature's darkness and translated into the marvelous light and liberty of the children of God, and also how it is not done. It is not according to our works that one is thus saved and called with an holy calling. It is alone God's doing, and is altogether by His grace. In the second text he was telling one who was already a child of God and a minister of the gospel how he should live, and how he should do and act. And in doing this he would save himself and those that hear him. He would

not save himself from eternal ruin by doing this, for that is not according to our works. This shows the necessity of "rightly dividing the word of truth." It shows the necessity of making the right application of the word of truth in every particular. Bear in mind that there is more than one kind of saving spoken of in the Bible. Then when we find the word saved, we should apply it where it belongs. There is more than one kind of justification spoken of in the Bible, and where we find justification spoken of, we should apply it where it belongs. There is more than one kind of faith spoken of in the Bible, and where we find faith spoken of, apply it where it belongs. There is more than one kind of temptation spoken of in the Bible, and where we find temptation spoken of, let us apply it where it belongs. In making the right application of the Scriptures we rightly divide the word of truth. May the Lord help us all to do this. C. H. C.

Many, Many Thanks

---January 16, 1930

We will try to express our thanks to the readers of The Primitive Baptist for their kind words of sympathy and encouragement to Elder Cayce since his health has not been so good. He appreciates each letter, each word of encouragement, so much. Makes him feel like pressing on awhile longer. It does him so much good to know that the readers of The Primitive Baptist are begging the dear Lord in his behalf. We feel that the prayers of the righteous availeth much, so please continue to remember him in your petitions. We also wish to thank each one who so kindly remembered us during the holidays with cards and other remembrances. It makes our poor hearts rejoice to be so remembered. Elder Cayce's condition seems better. The blood pressure is easier controlled now than it was at the first. On last Wednesday night he took the bed with flu. He is now (January 6) in bed, but improving slowly. Time forbids answering the hundreds of letters of sympathy and encouragement. So please, each one, consider this a personal note to you. And when you have a mind to, write to him again. Flowers now are more appreciated than when silent in death. May this New Year bring happiness and joy and prosperity to each reader, is my prayer. While remembering Elder Cayce and all others, please remember me. I feel to need the prayers of God's children. Yours in hope, Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

Price Not High

---January 16, 1930

When the size of the paper was changed to the present form we received some complaint in regard to the reduction in size. Brother W. W. Hollingsworth commented some on that line. This caused us to send Brother Hollingsworth two copies of six other Old Baptist papers, besides The Primitive Baptist, recognized as our sort of Baptists, with the request that he, at leisure time, count all the words in each paper, and to count only reading matter, no advertisements, in The Primitive Baptist; and then to please write us how The Primitive Baptist compares in price with other Baptist papers. And after such a count to please tell us if he thought The Primitive Baptist too high. An article appearing elsewhere in this paper shows how well and thoroughly he has gone into the matter. Having no desire to wound the feelings of any brother editor, or to injure any paper, we do not give the names of any of the papers in Brother Hollingsworth's article. All the desire we have in the matter is to show how utterly without foundation is any complaint that the price of The Primitive Baptist is too high. For it is far cheaper than any other published in

the United States or elsewhere. Reading matter at a cost of 21 mills per 1,000 words would give 3,478 words for one cent. Anyone knows this is not a high price for reading matter. So if you do not wish to take The Primitive Baptist, do not tell us it is because the price is too high. But tell us the truth about it, if you are able to take a paper at all, and tell us you do not want it or that you are too stingy to pay for a religious paper. On the other hand, if you are not really able to pay for a paper, do not write us the paper is too high, but tell us your true condition, and you will not have (on account of your poverty) to do without the comfort and enjoyment the paper would give you. If you cannot pay the regular price of the paper, as low as it is, then pay what you can. If you cannot pay anything at all, please be frank and tell us your condition in a private letter, and we will try to see that you will have the comfort and pleasure of reading the paper. We do not want any of the Lord's little ones to be deprived of reading the paper on account of poverty. Please read this article again, and read and re-read Brother Hollingsworth's article. Then tell us if you do not really think that The Primitive Baptist is not the cheapest Old Baptist paper published. This is not said through any disrespect to others or with any disparagement of others; for no doubt they are giving as much reading matter as they can afford, considering the size of their circulation and the cost of production under ordinary conditions. Are you willing now to lend a helping hand, and to do all you can in extending the circulation of The Primitive Baptist, and to show them with these facts that the price of the paper is very low? Now, Brother Hollingsworth, we know this accounting has taken quite a bit of time and thought. We certainly appreciate your valuable article. Elder Cayce is sick in bed with the flu. He suggested some of the foregoing things to write. We will appreciate any help the subscribers may render by sending in new subscribers. If anyone gets a copy of this paper who once took the paper, and not getting it now, don't let your name stay off the list any longer. Send us your subscription at once, and help us to keep the paper going weekly at this extremely low price. Yours in hope, Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

To The Subscribers of The Primitive Baptist

---January 16, 1930

The following article by our precious Brother Hollingsworth, who has since been called to his eternal home of rest, is the article referred to in the foregoing article written by our dear companion. We feel that the readers of this book should have the benefit of the following article; hence we are giving space for it. Consider well what Brother Hollingsworth has done in making the calculations he did, and what he said in regard to the price we get for the reading matter we publish. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

About the time Elder Cayce changed The Primitive Baptist from its original makeup, to its present magazine size, there was quite a bit of unfavorable criticism and occasionally dissatisfaction expressed. These expressions led to the thought of making a comparison with other papers of a like nature. The writer got seven of our papers, which appear to represent an average. He carefully counted the words in one copy of each publication, omitting all advertising matter. For the benefit of the subscribers of The Primitive Baptist, and more especially for those who are inclined to be critical, we give below the result of our findings; showing the number of words in a single copy of each publication, the number of issues per year, the subscription price, the number of words each subscriber gets each year, and the price its editor gets for each thousand words; the same being its cost to the subscriber. The primitive baptist Published weekly; subscription \$2.00 per year;

each copy contains approximately 18,612 words; fifty-two copies gives each subscriber 707,824 words in one year at a cost of each thousand words of about 2J mills. Paper No. 1. Published monthly; subscription \$2.00 per year; each copy contains approximately 12,146 words; twelve copies would give each subscriber 291,504 words at a cost per 1,000 words of about 61/2 mills. Paper No. 2. Published semi-monthly; subscription \$2.00 per year; each copy contains approximately 11,200 words at a cost per 1,000 words of about 71/2 mills. Paper No. 3. Published monthly; subscription \$1.50 per year; each copy contains approximately 16,064 words; twelve copies would give each subscriber per year 192,768 words at a cost per 1,000 words of about 7| mills. Paper No. 4. Published semi-monthly; subscription \$2.00 per year; each copy contains approximately 10,757 words; twenty-four copies would give each subscriber per year 258,168 words at a cost per 1,000 words of about 73/4 mills. Paper No. 5. Published monthly; subscription \$1.25 per year; each copy contains approximately 12,468 words; twelve copies would give each subscriber per year 149,616 words at a cost per 1,000 words of about 8J mills. Paper No. 6. Published monthly; subscription \$1.75 per year; each copy contains approximately 14,770 words; twelve copies would give each subscriber per year 173,240 words at a cost per 1,000 words of about, or a little over, 10 mills. The reader will notice that The Primitive Baptist gives 1,000 words of reading matter for less than three mills. The next lowest gives 1,000 words for 6| mills; then they go up to 71/2, 73/4, 81/4 and on up to a little above ten mills per 1,000 words. Therefore, it will be noticed that in spite of the reduction in the size of The Primitive Baptist, you are getting from it two to four times the reading matter for the money, in one year, you get from other papers named. Taking time and pains to count the words in these papers and the average number of letters in a word, causes me to ask the reader to think about a person setting up 1,000 words, handling 4,000 pieces of type, furnishing paper, machinery, office clerks and postage for one cent. But, still more astonishing, Elder Cayce has all this done for less than one-third of one cent, or for one cent he sets up over three thousand words and handles over twelve thousand pieces of type, and still some people complain about the price of the paper. My heart goes out in good will to the editors of each of these papers; in fact, I bid every Old School Baptist paper, published by orderly Baptists, "good speed." I wish I could enlist a more liberal support for them; they deserve it and they ought to have it; they are all circulating these papers at a sacrifice; still, many do not know it; others are indifferent and even unconcerned. The old year has almost slipped away from us; we have a very little of it left in which to do the many things we had in mind to do and many we really desire to do. Some we promised ourselves in good faith that we would do, but put off for a more seasonable or opportune time; but the time has not come, so it's gone undone and in many cases it's gone forevermore; many good thoughts have been unexpressed, many kind words not spoken, many good deeds undone, that if had been expressed or done, possibly would have lightened someone's load and revived one's cast down feeling. May the Lord help us and bless us with moral courage and strength to do our duty, and may we use that courage and liberty He has blessed us with in the discharge of our duty and not in shirking it. Let us strive to use more of the efficiency we have been blessed with and use it for good, do a better part by our home, our friends, our community, our church, our preachers and our papers. Written on my birthday, December 30, 1929. W. W. HOLLINGSWORTH. Bessemer, Ala.

Appreciated Letter

---January 16, 1930

Dear Brother Claud: I have for some time had a great desire to write and let all know how I, a poor worm of the dust, enjoy the many sweet articles which appear in the best paper, it seems to me, that is now published in defense of our doctrine. I suppose one main cause is I have known you, dear Brother Claud, so long. I first met you at old Shiloh Church, in Marshall County, Miss., in August, 1895. But when I wanted to say a word I would think of the sweet articles in each issue that were so far superior to anything I could write, until the present issue, the 14th of November, came, and when I read dear old Brother Jimmie's sweet piece, I just had to cry for real joy. God bless you, dear old brother, and may God spare you to write again, for I just know in your sixty years of continual service you could tell us much that would comfort and build us up. Oh, how happy I am that I, too, can use your very words in saying, "I, too, want to register my name as being for peace and unity among God's little children." And, kind old brother, there was a time in my life, after I came to Texas and experienced two sad divisions in the dear old church, that I was so fully in the flesh I took great pride in calling in question the order of such men as Elders Cayce, Duncan, Wallace, Newman, Collings, and many others I could name. I repeatedly said they were all wrong, and, dear Brother Claud, you came and preached in our city and I was so fully in the flesh I made no effort to go and hear you. Oh, my very dear brother, can you forgive me? I am not worthy, but I want to live at your feet. Now, I would feel it a great pleasure to go all the way to Thornton to hear you preach that glorious gospel, salvation through the suffering of Jesus Christ. Dear kindred in Christ, I can remember so well the 14th of May, 1883, when my blessed Saviour (I hope) caused me to feel that He had satisfied the broken law in my room and stead. Now, I can look back to that day and sing, What peaceful hours I then enjoyed, How sweet their memory still; But they have left an aching void The world can never fill. Oh, precious brethren, go on, go on, and preach peace by Jesus Christ. Oh, thank God forever for causing me to attend the first council meeting at Dallas, Texas, merely to see what could be done or what they had to offer, and when those dear brethren came forward so freely and lovingly, confessing in full all they had done that they felt was wrong, I, a poor worm, was completely melted down and was more than willing to say, "If you can bear with me, I can freely and willingly forgive you all." It has been more than three years and we have been drawn much nearer and God has so wonderfully blessed us. We have had great and grand meetings and many coming to the dear old church. I want to say for my own individual self, I esteem Elders Newman and Collings as I do Elders Herriage and Fowler or any that have been with us all the time. Thank God, thank God! I am just expressing my own feelings. Oh, brethren, let me live with you. Let me have a place at your feet, and oh, that my days might be spent in His praise, who has so wonderfully blessed me with a sweet home in His own dear church forty-six years and has given me so many sweet, good brethren, sisters, and friends. Now, to my dear brethren and sisters of Hopewell Association, in Mississippi, should any of you read this, I think of you all often and was made sorry to hear of the death of Brother Reeder-and others. Pray for me. I would be glad to meet you all again, if it be God's will. Now, brother, write on and preach peace by Jesus Christ, and God bless you. Pray for me. Come to see us, Brother Cayce. Your brother, W. F. Jones. R. 1, Box 323, Ft. Worth, Tex. REMARKS Dear and Precious Brother-We do not hold a single thing in this wide world against you. We remember very well being at old Shiloh, Marshall County, Miss., at the time you mention. It was at a meeting of the Tallahatchie Association. It was a great meeting. We have often thought of it. It has been a green spot in our

memory. We were just a boy then, both in years and in the ministry. Love and sweet fellowship abounded among the brethren. There were no factions in our ranks then. All seemed to be satisfied with the goodness of God's house, and all were happy. We have loved you, dear brother, all these years, and we still love you dearly. Wish we could see you now. If we are not permitted to meet again in this world of sorrow and trouble we have a sweet hope of meeting you and all God's dear children in a better home beyond the rolling floods. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon you. Please pray for us and our dear family. C. H. C.

Matthew 3:5-9

---January 30, 1930

Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation, of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.-(Matthew 3:5-9). This chapter begins by saying, "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." -(Matthew 3:1-2). This shows that the writer was telling about the work John was doing; and, although the writer says, "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan," yet there were some that he did not baptize. The Pharisees and Sadducees came and demanded baptism at his hands; but he did not baptize them. It must be true, then, that the expression, "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," must be taken in a restricted sense and not in a universal sense-just as many like expressions to be found in the Book. There were some from Jerusalem, and some from all Judea, and some from all the region round about Jordan who were baptized of him in Jordan. The Pharisees and Sadducees gave no evidence of repentance, or a change in life, or reformation of life. They gave no evidence of regeneration. If people are regenerated through the instrumentality of preaching; if people are persuaded by and through preaching to accept the Lord and to become children of God, we have often wondered why John did not go to work on those Pharisees and Sadducees and try to persuade them to become children of God, and thereby escape from the wrath to come. Evidently the Pharisees and Sadducees were in need of salvation-were in need of regeneration. If salvation (regeneration) is procured in baptism, we have often wondered why John did not baptize them. If one is regenerated or born again in baptism, and John refused to baptize those people, then John refused to allow them to obtain regeneration-he refused to do that for them which would make them to be children of God. The doctrine that eternal life, or regeneration, comes through baptism, would put the regeneration of sinners and the peopling of the heavenly world in the hands of puny men, which is a thing God has not done. Some might say that John had warned those people in his preaching to flee from the wrath to come; but he had not done so. He asks them the question, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" This is as much as to say that he had not done so. If he had done so-if he had been preaching that way-then they could have consistently and truthfully replied, "You have done so." They could not thus reply; and therefore John had not been warning people, in his preaching, to flee from the wrath to come. Before John would administer baptism to a person he required "fruits meet for

repentance." This means that he required fruits answerable to amendment of life. He required evidence of regeneration. True repentance is an evidence of regeneration. "Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death." -(0) (II Corinthians 7:10). Sorrow proceeds from the heart. A godly sorrow cannot proceed from an ungodly heart. It necessarily follows, then, that godly sorrow proceeds from a heart that has already been made good, and repentance is an evidence of regeneration, and does not procure it, or is not a condition to be complied with in order to it. Let us take these two Scriptural propositions: First. Those who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God (" For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." -(Romans 8:14)). Second. Those who repent are led to do so by the Spirit of God (" Or despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" - (Romans 2:4)). Third. Therefore, those who repent are children of God. This conclusion necessarily follows as a result from the two Scriptural quotations. As those who repent are children of God, it follows that repentance is an evidence of regeneration, and cannot be a condition to be performed in order thereto. The Old Baptists are evidently right on this point. On this question their teaching is Scriptural-and every theory contrary thereto is wrong. Many of God's dear children have been taught a wrong doctrine on this question. Those who were baptized by John confessed their sins. They confessed that they were poor sinners. If one realizes truthfully that he is a poor sinner, and that if he is saved it is wholly by the grace and mercy of God, it is an evidence of the work of grace in the heart. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." -(I Timothy 1:15). Paul never acknowledged this, nor felt it, while he was in an unregenerate state. When and after the Lord arrested him while he was on his way to Damascus to persecute the saints, then he realized this truth and confessed it; but he never realized or confessed it before. Regeneration brings a godly sorrow for sin; and a hatred of sin and a deep desire to be free from it is an evidence of the work of grace in the heart. This being true, then John baptized those who gave evidence that they were children of God. Primitive Baptists are that way yet. It was right for those who felt and confessed that they were poor sinners to be baptized of John in Jordan. Their hope of heaven was not in their own good deeds or in their own righteousness. Their hope was alone in the mercy and grace of God. If it was right for such people to do as they did then, it is right for such people to do that way now. Hence, if you have been made to feel and to know that you are a poor sinner, and your only hope of heaven is in the blood of a crucified and risen Redeemer and the mercy and grace of God, you should do as those people did-you should be baptized by a Primitive Baptist preacher. You should deny yourself, take up your cross and follow your blessed Saviour. He was baptized by John, this Primitive Baptist preacher. You cannot follow Him as you should, unless you do as He did. May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of our readers, and may He help us to live in a way that will glorify His name, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Chosen and Predestinated

---February 6, 1930

We are well aware of the fact that the doctrine of God's choice and predestination is often called in question and denied by many, especially by the religious world. Although this is true, yet there is nothing more plainly taught in the Bible; and

when properly understood there is no truth taught therein that is more consoling and encouraging to the Lord's humble poor. We will try to write a few thoughts concerning this precious truth for the benefit of our readers. We wish, first, to emphasize the fact that God's choice and predestination does not harm or injure anyone, and never has done so. If A is a millionaire, and makes choice of B and predestinates to make him heir to his estate, he does not thereby injure C. A's choice and predestination does not do C any harm, although C is not embraced in the choice and predestination of A. If A was under any obligation to B, then it was not a matter of mercy or grace that he was made heir to A's estate, but a matter of debt or obligation. Some people have charged that the Old Baptists believe that God made some people to save them and others to damn them. This charge is untrue. That is not Old Baptist doctrine or teaching, neither is it Bible teaching. God did not make people to save them or to damn them. Let the Bible answer the question as to what He made them for. "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." -(Acts 17:26). This tells us plainly that God made all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth. That is what He made them for. Let us accept it for just what it says, and take it at its full value. If any are lost it is not because God made them to be lost, but it is on account of sin-the transgression of God's law. Man did transgress God's law. It is not necessary to cite the Scriptures to prove this, as all professed Bible believers will accept that truth, so far as we know. Paul tells us that "we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." -(Romans 3:9). This shows that all are under sin, both Jews and Gentiles, and Paul says he proved this before. To deny it is no better than infidelity, for it is to deny the plain statement of God's word. Then, as all are under sin, it follows that all are in a lost state or condition, and will remain so, without the intervention of a higher power. Now, seeing that all are, without the intervention of mercy, or a higher power, forever lost, and the Bible plainly teaching that some are saved, let us look into the matter and find whether the Lord has made choice of them or not. First, we ask what the word choice means? And what does the word chosen mean? Choice is the act of choosing; the voluntary act of selecting from two or more things that which is preferred; the determination of the mind in preferring one thing to another; election; selection. Chosen means selected from a number; picked out; in theology, elect. Chosen people, the Israeli ties; see **((Chr 16:13) (I Chronicles 16:13)** "O ye seed of Israel His servant, ye children of Jacob, His chosen ones;" **(Psalms 33:12)** "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom He hath chosen for His own inheritance." See also **((7) (Acts 13:17)**. Chosen, as a noun, is one who is the object of choice or divine favor; an elect person. To know whether any persons are the objects of choice or divine favor, and are elect persons, and whether they were predestinated unto a better state, let us read **(Ephesians 1:3-4,5)** "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will," etc. The word us in this text is a personal pronoun, and as a pronoun must have an antecedent, it follows that persons (understood) is the antecedent of this pronoun. Hence, it must necessarily be true that persons (us) were the objects of God's choice. He chose persons- persons were chosen by Him. No man on earth can deny this without denying the plain statement of the Word of God. Not only is it true that God made choice of persons, but He also predestinated those same persons unto the adoption of children; He predestinated that they should be adopted into His heavenly family. To predestinate is to appoint or ordain

beforehand by divine purpose or decree; to preelect. These people were appointed beforehand to be adopted into the family of God. God predestinated that this should be done. He predestinated that they should be saved. He appointed them beforehand unto salvation. If you are ever saved, or brought into the family of God, or made a child of God, it is because God appointed beforehand, by His divine purpose, that you should be saved; that you should be brought into and made a member of His heavenly family. "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will." - **(Ephesians 1:11)**. If one obtains an inheritance in Christ it is because he was predestinated unto that end by the Lord Himself, and according to His own purpose; and He works all things necessary to the accomplishment of that end. Nothing in order to the accomplishment of that end is left to rest upon any condition to be performed by others-it is not contingent upon the works of men. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified." - **(Romans 8:28-29,30)**. Here we are plainly told that some persons were predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son. God the Father predestinated this. Who can object to being predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ? If you are ever conformed to the image of Christ it is because the Father predestinated that you should be conformed to His image. Can one object to that? "Blessed is the man whom thou chooseth, and caused to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts: we shall be satisfied with the goodness of thy house, even of thy holy temple." -((4) (Psalms 65:4). Who approaches unto the Lord? According to David's language here, it is the man the Lord chooses and causes to approach unto Him. No person has ever yet approached unto the Lord, only that person whom the Lord has chosen and caused to approach unto Him. For one to object to the doctrine of God's choice is for him to object to the very principle upon which a poor sinner may approach unto the Lord. Can you afford to object to a poor sinner approaching unto the Lord? If you cannot afford to object to that, then you cannot afford to object to the principle upon which he may approach unto Him. If you have ever been brought to realize your need of God's mercy and grace in your salvation, and caused to approach unto Him in humble prayer and supplication, begging Him for mercy, it was because God had made choice of you and caused you to approach unto Him; and that is the reason why you will be given to finally dwell in His courts. You will finally be brought into His glorious and holy presence in the heavenly world, and there be perfectly and fully satisfied. You will then be finally and fully glorified, and will dwell in His glorious presence forever. May this be your happy lot, if according to His heavenly will, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Help Obtained

---February 6, 1930

A short time after our health failed last fall we received a letter from Elder T. L. Webb asking us if we had a place for him in our office. We wrote him and asked that he make a little trip over here, and told him we could talk the matter over. He agreed to come, and we made some appointments for him. When he came to fill the appointments we spent several days with him. We readily came to an agreement. He returned to Tennessee and made arrangements to move in a short time. We felt that it was a providential matter, and feel that way yet. Brother Webb

has been working in the office now since before Christmas-a little more than a month. From the time we began making arrangements with him to come and work with us we felt that we wanted his name on our editorial staff. By his consent we are now putting his name there. On the first page of the paper will be found the editorial staff of the paper at present. On account of the failure in our health we feel that we need some help in the office in the editorial work. Brother Webb has kindly consented for his name to go on the staff, and he will help us in this work; but at the present time most of his work is in the mechanical department. While most of his work is in that line at present, yet he will be much help to us in editorial work. We are glad to have Brother Webb located here, and we are glad to have him in the office with us, and we are glad to have his name on our editorial staff. May the good Lord bless his labors among us, and may He bless our association together for the good of His blessed cause and His dear children, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Infant Salvation

---February 6, 1930

A SERMON BY ELDER C. H. CAYCE, PREACHED AT BETHEL PRIMITIVE BAPTIST CHURCH, NASHVILLE, TENN., SUNDAY, JULY 1, 1923

As we have been asked several questions recently on the subject of infant salvation, we have decided to publish in our columns the following discourse which we delivered in Nashville, Tenn., which was taken down by a stenographer and published in the Gospel Trumpet of August, 1923, a paper which was then being published by Elder W. L. Murray. C. H. C. The article Brethren, Sisters and Kind Friends: I am thankful, I trust, for the privilege and the opportunity of being with you at this place this evening to engage with you in the service of our blessed Master, and to try to speak to you for awhile concerning the teaching of His blessed Book. If the Lord will, I desire to try to speak to you more especially on the subject of infant salvation. I have been casting about in my mind for the past few hours as to what I should try to talk about, and I finally decided that I will try to use that for a subject. I wish to read from the tenth chapter of Mark, beginning with the thirteenth verse down to and including the sixteenth verse: "And they brought young children to Him, that He should touch them; and His disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, He was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them." In connection with that I wish to read from the eighteenth chapter of Luke, beginning with the fifteenth verse, down to and including the seventeenth: "And they brought unto Him also infants, that He would touch them; but when the disciples saw it, they rebuked them. But Jesus called them unto Him and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." The reason why I read from Luke's writing is because in the King James translation we have the word "infants," and that word is translated from a word that is applied to the child in its earliest age, even in the very beginning of its existence, sometimes even applied to it before its natural birth into the world. And

that word applies to one in its earliest childhood only. The word that is used by Mark which is translated "young children" is sometimes used with reference to those who are in their younger age through their infancy, up to young manhood or young womanhood, so that the word which he uses might be misunderstood by us if we do not compare that with what Luke has said in giving his rendering of the account. And as Luke uses a word that is applied only to, and is never used except with reference to, those in their very earliest life, even in their infancy, then we may understand what kind of persons the Saviour had under consideration in the lesson that is given us here. As an especial starting point, I use ((0:15) (Mark 10:15) "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." In connection with it, (Luke 18:17): "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." In this teaching, or in this expression recorded by Luke, the Saviour said," they shall in no wise enter therein." These two expressions mean the same thing-that the adult must receive the kingdom of God in the same way that the little child receives it. He must enter therein in the very same way that the infant enters therein; and that unless he does enter in that way, unless he receives it in that way, he does not receive it or enter into it at all. The very same way that the adult is saved is the way the little child is saved. And the same way that a little child is saved is the way that the old man is saved. So far as age is concerned, it matters not concerning this point, whether young or old-they are saved the same way. I wish to call your attention to the very wording of the text," Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child he shall not enter therein." The Saviour did not say," Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as this little child," pointing out some special or particular child, but he used the indefinite article, a-a little child. It matters not if it be this little child, or if it be that little child, or any other little child, no matter whose little child, nor where the little child may be. The Saviour is not pointing out some special or particular child, and teaching that you must receive the kingdom of God as this particular child receives it. Just here let me say that our people have been accused from time immemorial of preaching that there are infants in hell not a span long. I wish here to say that the principle, or the system of salvation, or plan of salvation, as taught and believed by the people with whom I stand identified is the only system of salvation on earth that will reach the case of the babe. That may be putting the statement in rather strong terms, you may say; but I wish to examine this evening, in the light of God's blessed truth, and in the light of reason, the system of salvation by grace as well as any other system that may be presented, or that may be taught by men, and see wherein they fail or wherein they stand the test. Suppose we ask how the little child is saved. I am going to say for the people with whom I stand identified that we are sure that every one that has or ever will pass off the stage of action in a state of infancy is saved in heaven. And that old story that has been told on the Old Baptists that they preach infant damnation has become gray-headed, absolutely, and about as near as I have been able to find the man that advocated it, upon a statement of those who would bring the charge is that grandmother said that her Aunt Mary said that her Uncle Tommie said that his grandfather said that his Aunt Susan said that her Aunt Polly said that her grandmother said that her grandfather heard a man preach that, who is dead and gone long ago. It is absolutely untrue; and I have a proposition right here to make, that if any man will prove to me that any Old Baptist has ever yet preached one single infant to hell, I will preach him out again; and if I can't accomplish the task, I will find a man that can, for I am sure that if one man has the power to preach one to hell, some other man has as much power as he had and can preach him out again. Every one that ever has or ever will die in a state of infancy is saved in heaven. Someone will say,"

Well, don't you Old Baptists believe in the doctrine of election?" Yes, we do." Well, do you not believe in the doctrine of eternal and particular election?" Yes, sir, we do." Do you not believe that God made choice of the people He saves, and that this choice was made before time began?" Certainly we do." Well, then, how in the world can you believe that all who die in infancy are saved, and at the same time believe that kind of doctrine?" Well, that is easy. Suppose I show you right quickly how we can do that. Suppose you bring a basket of apples in here, and one-half of them are red and one-half are yellow, and you say to me, "Cayce, take your choice of apples; choose as many of them as you wish." And I take all the red apples and one-half of the yellow apples. What have I done? I have made choice of apples. I chose apples. How many did I take? I took all the red ones and just as many of the yellow ones as I wanted. And so God Almighty, in his sovereign choice of sinners of Adam's race, took all the babies and just as many of the old folks as He wanted. Can you beat it? Now that is easy to explain, how we can believe the doctrine of election and at the same time believe that all babies are saved. You may say God made choice of the infant and saves the infant because of his infantile purity, or that the infant is saved because of his infantile purity. Suppose we examine the idea of infantile purity. I would ask, until what age may he be saved because of his infantile purity? Why, you might answer, "That all depends upon the tuition he receives; it depends upon his education; it depends upon his learning. If he is kept in ignorance, abject, total ignorance, he will not reach the line of accountability until he attains, perhaps, the age of sixteen years; but if he is educated well, if we send him to Sunday school and to the literary schools, and take him to church and give him the proper training and proper education, he may reach the line of accountability at the age of twelve years or younger, depending upon how well taught and how well trained he is." All right, let us try that. Now I am going to say that if I believed in that doctrine, or that theory, I would certainly be opposed to education. I most assuredly would be opposed to education from every standpoint if I believed in that idea. I do not believe in that idea, and therefore I am not opposed to education. I am in favor of education. Education is all right in its place-it is beneficial to us if rightly used. I have heard it said, however, that an educated fool is the biggest fool in the world; but education rightly used, and in its right place, is a good thing, and I wish I was in possession of more learning than I am in possession of, so far as that point is concerned; but if I believed in the other theory, I would be opposed to education. Now, let's see. Suppose that here are two little boys that are the same age-this little white boy and this little negro. They are the same age, born into this world the very same day, and at the same hour of the day. You know that occurs sometimes. And this little white boy is sent to school, and we give him all the training and all the education that it is possible to give him and at the age of twelve years he crosses the line of accountability. But we keep this little negro in ignorance, abject ignorance. We do not let him go to the day school nor to the Sunday school, and he never goes to church; he is reared out in the backwoods; he does not see a Bible, and he cannot read it if he did see it-kept in absolute ignorance, so that he does not reach the line of accountability at the age of twelve years. At the age of thirteen years this little white boy dies, after having crossed the line of accountability at the age of twelve years, and he has not accepted Jesus as his Saviour; he has not fallen in with the overtures of mercy; he has not complied with the terms and conditions of the gospel. What becomes of that little white boy? You are bound to say that he is lost. There is absolutely no escaping it, according to that position, as he has crossed the line of accountability at the age of twelve years, on account of his tuition, on account of his training. So his education has caused him to be lost. But the little negro lives to the age of fifteen years, having been kept in absolute ignorance, abject ignorance, total

ignorance, has never heard any preaching, he has never been to Sunday school or to the day school, and has not learned how to read. So he can't read the Bible, and would not know what it was if he should see it. At the age of fifteen, he dies, not having reached the line of accountability, on account of his having been kept in ignorance. What becomes of the little negro? The little negro is saved. Why is the little negro saved? Because of his ignorance. Why is the little white boy lost? Because of his education. There is not a man in all this wide world, there is not a theologian in the universe, I care not who he is, nor what his learning may be, who can get around that necessary conclusion. According to that theory it cannot be overthrown. That conclusion necessarily and inevitably stands, world without end. If I believed that doctrine I would be opposed to education. I would say, let us keep all of them in ignorance; let us keep all of them away from schools; it would be better to burn the Bibles; it would be better to destroy the preachers; it would be better to have no schools of any kind, and keep every person on earth in total, abject ignorance, if that doctrine be true, and let them be saved on their ignorance. But that doctrine is not the truth. But another point I want to examine right here on that supposed line of accountability. This little fellow here comes to the line, and when he gets just half way across the line, suppose he dies? I ask you what becomes of him? Is he saved? No. Why? Because he has not fallen in with the overtures of mercy and complied with the terms and conditions of the gospel. That is the reason why he cannot be saved, after crossing the line, unless he does that and he has got half way across. Well, is he lost? No, he is not lost, for he is only half way across the line. What becomes of him? Is he saved or is he lost? Does God get one-half and Satan get the other half?" Well," you may say," you have no right to suppose he dies when he is half way across the line." I have just as much right to suppose he dies when he is half way across the line as any other man has to suppose there is such a thing as such a line. There is not a semblance of an expression in God's Word, from the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis to the last verse of the twenty-second chapter of Revelation concerning such a line-not a scintilla of proof of any such a thing in the Bible-not a syllable that intimates such a thing. The little child is in possession of the very same life that the adult possesses. There has never been a human being born into this world since the first man violated God's holy and righteous law, but what was born into this world with a life that was poisoned and contaminated with sin, except Jesus. We are all in possession of the same nature, whether young or old, rich or poor, high or low, noble or ignoble, whatever station or condition in life they may be in, they possess the very same nature. There has been a whole lot said of recent years about this so-called scientific theory of evolution, that man sprang from the lower animals, which makes me think of an occurrence once in discussion with a gentleman in the state of Missouri some years ago. I made the statement that we are all Adam multiplied, and the gentleman did not wait until his time to make his speech, but spoke right out and said," I am not." Well," I said," that is all right. I like to agree with a man when I can, and since you deny that you are Adam multiplied, I will agree with you." I said," When I look at the way you act I think possibly you are kin to the monkey tribe, but when I look at you and see how you look, I don't know but what you are kin to the animal that Balaam rode. So tell us which of those animals you are related to-but as for me and us folks, we are Adam multiplied. That is all we are." "Of one blood made He all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." They are Adam multiplied. Just one people. No matter anything about their race, nationality, their age, their condition, or station in life, they all sprang from the same source and from the same man. Perhaps we had better examine that evolution business a little. Suppose I have a little acorn here. I ask you, Where did that acorn come from? You say, From an oak tree, of course. All

right. Where did that oak tree come from? It came from another acorn. What kind of acorn was that? Just like this one. Where did that acorn come from? Another oak tree. What kind of oak tree was that? Just like the oak tree this acorn came from. Where did that oak tree come from? From another acorn. Where did that acorn come from? Another oak. And so we follow the line back, back, back, until we come to the first acorn, and I ask you, Where did that first acorn come from? Why, you say, it came from the first oak, of course. Then I ask you, Where did the first oak come from? There is but one answer that can be given. Men, with all their scientific research, and with all their wisdom and their inventive genius and so-called science, can give but one answer to that question, and that is, "God made it." And that oak was just like the oak that this acorn sprang from. So your doctrine of evolution is exploded in the little acorn. There is no such thing as life without antecedent life. Spontaneous life is absolutely unknown. There is no such thing as the lower order of life lifting and raising itself up to the higher order. It is unknown in all the realm of science, in all the realm of nature. The higher order of life reaches down, according to its own will, to the lower order, lifting it up and raising it up and changing it into the higher order, by its own sovereign will, and its own work. Life has always come by a direct, immediate implantation or touch of life; it cannot be given any other way. And as this is true, it matters not whether a man is old, or whether it be the infant in the mother's arms, life is given, and must be given, by a direct and immediate implantation of life. It cannot be any other way. Suppose we go to the fountainhead of the Mississippi River and poison the fountainhead of that stream. When the water shall have flown down the stream to the city of St. Louis, it is the same poisoned water that it was at the fountainhead. When it has flown down the stream to the city of Memphis, Tenn., it is the same poisoned water that it was at the fountainhead. When it has flown down the stream to the city of Vicksburg, Miss., it is the same poisoned water that it was back there at the fountainhead. And when it has flown down to the mouth of the stream and empties into the Gulf it is the same poisoned water that it was back there at the fountainhead. I ask you, how may that water be purified and made fit for use? How may that be accomplished? Suppose we go to the bank of the stream and hold a big meeting there, and we have our evangelists there, and we have our singers there, and we raise a big shout around the stream, begging the water and pleading with it that it become willing to be carried through a purifying process that the poison may be all taken out of it, so that it may be made fit for use, and you should be standing there on the bank of the stream, and all at once the water should cease flowing down stream and begin flowing up stream, become willing to comply with the conditions in order that it might be purified and made fit for use-I will ask you, friends, what would you do if you were there? I freely confess that if I were there, and I was not scared too bad, I would run. I know that it is contrary to every principle of reason, to every principle of science, contrary to every principle of logic, contrary to the teaching of God's Word, and is contrary to common sense for water to cease to flow down stream and flow up hill. How may that water be purified, then, and made fit for use? There is only one way, and that is, a higher power must come to it, and take it out of the stream and carry it through a purifying process that takes the poison out of it, and make it fit for use. That is the only way under heaven it can be done. So the life that we live today, as we are Adam multiplied, is a life that was poisoned and contaminated with sin at its source, and when that life had flown down the stream of time unto Abraham's day it was the same poisoned life that it was back in Adam's day; and when it had flown down the stream of time to Paul's day, it was the same poisoned life that it was at first, and having flown down the stream to our day, it is the same poisoned life that it was at the fountainhead; and at the final windup of all time, it will still be the same poisoned

life that it was at the fountainhead. How can one be made fit for the Master's use, and be prepared to live with God in eternal glory? How can that be done? Just one way, and that is, the higher power, the Spirit of Almighty God, must come to where the sinner is, lift him up out of the stream and carry him through a purifying process that takes away the poison and stain of sin, and finally present him before the throne of God in eternal glory, as free from sin, as spotless and pure and white as though there had never been a sin committed. That is the only way it can be done. "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." Does a little child receive the kingdom of God because of his infantile purity, seeing he possesses a life that is poisoned and contaminated with sin? Does a little child receive the kingdom of God because of his infantile purity? If so, and Jesus told the truth when He said, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein," then the old man must receive the kingdom of God because of his infantile purity; and if he does not receive it on that ground, the Saviour having told the truth, if the child receives it that way, then the adult does not enter therein-except he receives it upon his infantile purity, if the little child does. If the little child enters that way, I ask you, then, can you reach the case of the adult by infantile purity? You know you cannot. You may say the adult cannot be saved because of his infantile purity; he must accept Jesus as his Saviour; he must fall in with the overtures of mercy, and comply with the conditions of the gospel, else he cannot be saved. All right. I ask you, If the adult is saved that way, can the little child be saved that way? Make your terms and conditions ever so simple, ever so easy to be understood and complied with, the little child, the babe in the mother's arms, cannot understand these conditions; he cannot comprehend them, and he cannot perform them or comply with them; and as you cannot reach the case of the little child with your conditions, and the adult is saved as the little child is saved, then you cannot reach the case of the adult with your conditions. The little child cannot be saved upon conditions, and he is saved the same way the adult is saved; then the adult is not saved on conditions. The adult is not saved on his infantile purity, and the adult is saved just as the little child is saved. Then the little child is not saved upon its infantile purity. If no one could be saved in heaven except on that principle, heaven would be a blank, and the other place would be full. I am glad that the Saviour gives us to understand that the very same power that is able to reach the case of the infant in the mother's arms is able to reach the old man and old woman; and the power and Spirit of God Almighty has embraced in His love, every object of His pity and tender compassion, of every age and every class. "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." I remember once in the Western portion of this state, some years ago, that I tried to preach on this same subject, and a preacher was present-it is unnecessary to tell you what he belonged to-and at the conclusion of the discourse he arose in the back part of the house and said, "Well, sir, if you have no objection, I would like to ask you a question." "Well," I said, "so far as I am concerned, I have no objection; but it is with this church and the pastor who sits behind me. If it is all right with them it is all right with me." The pastor said, "You have permission; ask your question." He said, "You say that you believe that all who die in a state of infancy are saved. I believe that too. But I don't think you can prove it by the Bible. I would like for you to give me book, chapter and verse that says so." I said, "Are you through?" He said, "Yes, sir." "Well," I said, "please take your seat. Now," I said, "it seems to me that in one particular we are in the same boat. I believe that all who die in a state of infancy are saved, and you say you believe that, too. So it appears to me that we are in the same boat. But it seems, as you say I cannot prove it by the Bible, that you are uneasy, and are afraid the boat will turn over.

Now, if I was uneasy about it, I would keep right quiet; but I am not uneasy. As I am not afraid, I am at perfect liberty to lean from side to side in the boat, and am at liberty to stand upon my feet, and walk about in the boat, because I am not afraid, at all, that the boat will turn over. I am not uneasy about it. Not only am I at liberty to walk about in the boat, but to place my toes right out on the edge of the boat, and then look over the edge of that boat down into the depths of God's love, mercy and grace, and see how it is that His love and mercy and grace reaches the case of the babe as well as that of the old man, and never feel uneasy about it. The very same principle that reaches the case of the old man will reach the case of the little babe, and if I was uneasy about it, like you, I would keep right still, and not say a word. I am not uneasy about it." Right here, if you will pardon this, I seldom ever tell anything like an antedote, but right here is something that I heard that so well illustrates the point. Some people have a plan or system of salvation that will reach the case of the old man and the old woman, so they think, but the system or plan will not reach the case of the babe; so, then they must get up the plan of infantile purity to reach the case of the babe-must have two ways to get in. That reminds me of the anecdote. I heard one time of an old maid who wanted a house built, and she employed a workman to erect the house. She was very particular and wanted everything just precisely to her notion, and when he had the house completed he called her to come and examine and see if she would accept it; and after going through the whole thing she said, "It is all right except one thing I didn't tell you about." "Well," he said, "what was that?" "Why," she says, "I forgot to tell you that I have some old cats, and I want a hole cut right here in this door for the old cats to come into the kitchen through the hole, without having to open the door to let them in." So the workman cut the hole down there at the bottom of the door to let the big cats in." Now," he said, "lady, is everything all right?" "Yes," she said, "except for one thing more that I forgot." "What was that?" "Well," she said, "I have some kittens, too. I want a hole cut on this side of the door for the little kittens to come in at." "Well," the workman said, "can't the little kitten go in at the same hole that the big cat goes in?" Some folks think the baby can't get into the kingdom of God, or obtain salvation, or be saved, the very same way that the old people are saved. It seems to me that a system of salvation that is broad enough and sufficient to reach the case of the old man will reach the case of the babe, too, without having to hatch up some other plan for them. It looks that way to me. That is the way it appears to me. "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." A little child-it matters not what little child it is-a little child-the indefinite article a. Let this pencil represent one little child; let this pen represent all other little children except that one little child represented by the pencil. Now let's hear the Saviour's language: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child" -it matters not if it is the one represented by the pencil, or any of those represented by the pen that represents all the others-" he shall not enter therein." Suppose a little child misses the kingdom, and you receive the kingdom of God as a little child, then as certain as God lives you miss it, too. Just as certain as one of the adult family of Adam's race ever enters the portals of eternal glory, just that certain a little child does not miss the kingdom. Every one that ever has or ever will die in a state of infancy enters the portals of eternal glory and basks in the sunlight of God's eternal presence forever and forever-more. And that little child of yours that has crossed the river of death, and has, in spirit, been ushered into the divine presence of God Almighty, will sing the same song of redeeming grace that you sing. Why is the little child saved? Because of its infantile purity? No. He has a life in nature that is poisoned and contaminated with sin. He is Adam multiplied. He cannot be saved that way, for the adult cannot be saved that way. Can the little

child be saved by complying with terms and conditions? No; he cannot be saved that way. And, since the adult must be saved the same way the little child is saved, then the adult cannot be saved that way. How, then, is the little child saved? "Jesus took them up in His arms, laid His hands upon them and blessed them." The Lord Jesus never did anything in vain. The very fact that He took them up in His arms and laid His hands upon them and blessed them shows that they needed the blessing. He never did anything that was not needful to be done. He never did a thing that was unnecessary to do. So they needed the blessing in order that they receive the kingdom of God. The little child, then, receives the kingdom of God. Why? Because of the blessing that Jesus bestows. That is the reason why. I ask why the adult receives the kingdom of God? Because of the blessing Jesus bestows. It matters not how young they are, it matters not how old they are, they receive the kingdom of God for the very same reason; and that is because of the blessing that Jesus bestows by His own power. He was able to manifest His power in the case of John the Baptist before his natural birth into the world. He was given to leap for joy by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, even before His natural birth into the world. And in this manner God Almighty, by the power of His Holy Spirit, is able to reach the case of the baby and of the aged, the old man. There is none that get too hard for the Lord. Sometimes I hear them say there is one in the community who is such a hard case we cannot do anything with him. Sometimes we hear them say, we will have to leave him in the hands of the Lord. The Lord is able to reach him, take care of him and save him; it matters not what his condition may be, his nationality, his color, or station; it matters not if he be a king on the throne, or the poor beggar that comes to your back door and asks for a morsel of bread. It matters not if it is the little babe that falls asleep in its mother's arms. The Lord is able to save them, to reach them, and raise them up to a higher order of life, to give them the spiritual and divine life, and take them to live with God in eternal glory. How many are saved, then, that die in infancy? All of them. How many of them are saved in adult life? Just as many as God Almighty wanted. You can't get a better platform than that, I don't care what sort you get. Just as many as the Lord wanted. Now, then, I shall conclude. May the rich, reigning grace of God be yours to enjoy all along the pathway of life, and may you study and be given to rejoice in these blessed truths that God is able to reach the poor sinner of every age, and of every clime, young or old, and take them to Himself. Years ago, in my childhood, I stood behind mother's chair, looking over her shoulder, and saw a precious little sister fall in mother's arms in death. In spirit this evening I am sure that sister is in the presence of God. I hope, blessed hope, that some day I shall be permitted to join her on the sunny shores of sweet deliverance, in singing praise unto the adorable Redeemer for my salvation. A few more days of toil, a few more days of trouble, a few more heartaches, a few more distresses, and you shall meet your loved ones on the other shore. Mothers, you who have had your little children taken from you by the cold and relentless hand of death, let me say that, by the power of Jesus Christ, and in the greatness of His love and mercy, that child of yours this evening is in the presence of God, in spirit, basking in the sunlight of His glory, and has missed the sorrows, the trials, the conflicts, the heartaches, and distresses that you have had to endure, and it will not be long until you will see that child again. David lost his child. The servants wondered why David would arise and take refreshment when he saw the child was dead, and they asked him concerning that, and he said, "While the child lived, I did not know but God would be gracious and spare the child." He says, "Now it cannot come to me, but I shall go to it." David had that blessed hope of a better home beyond this life, and he was sure of the fact that the little child had been taken home to glory. If one child may be lost, David's child might have been lost, as any other; but David was

assured by revelation and inspiration from God that the little child is taken home to glory by the power and grace and love and mercy of God, and so he said, "It cannot come to me, but I shall go to it." So it will not be long, mothers, until you will join that child on the sunny shores of sweet deliverance in singing the song of redeeming grace. C. H. C.

Elder Fairchild

February 13, 1930

In the Banner Herald, Elder Crouse's paper, the Progressive organ of Georgia, for February 1, we see the following item: Cordele Church will hold her week's meeting beginning Monday before and continuing through fourth Sunday in June. Elder J. W. Fairchild will assist the pastor, Elder Lewis. We understand Elder Fairchild is moving to Georgia soon. He is heartily welcomed by our brethren. We see, also, that Elder Fairchild's name is still on the editorial staff of that paper. True, he had an article in the paper some time ago resigning his position on the editorial staff, but his name remains on. His resignation was not given because of thinking the Progressives were wrong in any of their contentions, but because he was thereby handicapped among our people. But the above notice is sufficient to show where Elder Fairchild stands. In the same paper of December 15, 1929, is an article by Elder Fairchild on the question of divorce and re-marriage. He argues in this that if a couple are married and find that they do not really love each other, and are not congenial, it is all right for them to separate and that they have a Scriptural right to marry again. We would be glad to copy the whole article and reply to it at length, but our space will not admit of it. Such a position is right along the line of the modern infidels in advocating the idea of "companionate marriage." The idea is that they have a right to live together awhile on probation, or on trial. That is what it amounts to. Besides that, if a man and woman unite under the law and live together for a time, and then decide that they do not love each other, then, according to Elder Fairchild, they were not united by the Lord, and therefore were never Scripturally married. If they have children, then the children are illegitimate-they are bastards. We have been asked by a number of persons if we endorse the article by Elder Fairchild. We answer most positively that we do not. It would lead to immorality, more divorces, and the country is filled with bastards- if the idea be true. May the Lord deliver us from such teaching. Elder Fairchild says that the way Old Baptists have settled this question must be wrong because it does not stay settled. The way that Old Baptists have always stood on this question, as a rule, is that no man has a right to put his wife away and marry another only for the cause of fornication or adultery. This has been their position all along the line. The reason why the question continues to cause trouble occasionally along the line is that some man will occasionally do as Elder Fairchild has done in that article-try to raise the question again and deny the plain statement of the Lord of glory and set aside His teaching, and introduce some idea that is contrary to and foreign to what Old Baptists have always taught, and contrary to the teaching of the Master. We regret to have to write this way about these things, but we feel that the cause demands it, and we would be untrue to the cause if we did not speak out thus plainly. May the good Lord deliver us from such teaching. C. H. C.

Acts 9:7 AND Acts 22:9

---February 13, 1930

Some people think that these two passages of Scripture are contradictory-that one contradicts the other. But they do not contradict. They harmonize all right. **((9:7) (Acts 9:7)** reads: "And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man." **((2:9) (Acts 22:9)** reads: "And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of Him that spake to me." In this last text it plainly says they heard not the voice of Him that spake to Saul; but in ((9:7) (Acts 9:7) it says they heard a voice. It does not say what voice they heard, but it was not the voice of Him that spake to Saul, for he plainly tells us so in ((2:9) (Acts 22:9). Then, as they heard a voice, whose voice was it that they heard? Evidently it was Saul's voice they heard when he said, "Who art thou, Lord?" and when he said, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" They saw no man-they did not see who it was that Saul was talking to, though they heard him speaking to some unseen person whose voice they did not hear. The Lord's voice is a still small voice, {see **((Ki 19:11) (I Kings 19:11-12)}**} a voice not heard with the natural ear. C. H. C.

Another Editor

---February 13, 1930

Elder J. S. Newman, of Stockdale, Texas, has agreed to let us put his name on our editorial staff, at our request. Brother Newman will write for the paper, and will also take subscriptions at any place where he may go. Any of our subscribers may hand their subscription to him, when it is convenient to do so, and this will save them the trouble of sending to us. We all know that Brother Newman is a good writer, and we trust the Lord will bless his labors to the good of His cause and to the comfort and instruction of His little children. We are glad to have Brother Newman associated with us. C. H. C.

Baptist Standard

---February 20, 1930

Somebody sent us the first sheet (pages 1 and 2) from the Baptist Standard of December 19, 1929, published in Dallas, Texas. We do not know who sent it to us. On page 1 we see the statement in an article by W. R. White that "the Hardshells are the Primitive Baptists. Jonah and Peter belonged at one time to their ministry." Here is a plain admission that the people these folks call "Hardshells" are the original Baptists- that they are the Primitives. If they are the Primitives then they are the original Baptists. Since this is admitted, then why will they try to claim that they are the original Baptists? Can they be honest in making such a claim in the face of such an admission? On page 2 we find that these Missionaries (Fullerites) are in a bad row. We find there the statement that "the theological seminaries are graduating men much faster than churches are being organized," and that "there are not churches enough in the class desirable as pastorates to employ those who want churches of that kind." The writer further says that "there is hardly a day that some well educated, worthy man does not come into this office, or go to the headquarters office, to inquire about an available church. It is becoming alarming." What do you suppose is wrong? Wonder if the Lord did not know what He was doing? Wonder if He has called so many into the work of the ministry when there is no place for them, and no room for them? Solomon says that "a man's gift will make room for him." It seems that there is not room for these men that their seminaries are graduating. We wonder if one trouble is not that men are entering the ministry without the divine call, just to get

an education without cost to them, or to go into the ministry for a livelihood-just as one would go into the worldly professions. It seems that the seminaries are making preachers so fast that they have the market glutted. Such preachers are not worth much, anyway. There is always room for the preachers the Lord makes-as long as they do the Lord's biddings. On the front page we see that the Baptist Standard promotes ten different itemized things, one of which is the B. Y. P. U. Concerning this B. Y. P. U. the late Elder J. N. Hall said, in the Baptist Gleaner of March 28, 1894, "Fie, fie, you imp of hell. Why should you blaspheme the name of God without rebuke, and arrogate to yourself divinity, when you bear on your forehead the imprint of the pit. Get thee behind me Satan." He further says, "It looks like a genuine vomit from perdition." He also says, "In the name of common sense, how can such staunch, true, tried Baptists become infatuated with this liberal bloat from the pit, when it is so terribly naked, and its true nature so easy to be seen. Dash the thing to earth, brethren, and stamp its blasphemous form back to the pit from whence it came." One more statement from Elder Hall is this: "Another feature of this arrogant abortion is its defiance of divine laws." Just one more statement from his pen: "The B. Y. P. U. of A., together with the whole tribe of societies that is linked to it, is a contrivance of the devil, a slight of hand of crafty liberalists, seeking to paralyze the truth of God, and hinder His cause in the earth." Well, there you are! This Texas paper promotes an imp of hell-so Elder J. N. Hall called the thing-a vomit from perdition; a bloat from the pit; an arrogant abortion; a contrivance of the devil! That's the kind of stuff they promote-according to Elder J. N. Hall. Yes, evidently they are trying to paralyze the truth of God and hinder His cause in the earth. What a pity that they have so many of God's children blinded and deluded. But that is their desire. That is what the devil wants done, anyhow-to have God's children blinded and deluded. All their societies and aids and helps are absolutely unknown to the word of God. Every one of them is absolutely without divine authority. Those who hold to such things have no more right to be called the church of God than a hog has to be called an angel. Many of God's people are blinded and are among them, but they are not in the church the Lord established while here in the world.

We would be glad for them to get their eyes open to the truth, and to see them coming home to the true church of God, which still goes on without using those things invented in the lower regions. We should be satisfied with what the Lord has put here for His children, and let all other things alone. The Bible is given to furnish God's children with all that they should practice religiously, and it is very much wrong to practice what the Bible does not command. C. H. C.

Revelation 11:3,7-8

---February 27, 1930

We have been asked to give our views on (Revelation 11:3,8). We would be glad to publish Gill's comments on these passages, but do not have the space. We will write just a few lines, giving some of our thoughts in a very brief way. (Revelation 11:3) reads as follows: And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth. This thousand two hundred and three score days is twelve hundred and sixty years, and answers to the time the church was in the wilderness. The two witnesses are the church and the ministry-the true ministry of Christ. During these twelve hundred and sixty years they testified to the truth, but were sorely persecuted. They prophesied in sackcloth and ashes; and though they were persecuted by the world, yet the Lord blessed them. At the end of the twelve hundred and sixty years the

Reformation came, when Luther came out of Rome and established the Lutheran Church and Calvin established the Presbyterian Church. Then came religious liberty, and the true witnesses were allowed freedom to proclaim the riches of God's grace in a public way without fear of molestation. Now we come to (Revelation 11:7-8): And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them. And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified. Here is a prophecy that we would do well to take heed to. This beast is generally conceded to be Rome. The beast is to make war against the two witnesses and will overcome them and kill them, and their dead bodies will lie in the streets. Verse nine tells us that "they of the people and kindreds and tongues and nations shall see their dead bodies three days and an half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves." This severe trial and persecution will last for three years and six months, and it will be the most severe persecution that the world has ever known. It is true that in past ages the true and humble followers of the Master have been put to death and punished in every conceivable way that it seems Satan could invent, and the persecutions have been severe; but this will be the worst. But thanks be to the Lord, it will be of short duration in comparison with the length of time some of our ancestors had to suffer. For some years we have felt sure that we could see the dark clouds gathering, and we still believe we can see those clouds. Rome has been gradually working to gain her lost power, and the pope has been granted territory over which he is ruler in temporal matters as well as church matters. They have been working for years to make America Catholic. They are avowed enemies of our free school system, the bulwark of our freedom. They have always opposed the full and entire separation of church and state. For you to know these things to be true it is only necessary for you to read authentic church history and read what Catholics say in their own papers and publications now. They tried to elect Al Smith president, and all indications are that he will be a candidate next time. With a Catholic president this war on the two witnesses could be made before the Protestant people could have time or warning to help themselves. All papers opposing Catholicism could be put out of business in a few weeks time, and that without remedy. Do we want the trial of such persecution as is here told us about in this chapter? If not, then we should "be up and doing." Let us awake to the dangers confronting us, and awake to the discharge of our every duty. Let us go to God in prayer, that such calamity may not befall us, and then let us do our full duty. In the discharge of our every duty the Lord will bless us. We are not running a political paper, but we feel it to be our indispensable duty to warn all our readers of the impending crisis. May the Lord help us all to awake to the true situation and to do our whole duty. C. H. C.

Remarks to Elder J. R. Wilson

---February 27, 1930

Dear brother, we are so sorry to hear of your health being bad, and beg the Lord that you may be well again. We are glad to say that our health is better. We seem to be improving, and we hope to be well again soon. We hope to see you this summer, and want you to visit our churches. Our people will welcome you among them. We appreciate your kind words more than we can tell, though we feel so unworthy of it all. The Lord's dear children have been good to us-far better than we feel to deserve. True, we have had to endure trials and persecutions; but many have stood by us in our trials, and we trust we appreciate it all. May the good Lord bless every one of them, is our humble prayer. We would be glad to be at your

association, but at present we do not see how we can well be there. May the Lord shower down His richest blessings upon you and those dear to you, is our humble prayer. Please continue to pray for us. We are so poor and needy, and we need the prayers of all the Lord's faithful and true children. C. H. C.

Our Meeting

---**March 6, 1930**

Recently Brother Webb, or someone else, made the statement that there were six additions to our little church here in Thornton at our February meeting. We never thought, then, of the necessity of saying anything further about it. But since then we have thought perhaps some of our readers would like to know who they were and how they joined; so we will give you that information. They were Elder T. L. Webb and wife, Brother Whit Fowlkes and wife, and Brother E. B. Meeks and mother, Sister Mollie Meeks. They all joined by letter. We were all glad to have them cast their lot with us. The little band are all in peace, and the Lord is blessing us with some sweet and delightful meetings. Today is March 1, our regular conference meeting day. We have just been to meeting. Elders Webb and Harris (Elder John R. Harris) were both blessed to preach so sweetly and comfortingly to the Lord's dear children who were present. May the Lord be praised for such noble gifts, and may He help us to appreciate them as gifts from Him. C. H. C.

London Confession

---**March 27, 1930**

For some little time we have thought we would write a few lines concerning the London Confession of Faith, as the Absoluters seem to be so free to quote a part of it in proof of the doctrine they advocate-that God did, from all eternity, absolutely and unconditionally decree, predestinate and unalterably fix everything that comes to pass, good, bad and indifferent. They always seem ready to quote section 1 of chapter 3, or a part of it, to try to prove that they are in line with those ancient Baptists and that those who do not accept their contention have departed from the faith. Let us here quote chapter 3, section 1: God hath decreed in Himself from all eternity, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably, all things whatsoever come to pass; yet so as thereby is God neither the author of sin nor hath fellowship with any therein, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature, nor yet is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established, in which appears His wisdom in disposing all things, and power and faithfulness in accomplishing His decree. Please note that in this statement the London Confession says, "Nor yet is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established," etc. The word "contingency" means contingent or conditional. It is bound to be true, then, since they used that expression right there in that very chapter and section, that they believed God predestinated or decreed some things on condition, or that it was contingent on something else. Do the Absoluters believe any of God's predestination was contingent, or that He predestinated to do a single thing on condition of anything else? No, indeed. They not only do not believe that, but they brand those who do believe it as being Arminians and as departing from the faith. Can we prove by the Bible that God has predestinated or decreed to do anything on condition? or that one thing He has predestinated is contingent on something else? Let us read **((9:30) (Psalms 89:30-31,32)**: If His children forsake my law, and

walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Here we are told that God says He will visit their transgression with the rod and their iniquity with stripes. He has determined to do this. But did He so determine to thus chastise them unconditionally? He does not say so; but He says "if they forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes." He has determined to visit their transgression with the rod and their iniquity with stripes. He has not determined to thus chastise them, whether or no; but the chastising of them is contingent upon their disobedience-the forsaking of His law, walking not in His judgments, breaking His statutes, and keeping not His commandments. Thus it is clearly taught in God's inspired word that He has determined to do this on the contingency stated in the text itself. Let us read **(John 14:21)**: He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Gospel commandments are to God's regenerated children only, and are not to the unregenerate. Surely the Absoluters will not dispute this. They certainly will not deny, either, that some may have the love of God in their hearts and yet not obey the gospel. But those who love God and obey Him manifest that love by their obedience. They love Him in a manifest way. The Saviour here promised that He will love those who keep His commandments. This could not mean that He will love them in that way that He loved all His elect, for He loved them with an everlasting love; and that everlasting love of God is the very foundation of their final salvation and deliverance from all sin and its awful consequences, and is manifested to all the elect alike. This love, then, must be a love in a manifest sense. In order that they enjoy this manifest love of the Father and the Saviour it is necessary that they keep His commandments. Their enjoyment of this manifest love of God is contingent upon their keeping His commandments. God has so decreed it, and the Saviour clearly so teaches in this text, as well as in other places. Let us see what we find in **((9) (Isaiah 1:19-20)** is a text used by many in trying to prove that a child of God may be finally lost and go to eternal torment. If the text does prove that, it proves too much for them; and a text that proves too much is as bad as a text that proves nothing. Those who advocate the doctrine of the possibility of final apostasy tell us that if a child of God does fall away he can be renewed and get back into a saved state by repentance. Now, let us read that text and see just what it says and what it does teach. For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.-(Hebrews 6:4-6). The text says, "For it is impossible * * * if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance." Thus we see that if the text proves that one may thus fall away, it also proves that it is impossible to renew such a one again; and it thereby proves too much for them. But does the text teach that a child of God may be finally lost? No; but it teaches the very opposite. "If they shall fall away" it is impossible "to renew them again unto repentance." Why? Because "they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame." That is, if they fall away, the Son of God would have to be crucified for them again; and He would thereby be put to an open shame. He died once for the purpose of saving them in glory, and if they fall away and fail to reach heaven, He would be put to an open shame and His work branded as a failure, and He would have to come back and die for them again. Will the blessed and holy Son of God be put to an open shame? Most

emphatically, No. Then they shall not fall away; it is impossible, because He cannot be put to an open shame. Will He ever die again? He said, "I am He that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forevermore." -(Revelation 1:18). As He is alive forevermore He will never die again, and therefore they shall not fall away and be finally lost. Again, the blessed Saviour said, "Because I live, ye shall live also." - (John 14:19). The reason why they shall live is that He lives. His living is the cause, and they live as the effect. In order that the effect cease, the cause must first cease; but this cause will never cease, because He is alive forevermore. It follows, therefore, that they shall live forevermore. They will live as long as Jesus lives. If Jesus never dies again, then they shall never die. Jesus said to Martha, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?" This is the blessed and sure promise of the Lord of glory for His little ones. What a precious promise! How sweet that promise is to the poor pilgrim here. We feel like we have hardly got started with the subject, but our physical strength is giving way from the labors of the day, and we will have to stop for this time. Perhaps we can write some more on this subject next week. Remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Falling From Grace Article No. 2

---April 24, 1930

Last week we promised to try to write some more on this subject this week. In order to try to keep that promise we now try to write a few lines. The idea that a child of God may so apostatize or fall away as to be finally lost would necessarily involve the idea that such a one must cease to be a child of God and become a child of Satan, or that such a child of God goes to eternal torment, or to eternal perdition, which is absurd in the very extreme. No act of a child can possibly cause that child to cease to be a child of its parents and to become the child of another. If one is a child of God, that one has been born of God; born from above; born of the heavenly parentage. God's children may be rebellious and disobedient, which they often are, but that does not sever the relationship. If disobedience and rebellion on the part of the child could possibly sever the relationship existing between parent and child, they could not do so in the case of God's children, because God has sworn that they shall endure (live) forever. Let us read ((9:26) (Psalms 89:26-36): He shall cry unto me, Thou art my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. In this text David is impersonating or representing Christ, the holy Son of God. God says He has sworn by His holiness that He will not lie unto David, or unto His Son; that His seed shall endure (live) forever. If a child of God, then, forsakes God's law, walks not in His judgments; if they break His statutes, and keep not His commandments-will they go to eternal torment on that account? They certainly will not, for God has sworn to His Son that they shall live forever, though they do thus rebel, and yet He will visit their transgressions with the rod and their iniquity with stripes. He has promised that He would chastise them for their disobedience; but He has sworn by His holiness that they shall endure, or live,

forever. "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." -(Titus 1:2). Here we are told that God cannot lie. As He cannot lie, certainly He could not swear a lie. As He could neither lie nor swear a lie; and as He has promised His Son that His children shall live forever, and then confirmed that promise with an oath, swearing by His holiness, then it is impossible that one of them ever be finally lost. They will certainly live with Him in eternal glory. If one of the Lord's children should ever sink down to eternal night, or go to eternal perdition, it would necessarily follow that God made a promise to His Son which failed of fulfillment, and that He swore falsely. No one can possibly believe God swore truthfully and at the same time believe that a child of God goes to eternal torment. Both cannot be believed at the same time, for the two things are diametrically opposed to each other. If one believes that a child of God may go to an eternal torment, he certainly does not believe the Bible. He may think he does, but he does not; for the Bible tells us that God has sworn that they shall live forever. Could a true and loving mother be satisfied and see her child suffering in torment here in this world? All know very well that she could not. A mother's love for her child is too strong and too tender and great for her to be satisfied and at the same time see her child suffer tortures and torment here. But God's love is greater and stronger than a mother's love. It is far beyond and far greater than any earthly tie. God's love is everlasting and as unchanging and enduring as Himself. God is love. Then how could the blessed Redeemer be satisfied and see one of His children, for whom He suffered, bled and died, suffering the tortures of an endless torment? Such a thought is but a thought that besmirches the very character of that holy and lovely and heavenly Being. "He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied." -(3:11) (Isaiah 53:11). Isaiah was here prophesying of the work of the Son of God, and tells us that He shall "see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied." As He could not be satisfied and see one of the objects of His eternal love suffering the torments of an endless hell, then they shall never sink down to that place of torment. "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." - **((3:6) (Isaiah 53:6))**. The iniquity of all those people who were His was laid on the Son of God. As all their iniquity was laid on Him, and He put away their sins by the sacrifice of Himself, then sin or iniquity cannot cause one of them to go to eternal torment. The Father certainly will not demand payment of a debt of them which has been paid for them by His holy and spotless Son. What blessed assurances are to be found in the precious old Book for the Lord's dear children who are strangers and pilgrims here. There are troubles and trials and conflicts for them here in this low ground of sin and sorrow; but everlasting joy is in store for them when the troubles and distresses of this life are all over. These blessed assurances comfort and strengthen and encourage us here amidst all our trials and afflictions. We will try to write some more on this subject later on- perhaps next week. C. H. C.

Deacons Ordained

---April 24, 1930

Zion's Rest Church, near Jonesboro, La., requested Cane Creek Church, Thornton, Ark., to send or grant her ordained help to go there for the purpose of helping to ordain two brethren (Irvin Canady and Jesse Swanner) to the office of deacon. Our church (Cane Creek) granted the request. Elder Harris had an appointment elsewhere, so that he could not go, but we went along with Elder Webb. Elder Webb's wife and Sister Cloud went with us to be at the meeting, which was last Saturday and Sunday-the third Sunday in April and Saturday before. We were a little late getting there, the distance being 150 miles, and Elder C. M. Monk, the

pastor, was preaching when we arrived. Then Elder Webb preached a sweet and comforting discourse, after which the church sat in conference and agreed to attend to the ordination after recess for lunch. They had dinner spread and all were well fed with the temporal things, after which the congregation assembled again in the house. Then the writer and Elders Webb and Monk and Deacons J. L. McBride and J. M. Wiggins formed themselves into a presbytery and proceeded to set the brethren apart to the office of deacon by prayer and laying on of hands. We had meeting again that night and Sunday. Surely the Lord manifested His sweet presence, and it was an enjoyable meeting. May the good Lord continue His blessings upon them, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Falling From Grace Article No. 3

---May 1, 1930

Last week we promised to try to write some more on the subject of falling from grace, perhaps this week. So we will try to write a few more lines on that question. For the beginning of this article on the subject we will read **((4:9) (Isaiah 54:9-10))**. For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee. In this language we have, two covenants brought to our attention. The first one is the covenant God made with Noah and all flesh that He would never again destroy the earth by water, and the other is the covenant of His peace; and one is as the other. The covenant of His peace is as the covenant with Noah; for this is as that. If it is possible for a child of God to so apostatize as to be finally lost, then his final salvation in heaven would depend upon his faithfulness and right living here in the world. If his final salvation in heaven depends upon that, then the covenant of God's peace mentioned in this text would be a conditional covenant, and would depend upon their good deeds or faithfulness for its fulfillment. If the covenant of His peace is thus conditional, then His covenant with Noah that He would never again destroy the earth by water was conditional; for the covenant of His peace is as that covenant with Noah. Was the covenant with Noah a conditional one? Let us read it and see. And God spoke unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, And I, behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you; and with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth with you; from all that go out of the ark, to every beast of the earth. And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth. And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations: I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud: and I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant, which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth.- (Genesis 9:8-17). This is the covenant which God

made with Noah and all flesh that the earth should never again be destroyed by water-that there should never be another flood. Does that covenant depend upon the obedience or faithfulness of any human being on earth for its fulfillment? Most assuredly not. If it had depended upon the righteousness or obedience of mankind for its fulfillment, we know there would have been another flood long before this time. But upon what, then, does it depend for its fulfillment? It depends alone upon the faithfulness of God and His power to fulfill every promise He has made. The Lord put the bow in the cloud as a token of that covenant. Did He place it there so the people could see it and remember the covenant? No; but He said, "I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth." As long and as often as we see the bow in the cloud we know that God remembers that covenant, and that there will not be another flood. There will never be another flood, whether we remember the covenant or not. The fulfillment of that covenant does not depend upon us remembering it. God remembers the covenant which He made, and the apostle says that "God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord." -**(I Corinthians 1:9)**. Since God is faithful, He will fulfill the promise He made in the covenant with Noah and all flesh, and there will never be another flood.

Now, the covenant of His peace is like that, for He says, "This is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee nor rebuke thee." The Lord swore to the one just as He did to the other. The one is like the other. And this refers to the covenant of His peace, and He says "neither shall it be removed." This covenant depends, then, upon the faithfulness and power of God for its fulfillment, and does not depend upon the faithfulness and righteousness of men and women for that. As the covenant of His peace is like the covenant with Noah, and the covenant with Noah was an unconditional one, then the covenant of His peace is also unconditional. As it is unconditional, and does not depend upon the obedience of the creature for fulfillment, then not one embraced in that covenant will ever sink down to eternal night. God has sworn in that covenant that "I will not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee." In that covenant He has also sworn that "my kindness shall not depart from thee." What glorious and blessed assurance to the poor trembling pilgrim that eternal peace and unsullied bliss and glory is his to enjoy beyond the sorrows and dark scenes of this life. May these blessed truths comfort your hearts in all your sad trials and distresses. We may write some more yet on this subject-perhaps next week. C. H. C.

Falling From Grace Article No. 4

May 8, 1930

Last week we said we might write some more on this question, perhaps this week. So we will try to write a few more lines concerning the final preservation of the saints. Last week we wrote about the covenant of God's peace, as mentioned in **((4:9) (Isaiah 54:9-10))**, in connection with God's covenant with Noah and all flesh, which is referred to in this text. In ((4:7) (Isaiah 54:7-8)) we have this language: "For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer." Following this language is the language used in the beginning of our article last week, "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me," etc. Taking all these verses together it is very clear that the language in verses 7 and 8 and the sweet

and sure promises contained therein are to the same persons embraced in ((4:9) (Isaiah 54:9-10), the same persons embraced in the covenant of His peace. Those persons are the Lord's little children, who are on their pilgrimage here below. "For a small moment have I forsaken thee." When the poor little child of God here in this world of trouble feels and realizes that he is forsaken of the Lord, all is dark and gloomy then. They forsake the Lord's way sometimes, turn from His sweet service, forget His mercies and kindnesses; then "for a small moment" the Lord forsakes them; "in a little wrath" He hides His face from them for a moment. But it seems like a long time. When the Lord's face is hid, turned from the little child of grace, all is dark and gloomy then. It is a night season with him, and it is not a night of rest, either. There is no peace or rest enjoyed; but he is restless and disturbed, and it seems to him that day will never dawn again. He then begins to inquire, in deep sorrow and trouble, as David did, "Will the Lord cast off forever? and will He be favourable no more? Is His mercy clean gone forever? doth His promise fail forevermore? Hath God forgotten to be gracious? Hath He in anger shut up His tender mercies?" -((7:7) (Psalms 77:7-8,9). In such dark seasons as this, which the Lord's dear children pass through in their journey here below, it seems to them that they are cast off forever; it seems that they can no more enjoy the Lord's divine favor; it appears to them that His mercy is clean gone forever. They feel then that the Lord's gracious and sure and glorious promise does not embrace them. They feel that theirs is an "outside case;" that they are not embraced in the promise of God; that so far as they are concerned the whole matter is a failure. They feel that God will be gracious to them no more; that in His anger with them on account of their great sinfulness He has shut up His tender mercies. What despair! What distress is theirs during these dark hours! How dark is the night, and how long the night seems to be! But the night finally passes and the glorious day dawns again. "The darkest hour is just before day." That darkest hour finally passes, and the glorious and heavenly sunshine of the Lord's blessed manifest presence appears again in all the heavenly glory and sweetness of His sure promise, "but with great mercies will I gather thee;" "but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer." What joy then fills the soul! What peace! What content! What reconciliation! What trust in our Redeemer! Though the way is so rough and rugged here in this sinful world, yet here is God's promise, and that promise confirmed by an oath, in which oath He has sworn by Himself. To argue that this promise will not be fulfilled is to argue that the Lord of glory has not only told a lie but that He has perjured Himself by swearing falsely. If one of His little ones sinks down to eternal night, then God has sworn a lie. Would you rather believe that God swore a lie than to believe in the final preservation of the saints? If you sometimes pass through these dark and gloomy nights, it is but a sure evidence of the fact that you are a child of grace—a child of God; you have the spiritual life. If you did not have that life, you could never feel and realize the darkness; neither could you feel or realize and enjoy the sweetness of the manifestation of the Lord's heavenly presence. In ((4:17) (Isaiah 54:17) we have this language: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord." What a glorious promise and assurance for the Lord's poor little children here, where they are surrounded by so many temptations, and where the enemies are so thick and so numerous, and where Satan is continually near, and all his emissaries, with their fiery darts hurling at them. "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper." The eternal God Himself will take care of the situation; and He will take care of you. "This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord." This is their heritage, and all the demons of the under world cannot prevent them receiving that inheritance. The Lord Himself is

pledged to see that they receive it. "Their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord." They have no righteousness of their own, and they realize that fact. They mourn and grieve on account of their unrighteousness, but when they are enabled to realize and to have the assurance that their righteousness is of the Lord, it gives them joy and comfort. "The Lord" is "our righteousness." The Lord Jesus is made unto them "righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." -(I Corinthians 1:30). His righteousness is sufficient. Being clothed with His righteousness they shall be landed safely on the sunny shores of sweet deliverance, and shall dwell forever in the presence of God in glory. Blessed assurance. Hold up your bowed down heads; your sorrows will all end some day, and eternal peace is yours in a better world than this. We may write some more on this same question-perhaps again next week. Remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Falling From Grace Article No. 5

---May 15, 1930

We promised last week that we would try to write some more on this question. So we will try to write a few more lines this week. This time we will start with the language of the Saviour recorded in **(John 10:27-28,29)**, which reads as follows: My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. In this text there are some people whom the Saviour designates as His sheep. In (John 10:26) He said to some of the Jews, "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you." Some of the people were His sheep and some were not. Those the Saviour designates as His sheep hear His voice. In **(John 5:25)** the Saviour said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." Those who hear His voice and live are those He calls His sheep. They were His because the Father gave them to Him." My Father, which gave them me." The Father gave them to His Son for a possession; and the Saviour, by the power of His Holy Spirit, speaks to them and makes them alive from a state of death in sin. They are thus made alive in Christ." I give unto them eternal life." How can anything die that has eternal life? If one dies a physical or corporeal death, does not the natural life of that person cease, or come to an end? If the natural life was an eternal life, could one die naturally? Would, or could, the natural life ever end, if it was an eternal life? It is absurd to say that it could. But this life which Jesus here says He gives to His people is eternal life. That life is a never ending life. As the life is never ending, their final salvation in heaven is sure. There can be no such thing as one perishing in eternal torment to whom this life has been given. Not only is this true, but the blessed Saviour most emphatically says "they shall never perish." Never means not ever; not at any time; at no time, whether past, present, or future. As "they shall never perish," when will one of them ever perish? The Saviour says not ever. As "they shall never perish," at what time may one of them perish? The Saviour says not at any time. As "they shall never perish," we repeat the question, at what time may one of them perish? The Saviour says at no time, whether past, present, or future. If at no time, whether past, present, or future, one of them shall ever perish, then it is certain that not one of the Lord's children will ever fail to finally enter heaven and eternal glory. We remember one time in public discussion with a gentleman that he said, "If the doctrine you preach- the final preservation of the

saints-be true, the devil is the biggest fool ever heard tell of. If he could not get one of the Lord's children, after trying all these years to get one, he would have found out that he could not get one, and would quit trying, if he were not the biggest fool ever heard tell of." We replied by saying that we always liked to agree with a man when we can, and that we would agree with the gentleman that the devil is the biggest fool ever heard tell of, as is proven by the fact that he cannot get one of the Lord's children, and yet he keeps on trying; but, lo, it seems that the devil is not the only fool in the world, for here is another fellow who has not found this out, either. But we (Old Baptists) have found out better. We have learned that the Saviour told the truth when He said, "They shall never perish." Right here we wish to give three Scriptural propositions. First. Jesus prays for His people according to the Father's will. Second. The Father's will is that He should lose nothing. Third. The Father always hears Him. The first, above, is the first premise in the proposition. Let us prove that first premise. **(7) (Romans 8:27)** "And He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." The saints are the children of God, and the Saviour prays for them according to the Father's will. The second premise is that the Father's will is that the Son should lose nothing. Let us prove that. **(John 6:38-39)** "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which He hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." Those the Father gave to the Son are His people, His children; and the Father's will is that not one of them be lost, but that they be raised up again at the last day. The next proposition is that the Father always hears the prayer of His Son. He always hears the Saviour's prayer. Now let us prove that. **(John 11:41-42)** "And they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up His eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." The word hearest (or hear) in this text must be in the sense of "to give audience or attention to; to listen to; to heed; to accede to the demand or wishes of; to listen to and answer favorably." This clearly shows that the Father always favorably answers the prayer of His Son. There is not a man in all this wide world who can make it appear that one of the Lord's little children will ever sink down in eternal torment and let these three Scriptural propositions remain true. Here they are again: Jesus prays for His people according to the Father's will. The Father's will is that the Son should lose nothing the Father gave Him. The Father always hears the Son. It follows, therefore, inevitably and certainly, that every child of grace will ultimately be saved in glory. Blessed assurance! Jesus, our loving Saviour, prays for His little ones. Dear child, you often ask those you believe to be God's children to pray for you. They may not know when you need their prayers. But your loving Saviour knows when you are in trouble, in sorrow, in distress, in soul afflictions, when the tempter is near and trying you; and as He prays for you, and knows when you need His prayers, He certainly prays for you when you are in such troubles; and the Father always answers Him favorably-always grants His request. May these sweet and precious truths comfort your poor heart in your sad distresses, is our humble prayer. Pray for us. We may try to write some more on this question, perhaps again next week. C. H. C.

Falling From Grace Article No. 6

---May 22, 1930

We promised again last week that we would try to write some more on this question this week. This week we will begin with a text that is sometimes used to try to prove that a child of God may so fall away as to be finally lost. That text is **(Galatians 5:4)**, but we want to quote beginning with (verse 1): Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. If the text here quoted teaches that a child of God may perish in eternal torment, then it contradicts the language of the Saviour used in our article last week, recorded in **(John 10:28)** "And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish." Does the inspired apostle contradict the plain statement of the Son of God? Did the Lord Himself make this plain, positive and unequivocal statement, and then inspire His apostle to write something which contradicts that statement which He had Himself made? Unless the Lord has done this, then the language in **(Galatians 5:4)** cannot possibly teach that a child of God can be finally lost, or that a child of God may finally land in eternal torment. For one to prove that Paul meant to teach such a thing in this text, he must first prove that the Son of God told a falsehood in the statement above quoted, or that He was mistaken in what He said. Does Paul contradict the teaching, or the plain statement, of the Saviour? Certainly not. Then he does not teach that a child of God may perish in torment, or be finally lost in eternal perdition. Then what is the teaching of the apostle in this text? In the preceding chapter he is treating of the difference between the law service and gospel service. He calls attention to the bondwoman and the freewoman. He says: **{(Galatians 4:21-26)}** Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. This shows very clearly that the apostle had been treating in chapter four of the two covenants, and that Agar represented the law covenant, and he plainly says that the child of Agar was born after the flesh; and that covenant was a covenant of works. Isaac was the son of the freewoman, who represented the new covenant, or the covenant of grace, and he was a child of promise. "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." -(Galatians 4:28). This clearly teaches that the children of Jerusalem, the new covenant, the children of God, are children of promise. The old covenant, or law service, with all its rites and ceremonies, has been done away. The law service served its purpose; but when Christ came it was all fulfilled in Him, and was then done away. "Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman." -(Galatians 4:30). Some Judaizing teacher had been among the Galatian brethren and had taught them that they must be circumcised and keep the law in order to be saved-that they could not reach heaven without this. That was a false doctrine which they had imbibed from some false teacher. By embracing that doctrine they had departed from the doctrine of grace. The doctrine of grace, as taught by the Lord and His inspired apostles, is that sinners are saved in heaven, prepared for the service of God here, and prepared and qualified to live with God in heaven, alone by His grace, without works of any kind. "Who hath

saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." -(II Timothy 1:9). The Galatians had departed from that doctrine of grace; and in that way they had fallen from grace. They had not fallen from eternal life. They had not ceased to be the children of God. The apostle declares them to be the children of promise in (Galatians 4:28), and being the children of promise they were children of God, and God's children "shall never perish," though they depart from the doctrine of grace. There are many children of God who are taught a false doctrine and made to believe the same here in this world; but believing a false doctrine does not cause one to cease to be a child of God. Suppose Mr. Smith is the father of a boy we will call John, and suppose John has been taught that Mr. Jones is his father, and John believes that. Does that make John become a son of Mr. Jones? Does it cause John to cease to be the son of Mr. Smith? Any sensible person knows that it does not. Neither does it cause one to cease to be a child of God and become a child of Satan because he has been led to believe something that is not true. Those Galatian brethren had been led to believe that they were justified by the works of the law, and in turning from the doctrine of grace and believing in the doctrine of works in order to eternal life, they fell from grace. The old law worship and service had been done away, and these Galatian brethren had been taught the truth of gospel worship and service, and for a time had rejoiced in the same. In verse 1 the apostle admonishes them to stand fast in the glorious liberty of gospel worship and service, and to be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage-the bondage of law worship and service. To be entangled in law worship and service is to discard the work of the blessed Son of God. If we have to observe the rites and ceremonies of law service in order to be saved in heaven, then the death of Christ accomplished nothing-it was wholly unnecessary. We could be saved in heaven by observing the law just as well without the death of Christ as with it. That doctrine utterly denies the work of Christ. It utterly denies the doctrine of grace. God's children may, and sometimes do, deny the Lord and His doctrine, and thus, after having believed the truth, fall from grace and from their steadfastness. When they do that the Lord denies them the blessings He has promised His faithful and obedient children. Though He does this, "If we believe not, yet He abideth faithful: He cannot deny Himself." -(II Timothy 2:13). For a child of God to perish in eternal torment the Saviour would have to deny Himself; He would be compelled to deny the efficacy of His work; and this He cannot do. Therefore, a child of God cannot perish in eternal torment. This truth will stand through all ages. What we desire and need is the evidence, the assurance, that we are a child of God. Sometimes the evidences that are laid down in God's word (or some of them) are a sweet comfort and consolation to us; and we are glad of the assurance that though we should be deceived by some false teacher and led by him to believe a false doctrine, yet the Lord will not-cannot-deny Himself; and though we should lose the comfort here that may be enjoyed in believing the truth, yet we shall not lose the joys of the heavenly world and the glory of that heavenly home. This is a consolation and comfort to us. The doctrine of God our Saviour is comforting and consoling to the Lord's children here. Truth makes them free. Truth consoles them in trials and temptations. There is no comfort or consolation to them in the thought that they are liable to fall away and sink down in eternal ruin and despair at last. Therefore, that doctrine is not the doctrine of God. It is not the truth. The old servant of God was commanded thus: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins." -(0:1) (Isaiah 40:1-2). To tell the Lord's little children, who feel and realize their poverty and their utter dependence upon

the Lord for His mercy and grace every day and every hour, that they may so fall away as to be eternally lost at last is no comfort to them. Therefore, one who speaks that way does not speak as the Lord commanded. May the Lord bless the thoughts here given to the comfort and encouragement and consolation of our readers, is our humble prayer. We may try to write some more on this subject next week. Pray the Lord to be with and direct us. C. H. C.

Falling From Grace Article No. 7

---May 29, 1930

We promised again last week that we would try to write some more this week on falling from grace. So we will try to write a few more lines on the subject. This week we will begin with Jude 1, which reads as follows: Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called. In this text we find that Jude, the inspired writer, was addressing his short letter to "them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called." It was the work of God the Father to sanctify them. To sanctify means to make free from sin; to cleanse from moral corruption and pollution; to purify; to make sacred or holy; to set apart to a holy or religious use, etc. It was the work of the Father to set them apart to a holy or religious use. The Father had chosen them, and set them apart to salvation, or to be saved. Sanctification is "the act or process of God's grace by which the affections of men are purified, or alienated from sin and the world, and exalted to a supreme love to God," etc.-Webster. It was the act or process of God's grace by which they were sanctified. God did that work by His grace. The Father had chosen them to salvation, and set them apart to that end; and by His own act in giving them the divine life, He had planted in their hearts a love for Him. Thus they had been sanctified, set apart, exalted to that high state or condition, in which they were brought to hate sin and to love God and holiness. These people were not only thus sanctified, but they were "preserved in Jesus Christ." To preserve is "to keep or save from injury or destruction; to guard or defend from evil; to protect; save; to save from decay by the use of some preservative substance, as sugar, salt, etc.;-to prepare so as to prevent decomposition or fermentation, as by seasoning, canning, etc." -Webster. As these people were preserved in Jesus Christ, they are kept from injury. If they are kept from injury, how could they sink down to eternal night? If one should sink down to eternal night, would he be kept from injury? Would it be an injury for one to sink down to eternal ruin? If it would be an injury for one to sink down to eternal ruin, and if they are kept from injury, then they are kept from sinking down to eternal ruin. They (the Lord's children) are kept from destruction, as to preserve is to keep from destruction. As they are kept from destruction, then they are kept from sinking down to eternal ruin. The inspired writer says they are preserved in Jesus Christ. Did he tell the truth? If he did tell the truth, then how can one of God's children ever be lost in eternal torment, or everlasting destruction, seeing he says they are preserved, and being preserved is being kept from destruction? No man on earth can ever show that one of God's little children will sink down in eternal ruin without first proving that the inspired writer did not here tell the truth. We are inclined to think this would be hard to do. They are not kept from destruction by their own power, nor by the power of the preacher, nor by the power of the church, nor by the power of any set of men, nor by the power of any institution on earth. They are kept by the power of God. See **((Pet 1:5) (I Peter 1:5))**. God has the power to keep them, and does keep them from destruction. He keeps them through all the trials and conflicts of this life unto

salvation. He keeps them "ready to be revealed in the last time." Since they are kept by the power of God unto salvation, and He has the power to keep them, then not one of them will sink down in eternal ruin. As God has the power to keep them, and He does keep them ready to be revealed in the last time, then they will all finally be saved in heaven.

As to preserve is to save from destruction, and the Lord's children are preserved, then they are all saved from destruction. Not one of them, then, will ever be destroyed in an eternal hell. They will never sink down in everlasting destruction. They are saved from that by the Lord Himself, the inspired writer having told the truth. To preserve is to guard or defend from evil. The Lord Himself guards them and defends them from evil. Satan may tempt and torment them; but the Lord guards them; He defends them. If one of them is ever lost, it must be because the Lord is not able to defend them against Satan, the great enemy of their souls. But the Lord is able to defend them. As He is able to defend them, and does defend them, because He preserves them, then they are securely and effectually protected, defended, from the vicious attacks of their greatest enemy. Being thus defended it is impossible that one of them sink down in everlasting ruin. To preserve is to save from decay. As they are preserved by the Lord, then the Lord saves them from decay. Since they are saved from decay by the Lord of glory, then not one of them can ever perish in eternal torment. All the rottenness and decay that might be or can be caused by sin will be removed from them. They shall be finally made whole, without spot or wrinkle. They are saved by the Lord, and kept from the awful results and consequences of sin. They are preserved; they are kept from decay. They will all finally live with God and Christ in eternal glory. To be preserved is to be kept from decay by the use of some preservative substance. They are kept from decay by the use of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit has taken up His abode in their hearts. The Holy Spirit is a sure preserving substance, and by Him they are kept from ruin and decay. The love of God is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost. The love of God is a sure preserving substance. By it they are kept from decay unto eternal glory. Sometimes the sisters say, "I lost my preserves;" or, "my preserves spoiled." That is a mistake. Perhaps they lost their fruit; perhaps their fruit spoiled. Why did the fruit spoil? Because they did not have it preserved. They had tried to preserve the fruit; they thought they had the fruit preserved, but they were mistaken. The Lord is never mistaken. He never has thought He had one preserved and was mistaken about it. If He has thought He had one preserved, it was sure that way, for "as I have thought, so shall it come to pass." He is never mistaken; He never makes a mistake. If the good sister had preserved the fruit it would not have spoiled. The Lord has preserved, and does preserve, His people; hence they do not spoil. They will not sink down in eternal ruin. To preserve is to prepare so as to prevent decomposition. The Lord's people are preserved in Jesus Christ. They are so prepared by the Lord for final salvation as that they are prevented from decomposition. As they are so prepared as to prevent decomposition, then they will never be decomposed-they will never decompose. As they will never decompose-having been so prepared as to prevent decomposition-they will never be finally lost. Not one of them can ever sink down into eternal night. They cannot so fall away as to be finally lost. In order that one of God's children so fall away as to be finally lost, he would have to decompose; he would have to decay. But they are preserved-kept from decomposition or decay. Therefore, they are kept from finally falling away and being lost. They are not only preserved, but they are "preserved in Jesus Christ." The sister may have her fruit preserved; but she may have it in a vessel that may be broken. If the vessel should be broken, then her preserved fruit is lost. But Jesus Christ will never be broken or

destroyed, and God's children are preserved in Him. Since they are preserved in Him, then not one of them can be lost-unless they are cast out of Him. But Jesus has said that "him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." That is, he shall not, in any case, under no circumstance, be cast out. They are in the hands of Jesus and in the hands of the Father. No one is able to pluck them out of the hand of Jesus, and no one is able to pluck them out of the hand of the Father. See **(John 10:28-29)**. Since they are preserved in Jesus Christ, and shall, under no consideration, be cast out, and no one is able to pluck them out, then they cannot possibly be finally lost. How safe and secure the Lord's dear children are! The storms of persecution may rage; sorrow may sweep down over the soul like billows; temptations may assail them on every hand; poverty and distress may be their portion here in this world of sadness and sin; all the powers of darkness and the demons of the under world may be arrayed against them; but they are still safe and secure, for they are "preserved in Jesus Christ." He is the anointed Saviour. He was anointed to save them, and He saves them. The angel of His presence saves them. Lift up your heads; take comfort in the sweet assurance that your troubles and sorrows will soon end, and eternal joys will soon be yours. We will try to write some more on this question some time-perhaps next week. C. H. C.

Marrying After Divorce In Case Of Adultery

---June 5, 1930

John Owen was born in 1616, and died August 24, 1683. He was an able and eminent minister, and wrote many different works. We copy the following article from "The Works of John Owen," Volume 16, page 254, under the above heading. It is just what the Primitive Baptists have always believed on this question. C. H. C.
THE ARTICLE

It is confessed by all that adultery is a just and sufficient cause of a divorce betwixt married persons. This divorce, say some, consists in a dissolution "vinculi matrimonialis," (of the bonds of matrimony) and so removes the marriage relation as that the innocent person divorcing or procuring the divorce is at liberty to marry again. Others say it is only a separation "a mensa et thoro," (separation from bed and board-not free to marry another) and that on this account it doth not nor ought to dissolve the marriage relation. I am of the judgment of the former; for, First, This divorce "a mensa et thoro," (separation from bed and board) only is no true divorce, but a mere fiction of a divorce, of no use in this case, nor lawful to be made use of, neither by the law of nature nor the law of God; for-

1. It is, as stated, but a late invention, of no use in the world, nor known in more ancient times: for those of the Roman church who assert it do grant that divorces by the law of nature were "a vinculo," (absolute divorce) and that so they were also under the Old Testament; and this Action they would impose on the grace and state of the gospel, which yet makes indeed no alteration in moral relations and duties, but only directs their performance.
2. It is deduced from a fiction,-namely, that marriage among Christians is a sacrament of that signification as renders it indissoluble; and therefore they would have it to take place only amongst believers, the rest of mankind being left to their natural right and privilege. But this is a fiction, and as such in sundry cases they make use of it. Secondly, A divorce perpetual "a mensa et thoro" (separation from bed and board) only is no way useful to mankind, but hurtful and noxious; for,-
 1. It would constitute a new condition or state of life, wherein it is not possible that a man should either have a wife, or not have a wife lawfully, in one of which

estates yet really every man capable of the state of wedlock is and must be, whether he will or no; for a man may, as things may be circumstantiated, be absolutely bound in conscience not to receive her again who was justly repudiated for adultery, nor can he take another on this divorce. But into this estate God calls no man.

2. It may, and probably will, cast a man under a necessity of sinning: for suppose he hath not the gift of continency, it is the express will of God that he should marry for his relief; yet on this supposition, he sins if he does so, and in that he sins if he doeth not so. Thirdly, It is unlawful; for if the bond of marriage abide, the relation still continues. This relation is the foundation of all mutual duties; and whilst all that continues, none can dispense with or prohibit from the performance of those duties. If a woman do continue in the relation of a wife to a man, she may claim the duties of marriage from him. Separation there may be by consent for a season, or upon other occasions, that may hinder the actual discharge of conjugal duties; but to make an obligation unto such duties void, whilst the relation doth continue, is against the law of nature and the law of God. This divorce, therefore, supposing the relation of man and wife between any, and no mutual duty thence to arise, is unlawful. Fourthly, The light of nature never directed to this kind of divorce. Marriage is an ordinance of the law of nature; but in the light and reason thereof there is no intimation of any such practice. It is still directed that they who might justly put away their wives might marry others. Hence some, as the ancient Grecians, and the Romans afterward, allowed the husband to kill the adulteress. This among the Romans was changed "lege Julia," (in law of Julian) but the offense *was* still made capital. In the room hereof, afterward, divorce took place purposely to give the innocent person liberty of marriage. So that this kind of divorce is but a fiction. The first opinion, therefore, is according to truth; for, First, That which dissolves the form of marriage and destroys all the forms of marriage doth dissolve the bond of marriage; for take away the form and end of any moral relation, and the relation itself ceaseth. But this is done by adultery, and a divorce ensuing thereon. For the form of marriage consisteth in this, that two become "one flesh," (**Genesis 2:24**); (**Matthew 19:6**),-but this is dissolved by adultery; for the adulteress becometh one flesh with the adulterer, (**I Corinthians 6:16**), and no longer one flesh in individual society with her husband, and so it absolutely breaks the bond or covenant of marriage. And how can men contend that is a bond which is absolutely broken, or fancy a "vinculum" (bond) that doth not bind? and that it absolutely destroys all the forms of marriage will be granted. It therefore dissolves the bond of marriage itself. Secondly, If the innocent party upon a divorce be not set at liberty, then,-
 1. He is deprived of his right by the sin of another; which is against the law of nature;-and so every wicked woman hath it in her power to deprive her husband of his natural right.
 2. The divorce in case of adultery, pointed by our Saviour to the innocent person to make use of, is, as all confess, for his liberty, advantage, and relief. But on supposition that he may not marry, it would prove a snare and a yoke unto him; for if hereon he hath not the gift of continency, he is exposed to sin and judgment. Thirdly, Our blessed Saviour gives express direction in the case, (**Matthew 19:9**) "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." Hence it is evident, and is the plain sense of the words, that he who putteth away his wife for fornication and marrieth another doth not commit adultery. Therefore the bond of marriage in that case is dissolved, and the person that put away his wife is at

liberty to marry. While He denies putting away and marrying again for every cause, the exception of fornication allows both putting away and marrying again in that case; for an exception always affirms the contrary unto what is denied in the rule whereunto it is an exception, or denies what is affirmed in it in the case comprised in the exception; for every exception is a particular proposition contradictory to the general rule, so that when the one is affirmative, the other is negative, and on the contrary. The rule here in general is affirmative: He that putteth away his wife and marries another committeth adultery. The exception is negative: But he that putteth away his wife for fornication and marrieth another doth not commit adultery. Or they may be otherwise conceived, so that the general rule shall be negative, and the exception affirmative: It is not lawful to put away a wife and marry another; it is adultery. Then the exception is: It is lawful for a man to put away his wife for fornication, and marry another. And this is the nature of all such exceptions, as I could manifest in instances of all sorts.

It is to no purpose to except that the other evangelists **{((0:11) (Mark 10:11-12); (Luke 16:18)}** do not express the exception insisted on; for,-

1. It is twice used by Matthew, chap. x. 32 and chap. xix. 9, (((0:32) (Matthew 10:32); (19:9)) and therefore was assuredly used by our Saviour.
2. It is a rule owned by all, that where the same thing is reported by several evangelists, the briefer, short, more imperfect expressions, are to be measured and interpreted by the fuller and larger. And every general rule in any place is to be limited by an exception annexed unto it in any one place whatever; and there is scarce any general rule admitteth of an exception. It is more vain to answer that our Saviour speaketh with respect unto the Jews only, and what was not allowed among them; for,-
 1. In this answer He reduces things to the law of creation and their primitive institution. He declares what was the law of marriage and the nature of that relation antecedent to the law and institution of Moses; and so, reducing things to the law of nature, gives a rule directive to all mankind in this matter.
 2. The Pharisees inquired of our Saviour about such a divorce as was absolute, and gave liberty of marriage after it; for they never heard of any other. The pretended separation "a mensa et thoro" only was never heard of in the Old Testament. Now, if our Saviour doth not answer concerning the same divorce about which they inquired, but another which they knew nothing of, He doth not answer them, but delude them;-they ask after one thing, and He answers another in nothing to their purpose. But this is not to be admitted; it were blasphemy to imagine it. Wherefore, denying the causes of divorce which they allowed, and asserting fornication to be a just cause thereof, He allows, in that case, of that divorce which they inquired about, which was absolute and from the bond of marriage.

Falling From Grace Article No. 8

---June 12,1930

We promised again last week that we would write some more on this subject, perhaps this week. So we will try to write a few lines more. This week we will begin by reading **(Hebrews 6:13-20)**: For when God made promise to Abraham, because He could swear by no greater, He sware by Himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And so, after he had

patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec. In this promise to Abraham, which Paul here referred to, God said, "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." - (Genesis 22:18). And "in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." This is a promise which the Lord confirmed by an oath. As He could swear by no greater, He swore by Himself that He would fulfill the promise. This promise embraces and includes every heir of promise. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." -(Galatians 3:29). If you are a child of God, "If ye be Christ's," then you are one of the promised children, embraced in the promise God made to Abraham. Men always swear by the greater. A man placed on the witness stand is requested to hold up his hand and the person authorized to administer the oath will say, "Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in this case, so help you God?" He does not say, "So help you, yourself." But "So help you God." Thus the man swears by the greater. If a person in whom you have confidence-you do not believe he would tell a lie, much less swear a lie-is put on the witness stand, and he testifies under oath that a certain thing is a certain way, you would believe it was that way. That would settle the matter with you. That would be an end of all strife with you. You would be confident the matter was just as the witness stated. That witness might be one who would not lie, but no man is a witness that cannot lie. In this case brought to our attention in our text the one making the promise and who confirmed it by an oath is one who cannot lie-much less swear a lie. Men can, and do, swear by one greater than themselves. But God could not swear by one greater than Himself. Here are two things God cannot do-He cannot lie, and He cannot swear by one greater than Himself. These are the two immutable things. These two things have stood through all the past ages, and will stand to all eternity. They are always the same. As God could not swear by one greater than Himself, because He is the greatest of all beings, then He swears by Himself. What for? That the heirs of promise, His children, might have strong consolation. That they may have double assurance of the certainty of the eternal joys and happiness of every little child of God. There could not possibly be any consolation in the thought that one of the Lord's children may fall away so as to be finally lost-that one of them might sink down into eternal night, or everlasting perdition. Such a thought would be anything else but consoling. Suppose you could have the certain and sure knowledge that you are a child of God today, but also be assured that you may at last sink down in eternal ruin and despair- could that possibly be any consolation to you? Would it not rather be a terror and a matter of distress and dread to you? But it is not the truth. God has sworn by Himself that He will remember every heir of promise. He has given His oath that you may have strong consolation. Christ is formed in His children the hope of glory. The anointed Saviour is the only hope of heaven and immortal glory for His little children. The hope of the Christian, the child of God, "entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus." Jesus is their hope, and that hope is entered within the veil. This hope is an anchor of the soul. This anchor is entered upward, "into that within the veil." This anchor is both sure and steadfast. The vessels that sail over the seas, on the mighty deep, all have anchors. Those anchors enter downward; but this one

is entered upward. In time of storm those anchors are cast and go down deep into the sea. As long as the anchor remains steadfast, or sure, the vessel is secure and all the passengers on board the vessel are safe. If the anchor is sure and steadfast it will not give way. Sometimes those anchors give way. When they do give way, it only proves that they were not sure and steadfast. But this anchor is both sure and steadfast. The word sure means "admitting of no doubt, condition, qualification, or the like; indubitable; positive; - said of things; as, sure evidence; a sure success. Entirely trustworthy or dependable; certain not to fail or disappoint expectation." - Webster. This blessed hope is entirely trustworthy; it is dependable. What are you hoping for, dear child of God? Are you not hoping for a better home, a better place, beyond this life, beyond death, beyond the grave? Yes; the hope of the poor little child of God reaches out beyond death and beyond the grave. He is looking beyond these to a better home, a better country-hoping for that. Blessed hope! This hope is entirely trustworthy; it is entirely dependable. It is certain not to fail or disappoint of expectation. There is no doubt about that. If a thing is sure it admits of no doubt; and the apostle says this hope is an anchor that is sure. The safety of the little vessel that is now sailing on the boisterous and stormy sea of life admits of no doubt. It is true that the Lord's dear children have sorrows, trials, troubles, distresses, disappointments, bereavements, sore temptations, and dire conflicts all along the rough and rugged journey. The sea of their lifetime and their journey here below is rough and toilsome. Sorrows sometimes sweep down over the soul like billows. The winds of adversity blow hard and fast; the lightnings of persecution flash vividly; the thunders peal loudly, and sometimes in quick succession. Sometimes the waves of trouble roll so high, and the clouds of sorrows and distresses are so dark and threatening, that the poor little trembling child almost gives up in utter despair. How poor and helpless he sometimes feels! But the anchor is sure and steadfast. The little vessel sailing on this boisterous sea is safe and secure. The anchor is certain not to fail, and as the anchor is certain not to fail, then the little child of God cannot be lost. Blessed hope! Blessed anchor! Blessed assurance! What a strong consolation amidst all the storms and trials of this life! The lightnings of persecution may flash; the waves of trouble and distress may roll high, the clouds may be black, with all their threatenings; Satan, with all his emissaries, may gather together to battle against one of the Lord's dear little ones, but the eternal God has given them an anchor that remains sure and steadfast. He has pledged under an oath, having sworn by Himself, to engage all His omnipotent powers for their eternal security and safety. They are kept by His power unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time. We feel like much more could be said along this same line, but we must stop for this time. May the Lord bless these thoughts to your comfort, and may they bring strong consolation to your poor heart, is our humble prayer. We have received many letters from the Lord's little children telling us they have enjoyed these articles which we have been writing on this subject. Those letters have been much comfort and consolation and encouragement to us, along with the thoughts we have been giving you. Remember us in your prayers. If we still feel impressed that way we will try to write more on this question. C. H. C.

Another Editor

---June 12, 1930

In another column in this paper will be found an article from Elder S. N. Redford, of Valley Springs, Texas, giving his consent for his name to be placed on our editorial staff. We are glad to have Brother Redford associated with us again. Many of our readers will remember that some years ago his name was on the staff, and that he

was editor of the Southwestern Department. We have always held Brother Redford in the very highest esteem, and we have loved him dearly all the while as a dear brother in the Lord and as a servant of the Master—even during the divided condition of our people in Texas. We are glad that we can be again associated with this dear brother, as well as with many others. How much better it would be if all our people were together, as they once were, and all walking together to the house of the Lord. May the Lord help us to not only pray for the peace of Jerusalem, but help us to labor to that end; help us to “strive for the things that make for peace.” It is so much better for us to be striving to build up, rather than to tear down and to destroy. Brother Redford will write for the paper, and will be glad to take subscriptions. Again we say that we are glad to have him with us. May the good Lord bless his labors to the good of our readers and to the good of His cause, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Falling From Grace Article No. 9

---June 19, 1930

According to our promise we will try to write a few more lines on this subject—the final preservation of the saints, or the possibility of a child of God being finally lost. This time we want to begin with the language of Paul, the inspired apostle to the Gentiles, as recorded in **(Romans 8:28-34)**, which reads as follows: And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. In this text the apostle declares that “all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose.” This text has often been quoted to prove that all things in existence, and all things that ever transpire, work together for good to them that love God, etc. It is very evident that the apostle means no such thing by this expression, for the simple reason that he tells us in **(Galatians 5:17)** of two things that do not work together. In that place he tells us “For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.” Here are two things that work against each other. They work in opposition to each other. They are contrary to each other. Therefore, they are not working together, but contrary to each other. This is a condition that exists in the life of every child of grace, so that they cannot do the things they would. What would they do? They would live free from sin and above and without sin. This is the great longing and desire of every child of grace; but they cannot do that, for the simple reason that they still possess the same old sinful nature which they always had. They still have the same fleshly nature to contend with, and on account of still having the same old sinful and fleshly nature, which is contrary to the Spirit, they cannot do the things that they would. They will have this warfare as long as they live in this world. And this warfare within is an unmistakable proof and evidence of the fact that they are in possession of the

Spirit, and proves that they are the children of God. It is also true that God and Satan are not working together. Is it true that God and the devil have formed a partnership business and are working together for the accomplishment of one certain end? Is the devil working together with God, and in harmony with Him, for the accomplishment of the eternal happiness and glory of the Lord's children? They must be thus working together, if the expression "all things work together" means all things in existence work together. Nobody but Absoluters believe that expression means that; and, if their doctrine be true, they may ascribe as much glory and honor for their salvation to the devil as to the Father or to Jesus Christ; for, according to their doctrine, the Father, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit and the devil are all working together for their salvation and eternal deliverance-for their eternal deliverance from what? According to their doctrine they are all working together for their final deliverance from the predestination of God; for they say that God predestinated all their sins. Every child of grace knows, when he rightly considers, that this doctrine is not the truth. If the term "all things" always means everything in existence, when it is used in the Bible, then there is nothing under the sun which does not belong to every child of God in the universe, for the apostle says in **(I Corinthians 3:21-23)** "Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are your's; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are your's; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." If one of the Lord's children should see a stray horse going around he might take the horse up and lay claim to him under the plea that "all things are yours," according to the Absoluters. But we did not begin to write this article to refute the doctrine of the Absoluters. We have digressed, though what we have said is true. The "all things" the apostle had under consideration are described and mentioned in the text. In (Romans 8:31) he says, "What shall we then say to these things?" What things? These "all things" which are working together for their good. What all things are working together for their good, then? God the Father is for them in foreknowledge and predestination; God the Son is for them in atonement and justification; God the Holy Spirit is for them in calling them out of nature's night and darkness into the glorious light and liberty of the children of God. The final end and design to be accomplished by the work of these three divine persons in the Trinity is the glorification of every heir of promise. God the Father knew them in some special sense in which He did not know others. "And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." - (Matthew 7:23). Is there no sense at all in which He knew them? Certainly, He knew them as wicked men, sinful beings; but He did not know them as He knew others. There is a special sense in which He knew others that He did not know these. So, there is a special sense in which He knew this people- the heirs of promise. They were known as His covenant people before the world was; for the covenant was an everlasting covenant. See **(Hebrews 13:20-21)**. The Father not only knew them in the covenant, but He predestinated that they should be conformed to the image of His Son. This is the eternal purpose of the Father. He has purposed it, and He will also bring it to pass. Thus it is clear that God the Father is for them in foreknowledge and predestination. Then God the Holy Spirit is for them in calling. The Spirit calls all that the Father knew in the covenant and predestinated should be conformed to the image of His Son. This is the direct and immediate work of the Spirit, and it is accomplished without any human agency or works of men. Thus, the Father and the Spirit are working together for the final salvation and deliverance of every child of grace. The Spirit not only calls them out of nature's night and darkness, but also preserves and keeps them. God the Son is for them in making atonement, or in justification. The Son works with the Father and the Spirit. They are working together-not at variance. The Son died for all that

the Father predestinated should be conformed to His image-all that the Father gave Him for an inheritance. Thus, the three are working together, and all that these three do works together for one end, which is the glorification in heaven of all those who are called according to God's purpose. They are called by the Holy Spirit according to the purpose of the Father. They will finally be glorified in heaven, for the apostle emphatically says, "and whom He justified, them He also glorified." God's children are all justified. They are "justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." -(Romans 3:24). "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?" This is a stronger way of saying that no one can successfully be against them. If no one can be against them, successfully, then they must all necessarily be finally glorified with Jesus in the heavenly world. Since God is for them, then all the powers of darkness combined cannot drag one of them down to eternal night. If the Father spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for them, will He not also freely give them all things necessary to their final happiness and glorification in heaven? Surely, since the Father gave His darling Son, the darling Son of His bosom, to suffer and die for them, He will give all things else necessary to land them safely on the shores of eternal bliss and glory. He is going to see to it that not one of them is lost. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" His elect are those the Father knew in the covenant and predestinated should be conformed to the image of His Son. Since all their sins are charged to the Son, who shall lay anything to their charge? "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." -((3:6) (Isaiah 53:6). Since the Lord has laid all their iniquity on His Son, now who shall lay anything to their charge? Since nothing can be laid to their charge, how can one of them sink down to eternal night? If one of them should be cast down in everlasting darkness and ruin, they would go there without sin or iniquity, and without anything being laid to their charge. God has justified them. Though they were, in nature, ungodly, yet God justifieth the ungodly.-(Romans 4:5). Since they are justified by the Lord Himself, then no one can condemn. The law has been satisfied in the person of Christ for them, and therefore the law cannot condemn one of them. And Jesus is making intercession for them; He is praying for them; and the Father always hears and answers the prayer of His beloved Son. They will all finally be with Him in glory, for Jesus has prayed, "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." -(John 17:24). They will all finally be there. We are hoping for that final deliverance. May the Lord bless these precious truths to the comfort of our readers. We may write a little more on this subject next week. C. H. C.

Falling From Grace Article No. 10

---June 26, 1930

According to promise last week, we will try to write a few more lines this week on the question as to whether it is possible for a child of God to so fall away as to be finally lost. A short time ago a fellow in Texas asked for some sample copies of The Primitive Baptist. A copy of a few issues were sent to him containing our articles on this question. It seems that the article "riled" him a little, and he wrote quite a lengthy letter, in which he displayed some temper. He said that we do not have sense enough to pound sawdust into a rat hole. Perhaps not. But gentlemen do not write that way very much. Anyhow, we would rather be a fool for Christ's sake, and believe what the Lord said, than to be a wise man and be a Campbellite. We do not know what this fellow is, but he writes like a Campbellite. If he is not one, then we

would apologize to the Campbellites. Judging from the letter the poor fellow needs regeneration. This is all the attention we shall give him, and we say this only to let him know that we received his blatant effusion. We are not writing these articles for the purpose of debating, but for the comfort and consolation of the Lord's little children, to give them assurance from God's blessed word of their security, and of the certainty of their final deliverance from sin and all its dire effects and of their final happiness and glorification with the God of their salvation in the heavenly world. This week we will begin our article by reading **(Romans 8:35-39)**: Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Could language be any stronger than this? If none of these things, nor anything else, shall be able to separate one of God's little ones from His love, then how can one of them be separated from that love? A mother who loves her child would not allow her child to suffer untold tortures and agonies if she could possibly prevent it. The loving mother would unhesitatingly go into the flames and snatch her child from the flames. "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me." -Isa. xlix. 15,16. If the mother would unhesitatingly go through fire to snatch her child from the flames, would not the Lord Himself go into the very flames of hell to take one of His children away from that place, if one should get there, seeing that He loves His children with a greater and stronger love than the love of a tender mother? Could a loving mother be satisfied while seeing her child-the child she bare-suffering agonies and torment? Every loving mother knows that she could not be satisfied while beholding such a sight. "He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied." -(3:11) (Isaiah 53:11). If the mother could not be satisfied to see her child suffering torments, how much more the Lord of glory would not be satisfied to see one of His children, for whom He suffered, bled and died, suffering in eternal torment; for His love is greater than a mother's love. Let us state the matter this way:

1. "He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied."
2. But He could not be satisfied and see one of the objects of His love for whom He died suffering the torments of hell.
3. Therefore, not one of the objects of His love, not one for whom He suffered, not one of His children, can ever possibly sink down in eternal torment-not one of them can ever go to an eternal hell. Suppose we should admit that none of the things enumerated in the text can separate one of the Lord's children from His love, but make the statement, or claim, that they can go away from Him and from His love, and thus sink down into eternal night. If one of them should thus go away from the Lord, would it not be because of the influence of Satan that they thus go away? And if Satan can thus influence one of God's children to go away from Him, could he not influence others to do the same, if he wanted to? God loves them, and does not want them to thus go away; but Satan influences one to do so, in spite of the Lord. Then, why could he not influence all the others to thus go away from the Lord, if he wanted to do so? It certainly follows that if

Satan could thus influence one of the Lord's children to so depart from the Lord as to be eternally lost, he could so influence every one of them thus to do, if he wanted to. Then, if there should be one that he does not influence to thus depart from the Lord, would it not necessarily be because Satan did not want him? How many, then, would ever be saved in heaven? Would it be any more than just those the devil did not want and would not have? Certainly not. None would ever be saved in heaven, according to that position, only those the devil would not have. We are glad we do not believe such a doctrine, and we are glad the Bible does not teach such. "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" This question is asked in such a form as to admit of only one answer, and that is, No one-none. A proposition stated in the form of such a question is the very strongest way of stating the proposition. Hence, the inspired apostle has said, in the very strongest way of saying it, that none-no one-not one-is able to separate one of the Lord's little children, one of those who have been called out of nature's night and darkness by the Holy Spirit, one who has been born from above, one who has been brought into divine relationship with the Lord- no one is able to separate one of them from the love of Christ; no one is able to separate one of them from the love of God; which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. In our text the apostle mentions tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, and sword. Can Satan do more than to bring these things upon the Lord's dear children? Think of the tribulations of the servant Job; the Hebrew children cast into the fiery furnace; Daniel cast into the den of lions; Joseph tempted by the wife of the king and then cast into prison; think of the saints who passed through the trials mentioned by this great apostle in **(Hebrews 11:32-38)**. Let us read it: And what shall I more say? for the time would fail me to tell of Gedeon and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae; of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets: who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: and others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth. "In all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us." We remember the day the World War closed. The news was flashed over every country in the world on that day that the armistice was signed, and the firing ceased, and the war ended. There were more glad hearts that day, doubtless, than on any day since the world was made, and perhaps more than will ever be again. Our country and her allies were conquerors. But "in all these things we are MORE THAN CONQUERORS through Him that loved us." Can you imagine how they can be more than conquerors if one of them may sink down into eternal night? Dear child, some-yea, even many-of these trials may be yours to endure and to pass through while you are here in this world of sin, trouble, sorrow, distress, sickness, pain and death-but you are at last more than conquerors through Jesus your blessed and adorable Saviour. "For I am persuaded." The inspired apostle was fully persuaded of this one fact which he here states. He was confident of this. He was sure of this-and sure of it by divine inspiration. Sure of what? "That neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to

separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Dear child, whether you live or die, you shall not be separated from the Lord's glorious presence in eternity. You can't ascend so high, or descend so low, as to be separated from Him. If it were possible for you to sink below the depths of the bottomless pits of hell, you cannot sink so low as to be separated from Him. Wherever you may be, the Lord is there; and "in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." -(Psalms 16:11). Where the Lord is that is heaven for the Lord's little children. If you love the Lord, it is because God loved you first. "We love Him, because He first loved us." - **(I John 4:19)** "Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love: therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee." - **(Jeremiah 31:3)**. Since God's love is everlasting, and He loved you first, then He always has loved you and always will love you; and nothing is able to separate you from Him and from His love. Just as sure as you love the Lord, just as sure, also, as God lives and reigns in glory, just that sure will you, some sweet day, live with Him in the heavenly world-in eternal glory. May that be your happy lot, and may these precious truths comfort your hearts in all your sad distresses here, is our humble prayer. We feel like we could shed tears of joy with you in the sweet assurance of these blessed truths. We do not know that we shall share the glories of heaven with you, but it is our blessed and sweet hope that we shall. Please remember us in your prayers. We may not write any more on this question, as we are just now feeling a desire to take up another line; but we will try to be governed by the way we feel impressed when the time comes to write again. C. H. C.

Eternal Life Now

---July 3, 1930

We have been asked whether people receive eternal life while here in this world, or do some just have a promise of it now and receive it in the world to come. Some who have argued, and who take the position, that people do not receive eternal life while in this world have argued that the sinner must comply with certain terms and conditions in order to have the promise of eternal life, and that he must then live in obedience to the commands laid down in the New Testament in order to receive that life in the world to come. In **(John 5:24)** we read, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." In this text the Saviour emphatically says those who hear His word and believe on the Father have everlasting life. If they do not have everlasting life while here in this world the Saviour did not tell the truth about it. Then He says such a one "is passed from death unto life." The original language in our modern English means "have passed out of death into life." It is in the past tense-something that has already been accomplished. In **(I John 5:13)** we read, "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." Here the inspired apostle plainly says he has written that "ye may know that ye have eternal life." Was he trying to get them to know that a thing was true which he knew was not true? Certainly, if people do not receive eternal life while here in this world he knew it. If he knew that to be true, and yet was writing that they might know they have eternal life now, was he not a false teacher? In verse 11 he says, "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son." Verse 12 says, "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." If a man does not have eternal life while he is here in this world, then no

man has the Son while here in this world. But some do have the Son, and those who have the Son have life. If a man does not believe that people receive eternal life while here in this world he does not believe the Bible. Many more places could be cited, but these are sufficient. C. H. C.

Acts 2; 28:31

---July 10, 1930

We have been requested to give our views through the paper of **((38) (Acts 2:38)**, especially the latter part of the verse, "And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." The verse reads as follows: Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. This language was addressed to the people present who had heard the preaching of the apostle, and who "were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" These were the same people who were "amazed and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?" -((7) (Acts 2:7-8). "Others mocking said, These men are full of new wine." -((3) (Acts 2:13). This shows that there were two classes of hearers present that day. (Acts 2:5) says that "There were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven." The word devout in this text is the same word translated godly in **(II Peter 2:9)**, which reads, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." So these people were devout, pious, godly persons. These were the people who were amazed and who were pricked in their hearts. The effect produced by being cut in the heart and being cut to the heart is quite different. The people who stoned Stephen to death were cut to the heart, but not in the heart, by his preaching, and it made them mad, and they stoned him to death. But these people were cut in the heart, and cried out, "What shall we do?" "Then Peter said unto them, Repent." To repent is to turn from the former course of life, to turn from the former way of living, to turn from their former conduct. They were not to repent in order to regeneration, for the simple fact that they were already godly in heart. They had a heart that could be pierced by the words of the apostles; hence they already had "a heart of flesh." The Lord had already performed His promise, "And I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh." -((26) (Ezekiel 36:26). This being true, they were already children of God, but had been walking the wrong way. They are here commanded, or instructed, to turn from that wrong way in which they had been going, and to walk in obedience to the commands of the Master. "And be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." A great many people claim that the apostle meant for them to be baptized for the remission of sins. If this be the meaning of the apostle, then the expression "for the remission of sins" must refer to and modify the word baptized. This cannot be correct, for the simple reason that the modifying word or clause must be placed as near as possible to the word or clause modified. This being true, it follows that if the expression "for the remission of sins" modifies or refers to baptized, then that expression would necessarily immediately follow the word baptized. The sentence would have to read this way: "Repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." But it does not read that way, for the simple reason that it is not that way. It is true that the word Christ is capitalized in our translations, as though it is a proper name, but it is not a noun-that is, the Greek word is not a noun. 'The

Greek word, with the letters simply changed into English letters, is Christou. It means anointed. Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon, the highest and best known authority on the Greek language, says it is a verbal adjective. If the word is translated into English it would be anointed, or, the anointed. A verbal adjective is a word which denotes action, or being acted upon, and is also descriptive. Jesus was acted upon, by the Father, in that He was anointed with the Holy Spirit above measure. The Holy Spirit was poured out upon Him without measure. So He is described as the anointed one. Jesus was His name; see **(Matthew 1:21)**. Jesus means Saviour. He was the anointed Saviour. He was anointed to save. "He shall save His people from their sins." -(Matthew 1:21). In **(Matthew 26:28)** we have this language: "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Literally in our present day English the text would read, "For this is my blood, that of the new covenant, which for many is poured out for remission of sins." The words here translated "for remission of sins" are precisely the same words translated "for remission of sins" in **((38) (Acts 2:38))**. In this text we have the plain and positive statement by the Saviour that His blood is poured out for remission of sins. Was the pouring out of His blood sufficient to remit sins? If so, then water baptism is not necessary in order to the remission of sins. As the expression, "for the remission of sins," is precisely the same in the original, and the pouring out of the blood of Jesus is sufficient for the remission of sins, then **((38) (Acts 2:38))** does not teach that baptism is in order to the remission of sins. The phrase "for remission of sins," in **((38) (Acts 2:38))**, is an adverbial phrase, and modifies anointed. It tells for what purpose Jesus was anointed. He was anointed to remit sins, or for remission of sins; and the pouring out of His blood was sufficient for that. He was anointed to put away sins by the sacrifice of Himself; "when He had by Himself purged our sins." -(Hebrews 1:3). The language, then, simply means, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus who was anointed to remit your sins." He was anointed for the express purpose of remitting your sins, and you should be baptized in His name. "And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This expression cannot mean here that they shall receive the Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit, as a gift in the sense of being born again, for the simple reason these people were already children of God; they had already been born of God. Then, they "shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" in the sense of the comforting and assuring influence of the same. They will have the witness of the Spirit that they are rendering acceptable service to the Lord, and shall have His approving smiles. They shall enjoy the manifest presence of the Spirit, and be enabled to rejoice in the same. C. H. C.

Rules of Decorum

---July 10, 1930

We received a letter from a sister a few days ago requesting us to print the rules of decorum of the church for her, as she wanted to read them. She said she had been a member of the dear old church nearly thirty-three years, and has never heard the rules read in all her life. Evidently the good sister has either missed being at some of her conference meetings, or else the rules are never read in the church. How can the members ever know what the rules are if the rules are never read in conference? The rules should be read in conference occasionally, not only that the members may know what they are, but so that the friends may also know. When a person unites with the church, generally speaking, that person should have some little idea as to what the rules are. He should have some idea of the rules the members agree to be governed by, for he thereby agrees, in uniting with the

church, that he will be governed by their rules. The rules of decorum of the different churches are practically alike in sentiment, but they are not all worded alike. We cannot print the rules for the sister that her church has, for we do not possess a copy of them. They may not be worded just like the rules of our church here in Thornton. We have no idea that they are worded just alike. For the benefit of any of our readers who may be interested we will try soon to publish in The Primitive Baptist a copy of the rules of decorum which we have in our little church here at Thornton. C. H. C.

Will Not Our People Consider?

---July 17, 1930

In writing for and editing a religious paper it is much pleasanter for one to pursue the even tenor of his way, always writing about those things which please and comfort and which will have the approval of all God's people. When our religious editors depart from this course and take sharp issue with brethren, it is not to their liking, I am sure, but because they feel that in no other way can they be true to the cause they represent. There may be exceptions to this but they are rare. I recently read an article in one of our exchanges which has deeply wounded my feelings and broken my spirit. I have tried to cast it aside and forget it, but I cannot until I have called my brethren's attention to it. This time I have no word of criticism for the brother who sent in the article nor the editor who published it, but I do want to voice my condemnation of those good brethren among us who were responsible for it. It seems that some of our brethren just can't get a vision of our denomination beyond their own little section. They seem to have little consideration for the feelings of others, and the idea that their church can do as she pleases and none have the right to complain has been played to the limit. They will labor for peace and union in the school, in the town, or in the community, but when it comes to our denomination they are unmerciful toward others and seem to prefer their own foolish whims and unnecessary childish toys than the love and fellowship of their brethren. The Banner Herald, under its present management, whether for weal or woe to itself, stands firmly committed against any and all church auxiliaries. She is determinedly opposed to any and all "Aid Societies" as adjuncts of the church. Christ gave us but one organization-the church-and with that we are satisfied. If we may add one, we may add others, and soon the church will be lost sight of and cannot be distinguished from the organizations of the world. It is difficult for us to find words to express our condemnation of such things among Primitive Baptists; suffice it to say, we have no fellowship for them. In this we believe we voice the sentiments of a very large per cent of our people. The article mentioned above carried a clipping from a Georgia secular paper which reads as follows: The Ladies Aid Society of the Primitive Baptist Church held a most enjoyable and profitable meeting Monday afternoon from 3 to 5 o'clock at the home of Mrs.-----. A special Christmas program had been arranged by Mrs.-----, who had charge of the meeting. She read the Scripture lesson, the eighth Psalm, and the Lord's prayer was repeated in concert. Song, "Stars of December;" reading, "Christmas Thoughts," by-----. The Christmas lesson was then read by Mrs.----- and comment made by different ladies. Reading, "The Christ Child," by-----. A social hour was enjoyed and Mrs.-----served a lovely salad course, assisted by Mrs.-----. The guests present at the meeting were * * * * To me, this seems unpardonable. These good women knew how many of their brethren feel about such things, but they ignored our feelings and our advice and had their way. This is a good church and

there are no better ladies than those mentioned in this notice. The writer feels that they are much better than himself. But for them, by such foolish and unnecessary course, to destroy the labors of months of many of us for peace and union, and at a time when things looked so promising, I repeat, is almost unpardonable. It cuts deep, and we are made to wonder whether or not some are determined to bring us to the parting of the way. Now, there was nothing wrong in these sisters meeting at their sister's home as they did. That is to be commended. There was nothing wrong in serving a salad course, or any other course, if she chose to do so. There was nothing wrong in reading the Bible and commenting on it. There was nothing wrong in any of this. But when they style themselves as an "Aid Society of the Primitive Baptist Church" they go beyond their limit and we feel we have a right to complain. By what authority do they do this? Has the church in conference authorized this society? Has she recognized it as her auxiliary? Does she exercise authority over it and determine the work it is to perform and the manner in which it is to be done? Does this society report to the church in conference? Or does it consider itself independent of the church? Suppose a few of us at Statesboro were to decide to go into the fire insurance business and we advertise our organization as the "Fire Insurance Company of Statesboro Primitive Baptist Church." The public would at once understand that this company was organized by, and was acting under, the authority of the Statesboro Church. And doubtless the church would at once complain and compel us to drop her name in connection with the organization and its work. The same is true of Aid Societies of Primitive Baptist Churches. There are no such things. No church among us has sponsored one. No church has authorized such organization. A few good sisters have met together for social and religious intercourse, and feeling that they wanted to be "up to date" and get themselves before the public as truly "progressive" and having pulled out of the old ruts, someone foolishly gave them the name of the Aid Society of the Primitive Baptist Church. Doubtless it was unthoughted upon their part, but they usurped authority, and their action was in contempt of the church, which alone has all authority in all matters affecting her body. It is a principle in law that an organization is bound by the acts of its agent, and if this aid society is a creature of the church the church is bound by its acts-its acts become hers. We are not complaining because our sisters meet and spend certain hours together. It would be better if they did this more. And if they want to serve refreshments when they are together that's their business, not mine. But we do insist that they shall not, however pure their motives, publish to the world that our CHURCH has "Aid Societies," and thus wound the feelings of good brethren and hinder our labors for the union of our distressed people. While many of us are laboring to unite our broken ranks and bring peace to our distressed people, if others will not feel disposed to help in this great work, may we not at least expect of them that they will not "rock the boat." Brethren, throw all this worldly foolishness to the winds. There is nothing that will insure such joy, peace and prosperity as just being plain, humble, old-time Primitive Baptists. W. H. C. REMARKS The above article by Elder Wm. H. Crouse, editor of the Banner Herald, is copied from that paper of July 1, 1930. The article he refers to is an article by Elder J. S. Newman in The Primitive Baptist of June 5. We are glad to see this article from Elder Crouse, and we want our readers to see it and to know that at least some of those known as Progressives condemn such things as Ladies' Aid Societies. We most heartily approve of the sentiment the brother expressed in the following language: The Banner Herald, under its present management, whether for weal or woe to itself, stands firmly committed against any and all church auxiliaries. She is determinedly opposed to any and all "Aid Societies" as adjuncts of the church. Christ gave us but one organization-the church-and with that we are satisfied. If we may add one, we may add others, and

soon the church will be lost sight of and cannot be distinguished from the organizations of the world. It is difficult for us to find words to express our condemnation of such things among Primitive Baptists; suffice it to say, we have no fellowship for them. In this we believe we voice the sentiments of a very large per cent of our people. It is true that Christ gave us but one organization- the church- and it is also true that He put everything in the church that it is necessary to have in it. He was wise enough to know what would be needed in the church in every age; and nothing will ever be needed in the church which He did not place there. We may just as well add one thing in or to the church which Christ did not put there as to add another thing. Let us have nothing but the church, and nothing in the church but what Christ has placed in it. In this we will find just what Elder Crouse states in the following words: "There is nothing that will insure such joy, peace and prosperity as just being plain, humble, old-time Primitive Baptists." We are ready and would be glad to labor for union with all who are ready to be just plain, simple, humble, old-time Primitive Baptists. Let us just be that, and throw to the winds anything we may have that is contrary to that. C. H. C.

Questions On Order

---August 7, 1930

Elder C. H. Cayce: I want your opinion on the following questions: 1st. Would your association accept a member on confession of faith-one who had been excluded from a church in an association in line with your association-without first making peace in the church where he was excluded?

2. Would your association accept as a member on confession of faith one who had been re-baptized into an Absolute Predestinarian Church, who was a minister in that faith and order?

3. Who was a Socialist, and while in that party denounced all Baptists?

4. And was a long time doing evangelistic work for the Missionaries, and was a pastor for that people, dealing in Sabbath schools? Your opinion wanted as early as possible. Yours in hope, G. L. Peters. Lakeland, Fla. REMARKS The churches in our association would not receive a member on confession of faith who had been excluded from a sister church. We would consider it gross disorder to do so. This is really an answer to all the questions above. For a church to receive a member on confession of faith who had been excluded from a sister church while the church that excluded the person is still in existence is simply to deny that said church has the God given right to discipline her own members, and is to deny that she has the right to say who is not entitled to membership in her body. And if one church does not have that right, then no other church has the right. If one gospel church has that right, then every gospel church has the same right. This thing of receiving members on confession of faith who have been excluded from a sister church has caused more trouble and disruption in our ranks, perhaps, than any other one thing. If we ever expect our churches to dwell together in peace, we must quit that way of doing, and respect the right of the churches to discipline her members. C. H. C.

Remarks to Elder W. M. Brecheen

---August 7,1930

Dear brother, we do not know how to advise you. Advice is cheap, and it is often a very easy matter for people to say we should do this or do that; but to do the thing is another matter. We believe the Lord impresses His children, as well as His

ministers, with the duty He requires of them; and we believe it is their duty and best for them in the end to try to follow such impressions, and to discharge the duty He requires of them. We believe they enjoy an ease and peace of mind in the discharge of their duty. "If ye sow to the flesh, ye shall, of the flesh, reap corruption." "God is not mocked; whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." May the Lord bless you and your dear companion, and enable you to do your duty as He may require, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Trip to Alabama and Mississippi

---August 14, 1930

We left home Wednesday morning, July 16, at 3:20 for a trip to Alabama and Mississippi. We took our family with us, to visit wife's father and mother, B. B. Lawler and wife and the family, at Brownsboro, Ala. It is our desire to see that wife visits them at least once every year, for we know that she will not have them with her always. We took our time and stopped for a rest a couple of times on the trip, and arrived there Thursday morning at about 8 o'clock. Then we rested some Thursday and Friday. On Saturday and Sunday we went to Briar Fork, and were with the church there those two days. We were glad to meet Elders B. G. and G. A. Stephens and J. M. Warren there once more. Several brethren were there from Woodville, and a good crowd present both days. We enjoyed a good and pleasant meeting with those good people. They enjoy going to meeting, and rejoice to hear the truth preached. On Monday and Tuesday we had the pleasure of being with the good brethren at Union Church, near Woodville, once more. Elders H. P. Houk, John Page and Fred Stewart were present. They always have good congregations at this church, and they have good singing, too. Brother E. D. Thomas usually leads the singing, and he sure enjoys singing the good old songs of Zion, and many others enjoy helping, too. It makes the poor minister feel like they are interested in the service to go there and see how they enjoy the song service. They meet an hour or more before preaching time, and then put in the time singing. We enjoyed being with those good people one more time. That is the place where we had the debate a few years ago with I B. Bradley, who represented the Campbellites. It was a very pleasant discussion, and our people say the debate did our cause good in the community. On Wednesday we had the pleasure of being with the brethren at Flint River Church once more. This is the place where our wife united with the church. Her father (B. B. Lawler) is a deacon in this church, and his father was a deacon there when he passed away. This is the oldest Baptist Church in the state. It was organized October 2, 1808. The association met with that church in October, 1908, just one hundred years, to a day, from the time the church was constituted. We attended that meeting, at which time the hundredth anniversary of the church was celebrated. The Fullerites tried to take that celebration away from our folks - a thing they were no more entitled to than the Campbellites or Catholics. B. B. Lawler and his father have served that church in the deacon's office for more than fifty years. This church has never had anything to do with the modern missionary enterprises and inventions of men. They are not large in number as they have been in some of the days gone by, but they still have a few faithful ones who are content with the good old way our fathers trod, and in due time the Lord will reward their faithfulness. The way may look dark sometimes, but the Lord will not forsake His faithful ones. On Thursday we took leave of the dear family, Brother and Sister Lawler and family, and drove to Amory, Miss., near which place we thought the Tombigbee Association would meet the next day. We had got the idea some way that this association would meet at that time with the church at Hatley. We went to

the good home of Brother E. R. Pennington, arriving there late Thursday afternoon, July 24, and found then that we were mistaken, but that a union meeting was to be held Friday, Saturday and Sunday with Grub Springs Church, near Aberdeen. Friday morning we went to that union meeting. There we met Elders J. C. Huddleston, W. V McDonald and J. D. Holder. It was an enjoyable meeting. The preaching was all a unit, a oneness, and the Lord's sweet presence was felt among us. It was our expectation to come on home, but, by special request, we agreed to remain over on Monday and be with the church at Hatley. Brother Holder preached there Sunday night, and we, with Elder McDonald, attended the service. On Monday we tried to preach for them. This is a good church, and the brethren enjoy their services. Elder Huddleston is the good pastor of both of these churches, and they esteem him highly and love him as a true and faithful servant. We left Amory early Tuesday morning, July 29, for home, and reached home just before night. We felt very much fatigued, and in need of some rest. In a day or so we felt to be all right again. Our health is much improved since a few months ago, and we feel so thankful that we were able to make this trip and meet with those dear children of God once more. We enjoyed the trip very much, and feel so thankful to the good brethren and sisters for the kind treatment given us and the kind consideration they had for us. We shall never forget their kindness. May the richest blessings of heaven be theirs, is our humble prayer. Please pray the good Lord that our health may continue to improve, so that we may still go among His dear people. C. H. C.

Remarks to W. H. Hancock

---August 14, 1930

We have no fellowship for whisky drinkers. It is a shame and disgrace upon them and the church. They should be excluded. We have no desire or inclination to visit among people who tolerate such practices. We prefer to abstain from-stay away from-such appearance of evil. C. H. C.

Associations Visited

---August 28, 1930

We left home on Friday morning, August 8, in company with Elder John R. Harris and Sisters Cloud and Grubbs, for Atkins, Ark., to attend the Point Remove Association, which was in session on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. When we arrived Elder Lindsay was preaching the introductory sermon. They had service morning, afternoon and night, both Friday and Saturday, and on Sunday morning. Meals were prepared and served in a grove near by. We failed to get a list of the names of the ministers in attendance, and we may not remember all who were there, but those we remember were Elders J. M. Lindsay, J. H. O'Neal, J. C. Haskins, R. L. Piles, W. H. Lee, John R. Harris and the writer, and Brother J. T. George, who is exercising in a public way. The preaching was all a unit, and not a discordant note was sounded. It was a pleasant meeting. Elder Harris returned home from there, and we went on filling some appointments-which had been arranged by Brother Emmett Russell. From Monday to Thursday inclusive we filled appointments at the following named places: Howard school-house, Monday; Denny schoolhouse (we think that is the correct name of the place), Tuesday; Macedonia, Wednesday; Hagarville, Wednesday night; New Providence, Thursday. Elders R. L. Piles and J. C. Haskins were with us at these places, and sometimes one or both of them took part in the service. Elder Haskins preached at Denny schoolhouse Tuesday night. Elder W. J. Jordan lives near this place, and we visited

him in his good home. He was present at the service at the schoolhouse. Elder J. J. Brown lives near New Providence and we had a pleasant visit in his good home. Friday morning we went from Elder Brown's home to Friendship Church, near Scranton, where the New Hope Association convened that day and continued over Saturday and Sunday. We did not make a list of the names of the preachers at this meeting, but the best we can remember at this writing the following brethren in the ministry were present: Elders D. W. Witt, J. J. Brown, J. C. Haskins, J. L. McClelland, R. L. Piles, W. H. Lee, John R. Harris, G. W. Reed and the writer, and also Brother J. T. George. There may have been others, but we are writing from memory and may unintentionally overlook some. It was a good and pleasant meeting. They had service morning, afternoon and night on Friday and Saturday and then on Sunday morning. Three sisters came forward on Sunday and asked for a home in the church there, and the ordinance of baptism was to be attended to that afternoon at 3 o'clock by Elder Brown. We did not stay to witness the baptizing, as we had a two hundred mile drive to make to come home that night. We enjoyed the trip all the way. The brethren and sisters were all good to us. They did all they could to make us comfortable, and also to prepare for us such things as our physician had instructed us to eat. We shall never forget their many acts of kindness to us. We have not mentioned all the homes we had the pleasure of visiting, but we remember them, and pray the Lord's richest blessings to rest upon them all. We arrived home at 10:10 Sunday night, August 17, and found all as well as usual, except that wife and one of the children were suffering with some painful boils. We trust we are thankful to get back home feeling as well as could be expected and to find all as well as they were. We shall never forget your kindness, and trust you may remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

James 1:26,27

---September 4, 1930

If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain. Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.-(James 1:26-27). Two things we learn from the above text, at least, are that there is a vain religion and also what the pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is. They are not at all alike-and yet they are what people do. So, another thing we learn from this text is that religion is not something people "get," but it is something they do. Religion is what we do, not something we "get." We have heard much said by the world since our early recollection about people "getting religion." Worldly "religionists" have told us for years and years that we must "get religion" in order to be saved in heaven; that we will remain unsaved unless we "get religion." But we see from this text that religion is not something people "get." It is what they do. They may be doing the kind that is vain; and they may be doing the kind that is pure and undefiled before God and the Father. However, we are rather of the opinion that not many are doing the right kind. There is also another religion mentioned in the Bible. Paul said: For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it: and profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.-(Galatians 1:13-14). We learn here that Paul practiced the Jews' religion before he was made a child of God by regeneration- before he was born from above. That religion was to persecute the saints and to destroy the church of God. This is

another bad kind of religion to practice. We do not think it has all disappeared from the world yet. Sometimes persecutors even get in the church, and cause trouble and distress there. It is worse for a persecutor to be in the church, or to be identified as a member of the church, than it is for them to be in the world. Better things are expected of the members of the church. It is a bad state of affairs when a member of the church does not bridle his tongue, and thereby practices a vain religion. Behold, we put bits in the horses' mouths, that they may obey us; and we turn about their whole body. Behold also the ships, which though they be so great, and are driven of fierce winds, yet are they turned about with a very small helm, whithersoever the governor listeth. Even so the tongue is a little member, and boasteth great things. Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth! And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity: so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature; and it is set on fire of hell. For every kind of beasts, and of birds, and of serpents, and of things in the sea, is tamed, and hath been tamed of mankind: but the tongue can no man tame; it is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison. Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God. Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be.- (James 3:3-10). This shows something of the vain religion, and what the practice results in. It is deplorable, indeed. The wrong use of the tongue-not having the tongue bridled -defiles the whole body; it is a little fire, but kindles a great conflagration; it brings destruction, sorrow, distress, divisions and misery. It is a fire; it burns deep in the hearts of the Lord's little children, and makes scars in their poor bleeding hearts which they will carry with them to their graves. The scars can never be erased, for the burns were made too deep for the scars to ever be removed while they live in this world of sorrows and troubles. It is a world of iniquity. The unbridled tongue can fill the world with its unholy work! It sets on fire the course of nature. How quickly it can, and sometimes does, set the whole being on fire with madness, venom, and a spirit of destruction and revenge! "It is set on fire of hell." But there is a pure religion-a better kind, which the Lord's little children should be careful to practice. They should be careful to bridle the tongue, first. Say nothing about a person which you would not be willing to say to his face. Be careful, then, even, as to what you say. "Let your words be seasoned with grace." Be sure that you do not exaggerate in your use of words. Then, remember that the pure religion is to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction. That is a part of the pure religion. This does not mean to go to see them and "sponge" on them-to try to get all you can from them. To visit them in their affliction is to minister to them; administer to their necessities. A person that never does anything to help a poor widow along, or never does anything to help the poor fatherless children to fight the battles of life, never visits them in their affliction, no matter how many times he may go to their homes. He may go to their homes and eat some of the provisions they have obtained by their hard labors and toils, but he is not thereby visiting them in their affliction. If you want to enjoy the practice of some of this right kind of religion, try going to see some poor widow or orphan children in your section and administer to their needs; say a few words by way of encouragement to them that will help them to bear their troubles, and that will assure them that they have a true friend who is ready to lend a helping hand. Try this just once, and see how good it will make you feel. We are just as sure it will make you feel good as we are sure God lives and reigns in glory. Another part of this pure and undefiled religion is to keep himself unspotted from the world. No man can keep himself unspotted from the world and at the same time have his garments spotted with the institutions of men. He cannot belong to the institutions of the world and keep himself unspotted from the world. Neither can he keep

himself unspotted from the world and have his breath smelling like a rotten whisky jug. He cannot keep himself unspotted from the world and engage in such revelry and wickedness as the world engages in. He cannot keep himself unspotted from the world and use profane language. He cannot keep himself unspotted from the world and visit houses of ill fame, the speakeasies, the grog shops, the picture shows, theaters, and such places as are the gathering places for the wicked and profane. "Birds of a feather flock together." The dance hall is no place to practice the pure and undefiled religion. There are so many ways one may have the spots of the world that we cannot here enumerate them all. How careful we should be as to how we live. Those who have professed the name of Christ should endeavor to live above reproach, so as to have none of the spots of the world, and so as to not bring shame and disgrace and reproach on the cause of the Master. May the good Lord help us to so live. C. H. C.

Remarks to Mrs. Emma V. Smith

---September 4, 1930

Evidently it is the Lord's will that His children be banded together to keep house for Him in a church capacity, or else He never would have set up His kingdom here in the world for them. He most certainly requires His children to go to the church and tell what great things the Lord has done for them. Then He requires them, as His bride, to keep a clean house for Him. One part of the work of the ministry is to gather His children together; to teach them the true doctrine and order of God's house, and to teach them where the true church is to be found. Then it is their duty, when thus taught, to ask for a home in that church, and to labor therein according to the teaching of His blessed word. The Lord's children are commanded to let their light shine as a lighted candle on a candlestick. The candlestick is in the true church. The only way, then, for them to let their light shine as a lighted candle on a candlestick is to have membership in the church, and to endeavor to live as the Lord requires the membership to live. They may have their light on the candlestick, but then the light may be obscured by a dirty life-not walking right-and it would not shine very far. Those of God's children who live righteous lives and walk humbly and circumspectly before Him, enjoy blessings here in this world that His disobedient children do not and cannot enjoy. The home of God's children in heaven, and their happiness in heaven, does not depend upon what they do, either good or bad. That depends wholly and solely upon the finished work of the crucified and risen Redeemer, and they are joint-heirs with Him. Being joint-heirs with Him, they will finally enjoy heaven just as He does. They will have and enjoy heaven with all that heaven means. But those who walk in disobedience will miss much here in this life that they would enjoy by living in humble obedience to Him. When the Lord was here in person on earth He never called a woman to the apostleship. Not one of the seventy He sent out to preach was a woman. The Lord never had a woman for a prophet in the whole of the prophetic age. As the Lord never called and sent out a woman prophet, and never sent out a woman preacher in the early age of the gospel church, we conclude He does not do that now. He does not change. He is the same in every age. No matter what sort of inference we may draw, we know the Bible does not tell us of one woman preacher the Lord ever had. As we have no such example, and the Scriptures teach us everything we should practice in the church, then the Lord's church should not have a woman preacher now. A woman preacher, praying in public, and such like things, reminds us of a crowing hen. If you had a hen in your flock of chickens to begin crowing, you would kill that hen. You would remove her from the flock. If a woman goes to preaching in

the church of God, she should be removed from the flock. We have known some persons who had church privileges to "pick up" and move to destitute places where they could have no church privileges. No one is to blame for their destitute condition but themselves. We do not know that God's ministers are under any special obligation in such a case to hunt up such persons to feed them. Some have thus deprived themselves of church blessings and privileges for worldly gain. They are the losers, and they justly suffer for their own doing. But there are many of the Lord's dear children who are deprived of these blessings and privileges through no fault of their own. It is the duty of the Lord's ministers to go to such places and feed and hunt out the Lord's little ones. More of this kind of work should be done, and we believe the Lord would bless such labors. May the good Lord bless you, dear sister, and restore you to health, if it can be His holy will, is our humble prayer for you; and may He sweetly reconcile you to His will, is our prayer. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 16:24

---September 11, 1930

We have been requested to give our views of **(I Corinthians 11:34)**, which reads, "And if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto condemnation. And the rest will I set in order when I come." If you will get your Bible and turn to the chapter and begin reading with verse 20 you will see that the brethren at Corinth were guilty of converting the sacramental supper into a drunken feast. For this ungodly practice the apostle rebuked them sharply. In thus eating and drinking they did eat and drink condemnation to themselves; they did thus eat and drink unworthily. The Lord's supper should not be eaten to satisfy natural hunger. They should eat at home to do that. If they come together to make a feast of the Lord's supper, they come unto condemnation. It would be better to abandon the sacramental supper altogether than to make a feast of it. It should be observed in remembrance of our Lord and Master, and is a solemn thing. It is a sign of His suffering and death, and should be engaged in, having that in remembrance. We even doubt the propriety of having dinner on the ground at the church on that day, especially having the dinner before communion service. We think that if they are to have dinner on the ground, let the communion service be attended to first. We are aware, however, that in some places, perhaps many, they have the preaching service, then adjourn for dinner, during which hour they have their minds on worldly things, and feast on the dainties that are prepared, then gather together again for the communion service--their stomachs all full and their minds dull, and in poor condition to think on what the bread and wine truly represent. We do not think this is really best. C. H. C.

Mourners Are Blessed

---September 11, 1930

"Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted." -(Matthew 5:4). The Saviour does not here teach that one will be blessed provided they will mourn; but one who is a true mourner is a blessed character. A mourner is one who has been blessed with the light of God's Holy Spirit shining in his heart, which has made known to him the fact that he is a sinner, and shows him the deceitfulness and hatefulness of sin. Having been made to see all this, he begins to mourn on account of sin. One who has been enabled to see these things is in a blessed condition, though he may not know it. But the promise of the Saviour is that "he shall be comforted." The Comforter will come and sweet peace shall fill the heart of every

true mourner. The Spirit of God will bear witness with his spirit that he is a child of God. No such true mourner will ever sink down to eternal night, but will finally enjoy heaven with all that heaven means. C. H. C.

Will They Know Each Other?

---September 11, 1930

The above question is one which is not clearly made known to us in the Bible. Some passages may be construed to teach that we shall know each other in heaven, but it cannot be positively proven-so we think. Paul says we shall know as we are known. Fleshly ties and relationships will be done away. All the redeemed will know Jesus as their Redeemer and Saviour, and that they themselves are redeemed from sin, and they will be like Jesus, and will be perfectly happy and glorified -and that will be enough. C. H. C.

Communion With Trumpet Folks

---October 30, 1930

We have received a letter from a brother in a certain section asking about such a case as one of our brethren being at a church in line with the Trumpet, Elder J. C. Morgan, editor, and that church going into the communion service, and this brother partaking of the communion service with them. Those churches following Elder Morgan are the ones who are refusing to make peace by adjusting what little differences there may be. It seems to us to be very inconsistent for them to allow our members with them in their communion service, and yet are unwilling to adjust the little differences that may exist and recognize our churches and their work. You brethren who are among the Trumpet faction and want peace can do no better than come on and let us bury our little differences, if there are any, and come together and live in peace as brethren should. C. H. C.

Christmas Gift

---December 18, 1930

It is a great custom and habit the people have been engaged in since before our day of giving presents on Christmas time. Much money has been spent very foolishly most every year on this line since we can remember. Some years many people spend money foolishly for presents that are useless and worthless, and that can be of no possible benefit to any person in the world. This is wasteful and extravagant, and teaches our children to be wasteful and destructive. It is wrong and sinful. This year, perhaps, not so much money will be wasted in that way. But it has been instilled in us by precept and example so that we wish to remember our friends and loved ones with some kind of remembrance at this season of the year. This is all well and good, provided we give something that will be of benefit and of some good to the recipient. Do you not think you could do some poor saint much good by making them a present of The Primitive Baptist as a Christmas gift? That would bring comfort and joy to their hearts every week for the whole year of 1931. They would get comfort and consolation from reading its pages many times during the year, when cast down and in distress. Send us the name and \$1.50 for a year's subscription to any you wish to send the paper to for a whole year as a Christmas present. If you want us to tell them who sent the paper to them, just ask us to tell them about it. If you do not want them to know, you need not tell us to tell them. We are offering this reduced price to help you give this good present. Another good

present would be a Bible or a Testament. Just send us the amount you want to pay for a present of that kind, and we will send the best book we can find for the money. Rush your orders to us so we can get the books to them by Christmas. Thank you. C. H. C.

Are You "Blue?"

---December 18, 1930

If you are feeling "blue," and all cast down, all "down and out," all forsaken, and that you have nothing in the world to come your way but sadness, disappointments, distresses and trials and conflicts-just sit down and begin to count up your blessings, one by one, and see if you do not have employment for quite a long time. Are they not more than can be numbered? "Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted in me? hope thou in God: for I shall yet praise Him for the help of His countenance." - [\(\(2:5\) \(Psalms 42:5\)\)](#). C. H. C.

Close of Volume 45

---December 18, 1930

With this issue we close the forty-fifth volume of The Primitive Baptist. In many respects this has been a hard year. We have had distressing times, and it seems that it is not yet all over. Yet, we have had many things to be thankful for. True, we had a financial depression which started last winter, and then we had the severe drouth, with such a great crop failure in many parts of the country; and many people are out of work, and can get nothing to do. We have known of some even offering to work for their board. All these distressing things have caused many to have The Primitive Baptist discontinued to their address. Last winter we thought we could see hard times ahead, so we saved up all we could and bought enough paper to run us through the year. Thus we were, in some measure, prepared for the hard times. Still, we have had a struggle to get through; but we have been blessed not to miss an issue during the year, and have been able to get the paper out in the regular size every week. Many other papers have either reduced their size or have skipped several issues. The Lord has been good to us, and we feel thankful, we trust, for His many rich and wonderful blessings. We have tried during the year to do more writing for the paper than we had been doing, but these hard times during the last few months made it necessary for us to cut down expenses, and that made it necessary for us to do other work; and so we have not been writing during the past few weeks as we would like to. We hope, soon, to be doing more writing again. Some time ago we made mention that we had so much good matter on hand for the paper that we do not have room for. Several sent us small contributions to help pay the expense of printing some extra pages. We have not yet been able to do the work, but hope to do that in a few more weeks. Some brethren have complained because we have not recently stated where we stand in regard to some things that have agitated the minds of some of our people in the past. Just here we will say that on all the principles which have characterized our people in the ages past, we stand where we have stood all the while. We stand now just where we stood in the time of the trouble with the Kirklands, Todd, Strickland, and others, and where we stood in the time of the trouble with the whole Progressive move that was agitated among our people some years ago, and which brought trouble and distress in our ranks. We are still satisfied with the "good old way" of our fathers, and as we find taught in God's blessed Book. We still want nothing that we do not have "thus saith the Lord" for.

We do not think it wise to continually "hammer" on the things that have been "threshed out" by our people in days gone by, and upon which they have already spoken in unmistakable terms. When that has been done, the issue should be considered a dead one. That ends it. Then we may let that alone. To let it alone, we mean to let those things be forsaken by our people, and not try to engage in them again, to the hurt and confusion of good brethren. There are differences among our people in local customs, and these things should be matters of forbearance. If everything in the church in all sections of the country were just as we would like to have them, and just as we would have them to be, then there would be no forbearance necessary on our part. There would be no place for forbearance. The Lord knew there would be mistakes made, and differences would arise in these things; and hence we are taught the need of forbearance. We should "let patience have her perfect work" and "forbear one another in love." We now bid you farewell in the Lord, and hope to greet you again in the first issue of the next volume, beginning January 1, 1931. C. H. C.

1931

Introduction to Volume 46

---January 1, 1931

We now begin the forty-sixth volume of The Primitive Baptist, and we are also just entering on a new year. This volume begins with the first day of the new year. This is the day that so many of us make new resolutions. Many of us annually renew our vows and resolutions on the first day of the new year, only to find ourselves again, at the end of the year, about where we were at the beginning of the year-so far as concerns our new resolutions. We still know no more of what is in the future for us than we did a year ago, or even many years ago. No matter what our age or experience may be, we cannot penetrate the future and see what is in store for us. Each year of the past brought its joys and sorrows; and, judging the future by the past, this year will also have its joys and sorrows. But what they may be, no mortal can tell. Many of our readers will, no doubt, cross over the dark river before this year of our Lord, 1931, is past. It may be that the editor will be called to go, too. None of us know about that. "And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God. And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more. Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." - **(0:22) (Acts 20:22-27)**. The Holy Ghost witnessed that bonds and afflictions were to be endured by the Apostle Paul. Bonds and afflictions abide every true servant of the Lord, if he is faithful and true to his trust. But in the midst of all these bonds and afflictions there is a peace and calm quietude that is worth more than all this world. The peaceful feeling that we are "pure from the blood of all men," and that we "have not shunned to declare all the counsel of God," is worth more than all the

world beside. In this we have the blessed assurance that we shall "finish our course with joy," and "the ministry, which we have received of the Lord Jesus." Let us, then, have our faces turned Zionward, with renewed determination in the beginning of this new year, and the beginning of this forty-sixth volume of The Primitive Baptist, to "press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." - **(4) (Philippians 3:14)**. Some of us may feel that everything looks dark and gloomy, and that the prospect for the cause looks gloomy, and that the old church is declining and is destined to go down. We may become discouraged and cast down on account of these things. But the old church is not gone, and it is not going to become extinct.. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it" -so said the Lord of glory, while He was here on earth. He knew what He was talking about. He was not guessing. He established the kingdom, and His everlasting honor and power are pledged to preserve and keep it. He has allowed the winter seasons to come, and has chastised His people for their wrongs in all ages; and He is doing that yet. After a time of distress, when the distress has been sufficient to bring us to our right places, He will appear again in the manifestation of His mighty power in favoring Zion. In all our sadness and declension we do not need any of the inventions of men to help the old church. We do not need the things the world engages in that we may bring about a revival in the old church. Perhaps we have already gone too much after some of the things of the world and the inventions of men. If we have, it is high time for us to forsake those things and go to God in sackcloth and ashes, in humble prayer to Him, that He would lift up His countenance upon us once more in His heavenly smiles. The world may have their revivals, so-called, and by their efforts work up an interest in their affairs; but the Lord has not instructed the members of His kingdom thus to do. They are instructed to look to Him. "I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase." Let us try to do more planting and watering, and leave the matter with the Lord to give the increase. Let us not bring wood, hay, stubble, to build up the gospel kingdom. Let us do more preaching, leaving the result with the Lord. Let us "contend earnestly for the faith that was once delivered to the saints." The Lord has preserved and kept His church here in the world for about nineteen hundred years. He put it here to stay. He has preserved it in spite of our sinfulness and wickedness, and He will still keep it in the world somewhere. "Unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end." -Eph. iii. 21. Here we have it that it is "throughout all ages, world without end." "Unto Him be glory in the church" -not out of it-and this throughout all ages. How can it be throughout all ages, unless the Lord keeps His church standing throughout all ages? It could not be. The identity of the church may be destroyed and the church become extinct in some locality. This, has come to pass in many localities. When this is the case it is on account of our own wrong doing. "But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." -Gal. v. 15. That is the reason -or one reason-why the church becomes extinct in a locality-it is because they are consumed one of another. You never knew of a church becoming extinct in any locality where each and every member was doing his duty, and every person standing in his place, round about the camp, did you? Let us all "awake to righteousness, and sin not." -1 Cor. xv. 34. Let us not put in our time as fault-finders. Perhaps some of us have been too suspicious of our brethren. Let us try to lay all these things aside, and beg the Lord for His mercies, and pray Him to prosper Zion. Let us pray the Lord of the harvest to send laborers into His harvest. We have enough idlers already. We need laborers-faithful laborers. Lord, send them, and then help us to esteem them as gifts from thee. C. H. C.

Women Prophets

---January 1, 1931

Sometime ago we wrote an article concerning women preachers and prophets. Some have called our statement in question, that not one of God's prophets or preachers which He sent out in the days of the prophets and apostles were women. They were all men. Some have called this statement in question, and claim that there were women prophets, or prophetesses. Yes, there were women called prophetesses, and there are women in this day called preachers, too. But will you tell us which prophetic book in the Old Testament was written by a woman? What book of the Old Testament was written by a woman? Tell us, also, please, where it says in the Old Testament that the word of God came to a woman, for her to prophesy, as it does concerning Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and others. Is it there? No. Tell us, too, when the Lord sent out a woman, as He sent out the seventy. Tell us where He sent out a woman, as He sent out the twelve, or as He sent Paul. Tell us where He ever said to a woman that she should sit on one of the thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. There is no such thing in the Book. The Lord never had a woman to write a book for the Old Testament, nor for the New Testament. Again we say that a woman preacher is like a crowing hen. C. H. C.

Encouraging Letter

---January 1, 1931

Several days ago we received the following letter. More often we receive some letter of complaint, or finding fault with something we have said, or because we have not said something the writer thinks we should say. Were it not for the fact that we occasionally receive a letter like the following, we feel that we would give up in despair. We often get so discouraged and so cast down that we feel like our efforts and labors are all in vain. We often feel that it is of no use to keep on striving in the service, as we have been trying to do for many years. Perhaps it will not be long until we may receive an honorable discharge from the warfare. We do not want to give up; but we do desire to be enabled, by the grace of God, to continue to "endure hardness, as a good soldier," if it is necessary to endure it in order to continue to fight for the principles of truth as taught in God's blessed Book, and the principles which have characterized our people as distinct and different from the world in all the ages of the past. We do not print the brother's name who wrote the letter, as it was written as a private letter to us. May the Lord bless the dear brother, with all our readers, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

THE LETTER

Dear Brother Cayce: I wish I knew how to comfort you and encourage you. I know that you have spent your life for our dear people, and still they continue to war and fuss about non-essentials, and draw on their imagination, and think evil one of another. I do hope the Lord will give you grace to earnestly contend for the things that make for peace, as you have done all your life. Surely the end is near, and how it will be with me I cannot tell. I feel so sad and lonely of late. I often feel that I have deceived you and all the Lord's dear people, and sadness and sorrow is all I have in this life. O wretched man that I am! I grieve; I mourn; and yet I rejoice at times. I try not to burden anyone with my troubles. If there is not a better day for us here, I am sure there is a beautiful home over yonder for you and all who love Him here. I cut cord wood two days this week, and I just could not get you off my mind. I could see you hard at work for our cause, and likely someone writing you in a way he should not. May God bless you, is my constant prayer.

Wrong At Home

---January 8, 1931

Some brethren seem to have an idea that if a church or brethren do wrong they have gone from home. Wonder if any of those brethren ever had any children to do wrong without leaving home? We note that the different factions of Baptists have been compared to the prodigal son, with the idea that one faction remained at home and all the other factions left home. This has brought us to wonder if the son who remained at home ever did any wrong. It seems to us that according to the teaching of the Book that boy did about as bad as the boy who left home. Anyway, he manifested a very bad spirit when the prodigal returned. Evidently he was actuated by a wrong spirit then. Perhaps some of them are the home son that object to reconciliation. Churches can evidently do wrong without leaving their identity as churches of Christ. So can individuals do wrong without leaving their identity as followers of Christ. If not, then no follower of Christ can go wrong, make a mistake, or commit a wrong. If that does not savor of a claim to sinless perfection in the flesh, we confess that we do not understand things as they are. If churches, as churches, cannot do wrong, then confess their error and repent of it as churches, then the Bible is all bosh, for it teaches that they can. To repent of an error is to quit it. Churches in the New Testament were commanded to repent. If they had ceased to be churches of Christ-had gone off from identity as churches of Christ-then the command for them, as churches, to repent is meaningless, and such commands are a solemn mockery. If a church going into disorder always destroys her identity as a church of Jesus Christ, then she could not repent as a church, and could do no orderly act-there could be no such thing as a church repenting. If she could not do an orderly act while she has disorder in her body, then she could never get in order again. It would be a disorderly act for her to even repent, if she could not do an orderly act after having gone into disorder. Brethren and churches may do wrong without leaving the old home, and when they do they should repent of those wrongs and live in peace and fellowship with each other. C. H. C.

The Progressives

---January 8, 1931

Several months ago, or a few months ago, there was a suggestion in the Banner-Herald for a meeting of the different factions of the Primitive Baptists who are agreed on the fundamental principles of the doctrine to meet together to confer with each other with a view to a union. We have had several letters in regard to the matter, and some have asked us for an opinion in regard to uniting with them. We have endeavored to be as near neutral in regard to such a union as we well could. We think the matter of adjustment of the differences between the "Old Liners" and the "Progressives" is something that more directly concerns the brethren where they had the trouble than the brethren in other sections. We do not want to meddle with it. We do not even wish to encourage a meeting with them to consider the matter of differences if it is likely to cause more trouble among us. Personally, we do not see how it could do any harm for our brethren to meet with them in a kind and right spirit to discuss these matters, and to get their view point as to what they are willing to do, and to give our ideas as to what our own people would be willing to do. All parties should be kind and perfectly frank and honest with each other. Now, what we are writing this for is: We want each one of our readers to write and

tell us if you are opposed to such a meeting, or if you wish to have such a meeting, or if you are willing for such a meeting to be held. A postal card will do. Just say, "I am opposed to any meeting with the Progressives," if you are opposed to it. If you are willing for such a meeting to be held just say, "I am willing for our people to meet and confer with the Progressives." If you are in favor of such a meeting just say, "I am in favor of meeting and conferring with the Progressives." If we find that our people are opposed to such a meeting we want to be in position to say they are opposed to it. We do not wish to encourage any meeting of the kind if it would cause trouble. What we mean by this is that we want to know the wish and desire of the brethren where they had the trouble, so we may know what might be their desire as to what we should do. We do not want any controversy over the matter, and will not have any. We want the sentiment of the brethren, so we can tell any who have asked us and who may ask us. Please write us at once. We want to say, frankly, that we are no more in favor of the use of organs in Old Baptist Churches, or of affiliating with secret orders, or any other progressive measure or departure from the principles which our people have stood for in all the ages past, than we were when the trouble came up with the "Progressives." We stand now upon the same principles we have stood upon for more than forty years-ever since we have had a name with the Primitive Baptists. Since there has been some talk of meeting with the "Progressives" to talk over the matters of difference we have been asked if we would attend such a meeting. Now, what we want is to know the mind of the brethren. If they desire it, or are willing for such a meeting to be held, we are willing to attend the meeting, if the brethren wish us to do so. Otherwise, we do not wish to have anything to do with it. We have had enough trouble in our ranks without inviting more. Again we ask you to please write us at once. This means all the brethren and sisters who are in the section where there was trouble and division with the "Progressives." C. H. C.

Many Thanks

---January 8, 1931

We wish we could find words to say how much we appreciate the kind remembrances of us during the holidays. Many sent us cards, all of them nice, expressing wishes for our health, happiness and pleasure-not only for us, but also for our companion, who so faithfully and tirelessly works with us. Several sent substantial remembrances. These acts of kindness and expressions of Christian love and sweet fellowship were all appreciated more than we are able to tell you. May the richest blessings of heaven rest upon every one of you, is our humble prayer. Most every year we have been sending out a few cards, or something, as an expression of our remembrance of some of our good friends and brethren and sisters; but this time we have had to omit that. Our financial condition has been such that we had to cut out that expense, small though it has been. In the financial flurry which has hit our state, as well as some other states, in which so many banks have closed, we have been hurt, along with many others. The little bank here in our town was hit, with so many others, and had to close their doors. This hurt us, but we do not yet know to what extent. Plans are being worked on now for the organization of a new bank to take over the assets of the old bank, which we hope may be accomplished before many more weeks, and we are hoping for a better condition of affairs before many more months. Remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Valid Baptism And Some History

---January 15, 1931

The first Baptist Church in Boston was organized May 28, 1665. See Hassell, page 525; History of New England and the Baptists by Isaac Backus, Vol. 1, page 298. Other authorities could be cited, but this is sufficient. On August 10, 1713, Elisha Callender became a member of this church. He was a son of Ellis Callender, who became pastor of the church in 1708. On May 21, 1718, Elisha was ordained as pastor of this church. The presbytery that ordained him consisted of Dr. Cotten Mather and his son and John Webb. These three men were Congregational ministers. See Backus' Church History of New England, page 137; Encyclopedia Britannica, Ninth Edition, Vol. 15, page 631; Backus' History of New England, with Particular Reference to the Baptists, Second Edition, Vol. 1, page 421, and Vol. 2, page 419. Here is a historical fact, that this church, the first Baptist Church organized in Boston, Mass., which was in 1665, had a preacher ordained for them as pastor of the church, on May 21, 1718, by three Congregational ministers. If there was a Baptist preacher in the presbytery the records do not tell us about it-so far as we can find. Arguments may be made for and against a proposition, but facts cannot be argued away. Some brethren are contending that disorder in the line of ordination will make void and invalidate all official work following in the line of that disorder. If their contention be correct, then none of us have any valid baptism, for there are none of us but what follow in the line from this act of the Boston Baptist Church. If you can, suppose you trace your line back and see if you do not find that your ancestors in the church and ministry were not in some way tied on to this disorder. We are not trying to argue that we should practice such as was there practiced by this church, but simply to show the fallacy of the contention of some of the brethren. Callender baptized many persons, no doubt. Then later Samuel Stillman was called as pastor of this church. "A revival of religion began in that church in 1769, which caused the addition of eighty members in three years, to a church which had not seventy members before." -Backus, Vol. 2, page 419. According to the contention of some, this church lost her identity when she had Callender ordained by three Congregational preachers in 1718. Now, if you can trace your line of ordination by succession, suppose you try running the line and see if you do not find yourself springing from that disorder back there-and if you do, then you have no church identity, according to the contention of some; and in this case, you have no valid baptism, and none of the rest of us have it. Now, why do you want to fuss about a thing, when no one has it? Jeremy Condy was ordained pastor of this first Baptist Church in Boston on Feb. 14, 1739. He was pastor of that church when George Whitefield held a revival meeting in Boston. We have been under the impression that Whitefield was an Episcopalian, and really he was that; but he fell in with the Wesleys. The Wesleys embraced Arminian views, while Whitefield was a Calvinist in doctrine, so that from Whitefield's teaching sprang what was known as the Calvinistic Methodists. Whitefield preached in Boston in 1740, under which there was a revival in the city. Some of the members of this Baptist Church were favorable to the revival, and it appears that they took some part in it. This resulted in a division in that church, and the exclusion of those who were favorable to the revival. About a year after this those who were favorable to the revival, and who were formerly members of this Baptist Church, came together and formed themselves into a church and called it a Separate Baptist Church. This church was organized in 1742. See Backus' History, page 177. In 1743 Ephriam Bound was ordained their pastor. "Philip Freeman, member of a Baptist Church in London, came over to Boston, and joined that new church; who sent an account of their principles and conduct to Dr. John Gill, which obtained his approbation, and a

considerable present was sent them from London." -Backus, Vol. 2, page 53. From this time those who were opposed to the Whitefield revival began to be called Regular Baptists, and the others were called Separate Baptists. The Regulars and Separates continued to preach in different parts of the country and to organize churches. They had no dealings with each other. Preachers went out from both the Regulars and Separates into the Virginias and the Carolinas, preaching and organizing churches. Remember, too, please, that these Separates originated from this church in Boston which had a man ordained to the ministry by three Congregational ministers-ministers who engaged in and recognized infant baptism, or infant sprinkling, if we are not mistaken, as they sprang from the Presbyterians. At any rate, they evidently practiced sprinkling or pouring for baptism. As to their practicing infant baptism, see Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Vol. 1, page 538. As to their springing from the Presbyterians, see Encyclopedia Britannica. At the close of the seventeenth century there were sixteen Baptist Churches in the United States, or the territory now called the United States. See Hassell, page 525. All those churches recognized and affiliated with the church at Boston. Did they all lose their identity as Baptist Churches, on account of affiliating with the Boston Church? Did they all get into such gross disorder that they could not administer gospel baptism? If what was done back there would not cause them to all be in such disorder that they could not administer valid baptism, would it have that result now? If such would destroy identity now, it would have done so then. If it did destroy identity then, it follows that the Primitive Baptists, nor any other Baptists, can administer valid baptism now; and if that be so, then no one now has valid baptism. Then, why are you so strenuous now about baptism-seeing you do not have it, according to your own contention? Remember that we are not arguing that Baptists now should practice what the Baptist Church in Boston did. What we are calling attention to this for is simply to show that a disorderly act does not invalidate baptism. If it would do so now, it would have done so then. If it did invalidate baptism then, none of us have it now. No matter which horn of the dilemma you take, you cannot "get anywhere." The Kehukee Association was formed in 1765. Some of the churches were constituted on the General Baptist order, many of them holding to the doctrine of a general atonement-springing from the General Baptists of England. Those churches of the General Baptist order had been formed previous to 1765. In 1755 many of those churches were reformed in doctrine through the ministry of Elders Vanhorn and Miller. Then in 1765 they formed the Kehukee Association, composed of seven churches of the Regular Baptist order. But many of them engaged in the disorderly practice of immersing people who were unregenerate. They would immerse any who were willing to be immersed, whether they were professors of religion or not. Some years after the formation of the Kehukee Association they made a proposition to the separate Baptist Churches for a union. "The Separates objected to the Regular or Kehukee Baptists in the following particulars:

1. Because they did not require strictly from those who applied for baptism an experience of grace.
2. Because they held members in their churches who acknowledged they were baptized before conversion.

3. Because they indulged too much in superfluity of apparel. There were other objections of minor importance. The most forcible objection of all appeared to be the retention of members who had been baptized in unbelief; and this was admitted on the part of the Regulars to be wrong; on which account several of

their churches sought to correct it, by requiring all such of their members to be baptized." -Hassell, pages 697, 698. This caused a division in the association in 1775, which continued until 1777. Take note that the historian says that some, or several, of their churches sought to correct the matter. He does not say that all of them did. From this statement it is very evident that some of them did not attempt to correct the matter. If not, then some of them retained persons as members who had been immersed without being first regenerated. If gospel baptism, in order that it be valid, requires a gospel subject-one who has been born again-then they had members without valid, or gospel, baptism. How do you know but what some of those persons were afterward ordained to the ministry and immersed great numbers of people? And how do you know but what your baptism came through that very channel? Have you got gospel, or valid, baptism, anyway? Can you prove that you have? If so, how? In 1777 ten churches came together in union as the Kehukee Association of United Baptists. Six of those churches were Regular Baptist Churches and four were Separates. See Hassell, page 698; Burkett and Reed's Church History, pages 48-51. Remember that the Separate Baptists started from an excluded faction in Boston, who took part in the Whitefield revival. Did that union of two factions-the Separates and Regulars- put the whole thing in disorder? Did it destroy their church authority, so that they could not administer valid baptism? If such a union of factions would destroy identity now, or put both the uniting parties in such disorder that they could not administer valid baptism, would it not do the same thing then? If not, why not? Do principles ever change? If such a union then did not destroy their right and authority to administer valid baptism, how could it do so now? On pages 302 and 303 of Semple's History of Virginia Baptists we find the following: In 1791 a case was brought before the association (the Ketocton) which produced considerable agitation. James Hutchinson who was born in New Jersey, but raised in Loudon County, Virginia, had gone to Georgia, and there first became a Methodist and then a Baptist preacher. Previous to his joining the Baptists he had been baptized by a Methodist preacher. When he offered to join the Baptists of Georgia it was made a question whether his baptism, being performed by an unbaptized person, was valid. The Georgia Baptists decided that it was valid. In the year above mentioned Mr. Hutchinson came to Virginia to see his relations in Loudon County. While he was there his preaching became effectual to the conversion of many. Mr. Hutchinson baptized them. These things stirred up the question in the Ketocton Association whether the baptism of Hutchinson and his new disciples was valid. The decision here was just the reverse of the decision in Georgia. They determined not to receive either him or those baptized by him, unless they would submit to be re-baptized. After some time they consented, and the ordinance was re-administered. Their proceeding on this occasion was more strict than that of any other association upon the same subject. The question has been before most of the associations at one time or other, and in every other instance they either deemed it unnecessary to re-baptize or left it to the conscience of the party to be re-baptized or not. Here we have the information that this preacher, James Hutchinson, was received by the Baptists in Georgia on his baptism administered by a Methodist preacher. How many persons he baptized in Georgia for the Baptists we do not know. But he returned to Virginia and preached and baptized in the bounds of the Ketocton Association, and the Ketocton would not receive him or his baptism; but the historian informs us that the action of the Ketocton was different from the action of any other association in the state. All the others deemed it unnecessary to re-baptize, or else left it to the individual. Evidently it was the common practice to receive members from other denominations without administering baptism. Now,

if this common practice in those days would invalidate their work which might follow, then will you please tell us who has valid baptism now? Remember that we are not arguing or contending that persons should be received from other denominations without being baptized by our people; but we are simply producing these historical facts to clearly show that if disorder in the church, or churches, makes baptism invalid when administered by them, then it necessarily follows that there is no such thing as valid baptism in existence today. No sort of arguments will remove these historical facts. As Baptists, we are all, throughout the entire South and Southwest, descendants of those Virginia and Georgia Baptists. We all have to go back through that line to tie on to the Baptist line in the settlement of this country. Time will not remove the difficulty-but only makes it the worse-for none can now go back behind all that and correct the matter. It has already been done, and cannot be undone. Now, will you "Simon-pure" brethren, who refuse to accept the work of your brethren, please tell us how pure your baptism is? Which is black-the pot or the kettle? If the validity of baptism rests in the person administering the ordinance, and requires that no disorder be in the line, then there is no such thing as valid baptism. The validity of baptism does not rest in the person administering the ordinance, but rests in the church authorizing it. It is the church that does the work, and the person who administers the ordinance is only the agent of the church-is the one through whom the church does the work. It may be done in an irregular way, but irregularity does not invalidate the thing done. A thing may be valid, yet done in an irregular way. The regular way for baptism to be administered is by one who has been set apart by authority of the true church to administer her ordinances. Baptism might be administered by an impostor. Of course, if baptism is administered by such a one, the church would be ignorant of the fact that he is an impostor. But ignorance concerning a matter does not make a good thing of a bad thing. If a thing is not done right, ignorance would not make it right. Hence, if there has been an impostor in the line through which your baptism has been handed down, and if baptism administered by an impostor is not valid, then your baptism is not valid. We all know that there have been impostors in the church and among the ministry all along the line. Such positions concerning the validity of baptism is to simply argue that there is no valid baptism today. May the good Lord help us all to search for the truth, and help us to have the courage to stand upon the same, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

The Progressives

---February 12, 1931

In The Primitive Baptist of January 8 we had an article concerning a proposed meeting with the Progressives to kindly discuss the differences between them and our people, to see if terms of agreement might be reached for a union. We asked our people to write us and say whether they would favor such a meeting, or if they are opposed to it. We did not ask for a long letter from any containing reasons for being opposed to it or for favoring it. In that article we very plainly said: We want to say, frankly, that we are no more in favor of the use of organs in Old Baptist Churches, or of affiliating with secret orders, or any other progressive measure or departure from the principles which our fathers have stood for in all the ages past, than we were when the trouble came up with the Progressives. We stand now upon the same principles we have stood upon for more than forty years-ever since we have had a name with the Primitive Baptists. Notwithstanding this plain statement some brethren have taken it upon themselves to write us a long letter as though

we had written something that sounded like we were in favor of taking in all the new measures the Progressives have or have had. This has only taken our time unnecessarily-to read those long letters telling of the new things the Progressives introduced, and why you could not fellowship this thing or that thing. Nobody asked if you could fellowship this or that measure, and we had plainly stated that we have no use for the new measures. We cannot understand why some brethren will be so forgetful and thus put a lot of unnecessary work on us, and write as though we were trying to get our people to accept some new things that are foreign to the teachings of the Scriptures. Now, when you read this do not write us a long apology, for we are not hurt with you, and it is not necessary to send us a lot more writing that is not necessary to take our time to read. We want you to write us everything it is necessary and beneficial for us to have, but we are overworked already without having unnecessary things to do. We are willing to do everything necessary to be done; and we are willing to do everything our brethren think is necessary to be done, even though it is not really necessary, so far as we are able. But if all would first ask, "Is this really necessary?" they might save themselves and others some time and labor. Do let us try to be considerate. Now, in regard to the meeting. Quite a number have written that they are in favor of having a meeting with the Progressives to discuss the matters of differences in a friendly way. Quite a number have written that they are opposed to such a meeting. Some have assigned their reasons, and some have not. No matter about what their reasons are; this is the way the matter stands. We have had enough to satisfy us that our brethren are not yet in a condition for us to make any effort toward reconciliation with the Progressives. If an effort for reconciliation with them will bring trouble in our own ranks, the only thing to do is to let the matter alone. Not only is this true, but we have heard some from the Progressives, too. Now, some of the Progressive brethren may be ready to lay aside the things that caused the trouble and the division; but it is evident that some of them are not. If any of the Progressive brethren are ready to abandon those things, and want to get in line with our people, no doubt they can do so without the proposed meeting. It is useless to talk about a union with our people unless those things are dispensed with. It seems that the main things that are in the way are musical instruments in the churches, affiliation with secret orders, protracted meetings, Sunday schools, and some societies. These things are all comparatively new among the Baptists, and our people would not be willing to consider a union with those brethren unless these things are abandoned. We would be glad to see all true Primitive Baptists together, but we are not willing to depart from what is recognized as Baptist principles and practice. Let us all lay aside our prejudices and try to labor for the things that make for peace. C. H. C.

Should Forgive

---March 5, 1931

We have been requested to give our views on (Matthew 18:21-22), and (**Luke 17:3-4**). The citation in Matthew reads thus: Then came Peter to Him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times, but, Until seventy times seven. The citation in Luke reads thus: Take heed to yourselves: If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him. It seems to us that these expressions from our Saviour are so plain that they need no explanation. That the

Saviour here teaches His disciples that they are under obligation to forgive each other their trespasses there can be no question. He does not simply teach that they should forgive one trespass, but He teaches that there should be no end to it. Seven in Scripture is generally considered to be a full and complete number. The disciple of Christ is required to forgive, not only seven times, but seventy times seven. There is no end to the matter. In Luke it is plainly taught that the follower of the Lord should forgive seven times in a day-and that means seven times in every day. There is, again, no end to it. Forgiveness is needed all along through the journey of life. It is needed every day. A trespass, however, is one thing and an offense is another thing. A brother may trespass without bringing shame and disgrace on the cause. Therefore, trespasses should be forgiven. When a brother is guilty of committing an offense, he is guilty of a crime which brings shame and disgrace upon the whole church, and upon the cause of the Master. No matter how great one may be considered to be, and no matter how highly he may be esteemed in the church, and no matter how useful he may have been in and to the church, if he commits an offense which brings shame and disgrace upon the church, he should be dealt with. For example, if one is guilty of public drunkenness, swearing, or such like offenses, the church should deal with him. To continue to retain such persons in fellowship as members of the church, is to say to the world that the church condones, favors and harbors such crimes by her members. This brings shame and disgrace upon the church, and brings the church into disrepute. Such things should not be countenanced by the church to any degree. The parties guilty of such should be dealt with just as soon as the church is informed of such conduct. But a brother may trespass against another, or against some rule of the church, and yet not be guilty of a crime that brings disgrace upon the church. For example, when a person unites with the church he thereby subscribes to the covenant and agrees to be governed by the rules of the church. In the rules the members agree to meet together for the public worship and service of God. A brother may neglect that meeting, and thereby transgress, and he thereby becomes guilty of a trespass. If the brother is given to see the error of his way and confesses his wrong, he should be forgiven. We are instructed that "if thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him." If a brother trespasses against us, and we fail to do what the Saviour instructs here, then we have become a transgressor, just as much so as the brother who was guilty of the trespass. If we become guilty ourselves, do we not need to be forgiven, as well as the brother who has trespassed? Then, how does it become us to refuse to forgive? We are taught in the above passages to forgive continually if the trespassing brother repents; that is, if he turns from his wrong and asks forgiveness, as is expressed in **(Luke 17:3-4)**. It is not so expressly stated in (Matthew 18:21-22); but here we are told to forgive until seventy times seven. In **((2) (Colossians 3:12-13))**, we have this language: Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. The word quarrel in this text means a complaint. If you have a complaint against a brother, you are commanded by the inspired apostle to put on bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering; forbearance. If everything was always just as you would like to have it in the church, or elsewhere, there would be no place for you to exercise or to use forbearance. There would be nothing for you to bear with. It is true that the church should not bear with everything. As stated before, they should not bear with things that bring shame and disgrace on the cause. But we should bear with each other's weaknesses, our thoughtlessness, our neglect of the many things which it would be better for us to attend to. Instead of trying to destroy our brother who has made some mistake, and perhaps has

neglected some things we think he should have attended to, let us try to help him along to a better way of living. Let us try to encourage him to a more diligent discharge of his duty. Perhaps, after all, he has not done any worse than we have. Suppose the Saviour had never forgiven us until we asked Him to, or until we had repented. Do you think you would have ever been forgiven? What did you do to get the Lord to forgive your many and grievous sins? "Even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye." How about it-do you do that way? Lord, help us to forgive our erring brethren. C. H. C.

General Meeting

---March 12, 1931

For some little time now some of the brethren in Texas have been talking and writing about having a general state meeting of the brethren. Waco has been talked of as a place for such a meeting. That city is near the center of the state, and would be a convenient place, so it seems to us. About the fifth Sunday in May has been suggested as a suitable time for holding such a meeting. We understand the object of the meeting is, first, to worship and serve the Lord; to sing and pray and preach together-to preach the truth as our people have done in the ages past, for the comfort and benefit of the Lord's dear children. Another object would be, as we understand, to try to further the work of peace among our poor and afflicted people-not to try to forsake any principle of right and truth; not to try to see how far apart any of us are, but to try to see how near we are together. If such a meeting is conducted in the right way, and all go there with prayerful hearts, it might result in great good to our bleeding cause. It is a great pity that all our people who are agreed on the great fundamental principles of the gospel are not together. Great forbearance is needed in these dark and distressing and strenuous times. May the Lord help us all to exercise forbearance and strive for the peace of Jerusalem. C. H. C.

Valid Baptism

---March 12, 1931

If we have been rightly informed, and if we are not mistaken, some years ago there was a preacher by the name of Thomas who was excluded from the church in some of the eastern states. We think it was in Tennessee that he was excluded. He went to Texas and joined an Old Baptist Church out there on a forged letter. Later it was found out that his letter was forged. He baptized quite a number of people, we understand. This caused a considerable stir among the churches. Some of the churches had those persons baptized again who had been baptized by Thomas. Some of the churches refused to have persons baptized again who had been baptized by Thomas. Still more stir was caused by this. The churches called for a council to consider the matter. The council said that the baptisms administered by Thomas were valid because administered by gospel and orderly churches. Thus the matter was settled. Now, if we have not been rightly informed, and if we have not correctly stated the facts, will someone who knows the facts, please tell us what the facts are, and cite us to the records? Now, if the foregoing are facts, will some of the brethren in Texas who are so particular about orderly and valid baptism please tell us if they are in line with the baptism administered by this preacher, Elder Thomas, who was excluded from the church? According to the contention of some, baptism administered by Thomas was no good, because he was excluded. Are you not in line with the baptism administered by this excluded preacher? Are you

not in line with churches that have baptism, or did have baptism, administered by him-and that work retained by them? Are those churches in disorder because they retained that baptism? If so, and you are in line with them, are you in order? Please answer these questions kindly. No use to get mad and out of humor because we ask about these facts. Which is the blackest, the pot or kettle? Let us be careful not to contend for something that will unchurch ourselves. Let us be consistent. C. H. C.

Why Not Save All?

---March 19, 1931

A few months ago we received the following: Dear Elder Cayce: I have just finished reading, for the second time, the Cayce-Srygley discussion, and fail to find the answer to this question: If God saves without conditions on the part of the sinner, why is not everybody saved? Why does He save a few and not save all? I can't possibly see, for my life, how He could save a few and send the balance to hell and be a just God. It looks like partiality to me. I know I am ignorant and very unlearned and don't understand the Scriptures; but the plan of salvation looks so simple to me; for, if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins. I don't believe that we can do any good thing that will save us; but it looks to me like we've got to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and He will save us and forgive us our sins. If you have time to answer the questions at issue I would appreciate it. I've asked several Primitive Baptists this question, and haven't yet found one able to answer it. Yours in humble hope, E. C. Ward. Pine Valley, Miss.

OUR REPLY

For the satisfaction of Friend Ward we will try to offer a few remarks and comment a little on the foregoing letter. It seems to be a puzzle to the writer as to why God would save some of the race and not save all the race. The question asked would imply that God is under obligation to the sinner to do something for him. If God is under obligation to the sinner to do something for him, then God could not justly condemn the sinner without first doing that something. This would necessarily say that the condemnation of the sinner is not just. If the condemnation of the sinner is not just, then the salvation of the sinner is not a matter of grace-is not by grace. That simply denies that salvation from sin is by grace. It is not a wonder to us why God does not save all the race, but the wonder to us is that He saves any of the race. Friend Ward says it looks to him like "we've got to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and He will save us." How can those people believe on the Lord Jesus Christ who have never heard about Him? If people have to believe on Jesus in order to be saved, then it would be impossible for one to be saved who has never heard about Him. This would condemn to eternal perdition every person who has ever lived and died, or who ever will live and die, without hearing about Jesus. If those who have never heard about Jesus can be saved without believing on Him, then a person does not have to believe on Him in order to be saved. Anything which must be performed, or complied with, as a condition in order to be saved must be absolute, universal, and without exception. That is, if a certain thing must be done by one person in order to his salvation, then that thing must be done by any and every other person in order that they be saved. If a thing is necessary to be done by one person in order that he be saved, then no person can be saved without doing that thing. Hence, if one person of the human race must believe on Jesus in order that

he be saved, then no person of the human race can be saved without first believing on Jesus. This would not only lose in eternal torment all who live and die without hearing about Jesus, but it would also inevitably exclude all infants from salvation who die in infancy, because they are not capable of believing on Jesus. Friend Ward says, "I don't believe that we can do anything good that will save us; but it looks to me like we've got to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and He will save us." Is believing on the Lord Jesus Christ doing something good? It is either good or bad. If it is doing bad, and the Lord will not save one unless he believes, then he must do something bad in order to be saved. If believing on the Lord is doing something good, and the Lord will not save one unless he first believes, then we must do something good in order to be saved; and if we can believe on the Lord before He saves us, and believing on Him is doing something good, then we can do something good in order to be saved. But if we must believe on the Lord in order to be saved, and believing on Him is doing something good, and we cannot do anything good in order to be saved, then no one can believe on the Lord in order to be saved. Friend Ward has contradicted himself, and is in a dilemma from which he cannot extricate himself. Every person who says that one must believe on the Lord in order to be saved gets into the same dilemma. If God could not remain just and save some of the race without saving all the race, then He could not be just and allow any of the race to perish. This would imply that God is under obligation to all the race, and would deny that the condemnation of any of the race is just. It would deny that God's law is just-and all are transgressors. All the world are guilty before God. **{(Romans 3:19)}** All, both Jews and Gentiles, are under sin. **{(Romans 3:9)}** The law is holy, and just, and good. **{((2) (Romans 7:12))}** As all are sinners, and the law is just, then all are justly condemned. As all are justly condemned, then God is not under obligation to do anything for any one of the race. As He is not under obligation to do anything for any one of the race, then He may save one or more of the race and not save another, and still His justice remains untarnished. If He could not do this, then the condemnation of the sinner is not just; and if the condemnation of the sinner is not just, then God's law is not just. If God's law is not just, then no one could be justly condemned on account of sin. If God saves one sinner by His mercy and grace, and does not save you, then will you say that God is not just because He does not save you also? Will you say that God is under obligation to save you, because He saves another? Will you deny that you are a justly condemned sinner? If so, then you deny that you are a sinner. If you admit that you are a sinner, a transgressor of God's just law, then you must admit that your condemnation is just. If your condemnation is just, then God is not under obligation to save you because He saves another. If He is under obligation to save you because he saves another, then He would be under obligation to save all the race if He saved one of the race. That being true, in order that He remain just, He must either save all the race or else allow all the race to be lost in hell. But God is just, and is under no obligation to save any. Hence, His justice is not tarnished if He saves some and does not save all. Instead of His justice being tarnished thereby, the fact that He does save some only manifests His mercy and makes His grace shine with effulgent glory. No unregenerate sinner ever Scripturally believes on the Lord. Those who truly believe on Him have already been born of God. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." -(John 1:11-13). In this text "were born" is in the past tense- something that was done, completed, finished, at some time in the past. "Believe" is in the present tense- something in the present time. They were born of God first, and then believe as a result. There is not a man in all the world who can

take this text and apply the rules of language to it and make it appear that belief preceded being born of God. If any man will do so, we will leave the Old Baptists and join his church. No man can make it appear that a thing existing in the present was necessary in order that a thing be accomplished or done in the past. The past is first, and the present follows after. They were born of God, in the past, and they believe in the present, after they were born in the time past. Hence, those who believe were born of God before they believed. This being true, it cannot be true that one must believe in order to be born of God; but it is true that one must be born of God in order to truly believe on the Lord. The Ephesians did not believe on the Lord in order to be saved. They did not do anything good in order to be saved. If one now must believe in order to be saved, then the Ephesians had to believe in order to be saved. Whatever the Ephesians had to do in order to be saved, that is what one will have to do now in order to be saved. If the Ephesians had to do something in order to be saved (believe, or any other condition), if we can find what they were doing when they were saved, then we will have found what they had to do in order to be saved, and we will also have found what every other person must do in order to be saved. What were they doing? Let us read **(Ephesians 2:1-2,3)**, and see: And you hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. Were they believing? What were they doing? They were walking according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air; they were having their conversation in the lusts of the flesh; they were fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; they were by nature the children of wrath. When were they doing these things? All the time prior to the time that the Lord saved them. Did they have to do those things in order that the Lord save them? If not, then they did not have anything to do (not even believe) in order that the Lord save them; for those were the things they were doing all the time until the Lord saved them. But why did the Lord save them? Let us read (Ephesians 2:4-7) and see: But God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: that in the ages to come He might shew the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. Again, we ask, Why did the Lord save them? Because He loved them-" for His great love wherewith He loved us." That is the reason why, and not because they believed. The final end of it all is that "in the ages to come He might shew the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness toward us through Christ Jesus." His mercy and grace in the salvation of poor, lost, ruined, hell-deserving sinners will shine with effulgent glory in all the ages of eternity. Praise be to His holy and matchless name for such unspeakable love, mercy and grace. C. H. C.

Valley Of Dry Bones

---April 30, 1931

By request I will write my views on the "valley of dry bones." And should my views be different to yours will you please remember that I am willing to admit I might be wrong. Let that be as it may, it is my views that is asked for and not yours. As I see it, preaching is connected with these dry bones living. The hand of the Lord was

upon the Prophet Ezekiel and carried him out "in the Spirit of the Lord, and set him down in the midst of the valley which was full of bones." The Lord caused the prophet to pass by them "round about," and he was asked the question, "Son of man, can these bones live?" Notice his answer: "O, Lord God, thou knowest." These dry bones did not then, and do not now, represent or refer to dead, alien sinners, but to the children of God who are living after the flesh, or have been. The Lord told the prophet to "Prophecy upon these bones, and say unto them, O, ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord." Paul said, "We are laborers together with God." Please notice that the Lord told Ezekiel to say to the dry bones to "hear the word of the Lord." I will quote (verse five) to prove that after the Lord told the prophet to tell these dry bones to hear the word of the Lord, that the Lord Himself spoke to these dry bones, "Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones, Behold, I will cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live." It is the Lord's work in the hearts of His disobedient children that causes the gospel to be a savour of life unto life. "And I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring up flesh upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and ye shall live; and ye shall know that I am the Lord." Here is the utility of the gospel ministry, as shown in the next verse. "So I prophesied (preached) as I was commanded; and, as I prophesied, there was a noise, and, behold, a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone. Then said He unto me, Prophecy unto the wind, prophecy, son of man, and say to the wind, thus saith the Lord God, Come from the four winds, O, breath and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied as He commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood upon their feet, an exceeding great army. Then He said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel; behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts." Preaching did not have one thing to do in making these bones the whole house of Israel, but it did have something to do with these bones coming together and these "slain, that they may live." The valley of dry bones are the whole house of Israel, though they were not together, but when the prophet began to tell them as he was commanded, there was a noise, and, behold, a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone. This is what occurred a few years ago right here in Texas, when stout-hearted and rebellious Israel met at Dallas, Texas. There was a noise heard and a shaking took place. The apples of discord were shaken off and we were all together before we hardly knew it. "And the bones came together, bone to his bone." Take the one stick, and write upon it, for Judah. Take another stick, and write upon it, for Joseph." Judah was Jacob's son by Leah while Joseph was Jacob's son by Rachel. These were the two bones, families, the whole house of Israel, though divided against each other. The Lord told the prophet to "join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand." This very thing being done is why we are called the "consolidated Baptists." Neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all."-(2) (Verse 22). The different tribes of Israel did not lose their identity as Israelites because they were divided against each other. And the different groups of our people have not lost their identity as churches just because they are divided against each other. The tribe of Benjamin was a small tribe, yet it was one of the twelve tribes of Israel and had the same right to function as the other tribes of Israel did. The nations surrounding Israel had no right to function for the Israelites, any more than the Arminian world has a right to do work for us. I am unwilling to look upon the different groups of our people as I do the different Arminian orders. I would love to see our people unite their forces, ground their arms, quit devouring each other and build up the waste places in Zion. Who will join with us in this much needed work? J. S. N. We have been requested

to give our views on "The Valley of Dry Bones." The above expresses our views. We do not see where we can improve it any. C. H. C.

Glad Tidings Bought

---May 21, 1931

We have just closed a deal with Elder J. H. Fisher whereby we have bought the subscription list and accounts of the Glad Tidings. All the Glad Tidings subscribers will receive The Primitive Baptist. It will take us some time to go over the list of names on the Glad Tidings list to compare with the list we already had. Some of you may get two copies of the paper until we get all straightened out, but you will not be charged for two papers. That is, if you were taking both papers you may get two copies of The Primitive Baptist for awhile, until we get the two lists combined in one. There may be some families where both papers have been going, one in one name and the other paper in another name. If you get two papers that way, please write us about it and explain the matter as soon as you can, so you may help us get all things straight as they should be. As soon as we can we will send a letter to each subscriber to the Glad Tidings and tell you how we find your subscription marked on the book. Brother Fisher admits there may be mistakes. He agrees with us that we should make any correction the subscriber thinks is right. Each subscriber on the Glad Tidings list will be given full credit on our books for the whole time paid to. What we mean is this: If you are paid a year ahead on the Glad Tidings, we will give you credit for the full year on The Primitive Baptist. If you are behind and owe the Glad Tidings anything, it is coming to us. You can send your remittance to us and be sure to tell us what it is for, so we can find the account and give you proper credit. If you prefer, it will be all right with us for you to send your remittance to Brother Fisher. He will report it to us. We believe it is best for the cause for the two papers to be consolidated. The Glad Tidings subscribers will get a weekly paper now, as The Primitive Baptist is published weekly. Let us all do what we can now for this paper and try to make it a blessing to the cause, and not have our interests divided. Let us all try to work together for the advancement of the blessed cause. We have added the name of Brother Fisher to our editorial staff. We trust he will make use of our columns and that he may be led to write for the comfort and benefit of all our readers. Brother Fisher has sent us some obituaries and other articles he had on hand which we will publish as soon as we can possibly get to them. If any of the Glad Tidings subscribers have missed any copies of the paper, write to Brother Fisher, and he will send you the copies you missed. If he cannot supply them, let us know and we will mark up your time on The Primitive Baptist to make good all copies you have missed. We trust that this consolidation will be for the good of our blessed cause. How many of you will write and tell us you are going to do what you can to help us extend the circulation of the paper and help to make it a blessing to the cause? C. H. C.

Bible Conference

---July 23, 1931

We see in the Banner Herald, the Progressive organ, that they are to hold their "Bible Conference" in Jacksonville, Fla., August 25, 26 and 27, and that Elder J. B. Hardy, of Perryton, Texas, is on the program for an address at 3 p. m. on the 26th. We also see a short article in the same paper from Elder Hardy that he has held a meeting at Childress, Texas, beginning on Friday before the fifth Sunday in May,

and that ten ministers attended the meeting, and that there were nine additions. C. H. C.

Elder T. S. Dalton Called Home

---August 20, 1931

In the Advocate and Messenger for August, 1931, we find the sad news that Elder T. S. Dalton has been called to his eternal home. He passed away suddenly on July 30, 1931. He was eighty-five years old June 3. Brother Dalton lived and labored years ago in West Tennessee, Texas and Illinois. No doubt many-or at least some-of our readers in these sections will remember his work in the ministry, and his able defense of the doctrine of grace in discussion with those who opposed the truth. From the Advocate and Messenger we copy the following: As this issue of the Advocate and Messenger goes to press the sad news comes of the sudden death of Brother Dalton, who, on June 3, was eighty-five years old. He died suddenly about 5 a. m. today-July 30. Just a few days ago the editor received from him two excellent editorials, both of which appear in this issue. God blessed him with a strong mind and warm heart until the last-filling his preaching appointments and attending to other religious duties until he heard the summons, "Child, your Father calls, come home." Many hearts will be saddened by Brother Dalton's going. He was my dear friend-I shall miss him so much. Our editorial staff not long since suffered the loss of Elder Hassell. Now Brother Dalton has laid down his pen. Let us pray that God will give us others like them. And pray for his dear devoted wife and children in this time of deep sorrow. An extended notice will appear later. -Editor. Brother Dalton was an able minister of the gospel and will be greatly missed. May the Lord give us more such men. And may His richest blessings rest upon his dear companion and children in this sad hour of distress, is our humble prayer. Most of our old preachers-those who were in the service when we began trying to speak in the name of the Master forty-one years ago-are gone. They have been called from the field of battle and service here below to their long eternal home. Not many more struggles here, and we trust we shall meet them in a better home beyond the dark river. C. H. C.

Elder J. H. Phillips Dead

---October 15, 1931

Elder J. H. Phillips passed away on the evening of October 4 at the home of his daughter, Sister Nora Rhodes, near Huron, Tenn. He had been in failing health for some time. We know this is sad news to many of our readers, as it was to us. We had known Brother Phillips from boyhood, and he was our bosom companion in our early ministerial life. We were as brothers, and were brothers. He served many years on our editorial staff. We could not help shedding some tears of sorrow at the news of his going away. He was faithful and true to the cause of the Master-he "was true as steel." He never betrayed a trust. As a man there are none better than Jim Phillips was, and but few equal. His life was honorable and above reproach. In all his life as a servant of God he never brought a single ripple or wave of trouble, yet he was faithful and true and firm for the principles of truth and righteousness. He suffered much privation and toil for the cause we love, and endured much physical suffering for many years. But his sufferings are over now. We grieve for him as for a true and faithful and devoted brother and friend. We loved him more than we can tell. His children have our deepest sympathy. May the good Lord bless them, is our humble prayer. The churches and brethren whom he

so faithfully served have our sympathy. You will miss his kind and mature counsel and advice. Will you remember it all now, and not forget it, and live according to it? May the Lord help you to do so, is our humble prayer. So many of our loved ones and dear friends are passing away. But it will not be long until the time shall come that we hope to meet them in that better country. May the Lord help us, and may He send true and faithful servants to fill the ranks as they are thinned out by the passing away of those faithful ones who have been called home to that better land.
C. H. C.

Merry Christmas

---December 24, 1931

You are now reading the fifty-second issue of The Primitive Baptist for the year 1931. About one thousand and four hundred letters during the year from home folks. Some of these letters have been of praise to our heavenly Father, some instructive and wonderful messages from His bountiful storehouse, some of grief and sorrow. All of which reminds us, "Mixtures of joy and sorrow, daily we pass through." Yet, after all, if we would stop and count a few of our blessings, we have much to be thankful for. All of us have drunk the dregs of the great financial depression throughout our country. Even yet the old saying holds true: "From the day you were born till you ride in a hearse, things are never so bad that they couldn't be worse." Let us try to forget the heartaches and sorrows of 1931 and press on, ever looking unto Jesus and the merciful Father, our All in All. Merry Christmas to all. Mrs. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 46

---December 24, 1931

This issue of The Primitive Baptist closes the forty-sixth volume of the paper. With the close of the volume comes the close of another year. We are all one year nearer to our eternal home than we were one year ago. During the past year many of our brethren and sisters and kind friends have been called to their long sought home. There have been many sorrows, trials and conflicts during the past year. Much suffering has been endured by many. Yet we have much to be thankful for. Many who were without food and feed stuff now have a bountiful supply for another year. Yet we know that money matters are close. Sometimes during the year we could not see how we could possibly pull through the year and meet expenses and keep the paper going out every week in its full size. Many other papers skipped a number of issues, and many others came out only half size. So far we have not missed an issue, nor has the size been reduced. Besides, we promised just fifty-one issues per year when we made the paper a weekly again, but this year you get fifty-two issues, as there are fifty-three Thursdays in this year. So, as there are fifty-three Thursdays in 1931, there will be no paper next week. We have had a "hard pull" for the last two years. Everything still looks dark and gloomy to us. But, the Lord willing, we hope to greet our readers again in the issue for January 7, 1932. Until then, farewell; and please do remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

1932

Introduction to Volume 47

---January 7, 1932

With this issue we begin the publication of the forty-seventh volume of The Primitive Baptist. During the past forty-six years there have been many changes. There have been "wars and rumors of wars;" there have been earthquakes and famines and pestilences. It seems that crime has been on the increase-especially during the past few years. Graft and wickedness seem to prevail in high places-as well as low. Business enterprises are going bankrupt; taxes are on the increase; city, county, state and national governments seem to be on the very verge of bankruptcy. It seems to us that upon very slight provocation, under existing conditions, there might be a mighty and wholesale overthrow and crumbling of governments. It seems, too, there is still a great spirit of unrest in religious circles. Graft and wickedness not only prevail in matters of state, but also in religious circles. Crime and wickedness are winked at and condoned and hidden and wrapped up. It is a wonder to us that the Lord is so good as to let this old world continue to stand. Surely He is longsuffering. The drouth in 1930 and the shortage of crops were distressing. People had been living too fast. In 1931 bountiful crops were made, and farmers have plenty to eat and to feed on for another year or more. Yet there are cries of distress all over the land, as well as all over the civilized world. It seems that starvation is staring millions of people in the face-and that, too, in the midst of plenty. The farmers can get very little for what they have to sell, or for their surplus crops. It seems that we have all forgotten God, and have been unthankful to Him for our many and wonderful blessings. The end is not yet. Covetousness and hoarding will not bring relief. But we must stop here along this line. We now begin a new year. We are still marching on nearer to the end of the tiresome and troublesome journey. We need new strength and courage to fight the battles which lie before us-if our life may still be spared. We desire to look to Him from whom all blessings come. We still see no reason why this paper should not continue to advocate the same principles which have been advocated through its columns during the past forty-six years. There is no reason we can see why there should be any change along that line. May the good Lord bless, sustain and keep us and all the readers, is our humble prayer. Please pray for us and help us all you can. C. H. C.

Biographical

---January 7, 1932

For some time we have been considering the matter of printing in The Primitive Baptist a picture of some of our ministers with a biographical sketch of each one. We have thought to put something like this in the paper at least once each month. We would like to have a picture and an article of this kind from one of our ministers in each issue of the paper, but the cost may be too much. Our companion has been attending to the details of this matter for us. So, now, here she comes to the editor, and says, "I want an article from you for the next issue of the paper to start this thing off. I already have the picture." Now, what can I do? I just cannot write a sketch of my life that will be worth a thing in the world to anyone-living or dead. I cannot go into detail regarding my "ups and downs." I need not recite the incidents, or accidents, or occurrences that have come to pass in my life. Since I have been connected with this paper in 1886, and since I united with the church in 1889, and since I was ordained to the work of the ministry in 1896, my life has

been an open book. Many of the things I have witnessed and have been engaged in and have passed through are already matters of record. What must I do? What can I say? I am the oldest son, and the oldest child, of Silas Fleming Cayce. He was ordained to the work of the ministry November 9, 1878, by Elders Wm. Howard, N. G. Phillips and H. Gilbert. He began the publication of The Primitive Baptist January 1, 1886. He was the oldest son of James Hardy Cayce, who was a Primitive Baptist and the oldest son of Elder Fleming Cayce, a Primitive Baptist. If we have the record correct, Fleming Cayce was the oldest son of Shadrack Cayce, a Baptist-of the old sort; and he was the oldest son of J. F. Cayce, who was also a Baptist before the modern sort were born. We do not certainly know, but have reason to believe that he was a minister. I have in my possession a walking cane which belonged to J. F. Cayce, which has been handed down to the oldest son from generation to generation. It has been in the Old Baptist family all along, and in the hands of the oldest son each time. We trust it may be the will of the good Lord that it may still be handed down in the same way to generations following. My mother was Flora Magdalene Beasley, a daughter of Elisha Beasley, who lived and died about Clinton, Ky. He and grandmother Beasley were buried at Mil-burn, Ky. According to what my dear old mother and father told me while they were yet living, I was born into this troublesome world on June 1, 1871, on a little hill in the town of Moscow, Ky. In the summer of 1879, I saw myself a ruined and condemned sinner in the sight of a just and holy God. I was just eight years old then; yet the agonies which I endured are fresh in my memory. Many times I heard father and mother praying for their poor boy; but their prayers did not bring peace to my soul. I tried reformation of life; but that gave no relief. Many times in secret, as well as in secret places, the very breathing of my poor heart went out in supplication to the God of all grace, begging Him to have mercy upon me, a poor sinner. I went thus bowed in sorrow and distress till about the spring or summer of 1885, perhaps just before I was fourteen years of age. One afternoon, though the sun was shining, yet all looked dark and gloomy to me. I went off to a secluded spot to try to pray one more time for mercy. It seemed that my pleadings for mercy were no better than mockery. I arose and started to the house. Before I got there I looked toward the sun, as it was just above the western tree tops. It seemed to me that I was there sinking into eternal despair-that I would never see the sun rise again. In my heart I felt to say, "Farewell; before you rise in the east in the morning, I will be suffering the vengeance of eternal torment." As I turned to take another step toward the house the burden was gone. I did not know how nor where it went. I felt to be at perfect peace and perfect ease. I then thought to go to the house and tell mother what a blessed Saviour I had found, but something seemed to whisper, "You might be deceived, and you might deceive her." Then I began to beg, "Lord, if deceived, undeceive me." "Lord, what shall I do?" Then the impression came to be baptized and to proclaim the riches of His grace. I tried many times to get that old burden back again, so I might know how and where it went. But I was never able to get back into that condition any more. Since that memorable day I have had many sore trials and conflicts, but the sweet hope I there received in the crucified and risen Redeemer has never yet been entirely obliterated. True, sometimes it seems that the evidences I have are so little and so dim that I can hardly claim that I have a sweet hope in Jesus; but in all the sorrows and heartaches and distresses through which I have come, it has been sweet and precious to me. I would not give it now for all this poor world. On the second Sunday in August, 1889, I went to the church in Greenfield, Tenn., and told them some part of the reason of my hope and asked for a home with them. I confessed my sins, as did those who went to John for baptism. I remember how that they kindly took me into their sweet fellowship, with tears freely flowing down their cheeks. I did not tell them of any impression I had

to try to speak in public. I thought perhaps that might leave me. The home and place they gave poor me with them was delightful to me. That dear old church and place will be precious in my memory as long as I retain the faculties of my mind. No matter where I may go, nor where I may roam, that dear old church, and those precious loved of God, who so kindly gave me a resting place with them, will be precious in my memory. On Thursday before the second Sunday in September, 1889, a dark and cold and cloudy and gloomy day, the church assembled at the water-a pond near the town of Greenfield-and my sainted father led me and my sister (Meda, who passed away in May, 1911) down into the water and laid us beneath the yielding wave. When he raised me up from under the wave, the clouds overhead were divided and the sun shone brightly over the scene. There I left a burden which I have never felt since. Once more sweet peace and joy filled my poor soul. When I turned my eyes toward the congregation on the bank, it was seemingly as glorious to me as though the very gates of heaven had been thrown open wide, and the angels had been beckoning me home to glory. Many times in my sorrows and heartaches my mind goes back to that time, and I yet sometimes feel a consolation in meditating upon that scene and that time, and the sweet feeling I then enjoyed. I may never reach that heaven of eternal rest beyond, but I had a little taste of heaven there. It may be that all the heaven I will ever enjoy is what little rejoicing I get here in this life-but I still want to seek that peace and ensue it, even if there should be no hereafter. On Saturday night, January 4, 1890, I made my first effort to speak in the name of Jesus. That was at the home of a Brother Morris in Wayne County, Tenn. A few years back I was passing that place with my dear wife and children. We stopped and I took a look at the place, and my mind went back in meditation. It was solemn to me. On Saturday before the second Sunday in October, 1890, the church at Greenfield liberated me to speak in the name of the Master at any place my lot might be cast. Sometime after this, circumstances making it more convenient for us, our whole family moved our membership to the church at Ralston. On the sixth day of December, 1896, I was ordained to the work of the ministry at and by the authority of this church. The presbytery was composed of Elders W. W. Sammons, S. F. Cayce and K. M. Myatt, and Deacons W. I. Tucker and T. P. Rawls. These were all precious and dear servants of the Lord to me. They are all gone now to that better home beyond, but I hold them in sweet and precious memory. I loved them all. I love their memory yet. I have traveled many miles, by day and by night, through heat and through cold, to try to tell the Lord's humble poor of the riches of the Master. I have tried to "count all things as loss" to try to serve the Lord and His people. I am well aware that I have made many mistakes. I have had many trials to endure. Some of the hardest trials a poor mortal could be called on to endure have been mine. When I now look back I feel that I have been able to accomplish so little that it seems my life has been almost, if not altogether, in vain. I am now past sixty-older than many of my ancestors lived to be. I realize that I am now nearing the end of the journey. My trials and troubles will soon be over. I no longer look forward to joys and pleasures in this life. I find myself now sometimes looking forward to joys beyond the river of death, beyond the grave. How will it be with me when I reach the end of the way? I do not know; but that sweet hope still lingers, and is dear to me as I pass on nearer to the end. When mother passed away she said, "Son, I will meet you over yonder in that better home." I said, "Mother, I do not know that I will be there, but I hope so." I am still hoping. Sweet hope; precious hope; glorious hope. Will it fail me in the end? It will not be long until I shall try it. I am willing, I trust, to risk it. Now, I must quit. Perhaps I have written too much. Please throw the mantle of charity over and around me, and please do remember poor me and my dear loved ones in your prayers. Will you love and cheer and care for my dear

companion and children when I am gone- the dear good woman and children who have helped me to bear the many burdens for the cause of the Master? C. H. C.

Things Appreciated

---January 7, 1932

We (Elder Cayce and I) wish to thank each one who so kindly remembered us with Christmas greetings. The kind words of encouragement, the many wishes for our happiness, and invoking the Lord's blessings upon us and ours, and the tokens of love are highly appreciated. The many words fitly spoken to Elder Cayce are as "apples of gold in pictures of silver;" make him feel perhaps his efforts in his Master's service have not all been in vain. A number of you are taking advantage of the Great Subscription Offer. This offer has been extended. We trust many will take advantage of this great offer. We wish to buy enough paper to do during this year. Had we not done this last January we do not know what the outcome would have been. The object in making this Great Offer is to buy enough paper now to do during 1932. By having the paper in our office we believe that we can keep the paper a weekly. We want it to keep going each week. Some of our ministers and members are trying to get the paper in each home of the membership of their church. We think that is a good plan. We believe that each reader will be benefited in some way by reading the paper. In this paper you see Elder Cayce's picture and biographical sketch. In February fourth paper we will have Elder Webb's picture and biographical sketch; in March third, Elder Newman's picture and biographical sketch. We intend to have a biographical sketch and picture in the paper once each month this year. We would like to have one each issue. The cost in getting the plates made makes us fear to try to have a picture in each issue. Will you tell your brethren, sisters and friends about this new feature, so they will send in their subscription so as not to miss any copies? We trust that you will continue to write for the paper. Please do not ask us to publish church trouble. If our own fleshly brothers or sisters err, we want to keep that to ourselves, and talk about it as little as possible. Then should not we be more cautious, and not broadcast the faults of our kindred in Christ? Write of your good meetings; of the mercies and wonderful love of our God. Praise Him in words and actions. Make your articles short and to the point. Many ask concerning Elder Cayce's health. For the last several months his health seems much improved. His general condition is much better. However, he is now (January 1) confined to his room with a slight attack of flu. Our wish for you is that the year 1932 will bring you and me closer to God, and that you may bask in the sunlight of His love and mercy. Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

The Outlook

---February 4, 1932

We feel that it is due our readers that we tell them frankly what the prospect is now for us to be able to continue sending The Primitive Baptist out weekly during this year. During the last two years our subscription list has fallen off considerably, and unless our subscribers put forth extra effort right now and send us a lot of new subscribers we do not see how we are going to be able to continue the paper as a weekly through this year. We must raise enough money to meet a few outstanding bills and to buy enough paper to run through the year, if we continue as a weekly- and we must do this immediately, or within the next few weeks. Right now is the time we have to make our plans for the year -and then we have to work through the year according to those plans-unless we are able to do better or have to do

worse, as unforeseen circumstances may require. Surely most of our subscribers could take advantage of the offer that is running in the paper. Surely many of our subscribers could get some new subscribers at one dollar for this one year-just half price for the paper. Will each one of you go to work right now and see what you can do during the month of February? What you all do this month will, in all probability, decide as to whether the paper may be sent on as a weekly during this year. Will you help us to continue it weekly? C. H. C.

Elder Hutchens Complains

---February 18, 1932

In the Lone Pilgrim (Lone Pilgrinder, as Brother Copeland calls it) Elder Hutchens, the editor, makes some complaint against a number of his subscribers. In the January issue he says: "As stated sometime ago, I have sent each subscriber who was in arrears a statement of their account. Less than half of them have answered this statement. I must say I cannot understand why so many will not answer. If I owed you, what would you expect me to do when you wrote me about it? Ignore you entirely, or tell you if I could not pay?" Well, Brother Hutchens, according to your doctrine, it is very evident that the Lord absolutely predestinated and fixed in eternity that you should send those statements out, and that less than half of them should answer. Of course, if your doctrine is the truth, God absolutely predestinated from eternity that those subscribers should be in arrears, and that they should not pay you. They could not help getting in debt to you, according to your doctrine; and then they could not help not paying you, because, according to your doctrine, God absolutely predestinated from all eternity that they should do that way. Of course, according to your doctrine, the reason why they will not answer is because God predestinated that they should not do so. We do not see why you cannot understand that-it is as simple and plain as can be. If God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated from all eternity everything that comes to pass, and unalterably fixed that all things come to pass just as they do come to pass, then God unalterably fixed that those persons should not answer your statements. But he says he cannot understand why they do not answer. Evidently he does not understand the doctrine he says he believes. It seems to us that if he believes what he says he does he would understand just why everything is the way it is. He says he believes God predestinated and fixed everything to be just as it is. If He did, then He predestinated and fixed that his subscribers should not answer his statements, and that is the reason why they do as they do. Of course. But Elder Hutchens says he cannot understand it. Of course not-who could? Elder Hutchens also says: "If each one had paid their subscription promptly I could have kept the paper in book form, and 64 pages." Certainly. But according to his doctrine, it is evidently true that God unalterably fixed it in eternity that he should not continue his paper in book form, "and 64 pages." Why complain at the subscribers about it? God is the one who so fixed and arranged and predestinated it, and now Elder Hutchens is complaining at what he says he believes. But he is complaining at the ones who had nothing whatever to do with the fixing of it, and who could not help the way it is fixed, nor could they change it if they were to try. But according to the doctrine advocated by Elder Hutchens, they could not even try, because if God fixed it that they should do what they do, then He must have also fixed it that they should not do any other way-He so arranged and fixed it that they should not even try to do any other way. If we believed as Elder Hutchens says he does, and he owed us something, and we should write him about it, we would expect him to do just as God has absolutely fixed and predestinated and

arranged for him to do. That is the way your subscribers have done-if your doctrine is the truth. Elder Hutchens also says: "I cannot continue to send the paper to those who are behind indefinitely. So there must be something done about it, and to you who have not written me, I ask what you expect me to do?" We did not know that subscribers for a paper who are in arrears ever get behind indefinitely. We suppose Elder Hutchens means that he cannot continue to send the paper on indefinitely to those who are behind. Of course he cannot, unless it should be so that God has absolutely fixed and predestinated that he should do so -and in that case we are inclined to think he would do so, whether he can or not! But he asks those who have not written to him what they expected him to do. Of course, if they believe as Elder Hutchens says he does, they expect him to do just as God did in eternity predestinate, fix, and arrange for him to do. He thinks that honesty would suggest that if they cannot pay him they would write and tell him so. Then, if they do not write and tell him they cannot pay, they are not honest. But if God so predestinated and fixed that they should do that way, then God fixed it that they should not be honest. Then God is "accessory" to the fact! They would have been honest, and would have paid the elder, if God had so arranged in eternity for it to have been that way; but He arranged it to be as it is! Therefore, the dishonesty and the stealing and lying comes from God's arrangement and fixing! That's their doctrine! C. H. C.

Did Not Like It

---March 10, 1932

The Primitive Baptist:

Your paper came to me some time ago, and I felt glad and thought I enjoyed reading it, insomuch I wrote a few lines of thanks for the same. So much was said about peace, I felt maybe the Lord was working through you all for peace. But, alas, when February 18 reached me and I saw how Mr. Cayce bounced on Elder Hutchens, even throwing slugs at the name of his paper, I read the piece through, and, I am sorry to say, I saw nothing like a sheep hunting a quiet pasture, but, instead, a wolf, ready to bounce on anything that is food for his pen. So I am sorry this confidence I had in you all working for peace is so soon killed. So please stop the paper. I do not care for the family to read it. Yours, H. H. Phillips. Ladell, Ark.
REMARKS

All right, Brother Phillips. According to Elder Hutchens' doctrine, we could not help it-we had to say what we did say-and you can't help it either. There is no peace to be had with the doctrine Elder Hutchens advocates. Many good brethren have been blinded and deluded by such teaching but we are glad to work for peace with any who are ready to abandon that doctrine. C. H. C.

Thirty Missionaries Waiting To Go

---April 28, 1932

We are in receipt of a clipping from a paper called The Other Sheep, which reads as follows: Thirty missionaries waiting to go to the needy fields. Why cannot they go? No money. Twelve fields calling frantically for reinforcements. No help can be sent. Why? No money. Ten missionaries who ought to be furloughed home. They cannot come. Why? No money. Ten thousand souls waiting for the salvation of Christ. It cannot be carried to them. Why? No money. Souls moving toward hell; the workers in foreign lands too few to rescue them; the missionaries at home anxious to go,

yet cannot do so. Why? Lack of money. Is the money here in America? Yes. Why will not our people give it? Lack of deep interest. Sixty thousand Nazarenes omitting one meal a week for a year, at a cost of 20 cents a meal, would, if that small amount were devoted to missions, send in \$600,000 in a year. Don't say "we cannot," but say rather "we will not." Poor missionaries! It is so bad that they want to go to the fields-that they are so anxious to go-and stop some of those souls who are so fast moving toward hell, and yet they cannot go. "Why? NO MONEY." What a pity that salvation is so scarce. Why is salvation so scarce now? "No money." We wonder if anybody had salvation before money was invented. Just think! The depression has been on now since 1929. The common people, and people generally, have no money. The poor "Nazarenes," as well as other poor, many of them, no doubt, have to miss more than one meal a week, even if that meal would cost no more than ten cents-and yet no salvation! What a pitiful plight we are in! If such as the above is the fact in the case, it looks to us as though the whole combined world is on the downward road to an eternal hell-and that all are going at lightning speed. The great majority have no money to give, and not many meals, either; the few who have the money are hoarding it, and will not give it, and will not turn it loose so that others might give it. The poor benighted heathen rushing toward an endless hell-and they are utterly helpless to stop; and God Himself cannot stop them. They are all going to hell on account of the fact that a few are hoarding the money. If the throne of God shines forth in justice in the ages of eternity, and the above effusion is the truth, then these hoarders, and those who will not give, will all be landed in hell with the benighted heathen. It is absurd to say that the poor heathen will suffer in an endless hell on account of this covetousness and stinginess of the American people, and the American people go free. The whole "fraternity" will go down to an eternal hell together. Thank the Lord, salvation is not hinged on such as that. "Ten thousand souls waiting for the salvation of Christ." "No money." Poor things. It seems that somebody has the salvation and the money, too. Why? Because, "Don't say 'we cannot;' but say rather 'we will not.'" There you are. If we say we cannot, then we lie, because we just "will not." Lord, help us! What blasphemy! Such as this is enough to make the angels blush! Did ever the devil himself invent a more deceitful and lying scheme to get money? It is no better than hijacking or bank robbery. It is nothing other than a scheme to beg money and to get money under false pretense. "For thus saith the Lord, Ye have sold yourselves for naught; and ye shall be redeemed without money." - **((2:3) (Isaiah 52:3))** "They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches; none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him; (for redemption of their soul is precious, and it ceaseth for ever;) that he should still live for ever, and not see corruption." -((9:6) (Psalms 49:6-9)). If these passages of Holy Writ do not prove that men and money have nothing whatever to do with the redemption and eternal salvation of sinners, then language does not mean anything at all. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you, who by Him do believe in God, that raised Him up from the dead, and gave Him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God." -((Pet 1:18) (I Peter 1:18-21)). This tells the truth about the whole thing. Sinners are redeemed by the blood of Christ, and it is by Him that they believe in God; and it is by Him that they are saved. The works of men and their money are all left out of the work of salvation and deliverance from sin and its ruinous consequences. Your faith and

hope are in God, and not in men and money. When will men cease to pervert the truth and to teach such blasphemous heresy? C. H. C.

Soupy Salvation

---July 7, 1932

There will be hundreds who shall appear in the Judgment who will bless Brother Cox for this wonderful work. Much of the money to carry on the work is now coming from those who have been saved at these free lunch services. We sometimes sing, "There is power in the blood," and there is, but there is power in SOUP to get men to the blood.-Ben M. Bogard, in Baptist and Commoner, June 24, 1932. If the above does not teach a "soupy salvation," then what does it teach? "Power in SOUP to get men to the blood!" If that were not so ridiculous it would be real funny! "There will be hundreds who will appear in the Judgment who will bless Brother Cox for this wonderful work." Wonder how Parson Bogard found that out? It is not in the Book. By revelation John saw the finally redeemed in heaven, and heard them singing. Wonder what they sang? Was it this: "Unto the name of Cox be glory, honor, majesty, might and dominion, because he brought salvation to us through the SOUP route?" But we suppose John did not know about the soup business. The Lord did not reveal to him the fact that sinners could be brought to the blood of Christ and made the recipients of the merits of that blood by pouring soup into their bellies-so it seems. Perhaps these modern fellows have taught the Lord something that He did not know when John was on the Isle of Patmos. If the Lord would give us another Book it would have all these modern "scientific" ways of getting sinners to the blood of Christ set forth in it -perhaps. Of course, until the Lord does give us another Book having such blasphemous tomfoolery in it, those of us who are "old-fogy," and who rely on the teaching of the Book God has given us, will have to still go on believing that the Lord does not need to have Cox, or Bogard, or others, to feed SOUP to people in order that He reach them with the blood of Christ. It seems to us that a man can get to the blood of Christ just about as easy through the water of baptism as though a bowl of SOUP. If this does not put things together "for your whiskers," we never saw it done! SOUP and salvation connected together! Get salvation down the poor fellows by feeding it to them in their soup! Several years ago, at the time of the Boxer uprising in China, the missionaries in that country called for help from the "home lands" asking for their soldiers to be sent to China. We suppose they wanted the soldiers to subdue the unwilling Chinese; and if they would not be subdued, then shoot holes through them to let in the light of the gospel, or to shoot salvation into them with their guns. Of course that would be a severe way of saving those heathen Chinamen. But over in Memphis, Tenn., according to Mr. Bogard, the Rt. Rev. Mr. Cox, D. D., has a more humane way of saving the "down and outers." Mr. Cox just feeds salvation to them in their SOUP. We have been aware, for years, that properly made and prepared soup was pleasant to the taste, and was good to fill the stomach-but, wonder of wonders!-here is a new use for soup! Feed 'em SOUP, and thereby give 'em eternal salvation and save 'em from eternal perdition! What will these fellows say next? C. H. C.

The Lone "Pilgrinder"

---September 15, 1932

The "Lone Pilgrinder" has suspended publication, having been consolidated with "Sovereign Grace," a paper recently being published in California. We note in that

paper for August this statement, in part: "Because of financial conditions of the Lone Pilgrim Elder Hutchens has seen fit to combine our two papers. A more detailed article will appear (D. V) in the September No." From this notice it seems that the "Pilgrinder" will grind no more pills. We saw some complaints in the "Pilgrinder" before it suspended publication about the subscribers not paying up. We suppose, according to their doctrine, that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated from all eternity that the subscribers should take the paper and not pay for it, and that Elder Hutchens should complain about it, and that the said paper should suspend publication. Brother Hutchens, you have our sincere sympathy, and may the good Lord have mercy on all who advocate such doctrine. C. H. C.

Remarks To Geo. W. Langford

---December 22, 1932

We are of the opinion that sometimes people may lay too much stress on some of the exercises mentioned by Brother Langford in the foregoing article. A Christian experience does not necessarily mean that the person agonizes for perhaps months or years, and then has a miraculous deliverance from his troubles. One does not have to have such an experience and be able to remember and tell all about it in order to be a child of God, or to be born from above. To be a child of God is to have been born of God, born from above. Brother Langford, you do not remember when you were born into this natural realm. The very first natural thought or emotion you ever had, you had already been born into this natural realm. Natural emotion springs from the natural life. Spiritual emotion springs from the spiritual life. Just as sure as you have ever had a spiritual emotion, just that sure you already had the spiritual life. You may not remember when you were born into the spiritual realm any more than you can remember when you were born into the natural realm. Remembering and knowing these things is no more necessary in the one case than in the other. John the Baptist was given to leap for joy by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit before his natural birth into this world. Brother Langford, do you suppose John the Baptist could tell such an experience as some tell in their writings? We are sure he could not. But he could love the Master and could love the truth and righteousness just as well as the Apostle Paul could. And he was a child of God, and heaven was his home; all the joys of heaven are his. God is as able to regenerate an unborn infant as an adult, and to plant His love in their hearts. He regenerated John the Baptist before he was born into this world. So with one of the prophets. When the children of Israel were delivered from Egyptian bondage there were many men able to bear arms, besides women and children, brought to the Red Sea. The enemy was in pursuit, and there seemed to be no way of escape. The sea was before them, and a mountain on either side. They were entirely hedged in. The Israelites began to complain at Moses, and to say, "Why did you not leave us in Egypt to die, where we might have had graves to be buried in? Why did you bring us into the wilderness to die?" Moses answered, "Stand still, and see the salvation of God; for the enemy that thou seest today, thou shalt see no more forever." Then Moses stretched his rod over the waters and they were divided, and the Israelites marched through as by dry land. The waters went back together and drowned the Egyptians who had essayed to follow. Then the children of Israel sang the song of deliverance on the other side of the sea. They journeyed forty years in the wilderness before they crossed over Jordan into the promised land. When they had journeyed thirty years in the wilderness those who were in their infancy and in their mother's arms when they reached the Red

Sea were grown to manhood and womanhood. They could not remember when they came to the Red Sea; they could not remember the complaint made to Moses; they could not remember seeing the enemy in pursuit; they could not remember seeing the waters divided; they could not remember the march through the sea; they could not remember the song of deliverance on the bank of the sea-they could not remember any of these things and tell about them. But there was something they could do. They could praise God for their deliverance just as well as those who could remember those things and tell all about them. They could love the Lord as well as the others could. So, you, dear brother, if you cannot remember and tell all about these things-you can love the Lord as well as those who can tell the things you speak of them telling. Do you love the Lord? This is an unmistakable evidence for you that you are born from above-heaven-born and heaven-bound. "Every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." - **(I John 4:7)**. Do you love the Lord's children? This is the very best evidence one can have that he is a child of God. "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." - **(I John 3:14)**. Does the gospel come to you in power, and in much assurance? "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God. For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." - (Th 1:4) (I Thessalonians 1:4-5). How much better evidence do you want than these? May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon you. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 47

---December 22, 1932

This issue closes the forty-seventh volume of The Primitive Baptist. Another year is drawing to a close -and another New Year will soon usher in. The passing year has been one of much distress. Thousands are suffering for food and shelter, and yet we are in the midst of plenty. Our legislative authorities are dillydallying in matters which concern money lenders and the money powers, instead of doing the things necessary to open up markets for our surplus products, and thereby give relief, and open work for the poor producers and unemployed. Crime is still on the increase. Governments-county, state and national-are on the verge of bankruptcy. Many of the professed followers of the lowly Jesus are careless and indifferent about the service of the Lord. They let the service of the Lord and the things which concern their spiritual welfare and well-being come in as a matter of the last and least concern. Many of them "cannot afford" a few pennies for reading matter for their spiritual comfort and benefit-but do they let worldly matters be of more concern? Should we economize in church and spiritual matters first? Or, should that be the last? Well, things still look dark and gloomy to us in many respects. But with us the battle will soon be over. We have been "in the field" a number of years now, and the end of this present year is just one more year's battles fought, trials endured, sorrows ended, and difficulties surmounted or gone around, and brings us that much nearer to an honorable discharge from the warfare. Our wife has been confined to her room and bed with an attack of flu for a little more than a week, but is now better and able to sit up some. Please remember her and us in your prayers. There will be no paper next week, as we always skip one week at Christmas time. We now bid you all adieu for the year 1932, praying the Lord's richest blessings may rest upon every reader, and desiring an interest in your prayers when you go to the throne of grace. C. H. C.

1933

Introduction to Volume 48

---January 5, 1933

We now begin the forty-eighth volume of The Primitive Baptist. We are facing another new year, with its joys and sorrows, its pleasures and disappointments. We need renewed energy and strength for the battles of life, just as much as we ever did. Although these are trying times-such times as try men's souls-yet we have all been wonderfully blessed. Our hearts should be filled with gratitude and thankfulness to God that matters are as well with us as they are. We have been blessed to send this paper out during the past year without missing a single issue, and without reducing the size of the paper for any one issue. Just as we promised at the beginning of the year, we sent out 816 pages of reading matter during the year 1932. We cannot promise that for this year. Many of our subscribers during the past two years have had their names dropped from the list. Many have written us to stop their paper, as they were not able to pay for it. We wish we were able to give the paper to all who are really not able to pay for it, but we cannot do that. We do give it to many-a great many-and would be glad to give it to many more. When we have done all we can, we can do no more. If we have no subscribers for the paper during these hard times, we will have no paper to send out when times do get better-and they surely will get better some day. We do not believe that these hard times are altogether the work of Satan. We believe the Lord is suffering these times as a chastisement for some people. He scourges His people for their sins and wickedness, and He scourges nations for their wickedness. It seems that almost the entire civilized world is in distress-the depression is almost world-wide. When the chastisement has been sufficient then it will stop. We do not know when that will be. Do you? Let us try to trust the Lord and mend our ways. Let us all be more devoted to Him and to His service. Let us try to serve and help one another. He will not forsake His humble followers. "Trust in the Lord, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed." - (**Psalms 37:1**) and (**II Corinthians 6:17**), they excluded from their fellowship those guilty of immoral, unscriptural or disorderly conduct. They debarred or excluded from fellowship persons who sold spirituous liquors; those who drank to excess; those who borrowed money and did not repay it; those who married irreligious and disorderly companions; those who did not treat their companions with proper love and kindness; those who told lies; those who swore; and those guilty of unchastity. Upon thoroughly satisfactory proof of heartfelt repentance, the churches were rejoiced to restore excluded members again to fellowship. They silenced preachers for improper conduct which was not thought to be so gross as to demand their exclusion; and, upon proper repentance, restored to them the privilege of exercising their gifts in public.

Some of the churches observed the Lord's supper weekly, but most of them monthly. Singing was not commonly practiced; and when engaged in, it was only at the close of the meeting, so that all opposed to it could freely go out, and the church would not be offended. * * * A very few churches observed the washing of feet; but this was placed among the things indifferent, and was never made a bar to fellowship. Some churches had a love feast before the Lord's supper. On page 845 we find the following: As to feet washing-This appears to be an open question among Baptists, some approving and others disapproving the literal observance as

a church ordinance or rite, and all getting along harmoniously together. * * * Some of the Kehukee churches have never observed it at all; others have occasionally observed it upon motion of someone in conference, and attended to it during some week day at the meetinghouse, or at some private house at night, and this at long intervals. Others observe it annually, and connect it with communion or the Lord's supper; while others repeat it quarterly, and in every instance connect it with communion, which almost invariably occurs on Sunday, after the preaching services are ended. In a footnote at the bottom of the same page Elder Sylvester Hassell says: It is the final result of all my researches among the Old School or Primitive Baptists of the United States that about one-half do, and one-half do not, practice the washing of feet as a church ordinance or rite. On page 846 we read: This irregularity, we must confess, shows more difference among orthodox Baptists than all other practices or observances adhered to by them put together. Some are ready to conclude on the account of this diversity that they are not one people; that they are divided and cannot walk together. But this is a wrong conclusion; they are one people still, and do not allow the observance or non-observance of this rite to affect their fellowship with each other. The churches composing the Kehukee Association will perhaps represent, on this subject, all the churches in the United States, some engaging in the practice of feet washing more or less, and others not at all. We conclude, therefore, if the discordant views on this subject have not broken fellowship among the dear children of God for the last hundred years, that they never will; and that the faithful in Christ Jesus will continue to press onward, hand in hand together, "toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus," through the remaining portion of the Christian dispensation. It would be deplorable and contrary to ancient usage among Baptists if any one or more should at any time hereafter, on either side of the question, set up a bar of communion between themselves and those who differ with them on this subject. Such a dogmatical or dictatorial spirit should not be encouraged or even tolerated in the household of faith. It would look selfish and out of place. We would be glad if all our brethren could see this matter alike and all would engage in the practice of it. But it would look bad for us to set up a bar of non-fellowship against brethren who have been fellow-shipped and loved and esteemed in the Baptist family all the years of the past. We are not ready yet to say that we are "the standard," and that all must come to our view or be read out of the denomination. May the Lord lead us all to have forbearance and to love one another. C. H. C.

How To Organize

---October 19, 1933

We have been requested to say through the paper how churches should proceed to organize an association. As we understand the matter, there is not much to do. A church may invite sister churches to meet with her by messengers to consider the advisability of organizing an association. If the churches see proper to go into such an organization they may meet at a place and time agreed on for the purpose. The constitution, if they wish to have one, may be submitted to the several churches for their approval, with the articles of faith and rules of decorum. Then when they assemble for the constitution, they may adopt the constitution, articles of faith and rules of decorum which the churches have approved of, proceed to elect their officers and proceed with their business. It seems to us that this would be all that would be necessary. Some associations have too much of a constitution, we think. It seems to us that the different churches meeting by messengers with another

church for mutual worship, and have as little business as possible, would be for the best. C. H. C.

Papers Missed

---November 30, 1933

Circumstances over which we had no control made it necessary for us to skip several issues of this paper. We failed to get out any paper for October 12 and 26 and for November 9. We have mailed the issue for November 19. This writing is being done the 21st. We will get out no paper for the 23rd. This writing will be in the issue of November 30. Circumstances are such that we will have to skip every other week for the remainder of the year. It is possible that we will have to continue on this way through next year. From the time that the NRA proposition began to be put before the public, we have been carefully studying its workings and the propositions for the codes, and so on. It soon became very plain to us that we could not observe the code and continue to publish *The Primitive Baptist*. Some of the requirements were such as to make it impossible for us to get the paper out weekly, as we had been doing, and to observe the code. The code required a reduction in work hours to forty hours per week for all employees. We were working the employees only forty-five hours per week. We were paying most every employee the same rate per hour that we paid in 1929. The only reduction we had made was a reduction in the number of hours per week to forty-five. As we had five employees, besides ourself and wife, a reduction in work hours to forty per week would leave us short twenty-five hours per week. The code also required a raise in the rate of pay on some of the employees. We were sure we could not get a printer to move here to live when we could give him only twenty-five hours work each week. This was a problem we saw facing us. This condition made it seem impossible to us to continue to get the paper out every week. So we have skipped the weeks as above stated. It is simply impossible for us to cut down the number of hours and increase salaries and continue to get the paper out. It could not possibly mean anything else but failure, and for the paper to go down. It caused us no little worry and anxiety. The only thing we could see to do was the one step we took. We laid off every employee after the issue for October 5 was mailed. Since then we have had our type set on a machine in an office in another town and your editor and wife have been doing the work of getting the paper out, except that a few times we have had Brother Webb to run the press and some others to help do the mailing. The editor and wife will have to get the paper out. We have been getting out another edition of the *Good Old Songs*, and have been giving the employees some extra work on that job. We have been working code hours and paying them what we understood to be the code price, though we have not signed any code. We saw no alternative only to put our work where the code would not apply. The owner may work as many hours as he pleases; but his hired help in the plant must work only eight hours a day and only five days a week. This is making the books cost us more than they would have cost us otherwise. We are sure that every employee we had would be glad to go back on the regular job at the same rate of pay they were getting; but we are afraid to do that. The government steps in and says we shall pay so much and work so many hours. If this is not dictatorship, then you may give it what name you please. It seems to us that the probabilities are that we will have to continue as we are doing next year—at least, for a part of the year. We are sorry this is so, but we see no other way now. Our subscription list has been falling off for three or four years. It is less now than it has been for years. Not only so, but we have been offering the paper at greatly reduced prices. Many of the subscribers

have renewed at the price of only one dollar for the year. How in the world could we increase the pay to the employees, and reduce the price of the paper-or take subscriptions at reduced rates-and continue to send the paper out weekly? We feel sure that our subscribers will see the utter impossibility of us doing so. If those who have been working with us in the office are not employed elsewhere we would be glad to put them back to work as soon as conditions will permit. We regret to give any of them up from the work. But we have been forced to take this step by reason of the existing conditions. We trust the subscribers will bear with us, and all will put forth an extra effort right now to help us increase the list, and get it back to where it has been, so we can get back to a weekly again and put these people back to work in the office. And do not forget that your renewal and new subscriptions will be appreciated. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 48

---December 28, 1933

This issue of The Primitive Baptist brings us to the close of another volume-volume forty-eight. For forty-eight years the paper has been published, without any suspension or change of hands or ownership, except from father to son. The way has sometimes been rough and rocky. There have been trials and conflicts, and many dark and dismal scenes. Yet in the midst of them all, the Lord has been good and kind and merciful; and by His help we continue to this day. There have been many changes during these years. Many changes have come even during the past year-the year that is now just drawing to a close. The future still remains dark. We cannot tell what the future holds in store for us. We trust that we can adopt the sentiment contained in this quotation from Paul: "And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there; save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." -((0:22) (Acts 20:22-24). The past few years have been severe. These are times that try men's souls. The "depression" has been as trying on us, perhaps, as on many others. We tried our best to keep the paper going weekly; but it finally came to where we could see no possible way to continue to do that. The NRA codes put requirements in them that we could not possibly meet or comply with and get the paper out every week. We have already made some explanation of that. The way things look to us now it seems that we will have to continue as we are now- sending the paper out every other week, or perhaps, twice a month. In connection with the increase in cost which compliance with the codes would bring us, our subscription list has continued to fall off for the past three or four years, and it is now less than it has been for twenty years. We have tried during the past year or two to hold the subscribers on the list at most any price they felt able to pay, and still they have continued to drop off the list. We have tried to be hopeful that things would be better, and we still hope-rather, we are wishing they be better. The next issue of the paper will be due January 11, 1934, when we hope to greet you with the beginning of another volume and in the new year. We wish for all our readers a merry Christmas and a happy New Year. May heaven's richest blessings be yours to enjoy, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

1934

Introduction to Volume 49

---January 11, 1934

We now begin the publication of the forty-ninth volume of The Primitive Baptist. The past forty-eight years have wrought many changes. Perhaps there are very few subscribers on our list now who were subscribers when the first issue was sent out from Fulton, Ky., by our sainted father. If there is one on the list now who was on the list then, we would be glad to hear from him. Let us hear from every one of you who were on the list then. Have you seen any change in the doctrine contended for in our columns now and then? Is the paper not advocating the same principles now that it was then? There have been great improvements in some things, but there has been no improvement in, or on, the doctrine of God our Saviour. The principles of truth are the same now that they have ever been. Why should we turn from those principles now? We greet you with renewed hope and trust and confidence in the Lord in this, the beginning of a new volume of The Primitive Baptist. Other things fail; but the Lord has never failed. All His precious promises are sure. Although there have been trying times during the past few years, yet the Lord has promised to never leave nor forsake. "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee." --(3:2) (Isaiah 43:2). This is God's promise, and it is as sure today as when it was first made. We have been passing through some trying times, but we feel that the Lord has preserved and kept us to the present. We feel that we are under renewed obligations to Him for His rich and wonderful blessings; and we are under renewed obligations to our subscribers for the help they have been in the past in supporting the paper. We have made mistakes in the past. We do not promise that we will do better in the future; but we will promise to try. We now promise to try to do more writing for the paper this year than last. We have had so much more good matter for the paper than we had space for, and still have many good articles that we do not have room for, that we felt like it would be better to give preference to the writings of others than to take space for our own poor writings. But many have asked us to write more ourselves. Well, we will try to do that this year. Now, brethren and sisters, we need your co-operation to make the paper what we desire it to be. The way we are having to work in the office ourselves to get the paper out, it is impossible for us to get out among the brethren and ask them to subscribe for the paper. Our brethren can be a great help to us in this way. Will you please not forget to ask the brethren and friends where you go to subscribe for the paper? Will you offer to take the subscription and send to us? We will appreciate this, and you have no idea how much help it would be. At present we will have to continue getting the paper out only every other week. We do not make this as a permanent change; but it is at present only temporary, and is the very best we can promise to do. As soon as circumstances will admit, and as soon as we can do so, it is our desire to again send the paper out every week. Please do all you can to help to that end, and remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

Looking Backward

---January 25, 1934

We suppose that when one begins to look backward he begins to go backward; he does things backward- begins at the wrong place and in the wrong way to get the thing done that he tries to do. So, here we begin this little article in the wrong way. It is all backward. Sometimes we wish we could never look backward. Then again we wish we could spend all our time looking backward. Jesus said, "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." --(62) (Luke 9:62). We have no desire to look back in that way. That is not the kind of looking back we sometimes desire to do. We do sometimes desire to look back and meditate upon some of the things we have experienced and some of the delightful seasons we have had in the journey through life. Many things we have experienced and many seasons we have passed through we wish we could forget. We have no desire to look back upon them or to meditate upon them. They bring sorrow and sadness to our poor heart. For about a year, or nearly a year, our wife has been wanting us to write a little article about the time and place when and where we made our first effort to speak in the name of the Master. We suppose we have to look back a little to do that. And we have made the start at last to comply with her request-and have begun backward-the wrong way. As evidence that we have begun in the wrong way we have given you evidence of how hard it is sometimes for her to get us to do what she wants us to do. Well, sometimes it just seems everything we go at is done in the wrong way. If you get nothing out of this, perhaps it will satisfy the good wife, who is always alert to look after our welfare, and who does everything in her power to help us along in our struggles. That is worth while-to give her satisfaction-if no other good comes from our little effort. She has our picture in this issue, made from a photograph which was taken when we were about eighteen years of age. We were eighteen years of age on June 1, 1889. If we are not mistaken the photograph was taken during the year 1889. Our first effort to speak in the name of the Lord was on Saturday night, January 4, 1890, at the home of an old Sister Morris, near Waynesboro, in Wayne County, Tenn. The ministers present were Elders S. F. Cayce, our sainted father, J. P. Pilkington, and M. L. Rhodes. Elder Pilkington is still living. At that time he lived near the home of the Sister Morris. We do not know what became of Elder Rhodes, but think he passed away several years ago. As most of our readers know, our dear father passed over the river in August, 1905. We believe there are very few living who were present there that night. In this paper is a picture of the old house where we made this first effort to preach. We stood in the corner of the room to the right. Notice the old-fashioned "porch." There is a hall between the two front rooms. Going into the hall, the service was held in the room to the right. We stood in the corner of the room between the window and the door into the hall. Notice in the picture the window near the shadow from the porch. We stood near that window. Our father and the other ministers were seated near that window. With great fear and trembling we arose to introduce the service and to try to speak. While we live and retain our memory we will not forget the song we selected and the text we tried to use. The song was a favorite with us then, and is yet. It was that good old song, which is always new, "Amazing Grace." The Scripture we read, and from which we tried to speak for a few minutes, was this: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." --(Eph. ii. 8, 9). The doctrine of salvation by grace was loved by us then, in our youth, and it is the doctrine we yet love. We realized and knew then that aside from salvation by grace there could be no salvation for us, and we yet know the same. We learned this in our youth-when about eight years of

age; and, if not deceived, at about thirteen years of age, we were blessed with a good hope, through grace, that we would be enabled, prepared and permitted, by grace, to meet the dear Lord in peace beyond this life of sin and trouble. We were satisfied then with the doctrine of grace. We were satisfied with the goodness of God's house. We wanted nothing in the house of the Lord which He did not place there; and we wanted nothing left unused which He had placed there. We were satisfied with the church and her principles and practices then; and we are satisfied with them yet. There is a brother now living, who is a deacon indeed -a precious brother to us; a faithful and devoted member of Fuller's Chapel, in North Little Rock, a church we have been trying, to serve for several years-who was present at the home where and when we made this first effort. It is Brother G. L. Pilkington, a son of Elder J. P. Pilkington. He heard this first poor effort. He has heard us many times since at the little church in North Little Rock. When we made that first effort we thought we had ruined everything, and that we would never try again. We felt that this was not only our first, but that it was also our last. But we could find no peace or satisfaction without trying again. Much against our will in the matter the church at Greenfield, Tenn., liberated us on Saturday before the second Sunday in October, 1890, to exercise our gift at any place where God, in His providence, might cast our lot. If we remember correctly the motion was made by Brother J. W. Tillman (Uncle Joe, as he was familiarly called). He was a faithful and true man of God, and a faithful deacon. Brother F. M. Campbell was clerk of the church. We do not remember whether he had been ordained to the office of deacon at that time or not; but he has been a true Primitive Baptist, we think, and has filled the office of deacon well. Brother Tillman has long since gone to his long eternal home. Brother Campbell is still living and is still a member of the same old church. Not many who were living and members then are living now. Most of them are gone to a better country. Brother Campbell, we know you are older now than you were then. We are both getting old now. It will not be long until the battles and struggles and trials and conflicts will all be over. You will soon enjoy that sweet and eternal rest for which you have been hoping through all these years. We still love you, and you will have a warm place in our heart while this life lasts. May the good Lord manifest His sweet presence to you in your last days, is our humble prayer. We often think of the sweet delights we had in those days of the long ago. Sometimes there are a few of those days we wish we could live over again. Much of our life has been in sadness and trouble. We have no desire to live over that part of it. Well, we have written what we have written. If you get any good from it, you are welcome to it. May heaven's richest blessings rest upon each of you, is our humble prayer. The day is far spent. Will you all please remember us in your prayers? Pray the Lord to help us to remain true to the principles that characterized His church as being different from and not of the world when we made our first effort to speak in His precious and glorious name, and which have been the same in all ages of the world. C. H. C.

ANOTHER ARTICLE

In the same issue of the paper with the foregoing article was another article written by Brother G. L. Pilkington, who was then a deacon in Fuller's Chapel, North Little Rock, under the same heading. Wife had told him about the above article, and asked him to write some in connection with it, as he was present and heard our first discourse. Since January, 1934, Brother Pilkington has been ordained to the work of the ministry. Wife wishes his article to be in this book, following the above article; so we insert it here. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

Elder C. H. Cayce:

My Precious Brother-Looking back over my life I sometimes wonder that I have not been consumed with its cares; and then I can truthfully say, as did one of old that "surely goodness and mercy hath followed me all the days of my life." I will not take up space in this letter to try to tell you of my travels from nature's night and darkness into the marvelous light of the children of God-if indeed I have ever traveled that road; but will say that there came a time in my life when I felt to be a poor lost and justly condemned sinner in the sight of God; felt that I had sinned away my day of grace, and that there was no hope in heaven and immortal glory for me. But, to my great joy, there also came a time in my life when this burden of sin was rolled away, and, if not deceived in the whole matter, Jesus was revealed to me as my personal Saviour, and I was enabled to rejoice in a Saviour's love. Since that time my hope has seemed so small at times that I would think of laying it aside and not claim it any more. But about the time I would get ready to cast it aside my mind would go back to the spot where I first felt that God, for Christ's sake, had pardoned my sins, and I would again be enabled to rejoice in the love of God my Saviour. So I have been first in the valley, then on the hilltop; in the valley, and on the hilltop all these years. But I would not exchange the sweet hope I have, which reaches beyond the grave, for all the wealth of this world. Looking backward I so well remember that while laboring under this great load of sin I heard you preach your first gospel sermon, to the joy of the children of God assembled for worship. No doubt you had preached in your mind before this. I know you remember the occasion better than I; but it was at the home of old "Grandma" (Polly) Morris, in Wayne County, Tenn., on Saturday night, January 4, 1890. Three Primitive Baptist preachers were present-your sainted father. Elder S. F. Cayce; my father, Elder J. P. Pilkington; and Elder M. L. Rhodes. I remember while you were so sweetly preaching Jesus how the tears of joy were running down the cheeks of those there assembled; and I remember thinking, "Oh, if I was as good as that boy." Dear brother, I can say something just here that no other living person can say-I heard your first sermon, and I heard your last, to date, which was Sunday, January 21, 1934, and you preached the same doctrine in your last sermon that you preached in your first, giving God all the power and all the glory for the eternal salvation of poor sinners, and admonishing those who are thus eternally saved to walk in humble obedience to the commands of their Lord and Master, thereby missing many pitfalls in this life. And by the power of those glorious truths you have preached, by the power of that God you have been proclaiming for over forty-four years, we will be brought from the grave, and be wafted on the wings of God's eternal love to that home where there will be no more sad partings. And when you have preached your last sermon, and prayed your last prayer, I know you can say, as did Paul, "I have finished my course; I have fought a good fight; I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day." I could write on and on, but will close by saying, may the Lord spare you many more years to speak, from pulpit and press, comfortably to Jerusalem; "cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned, and that she hath received at the Lord's hand double for all her sins." Written with a feeling of weakness and unworthiness, by one who dearly loves you for the truth's sake. Give our love to Sister Cayce and the children, and the brethren and sisters at Thornton. In humble hope, G. L. Pilkington. 1510 Chandler St., North Little Rock, Ark.

Going To The "Bowwows"

---January 25, 1934

When you hear an Old Baptist preacher talking as if he thinks the old church is going to the "bowwows," you can put it down in your book that he is getting ready to go somewhere himself. Such men usually "go to the dogs" themselves. Remember the case of Strickland, Hackleman, Todd, and the Kirklands. They went to the Missionaries. C. H. C.

Getting Mixed

---February 8, 1934

It seems to us that some brethren are getting some things rather mixed over east of the Mississippi River. It seems that nearly a year ago Elder W. A. Bishop introduced some practices into his church in Jackson, Tenn., which Primitive Baptists have never endorsed and have not been accustomed to, which resulted in his withdrawal, with some others, who met at Elder Bishop's home and organized a church on a more "liberal" plan. Some of the things objected to were the use of a Campbellite song book and a Sunday school. Of course, Elder Bishop and those with him did not call it a Sunday school. They never call the thing that when they first introduce it. It is usually called a Bible class, or some other name thought to be less offensive; but it always turns out to be the same fox. It appears from a clipping from the Weakley County Press, Martin, Tenn., of March 17, 1933, that Elder Cayce Pentecost, of Dresden, assisted in the organization of this church. A statement from Elder Bishop in a Jackson paper of March 20, 1933, says: The minority of the members that attended church brought certain charges against the majority and demanded that certain practices must be stopped and removed. The objections were set out as practicing Bible study at the church on each Lord's Day, singing religious hymns from a little song book called "Wonderful Songs," and passing the collection plates, when receiving the Lord's Day offerings. We were not satisfied to separate ourselves from these practices and rather than be in confusion and continue strife in the church we asked for letters of dismissal in order that we might organize ourselves into a church where we could worship our Lord according to the dictates of our own conscience and in the light of God's revealed word. This shows, of itself, what brought their trouble and the division. All people who know anything about Primitive Baptists know that they do not have Sunday schools, and that they are opposed to them. They are foreign to God's word, and the thing is an invention of men. The first Sunday school was instituted by Robert Raikes, in Gloucester, England, as all historians know, for the purpose of teaching the children of the poor to read and write. Some years later it was adopted by the churches of the world as a nursery for the church, and to teach and train children so that they might be made children of God-to bring them into a higher order of life by training and teaching. Some have claimed that they may be so taught from their infancy that they may never become sinners, but be saved without the necessity of regeneration on account of such training and teachings. The introduction of such a thing in the church is clearly a flagrant departure from the principles and practices of the Primitive Baptists. Well, from another Tennessee paper we see under date of August 1, that "Elder Harry Todd, the noted Dresden preacher, is preaching for the Primitive Baptist meeting at Greenfield. Also Elders Cayce Pentecost and A. B. Ross are to be present. Large crowds and fine interest." This item is dated from Brock's Chapel, August 1. We also have a clipping from a Tennessee paper stating that a Primitive Baptist revival will begin in Dresden, it seems, "on the fourth Sunday in August, and Elder Harry A. Todd, well known and popular evangelist, will assist the pastor." Another clipping, headed "Meeting at Palmersville," says that "the days of meeting at the Palmersville Primitive Baptist Church will begin the third Sunday in

August. Elder Bishop, of Jackson, will assist the pastor, Elder Miller." Before we left Tennessee this church was not recognized as being an orderly Primitive Baptist Church-if this is the same church which was there when we left there, and we have not heard of it going down or being moved or getting in line with the churches in that section. That church was in line with the Kirklands in their departures from Primitive Baptist doctrine and practice. The Elder Todd is the noted Elder Todd who went to the Missionaries several years ago, along with the Kirklands, Strickland, Hackleman, and others. Instead of being restored where he lost his identity he was received by South College Street Church, Nashville, Tenn., and that church has been dropped from the roll of churches in the Cumberland Association on this account. We understand that Elder Harry has a son who was also with the Missionaries, and that he was also received by that church in Nashville. Wonder if he has been ordained yet? We understand that he is also a preacher. Elder Todd stayed with the Missionaries a long time. Wonder if he is satisfied now with the old doctrine and order of the Primitive Baptists. We see, also, that one of our exchanges still has the name of Elder Bishop on the editorial staff. Wonder if the editor approves of such a mixture as this? It seems to us that it is about time for somebody to call a halt. The Primitive Baptists, long ago, spoke out against these progressive measures. Such things are a departure from the order of God's house. If allowed to spread they will only cause the more trouble. It is strange to us that preachers will try to introduce such departures in the Old Baptist Church. If a man endorses such things it would be commendable for him to leave the Old Baptists and go where they are, and where they are endorsed, and then stay there, and let the Old Baptists alone. Why trouble them with such "progressive" measures? Why introduce such things among them as they have never practiced, and which they have always condemned? We wish the brethren would let such things alone, and let the old church go on in peace. Remember that when there is a division in the church that the party who is responsible for the division is the party who has the things that caused the division. Progressive measures and things foreign to the original doctrine and practice of the church being introduced by Wm. Carey and Andrew Fuller caused a division then, and from those measures sprang the Fullerites, commonly called Missionary Baptists. Such will always bring strife, confusion and division in the church. If you do not want a division, and do not want to be responsible for one, then let those things severely alone which the church has always rejected. May the good Lord help us all to continue in "the good old way," to "ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein," is our humble prayer. We have not written this with any feeling or degree of malice or with a view to strife, but from a feeling sense of duty to give the cry of alarm, and to utter a note of warning. C. H. C.

Perverse Rulers

---February 22, 1934

For quite a while we have felt that it was our duty to make some reference to the new publication appearing from Birmingham, Ala., called The Independent Primitive Baptist, and some few things contained in the copies we have seen. The sheet is being sent out by Elder N. P. Vandiver, who is excluded from Beulah Church, in the Birmingham district. Elder Z. C. Hull has been connected with the paper, but we have the information that he has severed his connection with it and also severed his connection with Elder Vandiver. It is painful to us to refer to these matters, but it seems to us that the cause demands that we make mention of the same. We

have before us a copy of this paper of September 15, 1933. On page 3 is an article from Elder J. H. Veach, from which we wish to make a quotation, as follows: I was born and reared by Old Baptist parents, but "tradition and custom," together, caused by unruly and ungodly men and women caused my mother and father many days and years of deep sorrow and grief; and that being the history of most true, honest people among the Old School or Primitive Baptists, I have come to a complete halt between two opinions; if the Lord be God, serve Him! if Baal be God, serve him. My experience with the Primitive Baptists in the six states where I have been connected with them in a church way, is that they are and will be ruled by men of perverse minds, who have risen up in our own ranks (Primitive Baptist). The main leaders are men of supposed pre-eminence, and I have come to this conclusion, that there is no use to try to reform the church back to the apostolic doctrine and practice under such leadership. There are several charges in this little space above which we wish to notice and to call attention to. 1. The deep sorrow and grief brought to the father and mother by the traditions and customs among the Primitive Baptists. 2. These traditions and customs were caused or brought by unruly and ungodly men and women. 3. Hence, the traditions and customs among the Primitive Baptists are ungodly, as coming from ungodly men and women. Their customs are not of God, and are unauthorized by the Scriptures. This follows as a conclusion and result of the charges made by Brother Veach. Next: The above is the history of most true and honest people among the Primitive Baptists. This necessarily means that not many people among the Primitive Baptists are true and honest; and that most of those who are true and honest are not satisfied, but are grieved and in deep sorrow on account of the conditions which prevail with the church and in the church as a whole. It is true that untrue and unfaithful men creep in. It is true that some come in to "spy out our liberty." It is true that some get among us who are not satisfied with "the good old way," and bring trouble and distress among us. But such men are not the body as a whole. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." --(0:28) (Acts 20:28-29,30). Brother Veach, will you let us kindly admonish you to take heed to the admonition and instruction given in this by the inspired apostle? Will you take heed? This quotation from the apostle tells us that men of our own selves will arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. They draw away disciples from the church. But the church stays on the same old "traditions and customs." The unruly and ungodly men are not the church. They are the few who creep in and destroy the peace and fellowship of the brotherhood, as much as is in their power. But Brother Veach charges that his experience with the Primitive Baptists in six states is that they are ruled by men of perverse minds. We beg to differ. The Primitive Baptists ARE NOT RULED BY MEN OF PERVERSE MINDS. Occasionally some men of perverse minds get among us and TRY TO RULE; but they fail. Their disposition is to rule or ruin. As it is impossible for any man or set of men to rule the church of God, then they try to ruin. They usually succeed in drawing away some disciples after them. When they succeed in doing that, then the church is left in peace for a season-until another man of like character gets among them and begins his nefarious work. Elder Veach says the main leaders are men of supposed pre-eminence. We wonder if he did not get mixed on his words in that expression. Perhaps he meant to say "men of supposed prominence." We may have some good and true men among us who are men of prominence-and we do have them. But we do not have men of pre-eminence. That word means "superiority in rank, position,

excellence, etc.; distinction above others in quality, rank, etc." We do not have any among us who are above others in rank. "All ye are brethren." - (Matthew 23:8). Primitive Baptists acknowledge only one as having the pre-eminence. "And He is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence." -(Colossians 1:18). Diotrephes would love to have the pre-eminence. {((Jn 1:14) (III John 1:14)} Diotrephes prated against the apostles and brethren with malicious words. Be careful, Brother Veach, about the words you have used and that you may use. We think you have overstepped the matter somewhat. We trust you will retract. But Brother Veach says there "is no use to try to reform the church back to the apostolic doctrine and practice." This is a charge that the church has departed from the apostolic doctrine and practice. If she has, pray tell us where the church is to be found today? That is the doctrine of the Campbellites and Mormons-that the church departed. Joseph Smith claimed to restore primitive Christianity. Alexander Campbell set out to restore the ancient order of things- to restore primitive Christianity. Now, Brother Veach, do you want to restore the church to the primitive order of things? If the church has departed, and the whole thing is gone, so far as the Primitive Baptists are concerned, should we not leave them alone-not bring disturbance among them-but go to the people who practice the primitive order in doctrine and practice? From time to time some men have risen up among us who have tried to reform the old church. But they undertake an impossible task. The good Lord will reserve to Himself, always, a few that He will not suffer to be deceived and led astray. To reform the old church would be to draw her away from the original doctrine and practice as given by her Head and Founder. "She shall not be moved." There may sometimes be only a few who will contend for the true order of God's house and the ancient order of things, the same old "traditions and customs," but there will always be enough for the truth of God to be maintained in the earth. Brother Veach, we have not written this because we do not have Christian love for you; but your writing was public and demanded public exposure. Will you reconsider and retract, and make amends? May the Lord help us all to contend for the "good old way." C. H. C.

Changed to Semi-Monthly

---March 1, 1934

Since the first of October, as our readers know, we have been sending The Primitive Baptist out only twice a month-or, rather, every other week. We had hoped that this was only a temporary matter. Finances were such that we were not able to get the paper out every week. The readers will remember that we had to let all our helpers in the office lay off on October 5. The code business was such that we could not meet the requirements, which were to reduce the working hours and also increase the pay of the employees. This at a time when our subscription list was falling off instead of increasing; and we had been taking subscriptions at any price the subscribers felt they could pay. Many of the subscribers during the past year or two have been given credit for a whole year when they paid not more than one-fourth of the regular price, and many were having their names dropped from the list. Of course we could not continue to send the paper out every week under such conditions as these. There was nothing left to do but to let the employees all off and have the type set in another place on a machine. Having to go to the other town for the type when it was set up involved a lot of trouble and loss of time. We and our companion had this extra work to do. Well, as we say, we had hoped that this would be only temporary and for a short time. We have now managed to get

arrangements made to have the type set in our own office, and this will eliminate the making of trips to another place to get the type. Outside of that we and our wife will still do the work we had others to do-only that we cannot do enough work to get the paper out more than twice a month. We will have to use the same type we were using before we had the type set on a machine. This will give more reading matter than the machine-set type. But now the postoffice department requires us to resume the sending of the paper out weekly or to change the publication to conform to the way we are sending it out. To change so as to make it semi-monthly requires a re-entry as second-class matter, and this requires a payment of \$10. There was no entry fee until the present administration of affairs. It costs \$10 now to make a change; but we have to make the change. We cannot get The Primitive Baptist out every week under the present conditions. Our publication days will be the first and third Thursday in each month. Usually papers published twice a month are dated the first and fifteenth, but the first and third Thursday will divide the work up better for us, and will give the same number of papers for each month and for the year. If conditions ever admit of it we will go back to a Weekly again. If you want a weekly it is up to the subscribers-or up to the brethren, sisters and friends. 'Having your name dropped from the list will not help to put the paper out weekly, nor will it help us in any way. If you want The Primitive Baptist to come to you weekly, go to work and get new subscribers for it-persons who are not now taking the paper. The list of subscribers is smaller now than it has been for perhaps twenty years. Last month we dropped a hundred more names from the list than were added to it. What are you going to do about it? Are you going to go to work to help stop this decrease, and to help make it increase instead of decrease? Do you have enough interest in the cause The Primitive Baptist advocates and stands for to arouse you to put forth some extra effort now in this time of special need? Or, will you just think or say, "I am in sympathy with this cause, and greatly deplore the condition the paper is in?" Sympathy is all right, and we appreciate it; but for the paper to continue to go forth in defense of the cause we love, it is necessary for us to put forth some effort right now. As we have had to reduce the frequency of the issues of the paper, we have also reduced the regular price of same to \$1.50 a year. Now, let us repeat what we have frequently said before, that the object in the publishing of The Primitive Baptist is not to make money. That was not the object of our father before us, and it has never been our object. The object and desire has been, all along, to publish the truth as it is taught us in the Holy Bible; to comfort and benefit the Lord's humble poor; to advance His cause and kingdom in the world; to honor and glorify His precious name. The effort all along has been to give as much reading matter as possible for the money. That is still our desire. Will you help us? Read our special offer in this issue, and then please respond to it at once; and, above all, will you please remember us in your prayers? C. H. C.

God the Cause of Sin

---April 5, 1934

In order that our readers may see for themselves what Absoluters advocate and contend for, we copy the following from Sovereign Grace and Pilgrim, a magazine published occasionally, and edited by W. J. Berry. The Lone (some) Pilgrim was consolidated with this magazine sometime ago, and' that is where the name Pilgrim comes in on the paper. Here is what the writer says: Limited predestination is also foolish; for limited predestination surely leads directly to limited foreknowledge.

How could anyone who presumes to believe in God possibly charge Him with limited knowledge! Yet some say that God's foreknowledge is unlimited, but predestination is. Such an argument will not even stand in the light of human logic. I like to think of the subject in this way: We find in a modern factory an intricate machine which is fed raw material at one end and ejects a finished part at the other end. This machine is made up of hundreds of working parts. Each part of it is put in for a definite purpose. The engineer who built the machine did not incorporate a single part that was not needed, nor did he omit a single necessary part. Each part of the whole does the work for which it was intended. For a given length of time the machine works perfectly, every part performs the function for which it was intended. We can say that the machine works perfectly because each part is doing exactly what it was predestinated to do by the engineer. The machine working perfectly represents the predestinated events of the world. Now suppose while the machine is running smoothly we were to throw in a handful of sand (unpredestinated events). How long would the machine continue to do its work? Only a few moments would be required for the machine to be wrecked. Is it not the same with the world? How long would God's machine continue to do what He intended, if He had not planned and provided ALL things. God is the first cause. **{((0:11) (Exodus 20:11))}** I believe He is the first cause of sin as well as the first cause of good. **{((7) (Isaiah 45:7))}** Amos I wrong? tell me. If I sin, it is not a surprise to God. Sin is as much a part of the eternal plan as anything else. God had and has a purpose for sin. **{((26) (Acts 4:26-28))}** It is one of the parts that make up the complete structure of His creation. To say that God foresaw but did not predestinate sin, is to say that He foresaw something that He did not create; but the Scriptures teach that there is only one creator. **{((6) (Colossians 1:16))}** I cannot understand the mystery, but I believe God causes all things. I have not been able to accept the word "permit" as expressing God's attitude toward anything. Moreover, I cannot find any logic in time salvation. If the Bible teaches the doctrine of second blessings, that is, that we are blessed FOR good works as well as in them, it also teaches a second curse-that we are cursed here in a time-state FOR our evil deeds as well as IN them. **{ (Deuteronomy 28)}** Who would find any comfort in such? If my works are not good enough to earn me eternal blessedness, how can I think that I can merit time-blessedness? The very facts of life and history will not support the idea of second-blessing. Who are the people who seem to enjoy the most time-blessedness? Are they not those who have been willing to lay honor, charity, and brotherly love away? Are they not those who have trampled their fellow-men in the dust? The very men who live comfortably and are honored by the world are, for the most part, men who have no good works to have earned them time salvation. On the other hand God's chosen few are, and always have been poor and dishonored. The history of the church of God is written in blood. The children of God walking in good works have always been trampled under foot, while the evil men have triumphed in this world. Where, oh, where is the second blessing? The above is signed by R. C. Bumb. As he asks the editor to tell him if he is wrong, and we find no comment from the editor, we take it for granted that the editor indorses the sentiment expressed and contended for. On another page in the same paper we find this statement over the signature of W. J. Hocutt, of Berry, Ala.: "When I joined the Old Baptists over fifty years ago this conditional salvation was not known among them, and it has caused much strife and division among them." This refers to what is termed by some as "conditional time salvation," though we seldom hear that expression used among our people today.' Fifty years ago would take us back to 1883. Time salvation is not a new term among the Primitive Baptists. In another column in this paper is an article copied from the Zion's Advocate of May 15, 1858. It was written by M. Hodges, of

Fountain Head, Tenn., March 11, 1858. In that article he says, "there is a time salvation to be enjoyed in obedience only. * * * As before hinted, our own salvation here mentioned is a time salvation, and we must work it out or go without it." This was written long before Brother Hocutt joined the church, and was generally believed and advocated by the Primitive Baptists then. True, then as now, there were a few who did not believe it, and who advocated the same things that the Absoluters advocate now. Elder Beebe introduced the term "absolute predestination of all things" among the Primitive Baptists, and that doctrine was, and is, a departure from the original Baptist doctrine-just as much so as Arminianism. Limited predestination does not lead to limited foreknowledge. Take the case of the parable of the talents; **(Matthew 25:14-30)**. The Lord gave to the servants according to their ability. To one He gave five talents; to another He gave two talents; to another He gave one talent. He gave to each according to his ability. The one who received five talents had ability to improve five talents; the one who received two talents had ability to improve the two; and they used the ability which they had. The one who received one talent had the ability to improve the one talent. The Lord said so; to each was given according to his ability. The Lord gave them the ability which they had. Ability means "quality or state of being able; power to perform, whether physical, moral, intellectual, conventional, or legal; capacity; skill or competence in doing; sufficiency of strength, skill, resources, etc." -Webster. A man can do what he has the ability to do. Hence, the servants could improve their talents, for they had the ability. The Lord knew that they could improve their talents, and He also knew that one would not do so. To say they had to do what they did do because the Lord knew they would do that way is to deny the foreknowledge of God and to say that He knew only one side of the question. These Absoluters thus deny the foreknowledge of God while charging us with doing that very thing. But the writer of the above makes the whole affair the matter of a machine, and that God made the machine, and has it running just as He made it to run. According to that, as some of the race are running into hell, God made them for them to run there. This is not the old doctrine of the Baptists. The old London Confession of Faith, Chap. III, Sec. 3, says: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated or foreordained to eternal life, through Jesus Christ, to the praise of His glorious grace; others being left to act in their sin to their just condemnation to the praise of His glorious justice." These Old Baptists did not believe that God worked wicked men and devils, but that they were LEFT to act in their sin. God did not act them-they acted. A machine is not active. It is acted upon by another. If the machine goes to pieces by a "handful of sand being thrown in," the machine is not blameworthy. What sensible man would think of such a thing as punishing the machine on account of the "blow up?" The machine is not responsible. If a man is slain with an ax, the ax is not responsible. The responsible party, the party that is to blame, is the person who wields the ax. According to such reasoning and logic, the men who are guilty of all the crime that has been committed, and that is being committed, in the world, such as robbery, theft, murder, rape, seduction, incest, and every crime that men are guilty of and that Satan can invent,-are not responsible and are not to blame, and are not to be punished for their crimes, in this world nor in the world to come. God is the maker of the whole machine, and He is running it just as He designed it to run. Men nor devils have not been able to, nor can they ever, do a thing that is displeasing to God. They are a part of the machine-and God is running it as He pleases for it to run! This is worse blasphemy than to say that Jesus cast out devils by the prince of devils. The above writer says he believes God is the first cause of sin, as well as the first cause of good. Again, he is not a Primitive Baptist. The old order of Baptists said, in the London

Confession of Faith, Chapter V, Section 4, "the sinfulness of their acts proceedeth only from the creatures, and not from God, who, being most holy and righteous, neither is, nor can be, the author or approver of sin." If God is running the whole universe, and every act and transaction is run by Him, then He approves of all the wickedness and crime that is committed. When a wicked brute ruins and rapes an innocent girl, according to this blasphemer, God is the cause of it. When those negroes raped and killed that innocent girl near-----, a year or two ago, they did what God caused them to do-according to this blasphemous doctrine. How any man who is not a wicked devil himself can charge such as this to the good and merciful and holy and righteous God, is beyond us-it is something we cannot understand. One who makes such a charge is terribly wrong somewhere-either in the head or in the heart. Our Bible teaches no such blasphemous heresy. Elder Hassell says, in a footnote on page 415 of his history, "The Mohammedan principle, says Neander, derived sin and holiness alike from the Divine causality, and denied the distinction between a permission and an actual efficiency on the part of God. It is Mohammedanism, and not Christianity; it is the most wretched perversion of Scripture and the most awful imaginable blasphemy, to identify God with Satan, the source of holiness with the source of sin; to maintain that the Holy, Holy, Holy Lord of hosts, the Holy One of Israel, He whose nature is holy and reverend, who is of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on iniquity, who is the Father of lights, and in whom is no darkness at all, who does not tempt or seek to seduce any man, to maintain that the Holy Spirit, who is God, inspires sinful thoughts or purposes in any of His creatures. He foreknows, and permits, and controls all things, not instigating, but bending the wickedness of men and devils into that channel that shall enhance His own glory and His people's good. The Divine Spirit is the author of all holiness, and not the author of any unholi-ness. No Baptist, no Christian, believes that God is the cause or author of sin." Elder Hassell says that no Baptist, no Christian, believes that God is the cause or author of sin, and we are inclined to agree with him. What do you Absoluters say, now, who have been denying all the time that you believed such damnable heresy? Your names, some of you, are on the editorial staff of the paper sending out and teaching that heresy. What do you elders say about it now? Will you stay on the editorial staff of such a paper and still claim that this is not your doctrine and that you are a Primitive Baptist? If you do not indorse and believe it, then prove it by coming out from it. There is no way for a man to show his faith only by his works. We have before us a copy of Backus' History, volume 1. The author wrote his preface to that volume and dated the same July 9, 1777. On page 97 he quotes from Hubbard, page 343, as follows: "Nicholas Easton * * * used to preach at Newport. * * * He maintained that man had no power nor will in himself, but as he was acted by God; and seeing that God filled all things, nothing could be or move but by Him, and so must needs be the author of sin, and that a Christian is united to the essence of God. Being shewed what blasphemous consequences would follow therefrom, they seemed to abhor the consequences, but still defended the position. * * * Mr. Coddington, Mr. Coggshall, and some others, joined with Nicholas Easton in those delusions; but their minister, Mr. Clarke, and Mr. Lenthal, and Mr. Harding, with some others, dissented and publicly opposed; whereby it grew to such a heat of contention that it made a schism amongst them." The advocating of such a blasphemous doctrine always has and always will bring division among true Baptists. On the same page the author says that "Mr. Coddington and Mr. Easton afterward joined the Quakers. Mr. Clark and his friends formed the first Baptist Church on Rhode Island." On page 125 Mr. Backus gives the probable date of the formation of this church as 1644, and possibly as early as 1638. On page 526 Hassell gives the probable date as 1638. The first Baptist Church formed in the United States and its founder

rejected such teaching as blasphemous, and true Primitive Baptists do the same today. The teachers of such doctrine are not in line with the first Baptists of the United States, nor are they in line with the inspired writers of the Bible. David, the sweet singer of Israel, and a man after God's own heart, said, **(Psalms 69:4)** "They that hate me without a cause are more than the hairs of mine head: they that would destroy me, being mine enemies wrongfully, are mighty: then I restored that which I took not away." In **(John 15:25)** the Saviour said, "But this cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause." The prophecy of David was concerning the Lord, and the Saviour tells us the same was fulfilled. If the Lord is the cause of all things that come to pass, including sin and wickedness, as these Absoluters contend, then the Lord was the cause of them hating Him, and they did not hate Him without a cause. But the Lord said they hated Him without a cause. Therefore, the Lord was not the cause of this. These Absoluters deny the plain statement of David, the inspired man of God, and they deny the plain statement of the Son of God Himself. It is no better than rank infidelity. The writer in the above article denies that any are punished for their wrong doing. Hear the word of the Lord concerning that matter. **(Ezekiel 33:13)** "When I shall say to the righteous, that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it." Here the Lord says "he shall die for it." These Absoluters say it is not true. "Let God be true, and every man a liar." We have no fellowship for their doctrine. It is not the doctrine of God our Saviour. May He deliver us from such, and help us all to teach such things as are an honor to His glorious name. C. H. C.

What Shall We Do?

---April 19, 1934

Frequently when we warn against departures from the principles and practices that have characterized the Primitive Baptists as a separate and distinct people from the world, there are some who are displeased. They sometimes have us stop sending the paper to them because we speak out against such departures. A few days ago we received a letter from a brother who told us in the letter that a number said they were going to have their paper stopped because of the way we had written recently about some things that are being advocated and practiced. Some brethren have written us highly commending what we said. But what some may say is not so much concern to us as the question as to what the Lord would have us do. What some of the brethren may do does not concern us as much as what is pleasing in the sight of God. What does the Lord require of us? That is the question we desire to have answered. In meditating over these things our mind has been called to what the Lord said in **(Ezekiel 33:1-11)**. Here is what the Lord said: Again the word of the Lord came upon me, saying, Son of man, speak to the children of thy people, and say unto them, When I bring the sword upon a land, if the people of the land take a man of their coasts, and set him for their watchman: if when he see the sword come upon the land, he blow the trumpet, and warn the people; then whosoever heareth the sound of the trumpet, and taketh not warning; if the sword come, and take him away, his blood shall be upon his own head. He heard the sound of the trumpet, and took not warning; his blood shall be upon him. But he that taketh warning shall deliver his soul. But if the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come, and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood

will I require at the watchman's hand. So thou, O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me. When I say unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand. Nevertheless, if thou warn the wicked of his way to turn from it; if he do not turn from his way, he shall die in his iniquity; but thou hast delivered thy soul. Therefore, O thou son of man, speak unto the house of Israel; Thus ye speak, saying, If our transgressions and our sins be upon us, and we pine away in them, how should we then live? Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel? Here we have it plainly and clearly taught that the Lord requires His servants to warn Israel against every false way. The Lord has made it his indispensable duty to give warning of every approach of error and every false way. No man can be a true and faithful servant of God and fail to do that. He must warn against every innovation. He must warn against every departure from the way the Lord has marked out in His blessed Book. The Book teaches everything that the Lord's people should believe or practice religiously. It teaches that they should sing spiritual songs. They cannot sing spiritual songs and sing songs that contain false sentiment, or false doctrine. Unsound sentiment is not spiritual but fleshly, of the world, worldly. Thus, when they sing songs containing Arminian sentiment, they are violating the command of God. They are disregarding what the Lord has taught in His blessed Book, and which Book is given to thoroughly furnish them unto all good works. The Lord does not instruct, in His Book, that His people in His worship and service, are to use an organ, or any man-made instrument. He made the organ which He requires them to use in His worship-the vocal organs. To use any other organ than what He made and authorizes to be used in His worship, is an affront to Him. It is a disregarding of His teaching, and is treating His teaching with contempt. Do we know better how we should serve and worship God than He does? If we say yes, then we are guilty of the sin of presumption. If we say no, then let us leave alone everything which He has not commanded-leave everything severely alone for which we do not find precept or example. Do we find any precept or example in the Book for a Sunday school? If it is there it must be in the twenty-third chapter of Revelation. See if you can find it. It is not to be found between the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis and the last verse of the twenty-second chapter of Revelation. It is outside the Book. Then why organize such a thing? Why practice it? Is it to be like the world? "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are very strong; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord." -Isa. xxxi. 1. The Sunday school is a thing of the world. It is an institution of the world. If the Primitive Baptists practice such, they are only going down to Egypt for help; they are not trusting in the Lord. But someone may ask, Is it wrong to meet together on Sunday, or the Sabbath day, and study the Bible? Is it wrong to have classes in Bible study? We answer by asking, Is it wrong to organize a ladies' aid society, a junior league, a senior league, a Christian endeavor society, a Baptist Young People's Union, or any other of the numerous societies the world has? That is the same argument the Burnamites made when they introduced the thing years ago. Usually when the thing is started it is not called a Sunday school. The Old Baptists would "catch on" to the "racket" at once, and spurn the thing. Every time that little brat is born into an Old Baptist Church it is called a Bible class, or a Bible study, Bible hour-or some such little "no harm" name. And it usually catches the fancy of some. The little imp makes its appearance at first in

some such unpretentious way. Beware! Such things are a departure from the original Baptist principles and practice. If you do not want trouble, quit your departures. Let the whole brood of Arminian inventions alone. Stay out of the mire of Arminian doctrine and practices on the one hand, and stay away from the icebergs of "can't-help-it-ism" on the other hand. Stand fast and faithful and firm and true for the original doctrine and order of God's house; then the Lord will bless and prosper Zion, and peace and happiness will be enjoyed by her inhabitants. By the help of the Lord we expect to try to contend for the truth and for the original and old-time practice of the church, if every subscriber we have quits. Will you quit on that account? Will you do that, or will you lend a helping hand? We are willing to trust the Lord, and try to be true to Him. May the Lord help us. C. H. C.

Should Be Truthful

---April 19, 1934

We are in receipt of a letter from a dear brother renewing his subscription. He tells us he has tried to get some subscribers for the paper, but has not been able to do so. He says: I have tried to get some more subscribers, but can't. I know several Old Baptists who take a daily paper that costs 20 cents a week, but say they are not able to take The Primitive Baptist. I hate to doubt an Old Baptist, but I doubt this statement. I want to take it as long as I am able, for many times I am about ready to give up. I get my paper and one article cheers me up and I am encouraged to press on. Many times I have some Scripture on my mind that I do not understand, and some brother or sister takes it up, and I am made to rejoice. So, dear brother, do the best you can in getting the paper out, and I will be satisfied, and will do all I can to send you some more subscribers. If any of your readers have a heart to pray, please pray for poor me. Well, dear brother, please tell us who can believe that a man is not able to pay \$1.50 a year (a little less than three cents a week) for his church paper, or for a religious paper, when he is able to pay 20 cents a week for a newspaper? In the newspaper he will read about murder, theft, kidnapping, hijacking, bribery, robbery, bootlegging, highway robbery, and all other sorts of crime that Satan can invent. In The Primitive Baptist he may read the good news from the heavenly home of the Lord's humble poor. In this paper he may read about what the Lord has done for poor sinners, what He is doing, and what He has promised to do for them; and may read about what the Lord teaches in His word that His children should do in honor to His blessed name. But you know the blessed Master said, while He was here on earth, that "where your treasure is, there will be your heart also." May the good Lord bless you, dear brother, and keep you by His grace. C. H. C.

God the Cause of Sin

---May 17, 1934

In our issue of April 5 we copied a lengthy quotation from an article written by R. C. Bumb and published in the Sovereign Grace and Pilgrim, by W. J. Berry, of California, and replied to the same. We did not say all that could be said in reply to the blasphemous doctrine R. C. Bumb advocated, and perhaps did not say all that should be said. We called attention to the fact that Bumb asked the editor to tell him if he was wrong, and that the editor offered no objection to the article or any sentiment therein, and we took it for granted that the editor indorsed the sentiment. Of course he believes and accepts the sentiment, for he advocates the

same sentiment himself. On page 510 of the same issue of that paper the editor says: But if he will say that Christ indeed merits all praise for our eternal salvation, but that we are rewarded for our good works in time, -we deny it. The editor used this expression in referring to our people-true Primitive Baptists, or those who advocate what true Primitive Baptists have always advocated. What part of the statement does the editor mean to deny? Does he mean to deny that Christ merits all praise for our eternal salvation? Or, does he mean to deny the whole-both that Christ merits such praise and also that God's people are rewarded in time for their good works? Or, does he mean to deny only the latter part? It is the whole thing which he says he denies. But we will be liberal and lenient toward him, and grant that he does not really mean to deny that Christ merits all praise for the eternal salvation of all the redeemed, and that he really only means to deny that God's children are rewarded here in time for their good works. Of course we were and are aware of the fact that these advocaters of this doctrine of the "absolute and unconditional predestination of all things that come to pass" deny the truth of God. Let us see what God's word says about the matter: And ye shall eat it in every place, ye and your households: for it is your reward for your service in the tabernacle of the congregation.-((Num 18:31) (Numbers 18:31). Here it is plainly stated that this is a reward for the Lord's servant for his service rendered in the tabernacle of the congregation. God said this to Moses. This doctrine of reward in and for service rendered was true in ancient time. That was God's way and promise in the days of Moses. If God has not changed since then, the same doctrine is true now. What about it, Mr. Berry? Has God changed? Did Moses tell the truth when he put it on record that God said this? But let us now pass over a long period of time, and see how it was at a much later date: But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be called the children of the Highest: for He is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil.-((Luke 6:35). Here the Saviour emphatically tells His disciples that their reward shall be great for doing the good things He here tells them to do. This was positively stated by the Saviour while He was here on earth tabernacling in the flesh. But these Absoluters do not believe it. They positively deny the plain language of the Son of God. But let us have another statement: Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye service, as men pleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God: and whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons.-((22) (Colossians 3:22-25). In this place the inspired apostle, the apostle to the Gentiles, the eminent Paul, most positively affirms that they should, of the Lord, receive the reward of the inheritance. Paul clearly taught the Colossian brethren that they would receive a reward for right doing; and that they would receive a reward for wrong doing. Evidently the reward for right doing was a blessing and joy from the presence of the Lord manifested to them; and the reward for the wrong doing was a chastisement and punishment for their wrongs. Paul was inspired of God to teach this doctrine. But these Absoluters do not believe the inspired writings; they flatly deny this teaching and call it heresy. But let us have another statement: And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.- (Revelation 22:12). Here is the promise of the Saviour that He comes quickly, and that His reward is with Him to give every man according as his work shall be. If his work is good, the reward is a blessing; if his work is bad, the reward is a curse, punishment for his evil doings. This is being fulfilled now, every day, every week, every month, every year. The sorrows and sufferings and dreadful state of affairs today in the nation and in the churches is

nothing else than punishment for wickedness and wrong doing. Will you please get your Bible now and read the plain statements of God's word recorded in the following places: **((8) (Proverbs 11:18); ((9) (Ecclesiastes 4:9); ((0:42) (Matthew 10:42); ((9:41) (Mark 9:41); (I Corinthians 3:8,14); (Deuteronomy 32:41); ((Sam 3:39) (II Samuel 3:39); ((21) (Proverbs 25:21-22); ((Hos 4:9) (Hosea 4:9); (Matthew 6:3-4,6,17-18); (16:27); (II Timothy 4:14); ((Sam 22:21) (II Samuel 22:21); ((Chr 15:7) (II Chronicles 15:7); (Jeremiah 31:16).** In all these places the doctrine is plainly taught that there is a blessed reward for those who lovingly and humbly obey the Lord and do His commandments. But these Absoluters absolutely cannot come to the Lord. They do not believe in Him. They do not believe His word. They do not believe that He is a rewarder. Hear what the inspired apostle says: But without faith it is impossible to please Him: for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.-(Hebrews 11:6). Here the Apostle Paul not only teaches that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, but he also teaches that in order for one to come to God, to come to the Lord, one must not only believe that God is, but he must also believe that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. These Absoluters do not believe that God is a rewarder of any for seeking Him. It is, therefore, impossible for them to come to God. We are not the author of this; Paul so wrote it-and that by inspiration. He was moved by the Spirit of God to write it. Poor fellows. We are not mad with you. We do not glory that you are in such a deplorable and hellish state that you cannot come to God. Rather, we are sorry for you. We are sorry that you are so deluded by the devil and the demons of the lowest hell that you are such infidels and such devil-lovers-or such lovers of doctrines of devils-that you cannot come to God and enjoy the sweetness of His blessings and truth here in this world. May the good Lord have mercy on your souls. More later on. C. H. C.

Was Mother Right?

---May 17, 1934

We copy the following article from the Banner Herald for April, 1934. It was not signed, but we presume it was written by Brother Crouse, the editor. We copy the whole article because it contains much food for thought. Here is what Brother Crouse says: When I reached my twenty-first birthday, I decided to join the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, and did. Mother warned me against it. I was teaching school and working my way through college and argued that it would be a great help to me to belong to some of these orders. Mother said it was wholly unnecessary; I had a hope in Christ, and if I was a member of the Primitive Baptist Church I needed no other affiliation. She said these worldly brotherhoods could not compare with her church-Primitive Baptists would stick together, they would stand by you and help you when all others had "passed by on the other side." It was her firm conviction that if a young man or young lady wanted to travel around the world, it was better to be known as a member of the Primitive Baptist Church than to hold membership in ALL the institutions of the world. Her implicit faith in her people made a deep impression on me, although I did not take her advice in this matter at that time. I closely observed her brotherhood and compared it with this brotherhood with which I was actively and zealously affiliated. I saw such love manifested among her brethren, such loyalty to each other, that I finally decided mother was right. Most forty years have rolled by since mother gave me that advice. A great change has come in mother's denomination. Time and again her

brethren have been at each other's throats, striving to destroy each other. I have seen brethren so prejudiced against each other that they would have no dealings with each other. They would give their influence and support against their own brethren. I have seen them liberal in helping others when good and faithful nearby brethren were sorely neglected. I have seen them raise much for "foreign-mission" work and they made no effort to meet the needs of brethren at home, in their own church. I have known good brethren to seek some position and Primitive Baptists gave their support to others wholly unfit for the position rather than help their own brethren. Fred told us, at the last Bible Conference, of his experience in the insurance business. It was amusing, and yet it was serious. In his effort to make something on the side to help him to preach the gospel and serve our people, he had, at times, been turned down by the brethren he served; they had given their business to one who cared nothing for our cause rather than give it to their brother in the church and their pastor. I had an experience recently which was interesting, and a little humiliating. I had three marble prospects. Two were Primitive Baptists, and "Progressives." One was a Methodist. I did my dead-level-best (as Hendricks says) to sell them. I needed the help. I was trying to get Mary through college and to pay my obligations and save my home. I had two competitors on these jobs, neither was a Primitive, and I doubt if they had ever been inside of one of our churches. Well, I sold the Methodist brother and LOST both of the Primitive jobs. And it just happened that the Methodist was also an Odd Fellow. I thought of Fred's experience, and of mother's advice and wondered what she would think if she were now living. There are some of our brethren who have left no stone unturned in helping our young people to get positions. (I feel I may be allowed to make special mention of J. Walter Hendricks and Geo. D. Godard.) But very many of our brethren have been indifferent. When our boys and girls have graduated from college they have had to turn to other orders for real support. A hint to the wise is sufficient. Wake up, brethren, and give these young people the help they so much deserve. In the above Brother Crouse gives some of his experiences, and tells of how the Primitive Baptists were loyal to each other in his young days and in his mother's section. Well, so far as our knowledge extends, they were loyal and true to each other, generally, in our young days. They would help each other. They would patronize each other, and as a rule they were willing to patronize each other, even if they could do a little better in a financial way—a little better price from some others—they would give the preference to their brethren. As a rule we confess that they are not as true and loyal to each other in this way as they once were. But they are not all that way. We have had some of the same kind of experiences. We have had, in our time, some experience just like Fred had. Not only by members, but preachers, the ministers—some. Yes, we have been along the road, too. Not only in lines like you mention, Brother Crouse, but in the printing line, too. Most of the time for about forty-seven years we have tried to make our living by doing printing. Many have had their minutes printed by others, by some who care nothing for the Primitive Baptist cause, when we needed the work. What has brought about these changes? May it not be partly caused by introducing into the church some things the Lord has not commanded? Might not that course cause a coldness and indifference in the brotherhood in a general way? If we would all return to the "old paths" in practice, as well as doctrine, might not this cause the membership to live closer together and to be more loyal to each other? Let us consider, and then let us try to serve the Lord and do the things He has commanded, and leave all things else alone. Though we have trials to endure, and though some may patronize the haters of the cause of the Master, rather than patronize us, when we are devoting our whole life to the cause the best we know how, yet we are determined, by the help of the Lord, to "stay in the ship," and to

continue to fight for the principles of truth while the good Lord lets us stay here in this old world of sorrow. Our heart may be made to bleed, and the wounds may be deep, that are made by brethren who thus show favors to the world, rather than to us; but the fight is almost over. The end is almost in sight. The armor will soon be laid by. May the Lord help us to "bear all things" and to "endure all things," until the final summons comes. C. H. C.

They Wash Feet

---May 17, 1934

Yes, the churches in our association all engage in feet washing. They all engage in it at the conclusion of the communion supper, or sacramental supper. Our home church-Cane Creek, here in Thornton-practices it. Bethel Church, Oak Grove, La., which we serve, practices it. Fuller's Chapel, in North Little Rock, in the Mountain Springs Association, which we try to serve as pastor, practices it. Elizabeth Church, near Marvell, Ark., which we try to serve, practices it. We do not know of a Primitive Baptist Church in the state but what practices it, and we have never heard of one that does not. All the churches in Tennessee, where we came from in 1919, practice it. We have never had membership in a church that did not practice it, and we united with the church in August, 1889, and we were baptized on Thursday before the second Sunday in September, 1889, at Greenfield, Tenn. Why will some put out a report that we are non-footwashers? Old Baptists should tell the truth. Is it not a pity but what everybody would have the same motto we once saw at the masthead of a newspaper? That motto was, "Tell the truth, and shame the devil." Brethren, we have done you no harm. Then why do you want to injure us unjustly? C. H. C.

God the Cause of Sin

---June 7, 1934

In our last issue we gave a little quotation from the pen of W. J. Berry, the editor of the Sovereign Grace and Pilgrim, and replied to same. We concluded that article with a promise to write more later on. Here is another expression from the editor, on page 510 of that paper for November and December, 1933: Does the Conditionalist admit that God is a sovereign God, and that He "works all things after the counsel of His own will," -so we believe. But if he vacillates, and says that God is indeed a sovereign, and foreknew all things, but did not predestinate all things or that He works only all good things,-we deny such sophistry. If it has pleased God to move men to do His will in not only good deeds, but the murder of His only Beloved Son and the slaughter of millions of Christian martyrs so that their blood ran in the streets as water, and all this to His eternal praise,-O vain, wretched, depraved and finite man, keep your mouth shut-" Let God be true and every man a liar *guilty*." But they will not shut their mouths, for they must "foam out their own shame." The above are two paragraphs copied from the article by the editor. Did you ever read more blasphemy in the same amount of space? In the first paragraph quoted above the editor most positively denies that God works only all good things. He declares thereby that God also works all evil, devilish, corrupt, hateful and hellish things. A few years ago a brutal negro in Little Rock, Ark., enticed an innocent young girl into a church and brutally murdered her and hid her body in the tower of the building. According to the devilish doctrine of this man

Berry, God worked that crime. He worked in the negro to do that. Not so very long ago some wicked brute crept into the home of Col. Lindberg and stole the infant child of Mr. Lindberg and wife, and brutally murdered that baby. According to Berry, and his ilk, God worked that hellish crime! Berry declares that God not only works all good things, but that He also works all the hellish crimes of the devil and all the imps of hell! Berry says that God moved men to slaughter millions of Christian martyrs, so that their blood ran in the streets as water. Here is the charging of the very meanest of crimes of the lowest demons of hell to the thrice holy and eternally righteous and perfect God! This teaches that God delivered these demons of the lower regions to do these devilish and hellish deeds. Could any person who loves God and holiness and righteousness thus charge upon the holy and spotless Jehovah the moving of men to such diabolical crimes? Is such doctrine the truth? Does it come from God? Or is it really one of the blackest and meanest of lies, emanating from the prince of devils? The devil is a liar, and the father of it. Please read **(Jeremiah 7:8-9,10)**: Behold, ye trust in lying words, that cannot profit. Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and come and stand before me in this house, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations? Those people claimed that they were delivered to do all those abominations; but God said such were lying words. Berry and his cohorts claim that people are delivered to do such abominations. If such claims were lying words in the days of Jeremiah, they are lying words yet. We did not put this in the Book. It is God's Book where this is found, and the words quoted were written by inspiration. The Holy Spirit of God moved the prophet to write just what He did write. If the doctrine of these Absoluters be the truth-that God delivered people to commit such abominable crimes- then the Spirit of God moved the prophet to write a lie. Does the Spirit of God move men to lie? Yes, God moves men to lie, if the doctrine advocated by these Absoluters be the truth-for Berry says God moves men to do all the devilish things they do. But God does not move men to lie. When they make such claims as Berry has made, and that Mr. Bumb made, and when they charge that such crimes emanate from men being moved by the Spirit of God, they are not moved by the Spirit of God to advocate such doctrine. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lust of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.- **((4) (John 8:44)**). A lie is from the devil, and not from God. The devil was a murderer from the beginning, and is a murderer yet. He is the "chap" that moved men to murder millions of Christian martyrs until their blood ran in the streets. Yes, we can understand that it pleases him to have men charge this to God, and for them to say, as Berry has, that God moved them to murder His saints until their blood ran in the streets. Such a charge cannot, by any sort of means, be honoring and glorifying to God. The devil never wants God honored or glorified. If he can but get men to believe and teach that God moves men to lie, and to steal, and to commit adultery, and to murder, and to do all such heinous crimes as men do commit, he could not get them to believe and teach a doctrine that could possibly be more dishonoring to God. May the Lord deliver us from such teaching and from men who would advocate and teach such a blasphemous, black, devilish, lying, devil-invented doctrine. C. H. C.

An Explanation

---June 7, 1934

In our article headed "God The Cause of Sin" we have used some very rough language, and some of our readers have thought we used the language with reference to all who claim to believe in the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things. We had no such thought in mind. Many who claim to believe that doctrine most positively and emphatically deny believing that God is the author of sin, or that He moves men to sin. They claim to believe the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things, but deny believing in the consequences of the doctrine. We had no reference to them. The language was used with reference to those who say that God is the author of sin and that God moves men to sin. If we could we would get all those who deny believing the consequences of the doctrine to also renounce the doctrine as well as the consequences of it. We want them to see how ugly it is, if possible. We love many good brethren we know who claim to believe that God absolutely predestinated all things, but who deny that God moves men to sin, and we would rejoice for them to be saved from the error. But we confess that we have little hope for one being saved from his error who boldly advocates the idea that God is the author or cause of sin, and that He moves men to sin. May the Lord's dear children be delivered from such doctrine, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Light Shines Better

---June 7, 1934

Dear Brother Cayce: I am glad you are contending for the truth and exposing error. I am young, and have received some criticism for being firm and contending that our blessed Lord and the apostles' had a complete church. I think the church shines better and gives a better light without the world's institutions being mixed with it. I wish you a happy future life while you may live, and after death may you enjoy all that heaven's richest blessings contain. I very much desire that you will be firm and let the Lord's humble poor know your views as long as you have breath. When in the dust of humility, please remember me. Yours in hope, D. Spence. R. 2, Bexar, Ala.

REMARKS

We appreciate the above, dear brother, and all that your letter contained. Yes, indeed, the church shines without the institutions of the world and the inventions of men. Such institutions and inventions obstruct the light, and will finally cause the light to go out. God's people are commanded to come out from the world and to be separate. The very things that are necessary to keep the churches of the world alive would destroy the identity of the Lord's church-the Primitive Baptists. In love, C. H. C.

What Next!

---September 6, 1934

In the Sovereign Grace and Pilgrim (Pilgrinder) for May and June, the following effusion may be found, beginning on page 142, under the above heading: In May 17, P. B. Elder Cayce has virtually come forth with conditional eternal-salvation in trying to refute the old doctrine. We first wish to call attention to his trickery in quoting only the latter part of our statement on P. 510 of Nov.-Dec. S. G. and P. B., and pretends ignorance but later explains exactly what we do mean, and then begins to ridicule the same. Here is the statement in full: Does the Conditionalist observe that many shall receive a reward according to their works, and that that reward of the new creature in Christ, is effected and merited by the effectual

working of the Spirit in the same,-so we contend. But if he will say that Christ indeed merits all praise for our eternal salvation, but that we are rewarded for our good works in time,-we deny it. On page 148 he says certain ones are accusing his brethren of not washing feet; he replies that Old Baptists should tell the truth. Elder Cayce, if you greatly desire to do right and "shame the devil," you will publish our statement in full. We thot it base presumption for a child of God to claim any merit for one of the least blessings freely bestowed on him here in time. But now we are greatly surprised to hear one claiming to be an Old Baptist, virtually hinging our eternal inheritance on our good deeds. The elder quotes **(Luke 6:35)** and says "Here the Saviour emphatically tells His disciples that their reward shall be great for doing the good things He tells them to do." The parallel text to this is **(Matthew 5:44-45)** "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, etc. That you may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good." Would you contend that they were made children because they did these things? (you have argued to the contrary in other days). And for what reason does He make His "sun to rise on the evil" as well as the good? Furthermore, does He not also say in another place that after we have done these things "We are unprofitable servants," and have no thanks for doing what we should? {See **(0) (Luke 7:10)**} Why do you people not emphasize that vital truth? You next quote **((22) (Colossians 3:22-25)** in defense of the same theory. "Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance." The reward of what?-" Of the inheritance." "Ye are bought with a price." Christ did that. He is our reward. He that is the Lord's freeman is also Christ's servant, does a servant merit anything for his service? How then do you say it is by creature works? As to verse 25 none would presume to say that we do not merit far more chastisement than we receive. You next quote **(Revelation 22:12)** "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." I am astonished that such a text should be brought forth in defense of the do-and-live system. Do you really mean it? (Continued) PROPOSITION-You have falsely accused, misrepresented, and made the old doctrine look hideous to your people; now will you dare to publish to them the exact truth? Will you dare to publish just what we do believe? I say, will you print or tell a full exposition of the old doctrine without bombast or ridicule? If so, we offer this proposition: That you print our testimony verbatim and in a regular issue of your paper. We will reprint your remarks in full, provided they are not unreasonably long. This is open to any one of the Conditionalist papers. You should thoroughly sustain your position or forever close your mouths and columns of any word against the absolute sovereignty of the I AM THAT I AM. We give above a verbatim copy of what the wonderful blasphemer says. The above is the whole thing he said. Now, let us see if he will do what he said he would-see if he will publish our reply in his pilgrinder. Put it in there, old man, and grind to your heart's content. But we are made to wonder if the eternal and sovereign and holy God did absolutely and unconditionally predestinate from all eternity that Parson Berry should lie as he did in the above blather? Note that he said we "have virtually come forth with conditional eternal salvation," and that we are "virtually hinging our eternal inheritance on our good deeds." The parson absolutely knows that in these statements he has maliciously falsified. That is the way with these fellows who will charge that wickedness and iniquity and sin comes from the pure and holy God. He is without iniquity. See **(Deuteronomy 32:4)**. He is "a God of truth, and without iniquity." No lie comes from Him, either directly or indirectly, because He is a God of truth. Iniquity does not come from Him, either directly or indirectly, for He is without iniquity. Lying comes from another source. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the

truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." -Jesus, in **((4) (John 8:44))**. Say, parson, why did you not give our article as we published it? If you had done that, your readers would have seen that you falsified and misrepresented what we said. You know very well that we did no such thing as to argue, or even intimate, that eternal salvation depends in any degree upon the work of the sinner. Our first citation was **((Num 18:31) (Numbers 18:31))**. This was a positive promise of a reward for the Lord's servant for services rendered. In **(Luke 6:35)** the Saviour positively tells His disciples that their reward shall be great for doing the good things He there tells them to do. **((22) (Colossians 3:22-25))** teaches the same truth-that the Colossian brethren should be rewarded for right doing as well as for wrong doing. The reward for right doing is evidently a blessing, and the reward for wrong doing is punishment or chastisement. No such thing, as you well know, as an intimation that eternal salvation depends upon what they do or do not do. The first was to Israel, a type of spiritual Israel. The others, to those who were already children of God. Why thus misrepresent? The answer is in **((4) (John 8:44))**-is it not, parson? But the parson says: "As to verse 25 none would presume to say that we do not merit far more chastisement than we receive." If you merit more chastisement than you receive, then you merit it for carrying out God's eternal decree-for no matter what you do, according to your doctrine, you are only doing what God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated from all eternity that you should do. You could not help doing the meanness you have done, according to your doctrine, for God so arranged it that way. Those things were only links in the chain of events which God forged in eternity. Hence, according to your doctrine, God punishes His children for carrying out His predestination and decrees. Does God punish them for doing His will and pleasure? If God predestinated the said acts, was it not His pleasure to predestinate them? Did He do that which was not His pleasure to do? If He did do that which was not His pleasure to do, then He does not always do His pleasure, does He? If He always does His pleasure, and He unalterably predestinated the wicked acts His children do, as well as all wicked acts of men and devils, then it must be His pleasure for them to do those wicked acts, or else it is not His pleasure for His predestination to be done. So, you merit chastisement for doing what it was God's pleasure for you to do! Shame on such a blasphemous heresy! That doctrine is as black as the regions of hell-from whence it came. Give this to your readers, and then we will give you a little more. You may say that this is unreasonably long. We do not expect you to publish all we say. Why did you not publish our article in our issue of May 17? You do not intend for your readers to see your devilish heresy exposed-that's why. Come on, parson. C. H. C.

Will You Escape?

---September 6, 1934

We live in an age of spiritual adolescence. "Take thine ease" has been preached well by the enemy, and believed well by the human race, not excluding Christians. The world rolls on to judgment, and many Christians have their eyes closed to the appalling need of the unsaved. God's word is very plain in its teaching that the unsaved will be forever banished in outer darkness and Christian men and women close their eyes to those facts and never try to "pluck a brand from the burning." What will be the shame of our guilt when we go to be with the Lord?- Baptist and Commoner, page 1, August 10, 1934. "The world rolls on to judgment, and many Christians have their eyes closed to the appalling need of the unsaved." "What will be the shame of our guilt when we go to be with the

Lord?" According to this teaching the Christians have the wherewith and the means in their hands whereby unregenerate sinners (the unsaved) may become the children of God, and thereby be prepared for eternal glory, and yet they have their eyes closed to the appalling need. They will not, or do not, use the means in their hands for the salvation and final glorification of poor ignorant sinners of Adam's race. Sure enough, if that doctrine be true, what will be the shame of the modern Missionaries when they "go to be with the Lord?" Is it possible that the just and holy God, of whom it is said, "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne," **{(9:14) (Psalms 89:14)}** will send the poor ignorant sinners to hell on account of the wickedness of these modern Missionaries, and then let the Missionaries go free? Is it not possible that, if your doctrine is the truth, you will be very sadly disappointed when you "go to be with the Lord?" C. H. C.

John 1:11-13

---October 4, 1934

He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.-(John 1:11-12,13). If language means anything at all, the above Scripture teaches that it is the sovereign work of God for one to be born of God, or to be born from above. It is not of the will of the flesh that one is born of God. This being true, the will of the sinner has nothing to do with his being born of God. His will is not consulted in the matter. He has no will in that matter whatever. Neither is it of the will of man. The will of any man, or set of men, has nothing in the wide world to do with a sinner being born of God. It is not of blood that one is born of God. Hence, the works of men have nothing in the world to do with one being born of God. As it is not of blood, it is not by the doings of men. The things that men may do, or have done, or can do, have nothing to do with being born of God. It is of God-not of man or men. It is God's own work, God's own doing, by which a sinner is born of God. All works of men are excluded, and have nothing to do with the bringing about the spiritual birth. Not only is it God's own work, His own doing, but it is of His own sovereign will. He regenerates, or borns again, or from above, those whom He sovereignly wills to regenerate. "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will." -(John 5:21). It is of the will of God, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, that sinners are born of God, or quickened into divine life, or raised up out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ. This is clearly and unmistakably taught in the text. But "He came to His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him." Many of His own received Him not, but some of them received Him. To those who received Him He gave power, authority, right, privilege to become the sons of God. Those to whom this power, right, privilege, was given were those that believe on His name. They were not given power, or right, or privilege, to become the sons of God in the sense of regeneration, or of being born of God; for they were already born of God-" which were born, not of blood, but of God." They were born of God-in the past tense. "Even to them that believe on His name" -in the present tense. It is not possible that the present could be in order to the past. Believe is in the present, and were born is in the past, in the text. Were born must, therefore, necessarily, precede and come before the believing. The "were born" is something which was done, fully accomplished, at some time in the past, or in the long ago; and the believing is in the present, as something which is

the effect of that which was done in the past. Were born was the cause, and the believing is something which follows as the effect. One must be born of God, then, in order to believe. It cannot be true, then, that one must believe in order to be born of God. But God gives to those who have been born of God, and who believe on His name, the power, the authority, the right, the privilege, to become the sons of God. If He does not give them this power, right, or privilege, to become the sons of God by birth, or in the sense of regeneration-which He does not, for the simple reason that they were already born of God before they believe -then it must be true that. He gives them this power, right, or privilege, to become the sons of God' in some sense other than by regeneration or birth; In what sense, then, or in what way, do they have the power to become the sons of God? He gives them the power to become the sons of God in what sense, or in what way? It cannot possibly be in any other way than in the sense of obedience to His laws and commandments-thus in a manifest way, manifesting by their obedience that they are the sons of God. He gives them this authority, this power, this right, this privilege. It is not only a duty that one obey the Lord who has been born of God; it is a gracious heaven-given right or privilege. God gives them that right, that privilege, that authority, that power. The Lord's dear children should esteem this as a great privilege-to render service, and praise, and adoration, to the God of all grace, for His unspeakable mercy and grace bestowed upon them. In nature, one is first born of his parents; and the will of the one born is not consulted in the matter; his will has nothing to do with that work. He has no will before being born. He must first be born in order that he have a will concerning or pertaining to the natural realm. Even so, it is also true in grace, that the will of the one born of God is not consulted in that work; his will has nothing to do with his being born of God, or born into the spiritual realm. He has no will concerning or pertaining to spiritual things until he has been born of God, or born into the spiritual realm. A will pertaining to natural things springs from, and is a product of, the natural life. Even so, a will for spiritual things springs from, and is a product of, the spiritual life. Hence, in nature, one becomes a child of his parents first by birth; then he begins to hear about his parents, as his parents; then he begins to believe on them as his parents; then, if a dutiful child, he begins to obey his parents. This all being self-evidently true, it follows that one is first a child of his parents by birth; then a child by hearing; then a child by belief, or by faith; then a child by obedience. This is just as true in grace as in nature. One is first a child of God by birth; then he begins to hear about the Lord as his heavenly Father; then he begins to believe on the Lord as his heavenly Father; then, if a dutiful child, he begins to obey the Lord as his heavenly Father. This being true, one is a child of God by birth before he is or can be a child of God by faith. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." -(Galatians 3:26). They were children of God by birth before they were children of God by faith, or by belief. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." -(Galatians 3:27). In putting on Christ* in baptism, they put Him on, as one putting on a coat. A man has no right to put a coat on and wear it if the coat does not belong to him. But it is the right and privilege of one to put on and wear a coat which belongs to him. Even so, if Christ is yours, and you are His by regeneration, or by you having been born of God, then you have the authority, the power, the right, and the privilege to put on Christ in baptism. You have been born of God, and as a result of having been thus born, and hearing the testimony of the witness, and thus being a believer on Him, you have the right, and the privilege, of putting on Christ in baptism. It is not only your duty; it is your heaven-given, your God-given, right and privilege. Thus you become a child of God by obedience, which God has given you the authority, the power, the right, the privilege, to do. This is the teaching of God's holy and blessed word. The Arminian world may reverse the order in their

teaching, and the Absoluter may deny the teaching; but it remains the same blessed and eternal truth, and will stand amidst the wreck of nature and the crash of worlds. The eternal God is the author of it; and He is the author of all truth. Principles are eternal, and never change. The Lord's children and His servants should be bold and faithful and true to contend for these precious heavenly truths. May the Lord help us thus to do. C. H. C.

Eternal Hell

---October 4, 1934

We have recently been requested to give our views through The Primitive Baptist as to whether the Scriptures teach that there is any such thing as eternal punishment. We gave our views on this question in The Primitive Baptist of August 18, 1914. The same article was also published in pamphlet form, and all have long since been sold. For the benefit of the brother making the request, as well as for the benefit of other readers, we will reproduce the article below, leaving out the name of the party making the request in 1914. We will add here, for the brother making the recent request, that there cannot possibly be such a thing as punishment in the absence of suffering, and there can be no such thing as suffering without knowledge of the same. Hence, as there is eternal punishment, there is of necessity a consciousness of suffering. C. H. C. Note-The article referred to above published August 18, 1914, is on page 262 of Volume II, and it is not necessary to reproduce it here.

More Help

---October 4, 1934

Elder J. D. Holder, of Tupelo, Miss., has agreed for us to put his name on our editorial staff. We are glad to have Elder Holder associated with us. We esteem him as an able and humble gift from God to the church, though he is comparatively young in the ministry. The good Lord has wonderfully blessed him to speak in His glorious name to the comfort and instruction of many of His loved ones. We trust the Lord may bless his labors with us in writing for the paper, and that our readers may be benefited much by his writings. We sincerely believe that Brother Holder is a faithful and true servant of the Lord, and that he is satisfied with the goodness of God's house. He wants none of the inventions of men in the Lord's kingdom. He is satisfied to "stand ye in the ways, and see; and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein." We hope to hear from him from time to time, and beg the Lord to bless his labors for and among His humble followers. C. H. C.

Our Association

---October 18, 1934

Our association (the South Arkansas) met in the ninety-third annual session on Friday morning, September 14, with Friendship Church, El Dorado, Ark., and closed on Sunday. Elder T. L. Webb is the beloved and faithful pastor of the church. The association last year agreed that the pastor of the church where the association was held this year should preach the introductory sermon. Brother Webb did this, and the good Lord blessed him to preach a wonderful discourse, to the great comfort and joy of the saints and to the honor of His glorious name. The visiting ministers present were: Elders R. F. Pierce, R. 2, Quitman, Ark.; C. E. Coward, McCall Creek, Miss.; A. H. Garner, Searcy, Ark.; C. M. Monk, Jonesboro, La.; W. L.

Phillips, Blooming Grove, Texas; C. M. Mills, 133 W. First St., Charlotte, N. C.; J. R. Wilson, Martinsville, Va. These brethren all filled the stand, from time to time, as arranged by the committee on preaching; besides which they had Elder W. H. Lee, of our own association, to preach one time, and the writer to close the meeting. The Lord wonderfully blessed every speaker, as well as the hearers. We have never heard better preaching than was done during this meeting-if we have we have forgotten it. The home ministers present were Elders Jacob Sandage, Malvern, Ark.; T. L. Webb, El Dorado, Ark.; John R. Harris, Thornton, Ark.; E. W. Hargett, El Dorado, Ark.; W. H. Lee, R. 2, Arkadelphia, Ark., and the writer. By unanimous voice of the association Elder John R. Harris was made clerk and the writer was made moderator. On Sunday after the preaching thirteen willing souls came forward asking for a home in the dear old church. As they came forward many were made so glad that their cups ran over. There were many shouts of praise went up to the Lord for His goodness and wonderful blessings. We were told the name of each one, but some of them we cannot now recall; but among the number were the wife and mother of Elder Hargett. Well, Brother Hargett could hardly "stay on the ground." We rejoice with him, as well as with all others. You never saw a happier crowd of people. All were rejoicing. From the very start to the finish there was only one thing that we have had the least intimation of that could mar the feelings of any of the brethren or sisters present, and that was something said by the writer concerning some of the committees, or to them. We confess that we are full of mistakes and shortcomings. We here make this public confession, and beg any and each and every one to forgive us. We are deeply grieved and sorry that anyone is wounded at what we said, or the way we said it. We are sorry we said it. We had no thought of seeming abrupt. Please forgive us, if you can find it in your heart to do so. The Old Baptists have all been too good to us for us to intentionally wound the feelings of one of them in the very least. Will you forgive us, and forget it? We never attended a sweeter or more enjoyable meeting in life, and we have been attending Old Baptist associations for more than forty-five years-in fact, we have been attending them and enjoying them for forty-nine years. How thankful we should be that the Lord remembers us. Praise be to His holy name. Let us try to serve and honor Him-walk by faith and He will take care of us. Now, please bear with us, and let us still have a little place with you. May heaven's richest blessings rest upon each one of you, is our humble prayer. Pray for us. We need your prayers. Please take us by the hand, and help us to go along with you. We feel to be so unworthy of your love and sweet fellowship. Please forgive all our mistakes and wrongs, and let us still share a little place in your hearts and in your fellowship. The next session is appointed to be held with Elizabeth Church, five miles south of Marvell, Ark. This is a church of small membership at present. They have gone through severe trials, and they need all the help and encouragement they can get. Let us all now begin to make our plans to go and to be all the help and encouragement to them that we possibly can. Let us all try to go, and make them glad of our presence. C. H. C.

More Help

---October 18, 1934

Elder J. R. Wilson, of Martinsville, Va., has agreed for us to put his name on our editorial staff. We are glad to have this dear brother associated with us again as one of our corresponding editors. We have been acquainted with Brother Wilson for about thirty years, if we are not mistaken in the time. We have never known him to advocate a single thing that was not in harmony with the doctrine and practice our

people have contended for all along the line. He has no use for the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things, and that no matter what a man does he could not have done otherwise. Neither does he have any use for any new means or measures to be introduced in the house of God. He has no use for organs, Sunday schools, or any other invention of the world in the church of God. May the Lord bless his efforts in the service of the Master, and bless our labors together for the good of His people. An article will be found from him in another column in this paper. C. H. C.

More Help

---November 15, 1934

We have obtained the consent of Elder G. W. Lewis, of Auburn, Miss., to place his name on our editorial staff. Brother Lewis is the good and efficient moderator of the Amite Association. He is a man that is highly esteemed by the brethren of his own association, as well as by the brethren in other associations where he is known. He is highly esteemed as a man and as a citizen by other people who are not Primitive Baptists. He certainly does possess in outstanding degree the qualification the apostle says the minister must have- "Moreover, he must have a good report of them that are without." Brother Lewis has the full confidence of his brethren and of the people in his section of the country. Not only this, but we esteem him highly as an able minister of the gospel of the grace of God. He is sound in the faith and order of God's house. We have talked with him, and associated with him, and the more we are associated with him the more we love him. We are glad to have him associated with us, and humbly pray that the Lord may bless his labors to the good of His cause. We trust we may have an article from his pen for our readers as often as he may feel impressed to write. We trust, too, that he will watch over us for good, and help us to conduct The Primitive Baptist in such a way as to be of benefit to the Lord's dear children and to the building up of His cause. C. H. C.

Efforts Commended

---November 15, 1934

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I heartily commend your design in selecting good songs, and in making a hymn book, about the size and price of Lloyd's hymn book; that the words of the hymns should be sound in doctrine, to the glory of God; that the songs should be devotional and spiritual, to the joy of the soul of the saints. All know that a number of the songs in Lloyd's selections are not sound in doctrinal sentiment, and that a number of songs sung in our public worship selected from other song books in our church are not spiritually edifying to the saints or to the praise of their Lord. For saints to sing in public worship songs not sentimentally sound and devotional would be more hurtful to the church's good and unity than for the pastor to preach a little levity and some false doctrine. Now, as hundreds of new books of Lloyd's hymn books are in Primitive Baptist Churches, besides thousands of old shabby ones, may I suggest the ultimate interest of your book and the financial interest of our people that you place the number of Lloyd's song along side of the same song in your book. While I have ordered hundreds of Lloyd's books for the churches, I would far rather order a sound book, and I am sure that all other true and faithful pastors would prefer to do so, and in this way yours would gradually displace Lloyd's. I think that such a book as you propose will be a

godsend to our churches, and to that end I pray for the success of your purpose.
Yours to serve, M. L. Gilbert., Dade City, Fla.

REMARKS

We appreciate the above letter very much, and thank Brother Gilbert for the kind words of approval contained in the same. We also appreciate the suggestion to give the No. of the song as they appear in the Lloyd collection; but it is too late now, as we already have nearly all the plates already made-just a few of the last pages have not yet been sent to the foundry to have the plates cast. We are sorry we did not think of this before it was too late. We could not afford the additional expense now, as it would cost almost as much, if not as much, to have those numbers inserted in the plates as another set of new plates would cost. It is our desire to get books introduced among our people, and to get them to use such books, as have no unsound sentiment in them. It is just as important to sing songs that are sound in sentiment as to preach sound sentiment-so it appears to us. Many songs that our people are accustomed to sing have some unsound sentiment in them. As an example, take the song, "There is a fountain filled with blood." As usually sung in the books generally found among our people, as well as among other people, the second stanza says, The dying thief rejoiced to see That fountain in his day; And there may I, though vile as he, Wash all my sins away. In this language the pronoun I is the subject of the verb wash. This says we wash our sins away in His blood, which is not the truth. It is a rotten Arminian sentiment, and contrary to **(Revelation 1:1-5)** "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood." We do not wash away our sins in His blood; but He washes His elect, His chosen ones, the objects of His love, in His own blood, and cleanses them from their sins, and makes them kings and priests unto God. This is just one of a number of others we might call attention to. C. H. C.

Greenfield Association

---December 6, 1934

Elsewhere in this paper is an article from Elder J. W. Hardwick, of Smithville, Miss., concerning some matters which transpired at the meeting of the Greenfield Association, which was held at Sandy Branch on Friday, Saturday, and third Sunday in October, 1934. The following account of this meeting was given in the Weakley County Press of October 26, 1934, under the heading of "Dresden Items:" At a meeting of the Greenfield Primitive Baptist Association that met at Sandy Branch Primitive Baptist Church near Ruthville last Friday for a three-day session, eight of the churches withdrew from the association. These churches were Little Zion, Fulton, Martin, Greenfield, Sandy Branch, Matheny's Grove, Bethel and Rock Springs. Four remained in the association as follows: Blooming Grove, Union City, Concord and Brush Creek. Elder Henry Ross was elected moderator of the association, while Elder Bun Ross delivered the introductory sermon. When the association convened on Sunday for the last day session, two ministers delivered sermons, Elder Neal Graves from Bedford County, and Elder Beshears. A large crowd attended every service. The fellowship that prevailed was very fine. The churches that withdrew will not be affiliated with any association but will continue as independent sovereign churches. Under the same "Dresden Items" in the same paper we find the following announcement: It has been announced that Elder H. M. Sanders, of Dickson, will fill the pulpit for the Primitive Baptist Church in Dresden next Sunday morning and at night. Brother Sanders is rated a very fine preacher and the public is cordially invited to hear his able discourse. 'Squire R. R. Wright, president of the Weakley County Singing Convention, has been asked to lead the

singing at this service. He will have other singers to assist him with the songs. We have been informed that the Dresden Church uses an organ in their song service. We suppose they also had an organist. Brother Wright once had membership in Blooming Grove Church. We were present with that church at their centennial meeting on Friday, Saturday, and first Sunday in August, 1932. There were complaints lodged against Brother Wright by the church in their conference during that meeting, on account of him advocating the use of an organ in the church. In that conference Brother Wright said they would have an organ in the church if it were not for ignorance and superstition; that if it were not for some ignorance and superstition they would have an organ. If ignorance and superstition is the reason why Old Baptists do not have organs in their churches, then they have always been ignorant and superstitious; for they have never had them, only by a few when they would depart from the original practice and order of the church. The introduction of such new things as organs and Sunday schools in Old Baptist Churches has always brought trouble, confusion, discord, and division among them. They have always been so ignorant and superstitious as to believe the Lord put everything in His church that He wanted there. They have always believed, and believe yet, that God meant what He said in **(Deuteronomy 4:1-2)**: Now therefore hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and unto the judgments, which I teach you, for to do them, that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which the Lord God of your fathers giveth you. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you. What applied in this language to national Israel, and it was addressed to them, applies with equal force to spiritual Israel today. It was necessary for them to do just as here instructed in order that they live and enjoy the blessings in the land of Canaan. It is also true today that it is necessary to do exactly this in order to enjoy the blessings of the gospel Canaan and in order to live in a gospel church capacity. The very things that are necessary for the churches of the world to do and to have in order that they live would destroy the Old Baptist Church, and cause her to lose her identity. An Old Baptist Church may go down on a common level with the world by taking and using the things the world has invented, and thus lose her identity; but she can never raise the world up on a level with the church. She may become enveloped by the world, but the world can never become enveloped by the church. We wish the brethren would all be satisfied with the goodness of God's house, and not try to revolutionize or reform the church of God. It is good enough as established by our Lord and handed down to us by our ancestors. May the Lord help us. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 49

---December 20, 1934

This issue brings volume forty-nine of The Primitive Baptist to a close. We have now rounded out nearly a half century in the publication of this paper. Our readers know that the paper was established by our sainted father, and that the first issue was printed at Fulton, Ky., on January 1, 1886. He continued as editor of the paper until his death on the fourth Sunday in August, 1905. In the latter part of August, 1886, we moved from Fulton, Ky., to Martin, Tenn. On the first day of September, 1886, we began working in the office. Our father had bought an interest in a printing office at Martin from Mr. J. B. Gilbert, who was the prior owner of the office, and who was editor and publisher of the Martin Mail, a weekly county newspaper. Later on our father purchased the entire interest of Mr. Gilbert, and he

then owned the entire plant. From the first day we went to work with our father in the office we have been almost continuously connected with the publication of The Primitive Baptist. There was a short while, during father's lifetime, that we did not work in the office, though we still had an interest in it. For awhile our health was not good, and he and our physician advised that it would be a help to us to work outside the office for awhile, which we did. Our health improved, and it was not long until we resumed our work and duties in the office. All these years it was the desire of our father and ourself to conduct the paper in such a way as to advance the cause of truth. We have had no desire to go off after new things. The "good old way" is still good enough for us. It is still our desire to make the paper a medium of correspondence for the Lord's humble poor. It has been our earnest aim for the paper to be conducted in such a way as to be of comfort and benefit to the Lord's dear children. It has been our sincere desire to contend earnestly for the principles of God's eternal truth. How well we have succeeded in this remains for our readers to judge and to say. We have come through many sore trials and afflictions. We have had enemies along the way. Not only have we had enemies from without, but we have had them from within. We know what it means to be in perils of false brethren. We know, too, that the world has never loved the doctrine of God our Saviour, as it is taught in His Book. All along the line men have arisen among us who were not satisfied with the goodness of God's house, and have endeavored to modernize and to reform the church of God. We have been satisfied with the church as we found it when we asked for a home with them in 1889. We were tired of the world then, and have had no desire to go to the world. If we wanted the things of the world, we would leave the church alone and go to the world, where the things of the world may be found, and where those things are. We have been satisfied all these years that when the Lord organized His church, He knew just what would be needed in the church in every age of the world from that time until the final windup and consummation of all things. We were satisfied then that He put everything in His church that would be needed in every age, and we are sure of that same thing today. For us to try to put something in the church that the Lord did not put there is no better than the sin of presumption. We would thereby declare that we know better what should be in the church than the Lord knew when He organized it. The Lord has forbidden the adding of anything to His teaching, and has also forbidden the taking of anything therefrom. To add one thing in His church which He did not put there is to add to His teaching. We have made our mistakes during these years. We are free to confess this. "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." **-(I John 1:9)**. We can only beg Him to forgive our many sins and transgressions. We also beg the brethren and sisters to forgive our many sins and mistakes, and to continue to bear with us, with our many imperfections, and to help us to serve the Lord in a way that is acceptable to Him. Help us to do as Paul said, in **((3) (Philippians 3:13-14)** "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." The year 1934 is now drawing near to a close. Another year of history is about made. It has been a year of joys and sorrows-" Mixtures of joy and sorrow, I daily do pass through." So said the poet. It has been that way with us during this year of 1934, as well as during the other years which we have lived. Yet we have much to be thankful for. "And having food and raiment let us be therewith content." -1 Tim. viii. 8. We now bid you farewell for this year. We hope to greet you again in the new year. The next issue of The Primitive Baptist will be dated January 3, 1935. May each and every reader enjoy a merry Christmas and a happy new year, and may heaven's richest blessings be showered upon each one of you,

is our humble prayer. Please do not forget to remember us at the rich throne of grace. We feel to be poor and needy. C. H. C.
END OF VOLUME FIVE

1935

Editorial Writings From The Primitive Baptist

Beginning with 1935

By Elder C. H. Cayce

Volume VI 1940 CAYCE PUBLISHING COMPANY THORNTON, ARKANSAS

TO

My Beloved Wife who has, untiringly labored with me and for me during these many years, and TO My Dear Children, who are so attentive to their poor old father, and TO My Sainted Father and Mother who cared for me when I could not care for myself, and to My Dear Brethren and Sisters who have been so kind and good to poor me all these years is this and any following volumes Lovingly Dedicated

PREFACE

We have received many words of indorsement of the previous volumes of our Editorial Writings. We have also had some words of criticism. Every reader has not indorsed everything that each volume contained. We could hardly expect that they should. But we are trying to faithfully reproduce what we said in our editorial writings in The Primitive Baptist during the years since we began the work of trying to edit the paper. Our dear companion insisted for several years that we undertake this work, before we could "muster up the courage" to undertake it. Her opinion was that it would be of benefit to the cause of the Master. This volume, with the previous volumes, will show that our people-the Primitive Baptists-are still standing where they have always stood. They will also show, conclusively, that we have occupied the same ground during all our public life. Some things herein will be of value, from a historical standpoint, in the years to come. If we know our poor heart our desire in the publication of these volumes is the glory of God and the advancement of His blessed cause, and the benefit of His humble poor. The price we have been selling the books for is clear proof of the fact that the making of money is not the object in view. We desire that the Lord's dear children who are blinded by false teachers may be enabled, by the reading of some of these pages, to see where the true church is, and where the truth may be found. May the blessings of our Lord rest upon the reader, is the humble prayer of The Author
Thornton, Arkansas, August 16, 1939

Introduction to Volume 50

---January 3, 1935

We now begin the publication of the fiftieth volume of The Primitive Baptist. Forty-nine volumes have been completed, and this issue is the first of the fiftieth volume. We are beginning the labors of the new volume and the new year relying alone on the good Lord for strength and courage to perform the tasks and labors as we come to them. We do not know what the year has in store for us. We have never known what was in store for us in the beginning of any of the many years in which we have been engaged in the editing and publishing of The Primitive Baptist; but by

the grace and mercy of God we have come thus far. Through many dangers, toils and snares, I have already come; 'Tis grace has brought me safe thus far, And grace will lead me home. The Lord has promised good to me, His word my hope secures; He will my shield and portion be As long as life endures. Since the Lord has been so wonderfully good to us during these past years, why should we not trust Him and confide in Him? The way may often seem dark and gloomy, and our way may seem to be all "hedged in," but it is not our business to open up the way to go. The Lord has told us in His word what is well pleasing in His sight, and has directed us as to what He would have us do. His children are under law to Christ, **{(I Corinthians 9:21)}** and God's will concerning what we should do is expressed in His law. It is our bounden duty to put forth every effort to do what He has commanded in His word, as His children, and rely upon Him for strength and ability to do the same, and then leave the result with Him. The Lord God promised His chosen people Israel that when they walked in His commandments and did those things which were pleasing in His sight, He would go before them, and would fight all their battles for them. It was necessary for them to often go in obedience to God when the "odds" all seemed to be against them, and when it seemed to be impossible for them to do what was commanded or required. To refuse or fail to make the effort would have been rebellion. This would result in their destruction and overthrow, for God had said, "if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword." -((0) (Isaiah 1:20). To go forward they had to walk by faith. They could not see how they could ever accomplish that which was required or commanded of them. They could not see the way. It was their business to press forward, and to do their best to go on in the way the Lord had marked out for them to go, and it was the Lord's business to open up the way and to preserve and keep them. What was true concerning the Israelites in the prophetic age is also true with us today, if we are the Lord's children. In Paul's day he said, "For we walk by faith, not by sight." - (II Corinthians 5:7). It is just as true now as it was then, and as it was in the prophetic day. If we get anywhere in the service of God we have to walk by faith. Israel's God is the same today that He was in Abraham's day. Abraham walked by faith. He went out from his own kindred and from his own country, not knowing whither he went. God told him to go, and he went by faith, trusting the Lord to care for him and to care for the consequences and the result. May we not thus rely upon God today? He has not changed. He is the same "I AM" that He has ever been. We enter the new year and begin the task and the labors of editing and publishing this fiftieth volume of The Primitive Baptist, feeling to put all our trust and confidence in the Lord, that He will take care of us and our loved ones. Let us all look unto Him for protection and preservation, and strive to do the things that are pleasing in His sight; let us all "strive for the things that make for peace, and the things wherewith we may edify one another." Let us be satisfied with the goodness of God's house. Let us leave all the things of the world and the inventions of men in the affairs of religion severely alone. Let us try to use all forbearance the Lord requires. This does not require that we should indorse departures from His word or should fellowship the works or inventions of men in the church. Let us try to lay aside the things that bring disturbance and distress among the Lord's dear children and in His church. If we will live this way, the Lord will bless and prosper us. He has promised, and is faithful. May the Lord help us thus to do. C. H. C.

Crime Increasing

---January 17, 1935

A brother has sent us a copy of the Gospel Advocate of March 8, 1934, published in Nashville, Tenn. In that paper is an article concerning a report of the United States Senate committee appointed to investigate crime in our country. It seems that the committee put the blame for the enormous increase in crime on our schools, in part, at least. The writer in the Gospel Advocate seems to put much of the blame there. He also puts much blame on the moving picture shows, and the churches, or denominations, as well as on the home. There is little doubt in our mind that some of the blame may be rightly placed upon each of these different agencies. It is a serious fact that the home life of the average family is not what it once was. There has gradually developed a great looseness in discipline in the homes of our land. Years ago the young people, as a rule, were not gallivanting around all over the country in cars, day and night, as many of them are in these days. In our youthful days, it was a very seldom thing that a young man and a girl would go over the country at night alone. How is it now? If you travel much on our highways at night, how often do you find a car parked along the roadside and some young man and girl sitting in the car with their arms around each other? It is a common occurrence. Is it any wonder there are so few virtuous girls to be found? Is it any wonder so many young girls are ruined? Who is to blame for this? No one but the fathers and mothers. Do you allow your daughters to car ride at night? Do you know where your daughters are when they are not under your own roof at night? Are you teaching "the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed?" **{(Titus 2:4-5)}** Are you teaching the young men as the apostle directs in that chapter? It is true, and we are glad it is true, that there are some families yet where this teaching is observed and enforced. And these few are the "salt of the earth" in a moral point of view. Were it not for the few who yet stand for the principles of righteousness in the moral realm, it would be so bad in truth that decent people could not stay here. It is bad enough as it is. Right here we find much of the reason for the sad state of morals, or lack of morals, as we know they are today all over the land. Then there are the movies. These things constitute one of the greatest curses in the nation today. They are a curse from a financial standpoint. Many people who claim that they are unable to pay the debts they owe will go to the picture show and spend money which rightly belongs to their creditors. Perhaps they owe the money for food and clothing. But when they have thus spent the money, what do they get in return? Anything of benefit? It is certain they get no financial gain. Are they benefitted from a mental standpoint? Not in the least. Are they any better off from a moral point of view? Far from it. Seldom it is that a picture is put on the screen which teaches a good moral lesson. We are sure that fully ninety per cent (if not more) have a degrading influence. They cater to the sensual and to the baser instincts. Of what moral benefit can it be, for instance, to put on the screen the life of the base criminals, which all decent people know are a menace to our country? Such pictures can do nothing else than to excite in the young, especially, a craving for excitement and romance of the vulgar and base sort. It would be a God-send to our country if every picture show in the whole Union were forced to close their doors today. They are a menace to the good morals of the country. If you want your boys and girls to grow up in good morals and right living, for your own sake, for their sake, and for the sake of all that is good, keep them away from the movies. They may think you are too hard on them now, but in later years they will thank you and thank God that you kept them away from such influences. Next, as to our educational system. That is wrong from start to finish. The rule has been to start wrong. The first thing is to instill in the mind of the child the idea of obtaining an education in order to live without work-without producing anything. Then, the

idea is to educate for the professions. The idea is to educate the girls and boys all along the same line. Both boys and girls are required to pursue the same course of studies, from the lowest to the highest grades. In order to graduate from the high schools the boys and girls are both required to complete practically the same course of studies. Either boy or girl may omit a study-there is no difference. In order to graduate from college, they are both required to go through the same course of study. No matter what they may follow through life-it is the same course. In order to graduate, and get a diploma, the boy and girl must have completed the same course. Remember, too, that the course required is to educate the pupil for some of the professions. When the girl has finished her course of study in the schools, has she been educated to make a home? Has she been educated to be a wife and companion for a husband? Ten thousand times, no. In few instances does she know the first principles of home making. If she knows, even the first principles, it is in spite of the schooling and not because of it. It is an indisputable and incontrovertible fact, which all sensible people know, that deep down in the heart of every normal girl, in her young womanhood, is a desire to have a home of her own some day, and to be mistress and "queen" of that home. She hopes that some day she will meet her "ideal" of a man, and that they can be united in one, and have a little home of their own, in which she will be "mistress and queen." All right. She finishes her education, according to the requirements; she starts out in life in some of the professions-just any place where she may find a position. But in the course of time she meets with her "ideal." She and the young man "fall in love," if they have not imbibed too deeply of much of the modernistic idea of "free love," and they become united in the holy bonds of matrimony, in which they are to forsake all others and cleave to each other and live in the holy state of matrimony until death. They start out to make their home. But the girl has not been educated for that. Instead of having been educated to stay at home and to be a home maker, she has been educated away from home. Both are disappointed. Their lives are blighted. They separate. The courts are filled with divorce cases. They feel that the whole system of home and morals are a myth. Why should a man who is to be a farmer be required to study foreign languages in order to complete the course of study which he will need during life? Why should a man who is going to be a physician be required to take the course required in all the studies laid down in the curriculum of the school? Why not pursue the course of study and finish in the branches which will be of service and use to him, and not require him to spend the time and money now required? Some of us would fail to get the money we now get. "The love of money is the root of all evil." "Another thing wrong with our schools is the introduction and teaching of "modernism." The young and rising generation are taught to sneer at and to disrespect the faith of our fathers. It is true that in the lower grades this teaching is veiled, and approached lightly. The teaching is such that the Bible account of creation is set aside, and evolution is taught in its beginnings. Thus they begin to instill infidelity in the minds of our children. Then in the higher schools the same thing is more clearly and more strongly instilled. Thus many of the "educated" of the younger generation are infidels and atheists. Many of them are that at heart, and yet do not openly deny the Bible as being the word of God. Yet they do not accept it unqualifiedly. They profess Christianity, and at the same time deny the fundamental fact of Christianity. They are generally free to deny the miraculous conception and birth of our Saviour. Thus they deny that He is "God manifest in the flesh." If Jesus was not "God manifest in the flesh," then the Bible is not the truth; and if the Bible is not true, then there is no God; we do not know where we came from, nor where we are going. Hence, they usually deny any such thing as future existence, and claim that when a man dies that is the last of him. But this idea of evolution did not

originate, really, in or with the literary schools. Preachers advocated that idea before it was introduced in our text books in the schools. They advocated the idea that the sinner of Adam's race could be cultivated and trained up into the higher order of life-the spiritual or divine-and that this could be brought about by teaching; by selection or choice on the part of the sinner. This is nothing short of the doctrine of evolution-the sinner just" evolutes" up into the higher order of life. After a time the educators, who believed this teaching of the preachers, applied the same principle to the realm of nature. They began to teach that men" evolved" up from the lower animal; that the lower animal" evolved" up from something still lower. Thus they embraced the teaching of the preachers, and applied the principles to the preachers, and began to teach that the preacher "evolved" up from the monkey. When this was done, and was pressed pretty strongly, and was made plain, then some of the preachers began to raise objections. No use to "kick" and raise objections, unless you repudiate your whole theory, and come over to the principles of truth as taught' by the Primitive Baptists, which have been taught by them all along the line-that life is given by a direct implantation of life; that the higher order acts sovereignly of its own will upon the lower; that the lower is passive in being raised up into the higher order; that eternal life is the direct and immediate and sovereign gift of the eternal God, who is the great and all wise Creator of all worlds. The truth needs to be preached. Then we need to practice the same and in harmony with it. We need to reduce to practice in our lives what God has taught in His blessed Book. Our people as a nation need this in the home life. Churches need it. The schools need to be conducted in harmony with the same, and the teaching in the schools needs to be according to the teachings of the Book from a moral point of view. We need a sentiment created among the people against crime and immorality, and for the principles of truth and honesty and honorable living and dealing with each other, both in the church and in the home. God only knows how much we need. C. H. C.

Good Articles Left Out

---January 17, 1935

We trust that all who have written articles for The Primitive Baptist which have not been published will please bear with us. Our readers all know that every issue of the paper is full-all the space is filled. Yet we have many good articles on hand which have not been published. We would be glad to publish more of them, if we had the space. If we could get the paper out weekly, as we once did, of course we would have space for much more reading matter. But this is impossible, under existing circumstances. The code authority says how many hours we may work an employee each week, as well as how much we shall pay. We have not signed the code, but the law makes it apply to us in this respect, whether we sign it or not. This being true, we had to dispense with much of the help we had, and the editor and wife do much of the work we once employed others to do. In order to do this, and keep the paper going at all, we could get it out only twice a month. This is the very best we can do. The subscription list, seemingly, continues to drop off, and we see no prospect as yet of being able to get the paper out every week again soon. As matters stand, we are giving all the reading matter possible, and publishing all the articles we possibly can. As stated above, we have many good articles we would publish if we had space for them. If you have written an article (one or more) for the paper which has not been published, you need not conclude that it is because we find fault with the article that it is not published. We do the best we can to select what we think is best of what we have on hand-best for the cause,

and best under all the circumstances for publication. We may make mistakes along this line, but we try to do what seems at the time to be for the best. We ask that you keep on writing-do not quit because we have not published an article you may have sent already. The more we have on hand, the more we will have to select from. We try to give as much variety as possible, and still try to select what seems to us to be good. We need and relish a variety of natural food, and the same is true spiritually. Bear with us, please, and help us what you can. C. H. C.

Brotherly Advice

---February 7, 1935

In another column in this paper is an article under the above heading copied from the Banner-Herald for January, 1935, from the pen of Elder Wm. H. Crouse, the editor. It is a splendid article, and we unqualifiedly indorse the sentiment contained therein, with a very little exception. We have written Brother Crouse a private letter indorsing the article. One expression we might modify is in the following: "I have prayed and hoped that I might live to see all our people united. I have given up that hope and am convinced that a union cannot be effected and am of the opinion that further agitation along that line is unprofitable." If it is right that all true Primitive Baptists be together, or if all true Primitive Baptists should be together, then it is not unprofitable to agitate such a matter. It is right to lend all encouragement to that end. It is right to labor for peace, and to strive for the things that make for peace. It is right to teach the brotherhood, as Paul taught in **(I Corinthians 1:10)**, "that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." True, we may labor long and not see any benefit or good result of our labor; but "let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." -(Galatians 6:9). See also **(Th 3:13) (II Thessalonians 3:13)**. In the warfare for the principles of truth and righteousness there is no place to quit. A soldier enlisted in the Lord's army, under the banner of King Jesus, is enlisted for life. If we are not traitors or deserters we must keep contending for the principles of truth and righteousness. But we should do this in the right way. No doubt many of us have contended for the principles of truth and righteousness in the wrong way. When we "lose our temper," and manifest a spirit of madness and revenge, we may be contending for the right thing, but we are doing so in the wrong way. We should not forget that "the servant of the Lord should not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth: and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will." -(II Timothy 2:24-26). Perhaps it is true that in the war with the Progressives, against the measures which those brethren introduced, extreme and harsh expressions were sometimes used. Perhaps some things were said which should not have been said. In some cases is it not possible that extreme steps were taken, and perhaps sometimes some steps taken hastily? We do not mean to intimate that the principles the "Old-liners" contended for were not right. Our readers know very well that we stand unalterably and unequivocally against the introduction of new measures among the Primitive Baptists, and against all so-called progressive measures. Yet it is possible for us to manifest the wrong spirit in contending for the "old paths." We fully agree with Brother Crouse that it is "sinful to introduce anything among our brethren, not commanded in the word of God, which will disturb and divide our people." It is not what the Bible teaches that divides the

Primitive Baptists; it is what the Bible does not teach. Then why should we not be willing to lay aside those things which we may have that are not expressly commanded, and which divide our people, and come together and live together on the things the Bible does teach? Why can't true Primitive Baptists do this, and leave severely alone all things and everything the Bible does not teach, which may be calculated to bring trouble among us? Surely this would be commendable in the sight of God; and if we would do so, surely the Lord's rich blessings would rest upon us. May the good Lord give us all the spirit of true repentance and forgiveness, and help us to have the cause of the Master uppermost in our hearts and lives, and lay aside all selfish interest and selfish motives, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.
THE ARTICLE

For twenty-eight years I have been identified with the so-called "Progressives" of the South. All this time I have been either editor or associate editor of their paper. I have pastored quite a number of their churches and have traveled extensively among them. I was pastor at Graymont-Summit for twenty years, Statesboro twenty years, Metter sixteen years and Tifton sixteen years. I am now pastor of four good churches. They have honored me far above anything I have deserved and I love them. They are a fine body of Primitive Baptists. They have a number of ministers as able and as sound in faith as any in the United States-ministers of whom the world is not worthy. My companion is a member with me and into this body of Primitive Baptists I have received and baptized all of my six children. During all these years I have labored to bring about a union of the "Progressives" and the "Old-line" brethren of the United States. I have prayed and hoped that I might live to see all our people united. I have given up that hope and am convinced that a union cannot be effected and am of the opinion that further agitation along that line is unprofitable. Nearly all the churches identified with the Progressives now use an instrument in their song service. To remove them is impossible. To get the great body of our Old-line brethren to fellowship those who use them is equally impossible. I think there are some among the Old-line brethren who would be willing to fellowship those who use them, while at the same time protesting their use, but such a basis of union would divide the Old-line brethren throughout the entire United States and thus make bad matters worse. I love the Progressives, but I love our denomination throughout the Union and I would rather see the great body of our people united than to see such a union effected as would bring widespread division among the brotherhood and churches now united. I have never felt, and do not now feel, that the use of an organ in the song service is any sin within itself. But it has always been my judgment, and is now, that our brethren made a serious mistake when they introduced them and brought about a division of our forces. I urge our brethren everywhere who do not have them to leave them alone. My observation has been that they are unnecessary. Any help which they may have been in places has been more than over-balanced by the evil effects which have followed their use. Our people have become so accustomed to the instrument that it is difficult to have singing when there is no one present to play for us. In many instances, congregational singing has been destroyed and only a select few sing. Certainly spirituality has not been increased by their use. The condition of our churches prove that their use does not insure union, peace and prosperity. It is not worth while to argue the question as to the unscriptural-ness of their use. I hold that it is sinful to introduce anything among our brethren, not commanded in the Word of God, which will disturb and divide our people. It is not worth what it costs. I am sorry I have not followed this course. It is of much greater importance that the great body of Primitive Baptists throughout the Union

be united than that they should affiliate with the Progressives. The Progressives have chosen their course. By the introduction of the organ and their continued use, they raised the barrier. Let brethren everywhere treat them kindly and leave the future to the good Lord, but let the Primitive Baptists everywhere get together and stand united leaving severely alone those things which have so sadly disrupted the brethren of Georgia and Florida. This is my advice to my brethren everywhere. I would not cast any reflection upon the able and godly men among our ministry or the many sound and faithful ministers and brethren identified with the Progressives, nor am I ungrateful of the extreme kindness shown me by these people. I cannot, however, forget the battles I have had to wage against an attempt from certain sources to remodel our faith. The "bedbug" theory of election, the "power-plant" illustration of atonement, the "Means" doctrine, so boldly advocated by tongue and pen, we uncompromisingly opposed, and received all too little support, and the advocates of these false doctrines are still represented in the high councils of the Progressives. Whether or not they will be able to put these theories over on our people in the years to come remains to be seen. Just now our people are carried away with the movement to do a "big" thing in combing the denomination clean to take care of old women of other denominations and of the world while our own cause suffers and the clouds thicken for another battle sure to eventually come. Many of us oppose these things but the only consideration we have received has been the charge of "jealousy" and a desire to lead. I am not in any sense a Progressive. My heart and soul is with all those who are satisfied to be old-time Primitive Baptists, true ever to our faith, and who regard the fellowship and union of our people as worth vastly more than all that the world can give or promise. Primitive Baptists would do well to stop and consider and get together on that faith and practice which through all the centuries has been the glory of our denomination ere the judgments of the Lord utterly consume them.-W. H. C, in Banner-Herald, January, 1935.

Church Rights

---February 7, 1935

We have recently been asked these questions: Is a church a sovereign?-has it the right to discipline its own members? Does the church have a right to receive excluded members? It has been a principle of Primitive Baptist teaching all along the line that each church has the sovereign and God-given right to discipline her own members. Each church has the right to say who shall not have membership in her body. Of course she may make mistakes in that, and refuse membership to some who may really and Scripturally be entitled to membership. But no other church has any authority or right to say the church shall receive or hold one in membership which she does not esteem to be entitled to the same. The church is not such a sovereign that she has a Scriptural right to hold one in membership whose life is such as to bring shame and disgrace on the cause. If a church does so, the sister churches have a right to complain, because they are injured thereby. If the church still persists in the course, the sister churches have a right to cease affiliation with her until she corrects the wrong, or until she ceases holding such member in her body. This, however, does not unchurch her. The Lord is the only one who can remove the candlestick. To the next question we would say that no church has the right to receive a member into her fellowship who has been excluded by a sister church. The only place in the world to get an account squared is where the charge is made, or on record. This thing of receiving a person into one church when they have been excluded from a sister church without satisfaction and reconciliation being made where the party was excluded has been the cause of no

little trouble among our people. They should quit it. It is wrong, and there is absolutely no authority for it in the word of God that we know anything about. As long as a church exists as a gospel church where one has been excluded, that long should that excluded person not be received by another church until that excluded person has made satisfaction where he was excluded. This is our view of the matter. C. H. C.

Another Helper

---February 21, 1935

At our earnest request Elder A. D. West, of Wayne, Okla., has allowed us to put his name on our editorial staff as one of our corresponding editors. We are glad to have Elder West associated with us. We have heard him preach, and esteem him as an able minister of the gospel. We understand that he is highly esteemed among the churches and his brethren at home, as well as "those that are without." We are glad to have such men associated with us. We are glad to have the association and the fellowship of such faithful servants of the Lord. We trust that he will write for the paper, and that his writings may be blessed to the comfort and benefit of our readers. And we pray the Lord to continue to bless his labors in the Master's vineyard as he proclaims the riches of God's grace. C. H. C.

Tract Salvation

---February 21, 1935

In the Baptist and Commoner, of Little Rock, for February 5, 1935, is a little ad offering some tracts for sale. The ad says they put 75 tracts in an envelope and sell the whole bunch for 25 cents. The ad says that a tract may save a soul. Let's see- 75 tracts for 25 cents, and one tract may save a soul. These fellows are advertising salvation pretty cheap these days. The operation of the code has raised the price on most commodities; but it seems that these fellows are peddling salvation at a lower price than it has been advertised in recent years. Wonder what's the matter with their goods, seeing the price is so low these days. Let's see; 75 tracts for 25 cents; that would be one-third of a cent for one tract; and one tract may save a soul. If so, that would be a soul saved at the low cost of one-third of a cent! Blowhard's paper has these tracts for sale. There certainly must be a wonderful power in these tracts. In ancient times it took the work of the Holy Spirit to regenerate a sinner. In olden times the Holy Spirit made the application of the blood of Christ to the heart of the sinner; and in those days nothing short of that would save a soul. But these modern fellows have invented something the Lord knew nothing about, which saves souls at the low price of one-third of a cent each! In Paul's day sinners were redeemed by the precious blood of Christ. The Lord said in ancient times that His people should be redeemed without money. Well, these fellows have their system down pretty cheap- only one-third of a cent for the price of a little tract that may save a soul. God's people were redeemed long ago, and the price was paid in full; and the Holy Spirit does not forget to do His work in making the application of the blood. This tract salvation is unknown to the Book of books, and is nothing but the invention of a disordered mind-men making merchandise of the people-selling tracts under the pretense that souls may reach heaven by reading them which might otherwise suffer the torments of an eternal hell. They simply sell the tracts under a false claim when they make such pretensions. May the Lord pity them. C. H. C.

Hymn Book

---February 21, 1935

By the time this reaches our readers we expect to have the Good Old Songs Hymn Book ready to mail out. Of course it is possible for some unforeseen circumstance to intervene to hinder the work; but if no unforeseen trouble comes up, we will have some of them ready to mail out by the time this reaches our readers. It is in order now for you to send us your orders, if you want a good hymn book which we think contains nothing but sound sentiment. Of course some unsound sentiment may have escaped our notice, but we have tried hard to eliminate all unsound sentiment. The book contains 764 songs; 649 pages. It has the same songs as the Good Old Songs, the large size hymn and tune book we have been publishing for years. It is on the same order as the Lloyd hymn book. The print is good and clear, from new plates, which we have just had made. The price is only \$1 for a single book, or \$10.20 for a dozen. Postage paid. Your order will have prompt attention. We feel sure you will be pleased with this book, if you prefer a hymn book-a book without notes. The binding is an imitation of leather-stronger than sheep binding. C. H. C.

It Is Funny

---February 21, 1935

We had a name on our list which was marked paid to May, 1930. We marked the subscription paid free up to December, 1930. Then about December, 1930, somebody requested us to send the paper on; so it was sent on to the brother until January 1, 1932-a year on time. We sent two or three letters about that time, but had no response. A short time ago we wrote him a letter proposing that we forget the old subscription and offering to send him the paper another year if he would send us one dollar. Well, we got a good letter from him, which is funny. He says, "I never wrote you a line in my life. Take your paper and go to thunder and let me alone." Nice letter, that! We have had orders to go to a place, and we do not know which way to start, nor where thunder is to go to, unless we go to that brother, where he is. Thanks, brother; we will try to let you alone. Pardon us; we had been taking for granted he loved the truth. If we have judged him wrongfully, we are sorry, and beg his pardon, and we will try to "do so no more." C. H. C.

Church Harbors Crime - Minister Won't Reveal Name of "Confessed"

Kidnaper

---February 21, 1935

Fort Lee, N. J., Feb. 13 (AP).--To the Rev. Vincent G. Burns his dramatic outburst during the Hauptmann trial yesterday was but an episode-he has resumed life in his peaceful parsonage as if nothing had happened. Fort Lee and neighboring communities are abuzz, however. They heard reports that he would name the man who, he told the court at Flemington, had confessed the Lindbergh killing to him. "No," said Mr. Burns, "I will not make the name public. The man came to my church for protection." Told that he had been quoted as saying the man resembled Hauptmann, the clergyman expressed surprise. "I went to Flemington to help

Hauptmann," he said. The above Associated Press dispatch of February 13 is copied from the Arkansas Gazette of February 14. In the report of the trial of Hauptmann as given in the papers of February 13 may be seen some account of this minister speaking out in the court room, saying the man who kidnaped the Lindbergh baby had confessed to him, and the preacher was put out of the court room. The Rev. Mr. Burns says he "will not make the name public. The man came to my church for protection." The reports of the affair given in the papers of the 13th as well as those of the 14th do not give the name of the denomination of which the Rev. Mr. Burns is a member, or with what church he is affiliated. It seems from what was reported in the paper on the 13th that he is a minister at some kind of mission; but the report does say what denomination the mission is of. It is clear to us that the statement of the Rev. Mr. Burns reveals at least one startling fact. That fact is this: Here is an institution posing as a church, a Christian society, a church of God, a church of Christ-or whatever name it may go by-it is posing as a Christian institution; yet it harbors criminals of the lowest and basest sort. This preacher says the kidnaper of the Lindbergh baby confessed to him. But he would not make known the name of the criminal because the guilty wretch-if he confessed the truth, and if the preacher told the truth-went to his church for protection. Here is a public avowal that his church will and does protect criminals. Protecting a man who confessed to him that he kidnaped the Lindbergh baby! What can such a church be but a body of "hoodlums;" a band of robbers; a band of kidnapers; a band of hijackers; a band of whoremongers; a band of murderers; a band of highwaymen; all sailing under the protection of a society posing as a body of Christians-a church! Good Lord, what may we expect next! Here is another fact revealed: All you kidnapers; you bootleggers; you murderers; you devils clothed as men and women-just come and enlist with us! You are assured of protection under the cloak of Christianity with us! Here is a city of refuge, where you may hide and be protected from the civil laws, so you may be guilty of all the dastardly deeds the devil may be able to invent, and yet be shielded from the punishment due under the laws of the land! This reveals another fact: The foregoing being true, then here is a society of anarchists, defying civil law. This under the name of the church! Good Lord, we again exclaim! Have the whole people of the nation gone to sleep? Are we dead-utterly dead to all that is good and right, even from a moral standpoint-to say nothing of Christianity? Wake up, ye sleeping, slumbering, sluggards! Wake up to the peril by which we are surrounded! With all this, state legislatures considering the legalizing of gambling on races, the legalizing of liquor, and some even suggesting that the states go into the manufacturing of such hell-brew and selling so cheap that the bootlegger will be put out of business! Thus the state go into the business of making drunkards, manufacturing the stuff and selling it so cheap that more folks can buy it; thus putting more drunken drivers on the road; thus more automobile accidents; more orphans; more broken-hearted wives; more crimes; more prisoners; make more liquor; make more crimes! Yet such men in our law-making departments posing as moralists! Such is enough to make the devil blush! Is it any wonder crime is on the increase? C. H. C.

The Man of Sorrows

---March 21, 1935

We have before us a book bearing the above title, by Rev. Henry Beets, published by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. We have read the same with interest. We find much in it that is worth while. It contains many sublime and beautiful thoughts and sentiments; many precious gems of truth. Yet, we have

found some thoughts expressed therein which are incorrect, we think, and which are really contradictory to the truth the book contains in other parts. From page 30 we quote the following paragraph: Let us notice now the four-fold lesson our text contains. In the first place let us guard against abusing God's house, as Israel did. And it seems there is reason to remind ourselves of this. The devil is always going about trying to desecrate the holy things of God. In our days he is endeavoring to do it. I think if our Saviour were on earth at present, and would enter many a Protestant church building and see some of the things carried on in them, He might make a scourge and in indignation drive from the places of worship, solemnly dedicated to the service of the triune God, persons who endeavor to carry on practices which cannot stand the test of the Word of God. How true this is. How many things are now engaged in under the cloak and pretense of Christianity that are unknown to the Book! How many things are engaged in, making the house which is supposed to be God's house, erected for the professed object of meeting together to engage in the worship and service of God, a house of merchandise. Such as this is enough to cause alarm, and should be a matter of shame. On pages 59 and 60, concerning the thief on the cross, who cried unto the Lord to "remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom," we read: But this we know, that man to the right of Jesus became a glorious example of redeeming mercy and sovereign grace; a wonderful example of the power of God's Holy Spirit working unto salvation. When that criminal to the right of Jesus was first nailed to the cross, he was evidently just as bad as the one at our Lord's left hand, for we read in another gospel, Matt, xxvii. 44, that both the thieves cast words of taunting challenging to come from His cross, in the teeth of Christ, thus mocking the blessed One. But while he was hanging there, the Spirit of God took hold of that one man's soul, and in the twinkling of an eye, gave him a new heart. The impenitent wretch became a penitent sinner, and the unsaved criminal became redeemed, a child of God. Oh, friends, if you want to see a triumph of the grace of God, if you desire to see a proof that God's Spirit is able to save unto the uttermost, then think of that man at the right of the Saviour, saved in such a short time and transformed in such a wonderful way. On page 67, referring to the same thing, the author says: Doesn't it show the sovereignty of God's grace also? One man left, the other taken; and both criminals? In the foregoing we find especially two glorious truths of the gospel set forth in words which it seems to us should appeal to every child of grace, and cause his heart to glow with love to our blessed and holy Redeemer. One of these thoughts is God's great and everlasting and omnipotent power to SAVE. Surely the Lord's arm is not shortened, that He cannot save. He not only had the power to save the criminal, the thief on the cross, but He had power to save a persecuting Saul, and to make him a praying Paul. He had power to save the saints at Ephesus- He saved them and made them to be saints. Read **(Ephesians 2:1-6)** and see what the Ephesians were, and what they were doing, until the Lord saved them. Thank God, He has power to save. The next precious thought is God's sovereign grace and electing love. The Lord, in His boundless love and sovereign grace and mercy, made choice of the poor wicked wretch at His side, and by the work and power of His Holy Spirit, quickened him into a higher order of life-regenerated him, and gave him to see, to realize, and to know his own depravity; and thus caused him to cry out, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." God's grace in the heart, the work of the Holy Spirit in the heart, always makes the poor sinner cry, because that work, when performed, makes the sinner alive from the dead. God chooses to do that work, and has made choice of the sinners in whose hearts He performs the work. Hence, God's sovereign grace, His choice, His electing love, His power to save. Wonderful and blessed truths. But in the next paragraph on page 67 the author says: Notice also the wonderful riches of God's

mercy, to hear a man as quickly as he cries, and to offer him Paradise with all of its beauty and glories. Here we think the author has missed it. Why, in the face of what has gone before, and in the face of what follows, which we do not deem necessary to quote here -why say the Lord offered the poor thief Paradise? Brother, it was not an OFFER of Paradise. It was a plain and positive and unequivocal PROMISE of Paradise. God had regenerated the poor criminal; He made atonement for his sins; God had made choice of him; and now, in harmony with all this, and to finally carry out all that this embraces, He makes a sure and everlasting and a blessed promise of Paradise with all its beauties and glories. This same promise of Paradise, this same promise of heaven, with all that heaven means, reaches to every heir of promise, to every redeemed sinner, to every sinner embraced in God's electing love and mercy, to every regenerated soul in all the wide world. Thanks and glory be to His matchless name, now and for ever. There are a few other inconsistent statements in the book, to us; but we forbear. It is a neat book, good clear print, on good paper, 131 pages, and the price is only one dollar. It can be had from the publishers at the address given above. C. H. C.

The Lord Is Faithful

---March 21, 1936

God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.-(I Corinthians 1:9). The Lord is not only faithful, but He is not slack concerning His promise. He is sure to do everything He has promised. He will keep every promise He has made. Many times we fail to do what the Lord requires of us, and what He has commanded us to do, because our faith is weak, and we are afraid to risk it. We may be impressed with a duty to perform, which would require some sacrifice on our part. We may fail to do what we are impressed to do, for fear that we cannot afford to make the sacrifice. If we have membership in the church we have covenanted with the same that we will not forsake the assembly of the church, especially in the regular conference meetings, which meetings are usually held on Saturdays. We may feel when those days come around that we cannot afford to lose the time. We may be behind with our work, and we see so much which it seems to us needs to be done, so we try to excuse ourselves and fail to keep our promise, as we have covenanted. We feel that we cannot afford to make the sacrifice. It would involve a loss, and we think we cannot afford to take the loss. Thus, when we fail to do what we have covenanted to do in the service of God, we make a sacrifice of that service for the sake of worldly gain. We make the service of God a secondary matter. We are not seeking "first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness." We seemingly forget that all our labors for worldly gain will amount to nothing, unless the Lord blesses our labors, and gives the increase. We may feel an impression of mind, and there may be a case where someone needs our help in a financial way. But we may feel that we, ourselves, are poor and "hard run," and it is hard for us to "make ends meet." So we may fail to lend the helping hand to the one in need. We are afraid if we contribute to that cause, the Lord will let us suffer need; and that He will not supply our needs. We are afraid to risk what God has promised. We are afraid to make the sacrifice which we must make in the case in order to do what we really should do. We try to excuse ourselves on the ground of our own poverty. We have just been reading some in the life of William Gadsby, an able minister in his day, and for a long time editor of the Gospel Standard, of England. He was born in January, 1773, and died January 27, 1844. On page 25 we find the following circumstance related: One day, in the year 1800, he was going to Nuneaton to purchase provisions for the family. All the money he

had in the world was 2s, 6d *about 62 cents in our money*. He had left nothing at home with his wife. As he was going along, he was joined by a man, who began to tell him a pitiful tale of distress. He walked with his hand in his pocket, and, to give his own words, "I first took up sixpence, and I thought I would give him that; then I took up a shilling, and thought I would give him that; but the devil told me it was too much; I could not afford it; but at last I gave him the whole 2s, 6d *two shillings sixpence*. Then the devil set at me with passages of Scripture, that I was worse than an infidel, for I had neglected my family. But I kept walking on towards the town (Nuneaton), just as if I had the money still in my pocket. When I got there, I met a man that I had not seen for some years. We entered into conversation, and when he went away, he shook hands with me, and left half-a-guinea in my hand *about \$2.50*. Then it was my turn; and I set to, and gave it to the devil well." This he used to call being a match for covetousness. Here was a verification of the certainty of a promise of God. The Lord has said, "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given will He pay him again." - ((9:17) (Proverbs 19:17). Why can't we take God at what He says, and do what little He requires of us? Brother, are you afraid to risk it? "O ye of little faith." - (Matthew 6:30). "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief." -((9:24) (Mark 9:24). May the good Lord help us to trust Him, and to rely upon Him for all He has promised, and help us to be more faithful and true to Him and to His delightful service. C. H. C.

Christianity To Export

---March 21, 1935

To our everlasting shame as a nation it must be recorded that 5,068 persons have been lynched in the United States during the last 52 years. Asked once what he thought of Christian Missions, Sir Rabindranath Tagore of India replied: "So long as such things go on in your country, do you think you have any Christianity to export?" The above is taken from *Our Dumb Animals*, of March, 1935. This shows what the so-called heathen think of our great so-called Christian nation. Here we are posing as a Christian nation, the modern religionists "compassing sea and land to make proselytes," and yet crime more rampant, probably, in this country than in any heathen nation on earth. The missionary fanatics leave no stone unturned to get money for foreign missions, telling us that the heathen, poor benighted human beings, are going down to eternal perdition in their ignorance, and yet in our own country there have been a little more than an average of ninety-seven lynchings every year for the past fifty-two years. In the name of reason, in the name of all that is holy, if their theory, their doctrine, their claim, is true, why do they not go to work more zealously, more earnestly, on our own people here at home, and first make the United States a safe place in which to live? Talk about saving the heathen! And here we are going into the business of legalizing gambling, encouraging the making and selling of intoxicating liquors, encouraging more drunkenness, more crimes, more lynchings-more of everything that is contrary to Christianity or morality! The plea is that people will gamble and drink liquor, then why not the state get some revenue from it? Yes, and people will carry pistols; they will run and visit houses of ill fame; some will be guilty of public swearing; some will be guilty of stealing; some will engage in the "white slave traffic." Why not, upon the same parity of reasoning, put a tax on these things, and let the state get some revenue from the emissaries of the devil who engage in all the diabolical crimes? For heaven's sake, we would be ashamed to advocate the idea of legalizing

any of the inventions and practices of the devil and his hell-crew. To do so, is to simply advocate the idea of "playing into the hands of the devil." But this is only the production of devil-taught and devil-instigated doctrine, which these modern fanatics are teaching, and yet sailing under a cloak of Christianity. We were told years ago that if they could get money enough they could take the world for Christ. The so-called "Laymen's Movement" was inaugurated for that purpose. Yet crime is on the increase.. The so-called Christianity is a failure-from every standpoint. It does not even promote morality, much less Christianity. The doctrines they teach and promulgate are no kin to the doctrine of God, the doctrine of the Bible. Their teaching is that the sinner can quit his devilment when he gets ready-just repent, by turning from it and quitting it, and that he will then sail right into heaven and enter eternal joys and heavenly felicity at death. The doctrine is that God has done His part, and that now it is left up to the sinner; it is just optional with him. This doctrine is precisely suitable to the depraved nature of humanity. The unregenerate sinner loves sin. He does not love God, nor holiness and righteousness. Hence, he is encouraged to go on in the commission of murder, theft, robbery, rape, drunkenness, white slavery, hijacking, and every other diabolical crime that the devil and his cohorts can invent. But just before he leaves this world he decides to repent, turn away from, quit, his devilment, and sail right on into glory. Witness the case of Mark H. Shank, who wilfully and deliberately killed four members of the Alvin Colley family in the summer of 1933. He was sentenced to the electric chair, to be executed at the Tucker farm, Arkansas, the date set for March 8, 1935, early in the morning. At the last, when his lawyers gave up, and acknowledged they could do no more to save him from execution, just about two days ago he called for a priest. What for, we wonder? Of course, to make his good confession; repent, accept the Lord, and his spirit sail right into glory, leaving his body in the electric chair! There you are! "Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them." - **((0))** **(Matthew 7:20)**. Such persons as this man Shank, and others of like ilk, have given absolutely no evidence of anything else but an evil and wicked and devilish disposition by their fruits. If they are transported into glory upon the principle of the so-called Christianity of the day, hell is a misnomer-there is no such thing; there is no such place. If there is such a place, it will be empty, and will be for rent finally. Export Christianity! Good Lord; you fanatics better get to work to mend the morals of our own country, and quit so much of this devil doctrine and making merchandise of the people. C. H. C.

Romans 9:13 and Future Identity

---March 21, 1935

Dear Brother Cayce: Please give your views on **(Romans 9:13)** in regard to God's love and His hatred; and also your views on future identity. Subscriber. REMARKS The text referred to reads as follows: "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." By reading the connection you will see that this was before they were born, "the children having done neither good nor evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand. It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger." Then comes the language of the text: "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." The primary meaning of the word here translated hated means to hate, regard with ill-will, to detest, abhor. That is the sense in which the word is here used. Sometimes the word, by extension, means to regard with less affection, love less, esteem less. The word is used in that extended sense where the Saviour says, "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." -((26)) (Luke 14:26). This last text is the one Arminians run to with the

plea that God only loved Esau less than He loved Jacob, just as a man must love father and mother less than he loves the Lord in order to be a disciple of Jesus. But that is not the sense in which the word is used in **(Romans 9:13)**. God loved Jacob and did not love Esau is the sense in which the word is used; hence God loved Jacob and bestowed the blessing upon him and passed Esau by. Why? Because He did not love Esau. As to future identity, brethren have differed on that question. Some few have held the idea that we will know each other in heaven just as we know them here. But we hardly think so. Earthly ties and relationships will be done away there. I do not think I will know S. F. Cayce there as my father. It will be one family there. God is the Father; Jerusalem (the covenant) is the mother; the redeemed are the children; Jesus is the Elder Brother. It will be a spiritual and heavenly relationship, and spiritual and heavenly knowledge. Yet we will know that we have been redeemed from sin and its ruinous consequences to God, out of every nation, and kindred, and tongue and people. That will be enough. What's the use of fussing here about what and how much we will know in heaven, if we are so fortunate as to be there? We cannot know here as much as we will know there. We have to walk by faith here; over there faith will be swallowed up in knowledge. No use trying to find out here how much we will know there-it can't be done. C. H. C.

Sunday Schools

---April 4, 1935

On page 57 of Time, a weekly magazine, of March 11, 1935, we find the following: In 1780 a pious Gloucester man named Robert Raikes formed the first Sunday school. His purpose was to keep the children off the streets while teaching them their letters, "the truths of the gospel" and "moral restraint." As time passed a further objective appeared-to lead children into church membership. This tells a historical fact-that Robert Raikes founded the first Sunday school in the world in 1780. Jesus never established a Sunday school. Paul did not establish one. The Apostle" Peter did not establish one. Not one of the Lord's apostles ever established one. When Paul left instruction to Titus to set in order the things that are wanting, **{(Titus 1:5)}** he gave no instructions for the organizing of a Sunday school, a Ladies' Aid Society, a Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., a B. Y. P. U., a Junior League, a Senior League, a Ladies Auxiliary, a Mite Society, or any other society, such as the worldly churches have today. Robert Raikes organized the first one. The Lord did not do it, nor did He authorize it. If His church had needed it then, or would ever need such an invention, He would have organized it, or gave instruction for it. The devil may need all those things for his churches, but the Lord does not need them for His church. Robert Raikes did not organize the first Sunday school as a church matter at all. In those days there were no free schools. No child had any schooling only those whose parents were financially able to pay tuition, buy books, etc. The consequence of this was that the children of the poor factory workers of the town roamed the streets, without any opportunity of schooling. To help that class of people, Robert Raikes organized his school for Sunday and employed and paid the teachers. The object was to teach the children to read and write. The object was a worthy one; and if the Sunday school had been let alone and allowed to stay where the originator put it at first, it would have been a blessing to humanity. But not so. Later it was adopted as an adjunct to the church, and, as stated above, used to lead children into church membership. Does the Lord's church need such as that to lead children into church membership? If so, the Lord did not tell us about it. Was He ignorant of what would be needed? If He knew, did

He care so little that He would fail to tell us of a thing that is so much needed - as the world today thinks? Worldly churches may need that, as well as the "thousand and one" other things they have; but the Lord's church does not need any of the inventions of men. What the Lord's church needs to lead people into its membership is for the Lord to regenerate poor sinners by the direct work of His Spirit in their hearts, and then for them to hear the truth of the gospel proclaimed by true and faithful men, who will not shun to declare any part of God's blessed and eternal truth; men who will not court the world for popularity; men who will not try to be like the world; but who will have the courage of their convictions, and who will "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." If that will not lead people into the church for membership, God knows the church does not need them. Here is one great reason for the disrepute into which the church has been brought and the disrespect toward the church today-a catering to the world-efforts to bring the world up to the church. The world cannot be raised up to a level with the church. Such efforts only tend to lower the church in the esteem and respect of reasonable minded people, and brings the church into disrepute. God give us men who will dare to stand against every false way, and against every innovation of men. On page 58 of the same magazine the article quotes from a Mrs. Bro, "mother of four, lecturer, onetime Disciples of Christ missionary," "Parents pack their children off to Sunday school, feel no further responsibility. And most children who go to Sunday school do not go to church afterward." On page 57 she says the Sunday school has fallen short of its aims. Here you have it from one who should be in a position to know that the Sunday school is a failure-it has fallen short of its aims. But an even worse thing-" Parents pack their children off to Sunday school" and "feel no further responsibility." The eternal God has put the responsibility of the proper training of the child upon the parents. But these Sunday school parents shift the responsibility off on the Sunday school. Thus they disobey God's moral requirement, and do irreparable injury to their own offspring. The children are deprived of the training and care they are entitled to from their parents; they do not get it. What is the result? The deplorable condition the world is in today is partly the result. God pity us. Christianity seems to be at a low ebb. Thousands of sober minded people are turning away from the organized societies, called churches, in disgust. They are no more in attendance. They see nothing but commercialism, a cloak to wear to gain standing in the world, a thing to "profess" in order to get worldly gain and popularity. "Those who attend Sunday school do not attend church afterward." What is the tendency then? Evidently, instead of increasing church attendance, it detracts therefrom. Better "junk" the thing, and return to the original simplicity in the service of God, and leave off the sideshows and inventions of men. Say, you Old Baptists who "bring up" your children to go to Sunday school, do you not think it is high time you were taking back on your own shoulders the responsibility God has placed upon you, when He gave you your children, and keep them away from such things as the foregoing? Remember that "God is not mocked; whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." When you bring your children up to go to Sunday school, you bring them up to attend a thing, the avowed object of which, as above, is to lead them to church membership. What church membership? Membership of the church of said school, of course. Do you want your children thus taught, thus led, and thus brought up away from you; away from God's church; away from God's blessed truth? If not, for the love you have for your own flesh and blood, for the love of your heavenly King, train them away from the Sunday school, instead of "bringing them up" to attend it. C. H. C.

Compulsory Military Training

---April 4, 1935

The Supreme Court has decided that any university known as a "landgrant institution" can compel every student to take military training whatever his religion or conscientious convictions may be. So the two young men, Hamilton and Reynolds of the University of California, will have to give up their college course or their ideals of what duty demands of them. Furthermore, the Supreme Court has gone on record as affirming that military service is obligatory upon every citizen, man or woman, and each must resort to force of arms to defend the government when called upon. This liability to military service decision appears far more extreme than anything "ever established by Congress." Doubtless the Court's decision is in keeping with the Constitution, but let the Government get into another war and it will be surprised to find the number of citizens who will refuse to obey its mandate, Constitution or no Constitution. Wars, some day, will not be made without the consent of the people who will have to do the fighting, if fighting is to be done. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana is, we are confident, no false prophet when he says, "In the first World War which we like to think was the last World War, the common people were forced to listen to the voices of the politicians, the war makers, the munition makers, the bankers. Before the next World War the bankers, the munition makers, the politicians will have to listen to the voices of the common people, to the voices of the workers, to the voices of the younger generation. They will find that those whom they would use as cannon fodder will no longer be willing to make arms, to transport arms, or to bear arms that are going to be used against their fellow workers in other countries." The above article is copied from *Our Dumb Animals*, for March, 1935. The heading in that magazine was "Compulsory Military Training in America." As to military training this clearly and unmistakably shows the trend of things at the present time. When the universities all adopt this measure, then it will be extended to the colleges, and then to the high schools, and one will be compelled to take military training in order to attend any of our schools. It is surely a bad omen. It looks bad to us. How does it look to you? But even worse than that is the fact that "the Supreme Court has gone on record as affirming that military service is obligatory upon every citizen, man or woman, and each must resort to force of arms to defend the government when called upon." Here we have it that military service is obligatory upon our women. Brother, sister, how does that "taste" to you? Are we to come to the pass that our women folk are to be drafted to go to the front and fight on the bloody battlefields at the call of the government, when that government is brought into war as the result of agitation and propaganda put out by the war lords, the munition makers, the profiteers-as most every war is? If our representatives in Congress would have had to go to the front, and their wives and daughters would have had to go to the front in France, as our boys had to do in the World War, we are confident they would have been much slower in declaring war than they were. It is usual that the "brunt" is borne by the "common people" in such as that. Well, if the signs of the times do not change, the world is getting ready fast to plunge into another conflict. When that day comes it will be much worse-far worse-than the last. All nations are appropriating billions for war preparation-battleships, submarines, airships for bombing and other fighting. The so-called world court is doing nothing-not functioning. The powerful League of Nations is no longer "leaguering." Our own country is in the race, appropriating more, perhaps, than any other nation; and the Supreme Court has already said that our women as well as men should answer the call to arms. What do you say? We believe it is right for every man who is physically able to do so to be ready to take up arms and go to

the battle in defense of our country. We believe it right for us to be ready to defend what has been handed down to us by our forefathers, who laid down their lives on the bloody battlefields that we might have the form of government and the freedom they fought for. But we do most solemnly and sincerely protest against our women being called upon to bear arms. Now is the time to speak out on this question. Now is the time for our churches to speak. We, as citizens and as members of the kingdom our Lord left for us here on earth, should speak out on this all-important matter. It will be too late after the fire comes. It will be too late after the call has been made. We sincerely believe every Primitive Baptist Church-as well as every other church, who oppose the sending of the women to the battlefield -should right now pass resolutions declaring their position on this momentous question. We would suggest a resolution similar to this: Whereas, It has been published that the Supreme Court has gone on record as affirming that military service is obligatory upon every citizen, man or woman, and each must resort to force of arms to defend the government when called upon; and Whereas, We do highly prize and esteem and love the principles of the government which have been handed down to us by our forefathers, and for which many of them laid down their lives on the bloody battlefields; and Whereas, We do deem it to be our bounden duty, as well as a great privilege, for us to maintain and defend those unspeakable blessings and privileges thus handed down to us; and we here declare our allegiance and loyalty to these principles; but we do hereby protest against the idea that our women, our wives and daughters, should answer a call to arms. Therefore, be it Resolved, That we enter this solemn protest against such a measure; and declare that it is contrary to our understanding of our Lord's requirements, as given in His Book, the Holy Scriptures; and further, be it Resolved, That we hereby state that such a thing is a violation of and contrary to our conscientious religious views; and we therefore could not sanction such a course, on account of such conscientious scruples. Be it further Resolved, That we have sent to our representatives in Congress a copy of this protest and these resolutions. Please do not censure us for calling attention to this serious matter. Our people in the past ages have spoken out on such matters as concerned the welfare of the people as a people and as a nation. Now is the time to let it be known that we conscientiously oppose our women being called upon to bear arms and go to the bloody battlefields. May the good Lord help us in these dark and trying times. C. H. C.

John Newton

---April 4, 1935

Somewhere, some time, last year we heard some brother say that John Newton, who wrote *Amazing Grace*, was a Methodist. We thought the brother was mistaken, so we made a note in our memorandum book to look the matter up, which we have just done. We find the following information in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, ninth edition: "John Newton was born in London July 24, 1725, and died Dec. 31, 1807. He was a prominent evangelical clergyman of the Church of England. He was ordained priest at Olney in June, 1765. About three and one-half years later Cowper, the poet, settled in the parish. An intimate friendship sprung up between them, and they published together the *Olney Hymns* in 1779. In that year Newton left Olney to become rector of St. Mary Woolnoth, London, where he labored with unremitting diligence in visiting and preaching till his death. He held strongly Calvinistic views, although his evangelical fervor allied him closely with the sentiments of Wesley and the Methodists. His enduring fame rests on certain of the *Olney Hymns*, remarkable for vigor, simplicity, and directness of devotional

utterance, which have passed into almost universal currency throughout the Reformed churches of English speech." This is sufficient to show that Newton, as well as the Church of England in his day, as well as other Reformers, held to fundamental principles of doctrine very much the same as the fundamental principles of the doctrine the Primitive Baptists still hold to until this day. C. H. C.

Thanks, Brother

---April 18, 1935

Brother Cayce: Amos enclosing the \$1. Please let my subscription begin Nov. 1st, 1934, as I want to get all of the articles that have appeared. I don't want to miss any of the FUSS. You know the Lord wants us to keep up our fussing, if we have to leave off some of our peace.

REMARKS

Yes, thanks, brother, for calling our attention to what the Lord wants. Of course He wants some folks to continue to advocate the introduction of new means and measures into His church, into His kingdom, into His service. But of course He does not want anyone to say a word against that. Of course He wants all and each and every one to "keep mum" and never utter a word against any departure from what He has given in His word. The reason we know He does not want anyone to sound a note of warning against any departure or against any approaching danger is because He has said, **(Ezekiel 3:4,11)**: Son of man, go, get thee unto the house of Israel, and speak with my words unto them. And go, get thee to them of the captivity, unto the children of thy people, and speak unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear. It is very clear here that the Lord's ministers are required to warn the people of God of any approaching danger, and against departing from the teachings of His word. Of course it is also true that many will not be pleased with the warning. They were not pleased with such in Isaiah's day. Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever: that this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord: which say to the seers, See not; and to the prophets, Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits.--((0:8) (Isaiah 30:8-9,10). Then as many, or some, of the children of Israel will object to the truth, of course the Lord wants no FUSS about the matter; hence the Lord excuses His ministers under such circumstances, and they should, for these reasons, keep quiet and utter no protest against any new measures that may be introduced among the followers of the Lord! We have tried to warn against any departures from the plain and simple commands which the good Lord has given us in His blessed word. It seems that this brother thinks the one who raises an objection against a departure is raising a "fuss." Brother, let us kindly suggest to you that if any person brings anything into the Old Baptist Church which has not been clearly recognized as their usual practice, and which is not authorized by the good Book, that person is responsible for the "fuss." If you have been advocating something, publicly or privately, for which you do not find a thus saith the Lord, just quit it, if you think the Lord does not want the Primitive Baptists to fuss. The man who advocates something the Book does not authorize is the man who is a disturber of the peace. We repeat, we have tried to warn against the introduction of progressive measures into the old church. If no one has tried to introduce such, then there is no one for us to "fuss" with. When a man warns against such as that it does not disturb us. It does not cause us any alarm, and we have no fear that he will raise a "fuss" or a disturbance with us on that score. It does not make us think there will be a

disturbance on that account, or because of his contending against such things. Perhaps if we were a little guilty we might be disturbed and fear that there will be a "fuss," and that we might forget about peace, unless he would leave off opposition to our proposed departures. If we want peace in the old church, let us quit our departures, and contend faithfully for the things the Lord commanded, leaving all else alone, and then we will have peace. As long as some will introduce new measures into the church of God, just that long will God have somebody in the world to raise a cry against those departures. May the Lord help us all to stand in the good old way and walk therein, and then we shall find rest to our souls. C. H. C.

Work Appreciated

---May 16, 1935

During the past two months, while we had on a special effort to add new names to our list, and were offering the paper at one dollar a year, several brethren sent us a lot of new subscribers, as well as renewals. Brother S. E. Copeland, Guntersville, Ala., sent us over a hundred names, some new and some renewals. Several other brethren sent a goodly number. We appreciate their efforts and the work they did. They helped us to add quite a number of new subscribers to the list. If a hundred others had taken hold and had done as well as some of those who did work, we could have had many more names on the list now than we do have, no doubt. We know that a great many are so situated that they cannot do much, if anything, in the way of procuring subscribers for the paper, being isolated from the brotherhood; but perhaps several could have helped if they had only picked up the courage to try, and were not too easily discouraged. But we sincerely thank each one who did lend a helping hand, and again we say we appreciate it. May the good Lord bless you, is our prayer. Your work was an encouragement to us. It stimulated us to keep on trying to press forward. Perhaps the Lord is in the matter of our labors. He has blessed us much. To Him be praise and honor. We still desire to serve Him, and to contend for His truth. C. H. C.

Fairchild, Hardy, Todd, and Bishop

---June 20, 1935

Several days ago-in May-we received a letter from Elder W. C. McMillon, of Newport, Tenn., in which he enclosed a letter he had received from Elder J. W. Fairchild, and asking us if we could give him any information as to his state or standing among the Old Baptists. We wrote Brother McMillon under date of May 8 and told him the last we knew of Elder Fairchild that he had caused trouble in Mississippi and went to the Missionaries. We told Elder McMillon we thought the letter from Elder Fairchild should be published, that we felt like the cause demanded it. We received a letter from Elder G. W. Lewis, Auburn, Miss., dated May 18, in which he told us that Elder Fairchild had asked for restoration at Providence Church, where he had caused the trouble. He wrote a letter to that church asking for restoration, stating that the Baptists of Tennessee wanted him to be with them. Brother Lewis asked for our counsel and advice regarding the matter, stating that the church rejected him. We have written him that our advice would be to let him alone and to let him stay out. The letter he wrote to Elder McMillon will show for itself what kind of movement and effort is on foot among a few, at least. The following is the letter: Whitesburg, Ky., Apr. 14, 1935. Dear Brother McMillon: Seven years have passed

since I enjoyed the hospitality of your home, the fellowship of your churches and the companionship of your ministry. Those were blessed days and my mind often reverts to them with pleasure. But many changes have come since those days. The work of strife and division continued, the wounds of Zion were not healed but opened wider. It looked like all was lost. I gave up the struggle to unite and harmonize Baptists, for every effort was but sewing new cloth on an old garment. It seemed the Lord had cast off Primitive Baptists as He did the Jews and for the same reason. But I have hope the "seven thousand" have been reserved. Some of us ministers are getting together with the determination to go on, preach the truth in love, try to strengthen the churches that will work with us, and organize new churches where possible. The field is limitless, God's children are everywhere, starving for spiritual food, yearning for the simplicity of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and ready to be gathered into the fold. They are tired of trying to fill themselves with husks, and when the truth is brought to them in love they are ready to receive it as a thirsty man to drink cold water. They are in all denominations and no denominations. I know how deep most of them are in tradition, but the Spirit of Jesus will reach them. I tried to get Baptists to stop fussing over non-essentials and gather in these scattered sheep, but most of them seem to want them measured on their own bedstead. I could do nothing. But now a few of us ministers, including Elders J. B. Hardy, H. A. Todd, and a number of others have agreed to go into this work, work with all who will work with us, and those who will not, we will simply leave alone. We will love them, if they fight us we will not fight but turn the other cheek. We have no fuss with them, but love for them. We are getting-or trying to get a nucleus in Tennessee. Elder Hardy is at Hohenwald, Elder W. A. Bishop at Jackson. Elder Todd is going to do a lot of work in Chattanooga, and may locate there. My mind is leading me toward Knoxville. I would like to locate in Knoxville and work with the Primitive Baptists in that section. Knoxville is large enough for two Primitive churches if the work is properly done. And the territory around Knoxville is unlimited for our work. I hope you can find it agreeable to work with us. You know what I preached when I was with you. I have not changed in doctrine. And while the others who work with me would probably not agree with me on everything-I know of no two persons who do-we are all agreed on fundamentals and do not make a brother an offender for a word. We have no bars up against those who are in harmony with the fundamentals held by all true Primitive Baptists. Please let me hear from you. I want you to give me the names of some of the leading Primitive Baptists in Knoxville. I remember some of the ministers, but not initials and address. If you can send me a minute of their association I will highly appreciate it. I have been down with flu for two months and not able to work yet. I hope you and yours are well. Primitive Baptists here are beyond recognition by doctrine and preaching. One side is rank Arminian, the others are such extreme Predestinarians accountability is lost. No, they are not Predestinarians at all for they do not know what predestination is. They claim to be Absoluters, but they are skeptics. No reality about anything, Jesus Christ, according to some, never was a human being. With highest regards to you, Sister McMillon and children, I am, in love, J. W. Fairchild. Now, there you have the matter in a nutshell. Elders Fairchild, Bishop, Todd, Hardy and some others are banding together, thus forming a nucleus to begin the labors along the line that seemeth good to them- regardless of whether it suits the time-honored principles of the church or not. No matter how our fathers have stood. Elder Bishop is excluded from the Primitive Baptists in Jackson, Tenn. He has formed a church of his own, with a Sunday school, and using Campbellite song books. We do not know what else. Elder H. A. Todd was excluded years ago from a Primitive Baptist Church, we think at Rushville, Ind., for joining the Missionaries. He was received by South College Street, Nashville, Tenn.,

without his going back to the church that excluded him for restoration there. We think we have received the information that South College Street has rescinded the act of receiving him. In our issue of May 3, 1934, is an article from Elder Earl Daily stating that Elder Todd had located at Indianapolis and had organized a church, mostly from Progressives, who have had no affiliation with regular Primitive Baptists for years, and that those people have no standing with the regular Primitive Baptists whatever. Now Elder Fairchild says Elder Todd is going to do a lot of work in Chattanooga. We wonder who will work with him there. Elder Raulston, can you tell us who? Elder H. P. Houk, who lives at Gurley, Ala., is pastor of the Chattanooga Church (or was). Brother Houk, can you tell us who will work with Elder Todd? Elder W. J. Harwood, Dunlap, Tenn., preaches at Chattanooga. Brother Harwood, can you tell us who will work there with Elder Todd? We think Brother D. M. Raulston is clerk of the church. Brother Raulston, can you tell us who will work with the elder? Perhaps he can get some of the Progressives in that country to work with him; but we do not believe any of the regular Primitive Baptists, who stand on the old principles, in that country will work with him. What about Knoxville? Elder Hurst is pastor there. Brother Hurst, do any of our brethren in that section wish to have anything to do with such measures? Perhaps Elder Fairchild can have some workers with those in that country who left the old line practices years ago, about the time the Kirklands, Todd, Hackleman, and others left the old landmarks. What about any of you brethren in West Tennessee working with Elder Bishop? Are there, some of you who will do that? Will any of the brethren in the Predestinarian Association do so? Will any in the Forked Deer do so? Will any in the Big Sandy do so? Will any in the Greenfield do so? Will any in the Obion do so? Wonder if Elder Fairchild would be willing to tell what other preachers are expected to work with those he named? He said there are others, but did not give their names. Elder Fairchild says, "The work of strife and division continued, the wounds of Zion were not healed, but opened wider." Remember that the preaching of the truth and practicing what the Lord has taught in His Book has never brought strife or division in the Old Baptist Church. What does cause that? No one can deny that it is the teaching and practicing of things not authorized in the Book. Then who has been causing the strife and division to continue? No one only those who have been teaching and practicing the things that caused the trouble. If you brethren are sincere when you say you want peace in Zion why do you not leave off the things that cause the trouble? He says farther that "every effort was but sewing new cloth on an old garment." What do you want to be trying to patch up the old garment the Lord gave for His church with your new cloth (new things) for? Are you not satisfied with the old garment? Are you fellows afraid the old garment will wear out? The clothing the Israelites wore in the wilderness did not wear out; their shoes did not wear out. The Lord has told us the result of sewing new cloth to the old garment; and He has furnished everything His people need in His church and in His service. Leave your new things alone and let them stay out in the world where they belong, and then the trouble in the church would cease. Yes, there is "at this present time also a remnant according to the election of grace." There may not be seven thousand, but there is a remnant who will not yet have anything to do with your sewing of new cloth, your new measures. We are still satisfied with the "good old way," and we still have the courage to raise our voice against the bringing in of any of the new ways and means and measures. What the Lord has given in His word for us to teach and practice in His kingdom is enough. That is the only way to have peace-leave off everything else. There is no use to cry peace, peace, when there is no peace. Quit your ungodly departures, and then we will have peace." Most of them seem to want them measured on their own bedstead." It seems that one of the Lord's old prophets had some idea of the right sort of bed, too. "And

your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it. From the time that it goeth forth it shall take you: for morning by morning shall it pass over, by day and by night: and it shall be a vexation only to understand the report. For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it: and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it." -**(8:18) (Isaiah 28:18-20)**. Elder Fairchild says some of them are getting together and trying to get a nucleus-some of them covenanting together. They are going to work along their own lines-not the old lines the church has traveled. But the old prophet says your "covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand." When men agree to stand together in the church in things the church has not always practiced, and in things the Lord has not authorized, it is an agreement with hell-according to Isaiah-and he says it shall not stand. The Lord will take care of His church. He will have enough faithful and true witnesses reserved for His church and truth to be maintained. Yes, we want things measured by the bed we rest on; for the Lord has prepared and furnished the resting place for His children; and the covering thereof is wide enough for the hungry-hearted and wayworn pilgrim to wrap himself in it. Thus, and thus only, he may rest and find protection from the things of the world. Your bed and covering may be too short and too narrow. Yes, some of us still desire the Lord's way. You may go on with yours, if you desire; but for God's sake, if you desire those things, stay out of the Old Baptist Church and let the Old Baptists alone. That would be the commendable thing to do. If the things the Baptists fuss over are nonessentials, then leave those things off. If they are not essential then one can afford to let them alone. If one cannot afford to let them alone, then he should stay away from the Old Baptists and go where he can advocate them without causing trouble. It does not cause trouble so much among the Missionaries to advocate new things among them. Why do you not stay with them where you can advocate your "new cloth" without causing them so much trouble? One other point right here. This will inform you brethren in Middle Tennessee very plainly as to where Elder Hardy stands. It will also give the brethren elsewhere that information. We are not publishing this to injure anyone, but for the protection of the cause. We think the cause demands that the brethren generally be informed as to what this letter contains, and as to the movement on foot, and who the promoters are. Our kind advice would be to just let such promoters severely alone. May the Lord help us to "stand in the ways, and see; and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein." C. H. C.

Ministerial Qualifications

---June 20, 1935

This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous, one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.-(I Timothy 3:1-7). It seems to us that the above language is as plain and clear and positive as it is possible for language to

be. The apostle here tells what a bishop MUST BE. That is, a man is to have the qualifications here laid down, or else he is not to be put into that office. He MUST have these qualifications. He must meet these requirements. He must be blameless. That is the first thing the apostle puts down in the catalog. To be blameless is to be free from blame or fault. Not to be blameless is to be guilty of that which is worthy of blame, or deserving of censure or disapprobation; culpability; fault; crime. His life must be above reproach. Unless his life is above reproach, and yet he is ordained to the work of the ministry, the church utterly disregards the plain requirements of God's inspired word. It is true that every man who makes anything makes mistakes. No man reaches a state of sinless perfection here in this life. There has never been but one who lived a life of sinless perfection here, and that was Jesus, the God-man, the anointed Saviour. But He was God as well as man; He was God manifest in the flesh. While it is true that no man can or does reach a state of sinless perfection here in the flesh, yet God's children can and should "through the Spirit mortify the deeds of the body." They should keep the body under subjection, and thus live a life above reproach; and unless one does this he is not to be ordained or set apart to the office of an elder or bishop, or to the work of the ministry. To go contrary to this is a flagrant violation of the word of God, "The husband of one wife." This does not necessarily mean that he must be married. The Apostle Paul, who wrote this letter to Timothy, was not married. But he must be the husband of one wife only-or the husband of only one wife. That is, he may have a wife; but he must not have more than one wife. This does not mean that if he has a wife and the wife dies he must not marry again. If the wife dies, then he does not have a wife. He did have a wife, but the wife died and then he has no wife. There is no law of God forbidding a man having a wife, so he may marry again, since he has no wife after the death of the one who was his wife. There is another point here which we shall not discuss at length in this place, as it has been "threshed out" heretofore; and that is in the case of fornication or adultery. If a wife commits adultery or fornication she breaks the marriage bond and thereby becomes dead to her husband. Being dead to him, he is left without a wife. As there is no law of God forbidding a man having a wife, but the marriage state being honorable in the sight of God, the man, in such a case, is free to marry again, and is no adulterer-no more so than if the first wife should die and be put under the ground and he then marry again. But no man is to be set apart to the work of the ministry who has more than one wife. He must not be an adulterer. He must not be living in adultery. This is God's law, and we cannot disregard it without bringing trouble and distress upon ourselves and upon the church. He must be vigilant. To be vigilant is to be alertly watchful as one keeping vigil; circumspect; alert; attentive to discover and avoid danger, or to provide for safety. See Webster. The true minister-the one the Lord has made-is a watchman. "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me." -(Ezekiel 3:17); (33:7). As a watchman he must be vigilant. He must be alert in watching. He is not to be "asleep on the job." He must be attentive to discover and avoid danger, and he must give the alarm when he sees danger approaching. If there is, some departure from the principles of truth in doctrine or practice making any sign of approach, it is the business of the watchman, the minister, to detect it, and he must give the cry and warn the house of Israel of the threatened danger. It is dangerous to the Lord's house to depart from what God has authorized. If one does not possess this qualification he has no business being set apart to the work of the ministry. He must be vigilant; he must be watchful. This does not mean that he must be watching for an opportunity to find fault with his brethren, but he must be watchful to warn the brethren against every false way. He must be sober. Sober means, 1. Not so influenced by alcoholic

liquors as to have one's faculties materially impaired; not drunk; also, habitually temperate in the use of liquor. 2. Temperate or moderate in thought or action; exercising cool, dispassionate reason; self-controlled. 3. Characterized by dispassioned reason or judgment; rational; as sober judgment. 4. Serious or subdued in demeanor, habit, appearance, color, etc.; solemn; grave; sedate. See Webster.

How important this requirement is. How disgusting for a man professing to be a gospel minister to be under the influence of intoxicating liquor. Even if he is not so drunk but what his legs will walk straight, yet it is disgusting in the extreme, to us, for his breath to be smelling like an old rotten whisky barrel. The filthy smell of whisky on the breath of any professed follower of the Lord is bad enough, and much worse on the breath of one professing to occupy the sacred desk as a minister of the gospel of the grace of God. It is enough to "turn the stomach" of any decent person on earth, much less a poor hungry child of grace, who longs for the way to glorify God. Lord, deliver thy kingdom and thy poor saints from such professed leaders! But there is more than one way for one to be drunk. "They are drunken, but not with wine; they stagger, but not with strong drink." -(9:9) (Isaiah 29:9). When one staggers he does not walk straight; he is drunk; he is not sober. But the minister must be sober. He should be sober in his demeanor-that is, in the way he conducts himself. If he is not living that way, to begin with, he should not be set apart to the work. If he has already been set apart, and ceases to be sober, gets drunk, and begins to stagger, or walk crooked, he should be deposed from the office by the church. The church should remember, and not forget, that the minister **MUST BE SOBER**. And they should act accordingly. Thus much serious trouble in the church may be averted. Let us be faithful and true to our Lord, and not have the favor of men to control our actions. But what we do in the service of God should be in love and tenderness and humility, having the good of the cause at heart and in view. Do nothing in the spirit of malice, hatred or revenge. He must be of good behaviour. "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly: but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." -(I Timothy 3:14-15). The apostle wrote Timothy that he might know how he ought to behave himself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God. He was given proper instruction. We find that instruction in the Book. If we follow the teaching, or instruction, given therein, we will behave ourselves in the church of God. If one does not behave it is because he is not observing the instruction given. But the apostle tells us the minister must be of good behaviour. He must behave himself. If he does not, he needs to be "taken to task," if he has already been set apart to the office. If he does not behave before being set apart, the church has no Scriptural right to set him apart. How careful the church should be in this matter of ordaining men to the work of the ministry. We feel satisfied that much of the trouble that has come in the church has been on account of the failure to observe and take heed to the plain and positive instruction the Lord has given concerning this all-important matter. We have just begun to hint at some of the things concerning this subject, but our space is taken up for this time, and we will have to continue the subject, and will try to write more for the next issue. C. H. C.

In A Sad Plight

---June 20, 1935

Everywhere there are souls "drifting helplessly" toward eternity without any prospects of a heavenly anchorage. Shall we stand back and ignore those who do

not know their own awful plight? Or turn deaf ears to those who recognize their peril and desire to know how to be saved? Let us be up and doing. There are souls being lost because of our lack of concern. It is vital concern of all who belong to the Lord Jesus Christ and who rejoice in His great salvation. The above is copied from the Baptist and Commoner of May 28, 1935, and appears under the name of E. E. McMurry, under the heading, "Hear Ye!" That sure does put all those who belong to the Lord Jesus Christ and who rejoice in His great salvation in a sad plight. He says, "there are souls being lost because of our lack of concern." Then he tells us that "it is vital concern of all who belong to the Lord Jesus Christ," etc. If it is vital concern of all who belong to the Lord Jesus Christ to tell the people how to be saved, and they are being lost in an eternal hell because of a lack of concern on the part of those who belong to the Lord Jesus Christ, then pray tell us what will become of those who belong to the Lord Jesus Christ? The writer would have us believe that it is the business of those who belong to the Lord to tell the people who are not saved how to be saved, and that they are lost in an eternal hell because we do not tell them how to be saved. "When I say unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand." - **(Ezekiel 33:8)**. If God requires their blood at your hands, and they are eternally lost on account of your neglect, then what will become of you? Will you not meet the same fate as those you fail to warn? If you do not meet the same fate as those you fail to warn, and they go to an eternal hell on account of your failure, then God does not require their blood at your hands, does He? Here is a dilemma for you. If your doctrine is the truth, and people go to an eternal hell on account of your neglect, then so will you go to an eternal hell. On the other hand, if you do not go to an eternal hell on account of your neglect to warn them, then your doctrine is not the truth. Which horn of the dilemma will you take? Verily "the legs of the lame are not equal." C. H. C.

Words of Approval

---June 20, 1935

Dear Brother Cayce: Enclosed is my renewal to The Primitive Baptist for another year. I am glad to do this for two reasons—for the enjoyment and instruction I get out of it and also as an expression of my well wishes for your encouragement and continued successful operation of the work you are in. I would be glad that you should lose no subscriptions, but that they should increase. You have other publications that are my desire to order sometime. I do not suppose I am any busier than anybody else, but I find it hard to get around to things I would like to do, such as reading, writing and visiting, except at the expense of needed rest. It has been my desire to write you personally and to contribute an article to your paper, if it was worthwhile. You have heard from our admired and loved pastor here (Brother Duncan), and you may remember the remarks made in appreciation at the close of your sermon here last summer. I may be classed as the younger generation, but you can expect no new things out of me. I want to avoid even the appearance of them, much less have them exist. I think if you do not have the appearance of them you will not be troubled with their creeping in. This appearance in my opinion should be avoided, both in remarks and practice. I joined the Old Baptists and the church, and realize the Old Baptists and the church did not join me. But I have no desire to live with them except as I found them. I will defend them as they stand, and not try to make them more acceptable by catering. I appreciate the information you have given to the Baptists through the columns of

your paper, and feel that all should who wish to keep their house in order. The course you have pursued does not constitute tale bearing or strife making, and in my opinion has been entirely ethical. I would not consider the publication of a quarrel as ethical, but it is right for God's servants to give the warning, as shown in one of your previous articles, so they can "choose this day whom you will serve." I refer to the unadulterated cause, not men. By being warned they can be saved from destruction in happiness if they are disposed to obey. We are a unit in Memphis. We want everyone whom a cloud is over to stay at home, and we don't propose to go a visiting under clouds. Our church here has responded nobly to leadership and counsel, and we have had some good preachers come and say fine things for our good. I feel that if it is possible for something to pass by and disappear it is not wisdom to mention it, as it kindles and adds fuel to fire and if it persists, it is prudent to give the warning, but distasteful to engage in quarreling. I am heartily for your paper and the way you have managed it. It has not been vague in any way. I believe it is worthy of outspoken encouragement and I want to see it prosper, read and circulated, as advocated by Brother J. H. Fisher, Newcastle, Texas. Wife and I visited with Brother Duncan after supper last week and sat up until late talking over interesting and enjoyable things. Among the things that were said that interested me was the prospects of your coming to visit and preach to us. Was sorry of the conflict that existed at the time you thought of coming, but hope you will include us at another time, and early at that. It has been my plans to invite you, and I am glad that you have also thought of coming. We would love to hear you more than once or twice, and would be glad to have you and your family in our homes. Come and preach to us on Friday and Saturday nights before some Sunday and then on Sunday. Brother Claud, I just wanted to let you know where I stood and to speak for my church, and to write words of encouragement to you. If I should try to contribute an article to your paper it would be along the trend of thought as outlined in this letter. I don't think warning and protesting is trouble making. Remember me and wife in your prayers, and I pray God's blessings upon you and yours. Your brother in hope, S. W. Dearing. 996 Galloway, Memphis, Tenn.

REMARKS

Dear brother, we are taking the liberty of publishing the above letter, and trust you will not think hard of us for doing so. Write again, and especially for the paper, if you feel so impressed. We appreciate the above letter more than we have words to tell. Brother Dearing is a son of Brother W. P. Dearing, Covington, Tenn., and a grandson of the late Elder B. O. Dearing. He is an efficient and faithful deacon of the church in Memphis, and his dear father is a faithful and true deacon at Indian Creek, near Covington. His grandfather was a faithful and true minister. If all the Old Baptists were like these dear men there would be no departures, and no trouble in the old church. May the Lord continue His blessings with you and your dear companion, and continue to give you grace to sustain you as you go on in the good old way. Yes, we want to visit your church and be with you in more than one service. Make a suggestion as to the time, and we will see if we can work to it. Pray the Lord to keep and to sustain us, and to help us to be faithful. C. H. C.

Ministerial Qualifications Article No. 2

---July 4, 1935

In our last issue we promised to try to write farther on this subject for this issue. The text we were using was **(I Timothy 3:1-7)**. We wrote on the several

qualifications as "blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour." Before proceeding farther we wish to correct an error made in the print in the last line of next to the last paragraph in the article in last paper. That sentence reads, "If he does not behave before being set apart, the church has no Spiritual right to set him apart." It should read, "the church has no Scriptural right to set him apart." The next qualification the apostle gives is that he must be "given to hospitality." To be given to a thing is to be disposed to it, or disposed that way; inclined that way; addicted to it. Such is the habit or custom; it is his way of doing or being. Hospitality means the kind and generous reception and entertainment of strangers or guests. We once knew of a minister being on a trip visiting churches, which he had been requested to visit, his wife accompanying him. At one church on that trip two home ministers were present. They were members of that church. That visiting minister and his wife did not receive a single invitation to go home with those preachers, or with the members. To our mind, this is not "given to hospitality." The minister, if he fills this qualification, is glad to have brethren, sisters, friends, to visit in his home. He is glad to entertain them in his home-be that home ever so humble-as well as glad to have them visit his churches. "Apt to teach." Some people may know things, but are lacking in the ability to impart instruction to others. This is true in nature as well as in the gospel. We have met some literary teachers who are not a marked success because they do not possess the ability to impart instruction to others. They know the things all right; but do not have the necessary ability in order that they be successful teachers. They are not "apt to teach." There may be many who are well informed as to the teaching of the Scriptures; they are sound in doctrine and practice; they know what the doctrine and practice of the church is; but they are not "apt to teach." They know what the truth is when they hear it, but they cannot tell it in such a way as to make it plain to others; they cannot impart instruction; they are not "apt to teach." The one who is set apart to the work of the ministry must be "apt to teach." He must be able to instruct. He must be able to teach others. Here brings in the necessity of study. "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." Note the word rightly in this expression by the inspired apostle. The minister must not only study to divide the word of truth, but "rightly dividing." He must study to know what the right division is. He must study to know where each Scripture belongs which he uses. He must rightly apply it. This is necessary to be done in teaching. He must be apt in that line. To be apt is to be fit or fitted; suited; suitable; appropriate. Hence, for one to be apt to teach he must be fitted to teach. How is one to be fitted to teach the doctrine and practice and order of God's house unless he makes such things a study? If one does not read and study the Scriptures he is not "apt to teach," in the sense of our text. How necessary that the church observe this requirement, to see that one possesses it before he is set apart to the work of the ministry. The fact that one can make a noise with his mouth is no evidence that he is "apt to teach." Some folks seem to think that if a man can stand on his feet and make a great noise with his mouth that he should be ordained to the work of the ministry at once. That is a great mistake, and the church has suffered much on account of it. "Not given to wine." To be given to a thing is to be disposed, inclined, addicted. This is very clear to us that the minister is not to be in the habit of drinking. He should not be inclined that way. For him to be otherwise is to set a bad example, and to put forth a bad influence. If he is the kind of man the Lord requires him to be he MUST let wine alone. "No striker." By common usage the word striker now has a variety of meanings. Webster gives it as one that strikes, in any sense; and one who, especially in politics, attempts a strike. Under that definition he refers to the word strike used as a noun, note 15, under that word. There we are told that a

strike is an act of obtaining or attempting to obtain money by importunity or any form of blackmail. If this is forbidden-absolutely forbidden that a man shall occupy as a minister of the gospel of the grace of God who is guilty of this, how much worse for the church to tolerate and harbor a man in that position who is guilty of robbery! The word in the original also means quarrelsome. The minister must not be quarrelsome. He is to be faithful (or should be), and this requires that he speak out against false doctrines and wrong practices, things not authorized by the Book; but he should not be always trying to "pick a quarrel" with someone. "Not greedy of filthy lucre." Greedy is, 1st, having a keen appetite for food or drink; ravenous; voracious; very hungry. 2. Having, or characterized by, eager or keen desire; eager for wealth. See Webster. We gather that one may have a keen appetite for money, or wealth, as well as for food or drink. One may be very hungry for filthy lucre. One may be eager for wealth. It appears to us that it is just as possible for a man posing as a minister to be eager for wealth as for one occupying the pew. Is it not possible for a preacher to become covetous as well as other members of the church? We think that in our life we have seen some of that sort. If the preacher is greedy of filthy lucre he might allow himself to engage in some questionable practices, which would be calculated to bring reproach upon the cause. Besides, if he should be successful in gathering worldly wealth, according to his greed, he is liable to be lifted up with pride and haughtiness. He might forget God. He might forget from whence his blessings come. He would be more than likely to neglect the service of God. In fact, he is most sure to do that if he is greedy of filthy lucre. Or he might do some things in or as service to God to get gain. One greedy of filthy lucre is likely to think of self. We once knew a preacher to say a reason why he would not make announcement at his appointments that he would take subscriptions for an Old Baptist paper was this: One might be there who left home with a dollar in his pocket expecting to give it to the preacher; if he should announce that he would take subscriptions for the paper the party would give him the dollar for the paper, and thus he would not get the dollar the man brought there expecting to give to him. It looks like we cannot get through with this text. We will have to quit for this time, and try to write more for next issue. C. H. C.

Fairchild, Hardy, Todd and Bishop

---July 18, 1935

Our readers will remember that in our issue of June 20, 1935, we had an article under the above heading, in which we published a letter written to Elder W. C. McMillon by Elder Fairchild. In that letter from Elder Fairchild, the reader will remember that he said, "But now a few of us ministers, including Elders J. B. Hardy, H. A. Todd, and a number of others have agreed to go into this work, work with all who will work with us, and those who will not, we will simply leave alone." In our article we said, "Wonder if Elder Fairchild would be willing to tell what other preachers are expected to work with those he named? He said there are others, but did not give their names." Since our issue of June 20 came out we have learned the names of some of the others these brethren are working with, although Elder Fairchild did not give them to us. We have before us a part of a newspaper published in Jackson, Tenn., the home of Elder Bishop. That paper is dated June 28, 1935, and in that paper we find the following news item: The Bishop Memorial Church of Jackson will be host to the Primitive Baptist Conference which opened here today and closes Sunday. The conference opened this morning with Elder W. A. Bishop delivering the address of welcome. Elder J. J. Kirkland responded while the principal address of the day was delivered at noon by Elder J.

E. Stewart on "Co-operation of Church and Pastor." Tonight's session will open at 7:30 p. m. with a 30 minute song and devotional service. This will be followed by an address, "Unity of the Saints," by Elder Cayce Pentecost. The Saturday session convenes at 10 a. m. with Elder W. O. Miller speaking at 11 o'clock on "Prayer." The noon address will be delivered by Elder J. B. Hardy on "Scriptural Teachings as to Women's Work in the Church." The evening address will be by Elder W. A. Pinkstaff on "Inward Essentials to Outward Growth of the Church." The main address at the conference Sunday morning will be by Elder T. W. Mitchell on "Church Discipline." At the noon hour, Elder H. A. Todd will speak on "Church Sovereignty." The address Sunday night will be by Elder A. M. Towry on "Christian Experience." The above tells the names of some of the preachers they are working with. Note their names: J. J. Kirkland, J. E. Stewart, Cayce Pentecost, W. A. Pinkstaff, T. W. Mitchell, and A. M. Towry. Now, let us see a little about what kind of line-up this is. J. J. Kirkland was lined up with the other Kirkland brothers in the disturbance they caused the Baptists in the years 1905 and 1906. The other three went to the Missionaries, and died holding membership there. J. J. remained out where the other three left him, with what few followers they had in the whole country. Since that time he has had no identity whatever with the regular old order of Baptists. W. A. Pinkstaff went with the Progressive element along the same time, and has not been recognized by the Old Line Baptists since. He has been a part of the time in the Elk River Association, which has not been recognized by our people in twenty-five years or more. T. W. Mitchell is in the same line-up. A. M. To wry was excluded several years ago from Pleasant Grove Church in the Flint River Association. If you wish to verify this statement write W. G. Monks, Fayetteville, Tenn., clerk of the church, or to Elder J. M. Walker, Hazel Green, Ala., the pastor, or B. B. Lawler, Brownsboro, Ala. Elder J. E. Stewart is excluded from Shiloh Church in the Mt. Zion Association. We wrote a little article in regard to this some time ago when we saw he was mixing some with our people, which we withheld after writing it. Now is the time for us to give space for at least a part of what we then said. Here it is: It becomes our duty to notify our brethren generally that Elder J. E. Stewart stands excluded from the church. He united with Shiloh Church, in the Mt. Zion Association, and was baptized by authority of that church. In their conference in November, 1917, a committee was appointed to investigate his standing in the vicinity of Flint River Church, in the Flint River Association, where he had been living for some time, though his membership was still with Shiloh Church. Brethren V H. Copeland and H. Thrasher were appointed as the committee. Their report was not very good. In the March, 1918, conference he was charged with affiliating with a disorderly church and refusing to pay his just debts, and excluded from the church on said charges. Elder A. Whitworth, of Arab, Ala., was moderator of the conference, and H. Thrasher was clerk. Brother S. E. Copeland, Guntersville, Ala., wrote Brother Stewart on January 29, 1928, trying to get him to see the error of his way. Brother Stewart answered the letter. We have the letter before us as we do this writing. It is not dated; but on page one we find this sentence: "I have told public that I was excluded, never denied it in my life." Of course, he goes on in the letter and tries to justify himself. But this is evidence from his own pen that he was excluded, and the records of Shiloh Church show it to be a fact that he was withdrawn from. We understand the faction he now stands identified with is in or recognized by the Elk River Association, and they have no correspondence with our people. Elder James Duncan, 2053 Young Ave., Memphis, Tenn., wrote us on Dec. 11, 1934, that Elder Stewart told him he was in the Sand 'Mountain Association. He is not a member of any church in that association. If you wish a copy of the minutes of the meeting when Elder Stewart was excluded we are sure you can get the same by writing V H. Copeland, R. 3, Guntersville, Ala. He is

clerk of the church. Or you can get it by writing S. E. Copeland, Guntersville, Ala. Now note the fact that the above so-called "conference" met with Elder Bishop's church in Jackson, Tenn. And we see that Elder Cayce Pentecost was to deliver an address; thus it seems that he is also one of the number who will work with Elders Fairchild, Todd, Hardy and Bishop. We note the above article says "the main address at the conference Sunday morning will be by Elder T. W. Mitchell on 'Church Discipline.'" From the way matters are going it seems that some of them need a little instruction on the matter of discipline. This way of recognizing and affiliating with excluded parties is no better than the very grossest of disorder. This sort of practice destroys every principle of church discipline. It treats the churches with downright contempt, and utterly ignores their right to withdraw fellowship from those they consider to be disorderly in their walk. ' It destroys the right of any church to discipline her members for anything. We call attention again to the expression quoted above from the letter written by Elder Fairchild, "a number of others have agreed to go into this work, work with all who will work with us," etc. Well it does seem like they will work with anyone who will work with them. We have heard such a remark sometimes about some parties as this: "He is just anybody's dog that will hunt with him." But we are thankful that there are some who will not work with them in the work they are doing. We are sorry they are engaging in this, and that they are not content to let the old church alone. C. H. C.

Ministerial Qualifications Article No. 3

---July 18, 1935

We promised in our last issue that we would try to write more on this subject. We were using **(I Timothy 3:1-7)**. Last issue we wound up on the expression, "not greedy of filthy lucre." We will begin this article with the next expression in the text, "but patient." Here is a qualification that most of us, or many of us, at least, need to take heed to. Patient means, 1. Undergoing pains, trials, or the like, without complaint; bearing or enduring with equanimity; having or exercising patience. 2. Being indulgent to the shortcomings of others; lenient to others' deficiencies; forbearing. 3. Expectant with calmness, or without discontent; not hasty; not overeager; composed. See Webster. It is so easy for us to complain when we have trials to undergo. But the minister of the gospel should bear trials without complaint. He should be willing to suffer without complaining. He should be indulgent to the shortcomings of others. He should be kind to those who err from the right way. He does not need to encourage them in wrongs by being indulgent, or patient. He should not be ready to declare non-fellowship for every brother who may step aside from the right way. He should be ready to bear with the wrongs of his brethren. Yet he should not be willing to fellowship or bear with disgraceful practices and heretical doctrines in the church. He should patiently teach against and warn against every false way. He should do this in the right spirit, not manifesting a spirit that is overbearing. He must patiently labor for that which is right. He must do this calmly. He must not "lose his head." He should not be too hasty. Patient labor will frequently accomplish that which is right, when hasty action would destroy instead of save. He should not "make haste." Let us patiently labor for the things that are right. "Not a brawler." A brawler is one that brawls. To brawl is (1) to quarrel noisily and outrageously. 2. To complain loudly; to scold. 3. To make a loud confused noise. Two synonymous words are to wrangle, squabble. The minister must not engage in such practice. That is, he should not engage in such. It sure would look bad for a minister of the gospel to engage in a noisy and

outrageous quarrel. It would not look well for him to complain loudly and to scold. One can reprove without scolding. This is a very nice point, and one that the minister should be very careful about. He might administer reproof and some might think he is scolding. Hence he needs to be very careful about that. He should not wrangle. It is better to hush and say nothing than to wrangle over a matter. Let the other fellow "cool off," as well as "cool off" yourself. Do not wrangle or squabble. Here patience needs to be exercised some more. "Not covetous." This goes back somewhat to the expression, "not greedy of filthy lucre." They are almost just alike in meaning. Covetous is, 1st, very desirous; eager to obtain. 2. Inordinately desirous; excessively eager to obtain and possess (especially money); avaricious. See Webster. From Cruden we quote the following: "This word is sometimes taken in a good sense, as in **(I Corinthians 12:31)**, 'Covet earnestly the best gifts.' This covetousness is good and commendable, when spiritual blessings are earnestly desired and sought after. But most commonly it is taken in a bad sense, for an eager and immoderate desire after earthly things. Covetousness is called idolatry, because the covetous man places the love, delight, and confidence in riches, which are due to God alone. This sin is condemned in all sorts of persons, and is expressly forbidden by the tenth commandment, 'Thou shalt not covet.' Such as are addicted to this sin, are hated of God. They are cruel and oppressive. The riches they are so eager in the pursuit of prove but poison to kill them, and thus they are miserable. The inordinate love of wealth does likewise betray men to manifold sufferings; both from themselves, in denying themselves the comfort of their estates; and from others, as extortioners, thieves, and the like." We have omitted the citations which he gave; that is, the Scriptures referred to. Covetousness is classed with very grievous sins by the inspired writers. "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat." **-(I Corinthians 5:9)**. Here the sin is classed with fornication, idolatry and drunkenness. In (I Corinthians 6:9-10) the apostle says, "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." Horse stealing is no worse than covetousness. If you would not ordain a horse thief to the work of the ministry, neither should you ordain a covetous man to that office. Would you ordain a drunkard to the eldership? If you would, we would say God pity you. If you would not, but would ordain a covetous man, we wonder why. If you have a man in your church who has been ordained as an elder, and he should be a thief or a drunkard, would you continue using him as an elder? Perhaps some would; but if they would, it is very evident they have very little regard for right living. If you have regard for right living, and your preacher should be guilty of thievery or drunkenness, you would deal with him. There is no more Scriptural authority for dealing with him for those grievous sins than there is for dealing with him for covetousness. Do you know of one posing as a preacher who is guilty of the heinous crimes-any of them-here enumerated? God pity the people who will harbor such. They are sure to reap the vengeance of God for such wickedness. In **(Colossians 3:5)** we read: "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry." We are here plainly told that covetousness is idolatry. It is no worse for one to make an image of wood, or of stone, or of metal, and worship that as a god, than to be covetous. To be covetous is just as bad as to worship a star, or the moon, or the sun, or a bush, or a stump, or a graven image. To be covetous is just about as bad as the greatest heathen idolaters in the jungles of Africa, China, Burma, or the Hindoos. If you would not ordain and keep a Hindoo idolater in the ministry, then

neither should you retain a covetous man in the ministry. The next qualification would require too much space for us to take that up in this issue. We will have to stop now, and will try to continue the subject in our next issue. C. H. C.

Ministerial Qualifications Article No. 4

---August 1, 1935

In our last issue in writing on the above subject, embraced in **(I Timothy 3:1-7)**, we promised to try to write more for this issue. The last thought we gave attention to was, "not covetous." We will try now to take up the next qualification the inspired apostle laid down. One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) "One that ruleth well his own house." If a man does not do this he is not to be set apart to the work of the ministry. The man is supposed to be the head of the family. "But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man." -(I Corinthians 11:3). Paul wrote this by inspiration of God. It is God's order; and Paul would have you to know this fact. Yet, how few people seem to know it in this day and age of the world. So far as mankind in general is concerned times have changed and the order is reversed. Frequently, in this day, the head of the man is the woman. The woman, usually, in this day, rules the house-including the ruling of the man. We think we have met with a few women of that sort in our life. All they lack being "the man of the house" is wearing the breeches. Figuratively speaking many of them do wear the breeches. But in the very morning of time God said concerning the man and woman, "He shall rule over thee." -(Genesis 3:16). Many in this age of the world have reversed' God's order. No man who has reversed God's order is to be set apart to the work of the ministry. One to be set apart to the office of a minister in the Lord's kingdom must be one "that ruleth his own house." He must be one who has not and does not reverse God's order. When the Lord made the woman he did not take the dust of the ground to make her. Out of the ground He "formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air." -(Genesis 2:19). But Adam was without a help meet. Note that the woman was to be a help meet-not a ruler over the man. "And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made He a woman, and brought her unto the man." -(Genesis 2:21-22). Here is a surgical operation no human being can perform. But we must not "branch off" on that question. God made the rib a woman which He had taken from the man's side. He did not take a bone from his head and make a woman. She is not to rule over the man. God did not take a bone from the man's foot and make a woman. She is not to be trodden under foot-no more than she is to be a ruler over the man. The man is as much wrong if he treads his wife under his feet as the woman and man are both wrong if she is the ruler of the family. The woman was taken from the man's side, from near the heart, and from under his arm. He is to protect her, and is not to rule over her as a tyrant. But he is to rule in love. If they have children, he is to rule them also. This does not mean that he is to treat them as brutes or as slaves.- But he is to have control over them. The man who does not rule or control his children, if he has children, has no business being set apart to the work of the ministry. In the olden times the parents "raised the children;" but frequently in the present day the "children raise the parents." In the family where this is the case, the church has no right to ordain the man to the ministry. He must be "one that

ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity." The house means his family. He is the head of the family. If the head is weak, so that he cannot rule well his own house, then he is too weak for the work of the ministry, and has no business to be put in that office, or in that place. He will not fit there. If a man allows his children to be gallivanting over the country instead of going with him to the house of God he is not ruling well his own house. If he has his children go with him to the house of God, and yet they stay out on the grounds during the service, perhaps in some mischief, he is not ruling well his own house. If he allows his children to attend the Arminian Sunday schools, thus encouraging them in learning false doctrines, the doctrines of men and devils, he is not ruling well his own house. "If a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?" Here is a question asked by the inspired apostle, and the form of the question allows but one answer. He cannot take care of the church of God if he does not know how to rule his own house. This question is what is called an affirmative question, which is the very strongest way of stating a proposition. Hence, in that question the apostle makes the statement in the very strongest way of stating the proposition, that a man cannot take care of the church of God if he does not know how to rule his own house. We are of the humble opinion that the church has often in the past "eased over" this matter, and lightly regarded it. "Not a novice." A novice is one newly come to the faith. This should be a caution to the church not to be in a hurry about setting a man apart to the work of the ministry. "Lest being lifted up with pride he' fall into the condemnation of the devil." This brings reproach and shame and trouble upon the church. Here is where and how a man may be spoiled-ruined, absolutely, when otherwise he might be a benefit to the cause. The "big head" is a bad disease for a man to have who is posing as a preacher. How does it look for a young man to presume to advise an old man, who has spent years in the service, to dispense with and throw away his dictionary and his books that tell him what words mean, and reprove him for using them? Would it not be more befitting for such a young man to allow his head to "shrink" a little, and to learn something-at least enough to learn that he has much yet to learn? Is he not "lifted up with pride" just a little, you think? If the church puts a novice into the office of the ministry, she does him an injustice and an injury, and also does the church an injury. "Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without." Then the apostle assigns the reason why. "Lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." We do wish we could so emphasize and sound out this requirement that it might never be forgotten or overlooked by the church when they consider, or even think, of having a man ordained to the work of the ministry. The apostle places great emphasis upon this point. He starts out in giving the qualifications by saying he must be blameless; then enumerates or lays down the other qualifications, coming on down to this last one named; and places great emphasis upon this by saying, "Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without." He must not only have a good report of them that are within-those who are members of the church-but of them which are without. He must have a good report of them who are not members of the church. He must have a good report of them that do not love the doctrine he advocates. Those who even despise the doctrine must give him a good name as a man and as a citizen. His life must be such that the haters of the truth, the haters of the doctrine believed and cherished by the true church, will say of him, "He is a good man." We once heard a man say that he had lived in a community of Primitive Baptists, and that they were good people and good neighbors, but the doctrine they advocated is as bad as the devil wants it to be. He MUST be of good report of them which are without. To set a man apart to the work of the ministry who is not of good report of them which are without, is to bring shame, disgrace and disrespect upon the church. What man of

good morals can respect a church that will set a man apart to the work of the ministry who is not of good report of them which are without? What respect can they have for a church that will put a man in the ministry that the world cannot, or does not, speak well of as a man? His life must be above reproach, if he is to occupy the sacred desk as a minister of the gospel of the grace of God. Shame on the church that will harbor a man in the ministry who is of ill repute. What's the matter with you? Do you not have the Christian courage or fortitude to object to such? Do you love such as that, too? When you condone such, and pass up such without objection, by your act and conduct you say you approve of it. What will you do? Will you be true to your God and to His cause? May the Lord help us, and give us courage to contend against every wrong. C. H. C.

Requests For Views

---August 1, 1935

For several years we have been receiving requests for views which have not been complied with. There have been different reasons why we- have not complied with these requests to give our views on different matters and different passages of Scripture through the paper. But we are now going to try to answer some of them- all that we can, as fast and as soon as we can get to them. We have had requests for views on many passages on which we feel to have no light. We may have requests for views on some things that we may feel could be of no general interest to our readers. Such matters as these we will have to pass by. These requests have been put on file by our wife, and we are now going through them, and will do the best we can with them. Most of the comments will have to be very brief. Bear with us, please, and we will try to do our best with these matters. C. H. C.

Sheep and Goats

---August 15, 1935

We were requested quite awhile ago to give our views on the latter part of (Matthew 25), concerning the sheep and the goats. We do not have space to quote here the language contained in (Matthew 25:31-46). Turn and read it. (Matthew 25:31-33) tells us how the Son of man will come in His glory and will divide the people, or separate them, as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats, and that He will put the sheep on His right hand and the goats on His left hand. Then He will say to those on His right hand, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Here is a kingdom that was prepared from the foundation of the world. It is not being prepared now; but the preparation of the kingdom was done from the beginning of time, or even before time. That work is not going on now. It is too late now to work in order to have a place prepared for you in that kingdom, or in order to have the kingdom prepared for you. The kingdom was not prepared for the whole race of mankind. He will place a portion of the race on His left hand, and He will say to them, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Those He will place on His right hand are those He calls His sheep. His people are given the appellation of sheep. "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth His life for the sheep." -(John 10:11). "I lay down my life for the sheep." -(John 10:15). They were His by gift. The Father gave them to Him in covenant before the world was; and He calls them His sheep. The Father did not give Him all the race; but gave Him all that He wanted. David, in impersonating, or

representing, the Son, said, "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." - **(Psalms 2:7-8)**. Here the Father is represented as saying to the Son, "Ask of me, and I will give thee." Surely the language conveys the idea that "I will give thee all that thou askest for." The Father gave some to the Son. "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which He hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." -(John 6:39). The Father gave some to Him. How many did the Father give to Him? All that He asked for. How many did He ask for? He asked for all that He wanted. He asked for all that He wanted; the Father gave Him all that He asked for; He shall lose nothing the Father gave Him, but shall raise them up again at the last day; He will place them on His right hand; not one of them shall be forgotten or left out; then He will say to them, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." To those on the left, those not given to Him, those for whom He did not die, He will say, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Those on the left "shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." Those on the left are not injured by the Lord. He leaves them where they are placed by reason of sin. Those He calls His sheep were His by choice; they were chosen out of the lost race of Adam to be heirs of glory; the kingdom was prepared for them; and they were given to Christ for an inheritance and for a possession; they were predestinated by the Lord to be conformed to the image of Jesus; they were chosen to be heirs of eternal glory. They are heirs according to God's promise-not according to their works or doings. This is all of grace, from first to last; and to the Lord belongs all the praise. Here in time these heirs of promise are brought into divine relationship with Christ by the direct and immediate work of the Holy Spirit in the heart. This is an internal work. It is a work of the Spirit of God performed on or in the spirit of man. It is not a head work, or a work on the head, or in the head, but in the heart. The heart is the seat of affection. This work of the Spirit gives the sinner a new life, and with that new life comes new affections, new desires, new aspirations, a new love. No sinner of Adam's race ever truly cries unto the Lord for mercy until this work has been done in his heart. In this work God shines in the heart. This gives the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Then he has a new life, and has the light within. This gives him to see the depravity of his own heart and the corruption of his very life and nature. Then he begins to cry for mercy. A child never cries before it is born. The fact that a child cries proves that a living child has been born. The cry of the sinner unto the Lord proves that he has been born from above. He is a new born babe in Christ. Here is one of the Lord's sheep, one of His lambs. He will carry His lambs in His bosom. How lovingly and kindly and tenderly He cares for them. He preserves and keeps them; and He will finally place them on His right hand, and will say to them, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." How is it that these do the things the Lord says while here in the world? Doing of those things is bearing good fruit. The tree does not bear good fruit in order to be made a good tree. The tree must be made good first in order that it bear good fruit. The fruit the tree bears shows what kind of tree it is. The fact that a tree bears good fruit proves that the tree was good before it bore the fruit. The bearing of the good fruit here in the world proves that one is a child of God, and it does not make him a child by birth. It manifests what he is. When we see one doing the righteous works enumerated by the Saviour in this chapter, it manifests the fact to us that the person doing these things is a child of God. He does not claim heaven on account of these things. He feels his poverty; he feels his

unworthiness; he is depending alone upon the work of the Lord, the mercy and grace of God, for a home in heaven. And he is not saved in heaven on account of having done those things. Those on the left will claim a right to heaven on account of the good works they claim to be doing and that they have done. But their works will not save them. The goats, those not given to the Saviour, are not depending on the grace of God for salvation, or for a home in heaven. They are depending upon their own righteousness. But sinners are not saved on their own works. The grace of God brings salvation, and the grace of God saves from sin. It is alone the work of the Lord by which a poor sinner is saved in heaven. There is no end to this. The more we write the more beauty we see in the glorious doctrine of grace, and the more we feel to praise and adore the Lord of glory for His wonderful works to the children of men. Our poor heart feels to be filled with His love and praise. To Him be glory for ever and ever. Remember us in your prayers, and help us to love, serve, praise, honor, and adore His matchless name. C. H. C.

1 Timothy 5:9

---August 15, 1935

In this passage the apostle is giving instructions concerning the widow who may be taken under the care of the church—that is, he describes the widow that the church should care for in a temporal way. The church is not obligated to care for a widow who has children or nephews who are able to care for them. See (I Timothy 5:4). But if she has no children or relatives who are able to care for her, then the church is under obligations to see after her welfare—if she comes under the description the apostle gives; if she is well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children; if she have lodged strangers; if she have washed the saints' feet; if she have relieved the afflicted; if she have diligently followed every good work. If the church has a member who is a widow coming under this description, then the church should see that she does not suffer and that she is cared for. C. H. C.

Faith and Belief

---August 15, 1935

Several years ago J. E. Tate, Rutherford, Tenn., asked us to show or explain the difference between faith and belief, and referred to **(Ephesians 2:8)** "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." If we had time and space we might write a long article on this subject. The word faith is sometimes used in Scripture in the sense of belief; sometimes it means doctrine or teaching; sometimes it means trust or confidence; sometimes it means fruit of the Spirit; **{(Galatians 5:22)}** sometimes it is used in the sense of evidence. "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." - (Hebrews 11:1). Here it is described as evidence and also as substance. Sub is a Latin prefix, meaning under. Stance is from the Latin sto, which means to stand. Hence, substance is something which stands under. "By grace are ye saved through something which stands under." What stands under? "Neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." -(John 10:28). The hand of Jesus stands under. "By grace are ye saved through the hand of Jesus Christ." The poor sinner is saved from his sins by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, not through his belief. "He that believeth on the Son hath the witness in himself." -**(I John 5:10)** "Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us." -((0:15) (Hebrews 10:15). Belief is based upon testimony. The Holy Ghost brings the evidence by testimony, which produces the belief. If one truly believes on Jesus as his Saviour it is because the Holy Ghost brought

testimony, evidence, that Jesus is his Saviour. If the evidence is true, Jesus was his Saviour before he believed, and before the evidence was brought to him. The belief, then, does not procure the salvation, but follows after being saved. These are just a few thoughts on this line. C. H. C.

Todd's New Paper

---September 5, 1935

A brother sent us a copy of a new paper, Volume 1, No. 1, dated August 1, 1935. The name of H. A. Todd appears in the paper as editor and manager, and the name of W. A. Pinkstaff as book and circulation manager. There is a department for women edited by Mrs. H. A. Todd, and a department for young people edited by Mrs. W. A. Pinkstaff. They have for a motto (**Jeremiah 6:16**) "Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths," etc., which will serve pretty well for a blind or a camouflage, to deceive the unsuspecting. We note a few things said in this new venture which we think should be noticed and exposed and attention called to them, for the good and benefit of the cause. Of course these men are posing as Primitive Baptists. This only makes it the more necessary that their utterances should be examined and exposed. On page 2 Elder Todd says: We will contend for the sovereignty of His churches under Him and that they owe no allegiance to any lord or over-head authority on earth or in heaven. That each church has perfect freedom of action without let or hinderance from any other church or federation of churches or pastors or preachers or boards or synods or coterie of men, nor are they answerable to other churches or associations of churches for any faith or practice they may elect; nor can other churches unchurch them by declaring non-fellowship for them. One church is not and cannot be under jurisdiction of any one, or of another body, but is wholly under jurisdiction to its head and Lord. They are not sovereign to do or believe anything, as a church, their Lord forbids, nor are they free to leave undone things He has commanded them to do. We suppose the gentleman means hindrance by saying hinderance. It is true that a church of Christ is under jurisdiction to no one but to the Lord Himself, and the Lord is the only one who can remove the candlestick. He does this when a church departs from the faith or practice He has given. But to contend that a church is in no sense answerable to any other church for any faith or practice she may elect is as far from the truth as hell is from heaven. If that contention or statement be true, then the churches have no authority or way under heaven to preserve and keep themselves pure and free from the introduction of corrupt doctrines and practices. The Catholic party introduced corrupt doctrines and practices in the church in about the third century. According to Todd's statement the party then contending for purity of doctrine and practice had no right to declare against or to withdraw from those corruptions; and that being true, then the Roman Catholic party was and is as much entitled to the claim of being the true church of Christ as the party that opposed those corruptions. The only way under heaven for the church to protect herself from those corruptions was to declare non-fellowship for and withdraw from these heresies. About 1792 Andrew Fuller, William Carey and others departed from the original doctrine and practice of the church, by advocating a universal atonement, that Christ died for all mankind, and introducing the mission system among the Baptists. According to Todd the churches which embraced those heretical departures had a right to do so, and no other church had a right to call them in question, or to protest against the departures, or to declare

against them, or to withdraw from them. If Todd is correct in this, then the Missionary Baptists are as much entitled to the claim that they are the church of Christ as the Primitives are. Perhaps Elder Todd thinks they are as much entitled to this as our people are, as he remained with them so long. We wonder why he did not stay with them; we wonder why he would try to come back to our people in an irregular way and start out again with the claim of being a Primitive Baptist in such a direction as to cause more trouble among us and to stir up more strife among us. He certainly knows that the course he is pursuing will cause trouble among the Old Baptists if they allow his measures introduced among them again. On page 3 of the paper we see this statement: Revival season is coming on now among the churches and let us all earnestly pray that the Spirit of the living God shall be present in His power to convict of sin, to release mourners, strengthen saints and add to His churches the saved. Does that sound like Old Baptist reading? "Revival season is coming on!" That sounds to us as though there is a certain season of the year that the Lord may revive us. Then, too, we must get up and have a revival, and this is about the season of the year for us to work at it. If we do not have our revivals the Lord by His Spirit may not convict of sin. And we must pray for the Lord to do that or He might forget about it, or He might go to sleep on the job. "Cry aloud: for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is on a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked." --(Ki 18:27) (I Kings 18:27). On same page and in same paragraph we see the following statement: Good works are not conditions between the soul and heaven, nor are they evidences that a soul is born of God, but they are the accompaniment of salvation and the flowering out of a willing mind in humble obedience to God. In this is a flagrant contradiction of the doctrine Primitive Baptists have always held to. Primitive Baptists have always contended that good works are evidences of regeneration. The London Confession of Faith, Chapter XVI, Section 2, says, "These good works, done in obedience to God's commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith," etc. This section was unanimously adopted, with the rest of the Confession, by the ministers assembled at Fulton, Ky., in November, 1900. H. A. Todd acted as reading clerk in that meeting. Now, if good works are the fruits and evidences of a lively faith, they are evidences of regeneration; they are evidences that the one who performs them has been born of God. Elder Todd accepted that as truth in November, 1900. But he disputes it now. If he was a Primitive Baptist in what he then accepted as truth, he is not a Primitive Baptist now. In 1898 A. M. Kirkland published a pamphlet called "Cause Defended." That pamphlet contains an article on each of the articles of faith of the Philesic Association. Article 6 says: We believe that God's elect are regenerated by the Holy Spirit, and that good works follow justification and are evidences of faith. Elder J. N. Wallace, at the request of Elder Kirkland, wrote a chapter on this article of faith. In that article, or chapter, Elder Wallace said: Paul, to the Ephesians, ii. 10, "Created in Christ Jesus unto good works" -not by or for good works; showing that good works follow the creation in Christ Jesus, and by no means precede it. This is sufficient to show that the position then taken in this work was that good works were evidences of one having been born of God. The Primitive Baptists occupied that ground then. That was Primitive Baptist doctrine then. If it was Primitive Baptist doctrine then, it is so yet. As Elder Todd and those with him do not now occupy that ground, they are not Primitive Baptists. On same page we see this expression: If they can bring "forth fruit unto repentance," then, and not till then, should they be baptized. Any letting down at this point will endanger His work and will deceive those who have been urged to join the church, while they are dead in sin. The Scriptures teach something about bringing fruits meet for repentance, { **(Matthew 3:8)** } which verse is translated, in the Interlinear, to read, "Produce therefore fruits worthy of

repentance." This certainly teaches that those who are to be baptized should be required to produce evidence of repentance. But Elder Todd has the matter reversed, and he would require them to produce fruits unto repentance-they may produce the fruits first and then repent, according to the teaching of these men in this article. Well, here is another thing we never knew until these new-fangled fellows brought it to our attention: "Any letting down at this point will endanger His work." They have capitalized the pronoun His, thus making the word refer to Deity. Thus they set forth the idea that the work of the Deity may be endangered by the failure of men, or by the doings of men. If this is not the rankest Arminianism we would not know where to find it. And such men proposing to band together with a few others to save the old church from utter ruin and destruction! Wonder who appointed these men to accomplish such a wonderful work! On same page we see yet another statement to which we call attention: In these blessed doctrines rest the hope of the real Christian and the only cure for the sin-weary world. Here is another new thing under the sun. We never knew before that the world was sin-weary. The good Book teaches us that the wicked unregenerated world are all in love with sin. "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." -**(John 3:19)**. The Lord Himself has here told us that men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. This does not sound to us as though it was or is a sin-weary world. Verily, this elder has become wise above what is written. And here is another wonderful revelation we find on the same page: We do not think it quite true to facts in the case when we say, "The people do not like the Old Baptists because they preach salvation by grace." Perhaps it would not be true to facts to say the people do not like Elder Todd, and others like him, because they preach salvation by grace. He and others can "so wrap it up" that they can remove the offense from their preaching, and the world will not dislike them on account of the doctrine they preach. But why did those wicked men hate the Martyr Stephen? Why did they stone him to death? Nothing else under heaven only on account of the doctrine which he preached. Why did the wicked Jews despise our Lord? Why did they try to destroy Him time and again during His ministry? And why did they finally deliver Him to the Roman soldiers and they crucify Him on Calvary's cross? For nothing else under heaven than the doctrine He preached and the eternal principles of truth which He so boldly and fearlessly advocated. And if they hated Him on account of the doctrine He preached and advocated, so will they hate and despise all those who faithfully and boldly teach, advocate, and contend for the same principles. Why did the wicked enemies of truth persecute, stone, beat with stripes, and imprison the great Apostle Paul? For the doctrine he preached-salvation by grace. That doctrine in its purity and simplicity has always been despised by the world. And the world has always hated those who faithfully contend for that doctrine. "As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed. For do I now persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." -Gal. i. 9, 10. We find there has been a deficiency all along by reading the following statement on the same page: Our young people have left us in numbers because there was nothing for them to do in His churches. There has been nothing for any person on earth to do in His churches from the day He established the same in the top of the mountains until this good day, only the things He put in there to be done by His humble followers. Neither has anything been taken out of the kingdom which the King and Lawgiver put there. If there has been nothing in the church for the young people to do, it can be for no other reason than that those same young people had no business in the church. There has been something to do in the church for every person under

heaven whose duty it has been to be in the church. The trouble about that matter has been, and is yet, that such fellows as Todd & Company are not satisfied with what the Lord has put in His kingdom. They want some new furniture brought in which the Lord never authorized to be put in there. The furniture He put in the kingdom beautifully decorates that kingdom, and the stuff these fellows want brought in would only litter up and defile the kingdom of our Lord. But one more statement we find (on page 4) gives the whole thing away. Read it and ponder it well, you Old Baptists: Herein lies the marshy bogs in which we have floundered for many years and the price paid is the loss of prestige among men and going away of our young people. Have the Primitive Baptists been floundering in such "marshy bogs" all these years? Fuller thought so. Hence he introduced means and measures to lift the old church from the dung hill into society and the respect of the world. Such men always look down upon the old church. The reason why they look down upon the old order of things and upon the good old way our fathers trod is because they are very high and exalted in their own estimation. When one can really see the deplorable state of the inventions of men and their own true condition, and the exalted place where the Lord has placed His church, they then look up to see the kingdom, and can then realize the fact that they cannot raise the church up so as to have it look beautiful to the world, and so that the world will love and admire the true church of God. They may bring the church down by their inventions and contaminate it with the world, so that the world will admire the same. But when they do that they depart from the principles of truth and righteousness, as marked out by the Lord of glory, and bring upon themselves shame and contempt. The true followers of the Lord will not go after them. The Lord will reserve witnesses to Himself, and the old church will continue to stand aloof from the inventions of men, and will not entirely be swallowed up by the devil and his cohorts. C. H. C.

John 5:39

---September 5, 1935

Several years ago Sister F. I Stockton, Greenwood Springs, Miss., requested us to give our views on the text cited above, which reads, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." This was said by the Saviour to the unbelieving Jews. They thought they had eternal life in the Scriptures. Some people think the same way today. But eternal life is not in the Scriptures. The Scriptures testify of Jesus; they tell where eternal life is. The Scriptures testify that eternal life is in Jesus Christ. If God's people, those who have been born again, and who have been taught that eternal life is in the Scriptures, would search the Scriptures for themselves, they would find they have been taught wrong, and that eternal life is in Jesus and not in the Scriptures. C. H. C.

Several Questions

---September 5, 1935

Mrs. Annie Lester, of Shobonier, Ill., several years ago asked us what Paul meant by unknown tongues in **(I Corinthians 14:2-4)**; what he meant by letting the women keep silent; that is, in what way; why did Peter say be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, in **((25) (Acts 2:25)**-or did they baptize in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost; and what did Peter mean by the expression, "save yourselves from this untoward generation," in **((0) (Acts 2:40)**. The expression, "unknown tongue," means an unknown language. Tongue

means language. It does not mean such senseless mumbling noises as some practice and call it an unknown tongue. The women are to keep silent in the churches in the sense that they are not to engage in preaching or teaching, or in the public discussions of matters that pertain to the church business. It has no reference to them telling the dealings of the Lord with them, or giving a reason of their hope, when they ask for a home in the church, nor in engaging with the congregation in singing hymns in the service. Read the verses just before and you will see what the apostle is giving instruction concerning. As proof that no woman is to be a preacher, the apostle says the bishop is to be the husband of one wife. Can any woman fill that measure? The command to those on the day of Pentecost to be baptized in the name of Christ is the same as to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The command there recorded means to be baptized by His authority; or in the name of that One who was anointed to remit your sins. The command to save yourselves from this untoward generation, as given to those on that same day who were pricked in their hearts, is to be accomplished by doing what he had already instructed-by coming out from among the crooked generation and being baptized in the name of the Lord-obtaining membership in His church and living separate from the world in a religious way. C. H. C.

Luke 7:28

---September 5, 1935

In 1928 Brother J. E. Willis, Saltillo, Tenn., requested our views on this text. It reads, "For I say unto you, Among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist: but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he." There was no greater prophet than John. But he was not in the church. He made ready a people the Lord had prepared. He made them ready for the organization of the Lord's kingdom, or church, by baptizing them. Jesus took the material John baptized-such of them as He pleased-and organized His kingdom. Jesus was baptized by John. Hence Jesus Himself was a member of that church or kingdom; and He was greater than John the Baptist. John said, "He must increase; but I must decrease." Jesus placed Himself as servant-as least -in the kingdom; and He was greater than John. C. H. C.

The Last Judgment

---September 5, 1935

The general judgment at the last day is not a day in which mankind will go before, or be brought before, the great Judge of the universe and be examined or tried. The Lord's children and the other folks will be separated, and the Lord's children will hear the blessed announcement made to them, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Those on the left will hear the awful denunciation, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." God's people do not come into judgment. (**John 5:24**). The word translated condemnation in that verse primarily means judgment. C. H. C.

Sabbath Question

---September 5, 1935

In the law given Moses on Sinai was a command for the observance of the seventh day as a sabbath day. Of course some of the things commanded in that law should be kept, obeyed, or done, even if the command had never been written. One such command is, "Thou shalt not kill." Another is, "Thou shalt not steal." There are other commands in the law like these. It would have been wrong to kill or to steal if these commands had never been written in the law. But some of the things written in the law should be observed because they were written, and because God commanded them. One such command was the one concerning the sabbath, which was the seventh day. There were many other things which the Lord commanded to be done and to be observed under the law. But the law and all the ordinances connected therewith belonged to the Jews. The Gentiles were never under that law, and were never required to observe the ordinances connected with it. But it is wrong for a Gentile to kill or to steal, even though he was never under the law given by Moses. Now, when Jesus came and died on the cross He fulfilled the law, and all the ordinances under it were finished. The sabbaths under the law were typical of rest under the gospel-just as the offerings and sacrifices were typical. The real Christian sabbath is his rest in Christ and His finished work. Also there is a rest for the child of God in the service of God. The Sunday sabbath was first instituted by Constantine about the year 321. That was the first sabbath law after the death of Christ. But it should be observed because it is the law of the land. We should obey the law when there is not a matter of conscience violated. C. H. C.

Are Agreed

---September 5, 1935

Dear Brother Cayce: I have just been through Big Sandy Association-Hollow Rock, Mud Creek, Zion's Rest and Antioch. Spent some time with Elders T. M. Hampton, J. L. Puller, T. M. Phillips and-----Phillips. We talked over conditions as they prevail at present among our people locally, and we are one hundred per cent agreed; and were it not for a little misunderstanding as to the motives in the course some of us have pursued to try to warn and save the brethren that have departed there could not have been any difference among us. When we saw that we could not save these brethren we then made it plain to them we would not tolerate their departures. We did what we felt was best for the cause. Yours in hope, Z. Stallings.

REMARKS

We are glad that you brethren agree. We saw this matter coming, and felt the obligation resting upon us to warn the brethren of the approaching danger. We had to do this or be untrue and unfaithful. It was not pleasant to do that. We were well aware of the fact that to give the warning would bring down the wrath of some upon our head. "But none of these things move me," said Paul. To be true, as he was, we must not let these things move us from the path of duty; we must not fail to utter the warning. Sure enough, it brought forth the wrath of some brethren upon us. Some accused us of falsifying; some accused us of having "it in for them" all along the line. We are grieved that the brethren would thus accuse us. But, by the help of God, we trust we may be enabled to endure all the afflictions that may come our way what few days we may yet have to stay in this old world. It will not be long until we shall receive the discharg'e from the warfare; and we trust it may be an honorable discharge. We pray the Lord may forgive the brethren who have thus accused us, and who have persecuted us. We trust we are bearing these things for Jesus' sake. C. H. C.

More Absolute Doctrine

---September 19, 1935

On pages 143 and 144 of the so-called Sovereign Grace and Pilgrim, the issue for July-August, 1935, we have the information that one of their preachers (Elder J. B. Bowden) had his car stolen, which had his suit case in it. The suit case contained his Bible, Concordance, 40 pages of manuscript (some of his writings), his credentials, and other items. In his car was also eight dollars worth of honey belonging to one of his brethren. It appears that a detective agency was employed to work on the case. Elder Bowden says, "It has left me stranded, no way to go to church or anywhere else. I have no clothing, and am badly crippled in my nervous system. I have worried so much over it that I have not slept much the last three nights." He exclaims, "Oh, what is the world coming to!" Then in closing the letter he says, "I want to go home as soon as possible. I have been away so long, and to think that I was on my way, and some of Satan's bunch had to take away from me what little I had is hard, but the Lord will take care of His own." In a later letter Elder Bowden informs the editor that "the police found part of the car but could not get anything for it as most of the glass was broken." In a still later note, appearing on same page (144) it seems that he had obtained another car and had more trouble. It seems that he was run into while on the way home. He says, "Now to have a man of poor principles to try to go around me, turn too quick and hang the wide long truck into my car door, rip the body open and run me off into the ditch. It was my first of such an experience; several saw it and said I was in no way to blame." We agree that the brother has had some trials. Pretty tough. But if his doctrine is the truth, those fellows could not help stealing his car and the things that were in it, and smashing the car to pieces, for according to his doctrine, God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated from all eternity that they should do just what they did do. That was just a link in the chain of events, which chain was forged and welded by the God of heaven before time began, and that link in the chain could not be broken by any power in heaven, in earth, or in hell. Of course, according to their doctrine, those thieves would not have stolen the car and its contents, had not God predestinated, fixed and unalterably decreed for them to do so. Neither would that fellow have run into him with his truck, had not God unalterably decreed for him to do so. The witnesses who saw the affair said Elder Bowden was in no way to blame. Of course they put the blame on the driver of the truck. But, according to the doctrine of these Absoluters, the truck driver was no more to blame than Elder Bowden, because he was only doing what the eternal God unalterably fixed and decreed that he should do. The witnesses, of course, did not see that. That part of the affair was not done in a way to be seen by those witnesses. The witnesses, perhaps, could not exonerate the truck driver; but according to Elder Bowden's doctrine, the doctrine of these Absoluters, Elder Bowden could exonerate the truck driver, and could put all the blame where it belongs-on the predestination and decree of God, the forging and welding of such a link in the chain of events. That was the way God fixed and arranged and decreed and unalterably predestinated that the thing should be. The driver could not help doing that. The channel had been made by the eternal God for him to travel in. He had to go that way. Had he done otherwise he would have thwarted God's predestination and decrees, and of course no little truck driver can do that. Perhaps God will be sorry He so arranged the matter, as Elder Bowden complains about it. Elder Bowden says he has worried over the matter. He is just worrying over what he and his brethren claim is God's predestination. He says he is badly crippled in his nervous system. No doubt but what a man is crippled somewhere who will advocate the doctrine these fellows advocate. Let us hope it is in the nervous

system, or in the head, and not in the heart. But Elder Bowden says "some of Satan's bunch had to take away from me what little I had." If they had to take away from him what they did take, then they could not help, it. They did it because God had so predestinated and arranged for them to do it. They were carrying out God's will and predestination and His plan in doing what they did as much as Elder Bowden and his brethren are when they are preaching the greatest discourses; and they were carrying out God's will and predestination just as much as Jesus did when He ascended to His Father in glory. That is the doctrine of these Absoluters. The men who did that stealing were only doing what was God's will for them to do. They were just as much God's bunch as Elder Bowden or his brethren can be in their preaching, according to his doctrine. According to their doctrine God Himself made them all -the thieves and the truck driver-just what they were and what they are. Hear ye the following statement made by D. K. Caldwell, Hamburg, Ark., on the next page of the pamphlet (page 145): If I rejoice it is in an all wise and sovereign God who before determined all things. And in making all things He so made and fitted them with a nature that compels them to do the things He before determined they should do. There is no power in heaven, in earth, or anywhere else that can make, them do otherwise. There it is. God made those thieves and the truck driver just what they are. God so made them that they could not do otherwise. No power in heaven, in earth, or anywhere else, can make them do otherwise. God Himself cannot make them do otherwise, for there is no power in heaven that can do so, the writer says. God has made them that way, and He cannot change them. That's their doctrine. You have it right there, in black and white. God made those thieves that way. The devil or Satan had nothing to do with it. The only job Satan has, according to the doctrine these men teach, is to do dirty little tricks that God is ashamed to do Himself, so He has Satan to do them. We cannot see it any other way than that this doctrine came from the devil. He invented it so as to shift his dirty work, and the dirty deeds of his cohorts and emissaries, off on the Lord; and these fellows are helping the devil out by advocating that doctrine. May the Lord help us that we may never be deceived by such teaching. C. H. C.

Instrumental Music

---September 19, 1935

Regular preaching Sunday morning at 11 o'clock by the pastor, Elder Cayce Pentecost. You are most cordially invited to attend, hear the discourse and enjoy the music, both instrumental and vocal. The above is copied from the Dresden Enterprise of Sept. 6, 1935. The heading of the article was "Primitive Baptist Church." The item needs very little comment. It very plainly tells us that they have instrumental music in that church. The only question we are wondering about is as to whether other churches and ministers in that section affiliate with them as being a true old line Primitive Baptist Church in the using of instrumental music in their church service. How do you stand on this, brethren? We know how the brethren and churches of the Greenfield Association once stood, and the Forked Deer, and the most of the Big Sandy, if not all, and the Predestinarian, and perhaps all the Obion. How do you stand now? C. H. C.

Rich Man and Lazarus

---September 19, 1935

In 1930 Brother J. L. Dearing, Iredell, Texas, asked us the question, "Who are the five brethren of the rich man?" This is in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. The five brethren were his Jewish brethren. Notice **(Luke 16:31)** "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." This was literally and actually fulfilled and verified as true when Jesus rose from the dead. The Jews still rejected Him as being the Messiah. And they reject Him to this day. But they may be brought in again some day, and that day may not be very far in the future. C. H. C.

Matthew 9:16-17

---September 19, 1935

Mrs. A. D. Hodges, Carnegie, Okla., asked us for our views on this text. It reads, "No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse. Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved." The Saviour is here teaching that the old order of law worship and service is not brought over into the new or gospel dispensation. The new cloth of gospel worship and service is not tacked on or sewed on or simply added to the old law worship and service. The gospel day is a new dispensation, a new garment, and old cloth is not to be mixed with it. In that age bottles were made of skins. Old bottles would not stretch. If new wine should be put in them the bottles would burst-the fermenting and working of the wine would burst them. To put new worship-gospel worship and service-in the old bottle of the law dispensation would be to cause the bottle to burst, and the whole thing would come to destruction-all would be lost. There is to be no mixture of law and gospel. The old bottles served their usefulness in the first use they were put to. The law served its purpose, and it is passing out now. A new bottle-a new gospel day-is coming in, and the new wine of gospel worship and service is in it. Are you using old bottles, engaging in law worship and service? If so, you suffer loss. Since writing the above we find we gave our views on this same matter of new wine in old bottles, as mentioned in **((21) (Mark 2:21-22)**, in our issue of May 14, 1907, in which we gave the same views, though expressed in different words. C. H. C.

Jude 1:25

---September 19, 1935

Sister M. O. Lucas, Albertville, Ala., asked us in 1930 to give our views on **((Jude 1:25) (Jude 1:25)**, and asked if these persons under consideration were disobedient children of God or were they unregenerate. Jude says they are clouds without water. God's preachers are rain clouds -not "thunder heads." Jude says they are wandering stars. God's preachers are "fixed stars." Jude says "to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." That is a long time. That seems to us that the darkness is too long for a child of God. Go on down to **((Jude 1:25) (Jude 1:25)** and you will see that Jude says concerning them, "Having not the Spirit." Paul says in **(Romans 8:9)** "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." It seems to us this should settle the matter as to what sort of folks such people are. Jude warns the Lord's children concerning them, and they should be marked and avoided. The church does not need them. Keep them out. C. H. C.

Matthew 19:27-28

---September 19, 1935

In 1930 Brother J. T. Fannin, Corsicana, Texas, requested our views on the language there recorded. Get your Bible and read it, as we must use limited space. We suppose the main expression on which our views are wanted is, "That ye which have followed me in the regeneration," etc. This expression has no reference to the work of regeneration called the new birth; but refers to the new order of things; the bringing in of a new order of worship and service. The "ye" were the apostles. They were appointed as judges by the King, and they passed on and explained all the laws and rules and regulations which He gave to govern His kingdom. C. H. C.

Another Corresponding Editor

---October 3, 1935

In this issue of The Primitive Baptist we have the privilege of adding another name to our list of corresponding editors. For several years we have been reading some of the writings done by the brother whose name we now add to the list. We never had the privilege of meeting him until at our association at Elizabeth Church, near Marvell, Ark., which was held on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, September 13, 14, 15, 1935. He was named for us. This brother is no other than Elder Claud E. Webb, Carthage, Ill. For some time we have had a mind to ask him if he was willing to be placed on our editorial staff, but did not write him in regard to the matter, although we have had correspondence with him, as we preferred to talk with him face to face. We desired to hear him preach. This would give us a better opportunity to know that we were of one heart and one mind. We were made glad in our poor heart when we learned that he arrived at the association ground Thursday night. We had the pleasure of being associated with him, and others, for three days, and of hearing him preach. The good Lord blessed him to preach in the good old way to the comfort and consolation and instruction of His dear children who were present. So before we separated we asked him about allowing his name to go on our editorial staff, and we talked the matter over freely; then he gave his consent. In another column will be found his article giving his consent to be put in the list with our other corresponding editors. We have confidence in him, and believe him to be sound and true to the principles our people have loved and stood for through the ages. May the good Lord bless our labors together for the good of our beloved Zion. We feel thankful to have such able and faithful and true men of God on our staff as those whose names appear there. We are sure no truer set of men can be found. May the Lord's blessings rest upon them, and help us all to labor together and to strive for the peace of Jerusalem. C. H. C.

Revelation 20:12

---October 3, 1935

We were requested some time ago to give our views on **(Revelation 20:12)**. (Revelation 20:12-15) reads as follows: And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the

book of life was cast into the lake of fire. Notice that first the books were opened, and then another book was opened, and this other book was the book of life. Notice, also, that none of those whose names were written in the book of life were cast into the lake of fire. Those who were judged out of the things written in the books, according to their works, were cast into the lake of fire. Every person who was judged according to his works, or who was judged out of the things written in the books, was cast into the lake of fire. God's children were not judged out of the things written in the books. Their names were written in the book of life. Jesus said, in **(John 5:24)**, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." The literal rendering of the text in our present day English is, "into judgment comes not; but has passed out of death into life." God's children, those whose names are written in the book of life, do not come into judgment. Other folks do, and will be cast into the lake of fire. If you class yourself with the number who are to be judged out of the things written in the books, then you class yourself with the number that will be cast into the lake of fire. C. H. C.

Mark 16:16

---October 3, 1935

Some time ago Brother Clinton Bradford, Primm, Tenn., asked us about the above text, and wanted to know if the word is is future tense, and says he has been arguing that it is in the past tense. The verse reads, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." The language "and is baptized" is not future tense. The word is in connection with another word is never in the future tense. It cannot possibly denote something in the future. There is no such thing in the English language as is being in the future. The expression in our English language is the present perfect tense. But the word in the Greek translated "is baptized" is in what is called the aorist tense in Greek. That tense "is strictly the expression of a momentary or transient single action, being thus distinguished from the imperfect; and in the indicative mood it ordinarily signifies past time. It is, however, used of a prolonged action, if there is no positive need to make a direct expression of that circumstance. It is thus of constant use in the narrative of past transactions." See page xlii., Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon. You are right in saying it is past, although the English has it in the present perfect tense, which denotes an action finished or completed in the present. Yet the very expression frequently carries with it the idea of something already done. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God;" **{(I John 5:1)}** is born-already born-not will be born. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 11:33

---October 3, 1935

Brother J. L. Callaway, Manassas, Ga., asked us quite awhile ago if this text means for a church to put off the communion when there is a private offense between two members, which has been brought to the knowledge of the church generally, but has not been brought before the church. The text reads, "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another." No, the text does not mean to put off the communion under the circumstances or conditions named. It simply means to wait until all the brethren who are in attendance are gathered together. Do not begin the service while the brethren are still gathering together. Let the service be engaged in quietness and order and due decorum. As to the matter of

trespass, one member against another, the instruction given is, "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone." This is in (Matthew 18). He is not to tell others, but the brother who trespassed. "If he neglect to hear thee, take with thee one or two more." Still he is not to tell others. "If he neglect to hear them, tell it to the church." If one has been telling others, so that the membership in general are informed about the matter, somebody has violated the instruction given by the Lord. If a brother trespasses against us, we should either bear it in silence, and say nothing to a living soul about it, or tell the brother; and if this fails, then take one or two more. If reconciliation is obtained, then no one else should ever know about it. If we fail to get reconciliation, then tell it to the church. It is a violation to tell it to more than the one or two witnesses until this time. May the Lord help us to follow His teaching. C. H. C.

Revelation 12:7-8

---October 3, 1935

In 1930 we received a request from Brother S. H. Garland, Henryville, Tenn., to give our views on the language recorded in (**Revelation 12:7-8**). We gave our views in a short way on this text in The Primitive Baptist of January 9, 1917. The war therein mentioned, we think, took place in the Jewish heaven, when the woman mentioned in the first verse had made her appearance. She appeared in the end of the Jewish age, or Jewish economy. The woman appeared in heaven, and there was war in the same heaven; and the dragon was cast out. Then persecution of the woman (the church) began; then the woman fled into the wilderness, where she remained in seclusion for 1260 years. C. H. C.

Destruction of Sodom

---October 3, 1935

In 1930 T. L. Parnell, then at Cuba Landing, Tenn., asked us if the destruction mentioned in (Genesis 19) is eternal. He said, "Some say it is and some say it is not." It was a literal destruction. The city was literally destroyed. Nothing said in the chapter about an eternal hell or eternal punishment. C. H. C.

Where Was Judas?

---October 3, 1935

In 1930 Sister Cora Absher, Pressman's Home, Tenn., asked us where Judas was when Jesus washed the disciples' feet, and did Jesus wash Judas' feet? No, Jesus did not wash Judas' feet. He went out while they were eating the passover supper. While Jesus was eating the passover supper with the disciples, He gave the sop to Judas, and Judas went immediately out. After he was gone out, Jesus took the bread and wine and instituted the sacramental supper; and then when supper was ended He washed His disciples' feet. C. H. C.

Our Association

---October 17, 1935

It was our intention to write a little account of our association for our last issue, but after we got home from the meeting we were sick for several days, part of the time confined to our bed, so we did not write. The date we are doing this writing is October 3, and we still do not feel as well as we would like to. This will also explain why some other matters have been delayed, which need our attention. The

associational meeting (South Arkansas) was held with Elizabeth Church, five miles south of Marvell. Service was held at the church Thursday night, but the associational meeting began at 10 o'clock on Friday and continued until Sunday noon. Then they had preaching Sunday afternoon and night. We had service Friday morning, afternoon and night; Saturday morning, afternoon and night. The home ministers present were Elders John R. Harris, J. M. Burch, W. H. Lee and the writer. Other ministers present were Elders Claud E. Webb, Carthage, Ill.; J. W. Hipp, Prim, Ark.; W. H. Eubanks, Newport, Ark.; F. M. Russell, Pangburn, Ark.; T. E. Ellzey, Harrisburg, Ark., and W. M. Alley, Hot Springs, Ark. All the ministers present occupied the stand at some time during the meeting, except Elder Alley, and each one seemed to be blessed of the Lord to preach in such a way as to comfort, strengthen, build up and edify the Lord's dear people. One brother had joined at the regular meeting the fourth Sunday in August, the baptism to be attended to during the association. Then during the association three united with the church by letter and two more by experience. The writer had the pleasant duty of baptizing the three on Sunday morning. Then on Sunday another dear brother came forward asking for a home, and he was joyfully received, his baptism to be attended to on the fifth Sunday, the church having agreed to hold their regular meeting at that time instead of on the fourth Sunday. We have been informed that another one came to the church on Sunday night. We cannot say whether the baptism has been attended to or not as we are doing this writing, as we were sick and not able to go to the meeting. Elder Garner is the assistant pastor, and we have not received word as to whether he was there or not. Wife wrote him we were sick and not able to go, but we have not yet heard from him. The meeting was a pleasant and enjoyable one. May the Lord be praised for His mercies. Remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

To Our Exchanges

---October 17, 1935

We feel that the good of our beloved cause demands that we say something to our readers and to our Primitive Baptist exchanges in regard to W. D. Griffin, Fayette, Ala. We published a request from him some time ago, in which he wanted to get a minute of all the Primitive Baptist Associations. We have noticed the same request from him in some of the other Primitive Baptist papers that we exchange with. We had no idea when we published that request that he would pursue the course that he did in at least one instance. To at least one brother he sent a copy of the minute of his association and also a pamphlet which contains more false doctrine than anything we remember to have seen of the same size. He has taken this way, evidently, of getting names of brethren to whom he sends this blasphemous pamphlet. We intend, the Lord willing, to expose the heresies contained in the pamphlet, as soon as we can possibly do so. We would suggest to our readers that you send no more literature to W. D. Griffin, if you do not want the blasphemous doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things circulated among our people and that, too, in a deceptive way, as this pamphlet does. C. H. C.

Galatians 4:22-31

---October 17, 1935

Brother S. P. Taylor, formerly at Thomasville, Ga., now at Albany, Ga., requested us in 1930 to write on (**Galatians 4:22-31**). Our space is so limited that we will not quote the language contained in those verses. Get your Bible and read the

chapter. Neither can we write at length. There is much contained in the language; but we will have to do no more than just hint at some of 'the subject matter. The two covenants are brought to view. Agar (or Hagar) was a type of the covenant given on Sinai. This covenant gendereth to bondage, and was a type of national Israel, or the Jews, or national Jerusalem, which the apostle says is in bondage with her children. Sarah, the wife of Abraham, the free woman, was a type of the covenant of grace, called in some places the new covenant, because it was brought out and manifested after the covenant of works, or the Sinai covenant. Ishmael was the son of Hagar, by Abraham. Hagar was a bondmaid of Sarah. She was in bondage. Of course, as she was in bondage, she could not give birth to a free child. Her son was, therefore, born in bondage. And he was born after the flesh. God had before made a promise to Abraham and to Sarah. But Sarah began to doubt the promise ever being fulfilled. So she gave Hagar to Abraham. This is the first record we have of a ladies' effort society to help fulfill a promise He had made. But the effort did not bring about the birth of the promised heir, nor did it help to bring that about. At the proper and right time Isaac was born unto Abraham and Sarah. Isaac was the promised child. Isaac was the child of promise. "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." -(Galatians 4:28). Sarah typified the covenant of grace, and Isaac typified all the heirs of promise. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." - **(Galatians 4:29)**. The children of God were known and embraced in the covenant of grace before the world was. It was and is an everlasting covenant. It does not grow. It is ordered in all things, and sure. Not one has ever been added to it, and not one has ever been, or ever will be, taken away. The promise is sure to all the seed. The efforts of Sarah and Hagar did not help to bring about the birth of the promised heir. Even so, the efforts of all the men and women and the societies that have ever been organized have not helped to bring about the birth into the spiritual realm, or into the family of God, one heir of promise, or child of promise. That human effort in that day resulted in the birth of Ishmael, and not the birth of Isaac, the promised child. So the efforts and labors of the so-called religionists of the day do not, and cannot, and will not, help to bring about the spiritual birth of a single son or daughter of Adam. All they can do by their efforts is to bring about the birth of an Ishmaelite. Ishmael was a mocker. It is even so in this day, the Ishmaelites are only mockers. And as it was then, even so it is now, "the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman." The works of the flesh, the works of men, will not make one an heir of God. "They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." - (Romans 9:8). Read several verses there in the Book. God is the Father of His children, and Jerusalem, which is free, and which is above, is the mother. This Jerusalem is the covenant of grace. They were conceived in that covenant, and at "the set time" they are born from above. God foreknew them in that covenant. He is not surprised or taken unawares when one is born into the heavenly family. He has never been put to the necessity of calling for help in order to get one of them brought forth. We could write a lot more on this question, but our space is limited, and we must stop here. May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of every reader. C. H. C.

Non-Attendance

---October 17, 1935

We were requested some time ago to give our views in regard to members not attending the services of the church-. If they are providentially hindered, the

church should bear with them. If they are in need of help, and that is the real reason why they do not attend, then the church should help them. If they are simply drifting into a careless or indifferent state, they should be encouraged. If they are simply rebelling and refusing to attend the service when there is no good reason for not doing so, they should be dealt with accordingly. When one unites with the church he covenants with the church, or enters into a covenant with the church, that he will attend the services of the church when not providentially prevented. If one does not attend, the church should know the reason why. If A and B have entered into a covenant with each other, and A fails in some part of the covenant, B is entitled to know the reason of A's failure. It is B's business to know, and it is A's business to give B the information in regard to the matter. C. H. C.

Who Crucified Christ?

---October 17, 1935

In 1930 Brother B. A. Caddell, Brent, Ala., said, "I have always been taught that the Jews crucified Christ. It looks like the Gentiles did the actual work." He refers to **((0:33) (Mark 10:33-34))**, which reads, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem: and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes; and they shall condemn Him to death, and shall deliver Him to the Gentiles; and they shall mock Him, and shall scourge Him, and shall spit upon Him, and shall kill Him: and the third day He shall rise again." True, He was crucified by the Roman soldiers, and they were Gentiles. Pilate was a Gentile. But the Jews cried out unto Pilate, "Crucify Him; crucify Him." The Jews delivered Him to the Gentiles, and the Gentiles crucified Him by the authority and upon the demand of the Jews. Hence the apostle said, "Ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." - ((23) (Acts 2:23). If a man is hung or electrocuted by the authority of the state, the high sheriff springs the trap or turns the switch, but it is the state which takes the man's life. The Jews crucified the Saviour, but they did it by the hands of the Gentiles. C. H. C.

Psalms 37:25

---November 7, 1935

Miss Nannie Sewell, Winchester, Ky., asked for an expression from us some time ago on the language recorded in **(Psalms 37:25)** "I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." The righteous are those who do right-that is what it here means. When one does right-does as God commands him-he will not be forsaken. The Lord has promised to not forsake him. His seed are his offspring who also do as the Lord requires. One will never be brought to the state of having to beg for bread because of doing as the Lord requires. "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty." -((24) (Proverbs 11:24). C. H. C.

Administration of Baptism

---November 7, 1935

In 1930 S. Buckingham, of Upper Sandusky, Ohio, asked us "What kind of baptism did the disciples baptize with?" We suppose he means by this question to ask if they administered water baptism. They baptized in or with water. The baptism they administered was water baptism. Jesus authorized the apostles, in What is called

the commission, to administer baptism, and this could be none other than water baptism. Baptism is an ordinance of and in the church. The ordinances were delivered by the apostles to the church for administration and for keeping. See **(I Corinthians 11:2)**. In 1933 the same brother asked us were the prophets, evangelists and teachers mentioned in **(Ephesians 4:11)** ordained, and did they have the care of churches, and did they baptize, and did they pass the sacrament? We are sure that the pastors had the care of churches, of course. Yes, they baptized. Paul baptized a few at Corinth, though he said, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." The church gave him the authority to baptize, as the ordinances were in the hands of the church for keeping. Yes, they were ordained. See **((2) (Acts 13:2)** for authority for ordination. These ordained, and authorized by the church to do so, administered all the ordinances. They administered the sacramental supper as an ordinance, just as they also administered baptism as an ordinance. C. H. C.

Easter and Christmas

---November 7, 1935

In April, 1931, Elder O. K. Sheffield, Ft. Pierce, Fla., asked for our views concerning Easter and Christmas. The word Easter is found only once in our Bible, and that is in **(Acts 12:4)**. But the word there translated Easter is found in many other places in the Book, but is translated Easter in no other place. The word is pascha, and has reference to the passover. It means passover. It has reference to the paschal lamb, and is applied to Christ as our paschal lamb. He is our passover. The Easter observance is a Roman Catholic invention, and they set the time as having to do with full moons. Hence Easter Sunday comes on different Sundays. The Catholics established the observance of Easter Sunday in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, and yet it is not at a fixed time. It is heathen in its origin, the Catholics borrowing it from heathenism. The same thing is true of Christmas-it is of Roman Catholic origin. It was instituted by Constantine the Great. He brought different heathen customs with him when he professed to embrace Christianity. The Pagan idolaters, which Constantine renounced, observed mass in regard to different things. So Constantine brought "the mass" with him. So he ordered mass to be observed in commemoration of the birth of Christ; hence the name Christmas, or Christmass. He also set apart the day in winter. No one knows when Christ was born; but it was not in the winter. The shepherds were keeping watch over their flocks by night, in the fields, which they would not be doing in winter. Personally we have nothing to do with either of those feast days. To observe and keep them is to follow Rome. C. H. C.

Elder Webb Withdraws

---November 7, 1935

In another column will be found an article from Elder Claud E. Webb withdrawing his name from our editorial staff. We regret very much for him to do this, though it may be best for the cause for him to take this step, but we fear not. For several years there has been some variance and misunderstanding between many brethren north and south. We had hoped that this might all be removed and overcome by having Elder Webb's name on our editorial staff. We hoped that this might have a tendency to bring them all closer together. Elder Webb fears it might have a tendency otherwise. He may be right. We do not know. Anyway, it is our desire, and the desire of Elder Webb, to do all that we can to bring all the brotherhood

closer together. We ask the prayers of all the brethren and sisters, that the Lord would direct us in the way that would be best for the cause of the Master. C. H. C.

Galatians 4:27

---November 7, 1935

In 1930 B. N. Sullivan, now in Mississippi, asked for our views on **(Galatians 4:27)**. It means that there are more Ishmaelites than children of promise. C. H. C.

Restoring Excluded Persons

---November 7, 1935

We doubt very much if one church has the right to restore a person who has been excluded from a sister church, labor or no labor. True, if a church excludes a person unrighteously, sister churches have the right to labor to show the sister church her error. We truly believe this is as far as they have a right to go. We mean to say that a church has no right to restore such a one as long as the identity of the church remains that did the excluding. Such a course always widens a breach and makes it much harder for peace to be restored. A church has the God given right to say who shall not hold membership in her body. She may err in her procedure in such cases; but she should not be non-fellowshipped because of such error. We believe such acts as an exclusion by a church should be recognized by every sister church, and by so doing much trouble would be avoided. No church or set of churches can unchurch another church. This is our humble opinion on such matters. C. H. C.

Some Additional History

---November 21, 1935

We had an article under the heading of "Valid Baptism and Some History" in the issue of January 15, 1931, which may be found on page 330 of Volume V The same article was reproduced November 21, 1935, with the following "Additional History." Since the above was written, and having been requested to republish the same, we think it might be of some benefit to the brotherhood and to the cause for us to add a little additional historical facts, as follows: It appears that Little Flock Church in Killeen, Texas, was organized about the year 1848 in Bell County. The church was in Killeen in 1906. The church first joined the Lower Concord Association, with which it remained till the Lower and Upper Concord settled their trouble in October, 1880. The church was then in the constitution of the Primitive Association. In 1888 the church joined the Little Flock Association, of which it was still a member when the history was written, from which we get the facts here stated. The Concord Association divided in 1864. In 1880 the Concord Association met with Bosque Church in August. At that meeting in August the association passed this act: "We, the association, advise the churches to meet the brethren that went off from us (in 1864) and called themselves Concord Association, by messengers at Salem Church, Coryell County, on Friday before the fourth Sunday in October, 1880." After the division in 1864 the two contending parties were known as the "Lower Wing" and "Upper Wing" of the Concord Association. Both factions met by their messengers at Oglesby, Coryell County, in October, 1880. Both parties confessed their wrongs. Then the "Lower Wing" dissolved, after which the churches in that wing, and perhaps others, organized the Primitive Baptist Association. The above facts are gathered from "A History of the Primitive Baptists

of Texas, Oklahoma and Indian Territories; by Elder J. S. Newman;" published in 1906, by the Baptist Trumpet, at that time published at Tioga, Texas, and now published at Killeen. It seems to us that if two factions burying their differences and coming together, both sides confessing their wrongs, and thus adjusting matters, and each receiving the work of the other, would throw the whole thing in disorder, so that they could not administer gospel baptism, then the editors of the Trumpet are already in that disorder, and cannot themselves administer gospel baptism-for that is what the church of that editor's membership did in 1880. Have we made an incorrect statement, brother? If so, cite us. C. H. C.

One Talent Man

---November 21, 1935

If the one talent man always buries his talent, then the others always improve their talents. According to this, we do not see where any disobedience ever comes in. We have understood that God's people frequently disobey the Lord's commands. C. H. C.

Building The Home Christian

---December 5, 1935

The above is the title of a book published by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 142 pages; price \$1. Like most every book we have seen, it contains some things with which we cannot agree. On page 44 we find this: "The Sunday school is the church at work, gathering the young a little more closely about, for the purpose of instructing them more thoroughly. Here, too, is a wonderful help, if it is properly employed." We will just state here two objections to this. First, there is no authority in the Book for the church to organize a Sunday school. Another objection is that a false doctrine is almost always, if not always, taught in Sunday schools. Unregenerate persons, who know nothing of spiritual things, are often engaged in teaching the Sunday school classes. They are no more qualified to teach spiritual things than an outlaw is qualified to teach morality. It is outside of his realm. Page 55: "The child needs to be brought into a personal saving knowledge of Christ. Until he arrives at the period of personal responsibility, he is in the kingdom, and it is only by sinning his way out that he gets outside of the kingdom." Jesus said (literal translation), "Except anyone be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom." "Except anyone be born of water, even Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom." -(John 3:3,5). The way one is brought into the natural realm is by being born into it. Just so, the way one is brought into the spiritual realm is by being born into it. One who has been born into the natural realm cannot be unborn and thereby get out of it. Even so, one who has been born into the spiritual realm cannot be unborn and thereby get out. True, a child of God may be rebellious; but that does not unborn him, or put him out of God's family. One who has been born into a natural family may be rebellious; but that does not cause him to be unborn, or put him out of relationship with the family. Page 56: "It is an evangelism which seeks to direct the child from a state of childhood innocence where there is no condemnation upon him because of the absence of a sense of personal guilt, to a state of childhood where a sense of personal sin and guilt is beginning to be experienced, but where surrender to, and faith in, Christ has brought the testimony of saving grace." "According to this, it is not sin which brings condemnation but a sense of personal guilt. It is not the personal guilt which

brings condemnation, but the sense of it. If this is correct, then there could be no condemnation upon a being unless he has a personal sense of it. If he is made aware of it, then it would be so; otherwise not so. This does not seem to us to be very good logic or reasoning. It is simply an incorrect principle. Saul had no personal feeling or knowledge of guilt when persecuting the saints until the Lord, by the direct power of His own speech, made him to know his guilt. He was doing that wicked work "in all good conscience." But he was guilty just the same; and condemnation rested upon him before he knew it. He was made acquainted with the fact after the fact existed. The knowledge of the fact did not make it a fact. Though we have to take issue with the author on this teaching, yet there are many good things in the book. Here is a statement that is especially good, page 41: "Reverence for, and obedience to, the Bible has been one of the secrets of the greatness of the American nation, and the security of the American home, in the past. In the measure that there has been a neglect, or a reversal of this attitude, has the home been impoverished, and the nation morally and spiritually reduced." How true this is. This book has a chapter on the text in **((2:6) (Proverbs 22:6)** "Train up a child in the way he should go, and (even) when he is old, he will not depart from it." It is in treating upon this text that the author brings in the Sunday school. Let us call attention to the fact that the obligation of training up a child is resting upon the parents of the child. The parents are not instructed to send the child to others to be "trained up." To do that is to shift the responsibility upon others than where God has placed it. No promise in the text in that case that the child will not depart from it. The parents who follow the course of sending the child elsewhere for the training thereby become transgressors themselves. The training up of the child is required of the parents. Here is where there has been a great falling down in our nation. Parents have tried to shift the training of the children to others instead of doing the training themselves which God's Book requires., Page 63 is a relation of a story of a father going to sleep and his child wandering in the forest and falling over a precipice, and when the father awoke he found his dead child. This may be a good illustration of parents going to sleep, instead of being awake and doing the training of the child. The child is left to wander around in the teaching done by others. The parent may awake some day and find his child in the vortex of immorality. Better stay awake, and keep your child under your own roof and under your own personal supervision and training, and see that he is not brought under the influence of the inventions of men in the affairs of religion, gotten up under the professed object of "bringing souls to Christ." Worldly religion and so-called Christianity has made more infidels than any other thing. Chapter six in the book is especially good. So is chapter seven. We quote this from chapter seven, page 107: "As this manuscript is being prepared, the people of the United States are trying to find their way back to prosperity. Surely some of the efforts to solve the economic ills of our people have been mere gestures, while others have been absolutely false. Booze has led millions of people from prosperity into poverty, and how can a nation find its way back to prosperity drunk? When, and if, we are able to return to prosperity, it will not be because of strong drink, but despite it." How true this is. Drink never has brought righteousness or prosperity. Instead, it brings debauchery and crime. Dram drinking makes drunkards; and drunkards make widows and orphans. It brings murder, insanity, degredation and shame. It makes paupers, and brings innocent women and children to poverty, rags and starvation. Yet we are told that moderate drinking and the selling of legalized booze will bring prosperity. We are on the downward road to ruin. Nothing but a return to the strict observance of the teaching of God's Word, from a moral point of view, will save our nation from destruction. Lord, help us. C. H. C.

Matthew 4:16-17

---December 5, 1935

Mrs. B. Martindale, of Texas, asked our views on **(Matthew 4:16-17)**, in March, 1931. The text reads, "The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up. From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." If you will read beginning with (Matthew 4:12), you will find that here is a fulfillment of a prophecy of Isaiah. Get your Bible and read **((9:1) (Isaiah 9:1-2))**, in connection with (Matthew 4:12-16) here, and you will find that this is the prophecy of Isaiah concerning the land of Zebulon and Nephthalim. Those lands were in darkness, but when Jesus was there light was there. Then "from that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." This shows that the time was then immediately present when the Lord was to establish His kingdom on earth. The church was set up or established during His personal ministry. He set up the kingdom, just as Daniel prophesied that He would. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 7:15

---December 5, 1935

Brother W. T. Morrisett, Edmond, Okla., asked our views of **(I Corinthians 7:15)** in March, 1931. The text reads, "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace." The apostle does not mean by this expression that a brother or a sister is not under bond of the marriage vow in such a case. If he meant that, then he contradicted the teaching of the Saviour, who plainly taught that fornication is the only cause for which one may put away a companion and marry again. In (I Corinthians 7:11) the apostle plainly says for them to be reconciled. If one departs, then the other is not bound to follow; but they are bound under the law of God to remain in such a state as that they may be reconciled. C. H. C.

Genesis 2:15-17

---December 5, 1935

Virgile Harris, Lindsay, Okla., asked for an explanation of **(Genesis 2:15-17)**, and asked, "Does Eve's eating of the fruit of the tree represent natural death or spiritual death?" and "Did God foreordain or know that Eve would eat of the fruit? and does it represent any free moral agency on that course of hers?" **(Genesis 2:15)** says, "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and keep it." This plainly tells what God put the man into the garden for. He did not put the man into the garden to violate His law. This answers the question as to whether God foreordained that Eve should eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. God knew what they would do; but He did not foreordain or predestinate that they should do what they did. (Genesis 2:17) says, "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." If God foreordained or predestinated that they should eat and then commanded them not to eat, it would be what would be called double dealing. God does not deal that way. Hence, He did not predestinate or foreordain that they should eat of the fruit of that tree. As to free moral agency, we do not know what you mean by that. There is no such thing

that we know anything about. It is only a term men have invented. They acted (both Adam and Eve) freely, without any compulsion from the Lord, in the violation of the law. The death was not spiritual, for they had no spiritual life to lose. They lost all moral standing with God, and the life they lived became poisoned and contaminated with sin. C. H. C.

Elder Newman Gone

---December 19, 1935

On Tuesday, December 3, just as we were ready to go to press with the last issue of The Primitive Baptist, we received the sad news of the death of our dear brother, Elder J. S. Newman, who passed away on Friday morning, November 29. It was sad news to us, and we are sure it was sad news to many-yes, a great many, of the Lord's dear children. A great and good man is gone. He endured much and bore much for the cause that we all love. He has been maligned and persecuted, but he bore it without murmuring or complaining. He went on faithfully declaring the truth, and was able and bold in defense of the truth, even in face to face combat with men of standing and learning in the world. He was a strong man in public debate, and has routed many champions of error in public discussions. Our cause has lost much in the passing of Joseph Sylvester Newman. We grieve for him. Lord, help us to be submissive. We knew that he was growing old, and that he could not stay here many more years; yet we were not prepared for the stroke. He remained active in the service until the end. He returned home from a trip in the service on Monday before his passing on Friday. He traveled and preached and engaged in debates in many states. We will hear his voice no more on earth. He has been on the editorial staff of The Primitive Baptist most of the time for many years. He has sent us many subscribers. He has written much for our columns. His work will be missed. He was a great historian. Perhaps we do not have a man in our ranks now who is better read in church history than he was. May the good Lord bless and sustain the bereaved, is our humble prayer; and may He give us more such true and devoted and faithful men to fill up the ranks. C. H. C.

Jeremiah 2:13

---December 19, 1935

In April, 1931, J. D. Rinehart, Rienzi, Miss., asked for our views on (**Jeremiah 2:13**), which reads, "For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." The Lord said His people had done these things. They forsook the Lord; they departed from His teachings. They forsook His commandments. This is certainly a great evil-for His people to forsake Him. His tender mercies had been extended to them; His rich blessings had been showered upon them; and they forsook Him. As did Israel in ancient times, so do many of His children in this present age of the world. Not only did they forsake the Lord, but they hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns. The Lord was a fountain of living waters. A fountain never runs dry. A fountain is self-sustaining. It needs no outside power or force to sustain it. It is continually springing up, and flows on without cessation. It never ceases to flow. But a cistern must be supplied from an outside source. Then it will go dry; but a broken cistern will not hold water at all. The water is all wasted that may be put into it. How different from a fountain! Yet, God's people often turn from the living streams and from the fountain, and will hew out for themselves broken cisterns that can hold no water. The things they turn to can

give them no benefit whatever. To turn from the true service of God is to forsake the fountain of living waters, where there is joy and peace and blessed consolation, and the soul can drink of that water that comes from heaven, and have the spiritual thirst assuaged and quenched. Then to turn to the inventions of men, and engage in the things in pretended service of God which men have invented, is to hew out broken cisterns that can hold no water. It is a great evil thus to do. May the good Lord help us all to let the cisterns severely alone and to be faithful to Him and to His cause and to His service. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 50

---December 19, 1935

With this issue we close volume fifty of The Primitive Baptist, and once more it falls to our lot to write a little article in closing the volume. We have now rounded out the half century mark in the publication of The Primitive Baptist, Fifty volumes of the publication are completed with this issue. During these fifty years many changes have taken place. Many friends have come and gone. How many of those who were the old folks then are on the stage of action now? Those who are living and old now were the young ones then. We doubt if we have a single subscriber on our list now who was a subscriber when the first issue of this paper was printed and sent out fifty years ago. If there is one, we would be glad that person would write to us. Is there one on the list who has been a subscriber during all these fifty years? While there have been many changes, yet the principles of the doctrine of grace are the same now that they have ever been. Principles are eternal and never change. Many have forsaken those principles; but the principles are the same. Men have despised and endeavored to overthrow and destroy the doctrine of God our Saviour; but it remains the same unvarnished and untarnished truth. Truth may be crushed to earth, but it will rise again, and will continue to shine in effulgent glory throughout all ages. We have tried to contend earnestly for the principles of God's eternal truth, not only during this year of our Lord, 1935, but all along the line. We do not believe that any person on earth can present any article we have ever written that will contradict any other article we have written. We do not feel to deserve any praise for this. We have only tried to stand on the principles of truth all along; and we very well know that truth does not contradict itself.' Truth always harmonizes with itself. We are free to confess that we have made mistakes. It is human to err, and we are only human - just a poor sinner. We trust that we are a saved sinner-a sinner saved by the grace of God. Our only hope of rest when the toils of this life are over is in the free and sovereign and unmerited grace of a crucified and risen Redeemer. Our only hope of a better place beyond this life is in the mercy and grace and love of God. We have believed that the Old Baptists would do their best to maintain and support a publication which stands without fear or favor for the principles upon which the church has stood through all the ages of the past, since our Lord organized His kingdom during His personal ministry while here on earth. That kingdom, or church, we are sure is the Primitive Baptist Church. It is here to stay. He put it on earth to stay until He comes back to earth again in person. He is coming back to gather His jewels home. And when He comes, He will take them all to heaven, in body, to live with Him in eternal glory. He will raise the bodies of all His sleeping saints, and will change them from natural to spiritual. The bodies will then be spiritual bodies. No more suffering or sorrow then. No more darkness; no more distress; no more tears of sorrow to be shed then. No more troubles and sad divisions then. Is such peace and joy ours to have in the sweet by and by? We are hoping for this, if we are not deceived. We beg the Lord still for His mercies, and that He will forgive all our

mistakes and the wrongs which we have committed, and to help us to continue to strive for the better things while we are permitted to stay on earth. If we have done anything which wounded the feelings of any of the Lord's little children, it was unintentional on our part, and we humbly beg their forgiveness. Do not cast us aside because we have not always done as you think we should have done; but please bear with our many imperfections, and help us to strive for better things. May the richest blessings of heaven rest upon each one of you, is our humble prayer. The next issue of the paper will be dated January 2, 1936. Farewell in the Lord. Please remember us in your prayers. C. H. C.

1936

Introduction to Volume 51

---January 2, 1936

Once more it falls to our lot to try to write a few lines by way of introduction to another volume of The Primitive Baptist. This time it is volume fifty-one. Now, what shall we say? We feel to be at an utter loss as to what we should say, or how we should say it. If we knew how, we would just try to re-consecrate ourselves anew to the service of God and to the service of His people. It is still our desire to continue the publication of The Primitive Baptist in defense of the same principles for which it has contended through all the past fifty years. We are sure that the same principles have been advocated and set forth in the columns of this paper from the beginning of its publication by our sainted father. The principles of truth are the same now that they were then, and they were the same then that they were during the personal ministry of the blessed Saviour while He was here on earth. If we are not deceived in our poor heart, we love those principles, and it is our sincere desire to continue to advocate and contend for them. We desire to do this in the right way. We desire to advocate the truth in love. It is our desire to be faithful and true to the Master and to His blessed cause. We are well aware of the fact that in doing this we will incur the displeasure of some. One reason why we are aware of this fact is that we have incurred the displeasure of some in the past. We are sorry to incur the displeasure of any of the Lord's children; but we must confess that we would rather displease them than to displease our loving Saviour. Some have not been pleased, and have censured us, because we would speak out plainly and sound a warning at approaching danger. We could not do otherwise and be true to our Lord. Why will brethren censure us and become offended at us because we give the warning when we see such things? We regret that brethren have done this, but we do not regret trying to be true to our Master. We may not have many more days to spend on earth. Our labors may be almost done. We have no more knowledge of the future than we had one year ago, and we could not look into the future then. The only way we can judge the future is by the past. While we do not know how much longer the Lord may spare us to stay in this old world, or how much longer we may have to labor in the Master's cause here in the world, we are aware of the fact that there are troubles and trials to be met and encountered while we do live. "In every city bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." -[\(\(0:23\) \(Acts 20:23-24\)](#)). It is our desire to shun no

part of the truth. To shun any part of the truth is to be unfaithful to the trust. It is our desire to earnestly contend for the things that make for peace in the Lord's kingdom-the Old Baptist Church. The truth-what the Bible teaches-does not divide the Old Baptists. If every minister in the ranks of the Primitive Baptist Church would "behave himself" in the house of God, and live as the Bible teaches that he should live, and advocate nothing only what the Bible plainly teaches, we would have less trouble in the church. There would not be so many factions and divisions. We humbly pray the Lord to give us faithful and true men, men who are open and frank, and such men as that we may know where to find them and where to place them-men who are not deceivers. We need such men, and we need more of them. Let us pray the Lord to send them. May the good Lord help us, and sustain us by His grace. In conclusion, we humbly ask an interest in the prayers of our readers. And will you help us to conduct The Primitive Baptist in such a way as that it may be for the comfort and benefit of the Lord's dear children, and the advancement of His blessed cause? C. H. C.

Our Special Offer

---January 2, 1936

From time to time during the past we have been making some special offer for subscriptions. One time we sent out a circular letter to persons who had been taking the paper, but whose names had been dropped- many of them having written us that they just did not have the money to pay for the paper. That circular letter asked them to send just what amount they could, and that we would send them the paper for a year. We remember now one poor widowed sister sent us a dime in answer to that circular. We sent her the paper for a whole year for that dime. We have made these special offers for the sole reason that we did not want one of the Lord's dear children to be deprived of reading The Primitive Baptist on account of poverty or misfortune. We were willing and glad to bear the expense and the loss of sending the paper to them in order to try to be of benefit and comfort to the Lord's humble poor. It was our desire to do all we possibly could for their benefit and for their help and for the benefit of the cause of our heavenly Master. We find that we have frequently been imposed upon and wrongly treated on account of the special offers which we have made. This may have been unthoughtedly done by some who have thus injured us. Some have even used some of the propositions, or spoken of them, in such a way as to discourage others and to cause them to not subscribe for the paper. We do not understand why they would do this, as it could not possibly be of any benefit to the one who would thus do. But it has been done. In doing this, they have unwittingly done some injury to the cause-if it is a benefit to the cause for the Lord's little children to read our paper and to have the benefit of the letters of comfort and instruction that go out in its columns every issue. They have hurt the cause and been of more hurt to those poor children of God thus deprived of the privilege and benefit of reading the paper than they have hurt us. Every paper we have sent out on the reduced prices has been sent out at a financial loss. We do not publish the paper for the purpose of making money. All we have ever tried to make is just a living for our family. We have not tried to lay up any estate for them, and do not expect to do so. We have tried to be and do as the apostle admonished, "Having food and raiment, be therewith content." We have done without luxuries and even many necessities trying to do all in our power to send comfort and encouragement out for the Lord's dear children. If we know our own poor heart we love the Lord's dear children, and we love the Master's blessed cause. His service has been our meat and drink for

many years. We now realize that our race is nearly run. We do not regret one single sacrifice we have made. We do not regret the spending of a single penny we have used in trying to get some comfort and encouragement to one of the Lord's little ones. We only trust that when we shall have reached the end of the way we may be able to say with the eminent apostle, "I have fought a good fight; I have kept the faith." But, considering the facts as here stated, that some have used these special offers in a wrong way, we have finally come to the conclusion that it is best for us to not make any more offers of a reduced subscription price after the present offer, as appears elsewhere in this paper, is withdrawn. We cannot afford to publish the paper at a lower price than \$1.50 a year, under present conditions. We furnish more reading matter, for the money, at that price than any other religious paper published. We are thus doing all that we can do, without people using these special propositions to make it appear that we could afford to publish the paper at such a ridiculously low price. It seems that if the paper were published free, some would expect to be paid something to get them to take the paper then. When this special proposition is withdrawn, you need not look for any more offers of a reduction in the price of the paper. Now is your last opportunity to get the benefit of such an offer. We have no idea now that we will ever make such a proposition again. Once again we ask the prayers of our dear brethren and sisters. Pray the Lord to direct us in the right way, and to give us Christian courage and fortitude to walk in that way, and to sustain us by His grace, and enable us to bear all the trials which we may encounter during the few remaining days we have here on earth. May His blessings be showered upon each one of you, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Holiday Remembrances

---January 2, 1936

We would be glad to write a personal letter or card to each one who remembered us during the holidays, but we cannot do so. We appreciate every expression of love and fellowship and friendship which we received, and we received a great many. It fills our poor heart with gratitude and thankfulness to God that we have so many true and faithful and loyal friends. We do not know how we could get along in this old world without friends, faithful and true, and brethren and sisters in the Lord. We do not feel worthy of their love and fellowship and friendship and esteem; but we love them all and appreciate them. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon each one of you, is our humble prayer. Let each one take this as a personal note of friendship and appreciation. Words cannot be found by us to fully convey to you our appreciation of your kind remembrances. With love to all, we remain, yours in love and fellowship, C. H. C.

Matthew 5:40 AND 1 Corinthians 6:1

---January 2, 1936

We have been requested to give our views on **(Matthew 5:40)** and **(1 Corinthians 6:1)**. The verse in Matthew reads: "And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." The teaching of the Saviour in this language is that if one should take from you your coat by force or by unjust means, let him have your cloak also. His humble followers should rather suffer wrong than to do wrong. The expression, "sue thee at the law," implies force or violence. Better let one have the coat and the cloak also rather than engage in force and violence. Turn and read beginning with (Matthew 5:38), and you will see

that violence is the matter under consideration. In **(I Corinthians 6:1)** the apostle says, "Dare any of you, having a matter against a brother, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?" Get your book and read on down to and including (I Corinthians 6:8). The apostle here most positively and plainly condemns such a thing as a brother going to law with a brother. It is here described as a shame. It has always been contrary to and against the rules of the Primitive Baptist Church for any brother to go to law with another brother without the consent of the church. The rule, then, evidently has in it the idea that every other means of settlement should be availed of and used before taking such matters into the courts of the land-and not even then until permission is had from the church. When any brother takes a matter into the civil courts against another brother, he has flagrantly violated the teaching of the apostle in this text and the connecting verses, and has gone in direct opposition to what has always been the rules of the Primitive Baptists. We suppose this is enough for us to say on this line. C. H. C.

What Should Be Done?

---January 2, 1936

A brother has asked us this question: "What should be done in the case where the church ordains a man to preach and he does not preach, but his life is upright?" Well, in the first place a church has no right nor authority to ordain a man to preach unless he does preach. The church cannot make a preacher by ordaining him. Some people seem to think the one and only thing necessary to make a preacher is for the church to ordain him. Ordination does not make a preacher. It only sets a man apart to the work whereunto God has called him-if God has called him to the work. If God has not called him, ordination does not help him any, nor does it help the church. Instead of helping the church, it is an injury to the church and to the cause. It is an effort to put a man into a place where God does not require him to be. God has not made a place for him there, and he will not fit that place. It is an effort to have him stand in some other place than his own. God's requirement is for every man to stand in his own place round about the camp. When you thus put a man in the wrong place by ordination, you are going in flagrant disobedience to the command of God, and you are sure to suffer the consequences. You not only do yourself and the church and the cause of the Master an injury, but likely to do an injury to the man thus ordained. You may make him think God has called him to the work of the ministry, when He has not, and thus you deceive him; and this may cause him to desire to stand in a place other than his own place. If and when a church makes such a mistake as this, it is her indispensable duty to confess her error, confess the mistake, and ask for the return to her of the man's credentials, and withdraw from him the liberty of using the authority the church gave him when she tried to make a preacher of him by ordination. Not every man can preach whose walk is upright. No man can preach the gospel of the Son of God, in the spirit of the gospel, unless God has called him to the work, and bestowed the gift upon him. If a man is "running for preacher," it is usually pretty good evidence that he is mistaken in his thoughts. C. H. C.

W. T. Stegall

---January 16, 1936

We have before us a little paper called Baptist Examiner, published at Ashland, Ky., bearing the name of W. T. Stegall as associate editor. We suppose this is the same Stegall whose post-office was Pontotoc, Miss., and who once had membership with a Primitive Baptist Church somewhere in that part of Mississippi. He was excluded from the Primitive Baptists. We think Elder J. W. Hardwick was pastor of the church. In two of these papers we have before us are articles by Elder Stegall. He makes a challenge to our people, whom he is pleased to call "Hardshells." His whole effort is to prove that no one is saved unless that one has faith in Christ. His contention is that no one can be saved without hearing and believing the gospel. He bases his whole contention on **(Romans 10:14-18)**. He contends that one must believe in Christ, or have faith in Christ, in order to be born again, or in order to be saved. This is the doctrine he was advocating when the Primitive Baptists excluded him. Let us try his contention a little. First, we will quote the language of the apostle, upon which Elder Stegall places so much stress to prove his contention: We begin with (Romans 10:13): "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." - **(Romans 10:13-17)**. If Elder Stegall's contention be true that one must believe in Christ, or believe on the Lord in order to be born again, or in order to be saved, it is also true that one must also call on the Lord in order to be born again; for the apostle says, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." It is just as necessary for one to call on the name of the Lord in order to the saving under consideration by the apostle here as it is for him to believe. The saving the apostle is here considering does not come until one calls on the name of the Lord; and no one calls until after he believes. This is true in the sense of the apostle's teaching here, or the lesson he is teaching. So, Elder Stegall needs to tack on another condition for the sinner to perform in order to be regenerated. Elder Stegall makes the word of God in (Romans 10:17) the written or preached word. This is not correct. The Greek word is *ramah*, and means the speech of God. The faith the apostle is here treating of comes by hearing. But how does hearing come? How does one get the ability to hear? The unregenerate do not have that ability. In speaking to unregenerate sinners Jesus said, "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." - (7) (John 8:47). Such persons who are not of God do not hear (understand) God's words; they cannot hear, and therefore cannot understand. "How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another?" - (John 5:44). This is a stronger way of saying that persons in such a condition cannot believe, and it is the language of Jesus. If they must believe in order to be regenerated, and the Son of God told the truth, then it is impossible for an unregenerated sinner to ever be regenerated. How does one receive the ability to hear, or how does hearing come? It comes by the power of God's speech. God speaks, by the power of His Holy Spirit, to the dead faculties of the soul, and thus He imparts life to the sinner who was, before that, dead in trespasses and sin. In the same way that the Father will raise the dead in the resurrection at the last day, even so the Saviour raises poor sinners now from a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ. See **(John 5:25)** and (John 5:28). Does Elder Stegall expect the Father to send him out on the morning of the resurrection to preach to those who are in their graves, in order that they be resurrected from that dead state? If the Father will not do that, then neither does He send Elder Stegall, or any other

preacher, to preach to unregenerate sinners in order that they be raised out of that state of death into a state of life in Christ. It is the voice of the Son of God that raises out of death into life; it is not the voice of Parson Stegall, or any other Softshell preacher, or any other man or preacher. Being raised out of death into life is the how that hearing comes. They then have the ability, the power, to hear the preacher, and to believe the gospel of Christ, the good news of salvation by the power of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. The gospel message is a spiritual message. One can no more hear a spiritual message without first having spiritual life, than he can hear a natural message without first having natural life. Parson Stegall's doctrine will exclude every infant from the portals of glory who dies in a state of infancy. He would necessarily leave them out, or else he must say that the hour-old infant is capable of believing what he preaches. If one must believe what he preaches in order to be regenerated, then the infant dying at one hour of age would be eternally damned, unless that infant could hear and believe the preaching of Parson Stegall. Or, will he say that God has another plan for the infants, different from that of the mature and sane adult? Parson Stegall is simply advocating the same blasphemous heresy that was invented by Rome and has been advocated by her and her kinsfolk all along the line. It is contrary to God's Word, and is not the original Baptist teaching or doctrine. Rome invented it, and from that doctrine sprang her inventions in missions and machinery for the conversion and salvation of the world. It is the teaching of Romanism. C. H. C.

From Belshazzar to Roosevelt

---January 16, 1936

The above is the title of a book published by the Rail Splitter Press, Milan, Ill. It is the last production of William Lloyd Clark, who spent many years of his life as a publisher and lecturer. He was editor of the Rail Splitter, which paper was, and is, devoted to exposing Roman Catholicism. He was a man who spoke against Romanism, without fear or favor. This book, his last production, contains 207 pages, good clear type. He has not "minced" words in this book. No matter what your political preferences are, this book is worth your reading, and the facts stated and proven are worth considering. If you will but give the work a careful reading, and at the same time endeavor to make the application of things found in the Book of books, it might be worth your while. You may not agree with the author in all that he says, but you may get something worth while. The price is reduced to \$1. Send your order to the Rail Splitter, Milan, Ill. C. H. C.

Radio Sermon

---February 6, 1936

A few nights ago we listened to a sermon over the radio. We did not get the name of the speaker. If we correctly understood the announcement, the broadcast came from some other church by a hookup through Frank Norris' church in Fort Worth. The preacher was strongly urging the unregenerate to get right with God, and to get saved before it is everlastingly too late. He told a number of things which might happen to one who is unsaved so that his salvation would be utterly impossible-it would be everlastingly too late for him to ever be saved. One thing he told his listeners that would make it absolutely impossible for them to ever be saved was that they might lose their right mind; they might become insane; their reason might be dethroned. And he said, "When reason is dethroned your opportunity for heaven is gone." We do not know what denomination this man is identified with,

nor do we know his name. We failed to get his name. But as we understood he came through the church of Frank Norris, we suppose he is of the Missionary Baptist or Fullerite persuasion. He is not a Primitive Baptist-of this we are fully aware. But from his discourse and statement we get the idea that he holds that God cannot save an insane person; God cannot save a person whose reason is dethroned. What a poor idea this man has of the God of the Bible; the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob; the God of Israel. We thought of the two who were possessed of devils that we read about in **(Matthew 8:28)**," And when He was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met Him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass that way." Here were two persons who were so fierce and so insane that "no man might pass that way." Here were two fellows that no preacher could get to. The preacher could not get to them by radio in that day. They had no radios then. They were in a deplorable state-so deplorable that they could not be reached by the preachers or any of the devices of men. And according to what the preacher said over the radio, the Lord Himself could not save them. Their reason was dethroned, and their opportunity for heaven was forever gone. It is true that so far as the efforts of men are concerned they had no opportunity for heaven. So far as the works and efforts of men are concerned, no man would have any opportunity for heaven. "With men this is impossible." With men it is impossible to be saved. "But with God all things are possible." It is not impossible with God for men to be saved. While, with these two lunatics," no man might pass that way," yet the Lord was equal to the occasion. Jesus passed that way. He did not do so accidentally. He passed that way on purpose. He always did His work on purpose. He intends to do what He does before He does it. He intended to pass that way. He had a work to do there which men could not do. It was a work that the preacher could not do. "No man," not even the preacher, "might pass that way." But they were not beyond the reach of the Lord. Though they were in such a deplorable condition, and they were so wild that "no man might pass that way," yet their "opportunity for heaven" was not "forever gone." The God of the Bible is able to save the idiot; He is able to save the poor beggar; He is able to save the poor heathen; he is able to save the infant, even the youngest; He is able to save the old man, the young man, the old woman, the young woman; He is able to save in every age and in every clime; He is able to save in every station and every condition of life, even to the uttermost parts of the earth-in all the habitable parts of the world. If God could not save the poor heathen, the condition of that poor preacher we heard talking over the radio would be deplorable indeed. What ignorance displayed over the radio! But such rot suits the world, and they pay a big price for it. The truth does not suit their taste. Lord, pity such ignorance. C. H. C.

Pool Halls

---February 6, 1936

We have been asked what we think about a member of a Primitive Baptist Church playing pool, or having anything to do with the running of a pool hall. Well, we do not think it very becoming in a professed follower of the Lord to engage in pool playing, or to frequent pool halls. Neither do we think they should own or operate one, or have one operated. It has an appearance of evil. In our young days pool rooms were almost always run in connection with saloons. Such places were not considered as the best in those days. The influence is not good. The world expects better of the Old Baptists than they do of other people, and we should not

disappoint them. The members of the Lord's kingdom are instructed to "abstain from every appearance of evil," and we should strive to do that. C. H. C.

John 13:14-15,17

---February 6, 1936

In October, 1931, Brother J. H. Hamrick, Unadilla, Ga., asked us to give our understanding of the signification of the words ought and should in **(John 13:14-15)**, and to explain what things are referred to in (John 13:17). Turn and read the verses. We will not take space to copy them here. The word ought means to be bound in duty or by moral obligation. The word should has almost the same meaning as there used. It is given in Webster as a synonym of ought-that is, the words may frequently be used as synonymous, or as meaning the same thing. They both express obligation. Ought commonly suggests duty or moral constraint. Should usually expresses the obligation of fitness, propriety, expediency and the like. In (John 13:17) the things meant are the things the Lord commands or requires. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." That is, if you know and do the things the Lord commands and has commanded, happiness follows as a result. Happiness is here promised to those who do the things the Lord requires of them. Read **(James 1:25)** in connection with this. C. H. C.

First Baptists in Mississippi

---February 20, 1936

We have before us a copy of the Baptist and Commoner, edited by Ben M. Bogard, of Little Rock, dated January 27, 1936. This seems to be a special Mississippi edition of that paper. On page 3 there appears some history of the early Mississippi Baptists, by Elder E. C. Gillentine, of Laurel, Miss. The author tries hard to make it appear that those early Baptists of Mississippi were identical with the present day anti-Board Missionaries-the Bogard stripe of Missionaries. The writer states the matter correctly that those early Baptists did not affiliate with boards and conventions. There were none to affiliate with. He states correctly that the first Baptist Church constituted was called Cole Creek, and was near Natchez, Miss. He states that the first association was the Mississippi Association, organized in 1807, which is also correct. But he took particular pains not to tell the readers the doctrine that the association stood upon in its organization. We find by consulting Griffin's History of the Mississippi Baptists that this church was called Salem, and was located on Cole's Creek, in Jefferson County. Elder Gillentine says the church was later called Salem. This history by Griffin was published in 1853-eighty-three years ago. Pretty old book. On page 74 we find the following language: It will be necessary, here, to take some notice of Dr. James Mullen, a Baptist preacher, who moved into the territory about 1797. The Doctor preached and contended for the general atonement system, which was so contrary to regular Baptist doctrine, and the articles of faith, on which the Baptist churches in the territory had been constituted, that he was unable to obtain membership. He, however, succeeded in drawing away from the churches some followers. But, after an unavailing effort for several years, not being able to realize his expectations, he left the territory, without ever constituting his adherents into a church. How did our author (Griffin) know about this matter? Was it hearsay with him? Let us see about that. On page 75 he says: The foregoing information was obtained principally from the writings of Joseph Erwin, who was born in Rowan county, N. C., in 1774, and emigrated to the

vicinity of Natchez, in 1783. He was a member of the first Baptist Church ever constituted in the Mississippi territory, and was a delegate for forming the first association. He has been a member ever since, and is now living in Holmes county, and enjoying as good health as is usual for his age. What information do we gain from this? Here was an eye witness that a preacher who advocated the doctrine of a general atonement could not get membership in this first church that was organized on Cole's Creek, near Natchez, Miss., in 1794. Joseph Erwin moved to that country from North Carolina in 1783, eleven years before that first church was organized or constituted. A man preaching the doctrine of universal atonement could not get membership with that first Baptist Church, organized in the state, or the other churches which were soon after that also constituted in that territory. Who ever heard of such a thing as a man not being able to get membership with these modern so-called Baptists because he preached the doctrine of a general atonement? That general atonement doctrine among the regular order of Baptists was an invention of Puller, Carey & Co. But this man could not get membership in these old churches of that day and section because he advocated that doctrine. We wonder why Elder Gillentine did not tell his readers about this? If he knew about it, he knew it would not do to tell it. That would disprove the very thing he wanted the reader to believe was the truth. Joseph Erwin was still living, at the age of 79 years, when Griffin's History was published. Griffin had a living witness to the truth. Those early Mississippi Baptists were not modern Softshells. But here is something more from the pen of Joseph Erwin, written in 1839. On page 76 he says: Well, another Babel or Castle built in the air, was the Mississippi Baptist State Convention; when and where all the churches belonging to the different associations must annually send up their delegates, with their pecuniary remittances to support theological schools, for the purpose of educating young men in and for the ministry. After the same had progressed a little, and got so it looked like it might stand on its legs, its features and forms could be more minutely discovered. And then the old Regulars, or some of them, did not like its shapes. They saw the impropriety of such a line of conduct-that it was not congenial with or to the gospel plan-believing that God called and qualified His ministers for and to the work. And now down comes the building to the ground, because it could not live without money. The Old School boys being now twice bit, began' to be a little more on their guard, and to stand aloof to things which they did not understand. Well, from some part of the state in pours the general atonement doctrine, with its multifarious doctrines, that Christ tasted death for every man equally alike, that all mankind are in a salvable state. The old Regulars opposed that doctrine strenuously, believing it to be false when weighed in the balance of the sanctuary. The Missionary System with all its multifarious train, were pressed upon the churches. But the old Regulars cannot submit to such measures, not believing them to be apostolic. My remarks turn particularly on the above mentioned associations. There are others ' of recent date, where the isms prevail abundantly, with their gigantic strides. The Primitive Baptist Association to which I belong has closed her doors against the above train of speculative notions, or moneyed institutions of the day; and I hope the day is not far distant, when all God's children will listen with attention to that solemn and pathetic invitation, "Come out of her, my people." Here we have it plainly that these original Baptists of Mississippi would not have the doctrine that these modern Softshells advocate. Are these "Blowhard" Softshells the same as those old Baptists of Mississippi? They are no more alike than swamp mud is like pure gold or a diamond. Yes, the Mississippi Association was organized in 1807 -the first Baptist Association organized in the State. Joseph Erwin was a member of the first Baptist Church organized in the State and was a delegate for forming this first Baptist Association organized in the

State in 1807. We already have from his pen above that these Baptists would not have the doctrine these modern Softshells now advocate. That doctrine was advocated by a man who came among them at that early date, but he could not get membership in any of the churches. But what was the doctrine upon which this old association was organized or constituted? The fourth article of their faith reads as follows: We believe in the everlasting love of God to His people; in the eternal unconditional election of a definite number of the human family to grace and glory. How does that article of faith agree with these modern money-hunters? Do they preach that doctrine? Do they preach anything that even sounds like it? No; a thousand times, no. They ridicule and vilify and slander the Primitive Baptists today because they do preach the sentiment and the doctrine contained in and set forth by that article of faith. The Primitive Baptists stand today upon that same eternal truth. The Missionary so-called Baptists will assert that if that doctrine is the truth it bids a premium on sin and makes God meaner than the devil. But let us have another article of the faith of these old Baptists. Article 6 reads: We believe all those who were chosen in Christ, before the foundation of the world, are in time effectually called, regenerated, converted and sanctified; and are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation. These modern Softshells tell us that this doctrine that God chose persons or people in Christ before the foundation of the world is heresy; that it makes God unjust; that it does not give everybody a chance; that it makes God meaner than the devil. Shame on a people who will so denounce the doctrine those old Baptists advocated, and then have the brass and the gall to try to make it appear to the readers in this day that they are the same people! You need not say that these modern Softshells have not so denounced this doctrine. We have it in, black and white from their own papers. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron." -(I Timothy 4:1-2). "And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." - (Revelation 18:2-4). May the good Lord help His little children to see the truth and to come out from error. C. H. C.

Five Smooth Stones

---February 20, 1936

In June, 1933, Brother M. R. Kuykendall, of Fulton, Miss., asked what we think the five smooth stones represent, which David took from the brook when he went to meet Goliath in battle. We think they represented the five fundamental principles of the doctrine of God our Saviour-eternal, personal, and unconditional election and predestination to salvation of all who will ever be saved; special atonement; direct and immediate and effectual work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration; final preservation of all the saints in grace to glory; and the final resurrection of the dead at the last day. In combatting error one needs to keep and have all these truths together; he may not use them all, but he needs to keep them all in mind. David did not use all of them on Goliath; he used only one, but he had all of the

truth. This is the way we have thought to apply this, though we may be wrong about it. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 11:19

---February 20, 1936

We have received a request twice, quite a while ago, from Brother J. T. Monfort, then of Buena Vista, Ga., now of Columbia, Ga., for our views of **(I Corinthians 11:19)**, which reads, "For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." This text has been used to endeavor to prove that God determined or predestinated that there should be heresies introduced and advocated among them in order that His true disciples be made manifest. This is not the teaching of the apostle at all in this text, nor does he teach that idea in any other place. The true and correct meaning of the word translated heresies in this text is strictly a choice or option; hence, a sect, faction; by implication, discord, contention. See Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon. There is no better authority on the definition of the words used by the inspired writers in the original language. Now, the question arises why must there be a choice or option, a sect or faction, or discord or contention among them? Read the preceding and some of the following verses and you will see that there had been and were departures from the true teaching of the Lord, especially in regard to the Lord's Supper. Some true followers of the Lord must oppose all departures. The introduction of departures in the Lord's kingdom, either in doctrine or practice, must always result in discord and contention, and hence result in divisions and factions. C. H. C.

2 Kings 20:1-7 AND Job 14:5

---February 20, 1936

In July, 1933, Brother R. A. Ford, of Harrisburg, Ark., asked us to harmonize **((Ki 20:1) (II Kings 20:1-7)** with **((Job 14:5) (Job 14:5)**. The text in Kings reads, "In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amos came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live. Then he turned his face to the wall, and prayed unto the Lord, saying, I beseech thee, O Lord, remember now how I have walked before thee in truth and with a perfect heart, and have done that which is good in thy sight. And Hezekiah wept sore. And it came to pass, afore Isaiah was gone out into the middle court, that the word of the Lord came to him, saying, Turn again, and tell Hezekiah the captain of my people, Thus saith the Lord, the God of David thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears: behold, I will heal thee: on the third day thou shalt go up unto the house of the Lord. And I will add unto thy days fifteen years; and I will deliver thee and this city out of the hand of the king of Assyria: and I will defend this city for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake. And Isaiah said, Take a lump of figs. And they took and laid it on the boil, and he recovered." The text in Job reads, "Seeing his days are determined, the number of his months are with thee, thou hast appointed his bounds that he cannot pass." This expression of Job cannot be construed to mean that each man has just so many days to live on earth, because the Lord has determined that each man shall live just so many days, and no more. That construction upon that language could not be harmonized, as we see it, with the language above in Kings regarding Hezekiah. But man's days are numbered in the sense that the bounds are set so that man cannot pass over the bounds. Let us

read, just here, David's language in **((0:10) (Psalms 90:10) (90:10)**, "The days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away." Here we have it that "the days of our years are threescore and ten." This does not mean that no man can live longer than that, or that no man does live longer than that. Not many do live longer than that. We may say that is the average old age. But some live to be a number of years older. We received a note recently from Elder John M. Thompson, Tipton, Ind., a man who is much loved among our people, that he was 91 years old last September. By reason of strength, which the Lord mercifully gave him, he has lived twenty-one years more than the average old age already. So the Lord gave strength to Hezekiah, and healed him, and his days were prolonged. Without the Lord's intervention, and healing, and giving strength, he would not have recovered. Sometimes we have seen people so low in sickness that no one could see how in the world they could ever recover, and yet they did. The Lord in mercy intervened, gave strength. But the old human machine will wear out and finally go to the grave. But the Lord knows where the bodies of His saints lie, and the Lord Jesus will come back to earth again some day for them, and He will raise them and change them and make them immortal, and they will see Him as He is and be like Him. We are hoping for that. C. H. C.

Elder Stegall Heard From

---March 5, 1936

In our issue of January 16 we commented on an article in the Baptist Examiner from Elder W. T. Stegall. The elder seems to be somewhat ruffled at our comments, or at us. We have a letter from him in regard to it. The following is his letter in full just as he wrote it: Pontotoc, Miss., Route 1, Box 60, Feb. 9, 1936. Dear Brother Casey: I did not know, until last Thursday, through a letter, forwarded to me, from J. H. Keaton, Huntington, W. Va., of, to say the least of it, your seemingly unkind sarcastic attack on me on the front page of "The Primitive Baptist" of Jan., 16, 1936. I went to Pontotoc (8 miles from my home) yesterday, and borrowed a copy of it, from a sister up there. On consulting with some fine Old Baptists up there about it, who know that your attack on me therein is false, and a misrepresentation of what I have been preaching and writing; suggested that I first write you, and give you an opportunity to correct it in "The Primitive Baptist," which it seems to me you ought to be willing to do, before I replied to you in the "Baptist Examiner. So as there is sometimes so much room for misunderstanding, I have taken the time, and gone to the trouble and taken special pains, to copy an extract from an essay that I have recently written, which I hope to have published in tract form, entitled: "The Absolute Sovereignty of God's Holy Will and Abject Bondage of Man's Carnal Will Versus Free Moral Agency and Accountability of Man in or as to His Own Eternal Salvation or Damnation," also an extract from a letter I wrote to Eld. Lytle Burns, 406 Viola St., Florence, Ala. dated Jan., 30, 1936, which, it seems to me, ought to show you clearly, that I do not believe that an unregenerate sinner has to hear the gospel of Christ and believe it, in order to induce God to born him again, and that I do not believe at all in conditional salvation. All of my writings, fairly construed, certainly prove beyond a doubt that your accusations against me in said attack, are false, and a misrepresentation. If you have been informed by anyone that they are true, they have simply falsified to you. I feel sure that Elders J. D. Holder and J. W. Hardwick, will not affirm that they ever heard me preach conditional salvation on the part of the unregenerate sinner. If you wish to know

the facts, if you do not already know them, read my articles that have been published in The Messenger of Zion and The Advocate and Messenger.' Elders N. T. Easley of Stewart, Miss, and J. M. Palmertree of Walnut Grove, Miss., two of the oldest ministers among Old School Baptists and great and good men, who sincerely desire in their hearts, to be fair and just, will, I feel sure, tell you, or write you, if asked, that I never in their presence preached, or argued any such heresy as you accuse me of. I denounce it as a falsehood, and now you certainly ought, since you have thus attacked me, to be interested enough to investigate the facts to see if your accusations against me is true, and if not, be man enough, and honest enough to retract them in "The Primitive Baptist" in which they were made. I will wait a few days, to see what you will do about it, before replying to you in "The Baptist Examiner." I would be glad you would write me a personal letter about it if you wish. If I know my heart, I want to do right, and be fair and just with you, as I desire you to be with me. God certainly will not bless us in slandering and butchering each other to the detriment of His bleeding cause. Yours in good hope behind the blood of the everlasting Covenant. W. T. Stegall. Pontotoc, Miss. Route 1, Box 60. P. S. As much as I have written in The Messenger of Zion for the last seven years, against conditional election and salvation, I was astounded when I read your attack on me. Surely you did not do it ignorantly, if you did, then you are to be pitied, and if I knew that you did, I could feel much better toward you. W. T. S. Elder Stegall, as the reader will observe, is wrought up because we charged that he advocated a conditional system of eternal salvation. Perhaps he does not intend to advocate such a system. We are sorry that we did not keep the article upon which we based our comments. In that article, as well as other articles which he has written, he has contended that no one is born again where the gospel is not preached. His contention is, if we understand him, that divine life is imparted through the proclamation of the gospel; that no one is regenerated where the gospel is not preached; that gospel preaching is necessary in order to a saving faith in Christ Jesus. If this does not involve the idea of a conditional salvation, then we do not know what would involve that. We may be as ignorant as Elder Stegall intimates. But whether we be as mean or as ignorant as he intimates, if none are saved where the gospel is not preached, then no infants or idiots can be saved, for they cannot be reached through the gospel. That is what got Elder Stegall tangled up with our people when he had membership with them, as we understand it. Elder Stegall sent us a copy of some of his writing, as mentioned in above letter. If we know what words mean he has said some things in this writing which cannot be harmonized with what he advocated in the article we replied to. Not only so, but there are some statements in this writing sent us which are contradictory with themselves, if we can understand simple language. Here is one: "A man naturally dead to natural things cannot possibly hear, believe in and accept any natural truth whatsoever; just so, a person spiritually dead to spiritual things cannot possibly hear, believe, or accept any spiritual truth whatever, and all Scripture confirms it as true." If this is true, and it is, then it follows that no sinner can be regenerated through gospel preaching. Gospel preaching has nothing whatever to do with regeneration, or being born again. In order that one be regenerated through gospel preaching, it would be necessary for that person to hear the gospel before he was regenerated. But Elder Stegall says one dead in sins cannot hear it-and truthfully, too. Then, if the unregenerate cannot hear the gospel, they are not regenerated through the gospel-they are regenerated without the gospel, if regenerated at all. But Elder Stegall continues right on with this expression: "That is why one must be born again, and given eternal life, and be effectually and irresistably brought by the drawing and bringing power of the Holy Spirit and divine truth, into the saving knowledge of Christ, as effectually revealed in the gospel to the one thus being

operated upon, before they can truly believe in and accept Him, because of, and not in order to; all of which is the work of God on them and in them, and, entirely and altogether of His super-abounding sovereign grace and mercy." Here he has truth, connected with the gospel, tacked on to and in connection with the work of regeneration. He makes both the work of the Spirit and divine truth necessary in regeneration. Then he quotes the Saviour's language in **(John 6:47)** and inserts comments as follows: "He that believeth hath (not going to get it, provided he as a dead man will not shut his eyes and ears to it, and will decide to hear and believe, and receive it when he believes) eternal life." The text here proves that one who hears the gospel is one who has already been born of God. He was born of God before he heard it. If he was born of God before he heard it, he was born of God without it. Then he quotes **(John 5:24)**, and inserts comments as follows: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him who sent me, hath (not is dead and will receive it when he believes) everlasting life, and cometh not into judgment, but has passed out of death into life." According to this text the man or person who hears the gospel is one who has already been regenerated, has already been born of God. Then why try to mix the gospel up in this work of regeneration? One must be regenerated in order that the gospel reach him. If one must be regenerated in order that the gospel reach him, as this text, as well as others, proves, then God does not use the gospel in regenerating persons. A saving knowledge and faith in Christ does not come through the gospel; but one must have that before he can be reached through or by the gospel. God does not reach them in the work of regeneration through preaching. If He does, then that involves the idea that their eternal salvation is conditional. Elder Stegall may not argue that it is conditional, as he did not in this writing sent; yet he involves himself in this dilemma, as we see it. We could quote a lot more from this writing, but this is sufficient to show that while he argues in this writing that salvation is not conditional, yet he involves himself in inconsistency. When we received the above we involuntarily thought of some experience we had soon after we moved to Thornton. There were some goats wandering around town every day and night, getting into yards and bothering folks. They would get into our yard, too. One night just before we retired we heard them in the yard. Wife ran out the back way to frighten them away. We said, "Wait, I will scare them away." We turned and went through the house, picking up a gun as we went. We went on out on the front porch, raised the gun and fired, thinking to frighten them away. Immediately we heard the loudest and worst squalling we ever heard "in our born days." We do not say Elder Stegall is a goat, for we believe he is a deluded child of God. We just thought of that incident. Well, that goat business was funny to our wife-the way we did, but it was not funny to us then. May the Lord bless you, Elder Stegall, and we pray that you may be able to see the whole truth more clearly. But, please do not bother our people with your idea that the gospel has any place in God's work of regeneration. C. H. C.

Elder Fisher Passed Away

---March 5, 1936

On the morning of February 15, we received a card, which will be found elsewhere in this paper, from Elder O. Strickland bearing the sad news of the passing of Elder J. H. Fisher at 5 o'clock on Thursday morning, February 13. It was a sad stroke to us. We dearly loved Elder John H. Fisher. For several months we had entertained a special desire to go to see him. At different times we stopped our work and looked up train and bus connections as best we could from our place to Newcastle, desiring

to make a trip just to see and visit Brother Fisher. At last we wrote him he might make some appointments for us for a few days, that we wanted to go to see him. He responded at once with a list of appointments for three weeks, or a little more, the appointments to begin in about two or three days after the last hearing from him. It seemed to be impossible for us to leave home that quick to be gone that long. Some things had to be done in the way of preparing manuscript for the paper, and such like work, before we could leave for that long a stay. So we just moved the appointments up for a month, and let them stand as Brother Fisher had arranged them, with that one exception. We had to do this or fail to meet some of them-make the trip shorter. So, after much thought, this is what we did-just moved the dates up. But now, we are sorely and grievously disappointed. We will not get to see Brother Fisher. We are just heartbroken. Perhaps the last thing this dear servant did in the way of service was to arrange this list of appointments for us. Before this paper gets to the readers, we will, if not providentially prevented, be on the trip trying to fill the appointments this dear servant of God arranged for us. We expect to start on the journey with a heavy heart and a bowed down head. It is some comfort to us to believe that when he arranged the appointments he prayed to God to bless our going to the comfort of His children and to the good of His cause. Lord, grant it. Brethren, especially the brethren in the ministry, will you be with us as much as you can on this trip-as many of you as possibly can? And each one please pray the Lord that we may be enabled to speak in such a way as to be a blessing to the cause of the Master. Elder Fisher was a true man. He was not a meddler. He was plain and quiet and unassuming. We will miss his writings in the paper, and we will miss the work he did for the paper. May the Lord grant to give us more such men. Many of our old faithful soldiers are being called home. Not long until others of us will go. Farewell, precious brother. And may the Lord bless and comfort and sustain his dear wife and all his loved ones, is our prayer. C. H. C.

A False Accusation

---March 19, 1936

On September 24, 1935, a clipping was received in our office from the Bel Air Times, published in Bel Air, Md., which was an article signed by W. W. Linkous, under the heading, "Discusses the Baptist Religious Denomination and the Split." We were requested to pay some attention to the statements contained in the article. Our wife opens all the mail coming into the office, and such as requires our personal attention is laid aside for us to attend to it as we can get to it. We are just now getting to this. We do not know really that the writer of the article is worth the attention and the space in our paper that it will take for his article and a reply to the same; but for the satisfaction of some Primitive Baptists in that section of the country, as well as elsewhere, we will copy the part of his article just as it appeared in the paper, capitalization, spelling, punctuation, and all, which has special reference to the Primitive Baptists, and will pay some respects to the same. The gentleman says: My father was a primitive Baptist Preacher and my brother also, and I was born among Baptists and raised up among them, therefore I should know something about them. There are several kinds of Baptists too numerous to mention here and I wish to say to all Baptist people that should read this article that if I make any mistakes I want them to correct me. Of course, it is a well-known fact that almost all the Baptists in this county are from the south either

North Carolina or Virginia and, as far as I'm concerned, proud to be numbered among them. The primitive Baptists or hard shells as they are nicknamed believe in Election and predestination, that is that each and every individual that is born into this world is born for Hell or Heaven and those that are born for Hell, will go there, worlds without end, no matter how much praying they may do or how good they may live. And those born for Heaven will get there no matter how much meanness they may do. Almost seventy years ago or shortly after the war between the states some good people began to think better and conceived the idea that men and women went to Heaven or Hell, according to the way they lived in this world and that Christ gave his life for all who was willing to give up their sinful lives and follow him and that not a single soul was left without a chance to be saved if they would only look to him as their savior. So there was a division among them and a split followed. The old side still keeping their name of primitive Baptists and the new side naming themselves regular or union Baptists, this being the same group who held this meeting. The little group of believers began to prosper and grow until now by reading the minutes of proceedings of their work we find there are several different associations corresponding with each other. REMARKS The first thing we wish to call attention to is this statement: "I wish to say to all the Baptist people that should read this article that if I make any mistakes I want them to correct me." Does the gentleman mean that? Was he sincere when he made that statement? If so, why did he not stand corrected when he was corrected? Now, do not deny that you were called on, and that you were corrected, and that you still insisted that you correctly stated matters. If you do, we might prove it on you-we have the proof all right. After being told, you still contended that the Primitive Baptists preach and advocate what you accuse them of in that article. But you misrepresented them. They do not preach what you say they do. They never did preach it. You say your father preached for them until he died. Then you have slandered your dead father; for your father never preached what you say Primitive Baptists preach. Not only has the gentleman slandered his father, but he has made a grand display of his ignorance. Poor soul! He wants folks to think he is intelligent and smart; but we would not miss it far if we were to say that he is as ignorant as a Hottentot. Here is a sample of his wonderful intelligence: "The Primitive Baptists or Hardshells, as they are nicknamed, believe in predestination and election" -but what is election and predestination? Sure, the Primitive Baptists believe in election and predestination. But what is election and predestination? Here is what this great "Solomon" says it is: "That is, that each and every individual that is born into this world is born either for hell or heaven, and those that are born for hell will go there, worlds without end, no matter how much praying they may do or how good they may live. And those born for heaven will get there, no matter how much meanness they may do." Now is that not a wonderful definition of election and predestination? We wonder if this great and wonderful Linkous has begun the little task of making a new dictionary-one just for his own use! Shades of Demosthenes, Cicero, Solomon and Paul! What a wonderful scholar we have over in Maryland! Is it not a wonder of wonders that he has remained in such obscurity for these years! Is it not passing strange that the people have not learned about such a wise man being so near the seat of government of the Union, and all marched together and had him placed at the head of the government? It is a wonder Roosevelt has not called him in long before now and put him at the head of his great "brain trust!" Surely if some "wise guy" will get an audience with Mr. Roosevelt and get him to read the wonderful production from the pen of this great "fountain of wisdom" he will go at once to interview this great man, and get him into his cabinet at once-and put him up as "head over all things" to this great nation of ours. Well, say, it is funny. Primitive Baptists do not believe people are born into

this world for either heaven or hell. Man was not put here in this world for either heaven or hell. Primitive Baptists believe on this just what the Bible says about it. "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." -Acts xvii. 26. Man was created and placed here to dwell on the earth, and not for either heaven or hell. This one man, one blood, brought death and ruin upon himself by his own transgression. He violated God's just and holy law, and he did that without compulsion; he did it of his own will; he was not deceived. Eve was deceived, but Adam was not. "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." - **(I Timothy 2:14)** "For the wages of sin is death." -(Romans 6:23). Sin is the transgression of the law. **{(I John 3:4)}** Wages is what one gets for what he does. What man did was that he transgressed the law; he sinned; what he got for it, and what he gets for it, is death. Man is not only a transgressor of God's law, but he is a wilful transgressor; he transgresses willingly or wilfully. One command of God is that "thou shalt not bear false witness." - (Matthew 19:18). A false witness is one who testifies that a thing is true which is not true. This fellow Linkous testifies that a thing is true which is not true, and we suppose he has no desire or inclination to correct the statement. The reader may judge the rest of the matter, without it being necessary for us to mention what these facts show. In a state of nature, as all men stand related to Adam and under the law, all are condemned by and under the law. They are justly condemned, for the law was just. "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." -(Romans 3:19). "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." -**(Romans 3:23)**. "For we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." -(Romans 3:9). Here we have it very plainly taught that the whole race is under sin, and justly condemned under the just law of God, and for the plain and simple reason that the just law of God was and is wilfully violated; and man is the transgressor. Without the intervention of divine mercy and grace without the intervention of the work of the eternal God - all are eternally lost. Man could not remove his own guilt; and his guilt must be removed, and satisfaction rendered to divine justice, if man is ever saved, or if he ever lives with God in heaven. Not one sinner of all the race could ever enter heaven without that. What is election? Linkous says Primitive Baptists believe in election. What is it? It is the act of choosing; choice; selection. See Webster. Did God elect anybody? Did He choose anybody? Did He make a selection? Linkous denies that God made any selection or choice, and contends that the whole thing rests-not upon what God does or has done, but-solely upon the work and choice the sinner makes. What he advocates is either what the inspired Book teaches, or else it is not. If it is what the Book teaches, then it is the doctrine of God. If it is not what the Book teaches, then it is a doctrine of men or devils. Now, let us see what the Book teaches about this matter. Did God elect, select, or choose anybody from among the posterity of Adam? Answer: "According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love." -(Ephesians 1:3). Here the inspired apostle most emphatically states that persons were chosen before the foundation of the world. The expression, "before the foundation of the world" literally means, in our present day English, "before the ages of time began." Hence, before the ages of time began, and before persons existed, God chose persons; He selected them; He made choice of them. He did this that they might be holy and without blame before Him in love. He did not choose them because they were holy and without blame; not because they made a good choice, as Linkous teaches; but the end and design of His choice of them was to make them holy and without blame before Him. They are made holy and without blame before God as a result of God's choice. Without that choice not

one would ever be made without blame before God in love. "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God." -((Th 1:4) (I Thessalonians 1:4). Paul here said, "Knowing * * * your election of God." Did he know it? He either did, or he did not. If he did not, then he was either mistaken or deceived, or else he falsified. Did he lie about it, and say he knew it, when he did not? Was he mistaken about it? If he was mistaken, he was not inspired to pen the language. If he knew they were the elect of God, did he not also know that the doctrine of election is the truth? "Knowing your election of God." They did not do the electing, the selecting, the choosing; but they were the ones elected; they were the ones chosen; they were selected. God did the choosing; the electing; the selecting. Their election was of God, not of themselves. Paul knew that this doctrine of election was the truth, and the Primitive Baptists teach it. Linkous and his stripe do not teach it. We, therefore, teach the doctrine of God, and the other fellow is teaching the doctrine of the devil. What Linkous (and his stripe) teaches gives the lie to the doctrine of God, to the doctrine taught by Paul, as plainly left on record by him, and as now taught by the Primitive Baptists. Well, we prefer to be on the Lord's side, rather than lined up with Linkous and his theological daddy-the devil. Elect means chosen; taken by preference from among two or more; chosen as the object of mercy or divine favor; set apart to eternal life. See Webster. Does God have a chosen people? Does God have a people whom He has taken by preference from among others? Does He have a people who were chosen by Him as the objects of mercy or divine favor? Does He have a people whom He has set apart to eternal life? Answer: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" -(**Romans 8:33**). Here the inspired apostle tells us that God has an elect; they are God's elect. They are God's chosen ones; God took them by preference from among others; He has made choice of them as the objects of His mercy or divine favor; He made choice of them and set them apart to eternal life. Yes; Primitive Baptists believe and teach what God has said by His inspired penman. But they do not believe or teach what Linkous, and others of the devil's cohorts, say they teach. What about predestination? Linkous says Primitive Baptists believe in the doctrine of predestination. Is that doctrine the truth? It either is, or it is not the truth. How about it? And what does predestination mean? It means to "limit or mark out beforehand; to design definitely beforehand, ordain beforehand, predestine." -Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon. It means "to appoint or ordain beforehand by divine purpose or decree." -Webster. Did God purpose beforehand to save anybody? If He did, the doctrine of predestination is the truth. If the doctrine of predestination is not the truth, then God did not purpose beforehand to save anybody. Linkous contends that the doctrine of predestination is not the truth. If his contention is the truth, then God did not purpose beforehand to save anybody. If God did not purpose beforehand to save anybody, then He does not save anybody -or if He does, He does it without any intention beforehand of doing so. If He saves without intending beforehand to do so, and yet does save somebody, He does it accidentally or against his will or intention-one or the other. If Linkous believes God saves anybody, we wonder which way He thinks He saves them- whether accidentally, or against His will or intention! Did God predestinate anybody unto the adoption of children, or unto eternal life? "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself." -(Ephesians 1:5). Here were some people whom the Lord marked out beforehand to the adoption of children; they were appointed beforehand by divine purpose or decree to be adopted into the heavenly family. Yes, if the Bible is true, the doctrine that God predestinated to save a portion of the human race is true; and the Bible is true. Any doctrine contrary to that is false, no matter if Linkous does deny what the Bible teaches. To deny the Bible or its plain teaching is infidelity. Linkous denies the plain teaching of the Bible. Then what is Linkous?

Linkous admits that the doctrine of the Primitive Baptists is the old doctrine; but a few fellows, like Linkous, got wise above what was written; they learned better. Hence, they learned that the teaching of the Bible is not true. Wonder where they got the information. Did they get it from an almanac? How wonderfully smart and intelligent such fellows are-in their own estimation. The poor fellow says some conceived the idea that men and women went to heaven or hell according to the way they lived in this world. They conceived an idea, then, very different to the inspired idea the Apostle Paul had. He said, "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." -(II Timothy 1:9). Paul had an inspired idea that people were saved, not according to their works; but Linkous says some conceived an idea that they are saved according to the way they live while here in this world. We wonder which idea is the truth. We are inclined to believe Paul had the right idea about it. These poor deluded folks conceived a lie; so they teach a lie, and believe a lie; and seemingly they take pleasure in it. See **((4) (John 8:44))**. Linkous also says that Christ gave His life for all who were willing to give up their sinful lives and follow Him. Where did he get that? He did not get it in the Book, for it is not there. Jesus said, "I lay down my life for the sheep." -(John 10:15). To some people He said, "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep." -(John 10:26). We presume Jesus knew better than these self-important Pharisees whom He laid down His life for. He said it was for His sheep, and the record in the same chapter tells us He told some folks they were not of His sheep. If He laid down His life for the sheep, and those folks were not His sheep, He did not lay down His life for them. To some people Jesus said, while here on earth, "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life. * * * But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you." -(John 5:40-42). People who do not have the love of God in them do not will to come to Christ; their will is to not come. That being their will, if they have to will to come, as Linkous says, then not one would ever be saved. These poor dupes advocate a system that will not reach a single one of all the race of Adam. According to their teaching hell will be running over and heaven will be empty and to rent out for a calf pasture-if you will excuse us for using slang. But the poor fellow says not a soul was left without a chance to be saved, if they would only look to Him, etc. How under heaven could they ever look to Him unless they first hear about Him? The doctrine of these dupes says they must first hear about Him in order to look to Him. But multiplied millions have lived and died without hearing about Him. They never saw a preacher, nor heard one preach; they never saw a Bible. The teaching of these folks is that multiplied thousands are dying every day and going down to eternal and irretrievable woe and misery because they do not have the gospel preached to them. And they do not have the gospel, so they tell us, because the people who do have it are too proud and too covetous and too stingy to give of their money to send the preachers who are ready and willing and anxious to go. Thus, multiplied millions are dying annually and going down to an eternal hell-not because of something they have or have not done, but because these hypocrites who claim to have and to preach the gospel are too stingy to give the money to send the gospel to them. Their doctrine is fathered by the father of lies. It came from hell, and will go back there. We understand Linkous had a brother that preached for the Primitive Baptists. So he says. But his brother was excluded. Perhaps this is one reason why this fellow would make such false charges against them. He may be trying to get revenge. Perhaps so. Judge for yourself. Well, some may say we have been rough. Perhaps so. Dogs have slick tongues. An oxen has a rough tongue, and God's book represents His servants as oxen. We do not know whether they are mulley or have horns. If they are mulley, they can butt such things as Linkous out of the way, and

go on pulling the load. If they have horns, they can easily gore to death such varmints as wrote that article in the Bel Air Times. Requiescat in pace. C. H. C.

Make The Paper A Weekly

---March 19, 1936

Elder C. H. Cayce: I do love to hear my husband read our paper. I was just thinking of our good paper coming just twice a month. I want to make a suggestion through the paper. Why can't we have a weekly paper? It does look like we could all send dear Brother Cayce 25 cents each. If 1,000 would do that it would be \$250, and I believe Brother Cayce could then make it a weekly paper. I don't know what about this. Dear saints, pray for us; we feel so little. Your little sister, if one at all, Callib McDow. Dilley, Texas. REMARKS We appreciate Sister McDow's suggestion, and we would be glad to send The Primitive Baptist out every week if we could possibly do so. The good sister seems to think that if the readers would send us 25 cents each that we could get the paper out weekly. She says if 1,000 would do that it would amount to \$250, and she thinks we would then send the paper out every week. Perhaps a great many others may have an idea like that. We are sure that very few of our readers really know just what it costs us per issue to get the paper out and mailed to the subscribers. We are going to tell you, here, candidly, just what it cost us on an average for every issue of the paper last year-twenty-four issues mailed out during the year 1935. Now, let us ask you to brace yourself for "a jolt," and do not let the "lick" knock you down. The average cost of each issue for the year 1935 was just \$236.55-a total of \$5,678.30 for the year. How far would \$250 go toward getting out a weekly paper? How about what so many say, that the price is too high? We just say this because we want the readers to know the fact in the case. C. H. C.

Romans 8:1

---April 2, 1936

In May, 1933, we received a request from Elder John R. Whitfield, Salida, Calif., for our views of **(Romans 8:1)**, which reads, in our King James translation, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." We hesitate to write on this text, because our view of it is different from the view held by so many of our good brethren. They may be right, and we may be 'wrong. If we differ as to what this text teaches, the brother who holds a different view from ours has as much right, in one sense of the word, to his view as we have to ours. If a brother does not look at this text as we do, we do not think any the less of him on that account. Brother Whitfield asked for our views, and we will try to give what little we have. We are aware that many brethren think this text teaches that there is a condemnation which we escape by walking after the Spirit. We believe the Bible teaches that there is a condemnation which God's people escape by living after the Spirit. It is taught in (Romans 8:13): "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." There are conditions in this text, and the living there mentioned depends upon the child of God mortifying the deeds of the body through the Spirit. By the help of the Spirit he can mortify the deeds of the body, and he should do that. But we do not think that is what the apostle was talking about in (Romans 8:1). In (Romans 7:25) the word then is translated from the same word as therefore in the text. "So then" (therefore) "with the mind I myself

serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.'Therefore," for this reason; what he has previously said being true; for this reason" with the mind I myself serve the law of God," etc. Then in verse 1 of chapter viii. he again refers to what he has already set forth by again using the word therefore. The original word translated therefore "denotes, first, transition' from one thing to another by natural sequence; secondly, logical inference; in which case the premises are either expressed, or to, be variously supplied. Therefore, then, consequently." See Bagster's Analytical Lexicon. The language, then, is a conclusion drawn from a previous premise-it is not a looking forward to something that will result in consequence to be laid down hereafter; but a consequence of a premise previously stated. In order to fully get the premise the expression rests upon it is necessary to go back far enough to get the matter the apostle starts out with. To do this begin with the first of chapter vii. There he starts out with his reasoning on the matter of law. That was something which the Romans knew something about-and it is something we know a little about-" how that the law hath dominion over a man so long as he liveth." Then he illustrates the principle he is starting in to set forth by the fact that a woman is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth. Then he tells us that "ye are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh," (that is, in an unregenerate state-before this work of grace was performed in our hearts) "the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." Now, here we have the key to the matter. Here is the premise laid down, and his reasoning through the remainder of the chapter is based upon this, as well as also the first part of the next chapter is based upon the same. The word therefore brings us back to this premise. This premise being true, then what he says after using that word follows as a consequence of this. The Lord's children in regeneration are delivered from the law. The law has been killed; its strength against them has been taken away by the body of Christ. He has satisfied the law for them; He has met all its demands, and so far as they are concerned the law has been killed. The application of the benefits of this is made to them in the work of regeneration. In regeneration they are killed to sin and the love of it, and are made alive unto God. In this work of the Spirit in regeneration, which is an inward work, called giving a new heart and a new spirit, a washing, a purifying, etc., there is given a new and higher order of life-the spiritual, divine life, and a new nature which belongs to that life. In this work the old or natural life which we have by reason of the natural birth is not taken away. The child then has two natures, and a disposition still remains in him which belongs to the old sinful nature. While he still has, that old sinful nature and disposition, he also now has a divine nature and disposition. The apostle shows in the remainder, or most of the remainder, of the seventh chapter how these natures or dispositions are at war in him, and how that he is often brought into captivity by the sin which still remains in him in that old nature. This is where the warfare continues in and with the little child of God while he lives in the world. There is a warfare within, which will not end until we come to the end of the way. Though this be true, yet we have been made free from the condemning power of the law, which law without the work of grace in our hearts, and without the work of Christ, held dominion over us. We have now been delivered from the law. See (Romans 7:5). Hence, having been delivered from the law, and having received this divine life, having received a new heart and a new life, a new seat of affection; having received the mind of Christ; all this being true, it follows as a consequence, as a "therefore," "with the mind I myself serve the law

of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." This law of sin, this sinful disposition and nature had not been taken away from Paul. See (Romans 7:23). This sinful nature and disposition still remained in his flesh. And it remains in all of us. That is why you are so often in trouble and sorrow about yourself. You often feel that if you were a child of God you would not have so many sinful and wicked thoughts, or so many times do the things you would not or should not do. Instead of this being an evidence that you are not a child of God, it is clear evidence that you are the Lord's child. The unregenerate do not have such a warfare. You did not have the warfare until a change was wrought in you. But, the foregoing mentioned work having been done for you and in you, "there is therefore," (for this reason; following as a consequence of it) "now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." The next clause," who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," is not in many of the ancient Greek manuscripts. It is in some of them, but not in all of them. Anyway, there is no change in the teaching of that verse and the connecting verses, for that expression comes farther down, in (Romans 8:4)," that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." To our mind the expression is descriptive, and does not express a condition to be performed. We are aware that good brethren think that clause in verse 1 expresses a condition, and they make some good arguments that way; and we do not fall out with them because we do not see this text alike. If we are wrong, they are right. There is nothing in it for brethren to "fall out" about. C. H. C.

Ephesians 5:25-27

---April 2, 1936

In 1932 a request was received from Elder S. A. Dawson, Kansas, Ill., for our views on (Ephesians 5:26) Poor health has been the main reason for the long delay in answering these many requests which we have received. We are trying to answer them now as fast as we can, and as best we can. (Ephesians 5:25-26,27)read as follows: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." We quote here both verses 25 and 27 so that we may have the connection. It may be necessary to know what is referred to by the word it in verse 26, and we find that in verse 25. It is the church. Christ gave Himself for the church. Those He gave Himself for are here denominated as the church-the whole family of God. These are they which will form and compose His complete body in the heavenly world. They are the whole number, the complete number, of the redeemed. Hence, He gave Himself for a definite and complete number. He did not give Himself for the race of mankind; but He gave Himself for the church- those that He saves. And He saves those He gave Himself for. He gave Himself for it-for the church; for those the Father had given Him; for the objects of His love. "But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." -(Romans 5:8). He did not give Himself for them with no definite end in view. The final end of it was" that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." He gave Himself for it" that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.'By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." -(10:10) (Hebrews 10:10). To sanctify is to set apart to a holy or religious use. They were all set apart through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once. He made just one offering, and will not make another; for the

one offering which He made is sufficient for all time, and was sufficient to accomplish the object for which it was made. He gave Himself for it that He might also "cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." When He was crucified and the Roman soldiers pierced His side," forthwith there came therefrom both blood and water." The blood was to satisfy for the sins of His people; to satisfy for the sins of the church; and it was sufficient for that end. The water was to purify and cleanse. Water is to use in washing. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." -(Titus 3:5). He regenerates, by the work of His Spirit, and cleanses and purifies, all that He gave Himself for. He does this by speaking to them by the power of the Holy Spirit. "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." - (John 6:63). It is by the power of His speech that sinners are regenerated, and in this work there is 'an inward washing and cleansing. In this the Lord begins a good work in them, and He will carry it on to perfection. He will finally land them on the sunny banks of sweet deliverance, where they shall be fully and finally glorified, and enjoy eternal bliss and happiness, and be like Him. They will then be without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. We have just given a few thoughts in a brief way. May the Lord bless the same to the good of our readers. C. H. C.

Our Trip in Texas

---April 16, 1936

We left home on Wednesday night, February 26, to fill the appointments which had been made and published for us in Texas. Appointments were filled at the following named places: Dallas, Fort Worth, Joy, Wichita Falls, Munday, Throckmorton, Median Chapel, Harpersville, Cisco, Deuteronomy Leon, Bosque. Also one night at a place near Deuteronomy Leon, the name of which we cannot recall just now. We never left home with a sadder feeling than when we left for this trip. When we agreed to make the trip we expected to meet and to see Elder J. H. Fisher, but he passed away, so we could not get to see him. The first appointment was in Dallas on Thursday night, February 27. We had a very pleasant meeting at this place, and there was one addition to the church, a sister, whose baptism was to be attended to at a later date. Elder Fowler is pastor here. Elder W. L. Barrett met us and conveyed us to his home after meeting, where we spent the remainder of the night and the next day. On Friday night we enjoyed a very pleasant service with the church in Fort Worth. Elder Barrett is their good pastor, and they esteem him highly. They are counting on building a new meetinghouse at an early date, and we wish them success in the undertaking. May the Lord bless their labors and efforts. Elders Fowler and Paine were present at this service. Saturday morning we went to Bellevue, where we were met by Brother Hammond, son of Elder T. C. Hammond, who conveyed us to the church. Elder Hammond was sick and confined to his bed, and was not able to be at the meeting. He had been real sick, but was some better. The last word we had from him he was improving. We trust he may soon be fully recovered. We enjoyed a very pleasant meeting at Joy, Saturday and Sunday. On Sunday Brother S. H. Holt conveyed us to his home in Wichita Falls. We had service in Wichita Falls Monday and Tuesday nights. At that time Elder H. L. Collings was living in that town, and it was agreed on Monday night to hold the service on Tuesday night at the home of Elder Collings, as he was sick and not able to attend the meeting. Tuesday Elder O. Strickland came in and was with us there that night. Wednesday morning Brother Holt conveyed us to Munday, where we had a pleasant service that day. Thursday morning Elder Strickland conveyed us to Throckmorton,

where we enjoyed another very pleasant service. Elder V F. Lowrance met us here. Elder Strickland went on with us to the home of Elder Lowrance. Friday afternoon we went to see Elder Broom for a little while. He is staying at Eden Home, near Graham, and he seems to be well cared for and contented. Saturday afternoon we held a little service at the home for Brother Broom's benefit, which he and others seemed to enjoy. On Saturday and Sunday we were with the church at Median Chapel, which church was so well and efficiently served for so many years by Elder J. H. Fisher. Elder Lowrance is the pastor there now. He is a devoted brother, and the brethren there seem to esteem him highly, which they should do, and should care for him, and this they seem to do with delight and pleasure. Elder Strickland left us here and returned home, and we were sad to separate from him. We love the man. Elder Jackson met us here from Cisco, and conveyed us to the home of a Brother Roberts on Sunday afternoon, near Harpersville, and was with us at Harpersville on Monday. At Median Chapel there was one addition by relation. On Monday we had a very pleasant service at Harpersville. Elder Jackson conveyed us to Cisco Monday afternoon, and here we met with Elder J. W. West, who is pastor of the church in Cisco. He had an appointment at the home of a Brother Akers for Monday night, and we were there with him and heard him preach a sweet discourse. Elder J. W. M. Pharr was living there, or staying there, at that time. Sister Akers is his daughter. The dear old brother seemed to enjoy the service. Since we came home we have received word that he has gone to his long-sought rest. May the Lord bless and sustain his bereaved loved ones.. We enjoyed a pleasant service at Cisco on Tuesday. Several brethren in the ministry were present, but we cannot give their names, as we failed to note them down. Wednesday we were at Deuteronomy Leon. The appointment was supposed to have been for that place both Wednesday and Thursday, but there had been a change made. Instead of having meeting there Thursday an appointment had been made for another place (the name of which we cannot recall at the time we are doing this writing). Several brethren in the ministry were present Wednesday. We may not be able to recall the names of each one, so we will not try to name any of them. Elder E. P. McNeill is pastor, and he was present, as also Elders S. L. Rives, S. W. Short, and others.

There was a good crowd present here, as well as at the night appointment. We were met here (at Cisco) Friday morning by Elder J. L. Collings and wife, who conveyed us to Bosque Church, near Hico, where we had service Friday, Saturday and Sunday. A good crowd was present Saturday, but a much larger one on Sunday. On Sunday a brother united with the church; his baptism is to be attended to later. This was a delightful meeting. Sunday after service Elder Collings and wife conveyed us to Dallas. Elder Collings expected us to meet Dr. Fowler at Cleburne, and for us to be brought by him on to Dallas, but when we reached that place we received word that Dr. Fowler did not show up there as he was sick with mumps. We have not heard from him since, but trust he is getting along all right. So Brother and Sister Collings came on with us to Dallas. We left that place at 6 o'clock and arrived home at about 2 o'clock in the night. Our whole family met us at the train, and we feel thankful that we found all well. We had good congregations and good attention where we went, and the Lord was good to us, and permitted us to enjoy some pleasant seasons, although we were sad at the passing of Elder Fisher, so that we did not get to see him. We saw Sister Fisher at the Chapel on Sunday. The brethren and sisters were good to us- far better than we feel to deserve. May the good Lord bless them, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Revelation 20:4

---April 16, 1936

We have been requested to give a definition of the word souls in **(Revelation 20:4)**. That is, we have been asked to tell through the paper what that word means. The expression containing that word says, "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God," etc. The word soul in this text is the same word as is used for the word soul in **(0:28)** **(Matthew 10:28)**, where the Saviour said, "and fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." This is sufficient to show that the soul is something which is separate and distinct from the body-that the body is one thing and the soul is another. This is evidently and emphatically true when simply the body or the soul is spoken of or referred to. It is true that the word soul sometimes means living beings or persons-such as "man became a living soul;" or "the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." But when the body, in the abstract, is spoken of, it does not mean the soul; or when the soul is spoken of, in the abstract, it does not mean the body. The word soul in **(Revelation 20:4)**, means breath, the principle of animal life, the life; the immortal soul; the soul as the seat of moral and religious sentiment; the soul as a seat of feeling; the inner self, and so on. See Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon. Thayer's Greek Lexicon gives it as "the soul freed from the body, a disembodied soul," and cites **(Revelation 20:4)**. The word cannot possibly mean anything else. For a person to try to twist it to mean the body is to twist into our Lord's teaching something the Book does not contain. C. H. C.

Andalusia Peace Meeting

May 7, 1936

We attended the peace meeting in Andalusia, Ala., on the first Sunday in April, and Saturday before. On Saturday a committee was appointed to draw up a statement, resolutions, etc., as a basis for settlement and adjustment of the matters concerning the disturbances which had existed for several years. Two brethren were appointed from each "side," and then by unanimous vote they requested us to serve with the committee-that is, by unanimous vote of all the brethren concerned in the matter-which we tried to do. The committee met together Saturday afternoon and drew up the following, which was presented to the meeting on Sunday morning, and was read three times: We, your committee, appointed by you, or requested by you, to draw up a statement, resolutions, etc., looking to a full settlement and adjustment of all the differences which have recently existed, do hereby submit the following: Recognizing the fact that when troubles and divisions come in the Old Baptist Church that it is almost, if not altogether, always true that there is more or less wrong on both sides; therefore, we who were, or have been, involved in the recent trouble in this section, do hereby, as individuals and churches, forgive and ask forgiveness for all wrongs committed, whether by word or deed, realizing, too, that some of the trouble may have been, and probably was, on account of misunderstanding. But, be that as it may, we hereby mutually agree to forgive all errors, wrongs, or mistakes, and to bury the past in oblivion. We also agree, so as to avoid friction and to straighten out any "kinks" that might arise on account of this adjustment and coming together, that the same shall embrace the following, namely: That this means a restoration to fellowship any who may have been withdrawn from, such person or persons to retain membership where the same is now, who may have their membership transferred by letter as though the

trouble had never existed. This part of our confession and act to be put on our records, with the foregoing and following, in order that all records may be straight, and showing a full and complete settlement to have been made.

We hereby reaffirm our belief in and adherence to the articles of faith and principles upon which our churches were constituted, and we desire to beg the Lord to help us to be faithful and true and steadfast in the same, and that we may have His help to walk the good old way, and to bear with each other's weaknesses, and to strive for the things that make for peace. May the Lord help us so to do. Respectfully submitted for your adoption or rejection. C. H. Cayce, W. R. Walker, J. K. Everett, W. R. Cross, D. W. Nall, Committee. Read and adopted by Union Church, Andalusia, Ala., Sunday, April 5, 1936, by unanimous vote, and approved by unanimous vote of every Primitive Baptist present. After the third reading and adoption by unanimous vote, as above stated, some of the good old songs of Zion were sung and the hand of fellowship extended to each other. While this was going on shouts of praise and thanksgiving to God went up from different parts of the congregation by brethren and sisters. Hearts were made glad, and the love of God was plainly and visibly manifested, as brethren embraced each other who had been estranged. May the Lord be praised for His goodness and wonderful mercies and blessings to His humble poor. It is delightful to see brethren and sisters bury and forget their little differences and come together in peace and fellowship and love. Troubles can be settled when brethren want to settle them. "How good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." May the Lord's richest blessings continue with those good people, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Who Died in Adam?

May 7, 1936

A brother asks us if all who died in Adam will be made alive in Christ, and refers to **(I Corinthians 15:22)**. He says someone is advocating the idea that all are made alive in Christ that died in Adam, and refers to this text as proof. If the text proves that, it will prove the doctrine of Universalism. But it does not come within a thousand miles of proving it-it does not even begin to sound like proof of it. In the first place the apostle is treating in this chapter of the resurrection of God's people. The Bible teaches that there will be a resurrection of all the offspring of Adam, the just and the unjust, the righteous and the wicked, the sheep and the goats, at the last day; but in this chapter the apostle is treating upon the resurrection of the bodies of the saints only. Now let us read (I Corinthians 15:21-22,23), "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." It was by man that death came-the one man Adam; the first man; and it is by the one man Christ Jesus that the resurrection came. By virtue of the work of Christ all His children will be raised in His likeness and in His image. "But every man in his own order." What every man? "Christ the firstfruits." He was the first to rise from the dead as the firstfruit of the harvest. Then what about the others? "Afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." The text here does not say that "as in Adam all died - but "as in Adam all die." "All died" and "all die" are two different expressions altogether, and do not mean the same thing. "All died" is in the past tense-something which transpired in the past. "All die" is in the present tense, and denotes something that is going on now, in the present time. They are dying in Adam every day and every hour; they are dying naturally, physically, corporeally, now-every day and hour. They are going down in death all the time. But they-the

same people he is talking about in this chapter-all God's children, will be raised again at the coming of Christ. He is coming back to this world, not as a sin bearer, but without sin unto salvation; and He will raise the sleeping bodies of all His saints, all His children, and fashion them like unto His own glorious body. Precious promise, and glorious hope. C. H. C.

Kind of Death Adam Died

May 7, 1936

Brother D. R. Loyd, Arkoma, Okla., asks us to give our views as to the kind of death Adam died when he transgressed the law in the garden, and asks, "Was it a corporeal death, or was it a spiritual death, or did he die to the stewardship of the garden?" It was not a corporeal or physical death, for he lived a physical life for several hundred years after that; but the Lord said he should die in the same day he transgressed. It was not a spiritual death, for he was not a spiritual man-he did not have spiritual life. He was simply a good natural man, a good man from a moral and physical or natural standpoint. It is true that he was driven out of the garden in the same day that he transgressed, and was deprived of the privileges and blessings of the garden. But the death that he died was a moral death. He lost all moral standing with God. He lost all moral uprightness. He lost his innocence. He became guilty before God. It was a moral death. C. H. C.

The First Man

---May 7, 1936

We have a letter from a brother asking us if there were any people before Adam; that a certain brother is advocating that there were another people before Adam and that Cain married one of them. If there were any people before Adam, then the Bible is not the truth, for it says, "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." -(I Corinthians 15:45). Here the inspired apostle plainly says Adam was the first man. If he was the first man, there was no other man before him; and if there was no other man before him, then there were no people before him. Again, the same inspired man said, "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," etc.-(Acts 17:26). If there were any people before Adam, and Cain had a wife from among that people, then they are not all of one blood; some of them would be of the blood of Adam combined with the blood of that other people. It could not, then, be true that God made all nations of men of one blood. If the man believes the Bible he should quit such speculation and stop contradicting the Book. C. H. C.

Trip in Alabama

May 7, 1936

We attended the peace meeting in Andalusia, Ala., on Saturday and first Sunday in April, and then filled appointments as arranged for us by Elders R. W. Cross and R. D. Dodgen, except two appointments. We were billed to be at New Home Church on Monday and Tuesday after the first Sunday, but were rained out on Tuesday.. We were billed to be at Consolation Church on Thursday, April 9, but were rained out at that place. Besides at Andalusia and one day at New Home we filled all the other appointments, as they were published. A large crowd was at the peace meeting, especially on Sunday, at Andalusia. We had good congregations at all the other

places, or most of them. We met several brethren in the ministry, most of whom we had met in days gone by. We enjoyed good meetings at each place. The brethren were good to us, and were much better to us than we feel to deserve. We would be glad to give a more extended account of the trip, but time and space forbid. We are due to leave home again in a few days for another long trip, and we have to be in a hurry to get ready to go. May the Lord help us to speak such things as will be to the good of His people and to the advancement of His cause and to the glory and honor of His holy name. Brethren, pray for us, to that end, and pray the Lord to keep our loved ones while we are away from them. C. H. C.

Tour in Alabama

---July 2, 1936

We left home on Friday morning, May 1, for Frisco City, Ala., to fill appointments which had been made for us by Elder J. W. Jones in the Antioch Association, and by Elder S. W. Etheredge in the Choctawhatchee Association. We arrived in Frisco City Saturday morning at about 5:30. Elder J. W. Jones met us at the train. We filled appointments every day, as they had already been made, and as they were published in The Primitive Baptist of April 2 and 16. Appointments were made at the following places in the Antioch Association: Mt. Pisgah, New Home, Ramer, Gravel Hill, Sardis, Corinth, Pine Level, Spring Hill, Union, Little Flock, Pensacola, Concord, Pleasant Grove, Antioch, Elizabeth, Bethel. The weather was fine, and we were able to fill the appointment at each place. We had the pleasure of meeting and being with the following brethren in the ministry: Elders J. W. Jones, W. N. Ether-edge, G. B. Nail, S. A. Nail, Jas. H. Jones, A. J. Parrish and J. C. Davis. These brethren are all in the Antioch Association. At the meeting at Pine Level on Sunday, May 10, Elder W. A. Shutt and wife, who have recently moved to that section, were present, and placed their membership there by letter. Elder R. W. Cross, of Andalusia, was with us at Bethel, the last appointment in this association, as was also Elder Parrish, who is the pastor there. We appreciated all these good brethren in the ministry named above being with us, and enjoyed associating with them. At Bethel we were met by a son of Sister Farris and conveyed to her home, where we tried to talk for just a few minutes that night. Then Wednesday morning, May 20, he conveyed us to Ozark for our first appointment in the Choctawhatchee Association, as arranged by Elder S. W. Etheredge. Brother Etheredge baptized a brother there that morning, just before we reached the place. We filled appointments in this association, as arranged by Brother Etheredge, as follows: Pleasant Grove (Ozark), Bethel, Antioch, Ramah, Mt. Enon, County Line, Piney Grove, Union and Little Vine. In addition to these, Brother Harrison met us at County Line and conveyed us to his home, near Bluffton, Ga., in the neighborhood of Mars Hill Church, where he had an appointment for us and Elder Etheredge that night, and then conveyed us to Piney Grove next morning. In this section we met and were with the following named brethren in the ministry: Elders S. W. Etheredge, W. I. Kelly, A. A. Garrett, T. E. McGowan, T. R. Crawford, R. K. Blackshear, L. Z. Folmar, J. K. Everett, R. D. Dodgen and R. W. Cross. We are giving these names from memory, and if we have left out any it is wholly unintentional. We enjoyed being with all these good brethren. On Saturday, May 23, Sister Winnie Hardin came to the church at Ramah asking for a home with them. She was joyfully received; and at her request and the request of the church and pastor we baptized her on Sunday morning. Brother Etheredge is the pastor here, and they all love and esteem him highly-as do the other churches which he serves. Brother Etheredge baptized a brother on Thursday morning, May 28, at

Union Church (Midland City). We did not put the brother's name down, and cannot recall it now while doing this writing. The last three days we were at a union meeting at Little Vine, near Dothan. It was a delightful meeting. All the meetings were pleasant to us. The Lord was good to us, and we were able to meet each appointment. The brethren were all good to us. We were never more kindly received or more heartily endorsed. The brethren gave evidence all the way around that they heartily endorsed our little efforts in trying to preach peace by Jesus Christ and to encourage the Lord's dear children to walk in the good old way, where we may find rest to our souls, for so hath the Lord promised. May the good Lord bless those good people. We beg an interest in their prayers. Many of them we will never see again in this world of sorrow and trouble, but we hope that by the grace of God we may meet in that blessed home above, where sorrows never come. We left Dothan on Sunday afternoon, May 31, at 4 o'clock, and arrived at home on Monday afternoon at 2:30-our wife and all the children meeting us at the bus station-and found all well at home, for which we trust we are thankful to the good Lord. C. H. C.

Obituaries

---July 2, 1936

In the last issue of this paper we had sixteen obituaries and resolutions of respect. We are doing this writing on June 17th and the paper is dated (last issue) June 18th. Today we have thirty-five obituaries and resolutions of respect on hand for the paper. Some of them are rather long-as some of them were in last issue, and as some have been all along. Now, please tell us what we can do about this? We have repeatedly requested that these things be short, but it seems that our requests are little regarded. There is only one thing we can do about this, as we see it-and that is simply this: We will have to "boil them down" -cut out a lot of words, and make them shorter, in order to get them in. the paper. That is what we will have to do with these we have on hand. We will be compelled to limit obituaries and resolutions of respect to 300 words. Hereafter, you can put no more words than that in an obituary. You know what you want to say most of all, and what you would rather have left out. Govern yourselves accordingly. If you put more words in than that, we will have to do the culling ourselves, and we might leave out something you would prefer to go rather than something else you have said. So, please remember that these things are limited to not more than 300 words. We are sorry to have to adopt this rule-but something must be done, and this is the best we know to do. C. H. C.

Church Sovereignty

---July 16, 1936

When Fuller, Carey & Company introduced their new doctrines and new measures among the Baptists about the year 1792, and then in the years following advocated those new measures, and pressed them to the division of the Baptist family, they did so under the plea of church sovereignty. If one will read the history of the church during those times, he will see that the followers of these men claimed that each church was a sovereign, and had the right to engage in those new-fangled measures, and that no other church had a right to object. Their claim was that if one church desired to engage in such practices, she had the sovereign right to do so, and that no one had a right to interfere or to object. When Burnam, Pence &

Company introduced their new departures among the Baptists they made the same plea. They made the same claim-that each church had the right for herself to have a Sunday school, and the other new measures they introduced, and no other church had any right to object or to interfere. Their claim evidently was that each church is a sovereign. When the Progressives introduced the organ and their other measures, they made the claim that each church is a sovereign, and had a right to do as she pleased, and no other church had a right to call the matter in question. Their claim was that each church had the right to decide the matter for herself as to whether she would have an organ in her worship or not, and that no other church had a right to object, or to say a word against it. If there is any such thing as the church being a sovereign, then the claim of all these people was right, and the old-fashioned Baptists who protested against these new measures were in the wrong. If that doctrine is the truth, then we better go, "boot and baggage," the whole "pile of us," over to the Missionaries, and confess to them that our people were wrong; that they had no right to object; that the Missionaries were right in contending that they had a right to introduce their new measures; that each church had a right to decide for herself; and that we departed from the Scriptures in denying that right. What do you say? Are you ready to give up what our fathers contended for? We are not -we can only speak for ourselves. No church has a right to disregard the rights of her sister churches. Each church has rights of her own but she does not have the right to disregard the rights of her sister churches. No church has a right to do that which is injurious to the cause in general. No church has a right to retain in her body that which is detrimental to her sister churches or detrimental to the cause of Christ. The church has no right under heaven to do anything else only what the Lord has taught and commanded in His blessed Word. The Lord is supreme, and the only Lawgiver in Zion. The church has no right to make or to enact laws, and she has no right to do anything else but to administer the laws the Lord has given. The apostles themselves did not enact laws. They explained and told how to administer and to execute the laws the Lord had given. They were judges-not legislators. There is a sisterly relationship between churches. This is a fact which has been recognized by the Old Baptists all along the line. Sisters in a family are not sovereigns. They have rights which are theirs by reason of the relationship which exists. But one has no right to do a thing that is grievous to another. One does not have a right to do a thing that is disreputable, for that injures the other sister, because of the relationship which exists. Hence, a church does not have a sovereign right to do as she pleases, regardless of her sister churches. The Lord has given no such right, that we have been able to find. It is true that each church is responsible to the Lord for her conduct. But so is a minister responsible to the Lord. While the minister is responsible to the Master, so is he responsible to his church for his conduct and for what he teaches. Hence, the fact that a church is responsible to her Lord does not release her from the responsibility she is under to the sister churches. If a church does not act according to the commands of the Master, the sister churches have rights, too, as well as she does. They have a right to cease affiliation and association with her until she sets herself in order -and they should do that. One good way to bring a church to consider her course and her conduct is to leave her alone- cease recognizing or affiliating with her, and leave her to herself until she reforms and sets herself in order. If all would observe this, and simply "keep hands off" when a church oversteps her bounds and fails to do as the Lord commands and requires in His Word, troubles would be kept at home, where they belong. If you have a dirty thing among you, remember that others have some rights too-keep your dirty business at your own home, if you want it. Others have a right to reject your dirt, and to not receive it. If one church has the right to have something, and no other church has a right to object, then

the other church has the same right to reject, and you have no more right to complain about it than you say the others have to complain about you having the dirt. Each church has the God-given right to say who is not entitled to membership in her body. But God has not given her the right to retain that in her body that is a disgrace to the cause. She is commanded to withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly. If a church has a disorderly member in her body and she will not, or refuses to, withdraw from him, then it is the duty of orderly churches to withdraw from her. To persist in retaining that which is a disgrace to the cause, is to walk disorderly; and the command is to withdraw from such. If all churches would strive as hard at all times to do what the Lord requires and to obey His requirements, as they sometimes strive to justify themselves, and to hide behind "church sovereignty" in order to retain something that they should not retain, or to retain some man whose walk has not been orderly, and to justify themselves in so doing, there would be less trouble among the Old Baptists. We are too apt to "have men's persons in admiration." God's servants should be esteemed, and appreciated as such; but they should not be upheld or shielded in ungodly conduct. May the Lord help us to observe His laws and to administer them, as we are taught to do in His blessed Word. There is no appeal from that. C. H. C.

Galatians 6:7 AND Ephesians 5:6

---July 16, 1936

Sister Alma Pate, Avant, Okla., has requested our views on **(Galatians 6:7)** and **(Ephesians 5:6)**; **(Galatians 6:7-8)** reads as follows: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." This language was written to the church at Galatia. It is not addressed to alien sinners. But it is true in nature, that "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." We know that this is true in the vegetable kingdom. If a man sows wheat, he will reap wheat, if he reaps anything. If he sows oats, he will reap oats. If a young man or a young woman sow their "wild oats," they will reap the same. It is sure to bring sorrow to them some day-when the reaping time comes. A person cannot sow something he does not possess. He must have wheat in order to sow wheat. If he sows wheat, he will reap wheat. He not only reaps what he sows, but he reaps from the same field where the sowing was done. If he "sows to his flesh," he "shall of the flesh reap corruption." He does the reaping from the same field where he does the sowing. In order to do the sowing, he must first have both the seed and the field, to which he does the sowing. If one sows to the Spirit, he must first have the Spirit. It cannot be true, then, that he must do the sowing in order to obtain the Spirit; but he must have the Spirit, first, in order to sow to the Spirit. One reaps the same thing that he sows. In this case, "he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." As one reaps what he sows, if he reaps life everlasting he must have life everlasting and sow that. That is what he sows, if he reaps life everlasting, because he reaps what he sows. Hence, one must have life everlasting in order to do the sowing and reaping here mentioned by the apostle. The sowing here mentioned is the doing of the things the Lord has commanded, for the ninth verse says, "And let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." The sowing to the Spirit is doing the things the Lord commands-" well doing." **(Ephesians 5:6)** reads, "Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience." To see what "these things" are, get your Bible and read, beginning

with the first of the chapter. Here is a plain warning that the wrath of God will be poured out upon His children who walk after and engage in the things that the apostle mentions in the preceding verses. It is a sowing to the flesh, and they will sure reap corruption. They will reap what they sow. May the Lord help us turn from the weak and beggarly elements of the world, and help us to live in such a way as to honor and glorify His name while we live in the world. C. H. C.

An Absoluter

---July 16, 1936

We had an article clipped from the News and Observer, of December 9, 1935, printed in Raleigh, N. C, and signed by Elijah F. Pearce, in which he advocated the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things that come to pass, and that man does what God tells him. We did not know who the writer could be. So we sent the article to Elder R. H. Pittman and asked him who this E. F. Pearce is. Elder Pittman wrote us he was not sure as to who he is, and sent our letter, with the clipping, to Elder B. S. Cowin, Williamston, N. C, with the request that he write us. Elder Cowin wrote us under date of March 31, 1936: "Elder E. F. Pearce is moderator of the Little River Association, and I am well acquainted with him. He was at the last session of our (Kehukee) association, and preached on Sunday; and his writings show that he is in line with Wyatt and all other Absoluters, but I never mistrusted such a thing from listening to his preaching." We give this information to our readers, so that they may know what is what in regard to the matter. We think our brethren should have such information given to them. C. H. C.

1 Peter 4:18

---August 6, 1936

We have been requested by Sister P. E. Meelear, of Texas, to give our views on **((Pet 4:18) (I Peter 4:18))**. ((Pet 4:17) (I Peter 4:17-18) reads as follows: "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" This judgment is at and in the house of God, the church. There is no reference to the unregenerate. The whole thing is evidently dealing with gospel worship and service. There is a certain punishment to be meted out to God's people for their disobedience and wickedness. "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know Him that said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge His people." --((0:28) (Hebrews 10:28-30). There is no scarcity in the grace of God. By His grace His children are more than conquerors. His mercy and grace are abundant, though we may not always feel and realize it. But there is a scarcity in our service and in right doing. Sin is mixed with all that we do. Evil is always present, so that we cannot live a life of sinless perfection, as we desire to do. When we have done the very best that we can, then "we are but poor unprofitable servants; we have only done that which was our duty to do." When we have done the very best that we know how and can do, we barely or scarcely "get by." We are then just scarcely saved from the chastening rod, the punishment that is sorer

than death. Some things are worse than death. The disobedient cannot escape that severe punishment. May the Lord help us to serve and obey Him. C. H. C.

The Holy Calling

---August 6, 1936

John D. Tate, Rutherford, Tenn., asked us in April, 1935, what is the holy calling, in **(II Timothy 1:9)**, and when does it take place? It is the calling out of nature's night and darkness into the marvelous light and liberty of the children of God. It is the calling out of a death in sins to a state of life in Christ. It is the hearing of the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. It is the quickening of the dead sinner into a state of life in Christ. It is done by the Lord, by the power and work of His divine Spirit; and, hence, a "holy calling." He also asked, "Is the highway mentioned in (Isaiah 35) the gospel way?" We think it is Christ. He is the way, the truth, and the life. He is the way that poor sinners are saved. No others are saved by Him, only those the Father gave to Him. C. H. C.

Tour in Mount Zion

---August 20, 1936

We left home on Tuesday afternoon, June 30, to fill appointments in the Mt. Zion Association in North Alabama, as arranged by Brother S. E. Copeland, of Guntersville. Our train was late, so we missed connection at Memphis, and on this account we failed to reach the first appointment, which was at Rocky Mount on Wednesday, July 1. We met all the other appointments, as arranged. On account of missing this first appointment we agreed to stay one day longer than was arranged for and to be at Rocky Mount on Monday, July 27. Elder R. O. Raulston, of Chattanooga, Tenn., was with us several days on the trip. We were glad to be with this dear old servant those several days, and felt sad when he left us on the 15th and returned to his home. If we are not mistaken we met the following named brethren in the ministry who are in this association while on the trip: Elders G. E. Graves, W. B. Talley, J. D. Putman, W. L. Kitchens, H. P. Copeland, F. B. Moon, W. T. Cook, J. J. Herring, M. O. Lucas, J. L. Burk, M. Sparks, R. J. Holcomb and J. N. Bobo. Some of them were with us several days. They are all sound and humble ministers, and seem to be of one mind. At Harmony Church, on the 18th, Brother H. M. Reid joined by letter, and his wife joined by experience and baptism. She was baptized Sunday afternoon by Elder Talley. We were in three communion meetings. One at New Clear Creek; one at Liberty, and one at Gum Pond. They took the bread and wine in commemoration of the broken body and shed blood of the blessed Redeemer. Then they engaged in washing each other's feet, following the example given by the Master. These were especially good meetings. Tears of joy were shed, and they all seemed to desire to continue on in the good old way. There were none, and are none, in that association who desire to leave off the following of this example; and they are satisfied to continue on just as our fathers have in the past. They see no use of having trouble over a matter that all the Primitive Baptists in the South are practicing. We had good congregations at most every place. The congregations were good, considering all the circumstances-weather, crop conditions, etc. They were good and kind to us-much better than we feel to deserve. May the Lord continue His blessings upon and with them. We love the good brethren of the Mt. Zion Association, and trust we may have an interest in their prayers. Our father-in-law, Brother B. B. Lawler, and wife, Brownsboro, Ala., with Brother Dave Jett, met us at Rocky Mount on Monday, July 27, and we went

home with them. His son and wife (Ben W. Lawler) conveyed us to Huntsville that night, where we took a train at 1:40 for home. We arrived home at 1:10 p. m. on Tuesday and found all well, for which we trust we are thankful. We felt that the Lord was good to us. We are doing this writing on Wednesday, August 5, at home. We are due to leave tomorrow to fill other appointments that have been made, expecting to close the trip at the Indian Creek Association at Princeton, West Va., on Sunday, August 30. Please pray the Lord to bless our labors to the good of His cause and people, and to care for our loved ones at home while we are away. C. H. C.

1 Timothy 4:1-3

---August 20, 1936

In January, 1935, Brother J. R. Nichols, Booneville, Miss., requested us to write on **(1 Timothy 4:1-3)**. Get your Testament and turn to it and read it, as we do not have space to copy it here. The expression, "latter times," refers to a later time in the gospel dispensation. Some shall depart from the faith, or from the true doctrine of God. They will give heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. The seducing spirits are evil spirits which seduce the Lord's children and deceive them, thus leading them away from the truth. And many of the Lord's children give heed to them. Doctrines of devils are doctrines that men and devils invent. Such doctrines are always contrary to the doctrine of God. The teachers of such doctrines speak lies in hypocrisy. They are hypocritical teachers. They teach for hire and divine for money. They make merchandise of the people. They teach for filthy lucre. Papal Rome is evidently clearly brought to view in this, for they forbid their priests to marry, under a pretext of great purity and sanctity. They command to abstain from meats. With them it is a great sin to eat meat on certain days. This is but Rome's invention. False doctrines are borrowed from Rome. Rome led the way in modern missions. Rome invented sprinkling for baptism. Rome invented the practice of infant baptism. Rome invented the doctrine of eternal damnation without water baptism. Rome invented the doctrine that the preacher or priest is an instrument in eternal salvation of sinners. Many of the Lord's children have been deceived by the false teachers of the world. C. H. C.

Future Identity

---August 20, 1936

In May, 1935, we were asked to write an article on future identity, the person making the request stating that some were advocating the idea that we will know each other in heaven just as we know each other here, even by the same name, etc. If that be correct, we wonder how the different John Joneses and the different Sam Smiths will be distinguished there? Wonder if some will be called the young John Jones, or little John Jones, or old John Smith, etc. Such is simply speculation. We do not know now how much we shall know hereafter. Why people desire to speculate on such things we cannot understand. For speculation is all it is. The Bible does not tell us plainly about this. What difference does it make? If it is any comfort or consolation to one for him to believe this, let him alone. After all, he does not know any more about it than we do, and we do not know anything, for the Lord has not told us. We shall know God as our heavenly Father, and know Jesus as our Elder Brother, our Saviour, our Prophet, Priest, and King; and shall know the Lord's children as the redeemed. If we know that when we get there, it seems to us that is enough for us now. Let us be content with the things the Lord has revealed

in His Word that are for the comfort and consolation of the Lord's humble poor here in the world. C. H. C.

Matthew 18:8-9,15-17

---September 3, 1936

We have been requested to give our views on (Matthew 18:8-9,15-16,17). We gave our views on this language, therein recorded, in The Primitive Baptist of April 15, 1923. We do not suppose it is necessary for us to publish that article again. The language recorded in (Matthew 18:8-9) is as follows: "Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire." The question was asked as to the meaning of the word offend, as here used. The word offend is translated from a word that primarily means to scandalize. If one commits a scandalous act, which is a disgrace to the body, or to the church, the plain and unequivocal instruction of the Master is to cut such a one off. This simply means to amputate the member-no matter how important that member may seem to us to be; no matter how influential the member may be; no matter how important an office he may hold -if he commits an act that is a scandal and a disgrace to the cause, the plain instruction of the Master is to cut that one off. In (Matthew 18:15-16,17), the matter of trespass is a matter of difference between persons or individuals, and is not a matter of scandal and disgrace to the cause and to the church. Now, these are the facts of the Saviour's teaching here, and to disregard this teaching is simply to go the road that leads to trouble, strife, discord, confusion, distress and division. Such a course as disregarding this teaching and distinction and dealing has always brought trouble in Zion, and always will. C. H. C.

Ephesians 2; 6:24

---September 3, 1936

For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast.-(Ephesians 2:8-9). Here is text enough for a long article, but we will make just a few remarks. In this the apostle emphatically tells us that we are saved by grace. That expression positively excludes all works of the creature in his salvation. But the apostle does not stop at that, but says, most emphatically, "Not of works, lest any man should boast." To suit modern theology, the theories taught by worldly religionists, the apostle would have said, "For by works are ye saved through the act of the creature; and that of yourselves: it is not the gift of God: it is of works, therefore let every man boast all he can." The reason why the apostle did not say that is because salvation from sin is God's gift through what Christ has done and does do for poor sinners. All boasting is thereby excluded. C. H. C.

Missions

---September 17, 1936

Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word. The heathen must hear before they can call on the Lord; but they cannot hear without a preacher, and a preacher cannot preach that does not realize God has sent him and is with him. (Romans

10). Yea, he goes because the Lord says "Go" ((Matthew 28:19-20)), and because the blood of the heathen will be required at the hands of the church and preacher if they fail to go. God has said," The wicked shall be turned into hell with all the nations that forget God." -(Psalms 9:17). This should make missionaries out of every church in the land, and cause fathers and mothers to pray God to send their sons and daughters to the lands of darkness. About one million die in China each month and probably not more than 5 per cent of this number are saved. God is going to bring America and England, with all the other nations that have the gospel, to account for their neglect. "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not to him it is sin."

REMARKS

The above is copied from the Baptist and Commoner of December 18, 1935, and appears to be from the pen of Elder W. L. Randall, of Somerset, Ky., who is a missionary in China, and who was in the States at the time. If "about one million die in China each month and probably not more than 5 per cent of this number are saved," and the "blood of the heathen will be required at the hands of the church and preacher," is it not a foregone conclusion that the church and preacher will go to hell with the Chinks? The very doctrine of the Missionary fanatics condemns them. If their doctrine and teaching is the truth, the whole pile of them will land in an eternal hell. There is no escape for them, if the above statements and teachings are the truth. On the other hand, if the "church and preacher" are saved in heaven, then the doctrine is not the truth. If their doctrine is not the truth, then it is an invention of men and devils. Hence, they must be advocating the doctrines of men or devils if they ever enter heaven. Poor fellows! We are glad their doctrines are not the truth. God can and does save poor sinners in China, and in all the habitable parts of the world, without the help of these false teachers and blind guides. These Missionary Baptists profess to teach the doctrine of the final preservation of the saints-once in grace, always in grace. Yet, if the preacher-a child of grace-does not do all in his power to get the gospel to the Chinaman in order that the Chinaman may be saved, then God will require the blood of the Chinaman at the hands of that preacher. So, if the Chinaman is sent to hell because he did not hear the gospel, he is sent to hell for something he could not help, and the preacher will be sent to hell with him. Wonder if that will be any comfort to the poor Chinaman in hell? Will these Missionary fanatics please tell us upon what principle of justice God will damn the heathen Chinaman in an eternal hell on account of the failure and neglect of the so-called Christian preacher and church? Is it a sin for the Chinaman to not believe the gospel, since he never heard the gospel, or had an opportunity of believing it? Are people sent to hell for rejecting the gospel? Can a person reject a thing that he has never heard tell of? If so, how? Then the heathen Chinese have not rejected the gospel, have they? Is it a sin for a person not to believe a thing he has never heard tell of? If so, how? Is not sin a transgression of the law? What law requires one to believe something he never heard tell of? Citation, please. Is not the "rich man in hell" the first case on record of one wanting persons to be warned to keep them from going to hell? Where is any case on record prior to that? Did not your doctrine have its origin in hell, then? Did God's doctrine have its origin in hell? "It is, however, a very remarkable circumstance, that in modern missions Papal Rome has led the way." Minutes Philadelphia Association, 1806, page 429. This mission business is an invention of Rome, and is not from God. It gets money from the people under a false pretense. We are sorry for the poor deluded children of God who are blinded by these false teachers. C. H. C.

Another New Bible

---November 5, 1936

NEW YORK, Aug. 5.-(AP)- The Holy Bible will look different after next October. At least the edition being published by one of New York's younger publishers will look different. Their product will be, it is said, a completely "rethought" presentation of the ancient text, designed to make reading the Bible once more a popular diversion. The publishers remark that although the Bible is esteemed as literature more highly today than at any time in the past, it is read less. Part of this neglect is traceable, they believe, to the somewhat forbidding form in which the text normally appears. Forty years ago Richard G. Moulton attacked the same situation with his "Modern Readers Bible." The new edition will go still farther than Moulton, however, and will try to use every device of modern typography and design to make the product seem readable and attractive. The Book of Job, for example, is headed "A Philosophical Drama." There follows a cast, as in an ordinary published play, two in fact. One is headed "Characters in the Prologue and Epilogue," and the other "Characters in the Drama." The voice out of the whirl-wind is one of the latter. The text itself is paragraphed without particular regard for the plan of the original. In the Book of Job, as well as Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon of Songs, the revised version is used. For the rest, the editors have chosen the King James version. All the books have been placed in chronological order, with punctuation modernized, and genealogies, repetitions and some of the minor epistles omitted. The whole of Chronicles also is left out. Ernest Sutherland Bates is credited with developing the editorial plan, and Phillip Van Doren Stern designed the book. Bates' latest book is a biography of William Randolph Hearst, written in collaboration with Oliver Carlson. The above, from the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of August 5, 1936, was sent to us by E. B. Steadman, of Fort Valley, Ga. It was in that paper under the heading, " 'Rethought' Bible to Be Offered To Popularize Its Reading." Evidently it is a "rethought" affair-and, at that, a thought emanating from the lower regions-a thought prompted by the very devil himself. It is simply another effort to detract from the beauty and the worth of the Bible-the inspired Word of God. Note that the effort is to make "reading the Bible once more a popular diversion." It is not to inspire or to encourage reverence for the Book as the Word of God, but simply to read as a diversion-simply for pastime and recreation-just to idle away time, Note that the getter-up of this new outfit thinks that our Bible appears in a "forbidding form." Hence he must make it all over. The things which he does not like are to be eliminated, and it must be made over to suit the devil and his cohorts. It is to be made to seem readable and attractive to the generality of mankind- to the world. In order to do that, it must be made over. The world has never been pleased with God's teaching, and never will be. Professed religionists have always despised God's blessed truth, and the effort has always been made by the world to destroy the good Book, and to "turn the truth of God unto a lie." Note, also, that the Book of Job is to be brought down on a common level with filthy opera house plays, and that some of the books of the Bible are to be left out entirely. Were it not for the fact that our God is long-suffering, it seems to us that this wicked world would have long since been destroyed. What blasphemy and brazen effrontery, that men will thus avowedly tamper with the inspired Word of God. The Bible is not simply a book-it is a whole library. No better code of moral laws have ever been written than it contains. It is a complete guide for human kind in all their dealings. If a man wishes to know how he should treat his wife, the Bible tells him. If a woman wishes to know how she should treat her

husband, the Bible tells her. If the parents wish to know how they should bring up their children, the Bible tells them. If children wish to know how they should treat their parents, and how they should honor and respect them, the Bible tells them. If young folks wish to know how they should respect the older folks, the Bible tells them. If old folks wish to know how they should treat the younger ones, the Bible tells them. If one wishes to know how he should treat his neighbor, the Bible tells him. If one wishes to know how to make of, himself a good citizen, the Bible tells him. If we wish to know how we may have a good community in which to live, the Bible tells us. If we wish to know where mankind came from, and how they got here, the Bible tells us. If we wish to know where we go when we leave this world, the Bible tells us. If we wish to know how nations and governments may be perpetuated, the Bible tells us. If we wish to know what things are bad, and where they came from, the Bible tells us. If we wish to know why everything produces after its kind, the Bible tells us. If we wish to know why one loves God and holiness and righteousness, the Bible tells us. If we wish to know how to honor and serve the God that we love, the Bible tells us. If we have sorrows and trials along the way, and wish to know where and how we may obtain sweet rest and comfort, the Bible tells us. If we desire more evidence that we are the Lord's children, and that sweet rest awaits us beyond this life, the Bible gives it to us. If we wish to know some of the evidences of a gracious state, the Bible gives them to us. If we wish to know what we should be engaged in doing, as good works, the Bible tells us what the good works are. If we wish to know how to follow the blessed Master, the Bible tells us how and what to do, in order to be the followers of Him. If we wish to know whether there is anything to be gained in this life by following the Lord, by walking in obedience to Him, the Bible tells us. If we wish to know if there is anything lost by walking in disobedience, the Bible tells us. In fact, the Bible is a thorough furnisher. In that Book the Lord has given everything we need. Everything good, as to how we should live, either as citizens, in the moral realm, or as His children, in the spiritual realm, is laid down and furnished in that Book. It also contains ample warnings as to what will be the result of wickedness and walking contrary to the teachings therein given. Let us beware of tampering with the Holy Book. If translators have made some little errors in translating it, let us not, on that account, fall in with and follow after such blatant tampering with the blessed old Book, which has been a guide and comfort to the Lord's humble poor all along the past ages. It has been sufficient on the above lines during the past ages, and will be sufficient through the ages to come. May the Lord help us all to respect it, and to observe and follow its teachings. C. H. C.

A Delightful Trip

---December 3, 1936

It is late now to write about our last trip East, but "it is better late than never" -so we have heard it said. But we will have to make another apology, which is nothing new for us to have to do. When we returned home from the trip we were completely worn out, and for a few weeks we were barely able to be up and stay on our feet. We had expected to attend the Mountain Springs Association at Little Rock, embracing the first Sunday in September, and the Salem Association, embracing the second Sunday in that month; but we did not feel well enough to attend them-not having regained our strength. So we have delayed writing anything about our trip. It was not on account of not enjoying the trip, nor because we were not well treated. We first attended the Sequatchie Valley Association on that trip, which was held in Chattanooga, Tenn., embracing the second Sunday in

August. Then we filled appointments in the section around Knoxville, visiting and filling an appointment near Cleveland, Tenn., on the way, until the meeting of the Powell's Valley Association, embracing the third Sunday in August. Then we filled appointments for a few more days in that section, then attended the North District Association, held this year in Casey County, Ky., embracing the fourth. Sunday. Then we filled two appointments in Kentucky-one at Richmond and one at Goshen, near Winchester. Then we went from there to Newark, Ohio, and filled an appointment there, and one at Hebron and one at Thurston. Elder J. H. Keaton, of Huntington, W. Va., met us at the North District Association, and conveyed us from there on through the remainder of the trip. From Thurston, Ohio, we went to Brother Keaton's home, where there was an appointment for us, for the night of August 26. From there we went to Little Vine, near Beckley; and from there to the Indian Creek Association, embracing the fifth Sunday in August. It was our intention to write about this trip some time ago, and to give the names of all the ministers we met on the trip; but it has been so long, we will omit that now. Thirteen ministers were present at the Sequatchie Valley Association, including their home preachers. Twenty preachers were at the Powell's Valley Association, including their home preachers. Seven ministers were at the North District Association, including one licentiate. In Ohio, besides Elder Keaton being with us, we met Elders T. W. Osborne, Corvin Dove, M. O. Curp and U. G. Porter, and we think we had met all of them years ago. There were forty-two ministers and four licentiates at the Indian Creek Association. We never enjoyed a trip better in life, and never have we been more heartily received, and never have our feeble efforts in trying to preach been more heartily endorsed than on this trip. We met many dear brethren whom we had never met before, and many others whom we had met in the years gone by. Many of them we will never meet again in this world of sorrows, but we have a blessed hope of meeting them in that land where there is no night. May the good Lord bless them for their great kindness to us. They were so much better to us than we feel to deserve. Especially do we desire to mention the great kindness of dear Elder Keaton in meeting us at the North District Association and staying with us until we had to separate at the Indian Creek Association, when the time came for us to return home. We shall not forget him and his good family and home. We trust those who may feel an interest in this matter will not think for a moment that our delay in mentioning this trip is because we felt slighted in any way, for we never felt that way. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon and with each one, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Whiskey Drinking

---December 17, 1936

If there is a member of the Old Baptist Church who spends his money for intoxicating liquors and his family, perhaps, half clad, and neglects his church, he is not fit for membership and should be excluded unless he will quit it at once-and no delay. Such folks are not fit to associate with decent folks of the world, much less fit to have membership in the Lord's kingdom. Now, reader, get mad at us for saying this and somebody will think you are guilty. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 51

---December 17, 1936

One more year is gone. Another milepost in the path of life is reached, and we are one more year nearer to our eternal home. One more year's work is done. The trials and conflicts of another year have been met and encountered. The trials have been varied, and the conflicts have been trying at times. But, thank the Lord, these things are not the only things we have had to meet and encounter during the year. There have been some joys and pleasures, too. Sometimes we have been discouraged, but we have not felt like we wanted to ground arms and quit. Sometimes we look back over the life we have lived, and the efforts we have made in trying to serve the Lord and His dear people, and we can see so little accomplished, if anything at all, that we feel discouraged and cast down. Our whole life has been given in trying to speak in His blessed name and in trying to publish the truth in the columns of The Primitive Baptist. We have endeavored to let these things be first in our whole course of life for nearly fifty years. We united with the Primitive Baptists in August, 1889, and began trying to speak in the name of the Master on January 4, 1890. We have been connected with the printing and publishing of The Primitive Baptist since September 1, 1886-our father having begun the publication of the paper January 1, 1886. We do not wish to quit the field (be a deserter) until the time comes to receive an honorable discharge. During the past few years, especially, we have come through some trying times-and they are not done yet. The N. R. A. was hard on us, and would have been almost absolutely destructive to our carrying on the paper had we not been fortunately situated so that we could put the little business at least partly out of the jurisdiction and reach of the code affair. But now we are facing another measure that is going to cripple or put many a little fellow out of business-the so-called Social Security Act. This puts another tax on us and on our workers, if we shall have any workers. All steps of our government are pointing toward a religious persecution. The time may be nearer than some of us think when we will have to go to jail for the principles of justice and freedom which our fathers stood for and which have been handed down to us. When we consider the trend, and consider the history of the past, we cannot help shuddering. May the Lord help us, and give us grace for our day and trial. Yet, in the face of all these things, brethren continue to bite and devour one another. Brethren have asked us to give our views in regard to matters in the Scripture, or in regard to church affairs, and we have tried to give our understanding of the matters asked us about. Then some brethren have been pleased to shoot at us through the columns of some other paper. No, they did not call our name; but they were careful to be plain enough for us to know who they were shooting at. We wonder if they got any pleasure out of doing such a thing. Do you think the Lord will bless you, or bless His kingdom and followers, because you pursue a course like that? Brethren, we pray the Lord may enable you to see the evil of such a course, and give you grace to enable you to turn from it. We have no desire to shoot back at you. May the Lord be our judge, and take care of the situation, is our prayer. Our year's work for 1936 is ended. We have tried to be faithful and true. We are free to still confess that we have made mistakes; but they were errors of the head and not of the heart. In the midst of it all the Lord has been good to us. His mercies still endure. Will you who read this please remember us in your prayers, that the Lord may direct us in the right way, and give us grace for every trial? May His richest blessings rest upon each of you, is our humble prayer. For the present and for this year we bid you farewell in the Lord. C. H. C.

1937

Introduction to Volume 52

---January 7, 1937

Another new year has now been ushered in, and with it we begin on another volume of The Primitive Baptist. The fifty-first volume was completed with the last issue, and this begins the fifty-second volume. What shall we now say by way of introduction to this volume? The present editor may not live to finish the volume'. No human being knows about that. And yet we may be spared to live several years yet. We are not as strong physically as we once were, but we believe that we believe the truth as strongly as we ever did. We are just as confident now that the principles contended for in our columns are the principles of truth as we have ever been. It is our desire now to earnestly and lovingly contend for those principles, as much so as ever before. We have no desire to forsake those principles now. The principles for which The Primitive Baptist has stood, and which have been contended for in the columns of this paper, ever since the paper was started by our father on January 1, 1886, are contained in and set forth in the Abstract of Principles which have appeared in most every issue of the paper from the beginning. The article in the Abstract of Principles which is really the keynote and the foundation of all the others, as we see the matter, is the second article. The article reads as follows: That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are a revelation from God, written by inspiration, and that they are the standard of faith, and the only rule divinely authorized for Christian practice, teaching, as they do, all that we ought to believe, know, or practice religiously. By the help of the Lord, if our life is spared through the year 1937, or even more than through this year, we expect to continue to stand on what is contained in that article of the faith. In the past we have opposed the introduction of things and measures not authorized by the Word of God, and we expect, by the grace of God, to do the same thing during this year, if the good Lord spares our life and blesses us with a sound mind. What the Bible teaches is enough, and is good enough. It was good enough for our fathers, and is good enough for us and for our children. The Lord was wise enough to know what would be good for His children in every age of the world when He inspired His chosen servants to write what is contained in His Book. Circumstances, customs, conditions, improvements in living, have never arisen to make it necessary or better to adopt something unauthorized by the Word of God. It contains a rule sufficient for all time, and sufficient for all conditions and circumstances of life. It is a perfect rule of faith and conduct for all time-whether past, present or future. Contending for what the Bible teaches has never brought trouble or distress among the Primitive Baptists. Practicing what the Bible teaches that the Lord's children should practice has never brought distress or disturbance in the church of God. It is what the Bible does not teach that brings trouble among them. When there is strife, confusion, trouble, distress and division among us, you may know, for a certainty, that it is because somebody has brought something other than what the Bible teaches. And it is a universal fact that the fellow who is responsible for the trouble is the fellow who has brought in what the Bible does not authorize. Some folks will talk about and cry loudly that they want peace, and yet continue to advocate things that the Bible does not authorize. Some of them will try to bring those things in on the sly. Some of them are not so very open and free. They will talk those things up in private which they desire to introduce. If you find it out on them and raise a warning cry, as the Lord requires you to do, then you are denounced as an alarmist and as a disturber of the peace. And those fellows are sure to "have it in for you." If they have the opportunity, they are sure to "stab

you in the back." And if they do not have the opportunity otherwise, they will make the opportunity. There are such persons living, and we know it, for we have had experience with them in the past; and we expect them to keep up their nefarious work, unless the Lord works in them in a way that He has not yet done. Boys, we know who some of you are. But, we again say that, no matter what men may do or say, by the grace of God, we expect to continue to stand just where we have stood during the years that are now in the past. If you want peace, quit your departures and behave yourselves. If our days are about ended, by the grace of God we can say, "I have kept the faith." May the Lord help us to still "fight the good fight," while He spares us to stay upon earth. To those who love the principles of truth which have been contended for in our columns during the past fifty-one years, we say, please remember us in your prayers, that the Lord will give us grace for our day and trial. C. H. C.

Holiday Remembrances

---January 7, 1937

During the holidays we have received a great many remembrances. Many sent us Christmas cards. Many sent gifts and presents-some of them extremely nice and valuable. Words fail us to tell how much these things are all appreciated. It is so much encouragement and consolation to us to know that we have so many good and true friends and brethren and sisters who remember us. These things all show to us that we have your Christian love and fellowship and confidence and esteem. We feel unworthy of it all, but we trust that we appreciate it. Please let this little note be a personal message to each one of you, and be assured that we appreciate your remembrance, whether it be a card, or whatever it may have been. May the good Lord bless you according to His loving kindness and tender mercies, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Barn Burned

---January 7, 1937

On Thursday afternoon, December 24, while the editor and wife were in Fordyce on some business, our barn caught fire and burned down. It was totally destroyed. We had a little more than enough hay therein to run us through the winter, and a lot of good lumber stored therein. All were destroyed. It was a total loss. But we felt thankful it was no worse. We felt thankful it was not our dwelling or office, and that none of the children were in the fire. The boys were left at home, and we felt thankful they were not hurt or burned. In the midst of misfortunes and hardships the Lord has been good to us. The little troubles we have to encounter are insignificant in comparison with the Lord's mercies and blessings. C. H. C.

Wonderful Order

---January 21, 1937

On another page in this paper will be found an article from Brother J. T. Foster, West Blockton, Ala., containing a brief statement of affairs in that section, and some of the proceedings of Elder S. F. Moore. We happened to know just when the trouble started at Cluster Springs Church, for we were present. It started over a person being received. * * * * No church can receive a member without a unanimous vote of the members present. The course pursued * * * * was like throwing ice on a hot fire. The meeting had been good-just fine-up to that time. It

was communion time, but that matter blocked the communion, and the meeting was dismissed in coldness, as though the north pole had been suddenly moved into their midst. * * * * Elder Streetman contended, * * * * and divided the church and destroyed the peace and fellowship of the body. * * * * So, now, Elder Moore and the Trumpet folks have some more of that sort lined up with them. They are welcome to them, so far as we are concerned. But the ridiculousness of the matter is that they will cry "ORDER, ORDER, ORDER," in the ears of the brotherhood, and pose as simon-pure, while going over the country and scraping up everything they can gather together that orderly Old Baptists have excluded, and recognize them as orderly, and then refuse to recognize orderly folks in the southwest under the pretense of "ORDER." Their cry of "order, order, order," reminds us of a lot of frogs in wet weather alongside of ponds and creek banks. It seems to us that our people have gone on bearing with them in their nefarious work about long enough. It seems to us that it is about time for us to recognize the bars they have put up, and treat them as their conduct deserves. May the Lord have mercy on their poor benighted souls. C. H. C.

Explanation Wanted

---February 4, 1937

Dear Brother Cayce: My brother is a subscriber to your paper, The Primitive Baptist, and I have access to its pages and read most of each issue. I have become very much interested in the doctrine of predestination as taught by you. I have not been able to understand clearly what you teach; nor can I understand Paul's teaching in **(Ephesians 1:5)** and **((9) (Romans 8:29-30))**. What I want to know is: a plain and concise interpretation of these Scriptures. Do they harmonize with **(John 3:16-17,18); (5:24)**, with **(Ephesians 1:5)** and **((9) (Romans 8:29-30))**, in an article in the next issue of your paper, or as soon as it is convenient thereafter. I am writing this for my own desire for truth and a knowledge concerning these things which have interested me for sometime, but have not been able to find a satisfactory conclusion. Thanking you in advance for this favor, I remain, yours in search for truth, W. P. Miller. Boise City, Okla.
OUR ANSWER

Since the writer of the above says he is asking the above for information and with a sincere desire for the truth, we will try to offer some remarks on the matters he mentions. We will take it for granted that he is honest and sincere in this statement, and will try to explain some of the things mentioned, as best we can. We do not promise to answer his questions to his satisfaction. They might be answered correctly and according to truth, and yet he might not be satisfied with it. To begin with we will say that the Scriptures do not contradict themselves. If one statement therein seems to us to contradict another statement therein, the trouble is that we are making a wrong application of one or both of the statements. If each statement in the Book is applied where it belongs, then there is no contradiction, but a perfect chain of harmony, beauty and truth, all the way through. There is nothing wrong in or with what the Book says, or what it teaches. The wrong is with us, in making a wrong application of what it says. Now, the brother admits that he cannot harmonize the Scriptures referred to. No man on earth can harmonize them and make the application of **(John 3:16-17,18)**, that the brother does. The trouble is that he makes a universal application of the word world in that text, as well as in many other places, where it must have a limited meaning, or else there is a contradiction, and no man can thus harmonize the Book, or show the harmony

therein. As evidence that the word world is often used in the Bible in a restricted sense, let us read **(Luke 2:1)** "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed." Evidently the word world here does not embrace all mankind-it is used in a restricted sense. Again, read **(I John 5:19)** "And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness." Here it is very plain in the text itself that the word world does not embrace all mankind; for "we," a part of the race of mankind, "are of God," and are not lying in wickedness, or in the wicked one. Here it is very evident that there is such a thing as the world of the godly, or the godly world, and the world of the ungodly, or the ungodly world. Keep this fact in mind, please. There is no disputing it. With that fact in mind, which is proven in the foregoing paragraph, we can make an application of **(John 3:16-17,18)**, which harmonizes with other Scriptures. The word world therein is used in a restricted sense, and has reference only to the world of the godly, the elect world. Another fact is this: God does not, and did not, love all the race. Read **(Romans 9:13)** "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." God did not love Esau; but Esau was a part of the race. Then God did not love all the race. God loved Jacob; but He did not love Esau; so He passed Esau by, and bestowed the blessing upon Jacob. This was said before they were born-notice the context in (Romans 9). So, your application of **(John 3:16-18)** is wrong. That is the reason you cannot harmonize that with the other places. You just cannot harmonize your application with other plain statements in the Book. The Book is right, but the application is wrong. Some covenants are conditional, but some are not. God made a covenant with Noah that He would never again destroy the earth by water. That was not a conditional covenant, depending upon the obedience of Noah or any of his descendants for its fulfillment. It depends alone upon the power and faithfulness of God for its fulfillment. Read **(Genesis 9:11)**. Then we will read **(Jeremiah 52:34)** "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee." Here the Lord tells us that the covenant of His peace is like the covenant He made with Noah. As the covenant made with Noah and all flesh that the earth should never again be destroyed by water was an unconditional covenant, and the covenant of His peace was like it, then the covenant of His peace was an unconditional covenant. The covenant of His peace is the covenant of grace. In it His mercy is promised; grace is promised. And the promise was like the promise to Noah-unconditional upon the part of humanity. In **(Romans 8:28-29)**, we have this language, "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren." That there is a sense in which God foreknew all persons, actions, and things, we do not suppose the writer of the above letter will deny. If that is admitted, then we have only to say that the language itself shows very plainly that there were some persons foreknown by Him in a peculiar way in which others were not foreknown. Those who were foreknown in this peculiar way were predestinated to be conformed to the image of Jesus, His Son. As those thus peculiarly foreknown were predestinated to be conformed to the image of Jesus, others not thus foreknown were not thus predestinated. Now, there is the Bible doctrine of predestination; and every place you find the word in the Book it has reference to the redemption, salvation, and final glorification of those the Lord thus foreknew. In what peculiar sense were they foreknown? They were known beforehand, before

they existed, before time was, in the covenant of His grace. That covenant was an everlasting covenant. See **(Hebrews 13:20-21)**. This is just one plan or way that God saves poor sinners from eternal ruin. There is no other way. The Lord has made conditional covenants, it is true, but the obedience of the parties of the second part in the conditional covenants did not procure eternal life. One conditional covenant God made with Israel, in ancient times, was, "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." --(9) (Isaiah 1:19-20). Here is a conditional covenant or promise, in which the Lord covenanted that they should eat the good of the land; but it depended upon their being willing and obedient. He did not promise eternal life on the condition that they be willing and obedient; but that they should eat the good of the land. They did not have to be willing and obedient in order that they become Israelites; for they were Israelites already; but they had to be willing and obedient in order to eat the good of the land. In **(John 13:17)**, Jesus said, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." Here is a happiness promised by the Saviour which depends upon doing the things He has taught. It is a happiness to be enjoyed here, and is not a promise of eternal life or of happiness hereafter. Of course, this belongs to the children of God--belongs to Israel. There is a happiness and peace in the moral realm which is enjoyed by those who walk uprightly in that realm; and there is a happiness and peace enjoyed by the children of God who walk uprightly in spiritual service. Our happiness and well being here in this world depends much upon the way we live; but our home in heaven does not depend upon that. That is something which depends alone upon the work of the Lord. It is dependent upon what the Lord does for us, and is not dependent upon what we do for the Lord. This is a great subject, and we have only hinted at it here, and the article is growing too long. We must stop here. We suggest to Brother Miller that he get hold of a copy of the Cayce-Penick debate and read and study that work. We have one copy, second hand, which he can get for the small sum of \$1.50. They are scarce and hard to get hold of. May the Lord bless these thoughts herein written to the benefit of all our readers. C. H. C.

Unionism

---February 18, 1937

There has been some question in the minds of some of our brethren as to the members of our churches holding membership in trade unions. Up to the present time we have had but little to say in regard to the matter. Yet we have had our own opinion as to whether we, ourselves, would operate a union shop. We believe we should inform our readers as to what, at least, some unions require of their membership. We have before us a blank application for membership in a certain kind of union. Here is the obligation one signs who makes the application for membership in that union: I hereby solemnly and sincerely swear (or affirm) that I will not reveal any business or proceedings of any meeting of this or any subordinate union to which I may hereafter be attached unless by order of the union, except to those whom I know to be members in good standing thereof; that I will, without equivocation or evasion, and to the best of my ability, abide by the Constitution, By-Laws and the adopted scale of prices of any union to which I may belong; that I will at all times support the laws, regulations and decisions of the Union, and will carefully avoid giving aid or succor to its enemies, and use all honorable means within my power to procure employment for members of the-----

Union in preference to others; that my fidelity to the union and my duty to the members thereof shall in no sense be interfered with by any allegiance that I may now or hereafter owe to any other organization, social, political, or religious, secret or otherwise; that I will belong to no society or combination composed wholly or partly of printers, with the intent or purpose to interfere with the trade regulations or influence or control the legislation of this union; that I will not wrong a member or see him or her wronged, if in my power to prevent. To all of which I pledge my most sacred honor. That is the obligation one signs in making application for membership in that union. We do not presume this to be radically different from others. There are some things in this to which we wish to call particular attention. One is that the applicant signs a pledge that he will belong to no society or combination composed wholly or partly of printers, with the intent or purpose to interfere with the trade regulations or to influence or control the legislation of the union. In this the person signs away all his right of having a word to say about any legislation the union may make. The person thereby signs away all his liberties, and solemnly obligates himself to be governed and controlled absolutely, without any voice or objection, by those who are the "higher ups," or by the head officers of the union. What liberty-loving child of grace wishes to thus surrender all his rights and privileges as to his own working conditions? No person on earth can do what he obligates himself to do in this and at the same time do as the Lord requires in His blessed Book. In fact, when he signs the above pledge, he absolutely signs a pledge that he will not do what God has commanded in His Book. Here is what the Book says: "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." -(Galatians 6:10). Here the express command is to do good "especially unto them who are of the household of faith." God's Book requires the first obligation be to the brotherhood-the brethren and sisters in the church. But the obligation above requires the first obligation to the members of the union. The obligation places the union above everything else in the world, "social, political or religious." To every member of the church our Lord has set up here in the world for the comfort and benefit of His humble poor, we would propound this question, and would have it sink down deep in your heart: What is higher, what is above the church our Lord has set up? True Primitive Baptists have always claimed that the church of Christ is the highest institution in the world, and that it is above everything else in the world. We think so yet. Will you belong to and affiliate with any institution where you have to sign away that belief and fundamental principle of our faith? Will you sign a pledge that you will procure employment for another in preference to your brother in the church? Do you think more of those who belong to the union, and who may not be as moral and upright as they should, than you do of your brother in the Lord? Which do you think should be given preference in the matter of procuring employment for-your brother in the "household of faith" or the member of the union? Both cannot have the preference. God's Book says, "especially to them who are of the household of faith." Let us try to do our duty as best we can, and as the Lord has commanded, and let such things of the world alone. You may rest assured that none of them are or can be for the betterment of the Lord's dear children. As for what we think about such things, we are free to say that we absolutely would not run a union shop. From the Bulletin of the Employing Printers' Association of America, the January-February, 1937, number, we copy the following concerning the strike in General Motors Corporation: Revolution by physical force is what we have witnessed in the "sit-down" strike of employees in the plants of the General Motors Corporation. The strikers have forcibly seized machinery, equipment, and buildings, which they refuse to relinquish except on condition that they receive certain supposed gains. Their plan and action plainly constitute a form of extortion.

An injunction issued by a Michigan court to protect the constitutional rights of the property owners has not been enforced by local authorities. General Motors thus has not been able to avail itself of the legal protection to which it is entitled under our government. The constitutional right of the great majority of the employees to continue in their work, as they wish, for the corporation that desires to employ them, has been flagrantly violated. Law and property rights have been flouted, the judicial system of the state defied, and citizens have been subjected to a reign of anarchy. If the labor-union forces win the present strike, the "check-off" will be instituted. The employer will have to deduct union dues regularly from the pay envelopes of all workers and remit the deducted funds to the racketeers who have the industry under their heels. The employing corporation thereby will be compelled to coerce its employees into becoming and remaining members of the union controlled by a union dictator. For many years we have published warnings that labor unionism's ultimate objective is a labor-union political dictatorship! To many who have read them, these warnings may have seemed farfetched, but not so in the light of the latest developments! Unless the American people awaken to what is going on and rise in righteous wrath to put down the revolution, they will soon live, not as citizens, but as subjects of the labor-union leader who is engineering the present strike. We copied quite at length above, but it was necessary in order to get the full force of the matter in this article. Read carefully, ponder well, and if you prize your liberties, then humbly serve the Lord and pray and labor for the peace of Jerusalem. C. H. C.

Mutual Rights

---March 4, 1937

It seems that some of us "old teachers" have had some very "apt" scholars in our day. It seems that some of our young students are very "apt" to take something which we have said and apply it to anything they want to, whether we applied it there or not. Perhaps our cause would get along a little better if some of our pupils were not quite so "apt." We have said, for years, and yet say, that if our church should withdraw fellowship from us, no other church, no council, no association, no tribunal on earth has any right to call the matter in question, or has any right to restore us, or to take us into the fellowship of the Primitive Baptists. Each local church or congregation has the God-given right to say who is not entitled to membership in her body. If our church should wrongfully exclude us, other churches have the right to endeavor to labor in love with her to show her the error—but they have no right to go any farther than that. The reason why this is so is because our church is holding to and harboring nothing that is injurious to the great and general body of Baptists, and is staying within her own God-given rights. But if our church should hold us in her fellowship when we are guilty of a thing that is a shame and disgrace to the cause of the Master, and which is, therefore, a disgrace upon her sister churches, then she is going beyond her God-given right. God has not given her the right to hold, and to harbor, and retain, in her body, anything that is a disgrace to her sister churches or a disgrace to the cause. In such case the sister churches have a right to enter their complaints to our church, and if she persists in retaining in her membership that which is a disgrace to the general body, they have a right to withdraw affiliation with her, and have a right to refuse such affiliation until she corrects her wrong, or ceases such practice. If our church here in Thornton has the right to retain whom she pleases, regardless of the conduct of such person retained, and regardless of the cause in general, then the sister churches also have a sovereign right to reject. Once upon a time a notice was

sent to us for publication that a certain person had been restored to fellowship in a certain church. We returned the notice with the statement that we did not care to publish to the world that such a person had been restored to fellowship in a Primitive Baptist Church. And we told them this, also: If you folks want him, we are not going to dictate to you as to what you shall do in regard to the matter. If you want him, you are welcome to him; and for God's sake, keep him, and do not send him down this way, for we do not want him. While they may have had some rights in the matter, we had some rights, too. Unless these principles are recognized and observed, there can be no such thing as union and fellowship to abound among our people in general. Otherwise than the recognizing of the bond of fellowship and sisterly and brotherly relationship that exists, or should exist, between and among the churches, each local congregation would be a denomination within itself. May the Lord help us to observe and to contend for the things that make for peace in our beloved Zion. C. H. C.

Questions on Scripture

---March 18, 1937

We have seen and heard so many things advocated by brethren along the line that we have felt, for quite awhile, it might be profitable for the cause and for some of the brethren for us to write a lot of questions, and put them in the paper for our readers to consider. We do not feel inclined to answer the questions ourselves, but feel it would be best for us to leave each reader to answer each question for himself. Perhaps this may cause someone to think about and to study some points they have not considered before. We are not putting these questions in the paper for them to be answered through the paper, but for each reader to study the questions for himself, in the hope that it may help some individual reader to arrive at the truth upon some point about which his mind may not be entirely clear. Can any person of the race of Adam, whether a child of God or not, make an atonement for one sin of his own, or even one sin of another person? Is it necessary that blood be shed in order that atonement be made? Will the blood of a sinner make atonement for one sin of that sinner? If there is one sin for which a person can, himself, make atonement, why could he not make atonement for all his sins? Which is the worse sin—one which is committed wilfully or one which is committed ignorantly? Did not the Lord make provision, under the law, in the cities of refuge, for His people that sinned ignorantly? Was any such provision made for those who sinned knowingly? Does it not appear, then, that the Lord, in dealing with His people under the law, made a distinction; and that the ignorant sin was not so grievous as the sin committed knowingly? If it is worse to sin wilfully or knowingly than to sin ignorantly, and one must atone for his own sins that he commits knowingly, why could he not atone for the lesser sins, or for his sins committed ignorantly? When Paul said, in **(Hebrews 9:22)** "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission," did he not mean the same as to say that "without shedding of blood is no atonement?" Is it not a fact that atonement is made by the shedding of blood, and that there can be no atonement made for sin except by the shedding of blood? See **(Leviticus 17:11)**. Can one enter heaven without one sin being atoned for by the shedding of blood? If one must atone for his own sin, how can he do it, seeing that atonement is made by the shedding of blood? Does not the making of atonement require a spotless sacrifice? Then how can a sinner make atonement for his own sin, seeing his sin is a spot on him? Is a child of God in danger of eternal damnation? If a child of God is in danger of eternal damnation, then how can he be in any better

condition than an unregenerate sinner? Is there not a difference between chastisement and atonement? If chastisement is atonement, then are not some sins put away by chastisement? If some sins can be put away by chastisement, why could not all sins be put away by chastisement? If sins can be put away by chastisement, then why was it necessary for Christ to die in order to put away sins? These are just a few questions we felt like submitting for the benefit of our readers, and we trust you may study them in the light of the teaching of God's blessed Book, and meditate upon the same. May the Lord bless them to your good. C. H. C.

The Organ Question

---March 18, 1937

The following article was published in The Primitive Baptist of December 17, 1912. It was copied from the Messenger of Peace. It is a letter written by Elder Walter Cash, who was then the editor of the Messenger, to a brother in Georgia, and was dated May 3, 1912. It was written especially concerning the question of organs in Old Baptist Churches, but the principles Elder Cash contended for in that letter are just as true and just as good on any matter of Scriptural doctrine or practice. We heartily indorse the sentiment of that letter then-nearly twenty-five years ago-and we still indorse it. We recommend that all our readers prayfully study and consider the contents of the article now. May the Lord bless the same to the good of Zion. C. H. C. The article (The following is a copy of a letter written to a brother in Georgia, who asked us to propose something for the settlement of the trouble there over having organs in the churches. We are not privileged to give his name.) May 3, 1912. Dear Brother-I have been thinking over your letter asking me to suggest something that might help your condition in Georgia, but with my present understanding of the situation, the outlook is anything but bright. I shall not attempt to discuss the matter from a Bible standpoint, except to say, If there is no Bible commandment for it, then to seek to introduce it at the sacrifice of the peace of the church is wrong. There is no passage of Scripture which leads to the conclusion in any direct way that instrumental music was used in any New Testament church. Fact 1. Instrumental music cannot be introduced among Primitive Baptist Churches without making trouble and division. (This fact has been demonstrated.) Fact 2. The supposed benefits are superficial and not spiritual, and do not justify making trouble among churches. A church that can sing well with the organ, with the same practice, can sing well without it. The only difference is the sound (noise) of the organ which may serve to drown possible discord. Fact 3. With other denominations the tendency has been to choir singing instead of congregational. What reason is there to suppose that it would be different with us? I preached in a town where there were few of our people and a choir furnished the music. I said at the close of the sermon, "I would like to have the congregation sing the last hymn and I will lead it." I spent the night with a Presbyterian. He asked me: "What is the objection of your people to instrumental music in the churches?" I said in reply: "Which hymn did you enjoy most tonight-the singing of the choir or the last hymn by the congregation?" "Oh," said he, "there is no comparison; the last by the congregation." I asked: "Do you remember when your church first put in an instrument? and what has been the tendency since?" He said in reply: "I had not thought of it, but the tendency since has been to replace congregational singing with the choir. There are quartets, and solos, and new pieces, and this part is an advertised feature calculated to draw a crowd, but it is not as much like worship as congregational singing." I said: "Really, is not that

answer enough to your question?" and he agreed with me. It may be said in reply to this that our people who use the organ still maintain congregational singing. So did others for a while, but the desire to "feature" the music grows and grows, until a service I attended a short time ago employed a full orchestra, consisting of organ, piano, violins, wind instruments and drum. And why not? If the organ is an improvement, why not the other instruments? Fact 4. If there is no Scripture arguments against it, in my mind, and evidently in the minds of a great majority of our people, it would be a blow at spiritual service and congregational singing, and lead in greater or less degree to "featuring" that for an attendance, rather than to preach Jesus and Him crucified. In my mind and in the minds of many others, for the above reasons and for reasons based on Scriptural reference as to the nature and character of the church service, and the manner in which it was carried on in the first churches as nearly as can be ascertained, there ought to be a firm, and yet positive, stand taken against the introduction of instrumental music in our churches: First-Because it will tear them up and make division. Second-Because it is in no manner necessary, as the expression by individuals embodies the true sentiment of praise. The praise is in the words, properly, and not in the tune, though harmony in expression is not barred by the Scriptures. Third-Because the tendency among other people who have gone into this practice is to please a worldly and sensual congregation rather than to uplift the spiritual element, and to lift up Jesus crucified. It is an open question whether our people could withstand this tendency. And after a trial, if it proved they were not, it would be too late to save them. Now as to the present situation. Can we get along and let each church do as it pleases about this matter? I feel that this would be a dangerous attitude indeed. Though we take the stand that the "organ" is not a matter for a declaration of non-fellowship, the persistence and determination of the minority against the great majority as to the prudence and wisdom of this practice is. A minority of a church might want a fence built around the church house, while a majority thought it not necessary. Fence or no fence is not a matter of fellowship, but this minority might show such contempt for the majority, and such determination to have their ideas prevail that it might become necessary to exclude them. The real situation is likely to be lost sight of in the struggle, and the minority might seek to have it appear that the majority excluded them because they believed in a fence-had non-fellowshipped the fence in fact, when it was not the fence, but the action of those who are for the fence. What is the situation of our people now as to the organ? I will be real plain with you, Brother-----, so that there will be no misunderstanding. I will not undertake to justify all that has been done by those who have opposed the organ in Georgia, but only speak of the situation as it is right now without regard to how it became so. Our people out here see so much danger, disruption and final division in the introduction of the use of instrumental music in the churches that they are likely to take a stand against all persons who encourage it in any way. There is no use in arguing over how we reached the condition we are now in, but at this time I see no indication that churches using instrumental music can be treated as in good standing. I have studied the matter carefully since receiving your letter, but I can think of nothing to suggest that would have any show of adoption by the churches generally, which would put those churches in favor with our people while they still persisted in a course that our people believe and know will cause trouble and division. To recognize them is a tacit indorsement of their course, if nothing more. Then if one church may be recognized as pursuing a right and proper course for the good of the whole cause that uses instrumental music, no limit can be placed on the number of churches, and so the advocates of instrumental music are free to work and increase. But this condition can never continue (that is the multiplication of

churches) and have peace, so there is no use to try to settle on a proposition of that kind. All this talk of churches being sovereign in such sense that they may take any kind of course, and other churches may not protest, and show their protest in withdrawal, is the merest drivel. This can never be true in doctrine or practice. No church may control another church, but it may protest against the action of another church, and if there is no amendment may refuse to walk with such church in fellowship. Especially is this true in case a church took such course as would by its influence affect other churches by leading to division of sentiment among them. Frankly I do not know what could be done now to bring about peace, since the introduction of the organ has become a well defined dispute. You say there is no hope that all the churches will abandon instrumental music, and as plainly say that other churches not using instrumental music will stand by those who do and affiliate with them. From what I can see of the situation I think that it is as well made out on the other side to show disapproval of the movement by not walking with those who use instrumental music, nor with those who encourage them by walking with them, because the result would be to spread the cause of trouble and draw other churches into the discussion of it, resulting in friction. After studying your letter I see you firmly take a stand that instrumental music in churches is Scriptural and right, which is putting it too high, I think, and I do not see how you - could do much against a movement that you really thought Scriptural. I have never written as much before upon this subject to anyone. If we have anyone in this state advocating the use of instrumental music in the churches I do not know of them, and I hope there will never be any movement in that direction. If you brethren in Georgia love peace and fellowship with the great majority of Primitive Baptists better than you do instrumental music I think you will find a way out, but if you think more of instrumental music, I think you will keep the instruments. I have written very plainly so that you would understand, because when you write me you have a right to expect that I will do that. Sincerely yours, Walter Cash.

Land, A Trust and Must Be Preserved

---April 1, 1937

I don't know whether any of you get the implication carried in the model soil law passed by the Legislature at the request of the president or not. The law passed as a method or means of the state and the farmers of the state participating more fully in the national soil conservation program. But it goes further than that. The time is not far distant when if a man lives on a piece of land it will be his duty to himself and it will be a duty imposed by the state to follow sound farming practices and methods so as to preserve and build up the fertility of that soil. There is as much constitutional authority and legal right to force a man to conserve his soil as there is to force an oil company or a lumber company to preserve and protect those resources. Courts have held in many instances that a state has a right to force people under penalty of law to preserve the oil and timber rights of a state or a community. Civilization existed for centuries without oil or even coal and such resources. The soil is one resource without which no civilization can exist. It seems logical then that the time is not very far off when you as a farmer will be told to terrace your land, you will be told to plant soil building crops and you will do just those things or you will not farm. That sounds drastic, does it not? Well, read the law we have just passed here in the Legislature and you'll see that the state of Arkansas is just about in position to do that thing right now. We are pretty independent, ourselves. We do not like for folks to tell us we have got to do

anything, but the police department of our city can make us clean the ditches in the ravines in front of our house; it can compel us to cut weeds on a vacant lot which belongs to us. It can do many things that would have been outrageous years ago. And as I said before, we suspect when we get a farm, and we are going to buy one some of these days, and they go to telling us what we must do on that farm to preserve the soil, we'll kick like a bay steer. On the other hand, when we drive across places in Arkansas and some other states and we see whole sections actually destroyed and desolate just because some fellow insisted on farming the way he wanted to and neglected that soil we are not so sure but what this new way of making us do things we should do is not so bad. At any rate, we're going to see a lot of things new in this farming scheme in the next decade. The above is an article copied in full from the Arkansas Farmer of March 15, 1937, under the large heading of "The Editor Speaking." We feel that the obligation rests upon us-and it does rest upon us if the Lord has put us in the ministry-to sound again the alarm. It may be too late now; but we sounded the alarm before it was too late. If the people did not take warning, then their blood rests upon their own heads and not upon us. If we fail to give the alarm, then the Lord would hold us responsible. Stop right here, please, and give the above article another careful reading before you proceed farther in reading our "little say" in regard to it. Let what it says "soak in" real good. Think about it; ponder it well. Note carefully that the law referred to, the editor says, was passed by our State Legislature at the request of the president. Just here let us say that we do not intend to make The Primitive Baptist a political sheet. We do not desire to take stock in politics, especially through the columns of this paper; and we are not going to do so. But when we plainly see a trend in matters of state and the nation toward the destruction and overthrow of our liberties, for which our people have always stood, and for which our ancestors laid down their lives on the bloody battlefields, it is our indispensable duty to raise the alarm. Our ancestors came to this country and founded this government to escape the oppressions and deprivations of the old countries. There many of them were deprived of the privilege of worshiping God according to the dictates of their own conscience. They fled from their native lands on account of religious persecution and the oppressions of their governments. Under God they founded this government upon the principle of freedom, and wrote in the constitution the fundamental law and principle which guarantees this right to every man in the nation-no matter how poor, nor what may be his station or condition in life. Under this government the church has prospered; and in many places and at times they "have waxed fat, and kicked," as Jeshurun, of old time. In a great measure, and perhaps in different parts of the country, we have sometimes forgotten God. We have grown to feel secure, and to be confident that the privileges which have been ours to enjoy for the past hundred and fifty years (approximately), will not or cannot be taken from us. The land of Canaan belonged to the Jews-God's chosen people. God gave that land to Abraham and to his seed after him "for an everlasting possession." They lived in and enjoyed the land as long as they remembered and obeyed the Lord. But on account of their unbelief and rebellion they were driven out of the land, and have been deprived of its blessings and comforts for about nineteen hundred years. Does it not seem like this should be a lesson for us? May we not well remember these things "were written for our learning," and that "all these things happened unto them for ensamples to us?" The trend of affairs in this government of ours for a number of years has been toward depriving the common people of their rights and privileges which are and were vouchsafed to us in the constitution. Take the history of every nation under the sun that has gone down and been destroyed; read and study their history and you will see clearly and plainly that as their rights were gradually encroached upon,

and laws enacted dictating to them what they might or might not do, or what they must or must not do, with their own personal property which they had acquired by hard labor under that government, so surely were those things followed by the establishment of laws governing and controlling their religious activities. Religious persecution has always followed. This has been a universal end. There is not an instance on record where the matter did not terminate that way. Take Russia, Germany, Italy, and Spain today. First they told their subjects what they could and could not do regarding their own property. Then they by law put an end to their religious privileges. You could not erect an Old Baptist meeting house and hold services in it in Russia today; nor in either of the other countries mentioned, we are sure. Consider how the Jews were persecuted and driven out of Germany. Consider how the churches were burned in Spain; and now consider the bloody rebellion that is in progress in that country. Do you want that to occur in this country of ours? Just as sure as matters go on for a few more years the way they are going now, and as sure as God reigns in glory-just that sure these matters will end with just such a rebellion and great bloodshed in this land. It is fast coming. But few of our people, few of our countrymen, realize or seem to comprehend the trend of the times. The storm will break in all of its terrible fury over their heads before they are awake to the approaching danger. We do not dread it so much for ourself. If it comes in our lifetime, which it will likely do if we live just a little while longer, it will soon all be over with us anyway. We know we do not have many more days to stay in this old world of trouble, anyway. Our race is nearly run. Our battles to fight are nearly all ended already. But our poor heart does bleed for our children, and for your children, if you are growing old, and for you if you are young and not far past middle life. May the good Lord look down upon us and our poor children in pity and compassion, is our humble prayer. Now consider the law above mentioned. It gives those in authority under the law the right and authority to tell you what you must or must not plant on your little spot of ground. Thus the government absolutely will control and does control you, if you are a farmer, in all you do. You can do, and must do, what they say, or else not farm. The government now requires us to collect one cent out of every dollar we pay our employees to get this paper out, and then to remit that to the collectors who are appointed by the government. Later the amount we are to collect from them will be increased. Then when we remit, each month, to the collector what we have collected from the employees, we must remit a like amount out of our own pocket. Thus, if we collect two dollars from the employees, we must also pay two dollars. This is claimed to be for the purpose of providing an old age pension when the worker reaches the age of sixty-five. Here we are, already past age sixty-five, and never will be eligible for the pension; we are getting old; our health is broken, and we cannot stand the hardships we once did. But no matter about that; we must take our hard earnings and send it to the tax collector for the benefit of fat-salaried office holders, and to pension somebody in the far distant future, when perhaps they have been as able to work, and will be as able to work, as we have been all along. Where are our rights? Where is there the slightest semblance of justice in any such procedure as this? If the government has a right to tell you what you shall or shall not plant and grow on that little spot of land of yours, they have a right to tell us that the doctrine we promulgate in our little paper is detrimental to society and to the country; and that we must not wear out the steel, and lead, and iron, and the antimony, and must not use the paper we use, which depletes our forests, because the forests are destroyed to make the paper. They have the same right to stop us, for the purpose of conserving the resources of the country, and for the good of society and the nation. Already bills have been introduced in legislative halls curbing the freedom of press and speech. But, thank God, they have not passed and become laws yet. But, look out! Yes, it is

as the editor of the Arkansas Farmer says, we are going to see a lot of changes and things new, not only in this farming scheme, but in many other things in the next decade. We are right now face to face with the hardest trials and the hardest things to endure that any man now living in this nation has ever had to pass through. The time is close at hand when the two witnesses will be killed and their dead bodies will be seen lying in the street for three days and a half. The time of the worst persecution on account of religion that the world has ever known is right now close upon us. Lord, help us, and give us grace for our day and trial. We have not said a thing in this article with malice in our heart for any person on earth, living or dead. What we have said has been said with love for the truth and for the Lord's humble poor, and we have written with tears in our eyes, and because we felt that the time is near for us to lay our armor by, and we do not wish to come to that hour with a feeling that we have shunned to do what the Lord requires of us. May He bless, sustain, keep, and preserve each reader, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

History of Walker County, Alabama

---April 1, 1937

We have recently finished the printing and binding of a book of three hundred and eighty-two pages, a "History of Walker County, Alabama," by J. M. Dombhart, of Parrish, Alabama. It is printed in good clear type, on good eggshell paper, and is well and strongly bound in a green cloth cover, with title printed in gold. It is a neat book, if we did do the work. It gives some history of the early days of the state, and the founding of the county, and then of the towns in the county. It gives quite a history of the early settlers, and some of the hardships they underwent, as well as some history of the prosperity of the section. It is a valuable and interesting work. It tells us that Robert Guttery joined the Primitive Baptist Church at Holly Grove in 1824, and that in 1826 he was ordained a minister in that faith, and served as such for fifty-one years. This is on page 212. On pages 38 and 39 we find that "While authentic records are not available, it would appear that as early as 1840 the Primitive Baptists had established churches at Holly Grove, at Old Zion on the Jasper-Russellville road, at Old Sardis on the Warrior River below Lynn's Park, and at other places." On page 38 we are told that "In 1842 the first Missionary Baptist Church in the county was constituted at Pleasant Grove." The book contains some interesting reading and some valuable information. Especially is this true with people whose ancestors lived in that section. The book sells for \$2.50. Any who are interested should write to J. M. Dombhart, Parrish, Ala. C. H. O.

Should Have Peace

---April 1, 1937

We have observed for some little time that some efforts have been made by some of the brethren for peace to be restored among the brethren and churches in North Carolina and Virginia. And though we are some distance away, yet we are, of course, interested in Zion's welfare everywhere, and heartily commend such a move for peace. We see no good reason why peace should not, or could not, be restored between the brethren and churches who are agreed in doctrine. It is almost universally true that when troubles come in the churches and among the brethren there are some wrongs done on both sides. Brethren get wrought up, and in the flesh, and things are done hastily and in the heat of passion. Wrong steps are often taken. Things are said that should not be said. Frequently a bad spirit is manifested. It is so easy for us to get in the flesh. It is so easy for us to retaliate

when we think a brother has treated us wrong, and it is so easy for us to judge a brother wrongfully. These feelings should be laid aside. All should be willing to forgive the wrongs of the past. If we are not willing to forgive our brother, how can we expect our Lord to forgive us? How many of us who have engaged in war with our brethren can sincerely say we have done no wrong ourselves? It seems to us that it would be a good move for the brethren who are divided on account of the troubles that have existed in that section, as well as in other sections, to have a meeting for the purpose of trying to adjust their little differences, if there are any, and see if they cannot come together. There should not be any compromise of true principles of the doctrine and order of God's house to do this, and no such compromise would be required. The Bible tells us how to adjust and settle our differences. If, and when, we follow its teaching peace and sweet fellowship will be restored. May the Lord help us all to strive for the things that make for peace. C. H. C.

John 1:1 AND 2 Timothy 4:2

---April 15, 1937

We have been requested to give our views on the above citations of Scripture. **(John 1:1)** reads, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." **(II Timothy 4:2)** reads, "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." We are going to give a little guess as to why we were asked to give our views on these two passages. Our guess is that somebody has said that the command to "preach the word" means to preach the Bible, and our questioner wants to know if that is the view we have of the text. We just make this little guess about it. In **(John 1:1)**, in the original language, it says "In the beginning was the Logos" (Word), etc. Berry's New Testament Lexicon, in defining the word Logos says it "is used by John as a name of Christ, the Word of God, i. e., the expression or manifestation of His thoughts to man, **(John 1:1)**, etc." The Word was made flesh; and in this God was manifest in the flesh. The Word was God, and as the Word was God, it was God manifest in the flesh. He was and is the second Person in the Holy Trinity. Logos is in the nominative case and singular number. In **(II Timothy 4:2)** the apostle says, "Preach the word." In this quotation it is "ton Logon." This is in the singular number and accusative case. It is the same as in **(John 1:1)**, only different case. We know that some brethren think the apostle meant to instruct Timothy to preach the Bible, or to preach the Scriptures. But the New Testament was not then written and gathered together. But if that is really what he meant, it must be modified so as to mean for him to preach just what the Bible teaches. And this is the way the brethren will usually bring it around to mean who say that the instruction was for him to preach the Bible. The apostle tells us, "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." -(I Corinthians 2:2). He would preach the Word; he would preach Christ, and Him crucified. Nothing else would he know, in the salvation of poor lost sinners. No other religious instruction would he give, only what Christ has authorized. Paul's preaching would be a very good example for the Lord's ministers to follow in this day. Again the apostle said, "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." -(II Corinthians 4:5). In this the apostle tells us that we "preach Christ Jesus the Lord." In **(I Corinthians 1:23)** he says, "But we preach Christ crucified." It was the apostle who did the preaching. What did he preach? He preached Christ and Him crucified; he preached the Word. If all who are professed Old Baptist preachers would put in

their whole time doing this, and behave themselves when they are not in the pulpit, the Old Baptists would not be divided as they are, and more of the Lord's little children who are out in the world would be seen coming home to the old church, and love and sweet fellowship would abound, and sweet peace would reign in the camps of Israel. The Lord would be showering His blessings down upon us, and this country would be a better place in which to live. We should try to mend our ways, if we have been doing otherwise. Suppose some of us try it and see what the result would be. Do not try it for just a few weeks or months, and then quit; it is a life-time job. Keep at it as long as you live; and that will not be too long. C. H. C.

Jeremiah 24:1-3

---April 15, 1937

We have been requested to give our views on **(Jeremiah 24:1-3)**, which you may read by turning to the same in your Bible. It is not necessary to take space here to quote it. Our views can be given in as few words as we know how to express them by giving what Gill says in his Commentary concerning this chapter, which we copy, as follows. By the term good people is meant the obedient ones among the Israelites. C. H. C.

GILL'S COMMENTS

This chapter contains a vision of two baskets of figs, representing the Jews both in captivity, and at Jerusalem. The vision is declared, (Jeremiah 24:1-3); where both time and place are pointed at, in which the vision was seen, and the nature of the figs described, and what passed between the Lord and the prophet concerning them. The explication of the vision begins, (Jeremiah 24:4), and continues to the end of the chapter. The good figs were an emblem of the good people that were carried captive with Jeconiah into Babylon, which the Lord says was for their good; and He promises to own them, and set His eyes upon them for good, and that they should return to their own land, and have a heart to know Him as their God, and return unto Him, (Jeremiah 24:5-7); the bad figs signify the people that were with Zedekiah at Jerusalem, and those that were in Egypt, who are threatened to be carried captive into all lands, and there live under the greatest reproach and disgrace; or be destroyed in their own land by the sword, famine, or pestilence, (Jeremiah 24:8-10).

Hebrews 12:6-8,12

---May 6, 1937

S. L. Miller, of Wray, Ga., has asked us to give our views on the language recorded in the verses cited. (Hebrews 12:5-8) reads as follows: "And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of Him: for whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons." This teaches us that the Lord chastises His children for their disobedience, and verse ten tells us that it is for their profit. It is very evident, too, that if one is not chastised by the Lord, that one is not a child of God—has not been born of God. It is also very evident, from the teaching of the apostle, that the Lord's children all do wrong. They have not attained to a state of sinless perfection here in this life, and do not attain to it here. They fall short of that; yet it is the duty of His children to strive for that, as much as possible. And it is for their

good that the Lord chastises them. Remember, though, that chastisement is one thing and atonement is another thing. The Lord Jesus made atonement for them, and thereby satisfied the law which, without that satisfaction being made, would have separated them forever from the peaceful presence of God in eternity. Jesus was their surety. He took their law place. But now that they are brought into divine relationship with God in regeneration, God deals with them as children. This brings in a parental relationship; and He chastises them for their wrong doing, for their good, to bring them into the path of obedience, and to bring them thus closer to Him. Hence, the instruction given them in (Hebrews 12:12-13), as well as in many other places in the Book, to which we do well to take heed. C. H. C.

Meeting Suggested

---May 20, 1937

Some few weeks ago we sent a circular letter under the heading "copies sent to preachers of Wetumpka and Hillabee Associations, also to many deacons and lay members in various sections" in regard to a meeting trying to blend the brotherhood together in Christian fellowship, to which we have received several favorable replies. We are now making a second appeal in behalf of said meeting, covering more territory than in the first appeal, as we now realize our differences are even greater and more widely spread than we realized in our first appeal. Dear brethren, do we not fully realize that we are commanded to labor for peace and fellowship among ourselves, in the spirit of love and humility, sacrificing every fleshly notion and personal hobby that tends to confuse the minds of the Lord's children? Surely none of us can truthfully say that we have the peace that Jesus left with the church, when many of us continue to agitate the question of feet washing when there is no church among us that does not practice the example. Also the practice of returning old church letters back, after having been received together with the bearer by another of the same faith and order, thereby shirking our duty and laying upon others a task which they cannot Scripturally perform. Also some of us sitting in councils, usurping the authority that belongs solely to the church. Be it known that we have no axe to grind, nor no personal enmity toward anyone of the Lord's children, and fully believe when trouble arises in the church it should be confined to the church wherein it arises, for she is commanded by her Head and Lawgiver to keep herself in Scriptural order and is fully capacitated to do so. "Where no wood is, there the fire goeth out: so where there is no talebearer, the strife ceaseth." - (**Proverbs 1-31**) and ((6) (Proverbs 24:6). The suggested meeting above, it seems to us, amounts to about the same thing as a council. But a council does not have the right to impose their suggestions upon a church. An orderly gospel church is the highest ecclesiastical court on earth; and it is the church that is to execute the laws of the kingdom. Strife and confusion and division among ourselves is all wrong. Such things come from beneath. Little differences and strifes over words to no profit should not exist or be engaged in. May the Lord help us all to "strive for the things that make for peace." C. H. C.

After The Flesh

---May 20, 1937

For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit.-(Romans 8:5). To our mind the apostle here draws a line of distinction and shows the great difference between the unregenerate and those who have been born from above. In his teaching here may

also be found an idea of comfort and consolation and encouragement for the tempest-tossed child of God, for it gives an unmistakable evidence of a gracious state. "They that are after the flesh" are those who have been born of the flesh; those who are the offspring of Adam in their natural state. They are those who have been born of the earthly parentage only. They have been born from beneath, but not from above. To "mind," as here used, simply means to love, to care for, to be concerned about. They do not mind or care for the things of the flesh in order to be born of the flesh, but they mind those things because they are born of the flesh. One does not care for the things of nature in order to be born into the natural realm. One has to be first born into the natural realm in order to care for the things that are in that realm. To be "after the Spirit" is to be born of the Spirit, born from above. One does not have to mind, or care for, the things of the Spirit in order to be born of the Spirit, no more than one has to care for the things of the flesh, the things of the natural realm, in order to be born of the flesh, or in order to be born into the natural realm. We love the things in the natural realm after we have been born into the natural realm. The loving or caring for the things of nature, the things that are in the natural realm, is indisputable and unmistakable evidence that one has the natural life-has been born into the natural realm. Even so, one minds, loves, cares for, the things of the Spirit because he has been born into the spiritual realm-because he has been born from above. The fact, then, that one loves God, minds the things of the Spirit, cares for and loves spiritual things, loves holiness and righteousness, is indisputable and unmistakable evidence of the fact that he has been born of God, has been born from above. It is evidence which inspiration has given that one is a child of God. The mind is something which pertains to and belongs to life. The carnal mind is a mind that belongs alone to the natural life. The spiritual mind belongs alone to the spiritual life. "We have the mind of Christ." -**(I Corinthians 2:16)**. Those who have the life of Christ have the mind of Christ. This mind is not a carnal mind, but a spiritual mind. To be in possession of no other mind than a carnal mind is to be in a state of death; or to be in a state of death in trespasses and sins is to have no other mind than a natural mind, or a carnal mind. One must be born of another parentage than the natural parentage in order to have the mind of Christ, or in order to have a mind for spiritual things. If you have a mind for spiritual things; if you have a desire for spiritual things-if you hunger and thirst after righteousness, it can be for no other reason than that you are "a child of Jehovah, of the seed Royal, a dignified race." You have been born from above. God is your Father; Jesus is your elder Brother; heaven is your home; and you will live with the Father and with Jesus and all His redeemed family in all the ceaseless ages of eternity. The light afflictions here are but for a moment, and are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in you after a few more seasons of sufferings and distress. May the Lord bless and sustain you. C. H. C.

Philippians 2; 4:23 AND Jude 1:25

---June 3, 1937

We have been requested to give our views of **((2) (Philippians 2:12)** and **((Jude 1:25) (Jude 1:25); ((2) (Philippians 2:12)** reads, "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." Next verse reads, "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Verse thirteen shows that it is God which worketh in them, and in verse twelve they are commanded to work out. By their works they are to manifest what God works within them. Note, though, that God works in them to do. God does not do this

doing for them, but He works in them to do, and they are to do the doing. God also works in them to will. It does not say that He works in them the will or the doing; but He works in them TO WILL, and TO DO. God gives them eternal or spiritual life, and He preserves, sustains, and keeps them and that life. Will springs from life, and it is a product of life; it belongs to life. Hence God works in them to will, and they have a will for spiritual things because God works in them. Then they should work out and manifest what God has done and does do for them. In this they glorify God in their bodies and in their spirits, which are His. They show forth His praise in thus working out and manifesting that they are His children, and manifesting their love for Him. ((Jude 1:25) (Jude 1:25) says," Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." Then the next verse says," For there are certain men crept in unawares," etc. It seems to us that the apostle here conveys the idea that it was necessary for him to write so that they be saved from the teachings of these men who had crept in unawares. We do not think that eternal salvation is called common; however, it may be that the word here used means a salvation common to all God's people. But if that is what the apostle means, we cannot understand how he brings in the exhortation as applying to it, which he does. Here is a salvation, called common salvation, in which exhortation becomes needful or necessary, and this saves from ungodly men and their false teaching, or is a salvation from that. Exhortation and admonition are necessary in this. In **(Hebrews 2:1-2,3,)**the apostle says," Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was sted-fast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward: how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him." Here we have it in a stronger way of saying it that we cannot escape if we neglect. And here is salvation on one side. What is the opposite of salvation? Condemnation, of course. Then, the child of God cannot escape the condemnation if he neglects the salvation. Does eternal salvation depend at all upon the person not neglecting it? Most assuredly not. But here is a salvation which does depend upon them not neglecting it. For this reason it is necessary for them to "give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard." Under the law every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward. The same thing is true now; and that being true then, "how shall we escape," if we neglect to give heed to and to observe the things the Lord has taught in His Word? There is no escape. In thus neglecting the salvation here mentioned and brought to view, we fail to take heed to what Paul has here written, and to what Jude taught in his exhortation. The result is that we do not escape condemnation. It is certain and sure. "God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." C. H. C.

Elder Cash Passed Away

---June 3, 1937

Today (Friday, May 21) we are in receipt of a card from Elder Leon H. Clevenger, of Excelsior Springs, Mo., stating that Walter Cash passed away the day before and that the funeral would be in St. Joseph on the 21st at 3:30 p. m. Elder Cash was editor of the Messenger of Peace for many years. We do not know his age, but he was growing old. May the Lord bless those who are bereaved. C. H. C.

Proposed Peace Meeting

---June 17, 1937

On another page of this paper will be found an article by Elder Lee Hanks, under the heading, "Can't All Who Truly Want Peace, Have a Peace Meeting?" We copy the article from the Messenger of Zion of March 15, 1937, by request. We have also copied an article by Elder A. B. Ross from the Messenger of Zion of April 12, by request, under the heading, "Endorses 'Peace' Article." Some of the brethren in Tennessee, especially Brethren Z. Stallings, A. B. Ross, and J. C. Ross, have been in correspondence with us for some little time in regard to the matter of making an effort to get peace restored in that country. Some of them have urgently requested that we make some suggestion, and to make some move, looking to that end.

What we have been doing has been in a private way—we mean, by private correspondence. We do not like the idea of publicly crying out peace, and posing as a peacemaker, and then doing things at other times and other ways that hinder peace. We are sorry to say that we have had some experience with matters of that sort, or some few persons of that kind. In our correspondence with some of the brethren in regard to the condition of affairs in Tennessee and Kentucky we suggested that the churches interested, where the disturbance exists, call for brethren from outside that territory to come and serve as a committee to hear all the evidence, and then to suggest to them as to what steps should be taken to restore peace so that all might be brought together. Some of these brethren have said they want us to come and serve in trying to get peace restored. We have told them that we will not serve if there is objection. In order for us to agree to serve, the brethren on both sides must be agreed for us to do so. We have thought it best to labor in a private way for some move whereby the matters might be adjusted and peace be restored, rather than to be airing these matters out in public print.

We still think that would have been the better course to pursue; but as these things have been made matters of public print it seems to us necessary now for us to say something that way, too. If we do not, then many who do not know all the circumstances involved would conclude that we do not want peace restored. We do not care so much for our own cause, but we do care for the cause of the Master. Hence, in what steps we take, and what we do, we must have the cause of the Master in view. In our young days the Baptists of Tennessee and Kentucky were all one people. They were all together. They met together in love and fellowship, and peace and harmony prevailed. They were a happy people. The Lord blessed them in their gatherings together. Their associations were seasons of happiness, joy and gladness. The Lord blessed the ministers to preach sweetly, and in defense of the glorious doctrine of grace, and the beauty of the church. Many shouts of praise went up from the camps of Israel. It ought to be that way now. It should have been that way all along. That things are not that way is known to all concerned. If brethren want peace, then peace can be restored; but there are some sacrifices to make. It will not do to sacrifice principles nor the truth. To do that would not bring peace, but more confusion. If we should have some little idea of our own, which we did not claim to be a fundamental matter, and it caused confusion, yet if we were not willing to make a sacrifice of that idea for the sake of peace, it could be clear to all that we are not very anxious for peace. If we really desire peace with our brethren, then we would be willing to sacrifice that little idea, and give it up. Some of the brethren who have been writing us have urged us to take some step looking toward the restoration of peace, and have urged that they wanted us to be in the meeting if one should be had. We trust we have been trying to consider the matter in the right way. We do not wish to suggest a step that would make bad matters

worse. But we are going to make a suggestion here. Our suggestion is this: That a meeting be called for, to be held at a suitable time and place, for the brethren to consider the matters over which they have been disturbed. Let them endeavor to frame up and recommend a course whereby peace may be restored, and the matters of irregularity be eliminated. There are irregularities which need adjusting. If you will meet together in such a gathering, in the Spirit of the Master, you can accomplish the desired end. Peace can be restored. If the brethren on both sides desire it, as they have plainly said to us in private correspondence that they do, then we promise to meet with you, and to help you all we possibly can. If you succeed, in this, it will be better than to call a council of brethren from a distance. What will you do, brethren? Let all the brethren over there, no matter which side you are on, write us and give us a frank expression of your feelings and desire in the matter. What we have here suggested as a meeting is somewhat after the order of the Dallas peace meeting held in 1926. There are some things which cannot be straightened out by brethren merely meeting together and confessing their faults and mutually forgiving each other. That is good as far as it goes, but that being done will not straighten out things that churches have done. Hence, our suggestion, as above. Our race is nearly run. We have spent forty-seven years laboring among the Primitive Baptists. We have labored all these years, the best we knew how, for the time-honored principles which have characterized our people as a separate and distinct people from the world in all the ages of the past. We have tried to labor for the things that make for peace. We have, all along the line, tried to plead that we should not be at war among ourselves. If all would do right, or strive for the right things, and try to live right, there would not be so many troubles and divisions in our beloved Zion. Some of us have advocated wrong things-things the Bible does not teach-and have done wrong things. That is where trouble comes from. We should stand for the things that God has authorized in His Word; but we should do that in the right way. We trust that such a meeting as we here suggest may be held soon, and that peace may be restored, and all matters ironed out in such a way that permanent peace may be the result. Let us hear from you. May the Lord bless each one, and lead us all in the right way, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Fenced Vineyard

---June 17, 1937

Now will I sing to my well-beloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My well-beloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill: and he fenced it, and gathered out the stones thereof, and planted it with the choicest vine, and built a tower in the midst of it, and also made a winepress therein: and he looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it brought forth wild grapes. And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem, and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard. What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it? wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes? And now go to; I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard: I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down: and I will lay it waste: it shall not be pruned, nor digged; but there shall come up briars and thorns: I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it. For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant: and he looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry. Woe unto them that join

house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth! In mine ears said the Lord of hosts, Of a truth many houses shall be desolate, even great and fair, without inhabitant. Yea, ten acres of vineyard shall yield one bath, and the seed of an homer shall yield an ephah.-(Isaiah 5:1-10). What great and solemn lessons are taught here! The good Lord had a vineyard. He planted the vineyard in a fruitful hill. He chose the place of the planting. He did not select a place of poor soil-not a desert place, nor a salt valley-but a fruitful hill. A fertile and beautiful place. And He fenced it. He put a fence around it that was sufficient for its protection. Nothing wrong, and nothing lacking, so far as the fence was concerned. But somebody must have moved the fence, and joined field to field, or laid field to field, with other people. Surely the Lord placed the fence at the right place. It was not joined to another fence. The Master gathered the stones out of His vineyard. The ground was made smooth and soft. Nothing there to cause stone bruises on the feet. Surely, a pleasant and a delightful place-a wonderful piece of ground. Then He planted it with the choicest vine. The vine was of His own choosing. It was not a wild vine, or wild grape. He makes the vines good. This is and was His own work. And He built a tower in the midst of it. His children need a tower along life's rugged way. There they may see the glories and the beauties of the land. They may there be above the troubles of this old world. And He made a winepress therein. From the winepress may be brought forth the fruit of the grapes, or the juice of the grapes, which gives strength to the poor pilgrims as they journey along the pathway of life. Everything is there that the poor pilgrim needs. Well fenced is the vineyard; all the protection necessary; the soil is good; the elevation is high; it is on a fruitful hill; all things necessary for the good thereof were done. But there was something wrong. The wrong was not with the Lord, nor with what He had done. The wrong was with His people. They did not bring forth the fruit that He required. "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples." -(John 15:8). The Lord was not pleased; He was not honored; He was not glorified; His name was not magnified, as should have been by them. Hence, He says, "I will take away the hedge thereof, and it shall be eaten up; and break down the wall thereof, and it shall be trodden down; and I will lay it waste: it shall not be pruned, nor digged; but there shall come up briars and thorns." Evidently this was Israel; and "what was written afore time was written for our learning." All these things are ensamples to us. The Lord also said, "I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain upon it." What a drouth then ensues. May we not so provoke the Lord by wickedness and rebellion that He will send no more clouds with rain where we are? Ministers are sometimes represented as clouds. Some clouds are without water, and bring no rain. How deplorable and desolate it would be to live in a country without gospel rain! "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth." The Lord's people were to be a different people from any and all other people. They were to be a separate people from all other people. They were not to adopt the forms and manners of worship of any other people. They were not to join in the worship of, or with, any other people. They were not to lay field to field. They were to take no part whatever in the worship of any of the idol gods of the nations round about. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God; and Him only shalt thou serve." To join in with any of the nations round about in any of their worship and service was to worship other gods than Israel's God. It was to join house to house and lay field to field. The only way not to join house to house or lay field to field was to simply abstain from any and all their worship, and to have nothing whatever to do with the same. This did not mean to have no friends in a worldly way with the people of the world; but to have no friends in a religious way with any others only in the way the

Lord required. Worship and serve no other way or place, only in His vineyard; and that worship and service to be absolutely separate from the world and from everything else but the vineyard; just do all the Lord said do, and do nothing else but that. "Take us the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines: for our vines have tender grapes." -**(Song of Solomon 2:15)**. Foxes are sly and cunning creatures, and those little fellows may look very innocent. But they spoil the vines. They destroy all the tender grapes. They can slip in almost if not altogether unawares. How cunning they are! We may think that they are so little that they will do no harm. But these "little no harm things" destroy the vines. They destroy all the tender grapes. Then, the first thing we know there are no grapes but wild grapes. Wild grapes are not sweet and delicious. They are sour, and put the teeth on edge. When the teeth are on edge, good and pleasant food cannot be enjoyed; and a bad temper is soon manifested. If we may have one of the little foxes that the world has, why may we not have two? And if we may have two, why may we not have four? And if we may have four, why may we not have eight? And if we may have eight, why may we not have everything the world has? And before we get into our ranks everything the world has, where would there be any Old Baptists? The very things which the world must have in order that their institutions live would destroy the Old Baptist Church. If we had the things the world has, there would be no Old Baptist Church. Where is the fence? "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and I will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." -(II Corinthians 6:14-18). The things which God has not commanded are here called unclean by the inspired apostle; and he commands to touch not. All things the Lord has not taught in His Word are to be let severely alone. Do not touch them. Are we all doing as the Lord here commands? If we mix and mingle with the world in our worship and service, may they not have the right to conclude that we esteem what they have to be as good as what we have? And if they so conclude, how and wherein may the Lord's children who are out in the world be encouraged to come home to the old church, where they may have that sweet rest and peace that is not to be found out in the world? If there is no difference between the church and the world, may they not do just as well out in the world? Why "come out from among them," if there is no difference, and if we have what the world has, and if we may join in with the world? We have many good friends out in the world. They have been good and kind to us. They have proved themselves to be friends to us in matters that pertain to the world and worldly things; but we cannot worship together. We cannot engage in the same things in a church way. They have so many of the little foxes, the little things the Lord has not given in His Book; and we cannot take part with them in those things. Those who are honest and sincere do not think less of us on this account. They admire our honesty and sincerity. They will be the same with you. Let us be faithful and true to our Master.
C. H. C.

Putting Up Fences

---July 1, 1937

It is a real nice thing for us to remember that it is easy for us to go to an extreme on most anything. It is easy for us to see a mistake, or a wrong, that somebody does, and be so fearful that we may get off on that side of the matter that we go to an extreme the other way. We might be like the mule that was blind in one eye. While crossing a bridge, he was so afraid he would run off the bridge on the "blind side," he kept getting farther and farther from that side, until he ran off on the other side. We should not go blind on one side and off to an extreme on the other side. That there are bars to fellowship laid down in God's Book no one need try to deny. "But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints; neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks. For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience. Be not ye therefore partakers with them. For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light: (for the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth;) proving what is acceptable unto the Lord. And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." -(Ephesians 5:3-11). We quote at length so that we may have the direct connection, and see at once, very clearly, that here is a command to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. Here is a bar to fellowship which the Lord Himself put up, by the pen of His inspired apostle. It is by the observing of the bars which the Lord has put up that the church is preserved in such a way as to have the Lord's approval. To fail to observe the bars which the Lord has put up would simply be to open the flood gates to all sorts of iniquity and wickedness, and would destroy the identity of the church where and when it is done. In the first division in the church the Catholic party threw down those bars, and a flood of iniquity came into the church. Novatian and those who stood with him for the purity of the church refused to throw those bars down-they kept them up; and that resulted in the first division in the church, or separation from the church. This is where and when the Catholic party appeared. The Lord has built every fence and put every bar to fellowship that His people need, or that the church will ever need. We need no other bars than those He put up. But we do need to observe every bar the Lord has put up. Let us lay down a principle which our father laid down in a debate with a Missionary Baptist. That principle is this: Whatever is Baptist is Scriptural. To deny this is to deny that our people are Scriptural. If what is Baptist is not Scriptural, then the Baptist Church is not Scriptural. If the Baptist Church is Scriptural, then what is Baptist is Scriptural. This being a fact, it will not do to deny that what is historically Baptist is Scriptural. If we deny it being Scriptural to do as history shows has been the general practice of the Baptists to do, then we deny that the Baptist Church is Scriptural. When we deny that, then we admit that we do not belong to a Scriptural organization. How careful we need to be that we do not find ourselves in a dilemma. In our contention against bars to fellowship which are not authorized by the Scriptures let us not forget that there are bars to fellowship which are authorized by the Scriptures. Let us not forget that the Lord has put up some bars in His Book. Let us not try to argue our point in such a way as to make people believe we are opposed to all bars to fellowship. If we are opposed to all bars to fellowship, then we are opposed to something the Lord has put in His Book. In the Throgmorton-Potter Debate on "Who Are The Primitive Baptists," held at Fulton, Ky., in 1887, Elder Throgmorton laid down a very broad basis of fellowship for the Missionary Baptists, and tried to make it appear that on this account they are the

Primitive Baptists. Let us not forsake or leave the position occupied by and contended for by Elder Potter in that debate, and go over to Throgmorton's position. He was wrong then, and that position is wrong yet. The new means and measures introduced among the Baptists by Fuller, Carey, and others, were borne with by the Baptists for years, though protested against for all those years, until forbearance had long ceased to be a virtue, when they finally withdrew from them from 1832 to 1845. That was the thing they should have done at the very introduction of those new measures and new doctrines. Those things were not Baptist, and hence a departure from Scriptural teaching. They brought trouble and disturbance in the Baptist ranks. Bringing in of new means and measures will always bring disturbance among them. Not so long ago a brother who has had much to do, we suppose, in the making of new tests of fellowship over in Georgia wrote us that he had a desire to visit this country, and asked if we would make appointments for him. We wrote him that we would not; that we were having no trouble in this country about the matter they were fussing about; that all our churches engage in feet washing, and we are having no trouble about the question, and do not want any; and that they had put up a fence themselves; and our desire is for them to stay on their own side of the fence which they have put up. The fence that keeps our people out should keep them in. So we just want them to stay on their own side of the fence. In doing this, they will have less opportunity of bringing trouble among us-and we do not want trouble. If there is smallpox in a house, and a quarantine is established, it is for the protection of those who are not in that house, to keep them from being exposed to the disease. The people who are on the outside are forbidden to go on the inside, for in so doing they become exposed. But if they do violate the law and go inside, they then have to stay on the inside. It is a violation of the quarantine law for those on the inside to go outside among other people who have not been exposed to the disease. So, if those brethren have established a quarantine against all those who do not make feet washing a test of fellowship, they themselves violate their own quarantine when they get outside the fence they have put up. Let us all require the folks to stay on their own side of the fence which they have put up. The same thing is true in every like condition or circumstance. The Trumpet folks have put up a fence. All Baptists everywhere should require them to stay on their own side of the fence. If our folks cannot go among them on account of the fence they have put up, how can they lawfully go among our folks elsewhere? Evidently they are fence breakers or jumpers. May the Lord help us to be consistent, and to observe the things He has given us in His Book. C. H. C.

Elder Duncan Married

---July 1, 1937

We received a request from Elder James Duncan, of Memphis, Tenn., to come there and be with the church on the first Sunday in June, and to preach for them that day and night, and also on Monday night and Tuesday night, and to solemnize the rites of matrimony for him on Wednesday evening at 7:30. As we have had a desire for quite awhile to visit the church there, we wrote Brother Duncan we would be there if not providentially prevented. So we were with the church in their service on Sunday at eleven, on Sunday night, and on Monday and Tuesday nights. The church also desired that we have service on Wednesday night, which was agreed to. So, at 7:30 on Wednesday evening we were at Elder Duncan's home and solemnized the rites of matrimony between him and Mrs. Rosa P. Nelson (unless we have gotten her name wrong), after which we went to the church and had service. After service we were conveyed to the depot by Brother Pruitt and wife. Left

Memphis at 10:35, arriving home about four o'clock Thursday morning and found all well, for which we trust we are thankful. The meetings with the good brethren, sisters and friends in Memphis were delightful and pleasant. We spent some pleasant hours with some of them in their good homes. On Tuesday Brother S. W. Dearing's wife and sister went with us to visit Brother W. P. Dearing and family, near Covington. We spent a few pleasant hours with them. We were so glad to see him and his good wife and dear mother once more. His mother is near eighty years of age, but is still strong in the faith, and loves the good old way the fathers trod. This is a precious Old Baptist family, and have seemed like "kinfolks" to us for about forty years. The congregations were good at each service, and there seems to be a good interest there. We enjoyed our stay with them. They were good to us—so much better than we feel to deserve. May the good Lord continue to bless them, and to lead them on in the same good old way. They are satisfied to be just plain old-fashioned Old Baptists. We hope to visit them again some day. And may the Lord bless dear Brother Duncan and his companion, is our humble prayer. We may not be giving her name correct above, as we failed to make a note of it, and we are so forgetful. But her name is Duncan now, anyhow. C. H. C. (We have the name corrected in this book.)

Should Be Marked

---July 15, 1937

Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.—(Romans 16:17-18). To our mind it is very evident from this language of the apostle that the things which bring divisions and offenses in the church are such things that are not taught in the Book of Inspiration. What men have learned from some other source than God's Book are the things that bring divisions in the church of God. If there is division and discord in the church any place, and you wish to know, for certain, who is responsible for such trouble and division, just find out, for certain, who is, or has been, advocating the thing that the trouble is over, and then you will have the person who is responsible for the trouble. Nearly all, if not all, the troubles in the Old Baptist Church are started by some of the preachers. The preachers are responsible for the troubles being started. Then the churches are responsible for the troubles not being stopped. When some preacher starts up something contrary to that which you have learned in the Book, or which is not taught in the Book, you may be assured that trouble will result soon, if that preacher is not stopped. Such preachers should be stopped by the church. And there is much more danger that the church will be too slow about stopping the preacher than there is that they will be in too much of a hurry. Such a preacher should be admonished at once, as soon as he begins advocating something not found in the Book; and if he will not desist at once—right now—right then and there—he should be promptly dealt with. He should be marked right then and there. Put a brand on him. And then when he has been branded, be sure to avoid him. If any will not avoid him, then brand that fellow, too. Such men as are here described by the inspired apostle do not serve our Lord Jesus Christ. They may claim to be in the service of God, and may tell us that the things they advocate are the very things that would be pleasing to our Lord, and necessary for the church to do and to have in order to stand high in the esteem and estimation of the world, and that they are good things to engage in so as to make the church an inviting place for our children, and so on. But the apostle tells us that

such men serve their own belly, and not the Lord. There is some motive in view which they have in bringing in things that the Book does not teach. "Such men can make use of good words all right. They can make fair speeches. They can talk one way to you, when present with you, or when writing to you; and then they can talk another way some other place, or to some other person. They know how to use deception, all right. They can tell you that they are longing for and hoping for a better union and better understanding among the Lord's people, and then they can tell some other party that it will not do to affiliate with some brother who is orderly and who stands for the traditions which we have been taught in the Word of God. He can write mighty nice to you, and he can give somebody else "hail Columbia" for recognizing you as a Baptist. What a pity that such men creep in; but they do. "For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts." -(II Timothy 3:6). The inspired apostle has warned us about such. It is our duty to be on our guard, and to do as the Saviour has warned-" watch." May the Lord help us to stay awake and to watch, as well as pray. C. H. C.

Remarks to A. H. Roden

---July 16, 1937

The following remarks were made to Brother Roden following a letter from W. D. Griffin and Brother Roden's reply, in which Griffin personated us. We do not deem it necessary to insert those letters here. Remarks-We do not care to spend time with Griffin in our columns. His folks will not publish our articles in their papers. Then why should we be continually giving them space in our paper? Griffin says he wants to be fair. The probabilities are that no one would have known it had he not said so. Is he seeking notoriety? If he wants an investigation of the differences between us, or if he wants a discussion, let his people indorse him as a representative man, able to set up and defend their doctrine, and accept the challenge we put out twenty years ago, and which has never been withdrawn. C. H. C.

Rev Cayce Pentecost Baptized

---August 5, 1937

The baptizing took place at the Dresden Baptist Church last Sunday night when eleven were baptized, including Rev. Cayce Pentecost and family. Bro. Pentecost has for many years been a minister of the Primitive Baptist denomination. He joined the Dresden Baptist Church last Sunday night with his wife and three children. They were immediately baptized. Bro. Pentecost was baptized by Rev. Stubblefield, the pastor, and then he in turn baptized his wife and children. A large crowd was present for the baptizing. Rev. Dewey A. Stubblefield, the pastor, is delighted with the interest manifested in the affairs of the church. He preached to big crowds at both hours last Sunday. The above item appeared in the "Dresden Items" in the Weakley County Press of July 16, 1937, published in Martin, Tenn. So Elder Cayce Pentecost has joined the Missionaries. His membership was at Little Zion Church, one of the churches which withdrew from the Greenfield Association in 1934. This is sufficient to show whether there has been anything wrong or not. It seems, from the way the above article reads, that Elder Pentecost was baptized by Elder Stubblefield, and that then Elder Pentecost baptized his wife and children. If that is correct, then Elder Pentecost baptized for the Missionaries without being ordained by them, unless the ordination was performed very quickly, for it seems that the wife and children were baptized immediately after Elder Pentecost was. It

seems to us that if the ordination Elder Pentecost had from the Primitive Baptists was good and valid, so would the baptism he had from them be good and valid. If Elder Pentecost had valid ordination by the Primitives, he also had valid baptism by them. If he had valid baptism by the Primitives, then the baptism he received from the Missionaries is not valid. In that case, he has exchanged a valid baptism for an invalid baptism- a baptism that is not valid. Get the pronunciation of that word, invalid, correct, please-not in-va-lid baptism, but invalid baptism. It is not even an in-va-lid baptism-it is equivalent to no baptism at all, for it is invalid. If Elder Pentecost is not satisfied with the old order of things, just as they were handed down to us by our fathers and grandfathers, then he has taken the right step-he should leave the Old Baptists alone in peace, and go where they already have the new means and measures that the world delights in, and that the churches of the world must have in order to live. We are sure he knows very well that the man for whom he was named-Elder S. F. Cayce-would have none of the new means and measures and doctrines of the Missionary Baptists. And if his parents would have taken in with such things as that, they would never have given him the name Cayce. Peace go with you, Brother Pentecost. C. H. C.

Call For Peace Meeting

---August 5, 1937

After we had the type all set for this issue of the paper and all made up in the pages and on the press ready to run, but just before starting the press, we received the following call, signed by Bethel Church, South College Street Church, and Richland Church, the three Primitive Baptist Churches in Nashville. Some time back we suggested that these three churches co-operate and join in the call for the proposed meeting. We are glad to get this from those churches. So we took the forms off the press, had this article put in type, and the paper made up again, and printed with this article in it. Now, please bear in mind that all the churches concerned may be represented in the proposed meeting by messengers. Any church desiring to do so may appoint any number of her members to represent her in the meeting. And we think that the churches should represent in the meeting. Also, please bear in mind that this meeting is not to make laws to govern the kingdom or to govern the churches. It is not proposed by us that any more is to be done in, and by, the meeting other than to submit recommendations whereby the troubles may be ironed out and eliminated. True, personal matters may be forgiven, and all who have indulged in such things may have the privilege of confessing their faults, which is right-" confess your faults, one to another." Personal wrongs should all be forgiven. But there are some things which this proposed meeting cannot adjust. All that they can do is to make recommendations as to how such matters may be adjusted. Some things have been done by churches, and the churches themselves will have to straighten out those matters, if they are straightened out. And it will be necessary for some things to be straightened out in order that perfect peace be fully restored. We are glad to see this move made, and an effort started to restore peace among the brethren in that section of the country-Tennessee and a part of Kentucky, where the peace of the churches and brethren has been disturbed. If not providentially prevented we will be at the meeting. May the Lord direct us all in wisdom's ways, and enable us to labor for the peace of Zion. We should work for peace, as well as pray for peace. Following is the call, as sent to us from the three churches. C. H. C.

PEACE MEETING

We, the undersigned Primitive Baptist Churches, of Nashville, Tennessee, herewith invite, as our guests, all Primitive Baptists, and especially the preaching brethren, who feel that they would like to see peace restored and all re-united again in one body, as we once were; who would like to attend the much talked of "peace meeting" through the columns of some of our Baptist papers, by private correspondence, and by face-to-face conversations among the brethren. Said meeting to be held in the Bethel Primitive Baptist Church house, 714 Gallatin Road, Nashville, Tenn., Friday, Saturday and fifth Sunday in August (August 27, 28, 29), 1937. Let all come in the right spirit-the Spirit of our heavenly Master-full of love and forgiveness for each other; and praying that the meeting might be one long to be remembered, in the way of estranged brethren being re-united in sweet love and fellowship; that it might be a great outpouring, of the spirit of love. Bethel Church, By John S. Reid, Asst. C. C. College Street Church, By W. L. Murry. Richland Church, By C. V Vandiver.

Our Union Meeting

---August 5, 1937

Our union meeting-the union meeting of the South Arkansas Association-was held Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, July 16, 17, 18, with Friendship Church, El Dorado, Ark. It Was a good meeting, from start to finish. The preaching service was as follows: The introductory on Friday morning was preached by Elder C. M. Monk. The rule of the union is that the pastor of the church where the meeting is held preach the introductory. Elder T. L. Webb is the pastor of the church. But as Elder Monk could be at the meeting only one day, by request of Elder Webb it was agreed that Elder Monk preach the introductory. The Lord blessed him to preach a good discourse, which was both comforting and instructive. After the discourse the privileges of the church were extended, when two dear sisters came forward asking for a home in the church. They were joyfully received. In the afternoon Elder Black, from Texas, preached. Then at night Elder W. H. Lee was blessed to preach a good discourse. Saturday morning Elders W. J. Puckitt and John R. Harris preached to the people. The Lord blessed them with sweet liberty. Then an opportunity was given for any to present themselves who desired a home in the church, and two more dear sisters came forward wanting to enlist in the service of the Master. They were gladly received. Elder E. W. Hargett preached in the afternoon. At night the preaching was done by the writer. Sunday morning the writer went first, followed by Elder Webb. Then after lunch the ordinance of baptism was administered, the four sisters being baptized, with a brother who had united with the church some time before, and who had been prevented from being at the church for baptism on account of providential hindrance. It was a wonderful meeting-a union indeed. Not a discordant note was heard. The Lord manifested His presence, and smiled on the assembly at each service. May He have all the praise, for to Him it is due. "Behold, how good, and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." The next union is to be held with Mount Paran Church. They are to set the time for the meeting. C. H. C.

Meeting at Cross Roads

---August 5, 1937

As has been announced in our columns, Cross Roads Church, near Henderson, Tenn., appointed a meeting to be held on July 7 and 8 as their fortieth anniversary, the church having been organized on July 7, 1897. We had no idea of attending the

meeting, as we thought we could not go, though we desired to be present with them. But we were called to conduct the funeral service of Brother W. S. Baughan, as it had been his request, or his expressed desire, that we should conduct his funeral when he should pass away. The funeral service was held in the afternoon on July 7, the first day of the meeting, which was at eleven o'clock. Brother Baughan's membership was at that church. He was the last one of the charter members, and he was buried on the fortieth anniversary of the organization of the church. By request of many of the brethren we agreed to remain over and be with the church in their service on the 8th. Elder W. C. Davis is the pastor, and was present. It was a sweet meeting. The Lord's presence was sweetly manifested. Elder J. H. Phillips is buried there. We had the privilege of visiting and looking upon his grave-buried beside his wife. We felt sad, and could not refrain from shedding tears as we stood beside his resting place. Our old friends are crossing over the river, and we sometimes feel lonely and sad. May the Lord remember us all in mercy, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Call For Peace Meeting

---August 19, 1937

In our last issue we published the following call for a peace meeting to be held in Nashville, Tenn. The meeting is to be held with Bethel Church, but the call was made by the three churches in Nashville-Bethel, South College Street, and Richland. This is as it should be, we think. It shows and manifests that the three churches' are willing to co-operate in doing what is right that peace may be restored in that country. We trust that much good may be accomplished by the meeting. We trust that all the churches who are concerned in the matters that have been disturbing the peace of the brethren in that country will be represented in the meeting by messengers. Let the churches represent, from each "side." If all go there with prayful hearts, leaving personal grudges behind, and with willing hearts to do what the good Book teaches, no doubt much good will be accomplished. No matter if some have said hard things about us, let us remember what the Lord has said, "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." Let us go there with willing minds to surrender, or give up, anything but the principles of truth and righteousness, and to be governed by the teaching of the Book-just to do and live as God has directed. The meeting is not to try to see how much wrong we can find; but try to map out, or suggest, what steps need to be taken in order that the brethren may all be brought together upon right principles. Let us lay aside all personal grudges and grudges, and try to labor for the peace of Zion. In our younger days the Baptists in that country were all together, and they should be that way now-and they can be, if all will try to do the right thing. May the Lord direct us all in the right way. If not providentially prevented we expect to be there, as we have been urgently requested to do. C. H. G. It is not necessary to insert the call again, or here in this place, as it is on another page in this book.

Our Church Papers

---August 19, 1937

The following article is copied from the Advocate and Messenger of April, 1937. We think the article is good and timely. Our people where we live know that we are always glad to have brethren in the ministry visit our churches in this section. And Brother Pittman is just with us in this matter, and he is also aware that we are agreed. We do not mean to intimate, by referring to this, or by saying this, that he

is otherwise than as he stated in this article. But we do wish to indorse the article. Our readers are aware of the fact that The Primitive Baptist and the Advocate and Messenger are harmonious, because of the fact that the two papers have been offered in a club together for a number of years. We are not afraid for our subscribers to read the Advocate and Messenger. We are glad for them to do so. Then they can see for themselves that we are not the only one who contends for the principles set forth in The Primitive Baptist. If our readers would all labor together, as our ministers should all labor together, with an eye single to the unifying of the Lord's people, and to the upbuilding of the cause of the Master, perhaps our cause would be in better condition today. If any are doing otherwise, may the Lord touch their hearts, and enable them to see the error of their way. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

As I look back to my young days I feel that the church paper in my parents' home had an influence on me for good. I would sometimes read it, especially matters of an experimental nature. And when I was baptized my pastor advised me to subscribe for a Baptist paper, which I did, to my profit, comfort and instruction. I believe that our Baptist periodicals have generally been a blessing to the cause of truth and righteousness, and I wish every family would take at least one church paper. Sometimes our papers have published things hurtful to the cause, for we editors are very imperfect-we make mistakes. But pastors, deacons, and members make mistakes. And so do churches and associations. And yet all of us, if following the teaching of the Spirit, are striving to serve for the greatest good to the greatest number-striving to unify Primitive Baptists upon the fundamentals of the Scripture. If there be church papers among us that divide God's people, or that seek to keep them divided where divisions have occurred, then such papers are not teaching as Christ taught. If there be some editors who want their readers to read no other Baptist paper except their own, then they are narrow and selfish. All we editors, of course, make special efforts to build up our subscription-this is right and proper. But in doing this we should not want to hinder the growth and influence of other Baptist papers. Nor should we be afraid to publish the addresses of our correspondents for fear other editors might send them sample copies and secure their subscription. Personally, I have felt it right to publish the writer's address-unless there be some special reason for not doing so. I would be glad if the blessed truths about Jesus and the precious doctrine of salvation by grace could be scattered everywhere. And I also want my readers to read other Baptist papers except the one I publish. I want my churches to receive visits from and to hear other ministers preach besides their unworthy pastor. By doing this they have an opportunity to read better articles than I can write, and hear better sermons than I can preach. This will do them good and make them stronger and broader Baptists. And if I am not jealous I will rejoice in that which tends to strengthen and unite our people. But selfish pastors and editors among us-if there be any-will, by acting selfish and uncharitable, hinder brotherly love and weaken the tie of fellowship. I am very imperfect-my mistakes are many-but I do not want to be called a selfish or jealous Baptist. In my heart there is a burning desire to see Zion prosper and her broken walls built up, but how to perform that which is good I find not. I know that not long hence I shall lay down my pen for another to take up, and when that time comes I pray that it can be truthfully said that my little labors were performed unselfishly, though imperfectly. And I would delight to see all we editors of the nine Baptist periodicals published in this country laboring more in love to unify our people upon the plainly taught truths of the Scriptures and manifesting less interest in doubtful matters that have brought confusion and division. By walking uprightly,

"speaking the truth in love," and writing in the spirit of brotherly kindness and Christian charity, our papers will wield a greater influence for good and manifest more glory to Him who has called us from nature's darkness into His marvelous light. R. H. P.

Will You, Please?

---August 19, 1937

For sometime we have been asking that obituaries be made as short as possible, but it seems that the writers of them forget about our request, or disregard it. Will you not please remember this request, and have mercy on your editor? It is very disagreeable to us to have to cut down on what you write in these obituaries, and leave out a lot of what you write. It is not at all pleasant for us to have to do this. Suppose you try to put yourself in our place, and try to imagine how you would feel if you were conducting the paper, and the space limited, and you have on hand enough good material to fill the paper for several months, and then folks send you a great long obituary, long enough to take up anywhere from one to three columns of space in the paper. And yet you have matter on hand that you cannot publish, on account of the space being limited, and matter that is of general interest to the cause any place where the paper might go. And notwithstanding this, some writer takes a lot of space in an obituary—a matter that cannot be for the upbuilding of the cause, but of special interest to only a few. How would you feel? When we thus take up so much space for some matter in which only a few of us can be specially interested, does it not look like it is selfishness on our part? Are we really treating the great majority of the readers right, or as we would wish to be done by, when we do this? We trust that the writers of these things will please remember these things in the future, and govern themselves accordingly. We know that these things can be made much shorter than many of them are. We know, too, that we feel like saying a lot of good things in such articles, but we can refrain from taking so much space. It is unnecessary to give the names and addresses of the surviving relatives. This simply takes up space and is of no comfort or instruction to the great majority of the readers. If we want to say so many good things about people, we should say them while the persons are living. Let us scatter more flowers along the pathway of the living. The good things you may say of us after we are gone will do us no good. Say more of your good things while we are yet living, and say less after we are gone. Do not keep back your good things to say after we are gone from this world. It is the living that need to have the good things said, and not the dead. May the Lord help us to be helpers one of another. And please remember that we are now giving fair warning that we will limit the space for obituaries. If you make them longer than three hundred words, we will have to leave out some of what you write. This is not to wound your feelings, or to wound the feelings of any who write; but we are compelled to make them shorter than a great many of them are. You can say all that is necessary in three hundred words, even if you cannot say all you would like to say. We know how you feel in regard to such matters; but we have to consider other matters as well as consider how the writer feels. Remember that we sometimes are called on to write obituaries, too; and for this reason we know the feelings of the writers. Will you now please consider these things, and make these matters short? C. H. C.

The Nashville Meeting

---October 21, 1937

We should have had some account of this meeting in our columns before now; but after the meeting, which was on Friday, Saturday and fifth Sunday in August, we were filling some appointments, and have been at home very little since the meeting. There were forty-two ministers in attendance at the meeting. The names of all of them were enrolled as being present, without regard to where or how they had stood-without regard to their order or standing among the brotherhood. The object of the meeting was not to pass judgment on the order or standing of any minister or others who might be in attendance at the meeting. On Friday morning it was put upon the writer to preach the opening discourse in the meeting, which we tried to do, as best we could, with the ability the good Lord saw fit to give. After the opening discourse a committee was selected to frame recommendations to present to the meeting, whereby all matters causing the disturbances and the troubles which have lately existed in that part of the country might be adjusted, and the brethren and churches might be brought together, and fellowship restored. However, before the committee was selected, the meeting made choice of Elder H. P. Houk as moderator and Elder C. H. Cayce as clerk. Elder E. S. Frye was requested by Elder Houk to serve as assistant moderator and as moderator pro tern in the absence of Elder Houk from the room, as Elder Houk was appointed to serve on the committee. The brethren selected to serve on the committee were: Elders H. P. Houk, C. H. Cayce, J. A. Monsees, James Duncan, T. L. Webb, R. O. Raulston, Lee Hanks, John R. Harris, J. D. Shain, and W. A. Shutt, and Deacon G. P. Nail. The committee labored hard Friday and until afternoon Saturday. On Saturday afternoon they finished their work, and their recommendations were read in open meeting. Then all were given opportunity to ask any questions they desired to ask concerning what was embraced in the recommendations, and the questions were answered. A stenographer was employed to take the questions and answers, which are to be published with the recommendations. After the reading of the recommendations, the same were approved by-unanimous vote of all the Primitive Baptists present- and a large crowd was there. We offered to print the proceedings-the recommendations, with the questions and answers-in pamphlet form for free distribution among our people. A contribution was taken up to help pay the cost of the printing and distribution of the same. The actual cost will be around ten cents per copy. If any desire to help pay this cost, it will be appreciated; but they will be printed and distributed free to any who desire them. Please write and tell us at once how many you would like to have, so we may have some idea as to how many to print. You are not obligated to pay anything for the copies you want. This is left entirely with you. At this writing we have not received the stenographer's report. This delay is holding up the work of printing and sending out the report of the meeting. When the proceedings are printed and sent out, it will be expected that the churches involved will either adopt or reject the recommendations of the meeting, as presented by the committee and approved by those present at the meeting; and that they will straighten out and eliminate the irregularities, so that peace may be restored. There are some things which will have to be cleared up in order to have peace and in order that fellowship exist and abound among the brotherhood. There are some things which will always bring trouble, confusion and distress among our people. No investigation was made as to the troubles, or as to who was in the right, or who was in the wrong. Not a single witness was called. Not a single question was asked as to whether this or that thing had been done, or as to whether this or that condition existed. Some of the things mentioned in the recommendations by the committee were known by some of the members of the committee to have been done and to have existed. Hence no witness was examined, no investigation was entered into, for the simple reason that this was

not a council meeting. Some of the brethren on the committee had been involved in the trouble, one way or another; and they simply unanimously agreed in the committee room as to what would bring about peace and restore fellowship, and how unity and fellowship may be maintained. It was a wonderful meeting. There was not a jar in the committee room. Everything was done harmoniously and by a unanimous voice there. We never served on a committee where things went more smoothly. Then when the time came for approval or non-approval of the recommendations as presented by the committee, the vote for approval was unanimous. Not a single vote was cast against approval. Then a song was sung and all engaged in shaking hands and embracing each other, while shouts of praise were heard and tears of joy were shed abundantly. We pray that much and lasting good may come of this meeting. May the Lord help us all to "behave ourselves in the house of God," and help us to labor for peace, and to strive for the things that make for peace. C. H. C.

John 8:1-11

---October 21, 1937

We have been requested to give our views concerning the case of the woman brought to the Saviour, which instance is recorded in **(John 8:1-11)**. We will not take space here to quote the language recorded concerning the case. Turn to your Bible and read it. We have heard this matter referred to as proof that persons guilty of adultery should be forgiven and retained as members of the church. If this does prove that, then will you please tell us what any person should be excluded from the church for? The matter of adultery is set forth in the Scriptures as the capital crime against the marriage vow and against the marriage bed, and is the only Scriptural ground upon which one may put away the companion and marry another. Note, here, the language of (John 8:4-5,6): "They say unto Him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act. Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou? This they said, tempting Him, that they might have to accuse Him." Observe that they said this tempting Him, "that they might have to accuse Him." The evident fact here is that they thought they had Him "cornered," so that no matter what He might say they would have Him entangled in His speech. Jesus had said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." -(Matthew 5:17-18). This being true, He was not to sit as a judge, to administer the law. If He should have said for them to do what the law said do, He would have been sitting as a judge, to pass sentence, and to administer the law; and this would have been a contradiction of his statement that He came to fulfill the law. If He should have said that He forgave the woman, that would have been to set the law aside, and not a fulfilling of the law. In either case, He would have been entangled in His speech; and this is just what those Pharisees and scribes thought He would have to do. But in this, as in all other instances when they tried to entangle Him, they were foiled in their purpose, and their efforts in that direction were a failure. Note that Jesus says, in (John 8:10-11), "Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more." In this He does not say that she is forgiven, and the law thereby set aside or dishonored and trampled under foot. Neither does He pass sentence, and thus sit as a judge. Thereby the scribes and Pharisees are thwarted in their purpose and design. The foregoing all being true, it is a twisting of the

Scriptures to apply this as an example to justify the forgiveness of the sin of adultery by the church. No such lesson is taught in this circumstance, and to apply the matter that way is a flagrant misapplication of the Scriptures. Just as well make a misapplication of the commandments and exhortations in the Scriptures, and give them to the unregenerate and ungodly world, as the religious world does, as to make such an application of this case as is sometimes done. Let us remember to rightly divide the word of truth, and put a lesson where it belongs. After writing the above we had the impression that we had expressed our views on this matter once before in the columns of this paper, hence we looked that up. For the benefit of our readers we refer you to page 179 of Volume I of our Editorial Writings-or Selected Editorials, which was the title given to the first volume. That article was written and published in The Primitive Baptist of May 7, 1907. C. H. C.

Excuses

---November 4, 1937

We have been gone from home a lot during the past several weeks, about three months, and have had so much to attend to that we have not been able to write for our columns as we would like to do. Besides this, we are far behind in answering letters received. We ask that all be as patient as you can, and we will answer the letters as soon as we possibly can, and will also write some for the paper as soon as we possibly can. For several days we have not been well, but at this writing (Oct. 22) we are feeling some better than for the past few days, and hope to be able to fully carry our work on in a few more days. Remember us in prayer. C. H. C.

Corresponding Editor

---November 18, 1937

In August, 1936, we visited the North District Association in Kentucky, where we were met by Elder J. H. Keaton, and who went with us into Ohio and then to his home, and then to the Indian Creek Association. While with him on the trip we heard him preach several times, and had the privilege and opportunity of talking with him, and exchanging views concerning matters that are of importance to our people and to the cause of the Master. Rather, we would say, that we had the opportunity of getting his views on matters of the faith and practice of the Primitive Baptists and in connection with the teachings of the Book. We also had the opportunity to learn something of his standing among the brethren in that country, as well as to learn something of his standing as a man. Hence, we requested that he make a trip west. This he agreed, the Lord willing, to do. So, we arranged a list of appointments for him, as our readers are aware; and we were with him on the entire trip. For several weeks we were with him and his family, and heard him preach almost every day during that time. It is with a great degree of satisfaction that we can say that we never heard him utter a single uncertain sound in the whole time we were privileged to be together. So, while he was here at our home, in our office, we asked him to let us place his name on our editorial staff. We had made no hint to him before that we would make such a suggestion. He seemingly hesitated for only a moment, and replied that we might do so if we felt that it would be for the good of the cause and would be no injury to the paper; We are thankful to have such men, as we esteem him to be, associated with us in the editorial work on The Primitive Baptist. If we know our heart, our desire, in continuing the publication of the paper, is to comfort and to benefit the Lord's humble poor, and to defend the truth as it is in Jesus our Lord, and for the glory

and honor of heaven's King. This was the desire of our sainted father when he began the publication of this paper, and was so until he laid down his pen in death, when the Master called him up higher. He died in the harness, with his face toward Jerusalem. We trust that by the grace of God we may do the same. We feel that no greater honor could be bestowed upon us than that we might die in the Lord's service, and in the service of His poor and afflicted people. The reproach of Christ is greater riches than all the treasures of this poor world. We are glad to have the name of Elder J. H. Keaton, 364 Brandon Road, Huntington, W. Va., added to our list of corresponding editors. May the Lord help us all to labor together for the advancement of the cause of the Master, and for the unifying and building up of the Lord's dear children. May we all endeavor to extend the circulation of the paper, for these commendable ends, and help us to fill the pages of the paper with such matter as will have a tendency to accomplish these things, and that we may never sow discord among brethren. Will the readers all pray for us, to this end? Elsewhere in this paper will be found an article from Elder Keaton, under the heading "Salutatory." May the Lord bless the dear brother, together with his family, as well as the brethren and churches where he labors, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Hens Furnish Church

---November 18, 1937

Sharon Church, near Culloden, has three beautiful plush chairs and stand which cost \$95. The ladies of the church took all the eggs laid on the meeting days and paid for this furniture. This was a great work and the hens felt better, we bet. - Banner Herald, November, 1937. Anybody taken the bet, yet? How much did you bet? Who won? Did you find out, for sure, that the hens felt better? Were they "talking hens," or were they "cackling hens?" Who sold the eggs? Were they fertile, or infertile, when sold? Were they sold as pure and sure fresh eggs? If they were fertile eggs, what would they hatch? Were any of them goose eggs? We ask this question because the article does not say they sold only chicken or hen eggs. Some of them might have been some other kind of eggs, for all we know. We have read in the Bible something about cockatrice eggs. Did they sell some of that sort? C. H. C.

Would Be Glad To Go

---November 18, 1937

For some time we have been urgently requested to visit the churches in some parts of Tennessee, especially in some of the middle and western portions of the state. We have felt that it was hardly prudent for us to make any extended trip just then; but now we are ready to visit the churches in those sections, the Lord willing, as the brethren may feel would be advisable, and where they feel some good might be accomplished by us going among them. So the brethren may write us concerning the matter, and make their suggestions as to the time they may think best for us to make such a trip, and also make their suggestions as to the places they may especially desire us to visit. Please remember and bear in mind that we are not as strong as we once were, and that it is not prudent for us to try to preach more than once a day, as a rule; and also that we might not hold out, physically, on too long a trip. Anyway, write us your suggestions, and pray the Lord that our labors might be blessed of Him to the good of the cause and His glory, if He should spare us to make the trip. C. H. C.

Advice and Advise

---December 2, 1937

There is quite a difference between giving advice and giving a command. To command is to direct authoritatively; to bid; order; charge; enjoin. The giving of a command carries with it the idea of having authority to enforce the thing commanded. The one who gives a command is one in authority. Advice carries no such thought or idea. Advice means a view or consideration of a thing; hence, opinion; judgment. An opinion recommended or offered as worthy to be followed; counsel. To advise is to give advice to; to offer an opinion to as worthy or expedient to be followed; to counsel; warn. For one to give or to offer advice does not signify that the one so doing is above or superior to the one to whom the advice is given. But the giving of a command does signify that the one giving the command is over or above the one to whom the command is given. If one can really give a command, in order that the command be effectual, or worth while, he must have the power or authority to enforce the command. No such thing as that is implied in giving of advice. One to whom advice is given is under no obligation to heed the advice, or to do as advised. The matter of doing as advised is optional with the one to whom the advice is given. The doing of the thing advised is left to the option, or will, of the one so advised. The inferior may advise the superior; or one may advise one who is his equal. But the superior commands the inferior. The inferior does not command the superior. Synonyms for advice are: Opinion, recommendation, instruction, suggestion, exhortation, admonition. Hence, if one recommends that a certain thing, or certain things, be done, he simply advises that. He gives that as his advice. But he has no authority to enforce the same. He can only advise or recommend, unless he is one in authority to enforce the thing proposed or commanded. For instance: In the peace meeting at Nashville we put forth some recommendations; things we recommended to be done and to be observed and followed. We had no right or authority to command that those things be done, nor any authority to enforce any of them. The churches are free to adopt or to reject the recommendations. The churches may adopt them, and they have the power and authority from God's Word to enforce them. All that meeting could do was to recommend or to advise certain things to be done. But the churches are to execute the laws which Christ gave to govern in His church or kingdom. Even the church does not have the right or authority to make laws. Jesus was the sole and only Lawgiver in Zion. He gave all the laws, rules and regulations to govern in His kingdom. He delivered all the laws and ordinances to His apostles as the judges in His kingdom. They sat as judges in that kingdom; and that is the Supreme Court. They, as the supreme judges, passed on all the laws, and told how to observe and how to execute them; and they delivered them all to the church for keeping. So the church is the executive body. They are to execute the laws which Christ gave, and they are to do that according to the direction and instruction of the Supreme Court. For them to do otherwise is for them to simply do that which is unconstitutional and contrary to the instruction of the Supreme Court. But the Lord never gave a law that is unconstitutional. Our law making bodies, in temporal affairs, sometimes pass a law that is unconstitutional; but our Lawgiver in Zion never did a thing of that sort. And those who are to execute the laws may do things that are contrary to the law, and contrary to the ruling of the Supreme Court. God's ministers should study the constitution and laws which our Lord has given, so that they may be able to rightly advise the Lord's children how to live, and how to observe the laws which Christ gave. They should be able to advise the church as to how those laws should

be observed, or executed, or obeyed, as the case may be. The minister is not the master. He is a servant-if he is a true minister of the gospel. He cannot enforce a single law in the kingdom; but he can advise, or recommend, in regard to the observing or enforcing those laws. To you ministers, who read this, we would put this question: Have you not, from time to time, advised the churches you were serving as to how they should do certain things? Have you not frequently advised them as to whether they should do certain things, or should not do them? In the giving of such advice, did you do so with the idea that you were above the church, or that the church belonged to you? Certainly not. If you did, we will say, kindly, though bluntly, that you are not a true servant. If you are, you have forgotten your station. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants, for Jesus' sake," says Paul. The true gospel minister is truly a servant; yet he is to advise, teach, and instruct the churches and the Lord's children as to how they should live here in the world. He is an overseer. As such, he is to set the right example as to how one should live as becometh the Lord's children. He should live right, himself. "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ," says Paul. He is to be an ensample to the flock. He should set the example as to how to live. In **(II Corinthians 8:10)** the apostle says, "And herein I give my advice." In this instance he chose not to speak as with the authority which he had as an apostle or judge in the kingdom; but to speak by way of advice. In thus writing concerning the matter under consideration, the church doing as advised shows forth a willingness and cheerfulness and gladness to do the thing that was commendable. Thus it was a matter of choice and willingness, freely done on their part. If the apostle chose to deliver the teaching here as a matter of advice, rather than as one of authority, which it seems that he did, then he has set an example that the minister may advise. But no other ministers have ever been appointed as judges in the Lord's kingdom. The apostles constituted the one and only Supreme Court. But they did set examples for the true ministers to follow in the succeeding ages. We would do well to endeavor to follow the examples set and left on record for us. May the Lord help us so to do. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 52

---December 16, 1937

According to the custom which has been practiced since the close of the first volume of The Primitive Baptist, it is now time for us to write another article on the close of the present volume-Volume lii. At this juncture we are reminded of the inquiry of the Prophet Isaiah, **{(0:6) (Isaiah 40:6)}** "What shall I cry?" The pondering of our heart for several hours has been, "What shall we say? How can we write another article as a close of the volume?" There are many and various and sundry things which might be said, but they would not all be appropriate for an article of the sort this is supposed to be. So, "What shall I cry?" was the question asked by the old prophet of God. Many a time when it falls to the lot of the poor servant of God to speak in the name of the Master he feels to be blank-feels that he has nothing in the world to say; and his earnest inquiry is, "What shall I cry?" Many times the editor is in the same condition in regard to writing. But the minister must make the effort. The people expect him to say something. So he must go forward, no matter how "empty" he may feel to be. So, the readers expect the editor to say something. He must make the effort. His inquiry may be, "What shall we say?" But the time is up; he cannot wait longer. He must write something-and he must write it now. The Lord told His prophet what to cry. He was not left to guess at what to say. Guess work

may have been as good in that day as at present. But guessing has never been any benefit to Israel in any age of the world. But will the Lord tell us what to say? There is an abundance of what to say given us in the Book; but some things set forth therein may not be exactly appropriate to write in an article for the close of the volume of a paper. There must be some truth that is appropriate for such an occasion. But, can we think of it? Will the Lord give us a mind on the things that may be appropriate? "Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not." -((Job 14:1) (Job 14:1-2). Do we realize how true this is? We are swift passengers from time to eternity. The time and place that now knows us will soon know us no more. But we are one year nearer to the end of our earthly trials and conflicts than we were a year ago. We have had some trials during the year past, as in every year since we can remember. But we have also had some seasons of rejoicing. We have seen and heard many of the Lord's little children made happy and to rejoice in the Lord along during the past year. We have seen some who had been at war possessed with a spirit of peace, and desiring to see an end of unholy war. This has been delightful to us. "Behold, how good, and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." We would be glad if we could live to see all true Old Baptists living together in peace and union and sweet fellowship; but we do not expect to see that. If such persecutions as the Lord's people have had to endure in some of the ages of the past should come upon them now, no doubt they would thereby be driven closer together. That time may come, whether we live to see it or not-and it may come sooner than some expect. "History repeats itself," is an old saying, which is very true. "That which hath been is now; and that which is to be hath already been; and God requireth that which is past." -((Ecclesiastes 3:15). If "that which is to be hath already been," then that which hath already been is to be again. "History repeats itself." The Lord's people have been persecuted in the past, and what hath been is to be again. It will come, whether we believe it or not. The Lord has suffered His people to be persecuted in days past, often as a chastisement and punishment for their sins and rebellion, and the forsaking of His laws and service. He will do the same again. He does not change. For our own good, it would be better for us to do that changing which needs to be done, and to forsake our own ways, and seek to serve the Lord. "Seek ye the Lord, while He may be found," is the instruction which has been given. Let us try to manifest our love for each other more than we have in the past. Let us forsake the world, and the things of the world, and "humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God, and He will lift us up." May He forgive our follies of the past, and help us to walk humbly and circumspectly before Him. Farewell until our issue of January 6, 1938, if the Lord lets us live until then. Remember us in your prayers. May the Lord bless you. C. H. C.

1938

Introduction to Volume 53

---January 6, 1938

We are now entering into the fifty-third volume of The Primitive Baptist. We do not feel to write much in the way of an introduction to this volume. We do not know what to say, nor how to say it. The best we know, just at this moment, is to pledge ourselves, with all our strength and energy, to endeavor, the very best we can, to earnestly contend for the principles for which this paper has stood since the first issue was printed on the first of January, 1886. That is, we pledge ourselves to this,

if the good Lord sees fit to spare us to live, and to bless us with a sane mind. Some of these days we will write our last article—we will lay our pen aside some day. We do not know any more now about how long the Lord will see fit to spare us than we knew a year ago. But for some purpose, best known to Himself, He has spared us to begin the publication of another volume of The Primitive Baptist. Will you pray the Lord to enable us to continue to contend earnestly for the faith that was once delivered to the saints? C. H. C.

Questions on Order

---January 6, 1938

We have received the following questions, with the request that we answer them through The Primitive Baptist:

1. Is it Baptist order and custom for a sister church to send a committee to a sister church without first giving legal notice of their intentions?
2. Is it order for said committee to ask the sister church to grant letters of dismissal, saying that they will receive said members if they see fit to grant them letters, when said members refuse to give a reasonable excuse for wanting letters? In case the letters are not granted, and the church in question would say that they felt that the church that refused to grant the letter did not have fellowship for their church, then go and receive these members by relation, when the church of their present membership is still in existence and holding regular meetings and transacting business in a regular way, would the church that received such members be in order?

3. Is it Baptist order and custom for a church to receive members by relation who have been excluded, without them first being restored to the church that excluded them? We will try to answer the questions, as best as we can, and as we understand them, by number. In answer to question one will say that it depends upon what the committee is sent for. If a committee is sent by one church to bestow labor upon a sister church, it seems to us that the committee should bear a letter from their church, with the complaint laid out in the letter. In answer to question two will say that we do not understand why a committee would be sent to a sister church asking that sister church to grant letters of dismissal to one or more of her members, unless it be to certify to the church that the member has been living right, when the church of their membership might be ignorant of the way they have been living, and therefore not be sure that the member is entitled to a letter. Remember that a church letter of dismissal says that the bearer is a member in full fellowship and good standing until joined to another church of the same faith and order. If the committee is not for that purpose, we do not see the propriety of a committee. A person asking for a letter of dismissal should have good reason for asking for it, and should be willing to give the reason. In fact, when the letter is given for the right purpose and in the right way, the person asking for the letter usually states the reason why the letter is asked for. If the person is not willing to do that, it looks like there is something wrong, on the very face of things. Church matters should be dealt with openly and frankly. To receive a member by relation from a church where that church has not granted a letter of dismissal is to treat the sister church with contempt. In our way of looking at things, it is a gross disorderly act. It denies that the sister church has the right to attend to her own business, or to attend to her own affairs. It savors of the assumption of authority by one church over another. In answer to question three will say that we have repeatedly stated our opinion in regard to the receiving of persons by relation who were

excluded from another orderly Old Baptist Church. It is gross disorder. It denies that a sister church has the right to discipline her own members. It is destructive to every law and principle of discipline by the church. When such a thing is done, then the church which excludes the person is forced to either fellowship the person in a sister church that she could not fellowship in her own body, or else fellowship between the two sister churches is broken and destroyed. Where an account is charged against a person is the only place on earth to get the account cancelled, or squared. If a concern in Chicago has us charged with a thing, whether the charge is just or unjust, that is the only place to get the books square. No other concern in the whole world can square that account, other than the concern who has the charge against us. Until our people recognize this truth and conduct themselves accordingly, there will be trouble and confusion and discord between sister churches, and fellowship between them will continue to be broken and destroyed. C. H. C.

Back With Us

---January 6, 1938

In another place in this paper will be seen an article headed, "Salutatory," by Elder H. P. Houk, of Gurley, Ala. We are glad to have him again associated with us on the editorial staff. Elder Houk is a man who is as "sound as a dollar," and is true to the principles for which the Old Baptists have stood all through the ages. We are sure that he can be depended upon to stand for the things that are true and right. We are glad to place his name on the staff again, and we hope he "will do better this time." We are glad to have such men with us as we have on our staff of corresponding editors. We firmly believe that each one of them is a true Old Baptist, and they have no "time" for any of the inventions of men in the affairs of religion. May the Lord bless them, and bless their labors in the kingdom to the good of the cause and to the comfort of His people and the glory of His name. C. H. C.

Softshell Stung

---January 6, 1938

In our issue of February 20, 1936, we paid some attention to an article written by one Rev. Parson E. C. Gillentine, of Laurel, Miss., which he had published in the Baptist and Commoner, of Little Rock, in which he had tried to make it appear that the early Baptists of Mississippi were of the modern sort, Missionary so-called Baptists. We showed from reliable and authentic history that those early Baptists did not advocate what these modern Pharisaical Softshells advocate. Our article stung the Hon. Rt. Rev. Parson Gillentine, so he wrote another article calling it an "Open Letter to the Editor of The Primitive Baptist." But in his so-called open letter he does not even pretend to answer what we said or what we proved from reliable history. Instead of that he vents his spleen on the doctrine of personal and unconditional election, and asks a lot of questions concerning the same, besides false statements and misrepresentations of the teaching of the Primitive Baptists. But suppose that doctrine is not the truth? What then? Does that prove that those early Baptists of Mississippi were the Bogard and Gillentine sort of Baptists? No; not on your life. Here is what those early Mississippi Baptists said they believed: "We believe in the everlasting love of God to His people; in the eternal unconditional election of a definite number of the human family to grace and glory." This is the very doctrine which Gillentine, in his "open letter," rants against. That doctrine was believed by those early Mississippi Baptists. It is the very doctrine these modern

Softshell hypocrites do not believe; and it makes them mad and gives them the jitters every time they come in contact with it. Poor fellows. No sort of bluster about what you "are doing for the Lord" can put you in line with those early Mississippi Baptists. You fellows do not preach the gospel, anyhow. We doubt if you would know what the gospel is, even if you should meet it in the road labeled in box-car letters. Poor little Gille. C. H. C.

Things Appreciated

---January 6, 1938

We have received quite a number of holiday remembrances, for which we are thankful. We cannot write a personal acknowledgment to each one who sent us these kind remembrances, with their assurances of Christian love and fellowship, and we wish each one of you to accept this as a personal note assuring you that these things are valued more than we are able to tell you. Besides these things, we receive, from time to time, from dear brethren and sisters, a few words of appreciation of our efforts and labors in the cause of the Master, many of which we do not deem prudent to put in the paper, for good and sufficient reasons, so it seems to us. But we do appreciate the same more than we have words to tell. They help us and encourage us to press on in the Lord's service, and in service to His dear children. We feel unworthy of so many expressions of love and appreciation and approval; but we appreciate the same. May the Lord bless each one of you who have thus spoken or written a good word of encouragement to us. They have been as a drink of cool water to our thirsty soul. If we are truly a servant of the Lord, not one of you shall lose your reward. We cannot reward you, but the God we try to serve can, and will. May His richest blessings rest upon you, is our humble prayer. And, please do not forget that we are poor and needy and need your prayers. C. H. C.

Genesis 6:2 Remarks To Reinert Varhang

---January 6, 1938

(Genesis 6:2) refers to the sons of God taking the daughters of men for wives. They married the daughters of men. This language is symbolic. The sons of God were children of God. The daughters of men were the inventions of men. The Lord's children forsook the true service of God and engaged in the practice of the doctrines and commandments of men. That is what many are doing in this present age of the world. Destruction came upon them then on account of their wickedness; and destruction will come again for the same thing. We will try to write a little further on the matter when time and opportunity will permit. You will find a little hint on that matter on page 387 of Selected Editorials. C. H. C.

Changed Over

---January 20, 1938

We see that "Dr. Bogard" has quit the Baptist and Commoner and is now connected with the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, as editor of that paper, which has lately been moved from Tennessee to Arkansas; but the former Tennessee editors are still retained on the editorial staff. It seems that the reason "Dr. Blowhard" quit the Commoner was because he could not very well have his way about some things. It seems that the Rev. Dr. has to be the "big boss" of everything he has anything to do with. Rev. Allen Hill Autry charged that the reason why Bogard quit

the Convention was because he could not boss the Convention. We note these short statements: "But she and I do not agree on what the policy of the paper should be and since the paper was not my property I was compelled to submit to much that I did not like." There; that's "the rub;" just did not like the idea of submitting; no, sir; I must be the "ramrod," the "whole cheese;" I must have the say-so about the policy of the paper, and what does or does not go into its columns. Hence: "There was just one way out and that was to walk out." So, out the Rev. Bogard walked. That's the way it seems to have been in regard to the Arkansas Baptist State Convention, too, several years ago, and so, out he walked. C. H. C.

Money Disappears

---January 20, 1938

A few years ago these anti-Board Missionaries were howling loud and long about how the Convention folks were extravagant, how they squandered "the Lord's money," how their expenses were high, and so forth, and so on. We thought then, and said so more than once, that it seemed to us just a question as to who handled the cash. So, now it seems that somebody besides Convention folks have been allowing some cash to "get away" somehow. On page 3 of the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight of December 10, 1937, we find an article under the heading of "A Page of Cold Facts," over the signature of Ben M. Bogard. In said article, under "Fact Numbers 1" we see this language: Why has a debt accumulated-steadily accumulated at the rate of more than TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS A MONTH since March? What has become of the THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS a quarter that came in over and above enough to pay the printer? Where does the money go? I do not say that anybody is stealing the money, but I do say somebody KNOWS where the money goes. There now! How could you intimate, "dear brother," that these honest (?) soul-savers could possibly do such a thing as to squander the Lord's money? Or, that they could possibly know what has become of the money? Don't you know, "dear brother," that they are not wanting money? Don't you know, "good brother," that they are "belly-aching" for the salvation of souls, and that filthy lucre has no charms for them? Precious, "good brother," calm down, now, and do not be so ugly as to put in your good soul-saving paper such a veiled intimation that your partners in the soul-saving business would do such a thing as to steal the Lord's money out of His soul-saving business. Under "Fact Number 7" we see this statement: It is a cold fact, and this fact is so very cold that it may blister. We have been abusing the Southern Baptist Convention for using so much money for expenses, so much overhead expenses, and we have done right when we abused them for this. But it IS A COLD FACT that the Convention only uses NINE PER CENT to cover the expenses while the Texarkana office used OVER FIFTY PER CENT for expenses! Here this fellow admits that the Convention folks carry on "the Lord's business" at the small cost of only nine per cent, and yet that they "howled" about the high cost. Well, it just appears to us that a cost of only nine per cent for the expense of carrying on a business is a mighty low cost. We believe the average cost of doing business is much higher than that. But, now the "Big Boss" admits that the cost of their machine at Texarkana has amounted to fifty per cent for expenses! It seems to us that for the sake of economy you folks had better go back home to the Convention, if for no other reason. You young fellows thought (?), perhaps, you had found a new way to carry on that monstrous work of soul-saving, a much more economical way, than the inventors had found and worked out, but you babies did not know as much, perhaps, as you thought (?) you knew.

Under "Fact Number 9" we find this statement:-----told Brother-----, a prominent member of the Malvern church, that money coming to that Texarkana office was FIRST USED to pay the ones who worked in the office and what was left went to the missionaries. Well, of course. How can a business be carried on unless the expenses are paid? That is always the first thing that has to be taken care of- the expenses. How on earth are you going to get an airplane to sail to heaven to carry passengers into glory, unless the gas bill is paid first? Of course, it makes not so much difference what the money is contributed for, the expense of the business must come out of the contributions, and "Jones, he pays the freight." This whole modern mission business is a great big humbug, and was hatched as one of the greatest money making machines of modern times. They beg money under the pretense of saving souls; but the Lord has not turned His work of salvation over to these modern money hunters. Nor has the Lord ever been a partner in their business. C. H. C.

Cheap Salvation

---January 20, 1938

We see in the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, according to the report made by the Reverend Dr. Blowhard that his "Missionary Baptist Institute" is doing a most wonderful work. He evidently has a most wonderful soul-saving machine over there in Little Rock. It seems to us that they might have all the folks saved in our capital city some of these days-unless they are saving "the same old sixty" over again from time to time. And it seems that they sure do have the "cost of production" down to "rock bottom." The "big boss" says: "We have figured up the cost of this work. It is amazing, but true, that the average cost of the work is one dollar and twenty-five cents (\$1.25) for each soul that has been saved." That is truly amazing! Gee, that sure is cheap salvation! Wonder how they did manage to get the article down so cheap! That sounds to us like it is too cheap to be a true and genuine article. We are afraid of that stuff. It surely must be a counterfeit. No genuine article of salvation has ever been so cheap in America, that we have ever heard of before. We have read in some of their literature that it cost only one cent to evangelize a heathen-but that is a long way off; and we could not all of us go over there to see if they were dispensing the genuine article or a counterfeit. However, we never did believe they were dispensing the genuine article over there, for the simple reason that we never caught them dispensing the genuine article here. We have never believed that it has been committed to them to dispense it. We have never believed that these fellows had anything to do with the matter of dispensing eternal salvation to the souls of men and women. But, if you will just hand over your cash to this "institute," they will in a short time have the millennium ushered in. The Rev. Dr. Bogard handles the cash. C. H. C.

Meddlers and Busybodies

---February 3, 1938

That there have been meddlers and busybodies along the line there can be no doubt. In days of old there were some of such characters, and they caused others to have trouble, and brought trouble upon themselves. To meddle is "to interest, engage, or concern one's self unnecessarily or impertinently; to interfere; to interpose or participate interferingly, or busy one's self improperly with another's affairs." To "meddle (with or in) is to concern one's self officiously or impertinently

with another's affairs." A meddler is "one who meddles; one who interferes, or busies himself with things in which he has no concern; an officious person; a busybody." A busybody is "one officious in the affairs of others; a meddling person." Here we have a definition of what a meddler is, and what it is to meddle, and as to what a busybody is. These are ugly things, and are sure trouble breeders. Solomon says, "He that goeth about as a talebearer revealeth secrets; therefore meddle not with him that flattereth with his lips." --(0:19) (Proverbs 20:19). To flatter is an "act of pleasing by artful commendation or compliments; false, insincere, or excessive praise." Hence, a flatterer is one who practices deception. He will praise you to your face, but in his heart he does not mean what he says. He is a deceiver. Better not meddle with one who is of that sort. He will sure get you into trouble, sooner or later, one way or another. He will not do to depend on. Better" let him alone." It is sure to the best interest of one to not meddle with one of that sort. A talebearer is" one who officiously or maliciously spreads gossip, scandal," etc. Gossip is" the tattle or conversation of a gossip; idle talk; groundless rumor." A talebearer will sure spread trouble, if he does not make it. For one's own good, he had better not meddle with a talebearer. It would be better for one to" mind his own business," and let the talebearer alone. To meddle with matters not our own will sure bring trouble upon us, as well as cause trouble among others. We would suppose that people know more about their own business than other people do. If other folks know more about how to manage and attend to their own business than we do, suppose we meddle with their affairs, and try to tell them how to run their business? That would certainly not look very well in us. Sooner or later such a course would get us into trouble. It would cause others to have a poor opinion of us, to say the least of it. If there is trouble in a community, and we go into that community, it is better for us, as well as better for the community, that we let that trouble alone. If we meddle with it, we get ourselves into trouble with some of them, or perhaps all of them. If we meddle with it, we only make bad matters worse. It might not be so hard for those concerned to get matters adjusted, and get the trouble settled, if we do not meddle with it. They understand it better than we do. To be a meddler, then, is to be a maker of trouble, or to be a stirrer up of trouble. It is to be a busybody. The Apostle Peter puts a busybody in a very ugly class. He says, "But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evildoer, or as a busybody in other men's matters." --((Pet 4:15) (I Peter 4:15). What a pity that all people do not try to attend to their own business, and let the business of other folks alone. When one puts in one-half his time attending to his own business, and puts in the other half letting the business of other folks alone, he will not cause trouble as a meddler or as a busybody, nor will he have to suffer as a busybody. This does not at all say that one church may have what she pleases, no matter what it is, and no other church has the right to object. What is detrimental to the cause is something which concerns any church, and she has a right to object to it. But it does not give her a right to interfere with the rights of sister churches. Nor does this give an individual a right to meddle with the affairs of the church, or with matters that the church is to attend to. No individual has the right to go from his own home and endeavor to regulate the affairs of others. Let us learn to "behave ourselves" in the house of God. C. H. C.

Mississippi Baptist History

---February 17, 1938

In the Baptist and Commoner of July 31, 1937, the Rev. Dr. Ben M. Blowhard gives some account of a trip he made in Mississippi and Louisiana. In this he refers to an

association which he calls the Mississippi Association, and says that it was organized in the year 1806, or that certain churches associated together in that year, forming that association. In his article he says: "The old Mississippi Association was always just an old-fashioned Missionary Baptist Association and many of the churches have remained the same until this day." Ah! they have remained the same, have they? Here is Article 4 of the Articles of Faith upon which the old Mississippi Association was constituted: "We believe in the everlasting love of God to His people; in the eternal unconditional election of a definite number of the human family to grace and glory." Do your churches have such an article as that now? Please answer, Doctor. Number 6 of their Articles of Faith says: "We believe all those who were chosen in Christ, before the foundation of the world, are in time effectually called, regenerated, converted and sanctified; and are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation." Do your people have that in their faith now, Doctor? Do you, and do they, believe the teaching and sentiment of that article, Doctor? Number 7 of their Articles of Faith says: "We believe there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who by the satisfaction He made to law and justice, in becoming an offering for sin, hath by His most precious blood redeemed the elect from under the curse of the law, that they might be holy and without blame before Him in love." Doctor, do you and your people believe and teach the doctrine embraced in that article of faith of those old Mississippi Baptists? Doctor, do you and your people believe that God did elect a definite number of the human family to grace and glory? Do you believe and teach that the elect were chosen in Christ before the ages of time began? and that they were a definite number of the human family? Do you believe that the elect, those thus chosen, are in time effectually called and regenerated in time? Do you believe that Christ redeemed the elect from under the curse of the law? Do you and your people, Doctor, really believe that Christ redeemed anybody from under the curse of the law? Or, do you believe that He only died to give every person of Adam's race a chance to be saved? Say, Doctor, do you and your people believe what those old Mississippi Baptists said they believed? Doctor, did you know what these old Mississippi Baptists said they believed? If you did not know, then why would you try to make it appear to your readers that you did know, by making the claim that you were just like them? If you did know what they said they believed, then why would you try to make it appear that you are in line with them, and that you are the same, seeing your faith and teaching is not what they believed and taught, and you did know it? Which horn of the dilemma will you take, Doctor? You will just keep quiet, will you not, Doctor? We get our information as to the date the Mississippi Association was organized, which was in July, 1807, from page 77 of Griffin's History of the Mississippi Baptists. We quote from their Articles of Faith from the same page of the same book. In 1810 this query was sent to the association, which may be found on page 86 of the same book, with their answer: "Is the washing the saints' feet a Christian duty? Answered in the affirmative." How would you answer that query today, Doctor? You are not like those Mississippi Baptists, are you, Doctor? From page 90 we give this extract from a circular letter they put forth in 1811: "Brethren, we are obliged to believe, that inasmuch as God sent His Son into the world to save His people from their sins, that He has a people whom He designs to save. Now, if any of those whom God designs to save should be finally lost, He must either change His mind, or else He has not power to accomplish His designs- the supposition of which we consider blasphemy." Doctor, you and your Softshell brood could not digest such doctrine as that, could you? On page 101 we find the following question put to the association from one of the churches, and their answer: "Should a brother be held in fellowship, who prefers the rights and privileges of the Masonic Lodge to the communion of his church? Answer-No." Say,

Doctor, those Old Mississippi Baptists came very near saying you should not be held in fellowship, did they not? How about you and your folks saying that, what they did then, Doctor? They said that in 1818, Doctor. Are you like them now, Doctor? Say, Doctor, who was editor of the Baptist Flag in November, 1906? On page 4 of that paper of November 29, 1906, in the department conducted by J. K. P. Williams, of Sherman, Texas, over the signature of T. J. Humble, we find the following language: In "Paxton's History of Louisiana Baptists," "I find the following articles:" We believe in the everlasting love of God to His people; in the eternal unconditional election of a definite number of the human family, to grace and glory," which was adopted by the first association organized in Louisiana, which was in the year 1818, which is No. 4, and the following is No. 6:" We believe that all those who were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, are in time effectually called, regenerated, converted and sanctified, and are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation." The reader will please note carefully that these are the same as the Articles of Faith of the old Mississippi Association. Evidently they copied the articles from that association, and were originally of that old body. But let us read from the pen of T. J. Humble: These articles of faith were rejected in the year 1845, and after the year 1850, there was not a Missionary church or association to be found in Louisiana having such articles of faith, and it seems to me that if there was nothing wrong about them, they would have been continued, and to contend for the accepting of the Primitive Baptist baptism is equivalent to charging an error of great magnitude against God's children for their action of the age, which I cannot be a party to. Get the idea, please. The Missionaries at that time were having a war among themselves on account of some preachers going over from our folks to the Missionaries, and who were taken in by them on the baptism administered by the Primitive Baptists. Humble was opposed to that. He did not believe the Primitive Baptists were right in their teaching, and did believe the Missionaries did right in changing their articles of faith, which he openly avows was done. Why? Because they did not believe the doctrine contained in them. Yet, this man Blowhard has the brass to claim before his readers that they are the same people. They are no more like those old Mississippi Baptists than a skunk is like an apple blossom. C. H. C.

A Stunner

---February 17, 1938

We received the following letter a few weeks ago, which we copy verbatim, punctatim literatim,-word for word, punctuation for punctuation, letter for letter: Nov. 15 1937. Eld. C. H. Cayse. Thornton Ark. Dear Sir. Referring to an article in your paper that you call The Primitive Baptist of date of July 15 1937. in which you state that you do not care to spend time with Griffin in your paper as his papers will not carry your articles, and you further state that you challenged our people twenty years agoe and they has never been withdrawn. I am utterly surprised at this statement from you in writings or otherwise, as you well know that I challenged you to your face and in writings and that I have witnesses to the oral Challenge and I have Registered return receipts showing that you received the challenge through the mail, and I have your corospondance and copies of mine where you accepted my challenge and agreed to correspond so as to arrange the nessary propositions, you also ask that I secure the endorsement of one or more of my Churches and I sent that And have a return receipt, and have return receipts showing that it has been impossable to hear from you on the subject since that time. Now there is no

need for you to be hurting to investigate our differences and publishing such statements in your paper as I am ready to accommodate you the Lord being my strength, also you will not have to depend on our papers to publish it I will publish it in book form or rather I should have said we will publish it for I know you would want it published, now you may carry an article in your paper correcting your statement and publish my letter and agree to debate the subject or shut up on the subject which you have already done only through your paper. Now Eld Cayce I don't want to be rude but you know that what I have written you is so and I can prove it. If you don't want to debate our differences that is alright but don't try to make it appear that we are all afraid to meet your great Theology neither are we afraid to meet you though you are considered the great leader among your people, it seems that you would come on out and not be forever challenging some one, the Philistine Giant He finally did fight so for I have more respect for him than I have for you due to the fact that all you have done is challenge and have failed to live up to it. Hoping to hear from you soon and that you may be ready to make good your long boasted challenge I am your friend. R. W. Rhodes. We have not written the gentleman privately. We honestly believe that notoriety, or publicity, is what he really wants; so we gratify him that much this time, by publishing his wonderful (?) effusion just as he wrote it, and just as we have it on file. Suppose you throw away enough time to read the blustery effusion again. See how he "butchers the King's English;" but yet he blows about wanting to debate, and the same to be published in book form to palm off on the public! Now, would we not have a book filled with wonderful language-a part of it, at least. Isn't the spelling, punctuation, and capitalization wonderful! These fellows must have a dictionary and a grammar all their own! The writer says he challenged us. Yes. But he sent propositions that would require a simpleton to accept, especially if the debate is to be published. We sent him a copy of the propositions we made our challenge on in 1910. Did he accept them? Not on your life. Will he do so now, after all his blowing? We shall wait and see. The "parson" refers to correspondence between us. Yes. Does he want the correspondence all published- including the list of questions we asked him and his letter in answer to the same? If so, we will give space for the whole thing, if he will get one of his papers to do the same. Will one of his papers publish all that? No. "Parson" Berry proposed in his paper that if we would copy a certain article from his paper, that he would publish our reply. We copied the article and replied to it. Did Berry copy our reply? No. He has not done so yet-and the evidence is that he does not intend to. Of course it is all right for these fellows to "go back" on their word; for, according to their doctrine, God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated from all eternity that they should do just what they do, and they could not do otherwise than the way they do and what they do. Yes, he sent an endorsement; but they did not give the kind of endorsement asked for. He knows what was asked for, or can find it by referring to the correspondence. Will he get that? We shall see what we shall see. He says "we will publish it." Will the gentleman give good bond and security that he will pay his half the cost of publishing the books? Frankly, we would want some security before obligating ourselves for any cost or expense on such a proposition. Yes, we said as long ago as 1910 that we wanted a debate with these folks, if they would put up a representative man, and have the discussion published. This will show the people what the real differences are between us, and will show the people just what we hold to and the principles we stand upon; and it will also show to the people just what these fellows advocate. We quit debating several years ago; but we would engage in this one more under the conditions proposed by us years ago. We have not withdrawn the challenge. "Parson" Rhodes says he has more respect for the Philistine giant than he has for us. Of course, we would expect that, for people

usually have more respect for their own kinfolks than they do for others. Au revoir.
C. H. C.

Trip Cut Short

---February 17, 1938

We left home on Wednesday night before the fourth Sunday in January for Tennessee to fill some appointments in the Western part of that state. We were at West Plains, near Milan, on Thursday, and at New Hope on Friday. The weather was bad, so the crowd was not large at New Hope. Saturday we were at Blooming Grove. The weather was still bad. We were to have been at Little Zion on Sunday, but the weather was so bad, and the roads so bad, that there was no meeting at that place. Word was scattered around and they had meeting again at Blooming Grove on Sunday. Several of the brethren in the ministry were with us at West Plains and New Hope, and an effort was made to change some of the appointments and give us more time at some places than the first arrangement called for. Elder W. C. Davis, of McEwen, fell in with us at New Hope, and was to make the trip with us. The rain continued, and besides the rain, the weather turned very cold, and some snow fell, so it seemed that we could hardly get to the appointments. So we, with Elder Davis, remained with Elder Commodore Brann and Brother G. T. Kelley until Friday, when we were conveyed to Dresden, where we took the train for Union City. We were with the church there Saturday and fifth Sunday. Several brethren in the ministry were at this meeting, which was a pleasant one. A number of brethren and sisters from sister churches were at the meeting. On account of the bad weather, and perhaps some misunderstanding on account of the change in some of the appointments, and the short time to give notice, we decided it would be prudent to return home and go back later. Appointments have been arranged and some of them will be published in this issue of the paper, and we suppose others will be sent in soon. Elder Scott had an aunt by marriage to pass away on Saturday, who lived near Murray, Ky., and it was the request of the family that we conduct the funeral on Sunday. Just as we are writing this her name is gone from us. We went with Elder Scott, and conducted the funeral at 2 o'clock; then went to Murray, Ky., where we took the train for home, and arrived home at 3:20 Monday morning, January 31. We trust the weather will be better when we try to go to that section later. Pray the Lord to bless our going to the good of His people. C. H. C.

Hardshellism Refuted

---March 3, 1938

The above is a sub-head of an article in the Baptist Examiner of January, 1936, written by one W. T. Stegall, of Pontotoc, Miss., whose name appears in that paper as associate editor. In this article Elder Stegall says (we copy it just as it was in that paper): If they can savingly and effectually receive a knowledge of and belief in Christ, immediately and directly by the operation of the Holy Spirit, without the record of Him and without apostles, messengers, and witnesses, had we not as well burn all the Bibles and kill all the preachers? Why mention His precious name at all? Notwithstanding the Elder has here made such statements as in the foregoing, yet we occasionally see something from his pen in some of our Primitive Baptist exchanges, in which it seems to us that he poses as a Primitive Baptist. He stands excluded from a Primitive Baptist Church in the bounds of the New Hope Association, in Mississippi, unless he has been recently restored. The above

paragraph contains the same reasoning which the Arminian world has used all along against the doctrine believed and advocated by true Primitive Baptists-" if they can savingly and effectually receive a knowledge of and belief in Christ, immediately and directly by the operation of the Holy Spirit, without the record of Him," etc., "had we not as well burn all the Bibles and kill all the preachers?" This is simply an argument that no one can be saved without Bibles or preachers-all would be doomed to an endless or eternal hell, without Bibles or preachers. That is the argument, in a nutshell. It also argues that if Bibles or preachers are not instrumental in regeneration then there is no use for Bibles or preachers. There is no more sense nor logic in the gentleman's argument here than for one to say that there is no use to sow seed and cultivate the soil because in so doing one does not or cannot make another world like this. Because one cannot make another world by sowing seed or tilling the soil is no reason why he should not till the soil. That is no proof or evidence that no good is accomplished by sowing seed and tilling the soil. Because sinners are not regenerated through the instrumentality of the Bible or gospel preaching is no argument that there is no good accomplished by reading the Book or through the medium of gospel preaching. There is a use for the Bible, and there is a use for gospel preaching, but they are not for the purpose of regenerating people. They are not for the purpose of imparting life to the dead. If the preacher is for the purpose of raising sinners out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ, then the preachers will be used in the resurrection of the dead from the graves at the last day; for our Saviour told us while He was in the world that the one is accomplished in the same way, and by the same power, and through the same process as the other. It is by the hearing of the voice of the Son of God that sinners are quickened into divine life. When Elder Stegall preaches, it is Elder Stegall's voice that the people hear. Then if it is through his preaching that sinners are regenerated, then Elder Stegall is the Son of God whom Jesus mentions. Wonder if he is Jesus? We knew it was prophesied that He was coming back to the world again, but we did not know that He had got here yet. Wonder if He looks like He did when He was here before? The gentleman's argument in the above paragraph necessarily embraces the teaching that life is imparted through a medium. There is no such thing taught or proved in all the realm of science, or in God's Book, as that life is imparted through a medium. The gentleman certainly should know that life is always imparted by a direct and immediate touch of life. There can be no such thing as life imparted through a medium. In the very nature of things such a thing is absolutely impossible; and it is absurd in the extreme to argue, or try to argue, such a thing. The gentleman made an effort in some of his articles to "play on" the ignorance of some Primitive Baptists. We would kindly say that it is ignorance "gone to seed" to argue that life is given or imparted through a medium. If the gentleman's contention is true that no one is regenerated except through the instrumentality of the Bible or gospel preaching, then no infant could ever possibly be saved in heaven, unless they go to heaven without regeneration or salvation. Those who argue that the Bible and preachers are necessary for the salvation of persons of Adam's race have, all along, accused the Old Baptists of preaching infant damnation -and the Old Baptists have always denied the charge. But here is the doctrine that has the idea of infant damnation in it-no preaching, no people saved. The infant is not in the reach of gospel preaching. If there is no salvation for any only for those who are in reach of gospel preaching, then there is no salvation for any infant. If the infant can be saved without gospel preaching, so can others be saved without it. The infant is saved without gospel preaching, and that is the way all other saved persons are saved. Jesus said, "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." -Mark 10: 15. The little child receives, enters into, the kingdom of God without the gospel, by

being born into it. And if the adult does not receive it that way, or enter into it that way-the same way the little child does-he does not enter it at all. The Lord has one way of regenerating people, and that way is suited alike to the infant and to the adult. He does not have one way to save the infant, and another way to save the adult. They are saved the same way-so our Master has said -believe it or not. If people cannot be saved now without preachers, pray tell us how the Lord ever got that saving business started. The first man saved had to be saved without a preacher-or else the Lord used a child of the devil to regenerate the first man for Him in order to get His business started. How does that taste? Excuse us, please. We have no use for your doctrine. It was invented by Rome, and she has deceived the nations with it along the line. C. H. C.

A Young Dog

---March 3, 1938

From the Arkansas Baptist of Nov. 29, 1906, we have the following language: When the Landmark Baptists of Arkansas come to understand each other they will be able to do a work that will astonish the world. We are only in the formative period now, but we are progressing. There is a bright future for us. Here we are in 1906, in the formative period. If they were in the formative period then, in 1906, they are a very young outfit now-only about thirty-two years old. And yet some of these young "bucks" are now claiming to be older than a body that has been in existence over nineteen hundred years. This young upstart sprang from the Board and Convention body of so-called Baptists; and the Board and Convention business was infused into the Baptist family by Fuller and Carey in 1792, and the Board and Convention crowd was finally thrown out of the Baptist ranks in the United States from 1832 to 1845-after the Baptists had protested against, and borne with, their nefarious business all those years. Forbearance ceased to be a virtue. In the casting out of this octopus the whole brood went with the bunch. But in 1905 and 1906 this new-born babe was in the formative period. This little thing was just a babe then-hardly old enough to walk. But they were making great promises. They would soon astonish the world. Well, perhaps they have begun to do that, in some of their Sunday school business at Texarkana-according to the Rt. Rev. Ben M. Blow-hard, D. D., LL. D. Wonder how many more D's the Rev. gentleman would like to have. According to Rev. Allen Hill Autry, Bogard wrote his own recommendations to get the D. D. Say, Doctor, who wrote the recommendations for you to get the later D's? From the Gospel Missionary of June 8, 1905, J. A. Scarboro, editor, we have the following, under the heading of "Fido and Bob:" A friend of ours had a pet dog named "Fido" and Fido was a great fighter. For a long time he would allow no other dog to either come in or pass by without a fight. Our friend's neighbor reared a puppy which he called "Bob" and Fido would stand on the porch and watch for Bob and whenever Bob passed on the street Fido would run out and whip Bob and then come back and look happy. He whipped Bob until he learned his name, and the boys would say "Bob" and Fido would fly to the door and look for Bob and bark. But Bob kept growing, as puppies will, and finally got big enough to give Fido a warm tilt; a little later he whipped Fido, and then the program changed from Fido versus Bob to Bob versus Fido. After Bob whipped Fido a few times, the boys would say "Bob" and Fido would run under the bed, and if Fido got out and Bob saw him he chased him home.

Moral: 1891-2 Board versus Gospel Missioner. Fido vs. Bob. 1901-5, Gospel Missioner versus Board. Bob vs. Fido. You can now find "Fido" under the Baptist bed. Selah. The anti-Board crowd was just a young dog then. The pup was born

about the year 1890 or 1891. The Board crowd was an old dog at that time. If the Board crowd was an old dog then (and that was the old dog, according to Scarboro), and the anti-Board crowd was just a young pup then (and the thing was just a young pup then, according to Scarboro), it necessarily follows that the Board and Convention crowd still constitute the older dog. It seems to us that it is just a case of "dog eat dog." C. H. C.

An Address To Young Preachers

---March 3, 1938

The following article, appearing under the above heading, is copied from a book called "The Primitive Preacher; a Book of Sixteen Sermons Delivered by Gregg M. Thompson." The book was published in 1888. Elder Thompson was an able minister in his day. The following chapter from the book is so good and timely that we feel it would be profitable to our readers now. Please read carefully and consider its teachings prayerfully, and may the Lord help us to take heed to the same. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

Dear Brethren: Will you take kindly, in the close of this book, a short address from an old servant, who has been for sixty years in the war, has passed through many severe and hard-fought battles, and is now standing upon the verge of the grave, ready to drop his armor, receive his discharge, and go home to rest from his labors? You are the called of God, to stand upon the walls of Zion, and watch for the good of God's people. Your life is one of labor, toil, and exposure to the fiery darts of the enemy. Your responsibilities are great, and a lack of faithfulness in the discharge of duty on your part, may bring great distress and confusion among Zion's citizens. When Moses delivered his last address to the children of Israel, he warned them of the dangers that would surround them when they entered the promised land; that the country was filled with idolatrous worshipers, and by them they would be led away from their God, and bring upon themselves His divine wrath. One little deviation from the law of the Lord, that might be thought very small and unimportant, brought upon them His wrath and correcting rod. The word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; and you will not escape if you neglect the word spoken by the Lord, and confirmed unto us by them that heard Him. Every thing not commanded by our Lord, and taught and practiced by His apostles, is forbidden, and classed with idolatry. It leads our minds away from Christ, and changes the order He has established in His kingdom, which is diverse from all other kingdoms, and is not to be numbered with the nations of the earth. An entire separation from all human and worldly institutions, and a strict observance of the commands of Christ, have been the infallible mark of His church in all ages of the world. Worldly churches may practice the ordinances of the gospel as commanded; they may teach a great deal of truth, but let them withdraw their worldly institutions and their humanly devised systems, and they are dissolved and killed at once. The very thing that maintains the distinct visibility and identity of Christ's church, and insures her final triumph over all her enemies, is the certain destruction of all false churches. I therefore charge you before God, to watch this point, and guard it well. False churches will hate and abuse you, and call you hard names, but let none of these move you; a faithful discharge of duty, and the comfort and peace of Zion are worth more to you than life, and all the honors earth can give. God has never promised you worldly honors, or wealth, or a smooth sea to sail over; reward here is found in suffering persecutions, and bearing reproaches

with His poor and afflicted people; for, "They that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." Your reward is in heaven, and your crown is waiting for you when you shall have fought your last battle. Be the servant of the church; not for filthy lucre, but because you love her, and are willing to suffer for her, and with her. Be careful to feed the lambs and sheep, to nurse the little ones, to strengthen the weak knees, encourage the fearful hearted, and speak comfortable things to God's people. I shall never meet you in this world; I shall soon drop into the grave, and be forgotten by the world; but my last words to you are: Be careful to maintain the purity of the church, and her entire separation from all the institutions of men. If men tempt you to the least deviation from the path marked out in the gospel, by the siren song of "No danger;" be not deceived; it leads to destruction. Again, I say, Remember the distinct mark that has in all ages identified Christ's church, and preserve it; and at the end of your warfare and stewardship here, your Lord and Master will say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." God bless you! and so preserve you that you may keep your garments unspotted from the world. Amen. G. M. Thompson.

REMARKS

After the foregoing article was put in type, and before going to press with this issue of the paper, we received the Primitive Monitor for February, 1938, containing the above article with the following comments by Elder John M. Thompson, who is now past ninety years of age, and is a nephew of Elder Gregg M. Thompson. We are glad to insert the comments from the Monitor, below. We knew as long ago as 1917 that Elder Gregg M. Thompson was not a Mason, or that he could not have consistently been a member of anything else in the world other than the Old Baptist Church. His writings were living evidences that he belonged to nothing else. See The Primitive Baptist of September 11, 1917, which article appears in Editorial Writings, Vol. III, page 242, which will be ready to mail out in a few more weeks. C. H. C.

THE COMMENTS

The foregoing "Address to Young Preachers," by Gregg M. Thompson, my father's oldest brother, which is the last in his book of "Sixteen Sermons." As I believe it will be valuable for our young ministers to thoroughly study and duly consider it, I send it to the highly esteemed editor of our well-beloved Monitor; and I request editors of our other periodicals to publish it if they so desire. I have been asked whether my uncle, Gregg Thompson, was a Freemason, and as I thought he was, I answered accordingly, and I was surprised to read his advice and warning relative to human and worldly institutions, that "An entire separation from all human and worldly institutions and strict observance of the commands of Christ have been the infallible mark of His church," and that everything not commanded by our Lord, and taught and practiced by His apostles, is forbidden. And if he had been a Mason, he was not when he wrote this address. He was a noble and Scripturally gifted minister of the gospel of Christ. He was highly esteemed by the faithful saints that knew him in his faithful labor. J. M. Thompson.

Isaiah 45:7

---March 17, 1938

I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things.-((7) (Isaiah 45:7). Our views were given briefly on the above passage quite awhile ago in our columns. This is a text which is strongly relied

upon by the Absoluters to prove that the Lord not only makes peace but that He also creates wickedness. One William Branham, of Hitchens, Ky., asked us for our views of this text sometime ago. We have given our views in our columns, as well as to him, that the evil mentioned in this text is not wickedness or sin, but that it is punishment for sin. We have placed ((Amos 3:2) (Amos 3:2,6) along with this text. Branham sent our letter, along with some of his remarks, to the editor of the Old Faith Contender, a rank Absoluter, which sheet is published in California. In Branham's letter to Parson Berry, the editor, he says: If anyone in this world will take one verse of God's holy word and show me that we have anything to do with our time salvation I will gladly acknowledge I am wrong. Surely that is fair. In regard to the brother's proposition, as here given, we will simply refer him to what he said in a letter dated April 10, 1934, which he wrote to Elder H. H. Lefferts, a copy of which he sent to us. In that letter Brother Branham says: In regard to the expression I used near the last of the article I wrote for the Signs that was published in the March issue, that "our present salvation largely depends on how we live in this present life," I should have explained it the way I understand it, but the letter was so long I had already wrote is why I didn't. I may be wrong the way I understand it, as I know I am very weak in many things. I do not claim to know as much as my older brothers in the Lord. If I am wrong I will be very thankful to you or any other of the brothers if you will show me where I am wrong. I did not mean our eternal salvation. I only meant our present salvation, or the common salvation, or the joys and peace we have in this present or natural life. I will refer you to a few verses of Scripture, the way I understand them. First: "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." -((Jude 1:25) (Jude 1:25). Did Jude mean our eternal salvation when he wrote this to the saints? If he did, the Scriptures undoubtedly would contradict itself; for another Scripture reads thus: "Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." -((2) (Philippians 2:12). Did Paul mean their eternal salvation? He surely did not. The ones, the way I understand it, was the ones who had already been quickened, and possessed the Holy Spirit. * * * Next is what James says, "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." -((9) (James 5:19-20). The two verses James wrote in this chapter undoubtedly don't mean eternal death, for he was speaking to the brethren, that had already been born again, or to the church. We copy the above from the brother's letter without taking the authority to correct the language, or the verbage. If we should do that, these fellows would say we had changed what was said. But in this matter we simply answer Branham with Branham. He answered his own request nearly four years ago. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." -(Luke 16:31). Branham also asked us concerning **((0:23) (Jeremiah 10:23)**, which reads: "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." Parson Berry quotes the following from what we said concerning this text: The man does the walking. The Lord does not walk him. The Lord directs, tells him how he should walk, but the man does not always walk as he is directed. The parent directs the child how to walk, but the child does not always walk as the parent directs; but the child does the walking. To this Parson Berry says: This is legalism pure and simple. Here is the voice from Sinai- Do-and-live. It is the law which says, here is a full set of directions, here is the rule you shall walk by,-now it is up to you to follow them; and if you follow

them of course you will inherit the land, if not you shall be punished according to all the just penalties attached to this law. * * * But do we not believe we must keep God's commandments? Yes, how we do believe it! For we have been shown what the keeping of the Law means and how unable we were to keep it except God "walks us." There you are! This infidel does not believe the Bible! The text says "it is not in man that walketh." God says it is the "man that walketh." Berry says "not so, but God walks us." Whom shall we believe-Berry or the Lord, as He gave it to us by the Prophet Jeremiah? As for us, we prefer to believe what God has said, rather than what this infidel says, even if he does call it legalism. Please note how he put the word "inherit" in his blasphemous language above. Neither we, nor any of our people, have ever taught that the Jews would inherit the land as a result of doing what God commanded. The land of Canaan was theirs by gift and by birth. God gave the land to Abraham and to his seed after him for an everlasting possession. Hence, the land was theirs by gift and by birth. But they had to do what God commanded them to do, they had to do what God said do, to enter into that land and to enjoy the blessings therein. That land (the land of Canaan) was a type of the gospel church. The gospel church belongs to the Lord's children, to those who have been born into His family. It is theirs by gift and by birth. But they cannot enter into the church and enjoy the blessings therein without doing something. They have to "walk." How would it have sounded for Jeremiah to have said, "It is not in man that God walketh to direct his steps?" Berry says that God walks him. That may be so; but we are frank to say that we do not believe a word of it. Neither do we believe that God "talks him." God's ways are equal; but Berry's ways are not equal. If God "walked him" his walk and ways would always be equal; he would always be walking in ways that are equal. But this fellow has actually denied the very language itself. In the text, man is the subject of the verb walketh. Hence, it is the man that walketh; it is the man that does the walking. The man in the text was the Jew. He did not walk in order to be a Jew; but being a Jew, the Lord's chosen and peculiar people, the Lord directed them how to walk, and they did the walking. If they walked right, they walked according to the direction the Lord gave. If they did not walk according to the direction the Lord gave (and sometimes they did not walk that way), then they walked wrong. If the Lord "walked them," as Berry says, then they would never have walked wrong, unless the Lord "walked them" wrong. We do not care which horn of the dilemma these infidels take. We use the word infidel in the sense of not believing what the Bible says; and Berry has denied believing what it says. Now let us notice **((7) (Isaiah 45:7))** a little farther. Matthew Henry, in his comments on this text, says: Here light and darkness mean the same as peace and evil. Light and peace denote prosperity, and darkness and evil signify adversity. The notion that evil is here put for sin is quite erroneous, being at once inconsistent with the scope of the verse and opposed to Scripture doctrine, by making God the author of sin. Again he says: "I form the light," which is grateful and pleasing; "and I create darkness," which is grievous and unpleasing. "I make peace," put here for all good; "and I create evil;" not the evil of sin, God is not the author of that, but the evil of punishment. The Jamieson, Faussett, and Brown Commentary says, on this text: Create evil-not moral evil, but in contrast to "peace" in the parallel clause, war, disaster. Gill, in his comments on this text, says: "I make peace, and create evil;" peace between God and men is made by Christ, who is God over all; spiritual peace of conscience comes from God, through Christ, by the Spirit; eternal glory and happiness is of God, which saints enter into at death; peace among the saints themselves here, and with the men of the world; peace in churches, and in the world, God is the Author of, even of all prosperity of every kind, which this word includes; evil is

also from Him; not the evil of sin; this is not to be found among the creatures God made; this is of men, though suffered by the Lord, and overruled by Him for good; but the evil of punishment for sin, God's sore judgments, famine, pestilence, evil beasts, and the sword, or war, which latter may more especially be intended, as it is opposed to peace; this usually is the effect of sin; may be sometimes lawfully engaged in; whether on a good or bad foundation is permitted by God; moreover, all afflictions, adversities, and calamities, come under this name, and are of God; see **((Job 2:10) (Job 2:10); ((Amos 3:6) (Amos 3:6)**. Now a word as to the actual and literal meaning of the Hebrew word which is translated evil in the text. The Hebrew letters transposed into the English are rah, and so the word is pronounced. The meaning of the word is bad or (as noun) evil-adversity, affliction, bad, calamity, etc. This word rah is from the word raw-ah, a primitive root, which means "to spoil (literally, by breaking to pieces); figuratively, to make (or be) good for nothing," etc., "do mischief, punish," etc. As proof of this see any reliable Hebrew dictionary. So, we have it that the very meaning of the word the prophet used is just what we said was taught in the language. Strange, is it, that some folks will actually, not only strain and twist the language of Holy Writ, but actually deny the plain teachings of the same in order to have a cloak for meanness and for the devilment that is committed and carried on in the world. May the good Lord pity and have mercy on such wicked blasphemers, who thus advocate a doctrine which charges the most holy God with the crime and devilment of this world and of the devil himself. C. H. C.

Preachers Should Not Lie

---March 17, 1938

It is a cold fact that some have gone to downright lying in connection with this trouble. It is bad enough for anybody to lie but still worse for preachers to lie.- Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, Feb. 25, 1938. The foregoing is from Dr. Bogard's statement of "Cold Facts" on page 4 of the paper named. We wonder since when, Dr. Bogard, has it been so bad for preachers to lie? And, have they all quit lying about other things than "this trouble?" If so, since when have they quit? Say, Doctor, did not some preacher say that one hundred dollars had been put up at a certain place in Alabama for a certain man to meet you in debate at a certain place? And the money was not put up, either, was it, Doctor? "Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?" -Rom. ii. 21, 22. C. H. C.

Elder Fairchild Again

---April 7, 1938

Yes, we have heard from Elder J. W. Fairchild again. We received the following letter from him: Whitesburg, Ky., January 8, 1938. Dear Brother Cayce: After a sleep of 29 years the Footprints of the Flock has awoken and is making its appeal to God's children again. It wants to be neighborly and exchange visits with The Primitive Baptist, so please permit The Primitive Baptist to come up and visit with it. I am enclosing two copies. If you are in reach of Bro. John Harris please hand him one. Bro. Cayce, I have heard of you opposing me very bitterly, but I can say

truthfully I have never opposed you. I have been ready at all times to co-operate with you. Were you to visit us I would ask our churches to receive you heartily, and would rejoice to have you in my home. I have not one ill feeling toward you. Why not let bygones be bygones, and you and I work together for the peace and union of our people? You know they need all the help they can get. You and I are getting old. Why not let the remainder of our lives be an example to God's ministers in love and forbearance. The Lord help us to do it. In love, J. W. Fairchild. In the same envelope was enclosed two copies of his paper, which he says has "awaken." We would be glad to know that it has "awaken" to the truth, and that the truth might be set forth in its pages, if the publication of it continues, for we do not think the truth was always set forth in its pages when he published it before. If you have a copy of our Editorial Writings, Volume I, turn and read the articles therein beginning on pages 264, 268, 314 and 361, and you will see some little something as to where Elder Fairchild stood then. On page three of the copy of the little paper he sent us with his letter we note the following statement: Again I am a member of Sandlick Church in Letcher County, Kentucky. Into the fellowship of this church I was baptized July 17, 1889, and on May 21, 1892, by request of this church I was ordained to the full functions of the gospel ministry, by the following presbytery: Elders William R. Craft, Peter Adkins, Samuel C. Caudill, John A. Craft, and Spencer Adams. Under the kind and brotherly guidance of these and other servants of the Lord, I received my first lessons in the ministry. So, it seems that Elder Fairchild has gone back to the Sandlick Church, where they had a division about May, 1896, on account of the doctrine of the absolute predestination of all things, as preached and advocated by Elder Fairchild himself. We presume he has gone back to that faction which stood with him at that time and since that time. Anyway, he is now identified with a faction that is not recognized by the regular Primitive Baptists, as we shall show presently. How did he get membership with those people? He did not join them by letter from orderly Primitive Baptists, for the simple reason that he was excluded from the fellowship of Providence Church, in the Good Hope Association, in Mississippi, and that church refused to restore him to their fellowship. Following is a letter from Elder G. W. Lewis, who is pastor of Good Hope Church and also moderator of the Amite Association: Auburn, Miss., Feb. 12, 1938. Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-I received your letter of Feb. 9th, and in reply will say: Elder J. W. Fairchild has not been restored to the fellowship of Providence Church. He stands excluded from the orderly Primitive Baptists of Mississippi. You may use my name, as requested in your letter, if you desire. If there is any other information, in regard to Elder Fairchild's standing in Mississippi, we can furnish you, please call on us. We would be glad to have you to visit us any time you have a mind. We have a great desire to hear you preach the unsearchable riches of Christ again. May God bless you and yours. Please remember us in your prayers. In hope, G. W. Lewis. This letter above tells plainly enough as to the standing of Elder Fairchild, or rather, his lack of standing. But what about the people he is identified with over in Kentucky? We wrote Elder J. H. Keaton, Huntington, W. Va., to find out about that, as he is not so far from that section, and were pretty sure that if he did not personally know, he could refer us to some orderly Primitive Baptist who does know. Elder Keaton wrote to Elder J. E. Craft, Neon, Ky., as follows: Huntington, W. Va., Jan. 15, 1938. Elder J. E. Craft: Dear Brother Craft-Will you advise whether or not the Sandlick Church, in Letcher County, Ky., is in the Sandlick Association; and if so, please advise if that association is in good standing. Has there not been some contention with those folks among other associations over the doctrine of the resurrection? In short, is it considered a sound body of Old Baptists? You remember showing me a letter some time ago from Elder J. W. Fairchild, and I think we agreed as to what was best to do about it. I notice now he is printing the Footprints

of the Flock, and seems to have membership in the Sandlick Church. When you answer this letter, will you state that your letter may be used for publication? Hope you are all well. Would be glad you could come to see us again. Won't you, soon? Please let me hear at once. Yours in hope, J. H. Keaton. Under date of February 3, Elder Keaton wrote us as follows: Brother Cayce: I have just received the enclosed letter from Elder J. E. Craft. He is moderator of the Union Primitive Baptist Association, of Kentucky, and is a safe man. He is located in the bounds of this Sandlick Church, and understands the situation. I am also enclosing a copy of my letter to him, to which his is a reply. You will not understand Elder Craft to be moderator of the Union Association which he mentions in his letter, but he belongs to the original Union, which withdrew from this faction which he mentions, because of this heresy. Thus it is plain to see the hole Fairchild has crawled in. I think you will find Elder Craft's letter to be in harmony with the statement I advanced in my former letter to you; but I wanted to be sure. Use my letter to Elder Craft as you wish; also he gives consent to publish his. Yours in hope, J. H. Keaton. The letter which Elder Craft wrote to Elder Keaton is as follows: Neon, Ky., Feb. 1, 1938. Dear Brother Keaton: Relative to the Sandlick Church you refer to; it has not been recognized as a sound Primitive Baptist Church for a number of years. Neither has Elder J. W. Fairchild been in fellowship with the Primitive Baptists for more than twenty years. However, he went into North Carolina during this time and preached for them under some coloring, I don't know what, and was let out as soon as he was exposed. The church he is now with belongs to that faction of Sandlick Association that preach a non-resurrection of our bodies, and that Christ was never here in the flesh, no punishment for the wicked; and in correspondence with that part of the Union Association that preaches Universalism, from which we withdrew, I think, in 1920 or 1921. Now there is an association known as the Sandlick Association; they are a very good body of brethren; I will refer you to Elder William Kash; he will know them better than I Brother Keaton, I would have written sooner, but was lacking in some of the facts, and had to gather them. You may correct and use this as you like. I have been very sick for nearly two weeks since getting your letter; hope you will pardon the delay. I enjoyed reading of your trip to Tennessee and Arkansas and its results. I don't know when I can come down. I would love so much to come. Yours in hope, J. E. Craft. The foregoing shows up more than one thing. For one, it shows that when Elder Fairchild was with our people in recent years, that he was with us under false colors, or else Elder Craft is mistaken. Evidently, when Fairchild left that country, whenever that was, he must have been considered as in disorder by the orderly Baptists there. But he got among the orderly Baptists in this western country, and then among the orderly Baptists in Mississippi, where he was excluded. Now, he has gone back to the disorderly faction in Kentucky where he was before, and now represents himself to be a Primitive Baptist. Let the reader note carefully the doctrine he is now identified with, and in line with. Such is not Primitive Baptist doctrine, and a man in line with such as that has no right to represent himself as being a Primitive Baptist. But it may deceive some folks. Elder Fairchild has heard, he says, of us opposing him very bitterly. So far as we are concerned, it is not a personal matter. We have no personal grievance against him. If such should be the case, we would follow the instructions our Lord gave in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew. We would have labored with him privately. But that is not the case. It is a matter of doctrine and principles advocated by him, and the course he has pursued in public life as a minister. It is the cause at stake, and not our personal feelings. And so long as he pursues the course that he has been pursuing in our acquaintance with him, just that long will we oppose him, if the Lord continues to spare us to live. Not only is this true as to Elder Fairchild, but we would oppose any other man who pursues a

similar course. Our life is an open book, and shows that this has been our course all along the line. We have no time or inclination to "co-operate" with any man or set of men who are trouble makers in Zion. The sooner our people get rid of such men, and pay no attention to them, and leave them severely alone, the better it will be for our cause. There can be no such thing as peace in Zion while such men are allowed to get in their work in the churches. "Ephraim is joined to his idols; let him alone." Since the above was written, we have received a copy of the third issue of Fairchild's paper, and we notice in it that Elder J. B. Hardy is still "hooked up" with Fairchild in his disorderly and trouble making course. We also note names of some other brethren who are lending support to Fairchild. In regard to this we would say that if a brother who is doing this will not cease and desist in that course immediately, he should be brought under charge for treating the cause with contempt and disrespect, and should be immediately dealt with by his church under the charge. To lend support and influence to a man who has been excluded by an orderly Old Baptist Church is to treat the cause of the Master with contempt and disrespect, and one who will do that should be dealt with for the same. In late years Fairchild has tried to line up and keep company with the Progressives; and he got to where they will not have him, so we have been informed. It seems that he "is just anybody's dog that will hunt with him," It seems to us that if Fairchild wishes recognition and fellowship with orderly Baptists, the first thing for him to do is to get recognition and fellowship with orderly Baptists over there in Kentucky where he got out, and make satisfaction with Providence Church in the Good Hope Association, in Mississippi. And it seems to us that in order to do that it will be necessary for him to do some walking. C. H. C.

Elder Monk Passed Away

---May 19, 1938

On Monday night, May 9, we received a call from Shreveport, La., telling us Elder C. M. Monk had passed away, and that we were wanted to be there Tuesday afternoon in the funeral service. A large crowd was at the funeral, which was held at Bethel Church. Elder John R. Harris and Brother Elvyn Attaway and our second son, Fleming, went with us. We went by El Dorado, and Elder Webb and Brother Craft went with us from there. We drove back home that night. Another faithful and true soldier of the cross has laid aside the weapons of his warfare, and we have lost another good friend. May the good Lord bless and sustain the bereaved family, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Returned Home

---May 19, 1938

We returned home on Monday afternoon, May 9, from our long trip in Tennessee and Kentucky. We do not have time to write an account of the trip for this issue of the paper, but will say that at most of the places we visited we found a good feeling prevailing among the brethren and churches. We will try to write more about the trip for the next issue. C. H. C.

Elder J. C. Ross Bereaved

---May 19, 1938

We are just in receipt of a card from Elder A. B. Ross, Martin, Tenn., bearing the sad news of the death of the wife of Elder J. C. Ross, Greenfield, Tenn. A good woman is gone. We deeply sympathize with Brother Ross in his great loss and sore trial. May the Lord give grace and strength for his need, is our humble prayer.

Sister Ross was double first and double second cousin to our father. She passed away on Monday, May 9. C. H. C.

Nashville Meeting

---June 16, 1938

Elsewhere in this paper will be found an article from Elder J. A. Monsees, of Macon, Ga., concerning the matter of reconciliation between the Old Line Baptists and the Progressives, of Georgia. Elder Monsees says, in a postscript, following his article: I have been asked if the Nashville peace meeting was not called in an effort to regain fellowship with the Progressives. Brother Cayce will, perhaps, answer this question from the standpoint of less bias than I. So we ask him to do so. We confess that we are sometimes a little dull of comprehension, and that it sometimes takes a little time for us to grasp the real and full meaning of something that may have been said, or of a question that may be asked. The full and real meaning of this question may not yet be fully grasped by us. If the querist meant to ask if the Nashville peace meeting was called and held with a view of our people regaining fellowship with and getting in line with the Progressives, we answer, without any equivocation whatever, that the part we took in it, in calling the meeting, or aiding in getting up the call, and what was done in the meeting, was with no such object in view. The object of the meeting is plainly stated in the pamphlet containing the proceedings of the same, both on page 1, first paragraph, and page 3, under the heading of "The Recommendations," first paragraph. On page 1 the minutes of the proceedings begin as follows: The proposed meeting for the purpose of endeavoring to restore peace in and among the disturbed churches in Tennessee and parts of Kentucky and between brethren, etc. On page 3 the paragraph reads: The following principles of faith, or doctrine and practice, are hereby recommended as principles upon which the present disturbances among the Primitive Baptists in Tennessee and parts of Kentucky may be adjusted. In the face of these two statements why would one ask if the meeting was for the purpose of making an effort to regain fellowship with the Progressives? Please read article 14, on page 8, on the subject of instrumental music in the churches; then read article 18 on page 9, and note particularly what is said with reference to progressive measures. It seems to us that the proceedings of the meeting speak as plainly as it could be spoken. It seems to us that these things make it clear and positive that in order to have peace, and in order for peace to be maintained, progressive measures must be eliminated and let strictly and absolutely alone. According to the way we have understood some of the Progressive brethren in the past, if our people would just eliminate these very things, as recommended in the Nashville meeting, which we here call attention to, we would thereby have regained fellowship, at once, with our Progressive brethren. Instead of the Nashville meeting recommending that, they recommended the very opposite. We have noted in some of our exchanges that a suggestion has been made that the ministers of the Progressives be invited to preach in our churches, and our ministers preach in their churches—meaning, as we understand the matter, an exchange of pulpits. This may be all right, but we do not think so. We frankly say that we do not approve of it. Read article 15 on page 8 of the Nashville meeting, taking notice of the note of warning. We had trouble enough years ago with progressive measures, without inviting any more trouble on those matters. If the Progressive brethren desire union with the brethren who are still in the "old paths," let them put out the things that brought the trouble, and so declare themselves, and we think it would then be time for an effort to be made for a getting together of the Old Line Baptists with them. No doubt there were

mistakes made and wrongs done on both sides; but let the things that caused the trouble be put away, and then the mistakes may be corrected and amendments made for the wrongs done, and all matters adjusted. But no use to make any effort to get together as long as the things are retained that brought the trouble, as we see the matter. C. H. C.

Tour in Tennessee and Kentucky

---June 16, 1938

We left home on Friday, March 5, to fill the appointments as arranged for us and Elder W. C. Davis, as published in The Primitive Baptist of March 3 and 17. We filled an appointment in Memphis that night. Next morning we were conveyed to Brown's Creek by Brother Hawkins, to meet the appointment at that place. An extra appointment had been made for Mt. Moriah for Saturday night, but the meeting that night was rained out. Elder Davis met us Sunday night in Jackson. From there on we filled the appointments as arranged and published, except that at Little Zion for Thursday, April 8. A brother conveyed us there from Bethel, but the weather was somewhat threatening, and looked like rain. We arrived on the ground, and, after we had been there for nearly an hour, one brother, a member of that church, came on foot. We asked him if he thought any more would be there, and he said he did not think so. Hence, we left, the brother conveying us taking us to the home of Brother G. L. Kelley. All the other appointments were met. We would be glad to give a detailed account of the trip, but believe our space can be used for a better purpose, and trust the brethren where we went will excuse us for not going into detail. We had good meetings at almost every place. The congregations were small at a few of the places, but almost every place the congregations were good. It was a very busy time, and we hardly expected so many to be present as were present at most of the places. At one or two places some brethren expressed a feeling of disappointment that no more were present. We, reminded them that it was a busy time, and that the people were under no obligation to come out to hear us preach. They were under no obligation to us. But we are under obligation to attend our regular church meetings. Elder Davis left us at Round Lick on Thursday, May 5, returning home to meet a regular appointment on Saturday and Sunday. We wound up at South College Street, Nashville, Sunday night, May 8, and left Nashville at 11:30 that night for home, arriving at Fordyce at 1 p. m. on Monday, where we were met by our wife and children. We were glad to get home, after an absence of six weeks and three days. Work had piled up while we were away; so we have had no time for idleness since our return. We are trying to get ready to leave for another trip, and expect to make another little trip to Alabama before this reaches the readers. Remember us in prayer. C. H. C.

Confession Changed

---June 16, 1938

At a Conference in Meridian, Miss., on May 21, the Southern Presbyterians changed their Confession of Faith. The Confession was the old Westminster Confession, which the Presbyterians have had for about three hundred years. We have been aware of the fact that not many of them have been preaching the doctrine for years which the Confession contained. For years many of the preachers have been preaching Arminian doctrine, and have not been teaching the doctrine of election and that the elect of God were predestinated to eternal life. The old Westminster Confession set forth the doctrine of unconditional salvation and also the doctrine of

unconditional reprobation. The Baptists have always denied the doctrine of unconditional reprobation. The old Presbyterian Confession said, Chapter III: Sec. 3. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels were predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

4. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished. These are the two sections which they have eliminated from their Confession. There was opposition to the move, but it was carried by a vote of one hundred and fifty-one to one hundred and thirty. We remember that an effort was made by them several years ago to change the Confession. So, at last, they have accomplished the matter. Calvin, the founder of the Presbyterian Church, was a strong predestinarian-too strong for the Baptists. The London Confession of Faith was largely copied from this old Westminster Confession; but they could not copy the above items; so they put them as follows: By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated or foreordained to eternal life, through Jesus Christ, to the praise of His glorious grace; others being left to act in their sin to their just condemnation, to the praise of His glorious justice. These angels and men thus predestinated, and foreordained, are particularly, and unchangeably designed; and their number so certain, and definite, that it cannot be either increased, or diminished. It seems that the world is still drifting farther and farther from the truth. If the Primitive Baptists should quit preaching the truth, it would not be preached. The Lord will have a few witnesses for the truth when the world comes to an end. He will not leave Himself without a witness. C. H. C.

Secret Orders “an error corrected”

---July 7, 1938

Under the above heading is an article in the Messenger of Peace of June, 1938, by the editor, Elder W. A. Chastain. It being our sincere desire to be perfectly fair, and being perfectly willing for our readers to know the facts in this case, as well as in any other with which we have to do, we copy the article from the Messenger in full: THE ARTICLE “Under the caption, 'Was He a Mason?' appears an editorial by Elder C. H. Cayce, in his paper, The Primitive Baptist, Vol. 32, page 8, Sept, 11, 1917, in which he calls in question some statements made by Elder W. A. Chastain in his late book, 'A Discussion on the Worship of God.' He quotes from his book as follows: “Eld. Gregg M. Thompson, who lived in Georgia for years, and who was one of the ablest debaters our people have ever had, and who met Eld. Burgees, a Campbell-ite and champion debater and won a grand victory for our people, * * * * was a Mason, so I have been told. Yet, the Georgia Baptists did not non-fellowship him. But this did not make Masonry right, understand. I am not saying this in defense of any secret order, but to show that this is no test of soundness of doctrine.” “The reader will notice that Eld. Chastain emphasizes the statement that Eld. Gregg M. Thompson was a Mason, and then adds, 'So I have been told.' To this we wish to say that Eld. Chastain should have better informed himself, before making such a statement, if he did not know. Eld. Thompson has gone to his reward, and is not here now to defend himself. It seems to us that this great man had enough to contend with while he was living, without a thing of this kind being published to the world about him when he has gone to his long eternal home, and is not here to defend his own practice. But fortunately, Eld. Thompson left on

record his position and principles as to how a member of the church should live, and what the church member should belong to." C. H. Cayce.' "We, doubtless, should have made no reference to the above through the Monitor had it not been for the unfavorable reflection cast on Eld. Chastain. Since we are, perhaps, mainly responsible for the statement by him, which Eld. Cayce criticizes: that 'Eld. Gregg M. Thompson was a Mason,' is correct. The late Eld. Gregg M. Thompson was my father's oldest brother. We very well remember him and have heard him speak of his membership in the Masonic order. Eld. Chastain is correct when he says he was a Mason when he resided in Georgia, and 'the Georgia Baptists did not non-fellowship him.' And now we adopt and subscribe to the following statement made by Eld. W. A. Chastain: 'But this would not make Masonry right, understand.' He, too, was a fallible man. We all need to be reminded of this fact. "Before closing this article we will give a quotation from Eld. Gregg M. Thompson which will not be called in question. We quote him direct from his published debate with Eld. O. A. Burgess-Page 258: " 'Good benevolent institutions may be gotten up among men, and great good may be effected by them. No one can see the great improvement in agriculture, that has been made in the last few years, but what will acknowledge that agricultural societies have had much to do with it. If the intoxicating bowl has been driven from the sideboard and a man feels degraded to be seen in a tippling shop, the temperance movement has, doubtless, had much to do with it. Many poor widows have been fed, and orphans educated and reared to respectability by the Masons. These, as worldly institutions, may be called good: I have nothing to say against them. But they have no power to impose their laws upon the church of Christ, neither has the church any power to adopt their laws, or to form an alliance with them. If it is true that John the Baptist and John the Divine were Masons (which I am inclined to credit), they were such as individuals, as citizens of the world and did not attempt to impose the laws of that institution upon the church, or to form a union or communion between the two institutions. This would have been a violation of the laws of the King, and would have destroyed the distinct visibility of the church. For the church to become united with any of the worldly institutions, and to adopt their laws and government, changes her organization, and she ceases to become the church of Christ." 'We give these facts in support of truth and right, and to the injury of no man dead or living. Truth will stand and will win its own fame. We all should be careful not to misjudge the motives of our brother and put him in an unfavorable light before the world. If we could all be more charitable one to another, be sure that we have just cause for censure before we accuse him of willful wrong, how much smoother the world would then run! Judge no man rashly. We all need more of Paul's charity-'Charity suffereth long and is kind.' Oh, that we were all filled with that spirit! Wrongs in doctrine and practice can oftentimes be more easily corrected through the spirit of kindness than otherwise. 'A soul saved from death,' saved to a useful life in the church. R. W. Thompson." -In the Primitive Monitor, October, 1917. "Remarks:-This editorial by Eld. R. W. Thompson is reprinted in this number because the same question seems to be up for discussion again by reason of Eld. John M. Thompson's comments on Eld. Gregg M. Thompson's 'Address to Young Preachers,' in the February (1938) Primitive Monitor. Eld. John M. Thompson in his comments, draws the conclusion that Eld. Gregg M. Thompson must not have been a Mason, but we have been informed by some of our ministers, who know the facts in the case, that he was a member of the Masonic order in good standing, at Ashland, Mo., at the time of his death. We feel that this article of Eld. Thompson's, and these statements, should settle this question. C. Dove, Editor. (Above from Primitive Monitor, April, 1938, p. 182.) We are thankful to God for such noble, Christian men as Elder Thompson and Elder Dove, who, with clear vision and noble hearts are faithful comrades in defense of

truth and right. Any cause that cannot be supported with fairness must utterly fail. We have an affidavit on file in our office that may be examined by any of our brethren, executed May 9, 1938, by Mr. A. F. Martin, present secretary or clerk of Masonic Lodge No. 156, at Ashland, Mo., stating that Eld. Gregg Thompson was a member in good standing at the time of his death in 1888, and had been received into that membership in 1882. This affidavit is given under the seal of Mr. O. T. Scott, Notary Public. Elder Lloyd Sapp also writes: "There is abundant evidence in this country that this is true. I am also acquainted with the records and know it to be true." Elder Cayce states in his paper of March 3, 1938: "We knew as long ago as 1917 that Elder Gregg Thompson was not a Mason, or that he could not have consistently been a member of ANYTHING ELSE IN THE WORLD other than the Old Baptist Church. His writings are living evidences that he belonged to nothing else." Here is plainly an error and a case of mistaken judgment. We wonder, will it be corrected? A correction is due the readers of that paper, as well as Elder Thompson. We repeat that Elder Gregg Thompson preached all through many of the southern states, especially Georgia, and he a Mason! Our northern brethren, many of them, have visited and enjoyed the churches of the southland, and the present bars against us certainly are not justified. But, here is a statement setting forth the present conditions:

" Amendment to the constitution adopted Sept. 19th, 1878, as follows: "This Association will not hold in fellowship ANY church, neither will we knowingly correspond with ANY association which holds a member which belongs to any secret institution, whether moral, political or religious. "Signed: Eld. C. H. Cayce, Mod. Eld. John R. Harris, Clerk." This resolution is found in the minute of the South Arkansas Association for 1935. Yet they preached on their stand that year a good brother who belongs to an association that has secret order members in it. The above amendment is very wide and decisive. We suggest you read it again and study it well. The writer is not a member, and never has been, of any secret order, but this amendment turns us all down together. In that great meeting at Fulton, Ky., in 1900, of which Elder J. H. Oliphant was moderator, where our people from all over the U. S. were more nearly unanimously represented than at any meeting of modern times, they adopted the following language: "Bars of fellowship set up by our local churches have been the most destructive influences against the growth and progress of the church. Traditions of men and human customs being regarded as authority have often given rise to bars of fellowship and resulted in the destruction of the peace of the churches. * * * It is painful to note on the pages of history how frequently our people have been divided and their happiness destroyed by foolish and sinful declarations of non-fellowship. * * * * "When bars of fellowship are raised they exclude the erring from the God-appointed remedy for the correction of their errors and render restoration hopeless. "When bars of fellowship are unlawfully raised among our people the bond of union by which our churches are held together is broken and the welfare of the cause exposed to the most uncertain results. If the raisers thereof cannot be induced to remove them at once, the only course for those who want to remain in this holy church union is to discard their actions and have no connection with them until they withdraw such bars of fellowship." "Such bars mob innocent Baptists by the wholesale." -Lee Hanks in Messenger of Zion, April 15, 1938. We often cry, "Peace, peace," and then crucify the Prince of Peace. We urge our brethren to stand where our fathers have always stood, and would be happy to see the day when peace may abound, and pray that all may labor to that end.

OUR COMMENTS

Elder Chastain says, "Here is plainly an error and a case of mistaken judgment. We wonder, will it be corrected?" Yes, Brother Chastain, it will be cheerfully and gladly corrected. We are not glad we made the error; but we are glad to correct it. When we read the above article in the Messenger it was the first time we had ever seen or read the statement from Elder R. W. Thompson, which is copied in the above from the Primitive Monitor of October, 1917. We did not know he had ever made the statement, as we were not then getting the Monitor, and no copy of it was sent to us; or, if it was, we did not receive it. Under such circumstances as that, how could we be expected to make any correction on account of that statement having been made? In the Monitor of February, 1938, Elder John M. Thompson said that "if he had been a Mason, he was not when he wrote this address." Brother Thompson was judging the matter from the writings of Elder G. M. Thompson; we were judging the matter from the same standpoint. We judged from that same standpoint in 1917, when we copied some of his writings from his book called "The Measuring Rod." We only "knew it" from the evidence which we had in the case. Since then, and since our comments on the article from Elder G. M. Thompson in our issue of March 3, 1938, we have received additional evidence which we never had before. We would have made correction of the matter if the above article had never been published in the Messenger. On March 29, 1938, we received the following letter from Elder Lloyd Sapp: Ashland, Mo., March 21, 1938. Elder Cayce: Dear Brother-I note that you say in your paper of the March 3rd issue that Elder Gregg M. Thompson was not a Mason. Now, Brother Cayce, I happen to live here at Ashland, Mo., in the same town where Elder Thompson lived the latter part of his life. I belong to the same church where his membership was when he passed away. I am also pastor of this church, the church he pastored while here, and was pastoring at the time of his death. I am in a position to get the facts concerning his membership in the Masonic lodge. Therefore, in kindness, and in defense of the truth, concerning this matter, I beg to say that Elder Thompson was a member of the Masonic lodge the last years of his life. The records of this lodge, No. 156, show that he was elected to membership October 21st, 1882. Also, that he was a member of good standing at the time of his death, April 19th, 1888. Three members of said lodge recommended him for membership and it was my privilege to have known all these members. Also, I have heard one minister and a lawyer say that they sat in lodge with Elder Thompson. There are a few who live in this community who can give the same testimony. Elder Thompson died one year before I was born. However, his name is often mentioned as an able defender, and one who was true to his calling. By those who remember him, he is still held in sweet memory, and his name revered. In fairness to the support of truth and all concerned, I wish you could see fit to publish the above in your paper. Lloyd Sapp. "The Measuring Rod," from which we quoted in September, 1917, was published in 1861. In that book Elder Thompson said just what we copied from the same, and which it is not necessary to again copy here. It is not our wish or desire to aggravate matters. In Zion's Advocate of May 15, 1881, page 377, is an announcement by Elder Thompson of the desire to publish the book, "The Primitive Preacher," dated Crawfordsville, Ind., May 9, 1881. We suppose this was before Elder Thompson moved to Missouri. He lived in Georgia prior to the year 1881. He joined the Masons on October 21, 1882, in Missouri. He died April 19, 1888. The book was not published until during the year 1888. Probably the writing was done, according to the announcement in the Advocate, before October, 1882. But, whether this be correct or not, he joined the Masons in October, 1882, at the age

of seventy-one years, six months and ten days, according to the date he gave of his birth on page 5 of "The Primitive Preacher" and the date given above by Brother Sapp. Yes, Brother Chastain, we make the correction. ' Brother Chastain says: "We repeat that Elder Gregg Thompson preached all through many of the Southern states, especially Georgia, and he a Mason! Our northern brethren, many of them, have visited and enjoyed the churches of the southland, and the present bars against us certainly are not justified," and then he quotes an amendment to the constitution of the South Arkansas Association, which was made in 1878. Are there any present bars up on this question by the Southern Baptists which have not been up all the while -since before Brother Chastain was born? That which Brother Chastain quoted from the minutes was an amendment. It was no new thing; but the amendment is sixty years old. The same year (1935) from which Brother Chastain quotes this, Brother Chastain tells his readers that there was a good brother present from a northern church. Was he barred? No, he preached peace by Jesus Christ, and did not intimate that we should reform our churches, and he was heartily received, and invited to come back. Does the fact that Elder Gregg Thompson was heartily received by the churches in the South show that he was barred? Does the fact that "our northern brethren, many of them, have visited and enjoyed the churches of the southland," prove or show that they were barred? We might name a number of brethren from the North who have visited and preached in churches, many of them, in the southland, and who were heartily received. About 1936 we invited Elder Chastain to visit the South, and insisted that he do so, which he refused to do. Does that even look like they were barred? In our repeated invitations to Brother Chastain we told him that we sincerely wished he would visit us and see for himself whether or not he was barred, and that he could come nearer telling in that way than by staying at a distance. We assured him that our invitation was made in sincerity and good faith. He declined, and gave his reason as follows: June 16, 1937. Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-In answering your letter of May 29 wish to say that I have been gone from home a great deal since getting it and been rushed much with pressing duties. Returned home last Monday from Ohio, where I attended the Sandusky Association and met about sixteen preachers and many brethren, and enjoyed a very fine meeting. As to making a visit to your country and churches permit me to say that it will be next to impossible to do so this year, due to my care of seven churches and editorial work and also my own private business affairs. May the Lord bless you and your people. Yours to serve, W. A. Chastain.

The reader will see that Brother Chastain did not say then that he was barred, or assign this as a reason for not accepting the invitation to visit the South. Elder Leon H. Clevenger has recently been in this country. In our issue of April 21, 1938, Elder Clevenger gave a short account of this trip, in which he says: The Lord was good to us, and the dear Primitive Baptists gave us a real welcome everywhere we went and many invitations to return. I have been visiting some of these churches occasionally for the last twelve years, and they are lovely people, who seem ready to welcome orderly Primitive Baptist preachers from other states at any time, as long as they come preaching Christ in peace and are not trying to spread trouble. Just here we copy Article 9, on pages 6 and 7, of the Nashville Peace Meeting: We do not think our members should be retained in the church who hold membership in or affiliate with any of the so-called fraternal or religious institutions of the world. It is a well-known fact that it has always been against the rules of the Primitive Baptist Churches of the South to retain members who affiliate with such institutions, whether secret or otherwise, which rule we believe to be Scriptural; and we think it would be destructive to endeavor to reform the churches. We should continue to stand where we have always stood on this question, and those

things should not be permitted to make inroads in our churches. In this we are not endeavoring to regulate other folks or their affairs; but we desire that our churches all remain clear of these things, as they have in the past. It seems to us that this explains the attitude of the Southern Baptists as clearly as it could be expressed. Our people have not had bars up against good brethren from the North or from the East or from the West who would come preaching peace by Jesus Christ. We have always welcomed orderly brethren to come South. If there are any bars up somebody else has them up, and not our folks. What we have is for our protection, and not as dictating to others. We would kindly suggest that "here is plainly" another "error and a case of mistaken judgment. We wonder, will it be corrected?" We would also kindly suggest that "we urge our brethren to stand where our fathers have always stood, and would be happy to see the day when peace may abound, and pray that all may labor to that end." C. H. C.

In Arkansas and Oklahoma

---August 4, 1938

We should have had a little account of this trip in our last issue, but it seemed that we could hardly get to the matter of writing about it. We left home on Friday morning, June 10, and went to Fort Smith, arriving there about 6:30 p. m., and were met at the bus station by Sister Martin, wife of Brother D. B. Martin. We were at the service at the church in Arkoma that night, and Saturday and Sunday. This was a union or district meeting of the churches of the Salem Association. It was a delightful meeting. We made no note of the names of the ministers in attendance, and so we cannot give their names. Of course we remember the names of some of them, but may not remember all. So we will not try to give their names. Elder John R. Harris, of Thornton, started before we did, and was at the meeting, and continued with us during the following week. On Monday and Tuesday, June 13 and 14, we were with the church called Little Flock, at Ratcliff, Ark., Elders D. W. Witt and R. L. Piles going with us and Elder Harris, through the week. On Wednesday and Thursday, June 15 and 16, we were at Revilee Church, near Magazine. On Friday, Saturday and Sunday, June 17, 18, 19, we were with Little Flock Church, at Abbott, Ark. This was their communion meeting. From this place Elder Harris returned home. These were all good and pleasant meetings. From the foregoing we went to Tulsa, and had meeting there on Monday and Tuesday, June 20 and 21. This seems to be a live little band, and they seem to be devoted to the cause. We enjoyed our stay with them. The services were at night, and good congregations were present. Then we filled the appointments in Ada, New Hope, (near Shawnee), Oklahoma City, Bethlehem, Union Springs, and Sulphur. We also filled an extra appointment in Edmond, going there from Shawnee, being met and conveyed by Brother W. T. Morrisett to his home. Brother Morrisett is one of our old Tennessee associates. We were in his home several times in Tennessee, years ago, before he moved to Oklahoma. We would be glad we could mention the name of each one whose home we were permitted to visit, but we cannot do so. We had the pleasure of being in the home of Elder Cummings, who is the pastor at Oklahoma City. They esteem him highly, and we learned to love him. We were also in the good home of dear Elder A. D. West. He was with us at several of the appointments, and did everything he could to make us feel pleasant and at home. We had the pleasure of meeting Elder M. L. Welch, whom we had not met before. Besides, we met many brethren and sisters for the first time, and doubtless many of them we will never see again in this life. The churches we visited are evidently in peace, and the Lord is blessing them. We have long had a desire to visit those dear people, and now we

have a desire to visit them again. Some other churches we had a desire to visit, but this was all the time we had for the trip. May the good Lord continue to bless them with peace and prosperity and fellowship, is our humble prayer. We desire that they all remember us in prayer. If we meet no more in this world of sorrow, we have a sweet and blessed hope that we shall meet in a better world, where troubles and sorrows never come. C. H. C.

Pie Supper Planned

---August 4, 1938

A pie supper has been planned at Midway schoolhouse Monday night (June 27). Proceeds will be used for the First Primitive Baptist Association of Oklahoma, which will be held from August 11 to August 14. The above is taken from the Purcell Register, of June 23, 1938, a newspaper published in Purcell, Oklahoma. This band of folks who advertised to have this pie supper at the schoolhouse named are not connected with the First Primitive Baptist Association of Oklahoma. They are identified with the Trumpet faction. But how does that sound, and how does it look, for people claiming to be so strict and so orderly, to be having a pie supper to raise funds to care for their association? Evidently they are resorting to the same ways and means of the world to raise funds for their work. Pie supper! Pie supper! Suppose we have a little paraphrasing of the Scriptures to justify this business. Get your Bible now and read as we refer to some citations. Let us go first to **(Acts 6:1-4)** "Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this pie supper business." ((7) (Acts 6:7): "And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient unto the rulers and dictators in the kingdom, and they had many pie suppers and raised large sums of money thereby for the advancement of the Lord's kingdom." **((3) (Acts 16:13-14,15)**. The case of Lydia. After she was baptized she was very zealous, and instituted and conducted many pie suppers to care for the meetings in that section. **(I Timothy 3:14-15)**. Paul wrote this to Timothy that he might know how he ought to behave himself in the house of God, and how he might raise funds to care for the Lord's service by having pie suppers, and other merchandising methods which he might get from the world. **(II Timothy 3:16-17)** "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Now, candidly, where, in the whole Book, do you find any authority for engaging in such methods as having a pie supper to raise funds to care for a meeting? Where is it? Book, chapter, and verse, please! Yet these folks cry "order! order!" Their cry of order reminds us of a lot of frogs in a swamp in wet spring time. Just listen to their noise: "Order! Order! Order!" "For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness." -(I Timothy 6:10-11). Get your book and read on to the end of the chapter. May the Lord help those of us who have been deluded, and who have been following men, to turn from the same, and help us to follow the teachings and examples found in His holy Book. C. H. C.

Another Correction

---August 18, 1938

Dear Elder Cayce:

The Primitive Baptist of July 7, 1938, reached me today. I note what you have to say about the Thompson matter. However, I note that you have misunderstood me again. I said that Elder Thompson was a Mason the last years of his life, that I was in a position to know about this. But I did not say that he was not a Mason in his younger life. In fact, he moved his membership here from another state. Also, I have never heard of a man being made a Mason at the age you mention he joined this lodge. He was elected to membership, not elected to take the work, as he had taken the work before this date. He did not join the Masons at the age of seventy-one years and six months, but moved his membership here at that age. The fact that he was elected to membership carries this thought and I am surprised that you give this as the date that he joined the Masons. I did not say he joined the Masons on this date. I said he was elected to membership to this lodge on that date. Elder Chastain was right when he said that Elder Thompson was a Mason when he lived in Georgia. What I had to say did not deny this statement, as you have used my name. Now Brother Cayce, let's be fair on this matter, acknowledging to the facts in the case, and let the matter drop. You have used what I wrote you to prove that Elder Thompson was not a Mason prior to the date mentioned in my letter. I feel that this is unfair on me and does not carry the thought which I tried to convey to you. As this matter first started in your paper, I feel that it would be fair to print the above. Lloyd Sapp. P. S.-It was not the desire of anyone to offend when the correction was made in the Messenger. But, in view of the fact that you had not corrected, and knowing that you had the proof, ample time having passed, it seemed there was nothing left but to correct the error. Had you acknowledged my letter, and said nothing more, this correction would not have been necessary. Everything that I have said has been in defense of the plain truth and not with a desire to agitate, nor confuse, nor to offend. Yours in hope, Lloyd Sapp. Ashland, Mo., July 9, 1938.

REMARKS

Yes, we cheerfully and willingly give space for the above correction. We have no desire whatever to mislead or to make a wrong impression. But, let us keep the record straight. If our readers will refer to The Primitive Baptist of March 3, 1938, they will see that we had copied the article from the "Primitive Preacher," an "Address to Young Preachers," and that the same was in type when we received the Primitive Monitor of February, 1938, with the same article in it, and with comments from Elder John M. Thompson, in which he said that "if he had been a Mason, he was not when he wrote this address." Brother Thompson was judging the matter by the same evidence by which we were judging the matter. This was in the Primitive Monitor before it was in The Primitive Baptist. Evidently Elder John M. Thompson was mistaken, and so were we. We must have drawn the wrong conclusions from the writings of Elder Gregg Thompson. We drew that conclusion in 1917 from his writings in the "Measuring Rod," a book which he published in 1861. Elder Sapp says above, "knowing that you had the proof." You are mistaken in that for a certainty. Elder Robert Thompson published a correction of our statement which we made in September, 1917. This correction was in the Monitor of October, 1917. But we did not see it. We never had a copy of that issue of the Monitor. The first time we ever saw that correction was when it came out in the Messenger of Peace for June, 1938. Will a correction of this be made? If we had been in possession of the proof, we would have made the correction long ago. In The Primitive Baptist of September 19, 1929, is, an article from Elder Burton L. Nay, of Cedar Falls, Iowa, giving an account of a trip he had just made in West Tennessee.

He said, "Their welcome and hospitality is unforgettable. I also found a desire for unity among us rather than forced divisions." "Let us heal rather than hurt. Under present conditions and in our present state, it appears that bridges are better than bars. The truth preached in love is Zion's surcease and safeguard." This is the way Elder Nay found matters in West Tennessee in 1929. This has been the attitude of the brethren we have been associated with all along. Will a correction be made of this matter, also? Only one more word. We think that from the reading of Elder Sapp's letter in our issue of July 7 we we're entirely justifiable in the conclusion which we drew. We thought that when one makes application for membership in an order, he is either accepted or rejected by vote of the membership, and we also thought it was customary for the applicant to be recommended by some member or members if accepted. Sorry we misunderstood the meaning. Thank you for the correction. If it is not desired to agitate this matter, then it will be dropped; but we think proper corrections should be made. However, it is immaterial with us whether a correction be made concerning the above matters or not. Neither have we had, nor do we have, any desire to agitate, nor to confuse, nor to offend. C. H. C.

Tour in the North and East

---October 6, 1938

We left home on August 4, 1938, to fill appointments which were made for us by Elders J. H. Keaton and T. W. Osborne. These appointments were in Kentucky, Ohio and West Virginia. They closed at the New Liberty Association, at Scott Depot, W. Va., the first Sunday in September. After that list of appointments were made we agreed, by urgent request, to allow other appointments to be made in Indiana, to close on the second Sunday in September. On the trip we were in attendance at the Scioto Association, at Pleasantville, Ohio, on August 19, 20 and 21. We also attended the Muskingum Association, at St. Louisville, Ohio, on August 24 and 25. The association was one more day, but we could not remain there for the last day, although we regretted so much having to leave before the meeting was over. But we had to do this in order to meet the arrangements which had been made. Both of the meetings were good. We attended the Indian Creek Association, at Lester, W. Va., on Friday, Saturday and fourth Sunday in August. Two united with the church at this meeting. Large crowds were present each day, and it was a wonderful meeting. We were at the New Liberty Association, at Scott Depot, W. Va., on Friday, Saturday and first Sunday in September. One united with the church during this meeting. This was another wonderful meeting. On Monday, August 29, at Coal City, a brother united with the church, to be baptized later. While in Ohio we met Elder J. Harvey Daily and wife, of Macon, Ga., who were on a trip in Indiana and Ohio. Brother W. T. Daily and wife, of Indianapolis, Ind., were with them. While on the trip we tried to make a note of the names of the ministers we had the pleasure of meeting. We may have failed to get the names of some of them, but the following are the names of those we did get: Those whose homes are in Kentucky were Elders E. H. Hicks, E. N. Slusher, Levi Saylor, W. L. Kash, A. J. Christopher, S. A. Amburgey, A. L. Tackett, G. W. Hall, W. M. Caudill, M. B. Tackett, Eli Moore, A. F. Kiser and C. L. Ratcliff. Elder Ratcliff was ordained at Ray's Fork Church on Wednesday, August 10, by a presbytery composed of Elders S. E. Angle, the pastor of the church, Levi Saylor, J. H. Keaton and the writer, besides the deacon, or deacons, present, whose names we failed to get down in our notes. In addition to the names here given, we met other brethren in the ministry from Kentucky at the Indian Creek Association. We desire to give their names, and expected to get them from a minute of that meeting; but as we do not yet have a copy of the minute we

cannot give their names. Neither can we give the names of all the ministers who were at that association, for the same reason. We do not wish to delay longer the writing of this account of the trip, and want to assure each one that we would be glad to give the name of each.

The ministers present at the Scioto Association were: Elders G. F. Hanover, Ashville, Ohio; M. O. Curp, Newark, Ohio; Corvin Dove, Thornville, Ohio; U. G. Porter, x Nashport, Ohio; T. W. Osborne, Coopersville, Ohio; J. H. Keaton, Huntington, W. Va.; Daily Hite, Morral, Ohio; A. D. Pitney, Maumee, Ohio; C. E. Denman, Chesterville, Ohio; Ivan Hindall, Findlay, Ohio, and the writer. Those present at the Muskingum Association were: Elders B. F. Robertson, Charleston, W. Va.; U. G. Porter, Nashport, Ohio; L. V and Daily Hite, Morral, Ohio; F. F. Burkepile, Fredericktown, Ohio; M. O. Curp, Newark, Ohio; T. W. Osborne, Coopersville, Ohio; A. D. Pitney, Maumee, Ohio; G. F. Hanover, Ashville, Ohio; J. H. Keaton, Huntington, W. Va.; Corvin Dove, Thornville, Ohio; J. S. Bibler and Herman Hartman, Newark, Ohio, and the writer. The Muskingum Association was held on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, August 24, 25 and 26. On Wednesday night a meeting was appointed to be held at Friendship Church, in Newark, for the purpose of ordaining Brethren J. S. Bibler and Herman Hartman to the work of the ministry, they having, at their regular meeting previously, invited the ministers attending the association to be at this meeting to attend to the ordination. An account of this ordination was given in our issue of September 15, 1938. The presbytery was composed of Elders L. V Hite, Corvin Dove, F. F. Burkepile, A. D. Pitney, T. W. Osborne, C. H. Cayce, J. H. Keaton and Daily Hite, and Deacons Samuel Francis, Elmer Iden, M. B. Claggett, P. F. Lantz and Howard McCurdy. We pray the Lord to bless the labors of these dear brethren in His vineyard. On Friday, August 12, on our way from Morehead to Catlettsburg, Ky., we stopped at the home of Elder L. P. Damron, where he was lying a corpse, having quietly passed away the day before. By request we held a short service there. The family told us that the dear brother had been looking forward to being with us at Morehead. May the Lord bless the bereaved ones, is our humble prayer. The Indiana ministers we met were: Elders Ed Allen, Cecil Fuson, George Culy, L. W. Johnson, S. J. West, G. B. Green, W. A. Walters, Ernest Bradley, Earl Daily and John M. Thompson. Elder Thompson is past ninety years of age, and is in good health and is strong for a man of his age. He has traveled and preached much in the past in different states, in the South as well as North and West. We were glad to meet him once more. He was with us in Indianapolis, and seemed to enjoy the service. May the Lord continue to bless him in his last days. In all probability we shall never meet again on earth, but we hope to meet in a better country. Other ministers we met, whose names we have noted, are as follows: Elders Lowell Lilly, I W. Kilby, Willie Harvey, H. J. Cox, J. L. B. Lilly, U. G. Nichols, L. G. Mann, C. M. Pendleton and Z. T. Whaling. Besides these we met a number of others whose names we expected to get from the minute of the Indian Creek Association, which minute we do not have. We are sorry we cannot give their names, too. We traveled more than 3,000 miles on this trip. The last appointment filled was in Louisville, Ky., on Sunday night, September 11. We tried to preach nearly every day on the trip, beginning at Richmond, Ky., on Saturday, August 6, and twice on several days. We arrived home about 1 o'clock p. m. on Monday, September 12, and found all well, for which we felt to thank the good Lord. This was a pleasant trip to us. Elders Keaton and Osborne were with us most of the time on the entire trip, Elder Keaton being with us almost the entire time for five weeks. Elder Osborne was with us several days. We have had a tumor on our neck for several years. Soon after leaving home it became inflamed and broke, and it gave us a lot of trouble and pain. These brethren were good to us, and dressed the place

twice every day, until we left them, a few days before we returned home. It is still, at this writing (September 21), not well, though much improved. The brethren were good to us every place we went-far better than we feel to deserve. May Heaven's richest blessings rest upon them, is our humble prayer. We desire an interest in your prayers. C. H. C.

Our Association

---October 6, 1938

Our association (the South Arkansas) was held with Pleasant Grove Church, Kirby, Ark., on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, September 16, 17, 18, 1938. They had preaching on Thursday night, though the associational meeting began at 10 o'clock Friday morning. The introductory sermon was preached by Elder M. A. Norman, who is the pastor of the church. The following visiting ministers, besides Elder Norman, were in attendance: Elders W. W. Fowler and J. A. Littlejohn, Dallas, Texas; D. W. Witt, Mansfield, Ark.; G. E. Griffin, Canyon, Texas; R. L. Piles, Hon, Ark.; Leon H. Clevenger, Excelsior Springs, Mo.; R. M. Willett, Platte City, Mo.; L. P. Griffin, Nixon, Texas; Lewis N. Barrow, Jr., Mena, Ark.; R. F. Pierce, Quitman, Ark.; J. F. Abernathy, Oden, Ark.; and W. J. Green, Gray, Ga. The home ministers present were: Elders W. H. Eubanks, Poplar Grove, Ark.; W. H. Lee, Donaldson, Ark.; J. W. Guest, Rolla, Ark.; John R. Harris and C. H. Cayce, Thornton, Ark. The preaching was all a unit, not a discordant note sounded, and the Lord blessed the speakers to preach the truth in love. They preached peace by Jesus Christ. And the Lord blessed the people to hear with joy and gladness. His sweet presence was felt and manifested. "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." Two willing ones were encouraged to come home to their friends, telling how great things the Lord had done for them. They were joyfully and gladly received, their baptism to be attended to at that church on their next regular meeting time, the second Sunday in October. It was a glorious meeting, and we are sure it will not soon be forgotten. The meeting was well cared for in every way. May the Lord bless those who so devotedly and carefully looked after the feeding and caring for the visitors, and for all who were in attendance. Good order prevailed throughout the entire meeting. The Lord willing, the association will meet next year with Macedonia Church, near Dalark, about twelve miles east, or southeast, of Arkadelphia. C. H. C.

Troubleth Israel

---October 20, 1938

Our readers will remember that we had an article in our issue of April 7, 1938, concerning Elder J. W. Fairchild and some of his works, and that he is again publishing his paper, which he is pleased to call the Footprints of the Flock, at Whitesburg, Ky. We would not have given him any notice were it not for the fact that he is again publishing this paper and representing himself to be a Primitive Baptist in order. We felt that we owed it to our people to inform them as to the status of affairs. Of course Elder Fairchild became very much wrought up on account of what we said. Below we give his entire article in reply to what we said: "HE THAT TROUBLETH ISRAEL" I am indebted to Elder C. H. Cayce, editor of The Primitive Baptist, for more than two pages of free advertising. Not many ministers are of such prominence that an editor will devote that amount of space in advertising them, so I feel greatly honored. And as a kick from some people is a

boost, I have received a real boost. You know "No one ever kicks a dead dog." But there is one thing I hardly understand. If a man's influence is such that his overthrow demands the use of more than two pages of such an important paper as The Primitive Baptist, is he not worth saving? If his influence could only be turned from "bad" to good, would he not be a real asset to the cause? I suppose Elder Cayce never thought of that. At least he has never tried it. If I am in disorder among Primitive Baptists, there is no one to blame for it more than Elder J. E. Craft, of Neon, Ky. Before I united with a church in this part of the country, I wrote Elder Craft asking him about the order of the Baptists in this section, and especially the people he is with. Not one word of counsel or explanation did I receive. Instead he took my letter to Elder J. H. Keaton, and as Elder Keaton wrote him, they "agreed as to what was best to do about it." What did they agree to do about it? To tell me just what to do to get in fellowship with the true Primitive Baptists? If so, they never mentioned it to me. They never suggested that I make satisfaction to Providence Church in Mississippi. On the contrary, they kept silent till they received orders from their chief, and then went to work to secure evidence to condemn me. A fine way to bring the prodigal back into the fold, don't you think? As to the order of the Baptists with whom I am affiliated, they are about like the rest of the Baptists here in Eastern Kentucky. There has been so much strife and division among them, all doing wrong, that it does not become one faction to throw up disorder to another. But the Sandlick Association of which I am a member is the one recognized by the Three Forks and Washington Associations in Virginia. True, they recently dropped correspondence with the Sandlick Association because some of its ministers deny the humanity of Jesus. Read the February Footprints and you will find I exposed and condemned that teaching. I have been laboring to get the Baptists here out of that error, and if that is done the Three Forks and Washington Associations are ready to receive us back. As to Elder J. E. Craft's faction, they are as deep in the mud as we are in the mire. There are noble people among them, good people in all the factions and I am laboring to bring about a better understanding among them and thus promote peace and union. And were it not for men like Elder Cayce, keeping up the strife, I believe they would soon be together living in love and fellowship. If Elder Craft does not know that his statement that I have not been in fellowship with Primitive Baptists "for more than twenty years," and that I "went into North Carolina during this time and preached to them under some coloring," is not true, I pity his ignorance. As to whether I made satisfaction with Providence Church in Miss., ask the members of that church. Ask them if any one could do more to make satisfaction than I did. Ask them if they ever knew a minister to so desecrate the sacred office of pastor and manifest such a spirit of envy and hatred as Elder Lewis did that day. Brother E. T. Ruffin, Taylorsville, Miss., can give the facts in the case. When I was received into Sandlick Church, it was on a statement signed by twenty members of Providence Church, stating that I had done all in my power to make satisfaction, and that the church did wrong in not restoring me. In that statement they further said, "During Elder Fairchild's residence in this part of the country, he had the respect of every one, and his character was above reproach, and we can truthfully say we have never known a sweeter spirited brother, and his preaching was sound and God-honoring." And that is the kind of men Elder Cayce refuses to "cooperate" with, and wants the denomination to get rid of. No wonder, for he would have to stop ferreting out God's humble ministers and seeking to bring about their destruction, and cease stirring up strife and confusion in the churches, to co-operate with such a person. And it would prevent him from having charges brought against brethren and them dealt with by the church for lending support to respectable ministers of irreproachable character, whose preaching is sound and God-honoring. No, Elder

Cayce would have to change harness to co-operate with such a one. I want to apologize to our readers, who do not know Elder Cayce nor read his paper, for using this space to reply to his charges. I regret to have to do so, but feel it necessary. The Footprints of the Flock is published to promote love and fellowship, peace and union, not to spread strife, nor oppose God's true ministers. And if we would all labor as hard to reclaim the erring and bring them back into the true fold as Elder Cayce and his agents do to destroy those who do not take orders from him, we would soon be one flock again and not need detectives to hatch up evidence to prove that some one is identified with the wrong faction of Baptists. But dictators are the order of the day, and if we must have one, I know of no one better qualified for the position than Elder Cayce. However, I shall continue to look to the Lord for my orders, even if it does bring down upon my head the anathemas of the big boss. The foregoing is copied from the Footprints for May, 1938. We would have replied to the same long ago, but have been away from home most of the time, and have not had time to notice the same until now. The reader will note that in the heading Fairchild places over his article that he slyly accuses us of being the one who "troubleth Israel." Well, this is just like Ahab." And it came to pass when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, Art thou he that troubleth Israel? And he answered, I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim." -((Ki 18:17) (I Kings 18:17-18). The very man who accused another of troubling Israel was the guilty party. So it is now. Fairchild is the guilty party. The reader will please take particular notice that Elder Fairchild wished to co-operate with us. Note carefully that on January 8, 1938, he said, "I have been ready at all times to co-operate with you. Were you to visit us I would ask our churches to receive you heartily, and would rejoice to have you in my home." But because we did not see proper to co-operate with him, or to "line up" with him, now he is pleased to call us a dictator and the big boss. If we are a dictator and the big boss, why would he wish to co-operate with us, and why would he ask his churches to receive us heartily? Why? Bah! The elder says he has received a real boost from what we said. Perhaps so. But he says no one ever kicks a dead dog. Perhaps not. Neither do dead dogs bark; nor do they bite. It is the dogs which bite that people need to be warned against. Hence, the warning which we gave. Most dogs that bite will slip up on the unsuspecting ones, and will bite when it is least expected. Better watch the dogs." Beware of dogs." Two legged dogs are about as bad as the other sort." Beware of dogs." Fairchild says that Elders Keaton and Craft "kept silent until they received orders from their chief," referring to us. Did they receive any orders from us? No. We made inquiry as to the body of people Fairchild is identified with, as to whether they are considered orderly Baptists, and those brethren, as faithful brethren should, got the facts and informed us; and then we published the facts. That is what hurt Fairchild. We knew he was excluded from orderly Baptists in Mississippi. And we also knew that when a man is excluded from an orderly Old Baptist Church he is thereby excluded from every orderly Old Baptist Church on earth. But Fairchild admits that he is identified with a people who deny the humanity of Jesus. But of course that is all right, as he has set in to convert them from the error of their way. So did he join the Missionary Baptists one time-or was it twice? Wonder if he joined them and set in to convert them from the errors of their way? We believe he was also once identified with the Progressives. Wonder if he united with them and set in to convert them? But the error he admits is among the people he is identified with is not the only false theory they hold to and advocate. He says, "Were it not for men like Elder Cayce, keeping up the strife, I believe they would soon be together living in love and fellowship." Our life has been an open book, and the work we have done, and the labors we have engaged in, to

bring our people to a better understanding, and to get troubles among them settled and adjusted, plainly and bluntly give the lie to this statement from Fairchild. But, according to the doctrine he advocates, when convenient, he could not help it, for God predestinated beforehand that he should do what he does. It is all according to God's determinate counsel; God determined that everything should come to pass just as it does. According to his doctrine, we had to do what we did; we were just doing what God determined before to be done. He tried to line up some of our people in Arkansas and Louisiana with that "Absolute" stuff, and the result was a dead church, and to this day they have not recovered from the blow the cause received from Fairchild's work. Elder Fairchild accuses us of not laboring to bring the erring back into the fold, and of trying to destroy God's true ministers. Well, we gave Fairchild a fair trial in this country, and the result with one church where he proposed to labor was as stated above. And that was done without any interference from us. We have had enough of it in this country, and we want no more of Fairchild. We do not say this alone for ourself (for C. H. Cayce), but we say it for the Baptists of this section of country. No detectives are necessary to find out some of the course Fairchild has pursued. Too many people know something about that for a detective to be needed. As he so abused Elder G. W. Lewis in the foregoing article, we sent the paper to him, and asked him for a statement. Just here we will say that there is not a man in the whole state of Mississippi who stands higher as an honorable, upright Christian gentleman than Elder G. W. Lewis. He is not only highly respected by Primitive Baptists, but he is highly respected by all people who know him-especially in the section where he lives. We are too well acquainted with Elder Lewis and with his standing and conduct as a man and as a Baptist to even begin to believe a single word of the aspersion of Fairchild concerning his conduct. Following is the letter we received from Elder Lewis in response to our request for a statement: Auburn, Miss., Aug. 8, 1938. Elder C. H. Cayce: Dear Brother-Replying to your letter of July 8 requesting that we send you a statement for publication in reply to what Elder Fairchild says in the May issue of the Footprints of the Flock, in regard to Providence Church and our attitude in the matter, will say: We are willing for Providence Church and our friends who were present to say whether or not we conducted ourself as a pastor and moderator should under such circumstances as confronted us at that time. We have served the church continuously since, and we have never been more kindly treated and shown any more consideration than these good Baptists have shown us. We feel grateful that we have the esteem, love, confidence and fellowship, not only of the church, but of the entire community. Providence Church belongs to the Good Hope Association, of Mississippi, composed of ten orderly churches. The association is in direct correspondence with the Bethany and Amite Associations, of Mississippi, and she is in fellowship with all the orderly Primitive Baptists of Mississippi. This is the home association of Elder J. E. Alderman, who is eighty-seven years of age, and has been in the work of the ministry for over forty-seven years, and has been moderator for many years. Elder C. N. Ware, of Taylorsville, Miss., is serving five churches in this association at present. Elder G. H. Banks, of Newton, Miss., has served churches in this association for years. These are godly men, and able ministers of the gospel. Orderly ministers of the Primitive Baptist faith visit Providence Church and the Good Hope Association from Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, and perhaps other states. These Baptists are recognized as orderly Primitive Baptists by the Primitive Baptists of the entire Southland. Elder Fairchild was excluded in an orderly way by an orderly Primitive Baptist church, and that is where he stands today. In hope, G. W. Lewis. If Elder Fairchild, or any other man, objects to being investigated and ferreted out, it is very evident that something is wrong. The preacher who is all right does not object to being investigated or ferreted out.

The man posing as a preacher should be investigated and ferreted out. If he is not all right, the sooner you find it out, the better it will be for you. The Lord has set somebody on the walls of Zion as watchmen. It is the duty of the watchman to watch. If he fails to sound the alarm he is a traitor. Yes, while the good Lord spares our life, we expect, by the help and grace of God, to watch and to sound the alarm when we see one endeavoring to represent himself as a Primitive Baptist when he is not." Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple. "-Rom. xvi. 17, 18. It is not pleasant to us to engage in exposing such matters as this, but faithfulness to our God and to His cause and people requires it. We would rejoice to know that men would cease to do as some men do, but we do not expect it in this life. "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowlege of the truth. Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith." -2 Tim. iii. 1-8. C. H. C.

Studies in Predestination

---November 3, 1938

In the Footprints of the Flock for May, 1938, Elder Fairchild has a continued article under the above heading. We copy the article in full, and recommend a careful reading of it before reading what we have to say concerning the same.

THE ARTICLE

Predestination is not the incentive or motive power that causes men to do either good or bad. Men do good deeds, not because it was predestinated they should do them, but because they are prompted by a righteous spirit to do them. And they do evil deeds, not because it was predestinated they should do them, but because they are moved by an evil spirit to do them. They do good deeds for the same reason a good tree bears good fruit, and evil deeds for the same reason that a corrupt tree bears corrupt fruit. Is not that clear? I believe we are all agreed on the above statement. The thing I am trying to get all my readers to understand is that there is a vast difference between God's predestinating a thing and authorizing or causing that thing to come to pass. The Bible clearly teaches that God has predestinated many of the wicked deeds of men, but it as clearly condemns the idea that God ever causes, authorizes or influences men to do wrong. No more wicked deed was ever committed by men or devils than the betrayal, condemnation and crucifixion of Jesus Christ. And yet His inspired servants tell us, "For of a truth against thy holy child, Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do WHATSOEVER THY HAND AND THY COUNSEL DETERMINED BEFORE TO BE DONE." -((27) (Acts 4:27-28). The whole mob, Jews, Gentiles, Herod, Pontius Pilate, doing whatsoever the hand and counsel of God determined before to be done. Predestinate and determine before mean exactly the same, so those who

condemned and crucified the Saviour did just what God had predestinated they should do. Will anyone dispute this? If so, will he please tell me what the above Scripture means? But while God predestinated that this should be done, was He the author of those men's sin? Did He cause or influence them to do it? Certainly not. Listen to Peter: "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and with wicked hands have crucified and slain." -((23) (Acts 2:23). God not only foreknew, but also determined that they should condemn and crucify Jesus, and yet they did it "with wicked hands." They knew nothing about God's purpose in the death of Jesus, and voluntarily condemned and put Him to death. They were just as guilty as they would have been if God had not "before determined" or predestinated it. They knew Him not, nor understood the voice of the prophets which they read, and "fulfilled them in condemning Him." -((27) (Acts 13:27). Will any one claim that these men were not responsible for their deeds because they fulfilled God's purpose? No, they did it "with wicked hands." No doubt some one will want to know how God can predestinate an act and not be the cause or author of it. I have already shown that predestination is not the force that causes men to act, but as this is the crux of the question, let me further illustrate. Over in Eastern Tennessee there are many large springs-good size streams springing out of the earth and wending their way toward the sea. They run through rich narrow valleys, and often cut away the banks and carry off the soil. If left to take their course they would wash away much of the soil, but those farmers save their soil by keeping the stream in proper bounds. They cut a new channel and straighten the stream in one place, and put in an abutment to protect the bank in another. They do not cause the water to flow down stream, but they do fix its channel and thus save their farms. These farmers go further than just preventing the streams from washing away their land. They sometimes direct it in an entirely new channel, cutting a race for it, and bringing it around the side of the mountain to where it will have a great fall. Here they build a mill and use the force of the water in its fall to run its machinery. They did not cause the water to flow down stream, but they fixed its channel, directed its course, utilized its power and not only prevented it from destroying their lands, but made it grind their wheat and corn, and in many other ways serve the community. And who will say those farmers did wrong in fixing the channel of the stream and turning it into a blessing instead of leaving it to take its course and wash away their best soil? God no more causes men to do wickedly than those men caused the water to flow down stream. The water runs down stream because the force of gravity draws it that way; and men do wickedly because their evil lustful nature draws them that way. And as men fix the channel of the stream and turn the force of the water into a blessing, so God sets the bounds of the wicked, lays out the path they shall travel, determines or predestinates what things they may do and what things they shall not do, and thus confines their wickedness in such a channel that it works for the good of them that love God. That is not bad of God, is it? Aren't you glad that God has fixed the bounds of the wicked? If the wicked were turned loose, unrestricted and unbounded by God's decree, where would our safety be? I am not so much concerned as to whether God has predestinated the righteous deeds of men or not, for I have nothing to fear from them; but I am immensely concerned as to whether God has determined or predestinated the wicked acts of men. Only by the bounds of the wicked being unalterably set can the righteous be secure. Aren't we agreed on this? It seems to me that here our limited and unlimited predestinarians can find a common meeting ground. The contention of our limited brethren that God is not the author of sin and in no sense causes men to sin, is not only granted but advocated as strongly as they advocate it. And our unlimited brethren's argument that God's predestination or determinate counsel extends to all the wicked actions of men and

devils, fixing their bounds, governing their deeds, determining what they may and may not do, is set forth in perfect harmony with His goodness and perfection. Does not each find here all for which he is contending and nothing contradictory to it?
OUR COMMENTS

The first thing we wish to say regarding the foregoing is that Elder Fairchild is here apparently engaging in his old tricks of trying to wrap up his doctrine so as to get our brethren to swallow it before they realize what it is that they are taking. Let the reader carefully note the fact that a strong effort is made in the article to convey the idea that predestination does not cause anything. Note the very first sentence in the article: "Predestination is not the incentive or motive power that causes men to do either good deeds or bad." In the Footprints for June the elder says this: I thought I made it plain last month that predestination is NEVER CAUSATIVE. Regarding predestination as causative is at the bottom of most of the schisms over that subject. If God's predestination is not causative, and never causes anything to come to pass-if predestination has nothing whatever to do with a thing coming to pass- then why be such a stickler for the doctrine that God predestinated all things that come to pass? Why be so bent on advocating that doctrine, if God's predestination has nothing to do with things coming to pass? If God's predestination of a thing has nothing whatever to do with that thing coming to pass, then the thing predestinated would come to pass just as well, and just the same, without God's predestination as with it. God's predestination, then, is a useless thing, and nothing ever comes of it, either good or bad. The doctrine may be the truth, but we are not yet ready to accept it. Are you? Let us try that just a little. Let us first call attention to **(Romans 8:28-29,30)**: And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified. In this God the Father is for you in foreknowledge and predestination; the Holy Spirit is for you in calling; the Son is for you in justification; and the final end of all this is the final glorification of every heir of promise -every one that loves God; every one that was known beforehand by the Father in the covenant of grace. Take God's foreknowledge out of the matter, and not one would be glorified. Take the calling out of it, and not one would be glorified. Take justification out of it, and not one would be glorified. Hence, all these, together, is the cause why one is glorified. Not only so, but take God's predestination out of it, and not one would be glorified-unless it should be done by accident. Hence, God's predestination is linked in as a part of the cause of one being glorified. To deny that God's predestination is a part of the cause why one is glorified is to simply deny the certainty of the final salvation and glorification of any poor sinner. Primitive Baptists have always held that the final salvation and glorification of all the elect of God is certain and sure, because God has predestinated, determined beforehand, that they should be conformed to the image of His Son, and finally glorified in heaven. But if predestination has nothing whatever to do with a thing coming to pass, then the Primitive Baptists have been wrong in this contention all along the line. Are you ready to surrender, and to renounce, the truthfulness of the doctrine which has been characteristic of our people all along? Let us have another text-Eph. i. 3, 4, 5, 6: Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as He hath chosen

us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will, to the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us accepted in the beloved. In this we have the fact that those who were chosen in Him before the ages of time began were predestinated unto the adoption of children. That is, God predestinated that those He chose should be adopted into the heavenly family-predestinated them unto the adoption of children. If predestination has nothing to do with a thing being done-and never causative-then God's predestination is no part of the cause of one being adopted into the heavenly family-it has nothing to do with, and is no part of the cause of, one receiving the "adoption of children." But God does adopt every one He chose, and they are taken finally into the heavenly family in glory, because He has "predestinated us unto the adoption of children." God determined beforehand that they should be thus adopted, and He brings them into His heavenly family in accord with His previous determination, or His previous purpose thus to do. Predestination does have something to do with this coming to pass. In the June issue of the Footprints Elder Fairchild also says: "Therefore, to be consistent we must contend for the predestination of all things or nothing." There you are, flatly! If we must contend for the predestination of God in the salvation of sinners, we must also contend that He predestinated all things that come to pass. If He predestinated all things that come to pass, then He also predestinated all the crimes, and all the sins, that are committed in the world. According to this, God predestinated all the sins that we commit; then He predestinated to save us from our sins. If this is true, then He predestinated to save us from His own predestination! Bosh! When Elder Fairchild was publishing the Footprints in 1909 he said in that paper for September, 1909: This world is governed by the law of cause and effect-not one thing is left to blind chance. There is not only a cause for every effect, but there is a cause for every cause except the First Cause. The First Cause is an uncaused cause-all the reasons for its existence are in itself. First Cause is another name for God. God is the first cause of all causes. We replied to this in The Primitive Baptist of October 26, 1909. See page 314 of our Editorial Writings, Volume I We quote these few words from that reply: According to the logic of it God did not cause Adam to violate the law, but the devil caused Adam to do so. And Elder Fairchild says God is the first cause of all causes. Then God caused the devil to cause Adam to violate the law. Adam would not have violated the law if the devil had not caused him to do so; and the devil would not have caused Adam to violate the law if God had not caused him to do that. There can be no effect without a cause. Then Adam could not have violated the law if the devil had not caused him to do so, and the devil could not have caused Adam to violate the law if God had not caused him to do so. If this does not make God the author and the first cause of sin, we confess we do not know the meaning of the words. There is no use caviling over the matter; it simply makes God the first cause and the author of all sin. In the article above Elder Fairchild refers to, and quotes, what we consider to be the strongest text in the Bible in support of the doctrine that God predestinated all things that come to pass. **{((27) (Acts 4:27-28)}** Note that He says the "whole mob, Jews, Gentiles, Herod, Pontius Pilate" "did just what God had predestinated they should do." If God is pleased with His predestination, then He was pleased with what that ungodly mob did. According to that doctrine, they were doing the will of God. In **((0) (Matthew 12:50)** Jesus said," For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." According to Elder Fairchild's doctrine, those wicked men-the whole mob -Jews, Gentiles, Herod, Pontius Pilate, and all the rest of that motley crowd-were, and are, brother, and sister, and mother of the blessed Son of God! And so is the

devil brother, and sister, and mother of the blessed Jesus, for he does the will of God, too; for the Lord predestinated that he should do everything he does. As another said, who advocates the same doctrine Elder Fairchild does, "God could not lie, but He raised up a nasty little devil to do His lying for Him." This doctrine these fellows advocate, sure enough, makes God meaner than the devil. Let us here have the text above referred to. First, we will quote, as follows, beginning with verse 5 **{((5) (Acts 4:5)}** down to and including ((22) (Acts 4:22): And it came to pass on the morrow, that their rulers, and elders, and scribes, and Annas the high priest, and Caiaphas, and John *not the Apostle John*, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest, were gathered together at Jerusalem. And when they had set them *Peter and John* in the midst, they asked, By what power, or by what name, have ye done this? Then Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them, Ye rulers of the people, and elders of Israel, if we this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole; be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by Him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men, they marveled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus. And beholding the man which was healed standing with them, they could say nothing against it. But when they had commanded them to go aside out of the council, they conferred among themselves, saying, What shall we do to these men? for that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem; and we cannot deny it. But that it spread no further among the people, let us straitly threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this name. And they called them, and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard. So when they had further threatened them, they let them go, finding nothing how they might punish them, because of the people: for all men glorified God for that which was done. For the man was above forty years old, on whom this miracle of healing was shewed. We have taken this long extract from this chapter to show plainly what gave rise to the following-or to what is embraced in ((26) (Acts 4:26-27,28). It is plainly seen here that these wicked men-the rulers, elders, scribes, Annas, Caiaphas, John, Alexander, and the kindred of the high priest-were threatening the apostles and forbidding them to speak in the name of Jesus. When Peter and John were thus threatened and forbidden to speak in the name of Jesus they were let go. See ((23) (Acts 4:23): And being let go, they went to their own company, and reported all that the chief priests and elders had said unto them. ((24) (Acts 4:24) says, "And when they heard that." The antecedent of the pronoun they is their own company, in ((23) (Acts 4:23). Their own company, to whom Peter and John went, heard the report, which they made, of the threatenings of those wicked men. So, let us read ((24) (Acts 4:24): And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said. Just here let us interrupt the reading to ask a question or two. If God predestinated everything that comes to pass, and His predestination is according to His will, then were not those wicked men doing what was God's will for them to do? And, as the apostles lifted up their voice with one accord in prayer to God, did they pray for God's will to be done? If so, did they not pray for those wicked men to do just what they were doing? Did not Jesus teach His disciples to

pray to the Lord, "Thy will be done?" Is it not a fact that the prayer of the apostles here simply resolves itself into a request, or a pleading, for the Lord to interpose and to interfere with these wicked men, and to hinder and prevent them from carrying out their wicked threats and designs? It is simply a pleading unto Him that He would do in this case as in another, to which they refer. Now, let us read on: And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord, and against His Christ. For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done. And now, Lord, behold their threatenings: and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word, by stretching forth thy hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy child Jesus.-((24) (Acts 4:24-30). This is plainly a prayer to God to prevent these wicked men from carrying out their threats and designs. It is a prayer to God to interfere in this case, just as He did in the other case, when Herod, Pontius Pilate, and the wicked mob were gathered together against His Christ. Did the Lord interfere in that case, and hinder, or prevent, them from carrying out their design? He most surely did. They did not carry out His predestination. The Lord did not allow them to do that. He does not allow wicked men and devils to carry out His predestination; He carries that out Himself. It was God's predestination that Jesus should die-that He should lay down His life. Those wicked men had tried, from the time of His birth,.to take His life; but the Lord did not allow them to take it. Jesus said: **{(John 10:11,15,17-18)}** "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth His life for the sheep." "And I lay down my life for the sheep." "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." Here we have it plainly that they did not take His life; but it was according to the will of the Father that the Son die. So those wicked men were not allowed to take His life. Their purpose and design was thwarted and overthrown. So, the apostles, in the text just referred to above, prayed the Father to thwart and prevent the carrying out of the designs of these wicked men in this instance, as He did before. When the soldiers came to the Saviour, as He hung on the cross, with the thieves, the thieves were not dead, but Jesus was dead already. {see **(John 19:33)}**} In **((23) (Acts 2:23)** it is said that He was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God; but it does not say that what those people did was by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. What they did was not by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, but was by wicked hands. God's determinate counsel was one thing, and what they did was another thing. It was by nothing else than by the devil's own lie and invention that men have advocated the idea that those wicked men and devils were fulfilling and doing and carrying out God's will, purpose, pleasure, and predestination. We never have believed it, and we do not now believe it, and never expect to believe it. If that doctrine is the truth, the eternal God has unalterably fixed, predestinated and decreed from eternity that we should not believe it-and we are glad He did. With these things before us, what shall we say? It is very clear and evident that all this pretense of pleading for peace and reconciliation is pure buncombe. This, above, is the blasphemous doctrine you swallow when you "swallow Fairchild." Excuse us, please. We still stand just where we have stood all along the line. See our Editorial

Writings, Volume I, pages 18, 335, 337, and 340; Volume II, page 218; Volume IV, page 389, as well as other articles in our writings on the same subject. Such doctrine always has caused trouble when advocated among Primitive Baptists, and it always will. It is heresy of the blackest sort and of the very deepest dye. The sooner the Primitive Baptists get rid of every mother's son that advocates it, the better off they will be. Put such as that out of the boat, and stop up the leak, to keep it out, or else the boat will sink; the candlestick will be removed, and the blessings and privileges of gospel worship and service will be taken from that place. This is verified from the history of the past. May the Lord deliver His poor little children from such doctrine, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Encouraging Letter

---November 3, 1938

Dear Brother Cayce: I have just finished reading Volume II of your Editorial Writings. I read Volume I some time back. Surely The Primitive Baptist has been an Old Baptist paper all along the line. It is still contending for the same doctrine and principles that it did fifty years ago. We love that doctrine and those principles. We love those who have not been afraid to speak out in defense of that doctrine. Brother Cayce, you have been plain-spoken. We were never left to guess as to where you stood. We love you for that, and would love to encourage you while we can. We know that you have had many trials, and many burdens to bear; the world has tried hard to crush you, but God has upheld you through it all. You have never been willing to compromise with error, but always ready to expose it. You are old now, and must soon lay your armor down; you have fought a good fight; you have contended earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. You have fought many battles for the dear old church; you have won many battles for it-and we love you. Some day we will go to our mail box and get our paper, and these words will stare us in the face: "Elder C. H. Cayce passes away." Oh, how we will miss you! There will be weeping in Israel. We will then think of many things we should have said to encourage and help you along the way. I wish all of the Old Baptists would tell you of their appreciation for you now. We do appreciate you and your labors and efforts. We pray God to continue to uphold you by His righteous omnipotent hand. Remember us at a throne of grace. Your brother in hope, Lewis Keith. Quay, New Mex.

REMARKS

Were it not for an occasional letter like the above we feel that we would have given up in despair long ago. "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing to both small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." --((22) (Acts 26:22). Not only has the world tried to crush us, but some of "our folks" have done the same. Persecutions from the world are not so hard to bear, but the daggers that come from within our own borders hurt. But the Lord has sustained us, and many brethren have been good to us, and have helped us much along the way. We have already forgiven those who have maligned us, and pray God to forgive them and help them to walk in the right and in the "good old way." Pray for us. C. H. C.

Hardshell Bragging Again

---November 17, 1938

Under the above heading is an article on page 4 of the so-called Orthodox Baptist Searchlight of July 11, 1938, by the Hon. Rt. Rev. Ben M. Bogard (or, rather Blowhard), D. D., LL. D. (and as many other D's as we suppose he could get), which some persons have asked us about. The article reads as follows: Brother P. P. Heliums, Russellville, Ala., writes: "I am sending you a clipping from a Hardshell paper. The reason I am sending this is that some of them around here are boasting that you will not meet Cayce, their big man, in debate. I want you to write me a personal letter telling me if you will meet him in debate, and also answer in your paper." It is very strange that Hardshells should boast of me not meeting Cayce in debate when I met him and so completely routed him that he cannot be induced to meet me again. It has been tried and he refuses to meet me. I met him at Little Flock Church near Burnsville, Miss., and he was OFFERED ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS IN CASH DEPOSITED IN THE BANK AT WIN-FIELD, Ala., if he would repeat the debate at Winfield, Ala. Witness, Mr. W. J. Perry, Winfield, Ala., and Elder Abner Green, Guin, Ala., and numerous others living near Burnsville, Miss. But what if I had refused to meet him in debate? I should not be blamed for according to the Hardshell doctrine it was thus foreordained from before the foundation of the world. Sic! We do not know what clipping Mr. Heliums sent the Rev. (?) Blowhard. But the first thing we wish to call attention to is what Bogard says our doctrine is. This he knows very well is not true. He knows very well that we teach no such thing. That is what he charged on us in the debate near Leedy, Miss., and he knows we corrected him on it, and he refused to accept the correction and said we taugt and argued it there. He knows we finally told him that he was a liar; that we said no such thing. He knows this, and still he makes the assertion that this is our doctrine. He knows better. He has read The Primitive Baptist enough to know that we have fought that doctrine all along. But there is no use to correct Bogard on anything. So long as he can make his people believe that is our doctrine he will continue to try to do so. But he named some witnesses in his article that one hundred dollars had been put on deposit in a bank at Winfield for us to meet him there in a debate. He made that statement in his paper quite awhile ago- perhaps about the first of the year 1924, or earlier. On May 30, 1924, we wrote to Brother S. W. Lucas, Win-field, Ala., and asked him to find out the facts in regard to this matter. On June 17, 1924, Brother Lucas wrote to us, and in that letter he said: Now as to the \$100 being on deposit here at Winfield for you to meet Bogard. I did not know any better way to get at facts than to ask the Missionaries about it. One of them said he told an outsider (not a member of the Primitive order) that Cayce would not meet Bogard again for \$100; but all of the other Missionaries whom I've talked with say there is not, nor has not, been any \$100 as a standing offer for Cayce to meet Bogard at Winfield. Since Brother Lucas wrote the letter of above date he has passed away. He was a man of unquestioned truth and veracity. So that shows the statement by Bogard to be untrue. But since he published the statement copied above in his paper of July 11, 1938, and gave the name of two parties as witnesses, we thought it might be prudent for us to investigate the matter a little farther. So we called on a friend of ours here in Thornton, who is an honorable man, and a member of the Missionary Baptist Church here, and showed him the paper, and asked if he would do us the favor of writing to those two witnesses given by Bogard and ask them about it. He readily granted the request, and wrote them as follows:

Thornton, Ark., Sept. 18, 1938.

Mr. W. J. Perry, Winfield, Ala.

Dear Sir: I am writing you in regard to a proposed debate between Elder Cayce and Elder Bogard at Winfield. I see in the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight that Elder Bogard says one hundred dollars was deposited in a bank there for Elder Cayce to

meet him in debate. In what bank was the money deposited? Is it still on deposit there, to be paid to Elder Cayce if he will meet Elder Bogard there in debate? What bank is the money deposited in? I will thank you for this information. I belong to the First Baptist Church, Thornton, Ark. Respectfully, C. C. Strickland. A verbatim copy of the above letter was addressed to Elder Abner Green, and mailed to him at Guin, Ala. Mr. Perry replied as follows: Sept. 26, 1938. Dear Sir, Amos sorry but I don't know anything about the matters you mention above; if you will write me the particulars, I will try to investigate and see if there is now or has been such as you mention. Respt., W. J. Perry. A few days after receiving the above letter from Mr. Perry our friend received the following: Guin, Ala., Oct. 6, 1938. Mr. Strickland: There is nothing of a debate at Winfield between Elder Bogard and Cayce, but they are about to get up a debate at Winfield with the Campbellites, if they can get someone to debate with them. Well, Mr. Green has done passed over; he died the 10th of January. So I will answer, instead of him. Mrs. A. W. Green. R. 2, Guin, Ala. Now, there you are! On July 11 Bogard gives a witness who passed over on the tenth of last January! The living witness says he knows nothing about it. Say, Bogard, your living witness will have to stand aside. He is not a competent witness, for he knows nothing about it! Wonderful witness! And the second witness is dead, and had been dead six months when you gave his name. Say, Bogard, have you had a letter from him since he left Alabama? Why did you not give his present address? Can you tell us how we can get information from him now? His wife answered for him, as he is beyond reach now, and says there is nothing of a debate between Bogard and Cayce. The reader may ponder these matters, and judge for yourself as to Bogard's brag-for brag is all that it is, except that it is plainly void of truth. Poor Blowhard! Wonder if that is the way he expects to get to heaven! C. H. C.

Titus 2; 3:15

---December 1, 1938

Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again; not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things.-(Titus 2:9-10). In this the apostle has instructed Titus to teach and so instruct as is here quoted. Servants were to be taught, instructed, and exhorted to conduct themselves as here laid down. They were to be exhorted to be obedient unto their own masters. This does not necessarily mean that the masters were the actual owners of the servants. A servant is "any person employed by another and subject in his employment to his employer's directions and control; an agent who is subject to the direction and control of his principal. One who serves, or does services, voluntarily or on compulsion; a person who is employed by another for menial offices, or for other labor, and is subject to his command; a person who labors or exerts himself for the benefit of another, his master or employer." See Webster's International Dictionary. If one is employed by another, then he is a servant of that employer. He may not be a good servant, or he may be a good servant-depending upon how well he serves. If he is not a good servant, then he will not remain indefinitely in the employ of the master or principal-that is, if the principal, or manager of the business, cares for the success of the business he is engaged in. This is a self-evident fact, and needs no proof. If one who is at the head of a business is aware of the fact that those under him are not conducting themselves according to the instruction given in our text, then it is manifest that the manager himself is not

true. There is something wrong with him. The business is not his own; and so he becomes a servant over other servants. Allowing the servants under him to continue in their stations, and they not being true to the master, he thereby becomes a traitor to the master, or to the employer. This principle is true, and holds good in all walks of life, whether in business affairs or governmental affairs. Now make your own application of this, and see where our people stand. Purlioning means "to take away for one's self; hence, to steal; filch; to practice theft; to steal." See Webster's International Dictionary. If one is employed by another, and is paid so much per day, or so much per week, or month; and is supposed to work so many hours per day, or per week, or per month, then that much of his time belongs to his employer. If he is to work one hour for the employer, then that hour of his time belongs to his employer. And that means for him to give the very best of his strength and talent to the work he is employed to do during that hour. If the servant wastes five minutes of that hour he has niched the employer that much; he has stolen that much from the employer. If a man is employed by the government on W. P. A. work-or any other work, for that matter-and he wastes his time, by leaning on his shovel, or in any other way, he has stolen that time from the government. As the worker is, himself, a part of the government, of course he has stolen a small fraction of that wasted time from himself, and in the final accounting he and his own children, or family, will have it to pay for. About as mean a man, we believe, as we have ever heard of along that line is a man who will steal money out of one of his pockets and put it in another. But such a worker steals from all the taxpayers of the nation, for they have the bill to pay. In the morning of time, according to the record we have in God's Book, our Bible, we have it that God said, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground." - (Genesis 2:19). "In the sweat of thy face" signifies labor, work. This is what God said about it. That is the fiat of the great King and Ruler over all. It has never been' revoked or repealed, or even suspended. That is the only honorable way to obtain a living here in this world. This will remain true as long as the world stands. There are only three ways by which one may obtain a living here. One way is to work for it; another way is to beg; the other way is to steal. If one is able to work, it is dishonorable to beg. If one is not able to work and is in destitute circumstances, the same Ruler over all has made it the personal duty of those who have of this world's goods to supply the needs of the destitute. But it was never made the duty of governments by the Ruler over all to supply those needs. When people attempt to carry out these things in such a way, it is no better than to presume that they have a better way of doing things than the all wise God has directed. No other way will do as well as God's way. "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat." -((Th 3:10) (II Thessalonians 3:10). That way and plan seems to be all out of date in these times. That is too old and out of date for us in these latter days. The plan now seems to be to feed and take care of those who will not work, and all live easy. In the law which God gave in ancient times He said; "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." This is found in **((0:9) (Exodus 20:9)**; in **((21) (Exodus 34:21)** He said, "Six days thou shalt work." But now we must cut down on the work, and live without doing much of that. A flagrant violation of what God has commanded. If we want happiness and prosperity in the land, or in the church, do what God has commanded; live in obedience to His laws and commandments. But does the infallible and sufficient rule-the Book of God-give any instruction to the masters? Yes, indeed. "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven." -(Colossians 4:1). Read also **(Ephesians 6:5-9)**. Which is the worse, for the servant to steal, or for the master? Is it not just as bad for one to steal as for the other? If the master fails to

give that which is just to the servant, then the master is stealing from the servant; but that is no more wrong than for the servant to steal from the master. And if one does wrong that does not justify the other in doing wrong. Two wrongs never make a right. "But shewing all good fidelity." Fidelity means "faithfulness; adherence to right; careful and exact observance of duty, or discharge of obligations; especially, adherence to a person or party to which one is bound; loyalty." See Webster's International Dictionary. It seems to us that this is so clear that no further comment is needed. We should all be faithful and loyal in discharging every duty which devolves upon us, in every walk of life. May the Lord help us to think on these things, and give us strength for our day and for every trial. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 53

---December 15, 1938

This issue brings volume fifty-three of The Primitive Baptist to a close. Fifty-three years of publishing this paper have been finished. Many changes have come during these years. There have been wars, and famines, and pestilences, and fires, and earthquakes, and storms, and cyclones, and tornadoes, and failures, and depressions, and high prices, and low prices, and surpluses, and short crops, uprisings, and downittings, dark days, and days of sunshine, and extravagance, and bankruptcies, and poverty-stricken ones, and millionaires-and what not. Through it all the Lord has brought us to this good hour. His mercies have never failed, and He has not changed. He is the same God that He was fifty-three years ago, and the same that He has ever been. His truth is the same. There has been no change in the principles of truth. God is the author of all truth, and so there is no change in truth. No matter what the circumstances may have been, or what they may be, what was a principle of truth any number of years ago is a principle of truth today. We asked a man once if he would then unqualifiedly endorse an article which he wrote several years before. After a time he answered that he would if the circumstances were the same. Would circumstances. change a principle of truth? If it was wrong to lie fifty-three years ago, it is wrong to lie today. It has always been wrong to lie. It has always been wrong to steal. It has always been wrong to commit adultery, and it is wrong yet. It has always been right to contend for the truth, and it is right to do that yet. It has always been right for one to acknowledge his mistakes, and correct them when possible, and it is right yet. But there have been some men all along the line who would not do that, and there are some who are that way yet. We suppose it will always be that way. "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived," so says God's Book, and we still believe that, as we have been doing all these years. The Lord has cared for His church ever since He set it up here in the world, and He is caring for it yet. He has promised to preserve His kingdom, and "all the promises of God in Christ Jesus are yea and amen, to the glory of God." There have been, and may yet be, dark and dismal scenes for His humble poor to pass through; but "God is faithful, by whom ye were called into the fellowship of His Son." God cares for the sparrows, and He cares for His little children. His mercies are everlasting. He never fails. He has never left us alone. He has been with us, and cared for us, in many deep sorrows and distresses. Blessed be His holy name, for His wonderful works to the children of men! Though the people forsake Him, though His children be forgetful and neglectful, yet He has never forgotten or been neglectful of them. He is rich in mercy. Being rich, the supply of mercy and grace is inexhaustible. There is no such thing as His mercy being exhausted. If it should be exhausted, everlasting ruin would be ours-not one would escape. Notwithstanding the great wickedness in the world today, yet the Lord is

merciful, and still preserves the universe and the world still stands. But there may be a great scourging ahead-unless some turn from their wicked way and from the course that things are going. May the Lord pity us, and preserve His faithful few from the awful catastrophe. Let us count up our blessings, if we can. Surely the Lord has been good to us all. Notwithstanding the great wickedness going on in our own nation, yet the Lord has been good, and is good, to this wicked nation. Think of the war going on in Spain, and in China, and the serious and dire threatenings of war in the entire old world! Yet, this nation is still blessed with peace with other nations and among ourselves. Wonderful blessing! Do we appreciate it as we should? Should we not, with the close of this year and the ushering in of another New Year, consecrate and dedicate our lives anew to the service and praise and adoration of our God, and begin the coming year with renewed determination, and by His help, to be more devoted to Him than we have in the past? May His blessings rest upon you, dear reader; and when you pray, please remember us and our little family. Pray God to forgive all our past mistakes and follies, and to help us to live closer to Him what remaining days we have left us on earth. C. H. C.

1939

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME LIV

---January 5, 1939

Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.--(3) (Philippians 3:13-14). As we pondered in mind the matter of writing an article as an introductory to Volume LIV the above Scripture came to mind. The expression, "I count not myself to have apprehended" means that he did not claim that he yet possessed what he evidently desired to possess and to attain to, as expressed in the language following. But he expressed a desire and determination to "press toward the mark." That signifies a desire to press forward. In a great measure the beloved apostle here expressed the desire of our poor heart as we enter this new year and new volume of The Primitive Baptist. We would be glad if every reader could and would join with us in "forgetting those things which are behind." So many things have been done in the past which should be forgiven and forgotten. Things have been said which should not have been said. They cannot be unsaid. But we can confess our wrongs, whether those wrongs were wrong words or wrong deeds. And we can and should forgive those who have trespassed against us. "It is human to err and divine to forgive." We do not have a mind to write a long article as an introductory to this volume. We do feel, however, to say that it is our desire to labor for the unity and peace of the Lord's dear children. It is our desire to labor for the unifying of the church in all places. We confess that sometimes things creep into our columns which should not be published. We confess that we make mistakes, and sometimes let things go in that should not be allowed. Perhaps some may think they could do better in the publishing of an Old Baptist paper than we do; and perhaps they could. It would be too bad if no one on earth could do any better than we do in some things. But sometimes we are imposed on. Sometimes things are sent to us for publication which should not be published, but it may be concerning something we know

nothing about, and we are innocent in the matter. It may be a matter that looks good to one who does not know all about the matter. When such is the case, somebody has not dealt honestly with the editor; and the editor is blamed for the matter unless he will publish something contrary to the other, or make some statement about it, by way of correction or exposing it. If he does that he sure incurs the displeasure of some, and so somebody is "ruffled," no matter how things may go in the premises. Things like this have been encountered by us along the line. But we desire to be as the apostle, "forgetting those things which are behind." We still desire to be "reaching forth unto those things which are before." "The mark for the prize of the high calling" is before. So it is needful to press forward. Let us not go backward. "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." -((62) (Luke 9:62). If a man is plowing in a field and looks back, he is sure to plow a crooked furrow. Let us keep our faces turned toward Jerusalem. Let us "press toward the mark." To press is to push hard. Labor to that end. "Strive for the things that make for peace." Do the things that tend to peace and not confusion. DO as well as TALK. Let us not be found talking peace and about peace, and doing contrary to our talk. "And let the peace of God rule in your hearts." -(Colossians 3:15). If we let the peace of God rule in our hearts, we will labor for peace. May the Lord help us to thus labor in the publication of this volume of The Primitive Baptist, and every volume He may permit us to live and publish, is our humble prayer. Brethren, reader, will you pray for us to this end? C. H. C.

Remembrances

---January 5, 1939

Here we are now, wanting to say something, and we do not know what to say nor how to say it. We just do not know how to find words to tell how thankful we feel and how much we appreciate the kind remembrances we have received during the holidays. Many nice and beautiful and splendid cards have been received during the holidays. Many sent us substantial gifts as an expression of Christian love and affection. We appreciate all these things more than we have words to tell. These gifts and remembrances have all helped to lighten our burdens, and have helped to make us feel lighthearted, and have given us renewed courage to press on in our efforts to serve the Lord and His dear people. They have brought to us the assurance and renewed evidences that we are not without friends, and that we have them in different states and different parts of the country. Many times we have felt to be cast down and almost forsaken and alone; but we know now that we are not forsaken, nor are we alone. May Heaven's richest blessings rest upon each and every one who has thus brought cheer and courage to us-to the editor and his dear companion and children-during these holidays. Our sincere and hearty thanks to each one. Again we say, may the Lord bless you. C. H. C.

Triune God

---January 19, 1939

Sister Bettie Murrie, of Avant, Okla., and Brother W. T. Parker, of Purvis, Miss., asked us some time ago to give our views on the Trinity in the Godhead. Sister Murrie asked if they are three spirit beings. We will try to give our views of the matter in a very brief way. In the first verse of the Bible we have the language, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The word which is here, as well as in other places in the Old Testament, translated God is a word which

denotes a plurality-that is, more than one; rather, it denotes one composed of more than one. The word does not signify as to how many the one is composed of, but it is more than one. A plurality is an indefinite number; but it is more than one. It may be two, or three, or four, or any other number more than one. But though God be composed of more than one, yet He is but one God. Christ (Jesus) was God; and He was also man. He was the Son of Mary and He was also, at the same time, the Son of God. He was God manifest in the flesh. **{(I Timothy 3:16)}** He was the Word; see **(John 1:1)** "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Turn and read the following verses. (John 1:14) tells us that "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." So, now we have the Son of God, which also carries with it the idea of a Father. Here is something which puzzles the finite mind-how that Christ could be God, or called God, and also called the Son of God; how He could be the Son, and still be as old as the Father. This is true, however, from the fact that He was and is the eternally begotten Son of God. Hence, though they be thus spoken of as Father and Son, yet they are one. They are one in divine essence, one in power, one in purpose, one in glory. Paul tells us in **(Hebrews 1:3)** that the Son is the express image of the Father. The terms "Holy Ghost" and "Holy Spirit" mean the same thing. "God is a Spirit." - (John 4:24). So, we have three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, or Holy Spirit. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." - **(I John 5:7)**. The three are the One God. But, though they are one, they are spoken of as separate, from the different office work of the three Divine Persons in the one Godhead. It was the office work of the Father to elect, make choice of His people, and to predestinate them unto the adoption of sons; it was the office work of the Son to redeem; and it is the office work of the Holy Spirit to regenerate those whom the Son redeemed, and to bring them into divine relationship with God. The work of the salvation of poor sinners is, therefore, all the work of God, and will end in the final glorification of all the heirs of promise. In **(Genesis 1:26)** we have this language, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." A likeness is a picture. Although God is a Spirit, yet man is a faint picture of Him. God is spoken of as having a head, eyes, ears, nostrils, body, hands, arms, feet, etc., and man has all these. We do not understand that God has these things literally, or materially, as we do; but these things picture God to us but faintly. He is an infinite being, and cannot be comprehended by finite beings, as we are. But man is one composed of three-the body, the soul, and the spirit. We can divide between the soul or the spirit and the body; but we cannot divide between the soul and the spirit; but the Lord can. **(Hebrews 4:12-13)** "For the Word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight," etc. Here we have it that the Word of God can and does divide between the soul and the spirit; but man cannot do this. As God is one composed of three, so is man one composed of three-thus, not only in the likeness of God, but also in the image of God. The man, the one made in the likeness and image of God, is the only being of God's creation that sinned. These are a few of our thoughts on this wonderful subject, though we have written more than we thought we would when we began this. May the Lord bless the same to the benefit of the reader. C. H. C.

When Are We Sheep?

---January 19, 1939

Quite a while ago Brother Pleasant Brown, of Bloomington, Ind., asked us to give a definition on "when are we sheep?" In the mind and purpose of God His people were always His sheep. Before they had any existence, even in eternity, before time was, they were embraced in the everlasting covenant, which is ordered in all things and sure. Hence, in His purpose they were His sheep then. But being members of the Adam family, they were involved in sin in the fall, or in the transgression of Adam. They went into bondage in that transgression, and so they needed to be redeemed. To redeem is to buy back. In the everlasting covenant they were given to the Son. When the fullness of the time was come Christ came into the world, made of a woman, born of the virgin Mary, and redeemed them from under the curse of the law. He paid the redemption price in full. Then they were His sheep by redemption. Then the Holy Spirit comes into the heart of every heir of promise, just at the right time-not a moment too soon, nor a moment too late, and quickens them into divine life; raises them up out of a state of death in sin to a life in Christ. By this work they are brought into divine relationship with God; they are made partakers of His divine nature. Then they are thus made His sheep by divine relationship. In the resurrection at the last day their bodies will be raised from the dead, made spiritual-for it is the same body that is sown a natural body that is raised a spiritual body. Then, in soul, body, and spirit, they will be received into glory-glorified-and will dwell with the Lord in eternity. May this be your happy lot, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Could He Have Kept From It?

---February 2, 1939

A brother has asked us "if Adam, in the garden, could have kept from eating the apple?" We do not know whether the fruit he ate was an apple or not; we rather think, if it "was an apple, it may have been a crab apple. A crab apple will make your mouth "pucker," and the mouth of man seems to have been "puckered" all along down the line. Perhaps it was sour grapes that he ate, as the children's teeth have been on edge. Do you know anything about 'possum grapes? Maybe it was 'possum grapes he ate. Or it might have been a peach, or an apricot. Anyhow, laying aside foolishness, we have been under the impression that it was the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil that he ate. It seems to us that this is the way we have learned it in the Book. The man violated the law which God gave him. If the man could not help doing what God told him not to do, then punishment could not possibly be inflicted upon any principle of justice. If the man did violate the law, which he did, and he is justly punished for the violation, then he could have kept from violating it.

Paul, the inspired apostle to the Gentiles, said that "the law is just." As the law is just, then the punishment of the violator is just; and as the punishment of the violator is just, then the man did not have to violate the law. If he could not have obeyed and kept the law, then he had to violate it. If it is argued that he had to violate it in order that people be saved in heaven, then that makes the salvation of men and women dependent upon wicked works-the very worst sort of Arminianism. God knew what the man could do just as well as He knew what he would do. To say that the man had to violate the law because God knew that he would is to deny that God knew the other side of the question. The man who argues that a thing had to be the way it was because God knew it would be that way denies the foreknowledge of God, for he denies that God knew the other side of the question. The servant that received one talent hid his Lord's money; but the talent was given according to his ability. Hence he had the ability to improve the talent. God gave him the ability and then gave him the talent. As God knew he had the ability, He

knew he could improve the talent. But He also knew that he would not improve it. He knew both sides of the question. The brother also asks, "If he could, why did Christ stand as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world?" To this we will say that He did not. We have heard that said times without number. There is no such statement as that in God's Book. **(Revelation 13:8)** says, "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship Him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Their names were written from the foundation of the world. Where were they written? In the book of life. What book of life? Of the Lamb slain. If He stood, He was not slain. If He was slain, He did not stand. That very expression is self-contradictory, and we have often wondered why brethren would use it. Why not quit contradicting yourselves? **(Revelation 17:8)** says: "And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world." This shows that what was from the foundation of the world was the writing of their names. The Lord knew that His people would fall into the bondage of sin, as well as He knew that man did not have to transgress, and so Christ was made surety for them. C. H. C.

Bible Classes

---February 2, 1939

We see in the Baptist Trumpet that they have some so-called Bible classes now. That is the way they usually start a Sunday school in Primitive Baptist churches—just call the thing a Bible class. Of course they are following the Lord in this; for did not Paul say, in **(Titus 1:5)** "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee?" The word wanting means left undone, according to the marginal reading. So the apostles left undone the matter of organizing Bible classes or Sunday schools, but authorized the organization of such things in this language. So they also left undone the organization of ladies' aid societies, women's missionary societies, junior leagues, senior leagues, ladies' auxiliaries, and the thousand-and-one other things which the world has. You folks may be kept busy now for a few years in catching up with the world in these matters you have started into. Go to it, boys. You have imbibed the Campbellite theory that baptism is a cure-all, and now you are taking on the Sunday school idea. We suggest for your next move to get some Campbellite or other Arminian literature for your Sunday school, as we see your class is open to all. Phew! That thing stinks! C. H. C.

Meetings Resumed

---February 2, 1939

In our issue of November 17, 1938, was a notice under the above heading of meetings being resumed at a certain place in New Mexico. After the paper was sent out some party wrote us that those people had been excluded. So we tried to investigate the matter to some extent, and we got the information that there has been some trouble there. We did not learn enough about the matter to form an opinion as to the merits or demerits of the case; but it seems to us that everything is not just right at that place. We feel that it is but justice to our readers for us to say this much about the matter. It is a great pity that people will impose such things on the editors of our papers. It would be so much better if people would settle their troubles when they have them without pursuing a different course—trying to get in with somebody, or trying to get others involved in some way with their troubles. When a church has troubles we believe it would be better for them

and for the cause if everybody would stay away from them, and take no part in their affairs, until they settle their troubles. Let them alone until they get straightened out. It would be still better if each one would behave himself in the house of God, and thereby have no trouble in the church. C. H. C.

Malachi 4:5-6

---February 2, 1939

Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.-((5) (Malachi 4:5-6). About two years ago Sister A. M. Law, of Marvell, Ark., requested us to write some on ((5) (Malachi 4:5). We have quoted both ((5) (Malachi 4:5) and ((6) (Malachi 4:6) above. This is a prophecy of the coming of John the Baptist, and of the work he was to do. The same prophet spoke of him in (Malachi 3:1), "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me." The Saviour lets us know in **(Matthew 11:7-14)** that the coming of John was a fulfillment of this prophecy. In (Matthew 11:14) He says, "And if ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come." But John said he was not Elias; and he was not Elias in person; but he was Elias in that he came in the spirit and power of Elijah's God. Concerning John the angel said, in **(Luke 1:16-17)** "And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." C. H. C.

Holy Kiss

---February 2, 1939

In 1935 a sister asked us what is meant by the "holy kiss," as spoken of by the apostle in **(Romans 16:16)** and other places. We believe it would be as well, or better, to give Gill's comments on that, rather than to write on it ourselves. Here is what Gill said in commenting on **(Romans 16:16)**. C. H. C.

THE COMMENTS

Christian salutation is a wishing all temporal, spiritual, and eternal happiness to one another; and which, as it should be mutual, should be also hearty and sincere, and this is meant by the "holy kiss;" the allusion is a common custom in most nations, used by friends at meeting or parting, to kiss each other, in token of their hearty love, and sincere affection and friendship for each other; and is called "holy," to distinguish it from an unchaste and lascivious one; and from an hypocritical and deceitful one, such an one as Joab gave to Amasa, when, inquiring of his health, he took him by the beard to kiss him, and stabbed him under the fifth rib; and as Judas, who cried, "hail Master," to Christ, and kissed Him, and betrayed Him into the hands of His enemies. I say, it is an allusion to this custom, for it is only an allusion; the apostle did not mean that any outward action should be made use of, only that their Christian salutations should not be mere complaisance, or expressed by bare words, and outward gestures and actions, either of the hand or mouth; but that they should spring from real love and true friendship, and be without dissimulation, hearty and sincere.

Doors Closed

---February 2, 1939

A brother has asked us what we think about a church closing her doors against a sound orderly preacher. Well, we might think there is something wrong somewhere. A man might be a good man, as we speak of men, and be sound and orderly, and yet can't preach to the edifying of the body. He might be trying to work with a gift that he really does not possess. A man can't preach just because he wants to, or has the desire. A man might have a desire to preach, and not have a call from God to preach. Perhaps the Lord has not bestowed that gift upon him. Then there might be something wrong with the church. They might be led by someone who should not be leading. There might be many things we could think. Circumstances might be such as for it to be imprudent for a sound orderly man to preach at a certain place. As to the conditions that exist where the question came from, we do not know, and we do not care to meddle with their affairs. We do not care to be a busybody. C. H. C.

John 5:37-42

---February 16, 1939

A brother has asked for our views on **(John 5:40-42)**, and asked, "Who was the Saviour talking to in the last two verses-are they children of God or not?" Let us here quote (John 5:37-42): And the Father Himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard His voice at any time, nor seen His shape. And ye have not His word abiding in you: for whom He hath sent, Him ye believe not. Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life. I receive not honor from men. But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you. To begin with, it seems to us that here is a very clear description of the persons addressed. They had never heard the voice of the Lord. "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will." -(John 5:21). "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." -(John 5:25). If one has never heard the voice of the Lord, he has never been made alive from the dead; he is still dead in trespasses and sins. It is by the voice of the Lord speaking that sinners are made alive from the dead. When He speaks they hear, and are made alive from the dead. So, if one has not heard that voice he is still dead in trespasses and sins. "And ye have not His word abiding in you." Word, here, is the logos word, ending in on, reading logon, which is the accusative case and singular number of logos. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." - (Romans 8:9). "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." - **(I John 5:12)**. It appears to us, from these statements, that here are two very plain evidences that these people were the unregenerated scribes and Pharisees. A Pharisee is a religionist all right; but that religion is a worldly religion. Paul was a strict Pharisee before he was regenerated. He was a strict religionist, but was not a child of God by regeneration. The Pharisee religion was removed from his heart when he was regenerated. "But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you." They were destitute of the love of God. That love was not in them. "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." - **(I John 4:7-8)**. The command, or admonition, here given is not meant to convey the idea, nor in the sense, that we should manufacture in our hearts a love for one another. It does not mean that we

can or should voluntarily love anyone that we do not love. But it is in line with the expression in (verse 18 of the previous chapter), "My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth." Hence, it means for us to love one another in doing, for in deed means in doing. If we are not showing our love by our doing, we are not loving one another in the sense that we are here commanded. But "every one that loveth is born of God." Then, if one does not love God, it is because he has not been born of God. "We love Him because He first loved us." - **(I John 4:19)**. God's love manifested is the cause; our loving Him is the effect. "Like causes under like circumstances always produce like effects." This is a true scientific fact. Hence, where the cause exists, the effect will also always exist. These people did not have the love of God in them; and remember that God's love is the cause. They did not have the cause in them to produce such an effect as for them to love God. They did not love God because they did not have the cause in them to produce it. We suppose, now, that this is enough on that line, or on that part of the subject. So we will proceed to (John 5:39). On a part of this verse (39) we shall not express an opinion so much as we shall present a few facts. That verse reads: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." In the Interlinear the verse begins, "Ye search," as though it might be simply a statement of fact; but the word in the original is *ereunate*, pronounced er-yoo-nah-ta. According to Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon this is second person, plural number, present tense, imperative mood of *ereunao*. Hence, the Saviour was addressing the persons already described above; second person, signifying persons addressed. Plural number-more than one person addressed. Present tense, signifies present time. Imperative mood, according to Webster's International Dictionary, is "expressive of command, entreaty, advice, or exhortation, as the imperative mood. Expressive of, or of the nature of, command; directive; commanding; authoritative; as, imperative orders. Not to be avoided or evaded; urgent; obligatory; binding; compulsory; as, an imperative duty or work." According to Macmillan's Modern Dictionary, "In grammar, expressing a command, entreaty, or exhortation." So, it is necessarily a fact that the Saviour commanded these people to "search the Scriptures." We do not give this as simply a view of the matter, but these are just simple facts.

There is no eternal life in the Scriptures, though worldly religionists may think so. Eternal life is in Jesus, and the Scriptures so testify. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son." - **(I John 5:11)** "This is the record" -it is so recorded. "And this life is in His Son." Eternal life is in Jesus-not in the Scriptures. The Scriptures testify as to where the eternal life is. No man, even in nature, can take the plain language recorded in Scripture and make it appear therefrom that eternal life is in the Scriptures. The letter of the Book is too plain for that. Yet the unregenerate man does not, and will not, believe this truth; and that only evidences the truthfulness of the Book. The unregenerate man will not accept, or believe, the plain statements that are found in the Book, even though he knows what the language says. We remember once, in conversation with a party, that we quoted some language recorded in the ninth chapter of Romans. The party said "that is a dangerous doctrine" and "would not do." We replied that it was so recorded in the Book. The reply was, "I do not believe it, even if it is in the Book; it is a dangerous doctrine, and will not do." Once in debate with a man we quoted this language of the Saviour: "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." -(John 11:26). Then we asked him, "Believest thou this?" He shook his head-answering that he did not believe it." And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." They had no will to come to Him. The Interlinear reads: "And ye are unwilling to come to me, that life ye might have." Their will was to not come to Him. Will springs from life. They had no such will because they had no life

to produce such a will. The carnal mind is enmity against God. The mind being enmity against God, the will is contrary to Him and to His teaching. All this clearly and plainly, to our mind, teaches the truthfulness of the doctrine taught by the Primitive Baptists. Brethren, we have the truth, and we should rejoice in it and delight in contending for it. We should "contend earnestly for the faith that was once delivered unto the saints." It is the only doctrine that provides comfort and consolation for God's humble poor here in this world. It is "our meat and drink." May His blessings rest upon the reader, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Romans 8:13

---February 16, 1939

For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.-(Romans 8:13). Some time ago. Brother B. T. Altman, of Wauchula, Fla., asked us to write an article on this text. In compliance with the request we will try to write a few lines. This language was addressed to the church of God at Rome. Let this fact be noted first, and that for this very fact the language cannot be applied to alien sinners. To apply this language to alien sinners is to say that the church of God at Rome was made up of alien sinners. Note the address in the (first chapter, down to and including verse 7). This language, then, is addressed to children of God, those who have been born of God, those who are in possession of the Spirit of God, and not to alien sinners. The word if as used in this text introduces a condition. This signifies that the result mentioned is sure to be reached by the doing of the thing introduced by the word if "If ye live after the flesh." The doing of this will surely and certainly lead to the thing the apostle names, which follows as a result: "Ye shall die." There is a death which necessarily and surely follows as a result of these persons living after the flesh. The word flesh here manifestly means the old and sinful nature and disposition. It could not possibly mean simply the body of flesh, or lump of flesh. In the absence of life the body itself is nothing but a lump of clay. Hence, to live after the flesh is to live after or follow the old sinful nature, sinful inclinations, sinful desires, which we possess. Even after regeneration we still find left in us that old sinful nature which we had before; and that is why we have a warfare within, which continues as long as we live in the world. In that warfare, if we give over to those old sinful desires, that old sinful nature, we live after the flesh, and that brings death as a result. We thereby lose the fellowship and communion of saints; we lose sweet communion with our blessed Lord and Master. It is called living after the flesh, because it is living after the old sinful nature, the sinful disposition, which we still have in the flesh, in the natural life-the Adamic life. "But if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." This could not possibly mean that one will receive spiritual or eternal life as a result of mortifying the deeds of the body through the Spirit. As already observed, this language is addressed to the children of God, to the church at Rome. Not only so, one must first have the Spirit, or be in possession of the Spirit, in order to do anything through the Spirit. Hence, it must necessarily be true that the Lord's children are those who are here addressed; and they should, through the Spirit, mortify the deeds of the body. By so doing, and as a result of so doing, they enjoy a life that it is impossible to enjoy by doing any other way. They thereby live-not obtain life; but live. There is a living here promised which depends upon them doing what is laid down-it depends upon what they do. May the Lord help us to live closer to Him, and to be more obedient than we have in days gone by, and thereby enjoy the sweet manifestations of His glorious presence and approving smiles while we live here in the world. C. H. C.

Scioto Association

---March 2, 1939

We have a history of the Scioto Association which was published when that association was one hundred years old, then an outline since that time (1904) to 1938. We also have a copy of the proceedings of the organization of the association in October, 1805. It was our intention to publish a little history of the association in our columns in some detail; but our space is so limited that we will have to abridge much more than we had intended. The meeting of the organization was held Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, October 12, 13, and 14, 1805. The introductory sermon was delivered by Elder Cyrus Paulk, from **(Zechariah 4:11-12)**. Four churches were represented-Ames, 49 members; Pleasant Run, 36 members; Old Chillicothe, 14 members; Salt Creek, 33 members. A circular letter was inserted in the minutes. To show where those old soldiers of the cross stood, and that the Primitive Baptists are still occupying the same ground today, we will take the space to insert that circular letter here.

THE CIRCULAR LETTER

The Elders and Brethren convened at Old Chillicothe, to the Churches in our Union, send Christian Salutation: Dearly Beloved in the Lord: We call upon you to rejoice that the great Head of His church is set upon His holy hill, Zion, and that the government is upon His shoulders; He will build His church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. It is He that stands amidst the golden candlesticks, and holds the stars in His right hand. He has all gifts, and 'tis He that has promised that the wilderness and the solitary places shall be glad for Him. The design of our corresponding in an association we wish to be understood, to become acquainted the better with each other; to be an advisory council, and not to give up the independence of each individual church. We consider that each church is possessed of full power to rule itself under Christ and His divine laws; and that no rule or vote of the association is to bind any church, farther than in love and entire satisfaction they may accept it. We believe it is the privilege of any brethren who want help in conducting any of their special business to apply to such church, or particular brethren, as they shall choose, to constitute a church, ordain a minister, or settle differences, where a church or churches think themselves unable to do it. We only want to know that our churches are built upon the foundation of the apostles, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone; that they keep the ordinances as they were delivered, and that they walk in the fellowship of the gospel of peace. These will doubtless be the grounds of the churches participating in mutual joy. On this ground they will feel a confidence to stir up one another to love and good works, and enjoy a satisfactory interview. At this meeting we trust we have had the blessing of our dear Lord's presence, when we have given attention to the preaching of His Word, in our prayers, praises and special interview; thanks to His name. And now may the peace of God rule in your hearts through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen. Signed, Nathan Cory, Moderator. Peter Jackson, Clerk. Right here we wish to digress, inserting this little paragraph by way of parenthesis: The idea that an association is not a higher court is no new thing among Baptists. To hold that an association is a higher court, and has the right or authority to sit in judgment over the church is a departure. Note carefully what these brethren said more than one hundred years ago. It is no new thing among Baptists that the church is the highest ecclesiastical authority on earth. The statement along this line in the Nashville (Tenn.) Peace Meeting in 1937 is in perfect harmony with what these old brethren

said in October, 1805. The following are the names of those who served as moderator, and the years they served: Nathan Cory, 1805-06; Samuel Comer, 1807; Nathan Cory, 1808-1819; John Littleton, 1820-21; Nathan Cory, 1822; Alex. Holden, 1823; Nathan Cory, 1824-26; Wm. Baker, 1827; Nathan Cory, 1828; Wm. Baker, 1829-38; J. B. Moore, 1839; Wm. Baker, 1840; J. B. Moore, 1841-45; Geo. Ambrose, 1846-47; Wm. Baker, 1848-50; J. B. Moore, 1851-55; J. S. Johnson, 1856-57; D. Scofield, 1858-68; G. N. Tusing, 1869; D. Scofield, 1870; G. N. Tusing, 1871; D. Hess, 1872; S. C. Stover, 1873-74; D. Hess, 1875-77; D. G. Baker, 1878-80; no session listed in the history for 1881-82; D. Hess, 1883; D. T. Poynter, 1884-90; L. T. Ruffner, 1891-92; J. W. Hoppes, 1893-94; G. N. Tusing, 1895-1904; R. W. Peters, 1905-06; Walter Yeoman, 1907-20; L. T. Ruffner, 1921-23; M. O. Curp, 1924-28; G. F. Hanover, 1929-38. The following are the names of those who served as clerk, and the years they served: Peter Jackson, 1805-1819; J. Root, 1820; Peter Jackson, 1821-22; J. Root, 1823-26; Peter Jackson, 1827; J. Root, 1828-29; Ewel Jeffries, 1830-33; T. McNaghten, 1834-38; Geo. Ambrose, 1839-45; J. Peters, 1846-47; S. P. Ashbrook, 1848-62; T. A. Peters, 1863-72; T. Cole, 1873-78; W. D. Wood, 1879-80 and 1883; no session listed for 1881 and 1882; L. T. Ruffner, 1884-87; T. J. McNaghten, 1888-92; H. O. Blue, 1893-94; T. Cole, 1895-96; T. J. McNaghten, 1897-1908; E. A. Huchison, 1909-12; G. F. Hanover, 1913-20; Chester Peters, 1921-22; O. W. Cory, 1923-1938. The second session, in 1806, and third session, in 1807, and the last session, in 1938, were held with Pleasant Run Church. According to the records this church has entertained thirty sessions of the association. The 1938 session was the one hundred thirty-fourth. Pleasant Run Church was organized in Virginia in 1790, and went to Ohio as a body in 1801. From the history of the association we quote this language concerning this church: "It has been blessed all along its history with a sound ministry and a discerning membership, and none of the delusions of the day were allowed to take permanent root. It was the first church that called a halt in the attempt made by the modern Missionaries to obtain a permanent foothold among us." At the seventy-third session (in 1877) a committee, consisting of Jonathan Peters and Elders Daniel Hess and Thomas Cole, was appointed to prepare a history of the association, and to present the same at the next session, which was done, and the history was published in the minutes of the seventy-fourth session (1878). At the one hundredth session (in 1904) a committee was appointed to bring the history down to that date, a period of one hundred years. Elders L. T. Ruffner and Thomas Cole and Brother T. J. McNaghten were appointed on this committee. The first eleven sessions were held in October, the next twenty in September. Since then the sessions have been held in August. The earliest confession of faith on record was adopted in 1816. This confession contained an article which prohibited correspondence with any church or association that did, in principle or practice, hold to involuntary slavery. The confession was revised at later dates, and this article left out. Article 2 of the confession was as follows, and has been retained all along the line: We believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God, and are the only sufficient and infallible rule of saving knowledge, faith and practice; and that the doctrine of unconditional election, original sin, total depravity of man, justification by Christ; redemption and the forgiveness of sins through His blood and according to the riches of His grace, regeneration, conversion and sanctification by the Spirit, baptism by immersion, final perseverance of the saints through grace to glory, resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment, are the fundamental doctrines thereof, which we feel ourselves bound to maintain. The association continues in these same principles. From the report of the committee at the seventy-fourth session we take the following:

Each individual church of Jesus Christ derives its existence from the Great Head of the church, Jesus Christ Himself, to whom alone is each one amenable. He alone is the Lawgiver, and He alone the one who has the right to walk as judge among the seven golden candlesticks or churches. To each one He gives of the same Spirit, the same laws, the same power; hence all are equal, and no one is superior, and none inferior. The mutual association of two or more equal servants does not change their relation to their master, or create an additional fund of power; but when so gathered together their highest duty is to "comfort each other with the same comfort wherewith we are comforted of God," and to "walk in the comfort of the Holy Ghost," and to "observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Hence, no decision of any church, or assembly of churches, can be a law, and should not be obeyed as such; but is valuable only as it may ascertain and point out the mind of Christ. ' The association is wholly the creature of the several churches. When they fail to meet together, it falls; but it has no power whatever to affect their existence separately. Hence, when queries have been presented, the object has only been to consult as brethren, and no individual church or association of churches can do more than give their advice. Hence, an association is called an "advisory council." Various queries have been submitted to the association, at different times, for her counsel or advice, a few of which are submitted: At twenty-first session-Query from Union Church: Can a member that is guilty of a public transgression be restored without general satisfaction? Answer: He cannot. There must be a general satisfaction to the body to which he belongs. Twenty-fourth session-Query from two churches: Has any church a right to silence a minister without a council? Answer: We consider the church independent; but in most cases of difficulty with the preacher, that amounts to a division in the church, we conceive that a council is expedient. Twenty-ninth session-Query from Laurel: Is it good order for a church to exclude members on the evidence of non-professors? Answer: In some instances testimony from credible persons not belonging to the church may, and ought to, be received; but as to the propriety and weight of such testimony, in any particular case, the church acquainted with the circumstances can best judge. Fifty-fifth session-Query from Pleasant Run: Is it according to Holy Writ for the church of Christ to receive the administration of ordinances as just, either baptism or the Lord's Supper, administered by any man not regularly ordained by the church? The association deferred an expression until the fifty-seventh session, when it decided that it was not gospel order to do so. In the work and report of the committee in 1904 they said: For information we are indebted to statements made by David Benedict, as quoted in Hassell's Church History, pages 747, 776, including Judson's letter to the ladies of America, Black Rock Convention of 1832, Life of J. B. Moore, Mosheim's Church History, pages 202 and 203, and extracts from minutes and church records; also History of Kettocton Association, by Wm. Fristoe. Thus it will be observed that they thereby endorsed the Black Rock Address, and held to the same principles the brethren did at Black Rock in contending against the new measures introduced by Fuller and his followers. The following is so full of good information and good reading that we take the space to copy the same from the history: It will be observed that this association first met under the simple name of Baptist. It is an ancient name, the most so of all claiming a Christian profession. "In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness of Judea." "There was a man sent from God whose name was John." Under the name Baptist and Anabaptist and the names of those who adhered to Baptist principles was the true God worshipped from the first dawn of Christianity to the present time, though the

gates of hell have opposed the travel of God's people through all past time, as it was declared to the serpent in Eden, "Thou shalt bruise his heel." This heel bruising is to continue to the end, "for all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." The "young child's life was sought;" John the Baptist was beheaded; the apostles suffered martyrdom and were made "as the filth of the world and the offscouring of all things." They were "chosen in the furnace of affliction." They were to be "hated of all men" for Christ's sake. They "should not be reckoned among the nations." They were a "holy nation, a peculiar people." Their great persecutor is presented under the figure of a beast having seven heads and ten horns, having a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies, and to continue forty and two months (1260 years), to make war with the saints and overcome them. See (Revelation 13). The second beast spoken of in that chapter, having two horns like a lamb, but a voice like a dragon, a pleasant exterior, but inwardly having the same nature as the first beast, is another persecutor of the saints. Under all these adverse circumstances were they to live, and great numbers of them sealed their faith with their lives, in the prison or at the fagot. All this was the result of the unholy alliance of church and state, a union forbidden of God and denominated in the Scriptures as adultery and fornication, a crime for which the Jews, as a figurative nation, suffered severely. How often were friendly overtures made to the Jews, "Cast in thy lot among us, let us all have one purse." -((4) (Proverbs 1:14). See also **(Ezra 4:2) (Ezra 4:2)**. The adversaries said, "Let us build with you; for we seek your God, as ye do." But the proposition was wisely rejected; an example set by the typical Jews, not followed in these last days by all professed Baptists. These adversaries of Judah and Benjamin were really enemies, as appeared shortly afterwards. But their snare they thought was concealed, knowing that "in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird." -((7) (Proverbs 1:17). The name Anabaptist was applied to those who repudiated the Catholic order and would not recognize their baptism. Says Mosheim, in the epitome of his Ecclesiastical History, pages 202 and 203, "The true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of Anabaptists, by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity and is extremely difficult to be ascertained.'Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed in almost all the countries of Europe * * * * many persons who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrine which the Waldenses and others had maintained, some in a more disguised, and others in a more open way, viz., That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church He had established upon earth, was an assemblage of true and real saints, and ought to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests, to oppose the progress of iniquity or to correct and reform transgressors." Two learned members of the Dutch Reformed Church, appointed by the king of Holland to examine into the origin and the history of the Dutch Baptists, reported in their book published in 1819 as follows: "The Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society which has preserved the pure doctrine of the gospel through all ages." See Hassell, page 471. From the first of their organization in apostolic times they were antagonized by Pagan powers, next by Papists, and as they always protested against them, even at the risk of their own lives, even unto death, they were the first and original protestants long before the rise of Luther and Calvin. The figurative Israel, in coming up out of Egypt, were accompanied by a mixed multitude, which were found along the line down to the end of the Jewish world. When the types ended and the antitype succeeded, there was also a mixed multitude peculiar to itself. But in both type and antitype, Israel has been and is a "speckled bird,'the birds round about are against her." -

(Jeremiah 12:9). As before stated, at the setting up of the gospel kingdom the term Baptist was sufficient to distinguish this "peculiar people" from others of Christian profession, when their denominational name was referred to, though they were afterward referred to as sects or heretics by way of derision in Mosheim's and Ruter's histories and others. The same name Baptist alone served to distinguish them in this association until A. D. 1837, when the most remarkable event in her history occurred. A division in the general body occurred, and as both sides claimed the name Baptist the adjectives "Old School" and "New School" Baptists were used to distinguish them. As different views were held on the doctrine of the atonement, the words special and particular atonement were used to designate the Old School party, and still later the word Predestinarian was used. The title Primitive Baptist obtains now generally. All these adjective terms describe those of apostolic origin. The causes that led to the division, and made necessary the above descriptive words, form the most important part of our history, to which we will now briefly allude. The division referred to was not caused by open and outward foes, whose violent persecutions had a tendency to unite rather than divide. Paul prophesied that after his departure "grievous wolves should enter in among you, not sparing the flock; also, of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." The Saviour gave warning. "Beware of false prophets who come among you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves." A further caution is, "Take heed how you hear," and "take heed what ye hear." We read also that "in the last days perilous times shall come. Men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof. From such turn away." "Of this sort are they which creep into houses (churches), laden with sins, led away with divers lusts." Again, "Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they are such as serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." It was by good words and fair speeches that sin entered into the world;" for when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also to her husband, and he did eat." The plan of the subtle serpent has never been improved upon. Notice, he did not tell the woman that she would surely not die, thus boldly denying God's word, but that she should not surely die. As much as to say, "You may die or you may not die; and in case you do not die, ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." This was the first open promulgation of the chance system on the lottery plan. In like manner the Bible doctrine of the special, definite, atonement was not at first violently antagonized by anyone claiming our name, but by artfully substituting an indefinite atonement, sufficient for the whole world were the whole world to believe in Him, thus pivoting the eternal salvation of any or every one on belief as a condition instead of the blood of Christ, and keeping out of view that "it is the work of God that ye believe in Him whom He hath sent." -John vi. 27. Thus virtually denying the Bible doctrine of eternal election, or being chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. "Knowing, brethren, your election of God." -(Th 1:4) (I Thessalonians 1:4). Thus transferring the place of election from the precincts of eternity to the precincts of time, and taking it out of the hands of God and putting it in the hands of carnal man. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." -(John 15:16)." How is the gold become dim! how is the most fine gold changed! The precious sons of Zion, comparable to fine gold, how are they esteemed as earthen pitchers, the work of the hands of the potter!" -Lamentations of **(Jeremiah 4:1-2)**. All of the foregoing was introduced among our people in England over one hundred years ago, not by

outside enemies but by men of themselves, soon to be transferred to American churches, and from small and tentative beginnings it took root, and by affiliating with kindred systems of similar age, all unknown to the Bible of our original principles of faith, it developed more and more its inherent character and its paternity. Apostolic fellowship is based alone on apostolic doctrine, and errors, however small, cannot be defended by the truth, but only by good words and fair speeches and following cunningly devised fables. Becoming more and more amplified, it claimed the power of saving souls from eternal burnings by the preaching of their gospel and patterning after Papal Rome and Mahomet, and more recently the Mormons. Missionaries were sent the world over, ostensibly to save souls, but gold in abundance being necessary, to propel the gospel, the Papal system of the fourteenth century was adopted. They abridged the Decalogue into two words, "fine gold," without which gold millions had gone to hell and millions more would follow. See Hassell's Church History, pages 772, 773, and 774. No difference between the holy and profane was searched after. And, as in Ezekiel's time, great and still greater abominations were shown, even so now. Strong delusions are sent of God to manifest more and more the mystery of iniquity." He that hath an ear to hear let him hear." Much is said lately about helping the Lord. Uzzah put forth his hand to steady the ark, to help the Lord. We read his fate for so doing. The tabernacle built by Moses had no windows to admit natural light into the holy place, but an inner light continually burned, all typical of the church, the antitype, the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man. This tabernacle is supplied with a continual inner light, needing no natural light. Yet vain man ignores the power of God, in whom is no darkness at all, ignores Him who is the light of the world, and sets at naught the anointing of the Holy One by which the recipient is enabled to know all things, and needs not that any man teach, save" as that same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie." - **(I John 2:27)**. Ignoring all this, they teach in the words that man's wisdom teacheth, and having itching ears and not enduring sound doctrine, teachers are heaped up who can teach man's wisdom. Not being satisfied with altars made of rough stones, they must pollute them by lifting up their tools upon them to polish them. The unhewed oratory of the brogue of Galilee does not suit the ears of the men of taste. They fear, as did Puller, that the Baptists would" become a dunghill in society" unless they could induce those to preach who could come with excellency of speech and human wisdom. This was contrary to Paul's practice who went among the saints, not with excellency of speech or of man's wisdom, and whose speech and preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. This was in order that their faith might not stand in the wisdom of men but in the power of God, for the wisdom of this world and princes of this world come to nought. Enough has been said to show cause for withdrawing church fellowship from all that ignored the plain teaching of the Bible, and who so plainly departed from the old landmarks. The question may arise, How or why did any, for a time at least, embrace erroneous views that resulted eventually in a great departure in many sections of America among our people? Snares are always hidden pitfalls; are not at first discernable. Nets are concealed, for" in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird." Leaven does not manifest its power and nature suddenly. The spittle at first applied did not give clear sight. The blind man could only see men as trees walking, but afterwards saw clearly. Mark viii. The typical Jews were commanded to drive out the Canaanites from the land the Lord had promised to the children of Abraham. They fought against those that occupied their own land. In the business of discipling they gathered together those whom the Lord had prepared beforehand. They were made fit for heaven by the Holy Ghost before they were qualified to be gathered together in a church capacity. The Holy Ghost

first brought the gospel, and no man can do more than to bear witness to it. The Christian is strictly commanded to "be ye separate" from the world, "for ye are not of the world," and all intermarriages with the world, spiritually, is forbidden. The evils resulting thereby are typically set forth in the last chapter of Nehemiah. Also in the seventh chapter of Proverbs antichrist is brought to view under the figure of a lewd woman.;" Now let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: "Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." One commandment is, "Follow me." Not to go ahead of Him and ask Him to follow us and bless us, as does the world, but to follow Him. There are many places the children are sometimes found in where Christ never went first, and were it not that the name of God and Christ are sometimes connected with such places, thus giving them a lamb-like appearance, perhaps they would not be so often frequented by the children of the kingdom. How willing are our adversaries to say, as in **(Ezra 4:1)** **(Ezra 4:1)** "We worship the Lord as you do; let us build together; let us have one purse," to which sentiment all the world seems to agree except that sect that is everywhere spoken against. Oh, that we would give the same answer the adversaries then received! Please read. Again, let us remember we cannot improve the rule, given us in the Holy Scriptures for our conduct, either as churches or individuals. The world furnishes no pattern for the church. Remember, brethren, your high calling as members of His mystical body. You belong to an ancient family, a royal family. Your history cannot be written without consulting the records of eternity; altogether unlike the harlot daughters of Babylon, whose pedigree, at most, dates back but a few hundred years. Why should we court the favor of so small a thing? Let Zion's "breasts satisfy thee at all times; and be thou ravished always with her love. And why wilt thou, my son, be ravished with a strange woman, and embrace the bosom of a stranger?" Why carry on a commerce with the world, contrary to God's law? You are entitled to the coin of the realm. O trade in that alone, "For the merchandise" of heavenly wisdom" is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold." Christ is head to His church, His body, and is head to no other body whatever. Therefore no one has a charter from Christ to organize or build up anything he pleases and call it by His name, or conduct it in His name. In conclusion we will say that we are at the close of our one hundredth session in 1904. We, as an association, are not alone in our past history. The experience of different associations in America has been the same as ours, and at near the same time. Since 1837 all our churches are as one on all vital points. What hidden snares await us, or what nets may be woven in the looms of Babylon to entangle the feet of the "speckled bird" in its meshes, we know not, during the coming one hundred years, but may we hope that we shall not be ashamed of the gospel of Christ, that we may all along be esteemed as the "filth and off scouring of all things," and may we not be ashamed of being regarded as the "dung hills of society" by an antichristian world. Would we be shown the bride, the Lamb's wife **{(Revelation 21:9)}** clothed in raiment of needle work, adorned with all the jewelry of heaven, and who, by virtue of her divine relationship to the King of kings, is mistress of the universe? whose name is found in the archives of eternity, who is compared to a city that hath no need of the light of the sun or moon, but is lighted alone by the glory of God and the Lamb? Then behold it in the church of the First Born. From all the foregoing it will be seen that this old body of Baptists has stood for 134 years, through the storms that have come and gone, and are still holding to the same principles of doctrine which have characterized the church all through the ages. May the Lord bless and prosper them, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Elder Morgan Replies

---March 2, 1939

Elder Morgan, editor of the Trumpet, in that paper of February 16, replies to our article on "Bible Classes," in our issue of February 2. He makes practically the same argument for having that little baby among them as the Burnamites made when they introduced them a number of years ago. That was one thing they introduced in some churches in Virginia, Kentucky, and other states years ago. The introduction of so-called Bible classes, with other trumpery, brought a division in the church in different states. It did so at Luray, Va., which resulted in a lawsuit over the church property, in which suit the property was awarded to our people who opposed such departures. The introduction of so-called Bible classes frequently is followed by the bringing in of other trumpery, unless the thing is soon abandoned. Elder Morgan, though, says he "knows nothing of Primitive Baptist starting Sunday school in the Primitive Baptist church." We had given him credit for being better informed than this. We did not know he was so ignorant of the history of the Primitive Baptists. Did he not know that the Sunday school, or so-called Bible class, was one of the things introduced by the followers of Fuller and Carey? Did he not know that this was also one of the things introduced by E. H. Burnam and his followers-as Pence and Bradley? These matters are historical facts. Better read a little history, Brother Morgan. Another little matter of history. Brother Morgan, did you not know that there was some trouble in your own section years ago, brought on by a man joining one of the churches there on a forged letter?-that he had been excluded from a church in Tennessee; moved to Texas, and forged a letter and joined a church there on that letter? Did you not know this, Brother Morgan? Did you not also know, Brother Morgan, that this fact was finally found out, and that it caused a great disturbance and division? Honest, Brother Morgan, did you not know something about this affair? Are you totally ignorant of all that? Are you wholly ignorant of the fact that those churches, after being divided for several years, came together and accepted all official work done, not only while they were apart, but also that done by the preacher who was excluded in Tennessee and was a member of one of your churches on a forged letter? Do you not know, Brother Morgan, that the church of your membership was in that matter? Or, are you altogether ignorant of all this? Come clean, Brother Morgan, and tell us whether you have been ignorant of this all the time, or have you known about it? Brother Morgan, did your baptism come through that which was administered by that excluded preacher, or did it not? Be candid with us, Brother Morgan, and tell us what you know about your own baptism-whether it is "Simon-pure" or not. Brother Morgan, we are not writing this in a spirit of ill-will, nor madness, nor to ridicule. But we would be glad to make you see some of your inconsistencies, if your eyes are not so blinded by prejudice that you cannot see. We still say that you folks go over the country looking for a job of disturbing folks and getting them to let some of your boys baptize them again and re-organize them into so-called churches. Witness _ a case in Louisiana; also a recent case in Arkansas. We do not know personally what was wrong in the case in Arkansas, but have read a little about it in the Trumpet. Brother Morgan, do you not know that it is an age-old practice for the Primitive' Baptists to settle their troubles, when and where they have had them, and divided, and to come together accepting the baptisms administered by them? Do you not know, Brother Morgan, that it is impossible for you to trace your own baptism back without going through just such procedure? And do you not realize, this being a fact, that your contention and practice unchurches and destroys the identity of every Primitive Baptist church in Texas, as well as in the whole south? You can't trace your baptism back without going

through the Kehukee Association, or through Daniel Parker. Can you? If so, please trace out the line for us, will you? We are not "from Missouri," but a large number of us need to be cited. Also, Brother Morgan, please tell us what church excluded some whose baptism you denounce-and what was the charge? Tell us the man, the church, and the charge, please. Prejudice, jealousy, and stubbornness have caused more of these troubles than real disorders or heresy. What a pity. C. H. C.

Communion Service

---March 2, 1939

Brother Thomas Herbison, of Dickson, Tenn., has asked us this question, and wants us to answer through the paper: "If there is no deacon present at a communion service, who should wait on the table?" It is the business of the minister to administer the ordinances, and not the deacon. Hence, the minister should break the bread and pour the wine. Then it is customary for the deacon, or deacons, to pass the emblems to the members; but, if no deacon is present, any other brother could do that as well as the deacon. C. H. C.

Deuteronomy 14 AND Leviticus 25

(Deuteronomy 14) AND (Leviticus 25) March 2, 1939

In July, 1937, Sister Lena Bowlin, of Madison, N. C, asked us to give our views on these two chapters. They are too long to quote here, but we will make a few remarks on them. In a portion of Deut. xiv. the Lord gives instruction to Israel concerning things that they might eat and things they were forbidden to eat. Certain kinds of animals were to be unclean to them, and which they were forbidden to eat. We take it that the observance of the law thus laid down was conducive to good health, as well as that they enjoyed blessings in obedience. In the chapter was given instruction, also, concerning tithing. They were required to give one-tenth of their earnings for the Lord's cause. Here is one place where many people get their idea of tithing in the 'present age; but under the gospel what is done is to be as a matter of freewill offering. In Leviticus xxv. the Lord gave instruction concerning the sabbath years. Under the law every seventh day was a sabbath day and every seventh year was a sabbath year; then every seventh sabbath year there was to be a jubilee year. In the jubilee year, or the fiftieth year, all property was restored to the original owner; debts were cancelled, and servants set free- that is, servants who were Jews. The land could not be sold for perpetual ownership. When the Jews were driven out of the land of Palestine the land was not sold by them nor bought from them. It is their land to this good day. God gave it to them for an everlasting possession, and no land in the country was to be sold, so as to be conveyed forever. The land is still theirs, and some day they will return and possess it. C. H. C.

Views Requested

---March 16, 1939

During, or about, January, 1937, Brother G. A. Sweetland, Damascus, Ark., asked for our views on (Matthew 5:12); (16:27); (Luke 6:23); (I Corinthians 3:14); (Revelation 11:18); (22:12). (Matthew 5:11-12)- reads, "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." The Saviour did not mean to teach us in this that we should rejoice and be glad that some men will lie or tell falsehoods on us; but to rejoice and be glad that we are

not guilty. We may rejoice that we are counted worthy to suffer for Jesus' sake. Remember that this is when they are saying evil of us falsely-not when they are saying evil and telling the truth. If we are guilty of wrong doing, and they tell that on us, we are not being persecuted. When we suffer for evil doing we are not being persecuted; it may be, though, that we are being prosecuted. No place for rejoicing or being glad in that. In **(Matthew 16:27)** the Saviour is teaching the fact that there are rewards and punishments here in the world for obedience and disobedience. It cannot have reference to a future state after death, for He says in (Matthew 16:28), "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom." The matter contained in the text, then, had special reference to what was in store for that present generation. **(Luke 6:23)** is right along on the same line as the foregoing, and is the same teaching. That is, it is along the same line as **(Matthew 5:12)**. We wrote an article on **(I Corinthians 3:14)** which was published-in The Primitive Baptist of October 30, 1906, which article is on page 128 in Volume I of our Editorial Writings. We do not have space to publish the article again now. Our views have not changed. **(Revelation 11:18)** is also along the same line, teaching how that the Lord blesses His obedient children here on earth. They are judged and chastised here for their disobedience. **(Revelation 22:12)** says, "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." He does come, in the person of His Spirit, and chasses us for our disobedience, and blesses us in obedience to Him. We receive our rewards here, according to the way we do. Heaven, which the saints receive after death, is not a reward; that is an inheritance. The bliss and glory of heaven is in store for them as an inheritance, and not as a reward. The rewards are here in this life. And this has special reference to the church state here in the world. Notice (Revelation 22:14-15), where He refers to the city, which is the church, and what is without-on the outside-of the church. When the Lord's children remain on the outside of His kingdom, and fail to walk in obedience to His commandments, they stay in bad company. C. H. C.

Some Questions

---March 16, 1939

In September, 1937, Brother J. M. Thornbury, of Wyoming, W. Va., asked us the following questions:

1. When, in point of time, does God forgive the sinner?
2. If Christ made complete satisfaction for the sins of the elect, were their sins ever against them? If so, when and why?
3. If they were never against them by reason of Christ's death, how could they be forgiven?
4. In what sense are we justified by faith? By the blood of Christ? We will try to give a brief answer to these questions:
 1. He forgives His people every day-all along the line of time. If not, why did the Saviour teach His disciples to pray for forgiveness?
 2. In a law sense the sins of the elect were charged to Christ as their surety. The work Christ did was to make atonement-to satisfy the demands of the broken law. Atonement is one thing and chastisement is another thing. And atonement is one thing and forgiveness is another thing. All such as the above is from a failure to distinguish between atonement to satisfy the broken law and fatherly chastisement and forgiveness. We gave some questions some time ago on these matters, and no man on earth could give an answer to them without dividing

- between these matters and keeping them in mind. If your child breaks the law you would satisfy the law, if you could, and thereby make atonement for him; but you would also chastise him for his wrongs. This answers question 3 also.
4. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." - **(Hebrews 11:1)**. The Spirit bears witness in our heart that Jesus is our Saviour. This brings joy and peace, and one is thereby justified by faith. This faith received in the heart is what enables one to believe in Jesus as his Saviour. But this faith is brought to none only those who have already been justified in the eyes of the law by the blood of Christ. C. H. C.

Please Have Mercy

---April 6, 1939

In every issue of The Primitive Baptist under the obituary heading we have a request that obituaries be short, and that they must be limited to 300 words. This is frequently disregarded. Now, please tell us how we can consistently insert an obituary of 350 to 400 words (and sometimes longer) for the gratification of one writer, and not do the same for others? Sometimes an obituary is sent us which much exceeds the limit we ask, and perhaps it is of some child, or very young person, unknown to nearly all our readers. We have sometimes cut them down; but sometimes that is hard to do. And if we can very well abridge them it puts needless and unnecessary work upon us. If such things are published as sent-much too long-it causes us a loss of much time to give the matter study and consideration. We do not wish to wound the feelings of any. But sometimes we wonder if some people have any regard for the feelings of the poor editor. Look through the columns of this issue and see how many obituaries and resolutions of respect this paper contains. During last year we published 189 obituaries and 39 resolutions of respect, making a total of 228. We do not object to publishing obituaries and resolutions of respect, but we do ask that they be short. Please have some mercy on us, and do not send us long obituaries and resolutions of respect. C. H. C.

1 John 2:2,15-17

---April 6, 1939

In January, 1938, Brother W. M. Blackwell, of Meadowview, Va., asked for our views on **(1 John 2:2)**, and asked if it means the same as (1 John 2:15-16,17). (1 John 2:2) reads, "And He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." If the word world in this text means the whole race of Adam, then of what race were the our and ours in the text? Propitiation means expiation, satisfaction. If He expiated the sins of all the race of Adam, what could send one of the race to eternal torment? What could condemn one of them? There is more than one world spoken of in the Book. Sometimes that word is used with reference to the Gentiles. He was the propitiation for the sins of His people among the Jews, and also for the world-His people among the Gentiles, or among the nations of the world, as well as Jews. (1 John 2:15-17) refer to another world- the world of the ungodly, the things of the natural realm, and that are contrary to God and godliness. In (1 John 5:19) John says, "And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness," or in the wicked one. There was the world of the redeemed in (1 John 2:2), and the unredeemed or ungodly world in (1 John 2:19). C. H. C.

Revelation 3:5

---April 6, 1939

In January, 1938, Sister John A. Crouse, Sparta, N. C., asked our views on this text. In November Thurmon Loftis made the same request. It is included in the message written to the church at Sardis. The one who overcomes will be clothed in white raiment. Obedience to the Lord's commands makes a beautiful robe. White raiment of the Lord's furnishing to His obedient children is a garment that is worth having on. See (Revelation 3:18), in the language to the church at Laodicea. The name of the one who overcomes will not be blotted out of the book of life. A blessing to be enjoyed here in the world. And the Saviour will confess his name before His Father, and blessings will be thus enjoyed which cannot be had any other way than in obedience to the Master. This language is all to the church, and not to the world, and has to do with their life here on earth and not in the glory world. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." - (Revelation 3:6). C. H. C.

A Reminder

---April 6, 1939

Dear Brother Cayce: I will write you a few lines. This leaves us well once more. We have had a lot of sickness this winter. Hope this finds you and family in good health. I received the copies of papers and gave them out Sunday at CrawfordsviUe Church. In looking through an old song book I saw where you were there in 1907. I am sending you the note as it was written in the book. This is the home church of Elder Harvey Oliphant. I have been pastor there eight years. I think you will get some new subscribers from there. I am going to send for your Editorial books as soon as possible. I think I can sell some of them also. We need a weekly paper; so I am going to do my best to help you get it. Your little brother in labor and love, Elder J. E. Sparks. Clermont, Ind.

THE NOTE

April 12, 1907-10:30 a. m.- Elder Claud Cayce; text, **((Th 1:4) (I Thessalonians 1:4-5))** "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God. For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power," etc.

REMARKS

Dear brother, we thank you for sending this. We remember being there, and being in the home of our precious brother, Elder J. H. Oliphant. We also remember dear old Brother Lockett very well. The writing looks to us very much like his. We loved those dear people; but we suppose most of those who were there then are gone to their long eternal home. May the Lord bless them, and continue to bless your labors among them. C. H. C.

John 10

---April 20, 1939

Brother M. B. Purvis, Cordele, Ga., has asked for our views on this chapter. He did not say what particular verse he wanted our views on. It would take quite a lot of space to give our views in full on the entire chapter. (John 10:1-5) the Saviour teaches that He came in by the door, which is the door of prophecy. Every prophecy concerning Him was fulfilled by Him when He left the world. He came according to prophecy, and is therefore the true shepherd. All others who came professing to be the Messiah were thieves and robbers. In (John 10:7) He presents another matter, as that He Himself is the door of the sheep. As He is the door, there is no other way by which a poor sinner can be saved or enter into eternal life.

He is not only the door by which His people enter in, but He is also the good and true Shepherd, and He cares for His sheep. He laid down His life for the sheep-not for the sheep and the goats. To the wicked Jews He said, "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you." If one has to believe in order to become one of His sheep, then they could have become sheep by believing, and the Saviour was mistaken in what He said. "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." He, as the good Shepherd, gives all His sheep eternal life, and not one of them shall ever perish. They shall all finally live with Him in glory. C. H. C.

Ecclesiastes 9:14-16

---April 20, 1939

There was a little city, and few men within it; and there came a great king against it, and besieged it, and built great bulwarks against it: now there was found in it a poor wise man, and he by his wisdom delivered the city; yet no man remembered that same poor man. Then said I, Wisdom is better than strength: nevertheless the poor man's wisdom is despised, and his words are not heard. -(((9:14) **(Ecclesiastes 9:14-16)**). Brother W. H. Dearman, of Chunky, Miss., has asked us to give our views on this text. The little city seems to us to be the true church, or the Lord's humble followers. That has always been just a few. The poor wise man appears to us to be the blessed Saviour. He became poor that we, through His poverty, might be rich. He delivered the city, notwithstanding all the powers of darkness were arrayed against her. Satan and his cohorts have besieged the city all along the line. It was by the Lord's own power and wisdom that His people are delivered from everlasting destruction and ruin, which Satan would bring upon them. No man remembered that same poor man. He trod the winepress alone, and of the people there was none to help. All His disciples forsook Him. Peter even cursed and swore and said "I know not the man." And His children, even now, often forsake His sweet and delightful service; and His service is so often made a secondary matter, when it should be first. How forgetful we are. C. H. C.

Proverbs 13:22

---April 20, 1939

A good man leaveth an inheritance to his children's children: and the wealth of the sinner is laid up for the just.-((22) (Proverbs 13:22). Brother R. L. Barrett, of Fontana, Calif., has asked us for our views on this text. "A good name is rather to be chosen than, great riches," said an inspired writer. The man who walks uprightly, in the service of the Master, who diligently fights the good fight of faith, who lets his light so shine that others may see his good works, who lives in such a way as that those who are personally acquainted with him can but say that there is a reality in the profession he has made, leaves an inheritance of much more value and greater worth than the wealth of this old world. He leaves a good name for his children and for their children. And such a one will be fed. God has so promised, and His every promise is sure. But ill-gotten gain never profits much, or for long. Wealth that is obtained by other means than honest toil and labor will not stay. It slips away. Much more could be written, but we have to be brief. C. H. C.

Preaching and Singing Article Number 1

May 4, 1939

So far as we know it has always been believed by Primitive Baptists that the Lord's ministers are called of God and put into the work of the ministry, and that the ability to preach the gospel in the spirit of the matter is a gift from God, and that God gives ministers to His church. "And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." -(Ephesians 4:11). These are the different gifts in the ministerial office, and they are all gifts from God. "And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that He counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry." -(Ephesians 1:12). The Lord put this man into the ministry; He made him a minister. "For I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee." - ((6) (Acts 26:16). While "it is true that the Lord makes His ministers- puts men in the ministry, it is also true that there is something for them to do. From one standpoint the Lord qualifies His ministers; but He does not do their studying for them. The apostle' admonished, or instructed, Timothy to" study to shew thyself approved unto God a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." -(II Timothy 2:15). It is necessary for the minister to study the Bible in order that he know the right application of its teachings, and then to make that right application. He needs to know the truth, or what the truth is, and then he should faithfully preach, or teach, or proclaim, the truth. He should teach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. In order to do this, he needs to study the Scriptures so that he may know what is the truth. It is a flagrant violation of Holy Writ to teach any doctrine that is not the truth. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." -(Galatians 1:8-9). Here it is very plain that a curse is pronounced against any man for teaching a doctrine that is not the truth. The doctrine a man promulgates is the doctrine he teaches. We are sure that all our brethren will agree with us that it is very important that a minister preach the truth, and nothing but the truth. Now, we would be glad for some person to tell us what the difference is in a man speaking a false doctrine in preaching and speaking a false doctrine in song? The sentiment is spoken in either case. We cannot sing. We have tried, but could not control our voice in song. If we had been trained or taught in our childhood we might have learned to sing, though we doubt it very much. The Lord did not bestow that gift upon us. Now, will you please tell us which is worse-we to preach a false doctrine to you, or you to sing a false doctrine to us? Is it not "about six of one, and a half dozen of the other?" If you set forth a false doctrine in your speaking in song, is there not just as much curse pronounced upon or against you by the God of heaven as upon us for setting forth a false doctrine in preaching? If not, why not, since it is a false doctrine spoken in each case? "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." -((6) (Colossians 3:16). Here we have it that teaching is done in songs. And remember that a curse is pronounced against one who teaches a false doctrine. Then, should we not be just as careful and particular to sing the truth as to preach it? Paul instructed Titus thus: "In all things shewing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned; that he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of you."

-(Titus 2:7-8). It is certainly just as important to use sound speech in singing as in preaching. There is no question but that the singing of a false doctrine is just as much and as strongly forbidden in Holy Writ as preaching a false doctrine. One should always speak the truth. Look at the following lines a moment, please: This world is not my home, I'm just a passing through; My treasures are laid up somewhere beyond the blue; The angels beckon me from heaven's open door, They're all expecting me, and that's one thing I know, I fixed it up with Jesus forty years ago; I know He'll take me through, though I am weak and poor. Now, just imagine yourselves gathered together at the church for the worship and service of God; the congregation sings this song; then the preacher gets up and delivers a discourse in harmony with the sentiment of the song. The angels are expecting you. Are you going to disappoint them? You should fix it up with Jesus-and do it today. Tomorrow may be everlastingly too late. You may die before the sun goes down, and your soul will be launched into eternal hell-everlasting burnings-unless you fix it up with Jesus. I fixed it up with Jesus forty years ago, and you can fix it up with Him right now. Oh, dear friend, will you come right now, and fix it up with Jesus! Suppose your preacher should advocate such a doctrine as that-would you not think he should be excluded from the church, unless he would recant and apologize? If he should be excluded for advocating such a doctrine, why should you not be excluded for advocating it? That's the doctrine you are advocating when you set forth such sentiment in singing. We do not wish to wound the feelings of any, but we do desire that our people sing the truth, as well as preach it. We cannot help but doubt the real soundness of any Old Baptist who will sing such sentiment. For the sake of the truth, which you profess to love, if you have been guilty of singing such unsound sentiment, quit it at once, and do so no more. The Lord willing, we will write some more next issue concerning this matter. C. H. C.

The Resurrection

May 4, 1939

Brother R. B. King, of Bakersfield, Mo., asked us if the Saviour was talking about the resurrection of the body in **(Matthew 22:25-27); ((20) (Mark 12:20-27); ((0:29) (Luke 20:29-38)**, and asked if it is not a fact that the bodies of the non-elect are left in their graves if this is what was the subject under consideration. We answer that it was the resurrection from the grave that was under consideration; but the Saviour was not talking about whether it was a certain class, or all classes, of human beings that would be raised. He was refuting the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection of the body. They were a set of non-resurrectionists, and went to the Saviour with a question designed to entangle Him in His speech and in His doctrine. This they utterly failed to do; and the Saviour taught the doctrine of the resurrection in refuting them. But that the Saviour taught the doctrine of a universal resurrection of the dead from the grave is evident from His statement in **(John 5:28-29)** "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." It is not necessary to argue here why they do good; it is because they were first made good by the work of the Holy Spirit. The Sadducees denied there being any resurrection at all, but the Pharisees believed in the resurrection. See **(Acts 23:8)**. Paul was called in question for his teaching. The multitude accusing him was composed of both Sadducees and Pharisees. In the midst of them Paul said, "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets: and having hope toward God, which they

themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." -((4) (Acts 24:14-15). See also **(Revelation 20:11-15)**. God's people were written in the book of life, and were not judged out of the things written in the books. Others were judged out of the things written in the books, and were all cast into the lake of fire. C. H. C.

No Weekly Paper

May 4, 1939

It is a fact that our people do not have a weekly periodical in the whole United States. Is this to our credit? We have some periodicals published twice a month and some published once a month-and some of them occasionally skip an issue. Does it not look like our people could support at least one weekly periodical in the whole United States? Of course they COULD. But what are you doing toward getting a weekly? Are you trying to get more to subscribe for one of our papers- one of the papers being published in defense of our cause? Do you ever try to persuade some to take The Primitive Baptist who are not taking it? Perhaps you may sometimes ask someone to take it, and that one may refuse, or put you off. Do you then get discouraged, and quit? How about a quitter? Do you not remember a poem we used to see in our old school reader, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try, again?" If you start in to do a certain piece of work around your place, and you meet with setbacks, do you quit- or do you keep on trying? Do we not believe in perseverance? To persevere is to keep on at it. There was once a business concern that had this for a slogan: "Keeping everlastingly at it brings success." In order to do what you can to help us make The Primitive Baptist a weekly, it is necessary for you to keep on trying to get others to take the paper. Try using your powers of persuasion on those who are not subscribers. Do not stop at simply asking them if they are taking the paper, and just asking them to do so-persuade them to try the paper for awhile-for one year, at least." Will you try this? If we will all try, and do our best, for the rest of this year, we can have a weekly. Some of our readers have been doing some good work during the past few months. But we need the help of others. Co-operation, and helping each other, will go a. long ways. Let us show by our work on this line that we have an interest in the cause. May we count on YOU? Let us WORK together? Will you work with us, to the end that we may make The Primitive Baptist a weekly? C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 6:1-7

May 4, 1939

Brother G. A. Waid, of Steele, Ala., has asked for our views on verse 4 in the above citation, and refers to verse 5. This language in the verses named is in regard to brethren going to law with one another, which some Corinthian brethren had done. The apostle sharply rebukes them for this. He instructs them in (I Corinthians 6:4) to set them who are little esteemed among them to judge between the brethren in regard to matters of this life, where difference exists; and then in (I Corinthians 6:5) he shames them, and asks the question, "Is it so that there is not a wise man among you?" Were they all so ignorant that they could not judge worldly differences between their brethren? He also asks, "Is there not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?" These questions naturally answer themselves. They are affirmative questions, and must necessarily be answered yes. Then, they were to be shamed, rebuked sharply, and reprovved for going to law. It is a shame for Primitive Baptists to go to law before the world with their

differences. Better suffer wrong than to do that. It has always been against the rules of the Primitive Baptist Church for brethren to go to law with one another. C. H. C.

Condemnation and Salvation

---May 18, 1939

Brother W. M. Jenkins, of Bold Spring, Tenn., asked us: "What is the cause of anyone's eternal damnation? Sin, I understand, but what sin? One Baptist preacher said it was what we do. If so, damnation is conditional. I can't so understand. That is what he understands Primitive Baptists have always believed." The preacher is right, as we understand the matter. "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." -(Romans 5:21). Wages is what you get for what you do. Sin is the transgression of the law; and that is what you do, and death is what you get for it. On the other hand, "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." It is true that Adam's sin was ours, as he represented us, and we are born into this world with the same life which he had; and that life became poisoned with sin when he transgressed the law. But as we grow old enough to do anything we commit actual sin. Either way, it is enough to condemn us, and when we have both, a sinful nature and actual transgressions, it makes condemnation doubly sure without the intervention of divine grace-without the intervention of mercy and the work of our Saviour. So, God's gift is eternal life. The old Westminster Confession of Faith, the old Presbyterian Confession, made condemnation unconditional as well as salvation. Chapter III, Sec. 3, reads: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels were predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death." This the Primitive Baptists have always denied. They have always believed that eternal salvation is unconditional, but have never believed that people were sent to hell unconditionally. The London Confession, Chapter III, Sec. 3, says: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated or foreordained to eternal life, through Jesus Christ, others being left to act in their sin to their just condemnation, to the praise of His glorious justice." The Presbyterian Confession was put forth several years before the London Confession, by the Baptists, which was put forth in 1689. The Baptists, in their confession, copied largely from the Presbyterian Confession, where they very well could do so. If the Baptists believed as the Presbyterians, in unconditional reprobation, why did they change that article? There is quite a difference in one being predestinated to condemnation and being left to act in his sins. If God predestinated the damnation of some of the race, and predestinated the salvation of others, then the salvation of those who are saved is not a matter of grace-no more than the damnation of the others is a matter of grace. C. H. C.

Exodus 3:1-6

---May 18, 1939

Brother J. R. Woodard, of Cullman, Ala., has requested our views on the language recorded in the above citation, concerning Moses and the burning bush. We will not take space to quote the language here. An angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush. The bush burned with fire, and was not consumed. The Israelites had been in bondage, and were afflicted, and yet they were not consumed. We think this was a type of the church. Notwithstanding the

burning, and the afflictions which the church has endured all along the line, yet the church is not consumed. The reason the bush was not consumed was that God was in the midst of the bush. The reason why the church is not consumed is because God is there. Moses drew nigh to the bush to see the great sight, and God said to him, "Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place where thou standest is holy ground." The church is a holy place; it is holy ground. God requires that when we draw nigh, to enter into His service, we put off our shoes from off our feet. We cannot serve God with any of the inventions of men, or with what men have made. The commandments of men being observed or obeyed is not rendering service to God. Nothing but what God has commanded in His Word will do as service to Him. The world, and worldly things, the things of the world, must be put off. They must be laid aside. The church is in the world, but is not of the world. The world must be kept out of the church, or else there will be a going down of the church in that place. "Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple." --(33) (Luke 14:33). The church-the true church-is an institution which the Lord established here in the world. It is holy ground. It is not to be esteemed lightly. May the Lord help us to serve Him in a way that we may show that we esteem the church above everything else in the world. C. H. C.

Preaching and Singing Article Number 2

---May 18, 1939

In the conclusion of our article in the last issue under the above heading we promised to try to write some more for this issue along the same line. We have not had the time to devote to this that we would like to have had, and so we will have to make this article brief. There are some hymns which have been very popular among our people, and are yet, that are good and soul-inspiring in the main, and yet a few words have crept into them in the books that our people have generally used that are corrupt and unsound. Why the compilers of our books have used those hymns with such unsound sentiment retained we are unable to say. Perhaps some of the compilers did not notice the sentiment. Perhaps some of them used the hymns without making any effort to correct the sentiment just because the hymns were popular. Be that as it may-it is a question we cannot answer; but we find such hymns-a number of them. Take this good old hymn as one example, the first line of which is, "There is a fountain filled with blood." Let us here quote the second stanza: The dying thief rejoiced to see That fountain in his day; And there may I, though vile as he, Wash all my sins away. There can be no question but what the pronoun I, in the third line, is the subject of the verb wash in the last line. Hence, the sense of it cannot possibly be anything else than that I wash my sins away. The language cannot possibly be twisted to mean anything else. Now, get yourself up a "distracted" meeting, and get your modern evangelist to "go to it" to get sinners to come up to the altar and wash their sins away! Just as well do that as to sing the sentiment! Just as well preach it as to sing it. We had in our possession years ago an old song book which went out of use before the Civil War. In that book we found this hymn to read this way: The dying thief rejoiced to see That fountain in his day; I hope that blood was shed for me, And washed my sins away. When you sing that hymn that way you sing the truth. There are more things we will try to write about along this line later on. For this time we must stop now. May the Lord help us to consider. C. H. C.

Church A Widow
CHURCH A WIDOW

---June 1, 1939

A brother writes us that it is being advocated that the church was a widow for three days and nights that Jesus lay in the tomb, and asks our views of the matter. A widow is a woman whose husband is dead. The church is represented in the Bible as being the bride of Christ. "Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife." -(Revelation 21:9). "For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is His name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel." -((4:5) (Isaiah 54:5). We remember being in debate with a Campbellite years ago on the question of the identity of the church. We took the position that the church was established by the Master during His personal ministry on earth. He said that if that be true, then the church was a widow for three days and nights, while Jesus was dead. We replied that he was correct, and that she was a widow for three days and nights, for her husband was dead just three days and nights; but the Lord's promise and assurance to her was, "Fear not; for thou shalt not be ashamed; for thou shalt not be put to shame: for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more." - **((4:4) (Isaiah 54:4)**. We told him that his so-called church was not the Lord's church, for she had never been a widow, for the simple reason she had never been married or had a husband. The church was a widow for awhile-three days and nights; but she is not a widow now, and never will be again, for her Husband is alive forevermore. May the Lord bless these thoughts to your good. C. H. C.

They Were Jews

---June 1, 1939

Brother P. S. Walton, of Danville, Va., asked us these questions: "Was Abraham a Jew? Was Christ a Jew? Was Mary, Christ's mother, a Jew?" Abraham was the father of the Jewish nation. Christ was a Jew. He was a descendant of Abraham, of the lineage of David. David was a Jew. Mary was a Jew-that is, her parents were Jews. She was of the Jewish nation. But Jesus had some Gentile blood in Him, through the lineage of Ruth. Ruth was a Gentile, the daughter-in-law of Naomi, and was married to Boaz, a Jew, and it was through his lineage that Christ came. C. H. C.

Communion Meeting

---June 1, 1939

Our regular communion time here at Thornton is the first Sunday in July. The meeting will be on Saturday and Sunday, 11 o'clock both days, and Sunday night, as usual. At our last meeting the church extended a special invitation for members of sister churches to be with us at that time. We will appreciate your coming. Remember, too, that we are to have two ministers with us at that time from Iowa. We hope to have a large number of brethren and sisters with us then. C. H. C.
Preaching and Singing Article Number 3

---June 15, 1939

We promised in our issue of May 18 that we would try to write something more along the line of preaching and singing at a later date. We could not very well get to it for the last issue. Will call attention now to a few things along that line. We begin this little article by asking a question. What is religion? True, there is more than one kind of religion. "For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and

wasted it." -(Galatians 1:13). Here we have mentioned the "Jews' religion," and how the Apostle Paul had practiced that religion, and in so doing he persecuted the church of God, beyond measure, and wasted it. It appears to us that this was not a very good religion; but it consisted of a very bad practice. He continues, in the next verse, thus: "And profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers." Get your Book and read on in the chapter and you will see how the Jews' religion was taken from him. But here is a religion that we would certainly all agree was not good. There is a vain religion also mentioned in the Book. "If any man among you seem to be religious, and bri-dleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain." -(James 1:26). A thing that is vain is something "having no real substance, value, or importance; empty; void; idle; worthless." -Webster. So, here is a religion that is of no value; it has no real substance; it is of no importance; it is void; it is worthless. And this is what some practice. It is the things they do. But here is another kind of religion the Book tells us about: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." -(James 1:27). Here is a religion that is approved of God; and it is something to do. In doing this one is practicing the pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father. It is "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction is not to go to where they stay and "eat up what they may have," or to heap burdens upon them, but it is to minister to them; it is to do something, or say something, that will help them to bear their burdens and sorrows; it is to be of help to them in their distresses. To keep one's self unspotted from the world is not to visit the grog shop, or the whisky store; it is not to go to the races; it is not to go to the theater or the picture show; it is not to engage in card playing; it is not to engage in "shooting dice;" it is not to engage in raffling off quilts; it is not to engage in selling chances in or on anything, even in the name of the church, or for the church; it is not to engage in any kind of gambling scheme; it is not to curse and swear, or to take the name of God in vain; it is not to engage in questionable things, means, or measures, in business; it is not to go to places where you would be ashamed for your wife, or daughter, or sweetheart to go with you; it is not to do many other things we might mention that the world engages in, and which are unbecoming in the membership of the Lord's church or kingdom. In fine, the pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is to visit and administer to the needs and for the comfort of the fatherless and the widows, and to do just what God has taught in His Book, and to strictly leave undone the things that are not taught therein. That is the way, and the only way, to practice the religion which God the Father and our blessed Saviour approve of. In the practice of this religion there are blessings which come to those who engage therein, and which no one can ever realize or enjoy any other way. "But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed" (or in his doing).-(James 1:25). The blessing enjoyed by such a person is here in this life; it is in his doing, and follows as a result of it. But there is no blessing to be enjoyed after this life as a result of our doing. All the joys of heaven come to one as a result of, and because of, what the Lord has done for us and what He will do for us. The blessings and joys of heaven are an inheritance-yours because you are God's child, and not because of what you have done, or can do, or may do. That is all a matter of sovereign grace and mercy. Yet, in the face of these manifest and evident facts, we sometimes hear Old Baptists sing: 'Tis religion that can give Sweetest pleasures while we live; 'Tis religion must supply Solid comfort when we die. After death its joys will be Lasting

as eternity; Be the living God my Friend, Then my bliss shall never end. If you have nothing but religion to supply solid comfort when you come to die, how do you think it will be with you? Remember that religion is what you do. "After death its joys will be" -What does the word its refer to? That word is a pronoun, and must have an antecedent. No grammarian in the whole universe would deny that religion is the antecedent of the word its. Then the joys of religion are lasting as eternity. The practice of religion here in this world will bring joys to you in eternity, for those joys are lasting as eternity. Do you believe that rank Arminianism? Frankly, we do not. When you sing that to us, you sing something that is not the truth-it is a flagrant contradiction of the truth taught in God's Book. It teaches that unless you practice the religion everlasting hell, eternal destruction, everlasting burnings, will be yours; but that in the practice of religion heaven and all its joys and glories will be yours. Now, how about praising and using a book containing such rottenness? We have to beg you to excuse us, please. Someone may hear you sing that sentiment, and then you preach contrary to it; then he would have a right to say, "Which way do you believe-the way you preach, or the way you sing?" May the Lord help us to consider. We may write some more concerning these things later on. C. H. C.

Resurrection

---June 15, 1939

We have been asked to give our views as to the order of the resurrection; or if those who were members of the church militant will be raised first, and then after a thousand years the others of the children of God be raised. No such thing as there being two resurrections of the children of God has ever been advocated or believed by Primitive Baptists-that a part of God's children will be raised when Christ comes back to earth, and then after a period of a thousand years the others of God's children will be raised. This seems to us to be rather akin to Russellism, or to the doctrine that is now being advocated by Judge Rutherford. It is not the truth, and is only another one of Satan's inventions to deceive the Lord's people. "For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." -**(Th 4:16) (I Thessalonians 4:16-17)**. There is no room for a mistake here-that all God's people will be raised at the same time; they will all be raised together. Not only is it clear in this that they will all be raised at the same time, but it is also clear that they will be caught up from this earth. This earth is not their home. They are pilgrims and strangers here. They have a better country beyond this life. The Lord was taken up in a cloud. He went away in a cloud of glory, and He is coming back the same way; see **(O) (Acts 1:10)**. And when He comes in the cloud of His glory all the dead in Christ shall be raised, and the saints who are still living on the earth will be changed and caught up together with them to meet the Lord in the air, and shall ever be with the Lord. "Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." -(I Corinthians 15:51-52). Here we are plainly told that the bodies of all the saints shall be changed, and that this will take place in the twinkling of an eye. Not only so, but that those who may be living at the time of His coming will be changed at the same time and just as quickly. John Gill, the learned Baptist divine, said that all the saints will be raised at the same time. No Baptist of any note has ever advocated anything else, and any other theory is a departure

from Primitive Baptist doctrine. Departures are what cause trouble in Zion. Let us be careful to let finespun theories and speculation severely alone. No man can get a good name for himself among the Lord's people by speculation. He may deceive some, and have a few followers; but such has a woe pronounced against him. May the Lord help us to stay with the truth, and to steer clear of the inventions of men. C. H. C.

Women Prophecy

---June 15, 1939

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother in Christ, I Hope-I am sending \$1 to subscribe for your paper. Through a miracle of sovereign grace I was permitted to come in contact with your paper, and it is the only thing that can satisfy my soul. You see, God's wonderful loving grace came into my heart over three years ago. I fought it, not knowing what church to join until last summer, I joined the Missionary Baptists; but they never have seemed to satisfy my hungry soul. But since I borrowed some of your papers I began searching the Scriptures and praying for understanding, and I know God is leading me in the way of truth. Brother Cayce, do you believe in women preaching? and what does the Scripture mean where it says in the last days your sons and daughters shall prophesy? Pray for me. M. B. Jones. Adamson, Okla.

REMARKS

Paul says to let the elders be the husband of one wife. If women can fill this requirement, as Elder Newman once said, then, by all means, let them be ordained to preach. Whatever the above prophesying may mean, it cannot mean for them to be put in the ministry. C. H. C.

Preaching and Singing Article Number 4

---July 6, 1939

Years ago we engaged in a debate in Texas with Mr. J. W. Chism, who represented the Campbellites. The debate was to have been between Mr. Chism and Elder S. A. Paine. We were present to attend the debate, but Elder Paine was called home after the session of the first day, on account of sickness in his home. So we had to take his place, beginning on the morning of the second day. During the debate Mr. Chism took the position and argued that Christ was our security; that when the debt which the sinner owed became due, He paid the Father, and satisfied the Father, and had the claim or debt transferred; that we now owe the debt to the Son instead of the Father; that it is like the song says, "Jesus paid it all-all to Him I owe;" that as Jesus then held the claim against us, He had the right to make the terms of settlement; that He has made the terms of settlement, and laid them down in the New Testament; and when we meet those terms of settlement by doing what He has commanded and required therein, then the debt is cancelled, or marked paid-and so on, and so on. Our contention was that Jesus did not simply go our security, but that He was our surety, "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament." -(2) (Hebrews 7:22). Modern law makes very little difference between security and surety; but there is a difference. If James buys goods of a merchant, and John goes security for James, when the debt is due the merchant looks to James for payment; if James fails to pay, then he will endeavor to collect from John. The merchant looks to James first, and, if James fails, then he looks to

John. He does not look to John first. The merchandise, or goods, is charged to James, with John's name on the book as security. Thus John guarantees the payment of the debt in case James fails. The name of James is first on the bill, and the name of John is second. That is security. That is not what Jesus was to His people; but He was their surety. In law, originally, surety is a person given, or who gives himself as a pledge. Jesus "gave Himself for us." If John stands as surety for James, when the debt is made it is charged to John, and not to James. The goods are charged to John, and put on the book as against John, by James; which shows that the goods were bought by James, but they were things to be paid for by John. If John is security for James, he would say to the merchant, "Whatever debt James contracts, I will pay if he fails." But if he is surety for James he says to the merchant, "Whatever debt James contracts, I will pay it." He stands with the merchant in the place of, in the stead of, James. So Jesus was the surety of His people. Your sins, if you are one of His children, were not charged to you; they were charged to Jesus, by you, as your surety. The Father has never looked to you for the payment of the debt. He looked to Jesus for the payment. He looked to your surety. He was able to pay, and did pay, the debt in full. As your surety He satisfied every demand of divine justice in your stead. No demand will ever be made of His people for the payment of the debt you owed. The law has been satisfied by Him; He has met all its demands, and hushed all its claims. It cannot condemn you now, for Jesus has met and performed all that it ever demanded or could demand. The surety paid the debt, and the transgressor goes free. This having been done for His people by their surety, the Holy Spirit is sure to regenerate each and every one of them, and bring them into divine relationship with the Lord, and they will be finally landed safe in glory. But if we should owe a merchant, or a bank, a thousand dollars, and we are penniless, and the debt is due, and the merchant's son, or the banker's son, should go to our creditor and satisfy that creditor, and have the debt transferred to him, so that we now have to pay the son instead of the old man, we cannot see how the son has benefitted us in the least, or has done us any good. We would just as soon pay the old man as to pay the boy. If we are penniless (and the sinner is penniless), we are no more able to pay the boy than we are to pay the old man. That position simply denies that Jesus has done the sinner any good. As to what the gentleman called a song we told him it was not a song, but a chorus to a song; and as originally written the chorus was, Jesus paid it all. All the debt I owed. Sin had left a crimson stain, He washed it white as snow. Now, we said, what is the matter with that chorus? The trouble with it is that some of you fellows have "doctored" it, and got it out of fix. Look at it a moment. "Jesus paid it all" -all what? What you owed, of course-or else He paid part of it and left part for you or someone else to pay. So far as we are concerned, if He did not pay the whole thing we are in as deplorable a condition as before, and He has done us no good. How about you? Were you in so deplorable a state as that-or could you pay a part of the debt yourself? All right. He paid it all-the whole debt; He paid it in full. Now take the next line, as quoted by our opponent, and as it is so often sung, "All to Him I owe." Then what do you owe to Him? According to the language, you owe to Him just what He paid. No use to try to twist the language and say we owe Him our service and praise-we know that is true; but what does the language say? That is the question. There is not a grammarian in the whole country who would say that is what the language teaches. He would say that, according to the language, we owe to Him just what He paid. And that is what it was changed and made to read that way for. The truth is that Jesus paid what His people owed; He paid all the debt; He paid it in full, and then they are given the benefit of it. Hence the inspired apostle said, "But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." -(I Corinthians 15:57). As long as sixty years ago we heard our precious

old mother sing No. 567 in the old Thomas Hymn Book with that chorus. For the benefit of our readers we close this article with that old sweet experimental hymn, with the old-time chorus. Remember that the hymn and chorus are not on practical lines, but law and experimental-the law satisfied by your Saviour and Redeemer, and your experimental knowledge of your insufficiency and failure to save yourself: Nothing, either great or small, Remains for me to do; Jesus died and paid it all-Yes, all the debt I owe. Chorus-Jesus paid it allAll the debt I owe- Sin had left a crimson stain, He washed it white as snow. When He from His lofty throne, Stooped down to do and die, Everything was fully done; Yes, "finished," was His cry. Weary, working, plodding one, Oh, wherefore toil you so? Cease your "doing;" all was done, Yes, ages long ago. Till to Jesus' work you cling, Alone by simple faith, "Doing" is a deadly thing-All "doing" ends in death. Cast your deadly "doing" down, Down, all at Jesus' feet; Stand in Him-in Him alone-All glorious and complete.

Perhaps you know the tune-you have it in some of the books, though changed just a little so as to suit the new song and to suit the change the Arminians have made. Do not sing such sentiment as to leave some to wonder whether you believe the way you sing or the way you preach. Preach the truth in its sweetness and simplicity, and then sing the truth, and nothing but the truth. Just as well mix up your preaching as to mix up your singing. May the Lord help us to stand for truth in all we do. We may write some more concerning these matters later on. Do you stand with us on these things? C. H. C.

Communion at Bethel

---July 6, 1939

Elsewhere in this paper will be found an article headed "Quaint Ritual of Foot Washing Observed at Church Near City." The article is copied from the Shreveport Journal. We feel sure that many of our readers will enjoy reading the article. Not many newspaper articles give our people such an unbiased report as this. Most articles in metropolitan journals are on the order of ridicule and sarcasm, though sometimes veiled. The reporter used an expression which we wish to call to the attention of our readers. It is this: "Regardless of the viewpoint on the mentality of foot washing, one would have to be void of sentiment or respect for things sacred to scoff at the foot-washing ceremony. It is a solemn, impressive rite that can create a lump in one's throat." (Let us say, and we say the truth, that it does not, it will not, it cannot, create a lump in the throat of one whose heart has not been touched and softened by the work of the Spirit of the eternal God. Whatever may be the religious belief of the reporter, he has here "given away" to us the fact that he knows something experimentally of the work of grace; and God's predestination embraced him-this is an evidence of that to us-and the "joys to come," which the Old Baptists draw a wordy picture of, are his. Another expression: "Then the pastor, Elder Garner, read some passage of Scripture from which he later took his text. I refer to him as 'Elder' because there are no 'Reverends' among Old Baptists. They think the term is too exalted to apply even to a minister." The Old Baptists have good reason for their position regarding the use of the word reverend. That word is found one time in the Bible, and that is in (**Psalms 111:9**), which reads thus: "He sent redemption unto His people: He hath commanded His covenant for ever, holy and reverend is His name." The one whose name is reverend is the one who sent redemption unto His people. That was the work of God, and not the work of the preacher. And He sent redemption by His Son-He is the Redeemer. Of course, worldly religionists, or modern religionists, do not understand our people in

this matter, as well as other matters. But there is one expression in the article in which our friendly reporter is mistaken. We are sure that he made the statement from the information which he had received. It was this: "His faith and creed are the same as when Roger Williams brought them to America." The mistake here is that "Roger Williams brought them to America." Roger Williams did not bring our faith or creed to America. We are aware of the fact that some have said that Roger Williams was the founder of the first Baptist Church in America; but that is a mistake. Roger Williams organized his church at Providence, Rhode Island, in 1639, upon the Baptist principles of freedom of worship. The first Baptist Church organized in America was by Dr. John Clark (a physician) and eleven others at Newport, Rhode Island, in 1638. Although the Roger Williams church was organized upon the Baptist principles of freedom of worship, yet his church was never really identified with the Baptists, and was not listed as being among them in those days. It was later on that some claimed him and his church as Baptists. We appreciate the good article from the reporter concerning our people. C. H. C.
THE ARTICLE BY RUPERT PEYTON (From Shreveport Journal)

Just beyond the outskirts of Shreveport in a spot from which, but for the terrain and trees, the spires of the city could be seen, is a little community where tradition and custom more quaint than the ante bellum period, still prevail. Here one may witness religious rites that have been unchanged in centuries and unaffected by the modern world growing about. Here is Bethel Primitive Baptist Church, a little shrine nestled in a grove of oak and pine which, to the faithful flock who worship there, is one of the loveliest spots on earth. Here is a church that exists without a collection plate, a Sunday school, a salaried pastor, an organ or a new song book. It has no missionary program, no drives, no revival meetings, no ladies' society, nor a custom that was not initiated centuries ago. The members say their rites have not changed, except in language, since the days of Jesus—they claim apostolic origin. Here the solemn ceremony of footwashing is observed at every communion with the same devotion as when it was customary among several creeds ages ago. Here is real wine served from a common cup—not grape juice from individual glasses. The bread is unleavened. Real wine is served, says the good pastor, because it is more symbolic of the blood of Christ—it doesn't spoil. I went to Bethel recently and spent several hours, and it was with some reluctance that I departed from the scene of religious fraternity. Hospitality is a trait of those good people. Bethel is but a few miles north of Shreveport. One goes up the Blanchard road, past the second K. C. S. underpass, then follows a gravel road to the right. A sign at the end of a sandy lane that intersects the road informs the traveler that Bethel is a quarter of a mile to the right. I found the service under way with the congregation singing an old hymn. No newfangled tunes for these Primitive Baptists. They still sing the songs their grandparents sang and their parents before them. "Amazing Grace" and "How Firm a Foundation" are among their favorites. Officially they are known as Primitive Baptists, but the adherents usually refer to themselves as "Old Baptists." However, they are known to the uninitiated as "Hardshells." This derisive appellation has been applied so long that "Old Baptists" have gracefully bowed to it without offense. Old Baptists present a unique and incongruous picture in the modern ecclesiastical realm. Their quaintness, their adherence to the old customs, their staunch belief in the doctrine of predestination, long since relegated to oblivion or never adopted by other creeds, set them apart. This is the very essence of their faith and accounts, principally, for their unchanging customs and mode of worship. It accounts, too, for their old songs, for most of the modern

hymns contain words out of harmony with the tenets of foreordination. Though there is no article of faith against instrumental music in the church, Old Baptists do not believe an organ necessary to worship, so there is none. I took my seat near the rear and listened to the old hymns that sounded like the chants of bygone years. Then the pastor, Elder Garner, read some passage of Scripture from which he later took his text. I refer to him as "Elder" because there are no "Reverends" among Old Baptists. They think the term is too exalted to apply even to a minister. Humility is one of their strongest traits. A restless child in the seat near me gave its mother some trouble and slightly disturbed proceedings. A young mother with a cute baby sat in front of me. The baby was but a few months old, but was in a good humor and smiled at me. I liked it. But soon the baby began to cry, and the mother stepped outside. She returned a few moments later with a nursing bottle. The baby was satisfied and fell asleep. There is no such thing as a nursery at a Primitive Baptist Church, and rural folks can't leave babies at home unattended. Some people, unacquainted with this situation, don't understand this. An old man, apparently 80, pronounced the invocation in a voice that was feeble but fervent, then took his seat directly in front of the pulpit a few feet from the minister and cupped his ear with his hand. His hearing was impaired, but he appeared very happy. The pastor started his sermon in typical Old Baptist fashion—an humble apology for his human frailties and expression of his profound love for the "brethren" and the great responsibility of the duty of "trying to say something of comfort to God's people." The sermon was over sooner than usual. There was a brief intermission while the men of the church arranged two rows of seats facing each other for the women to observe the communion ritual. The wine and unleavened bread were on a table in front of the pulpit covered with a cloth. There was a prayer and the pastor read the account of the last supper, emphasizing that Jesus had washed the feet of the disciples and had enjoined them and "all of God's children to wash each other's feet." "We Old Baptists," said the, good man, "believe in going all the way. We do not believe in going half way and then stopping. On that memorable night our Lord washed the feet of the disciples." So saying, Elder Garner pulled off his coat, girded himself with a long towel, as Jesus did. Two deacons drew forth basins from under the communion table and filled them with water from a pail. The pastor took one of the basins, knelt before the old man in front of the pulpit, who had pulled off his shoes, and washed his feet, wiping them with the towel. Then he arose, divested himself of the towel, gave it to the old man who girded it on. The old man knelt, washed the pastor's feet, then the two arose, grasped each other's hands and embraced. Both wept silently. Meanwhile, this same procedure went on among the members of the congregation as, two by two, they paired off and observed the ritual. Women washed women's feet and men washed men's. The women embraced each other at the conclusion of their part in the rite, and some of the men did also. Nearly all wept silently. Primitive Baptists do not shout, but they weep silently at intervals in their service. They say these are tears of joy. Regardless of the viewpoint on the meniality of foot washing, one would have to be void of sentiment or respect for things sacred to scoff at the footwashing ceremony. It is a solemn, impressive rite that can create a lump in one's throat. Realizing that their customs are unique and strange to the moderns, Old Baptists accept their position with kindly stoicism. Laugh at them and they will pity you. You do not understand their ways or know their joys. Only those with the faith and will to humble themselves in the ritual of footwashing can enjoy the pleasure of "obeying His commandments," say this band of faithful adherents. "Secret societies," said the pastor, "have a secret they could tell but won't. We have a secret that we would tell but can't. This is the secret of our joy in serving the commandments of our Lord." Old Baptists do not approve of divorce except for

"Bible grounds," which is infidelity on the part of either party contracting the marriage. There is also a church rule which forbids any member to defraud any person, or to evade the payment of a debt when able to do so. These rules are applied occasionally. Old Baptist pastors are paid no salary. However, they usually receive free-will offerings after each service. The clerk or a deacon notifies the congregation that donations will be received after the service. Those wishing to contribute do so by going to the clerk after benediction. No plates are passed during the service. Old Baptist pastors receive no special training, as the church maintains no schools and confers no degrees. Convinced that a brother has received the "divine call" any congregation can ordain a minister. The test of his eligibility is his understanding of the creed, good character and devotion. Usually the minister is a farmer who spends his week-ends serving four or five churches over a rather wide area. Few are full-time pastors and services are seldom held more than once a month. No sermon in an Old Baptist Church is complete unless it touches on the cornerstone of Old Baptist faith-predestination. This, with a wordy picture of the joys to come, is the spiritual meat and drink of the followers of faith. Believing as they do in predestination, Old Baptists see the gospel not as a "means unto salvation," but an evidence of it-a way to enjoy it. Eternal salvation, they contend, comes by the choice and act of God to which man, depraved by Adam's sin and curse, is wholly passive. Hence preaching, to them, is not a soul-winning duty but an obedient service and a joy unto the "saved." Other creeds call this fatalism. Old Baptists, however, deny this, contending that "God is not the Father of sin but the Almighty who exercises His will and pleasure." No wonder the missionary spirit does not exist among Old Baptists. The Primitive Baptists will accept anything modern but his religion and religious rites. He likes the radio, the automobile, modern things, and is, to the best of his ability, adapting himself to the changing material world. But on the spiritual side, he belongs to the old order. His faith and creed are the same as when Roger Williams brought them to America. Though profoundly faithful to his creed and satisfied with no other, the Old Baptist is tolerant. He has no dislike for Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant. He only wants to live and let live and enjoy his peculiar faith in the way that his ancestors have for centuries. The communion ritual over, the members of the flock closed their services with a procedure unique to the faith-the "parting hand." There is a special song for this occasion. It is called "The Parting Hand." There are many stanzas and the tempo is slow and the air doleful. As they sing this song the members walk about and shake hands, singing as they go. This is a part of their rites in which non-members may participate. The communion is for members only. Following the parting hand the crowd assembled under a big oak on the churchyard where a wooden table, about 50 feet long, stood. Then from near-by automobiles men and women drew forth boxes and baskets filled with treasures of culinary art of the countryside. Soon the table groaned under the weight of a feast fit for the gods. Certainly these people who know the economy of doing without do not practice it in their dining rooms, for they know nothing of the shortage of food. Here before us lay a feast-meats of every description, fried chicken, roast chicken, chicken pie, fruit pies, custards, salads of various assortment, cakes, cakes, and cakes, all prepared according to those delicate recipes that seem to be a secret of the rural South. On my plate I had a piece of roast beef, a la rural, a helping of chicken pie, two kinds of salad, a slice of roast chicken, a slice of fried country ham, a slice of custard, a slice of delectable apple pie, plus a few pickles. I managed to do justice to this generous plate and was offered more, but had to forego the pleasure of sampling other tempting morsels. Space would not permit. After the meal there was no hurry. Women cleared away the tables, the men pulled out their pipes, children began to play about the churchyard. Some boys tossed a

baseball. Men and women huddled in little groups under the trees, or sat on benches and talked. No European crisis bothered these people-not even the latest sins of the new deal. They were but slightly interested in state politics. A group of farmers looked at the clouds in the west and wondered if it would rain. Crops were suffering, they said, from both drought and cold. Women talked about the neighborhood matters. They were worried about "Sister" Jones, who was too ill to be present. She had been specially mentioned in a prayer. A group of little children, toddled about and played with a dog. A baby laughed with glee on its father's knee while a bevy of teen-aged girls looked admiringly on. A curious little boy whose picture I snapped, wanted to know whether it would be in the paper. It was a scene of naive peace, contentment and happiness that made the departure to urban artificiality exceedingly difficult. As I drove away I silently wished that this scene would never change.

Some Questions Asked

---July 20, 1939

We are in receipt of a letter containing the following questions, with the request that we answer the same:

1. Does the spirit come back, from where it is, to the body at the resurrection?
2. Is sin the cause of death, or does God especially cause one, at any age, to die?
3. What constitutes man-the soul, or the dust he was made of?
4. Do we have immortality while we live here in this life before we are resurrected from the grave?
5. Where does the Bible first mention a literal burning hell, and by whom first preached? We will comment just a little on the questions by number.
 1. Yes, the spirit comes back to the body at the resurrection of the body.
 2. All and every kind of death is a result of sin. Primarily death in sin, a loss of all moral standing with God, was the result of sin. All death follows as a result of sin.
 3. The man complete is composed of soul, body, and spirit; yet the body is sometimes called a man, and the soul is called the soul of man, and the spirit is called the spirit of man. Sometimes the man is called a living soul, or persons are sometimes referred to as souls.
 4. Yes, we have immortality in some sense before the resurrection. The very life of Christ-eternal life-is implanted in the soul or spirit in the work of regeneration; so that when the body dies the spirit does not die, Even the unregenerate possess immortality in the sense of never ceasing to exist, or in the sense of always dying, but not in the sense of always living and never dying. The literal translation of the sentence of the law of God in the morning of time is, "dying, thou shalt die;" which means always dying and never ceasing to be. The children of God are made alive from that state of death, and then are always living and never dying. This principle of always living is implanted in the soul, but not in the body, and so the body dies; but though the body dies, on account of sin, yet the spirit lives on account of righteousness. When the body is raised at the last day, in the resurrection, then the bodies of the saints will be changed and made immortal-always living and never dying.
 5. We have not looked the matter up as to where the hell referred to is first mentioned. What difference does it make where it is first mentioned, if it teaches at all that there is an actual place of eternal punishment? And what difference does it make whether it is a literal fire, or some other kind of fire? Are you interested in that place? Is your interest there, or is your interest in a better

place than that? The apostle said, "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence we also look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." -((20) (Philippians 3:20). This is the place where the interest of the Lord's children is. The Saviour preached that there is such a thing as everlasting punishment, for He said, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." -(Matthew 25:46). The word translated eternal here, with reference to the life of the righteous, is the same word that is translated everlasting with reference to the punishment of the wicked. If the life of the righteous is of endless duration, and it is, then so is the punishment of the wicked of endless duration. The word in the original means, "Of endless duration, interminable, never ending." C. H. C.

A Good Meeting

---July 20, 1939

Our last meeting here at home, Saturday and first Sunday, was a wonderful meeting, to us. To say it was a good meeting does not express it. This was our regular communion time. Elders A. W. Thompson and W. A. Holmes, of Iowa, were with us. After the preaching on Saturday, when the opportunity was given for any to present themselves who desired a home with us, our oldest boy, Claudis, Jr., came forward and asked for a home in the old church. He was gladly and joyfully received as a candidate for baptism. He said that it was his desire, if it was all right for us to do so, for us to baptize him. It made us feel so thankful, and yet so insignificant, for our own precious boy to express a desire that we lay him beneath the yielding wave in following the blessed Saviour. On Sunday morning we assembled at the water, at a large pond near-by, and led him down into the water and laid him beneath the wave, in obedience to our blessed Lord, and raised him up again-setting forth both a burial and a resurrection-to walk in newness of life. The Lord graciously smiled on us all in this delightful, yet solemn, service. Then we all went to the meetinghouse, and had preaching-good preaching, after which the communion and feetwashing service was attended to, in which we had the delightful privilege of washing the feet of our precious boy. We had often wondered if we would ever have this privilege. Elders Thompson and Holmes, and Sisters Holmes and Hill, who were with the two brethren from Iowa, all took part in the service. The service was delightful. We all got a taste of what is meant in the promise of our Saviour when He said, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." Many tears of joy were shed. The joy and love that was manifested cannot be told. Lacking from the first Sunday in July to Thursday before the second Sunday in September it was just fifty years from the time our father baptized us (his oldest son) till we had the sweet pleasure of baptizing our oldest son. "O give thanks unto the Lord; for He is good: for His mercy endureth forever." -(Psalms 136:1). Read the entire (Psalms 136). Each verse in it ends with "for His mercy endureth forever." Help us to praise His wonderful and glorious name. C. H. C.

Selling Chances

---July 20, 1939

We have been asked if we think it right for the sisters to piece a quilt and dispose of it by selling chances; the "lucky number" to get the quilt, some little article to be given to the parties who "take a chance;" this to pay a debt the church may owe. Just as well ask us if we think it is right to gamble, or conduct a lottery, for this is nothing but a lottery. If such a project should be advertised in a newspaper, that paper would be barred from the mails by United States' law, because it

contained an advertisement of a lottery. A paper containing an advertisement of any kind of lottery scheme is barred from the United States mails by law. Is it right to gamble? Who, but a perverse renegade, would say there is no harm in gambling, or that it is right to gamble? It is no worse to gamble in a game of poker with cards, or to shoot dice for the money, than to raffle off a quilt, or any other article. If it is done "for the benefit of the church" it is only a cloak to hide behind. If one would gamble "for the church" he would gamble for his own gain. Wrong is wrong, no matter under what name it sails; and gambling is gambling, no matter if it is engaged in for the pretext of paying a church debt, or what not. Such conduct is reprehensible, and so far as we are personally concerned, we "have no time" for any such practice. May the Lord pity the rising generation when they see the professed followers of the humble Master engaging in such immoral and ungodly practice. It brings shame and disgrace on the cause of the Master. C. H. C.

Preaching and Singing Article Number 5

---August 3, 1939

In the four articles we have written on this subject we trust we have given our readers something to think about-or that we have caused some of them to stop and think. It is a matter that deserves to be thought about seriously. But thinking will do very little good unless we act on the matter. We need to do something about it. And the thing we need to do is to quit singing a falsehood. The Arminian world recognizes the fact that many people will be unconsciously brought to believe the sentiment they sing. Realizing this fact, they take advantage of it, and make strenuous efforts to get their books, containing unsound sentiment, into the hands of the people; and they take great pains and put forth much effort to get those books to be used. This calls for strenuous effort on the part of our people to overcome such labor, and to strive to get songs and books containing nothing but sound sentiment to be used in our churches and homes. Here we wish to give you another sample of a song frequently used: "Brethren, we have met to worship." In some of the books in use the second stanza reads as follows: Look, and see poor sinners round you Trembling on the brink of woe; Death is coming; how alarming! Can you bear to let them go? Let us tell them of the Saviour; Tell them that He may be found. Let us pray that holy manna May be scattered all around. Now, look at that! Poor sinners trembling on the brink of woe! Death is coming-Lookout! Warn-'em, good and strong! Will you tell a few graveyard tales to get them frightened, and scare them into making a "profession?" "Can you bear to let them go?" What are you going to do about it? Will you get up a "distracted meeting," get your professional evangelist, bring in some straw and some sawdust, and "take them down the sawdust trail?" Will you set up a "mourner's bench," and get up there, and go into the "old-fashioned" revival business, beat them in the back, and have a hot old time, and "bring them through?" What are you going to do about it? To suit your actions to your singing, when you sing that language, you must "get a move on you." Some of the books do not have all that verse that way. Some of them have it this way: Look, and see poor mourners round you Fearing, trembling, as they go; Longing for a hope in Jesus, Will you comfort them or no? Let us tell them of the Saviour; Tell them that He may be found. Let us pray that holy manna May be scattered all around. The changes here made in the first five lines of this stanza are well and good; but why stop at that? Notice the sixth line: "Tell them that He may be found." As here used the word may can mean nothing more than that it is possible for Him to be found-there is no

certainty about it; it depends wholly and solely upon the amount of effort that is put forth by us and the mourners! He MAY be found! How do you like that? Do you want it preached that way?' Is that your faith or belief? Remember that the Master said: "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted." - (**Matthew 5:5**). Do you believe what He said? or do you believe that He MAY be found? Why not sing the truth and let us in song "Tell them that He will be found?" Suppose we notice the last stanza, as it reads in some books our people use: Let us love our God supremely; Let us love each other too; Let us love and pray for sinners, That our God their souls renew; Then we'll love them still the better; Take them to our kind embrace, Journey with them on to glory, There to sing redeeming grace. Notice the word renew. You will have God to renew some by your prayers, will you? You will get out, now, will you, and help the Lord to save souls? Why not, seeing you sing it that way? Renew means to make new again; to restore to freshness, perfection, or vigor; to make new spiritually; to regenerate. So, as here used, the word cannot possibly mean anything else than to regenerate, or to make new spiritually. So, you Old Baptists who sing that language, are you going to teach people in your song that you can help the Lord to regenerate sinners by your prayers? Or that you, by your prayers, can and will help sinners to be regenerated? We should, at least, be consistent-either go, "boot and baggage," to the Arminian camps, or else quit singing such rot. We will, the Lord willing, write some more later. C. H. C.

Millennium and 2 Peter 2; 3:18

---August 3, 1939

Dear Brother Cayce: I have a few questions I would like to have your views on briefly.

1. The people I am affiliated with have a lot to say about the premillennial coming of Christ-about the millennial reign.
2. Some of these same people teach that children will be born naturally; also that people will be saved from sin, or born again.
3. Also, (**II Peter 2:10-12**). When will this take place? at His coming for His church? This is for my benefit, as well as others. Yours in hope, John L. Brennen.
Webster Springs, W. Va.

OUR REMARKS

The writer of the above is not affiliated with the Primitive Baptists. We do not know what people he is affiliated with. On No. 1 we do not understand what he means to ask us. But we will just remark that we do not expect other people than the Primitive Baptists to advocate the truth. They are as liable to advocate one false doctrine as another. As to question 2 will only say that we do not understand how children will be born naturally and in sin during the millennial reign of Christ, as we understand those people to teach who hold that Christ will come back to earth and reign on earth in person for a thousand years. If the earth is renovated, and sin taken out of the world, as we have understood them to teach, then we do not see how any would be born in sin during that thousand years. Neither can we understand how any would or could be saved from sin during that time, for there would then be no sin for them to be saved from. But this whole matter of the millennium, as taught by the world, is nothing but speculation, and is plainly contradicted by plain declarations in Holy Writ. The inspired writers have plainly taught that when Christ comes again it will be to gather His children home in glory, and that their bodies are to be then-right then, not a thousand years later-changed and made spiritual, and that they will then be forever with the Lord. See ((Th 4:13)

(I Thessalonians 4:13-17); (I Corinthians 15:22-26),(51-57). Third. The false teachers described here are in the world now, and have been here all along since the Lord began to send out His true ministers. In the prophetic age the Lord sent out His prophets among His people. Then old Satan began to send his prophets, too. He is a great imitator-just like a monkey; or a monkey is like him. If you have a pet monkey he will try to do everything he sees you do. Old Satan is like that; he saw the Lord send out prophets, and he sent out a lot more. Then when the gospel day was ushered in, and the Lord sent His ministers out, old Satan soon began to send his preachers out, too. And as it was in the prophetic age, when he had so many more prophets than the Lord had, so now he has many more preachers than the Lord has. Satan's ministers "walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government." They have no use for the Lord's government; they despise His kingdom and the subjects of it; they despise the laws the Lord has given to govern in that kingdom. They are "presumptuous, self willed." They presume to do the work Jesus came to do. Their will is contrary to God and His way. "They are not afraid to speak evil of dignities." They are simply natural men; they are like natural brute beasts; they have only one nature, one life, and that is poisoned and contaminated with sin. They speak evil of things they understand not, "and shall utterly perish in their own corruption." They have eyes full of adultery, and cannot cease from sin. They have no life that is above sin. Sin is their element. Nothing can live above its own element. They beguile unstable souls. They deceive every child of God possible who is not thoroughly established in God's doctrine. That is one thing the devil sends them out for, and some of them work at it very industriously. They get big money for it, sometimes. They are exercised with covetous practices; and are cursed children; they are not blessed children. They are wells without water. They never bring that which will satisfy the spiritual thirst of the heaven-born soul. They are clouds all right, but they are carried about with a tempest. They are not rain clouds; they bring no gospel showers. Beware of them. Read the Bible for yourself, and shun those vain deceivers. May the Lord deliver His little ones from their clutches. C. H. C.

A Drunken Feast

---August 3, 1939

If you will read (**I Corinthians 11:21**) you will see that some of the members of the church at Corinth converted the sacramental supper into a drunken feast-that some of them were drunken. In some places they use grape juice in the sacramental supper. Will some of those who use grape juice please tell us how those people at Corinth could get drunk on grape juice? They were sharply rebuked by the apostle for getting drunk, but he did not reprove them for using wine (the fermented juice) in the sacramental supper. C. H. C.

Romans 11:2-5

---August 17, 1939

God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew. Wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.-(Romans 11:2-5). We have been asked who the seven

thousand men were. This was in the days of Elias, or Elijah, and refers to the time this old prophet had to flee for his life. God's plan was for Israel to care for the prophets He sent unto them; but they sometimes failed to do that, and even persecuted those prophets. They persecuted Elias, and he had to flee for his life. That was when he made the intercession referred to above by the apostle. It appeared to him that he was left alone; that he was the only one left who had not gone after false gods and false ways. But the Lord assured him that he was not alone; that there were others who had not bowed down to idol gods, or to Baal. Of those who had not thus departed the Lord assured him that there were seven thousand men. They were a few in comparison with the whole of Israel. They constituted a remnant-just a small part of the whole number. But that was a sufficient number for the truth to be maintained and for the right worship and service of God to be engaged in. God was not then without witness. Then the apostle said that there was still a remnant in his day. It has been that way in every age of the world-that the truth of God and His true worship and service has been maintained by a few. God has reserved to Himself a remnant in every age of the world to maintain the cause of truth and righteousness. What was done, and what was true, then, is still true. The truth is still maintained by just a few. The Lord will not be left without a witness in the earth. Things may look dark and gloomy, and we may sometimes feel that we are alone in the world, but there is still a remnant reserved. May the Lord help us to be identified with the remnant, and sustain us, who try to follow Him, in every trial. C. H. C.

General Address

---September 7, 1939

From November 14 to 18, 1900, there were gathered and assembled together at Fulton, Ky., a large number of Primitive Baptists from different states of the Union. Fifty-one ministers were present and took part in the meeting. In that meeting a general address was read and approved by a unanimous vote of all present. When the proceedings of that meeting were printed or published this address was in the book, under the above heading. On account of circumstances which exist in some parts of the country, and some things being done in some places, we feel that this address is timely now, and worthy of serious and prayerful consideration by the Primitive Baptists in every section of our country. When that address was put forth thirty-nine (almost) years ago it was evidently the sentiment then of the great body of Baptists. We were at that meeting, and we then fully indorsed the sentiment and principles set forth in that address-and we stand there yet. What do you say, dear reader? Do you stand now where the Baptists stood thirty-nine years ago? Remember that principles are eternal and never change. Following this address, which we copy below in full, are the names of the fifty-one ministers who were in attendance at the meeting, with the post office address of each one at that time. Many of them have crossed over the river, and some left our people and went to another order. Following this address we also copy an article which was written by several ministers and brethren assembled at Oakland City, Ind., on September 27, 1900. This article was unanimously approved by the Fulton meeting in November, same year, and published as an "Appendix." We recommend a careful reading and study of these addresses. If the things set forth therein were good then, they are good now. The Primitive Baptists as a body raised no objection then to the principles set forth therein. We stand now on the same principles as set forth therein. C. H. C.

THE ADDRESS

Pursuant to a call of the Primitive Baptist Church of Fulton, Ky., the elders and messengers of the Church of God known as Primitive Baptists, being convened from various places in the United States of America, in the city of Fulton, Ky., from the fourteenth day of November to the eighteenth day of the same month, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred. To all of like precious faith with us, Greeting. Recognizing with humble gratitude the gracious and divine providence of God in giving us the kingdom and preserving its order and purity through the lapse of many hundred years, fraught with commotions, revolutions, and other vicissitudes of human life, we do feel under profound obligations to thank God and labor faithfully for the prosperity of His holy cause.

1. The Importance of Fellowship cannot be overestimated. It is the sacred cord that binds together the members of this holy community. Since there is no tribunal higher than the local churches to which they may appeal, their safety and perpetuity depends on the preservation of their fellowship.
2. Bars of Fellowship set up by our local churches have been the most destructive influences against the growth and progress of the Church. Traditions of men and human customs being regarded as authority have often given rise to bars of fellowship and resulted in the destruction of the peace of the churches. Such customs and traditions as have no Bible sanction should never interfere with fellowship. It is painful to note on the pages of history how frequently our people have been divided and their happiness destroyed by foolish and sinful declarations of non-fellowship. We do most solemnly and prayerfully beseech all our churches and people that they raise no bars of fellowship against any Primitive Baptist with whom they are agreed on fundamental principles-such as the eternal salvation of sinners, wholly by grace and entirely unconditional on the sinner's part, and who are sound and orderly in the ordinances of the Church, administering baptism by immersion to penitent believers only by ministers of the gospel clothed with authority by the Gospel Church, and administering the Lord's Supper to such baptized believers only, and who manifest a willingness to labor for the peace, union, and fellowship of the whole body. The gospel is God's appointed remedy for the correction of errors in his Church, and it is in every way sufficient to correct errors among the children of God, if lovingly and faithfully employed. When bars of fellowship are raised they exclude the erring from the God-appointed remedy for the correction of their errors and render restoration hopeless. When bars of fellowship are unlawfully raised among our people the bond of union by which our churches are held together is broken and the welfare of the cause exposed to the most uncertain results. If the raisers thereof cannot be induced to remove them at once, the only course for those who want to remain in this holy Church union is to discard their actions and have no connection with them until they withdraw such bars of fellowship.
3. Heresy being so positively forbidden by the Scriptures, we deem it important to have a clear, accurate, and concise understanding of what the word implies. We take heresy to mean a departure from the teachings of the Scripture as explained in our acknowledged Confession of Faith, but not mere differences of opinion upon immaterial points of doctrine and practice upon which the Bible makes no positive statements. The Bible does not state the day nor the hour upon which members shall be received in the Church, nor the Lord's Supper administered, It mentions neither hymnbooks, associations, formal letter correspondence, nor general handshaking. So upon all such matters liberty should be allowed, provided that everything is done in decency and in order, and the books used are sound in sentiment. No doctrine nor practice that violates

neither the Scripture nor acknowledged confession should be construed as heresy. The treatment of heresy requires but little comment. The Bible plainly states that a heretic, after the first and second admonition, shall be rejected, **{(Titus 3:10)}** but let it be fully known that an action or doctrine is heresy before action is taken against it. We deem it unsafe to deal with a man as a heretic unless he avows the heresy. In cases where divisions have been forced in the Church by bars of fellowship or otherwise we do earnestly and prayerfully beg our brethren not to go to law over Church property. We believe it is better to take what would be paid out in cost of suit and expend it in a house than to gain the house by law, and much more in harmony with the teaching of our dear Saviour.

4. The Right of an Individual Church to discipline her members is clearly taught in the Scriptures. From the decision of an orderly church, in matters of discipline, there is no appeal. The church is the only authority to which complaint may be made. Only when a church has refused or neglected to discipline a member or members whose actions are bringing reproach or distress upon the cause in general, or when a church, in the opinion of sister churches, has so far indulged in disorderly practices as to render her incapable of proper self-government, or when she has departed from the faith, has a council of churches any right to consider her case, unless they are specially called on by her to do so. For instruction of churches in such cases as described above we refer them to the London Confession of Faith, Chapter XXVI, Section 15.
5. Restoration of Disorderly Churches is a subject that has given much concern to our people. When churches are guilty of only irregularity in doctrine and practice and are willing to disclaim such irregularities and return to primitive order it is our candid opinion that they should be received into the general fellowship of the denomination without being required to perform the impossible task of counteracting every individual irregularity.
6. That Associations may be made an advantage to the churches none would hardly deny. That they have sometimes been abused and made a disadvantage none will dare deny. Associations are useful in keeping the churches in sympathetic touch with each other. They can be made useful by making them a place of worship, a place to obtain news from the different churches in the community, by laboring to cultivate a spirit of love and fellowship and of Christian forbearance by putting in the time in trying to build up the cause of Christ rather than trying to impose our peculiar notions on others. Associations may be abused and rendered injurious by the opposite of the above.
7. The Care and Encouragement and Duties of the Ministry is a subject of too great magnitude to be passed by lightly. It is very thoroughly, however, in the London Confession of Faith, approved by this convention. We most earnestly request a careful study of the subject in that document (read Confession', Chapter XXVI, Section 10. See also Minutes of Black Rock Convention). It was evidently the belief of our London brethren, supported by the Holy Scriptures, that ministers of the Word should give their entire time, energy, and talent to their ministry, and the brethren should divide with them a sufficient portion of their living to keep them and their families who are not capable of self-support above want. It is a positive fact that our appreciation of any object is increased by the amount of care and labor we bestow upon it. It is natural for a mother to love her babe, but as she cares for it from day to day the intensity of her affection increases. A father and mother may take a child not their own to rear, and at first feel a slight

indifference, but nights of watchful solicitude and days of toil and care will render that child so dear that they with difficulty distinguish it from their own children. So a church that cares for her pastor loves him better and appreciates his service more than one that does not. There is a holy relation between pastor and evangelist that should not be ignored. The pastor should welcome the evangelist and his labor and show him due courtesy and consideration. In return the evangelist should remember that it is the pastor's duty and privilege to preside over the church and administer its ordinances. No evangelist should assume to administer any ordinance in the church when the pastor is present unless he is specially requested to do so by the church and pastor. The work of an evangelist is indispensable. Without such work the gospel kingdom would be extended no farther, as it is the chief work of an evangelist to introduce the gospel where it is not known, and to organize churches. There should be no lack of appreciation of either pastor or evangelist, as both are indispensable in the upbuilding and progress of the church and authorized by the Word of God. {See **(Ephesians 4:11)**} If the claim of Primitive Baptists be true, no one has access to baptism, the elements in the Lord's Supper, or any other gospel privilege, where there is no Primitive Baptist Church, or ministry. In view of the vast territory in our own country that is absolutely ignorant of Primitive Baptist doctrine, and therefore totally destitute of church privileges, and as the redeemed of the Lord are among every nation, kindred, tongue, and people under heaven {(**Revelation 5:9**)} we behold the great necessity of stirring our people up on this subject. This clearly demonstrates that we claim too much or do too little. We earnestly solicit our people to encourage the work of an evangelist. Not to spend his time in visiting large and well-organized churches, but to labor with the feeble and destitute churches and in places where there is no church. The churches should lovingly, freely, and faithfully contribute of their carnal means as God has blessed them to the support of brethren engaged in this needful work. We would not be understood to regard that there are degrees in the ministry, but different lines of work in the same office. It is the special duty of the deacons to superintend the financial interest of the church. They should have control of the church treasury and expend it in serving tables. First, the table of the Lord. Secondly, the table of the poor. Thirdly, the table of elders that labor for them. They should receive the donations from the brethren and keep a correct account of same and report to the church, that it may know who are bearing the burdens of the church. The object of the deacons is to equalize the burdens of the churches. (See Practical Suggestions to Primitive Baptists, by Elder Cash.)

8. The Confession of Faith, adopted over two hundred years ago by thirty-seven of the ablest ministers of England and Wales, representing over one hundred churches, has served one of the most needful services among our people of any document of faith since the days of the apostles, and has stood unquestioned as an expression of the Primitive Baptists' interpretation of the Bible from then till now. At the present assembly of fifty-one ministers, representing three hundred and thirty-five churches, aggregating fourteen thousand five hundred members in direct correspondence with over one hundred thousand Baptists, the Confession has been carefully read and approved. Language through the lapse of many years undergoes variations in applications and meanings, whereby certain clauses become more or less obscure in meaning. Wherever, in the opinion of this assembly, the meaning of a section was not apparent footnotes were added to bring out the meaning. The office of this Confession of Faith is not to be regarded as a standard of faith and practice, but as an expression of our interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, which is the only rule of faith and practice.

We recommend the Confession with the notes to the careful perusal of all Primitive Baptists, and insist that they make themselves familiar with its teaching. Believing that such a course would obviate many of the difficulties that have so sadly distressed our beloved Zion in the few years passed, we would be glad to see this document, that has stood the test as an expression of our faith for more than two hundred years, become uniformly used in our local churches as their expression of faith and practice. Praying God's blessings on His holy cause everywhere and that general prosperity may soon follow, we are your obedient servants and ministers of the gospel in the fear and love of God. John M. Thompson, Greenfield, Ind.; James H. Oliphant, Craw-fordsville, Ind.; J. W. Richardson, Petersburg, Ind.; E. W. Thomas, Danville, Ind.; Will M. Strickland, Fort Branch, Ind.; H. A. Todd, Grayville, Ill.; C. F. Stuckey, Carmi, Ill.; I J. Fuller, West Salem, Ill.; Simon Reeder, Cottonwood, Ill.; John Williford, Greenville, Ill.; Daniel Lowery, Dahlgren, Ill.; W. A. Fish, Benton, Ill.; J. B. Hardy, Calvin, Ill.; J. V Kirkland, Fulton, Ky.; R. S. Kirkland, Fulton, Ky.; J. J. Kirkland, Fulton, Ky.; J. C. Ross, Crutchfield, Ky.; L. F. Wallace, Elva, Ky.; W. M. Hopper, Pottertown, Ky.; K. U." Myatt, Clinton, Ky.; A. M. Kirkland, Whitlock, Tenn.; S. L. Pettus, Triune, Tenn.; S. F. Cayce, Martin, Tenn.; W. E. Brush, Clarksburg, Tenn.; John Grist, Friendship, Tenn.; B. O. Dearing, Covington, Tenn.; P. G. Johnson, Rutherford, Tenn.; C. F. Caruthers, Friendship, Tenn.; G. T. Mayo, Dresden, Tenn.; R. C. Taylor, Milan, Tenn.; E. B. Simmons, Mixie, Tenn.; J. N. Wallace, Tumbling, Tenn.; J. L. Butler, West, Tenn.; C. H. Cayce, Martin, Tenn.; J. B. Halbrook, Rutherford, Tenn.; W. T. Jackson, Ruthville, Tenn.; Church Peel, Maury City, Tenn.; J. G. Webb, Bonham, Tex.; J. T. Stewart, Diamond, Ala.; W. J. McCormick, Monroe, Ala.; R. L. Piles, Hon, Ark.; J. B. Little, Abbott, Ark.; J. K. Stephens, Brinkley, Ark.; Lee Hanks, Boston, Ga.; E. M. Verell, Trebloc, Miss.; W. T. Goddard, Milner, Ga.; T. E. Sikes, Cox, Ga.; E. D. Williams, Taylor, Miss.; J. C. Wilkinson, McComb City, Miss.; Ira Turner, Ashland, Mo.; I N. Newkirk, Dayton, Wash. APPENDIX We, the undersigned elders and brethren, pursuant to a request made by brethren of Patoka Association of Primitive Baptists, now convened at Oakland City Church, in Oakland City, Ind., on the 27th day of September, 1900, to our brethren of like precious faith everywhere: We sincerely regret the division and strife that have been among us, and earnestly desire that we may be led to see alike, and to unite in our understanding of truth as taught in God's Word. We represent in this meeting about one hundred congregations in Indiana and Illinois. We recommend the London Confession of Faith as an expression of Bible truth. The articles of faith of our churches are substantially inharmony with the doctrine and practice set forth in that instrument, and we do heartily recommend the London Confession to the household of faith everywhere. Inasmuch as there is some difference of opinion concerning the teaching of some of the articles in the London Confession of Faith, we will submit the following in the way of explaining our understanding of their teaching:

We do not believe that God has unconditionally, unlimitedly, and equally predestinated righteousness and unrighteousness. It is our belief that God has positively and effectually predestinated the eternal salvation of His people which were chosen in Christ before time. God's purpose concerning sin does not sustain the same relation to sin that it does to holiness. While we think that God's purpose concerning sin is more than barely permissive, it is such as to exclude all chance and uncertainty, yet we hold that God is in no sense the cause of sin. We do not believe that God requires or forbids anything in His law, and then by a power

irresistible moves His creatures to act contrary to His commands. In Chapter III, Section 1, of London Confession, we read: "God hath decreed in Himself from all eternity, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably, all things whatsoever come to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor hath fellowship with any therein, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature, nor yet is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away," etc. In this they deny that God's attitude to sin is causative, and in the body of this Confession we insist that they maintain that God's attitude to holiness is causative. So they clearly distinguish between God's efficacious decree of holiness and His purpose concerning sin. Section 2: "Although God knoweth whatever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions, yet hath He not decreed anything because He foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions." Here they distinguish between the knowledge of God as an attribute of God and the decree of God as an act of God, which we believe to be Scriptural. For God to foresee that man will yield to influences of a secondary nature does not imply that God moves man to sin, but only that He is the Permitter of sin. Webster defines "permit," "to suffer, without giving authority." We use it in the sense of "not hinder." Section 3 they say: "Others being left to act in their sins to their just condemnation, to the praise of His glorious justice." If they had believed that God moves men to sin, they would not have said, "being left to act in their sins," etc. We insist that we should not use language implying that God's attitude to sin is the same as His attitude to holiness, for this tends to destroy the distinction between right and wrong. The expression, "unlimited predestination of all things," seems to convey the idea that God's purpose concerning sin is as unlimited and as unrestricted as it is concerning holiness; and if so, then God's decree concerning sin would be causative, since it is causative concerning holiness, and this view would destroy all distinction between right and wrong. Chapter XVI, Section 2: "These good works, done in obedience to God's commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith; and by them believers manifest their thankfulness, strengthen their assurance, edify their brethren, adorn the profession of the gospel, stop the mouths of the adversaries, and glorify God," etc. Section 3: "Their ability to do good works is not at all of themselves, but wholly from the Spirit of Christ; and that they may be enabled thereto, besides the graces they have already received, there is necessary an actual influence of the same Holy Spirit to work in them to will and to do of His good pleasure; yet are they not hereupon to grow negligent, as if they were not bound to perform any duty unless upon a special motion of the Spirit," etc. They do neglect, not being forced in duty irresistibly. We believe the Scriptures teach that there is a time salvation received by the heirs of God distinct from eternal salvation, which does depend upon their obedience. The people of God receive their rewards for obedience in this life only. We believe that the ability of the Christian is the unconditional gift of God. Besides the efficacious grace of God in the heart in regeneration, we need the company of God's Holy Spirit to comfort, lead, and bless us, which He has promised to give to every one that will ask Him. **{(Luke 11:13)}** The act of God necessary to our regeneration must in some sense be distinguished from His act necessary to our obedience. We are never commanded to be born again, but in hundreds of places we are called on to obey. We are passive in regeneration, but in obedience we are active. Regeneration is neither a vice nor a virtue; obedience is a virtue and disobedience is a vice. Regeneration is wholly independent of the will. There could be no such a thing as obedience or disobedience independent of the will. Men do not neglect to be born again, but they do neglect their duty. In Section 5, Chapter XVI, we read: "We cannot by our best of works merit pardon of sin, or eternal life, at the hand of God," etc. They did not place obedience in the place of Christ, or His

atonement, and so we believe it would be exceeding sinful to mention good works as essential to these ends, yet we believe there is an important use for good works aside from these ends. In Section 2, same chapter, they say of good works: "By them believers manifest their thankfulness, strengthen their assurance, edify their brethren, adorn the profession of the gospel, stop the mouths of the adversaries," etc. We think these uses of good works Scriptural. We hold that God's government of His people is moral. We hold, too, that conditionality is an essential element of moral government. We distinguish between God's government of mind and His government of matter. Section 5, Chapter III: "God hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any other thing in the creature as condition or cause moving Him thereto." Although the two-seed doctrine was not thought of at the time this Confession was written, yet this article clearly condemns the two-seed doctrine in all its phases. Chapter XXXI, Section 1: "The souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places *heaven and hell* for souls separated from their bodies the Scripture acknowledgeth none." Christ will resurrect the wicked by His power, exerted in His office as King through a proceeding of law, and not under the new covenant, as the righteous will be, each to their endless reward. There is a sentiment prevailing in some parts of our beloved Zion that the wicked will be annihilated at death, and we call attention to the sentiment in this quotation on that subject. The annihilation theory is an innovation, and contrary to every Confession of Faith, and also contrary to the Scriptures. In Chapters III, IV, and IX, the London Confession mentions the freedom of the will. We do not understand them to mean that the will is free in the sense that it is self-determining, as the Arminians hold; nor that man is capable of choosing things of which he has no knowledge, nor things above and beyond his nature; we do not understand the Confession to mean that men dead in sin are, while in that state, capable of choosing holiness, but we understand it to mean that men are capable of choosing things in harmony with their nature—things most agreeable to them. They are and must be capable of voluntary action in order to their being accountable. Liberty of will in this sense is essential to moral government, as we believe. Men before regeneration are capable of choosing things agreeable to them, as they are afterwards. In conclusion, we love the doctrine of grace, and we believe that any view of predestination, or of the will, that will tend in any degree to apologize for sin will also tend to minimize the doctrine of grace. Paul says: "To the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us accepted in the beloved." Paul so preached as to make grace glitter and shine as a star of the first magnitude. He puts word upon word to lift up our ideas of God's grace, so we feel it important to oppose any view of the decrees of God that will in the least excuse any sin in man, or point out mitigating circumstances for sin, because just in proportion as we excuse or apologize for sin we also belittle the doctrine of grace; so we oppose the two-seed doctrine because it seeks to find some quality in man that stands as the cause of his election to glory, while Paul speaks of God's people, "were children of wrath even as others." We were no better in our nature or conduct than others, and this is the lesson of our experience. When low bowed before the Lord in the darkest hour of our lives, we confessed, and we knew there was nothing in us that could merit esteem, or give the Creator delight. So we oppose every feature of Arminianism as opposed to the doctrine of grace. We feel bound to contend for those principles that most exalt the doctrine of grace, and we feel sure that if we stay with those lessons that we learned in our first experience, we will expose everything that tends to minimize the doctrine of grace. J. T. Oliphant, E. L. Kerr, J. H. Oliphant, E. W. Thomas, J. W. Richardson, H. A. Todd, J. B. Hardy, C. P.

Stuckey, W. C. Arnold, A. J. Willis, William E. Williams, Archie Brown, James Crane, Will M. Strickland, Charles Arnold. Unanimously approved by the National Convention of Primitive Baptists at Fulton, Ky.

Matthew 1:1 AND 1 Peter 2:9

---September 21, 1939

A brother has asked us to give our views on **(Matthew 1:1)** and **((Pet 2:9) (I Peter 2:9)**, The two citations read as follows: The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.-(Matthew 1:1). But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light. -**((Pet 2:9) (I Peter 2:9)**. The brother wishes to know if the two places refer to the same generation, and asks when those were chosen, as mentioned in the last quotation. In **(Matthew 1:1)** the writer is giving the line of ancestry of Jesus, the Son of Mary, our Saviour, showing the line of descent from Abraham to Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom Jesus was born. This is the matter recorded here. You will find practically the same thing in the third chapter of Luke. In the other citation the apostle is referring to the Lord's children as a generation, and calls them a chosen generation. The people this apostle was writing to were not natural Jews. He was addressing "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappa-docia, Asia, and Bithynia;" and he calls them the "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father." As they were elect, they were chosen of God-that is, God had chosen them, and as such they were "a chosen generation." They were "a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people." They were different from the world-made so by the work of the Lord. As to when they were chosen, we may see from **(Ephesians 1:3-4)** "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love." The choice was made before the ages of time began, before they had existence. "Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, when as yet there was none of them." - Psalm cxxxix. 16. The chosen generation were His members. That is, the whole complete body of Christ; the redeemed family is His body. They were written in God's book before any of them existed-" when as yet there were was none of them." The choice, then, was before time-before they had existence. The Father made choice of them, and predestinated that they should be conformed to the image of His Son. They will be finally glorified. C. H. C.

Likes The Good Old Songs

---September 21, 1939

Dear Brother in Christ: I like your Good Old Songs very much, if you only had different music written for them. It seems like they are awful hard for the people to sing them. We like the words and the sentiment of the songs. I am with you when it comes to singing. I believe singing the truth is as necessary as preaching the truth. May God give you wisdom and strength to go right ahead in what you are doing. Your unworthy brother, I hope, saved by grace, if saved at all, Oscar Wallace. 8034 Sarena, Detroit, Mich.

REMARKS

We appreciate your kind expressions of approval and indorsement. The music to the songs in the Good Old Songs were the tunes written, usually, originally for those songs. They were all taken from old-time books, just as they were written in those books. We agree that the tunes are some harder to learn than the tunes written according to modern music. Things that are worth little are easy to learn. Things that are worth while are harder to learn than things worth less. The best things are harder to accomplish than other things are. To us, modern music only entertains and excites natural emotion; the old music stirs the soul, and excites solemn praise and adoration to God. They are deep in spiritual expression. The worship of God should be a x solemn thing. The church is a city of solemnities. Deep spiritual and solemn music is, therefore, better suited to the worship of God.) Light fantastic music is suitable for some things, perhaps, but we do not think it so suitable for the worship of God. We have heard some of this light fantastic music sung at times and places that absolutely disgusted us, and made us really wish we were somewhere else. Study the music in that book, and learn it, and sing it, and then you will be glad that you did. May the Lord bless you in your labors. Pray for us. C. H. C.

God's Way – The Right Way

---October 19, 1939

Note.-The following article was written as a comment on an article by Elder H. L. Golston, Brush Creek, Tenn., in which he was commending some deacons who called on a minister's family where there was sickness. They reported to the church some of their needs when the church met in conference. Elder Golston commended them for what they did. Our comments were as follows: The foregoing was good as far as it went. The deacons did the right thing in seeing after the needs in the case. But suppose there had been no church meeting the next night, or for a week or two. Then what? The Bible way is to lay by in store, as God has prospered us. The funds should be laid by, and put in the hands of the deacons. Then when the need arises they have the funds ready. That is God's way. If the church cannot risk the deacons to dispense the funds to those in need they should remove them from the office. God's way is the right way, and the best way. One in need might suffer much before time for the church to meet. C. H. C.

Preaching and Singing Article Number 6

---November 2, 1939

We have received many letters of indorsement of our articles which we have written upon this subject, as well as some letters of criticism. We did not expect it to be otherwise. Of course we could not well expect an indorsement of our writing on the question from many who think it will do to sing just "any old thing," no matter what the sentiment may be. But that does not deter us from calling attention to such matters, and warning our people and our readers of the danger there is in such things. Some have seemingly accused us of a wrong motive in the matter. Well, they did that in regard to the prophets and apostles of old. As sure as one endeavors to get the people to cease practicing a wrong, or to correct an error, somebody will accuse him of selfish and wrong motives, or of being a "grouch." If one is faithful to his trust, will he cease from giving such warning, because of such accusations? We all know that he will not. He will bear all such as that, and continue to issue the warnings. We do not expect to sell all the song books our

people use, nor do we expect to print and publish all the papers our people read; but, whether we do that or not, we do desire our people to put out literature and songs without unsound sentiment, and desire that our people use nothing but sound sentiment. We should be consistent. It seems that somebody in England has been disturbed a little in regard to this matter of singing, as well as here in the United States. We exchange with the Zion's Witness, published in England. We copy the following extract from the "Annual Address" of the editor of that magazine, as published in that paper of October, 1939: Many a man of God is sent to feed one solitary saint, be the congregation five hundred or a mere handful. The poor minister likes a nice congregation; yes, flesh is flesh, whether in a vessel of mercy or a vessel of wrath. But the Lord has better employment for His servants than trying to keep a people together who merely meet for old association's sake, or because wedded to a building, a pew, a denomination, or to worship the musical god. And how the devotees of the latter have increased since the appearance of the-----Tune Book! From its first inception we felt it would prove more of a curse than a blessing, introducing, as it does, a spirit antagonistic to that of true worship-the very spirit of the congregations of the dead. A real blight we consider many modern tunes to real devotion. The spirit that prompted the worthies of Gower Street to rise up in arms against the introduction of even-----into their service many years ago was a right one. What would they say now about the-----tunes almost universally sung throughout the denomination, not to mention Worse evils. We doubt whether they would own the sect at all. And if fashionable in the tunes, we must be up-to-date * * * * Besides, "quick's the word" in the world today, and we must move a little with the times * * * Thus they wrap it up. Oh, the emptiness of it all! the death! Probably a neurotic female presides at the organ, * * * whilst the slow solemn voice of the aged saint is silenced * * * and, alas! parson, deacon, member dare not, or will not object. Ah, "the Lord is a God of judgment, and by Him actions are weighed." How true is so much of the sentiment expressed in the above extract. It is a fact that the modern, light, quick, frivolous music of these latter times utterly destroys the spiritual emotions, and only animates the natural, baser, sentiment and instincts. The music sung in our assemblies in these days, where they have adopted so much of the modern sort, is not as sweet and soul-comforting and uplifting as it was in our youthful days. May the Lord help us to return to the old soul-enlivening and soul-cheering tunes that were so sweet to our ancestors, and to be careful to promulgate the truth in song as well as in preaching. May the Lord help us to "save yourselves from this untoward generation." C. H. C.

Special Meeting

---November 2, 1939

On January 4, 1890, in the home of a Sister Morris, Elder Cayce made his first attempt to speak in the name of his Master. This coming January 4 will mark the fiftieth year that he has labored in the Lord's vineyard-worked in that vineyard in the South, North, East and West; worked hard serving churches, debating and preaching, and with his pen. For some reason, I trust not from a proud or selfish viewpoint, I have desired to have services at our church, here in Thornton, on January 4, 1940; and that Elder Cayce preach the opening sermon. The first Sunday and Saturday before in each month is our regular monthly meeting. I told the church my desire. They, by motion and second, agreed to have services Thursday, January 4, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. We desire our kindred in the Lord to be with us. We want you to come. Come, praying the dear Lord to be in our midst, to own and bless. Pray-pray the Lord to send more laborers in His vineyard,

for truly the harvest is white. We would like to have representatives from each church Elder Cayce has served during these fifty years,' as well as Baptists from all parts of the country. He loves the cause of his Master. His greatest delight is in serving his Lord, and his brethren. He delights in having his brethren and friends with him in the house of the Lord. January is a winter month, and, sometimes, 'tis harder to care for a crowd comfortably at this time of the year than at other times. We are asking that, as soon as you can, write me and tell me you are coming; and, if you intend to come by private conveyance, tell me how many will be in your crowd. This will enable us to know how many to prepare for. This invitation is to all Primitive Baptists and friends. We are sincere when we say, we want you to come. Yes, come; and may the sentiment expressed by the poet be the prayer of each: 'Tis my desire with God to walk, And with His children pray and talk; Altho' I persecuted be, Yet Jesus suffered so for me. 'Tis my deire, around the board To meet thy saints, my dearest Lord; In union with thy saints to be, And oft commune with them and Thee. I will tell you more about our plans in the next issue of the paper. Yours in hope, Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

Universalism, Rutherfordism, Goats, Esau

---November 16, 1939

About a year ago we received a request from a brother for us to write a lengthy editorial refuting Universalism, Rutherfordism, and that the goats are the disobedient children of God, and that Esau represented the flesh. We do not have the time or space to write a lengthy article on these matters. In our issue of August 15, 1935, we had an article on the subject of the sheep and the goats. What we wrote on that subject in that article were simple facts then, and they are plain and simple facts yet. It is not necessary to go over those matters again here. That article will be in Volume VI of our Editorial Writings, which has been begun, but will not be ready to send out for quite awhile yet. We had to lay that work aside for a time, as we are busy now printing minutes, and we let them come first after the paper. In Volume II, page 262, is an article on General Judgment and Eternal Hell, and in Volume IV, page 153, is an article on the subject of Eternal Punishment. In those articles we gave some plain and simple facts, some of which the child of grace is taught in his experience. Universalism and Russellism (Rutherfordism) both deny that there is any such thing as eternal punishment. This doctrine has always been embraced in the Confessions of Faith of Baptists. If it is not the truth, the Baptists have always been heretics. If it is the truth, then those who deny it are heretics. A heretic should be admonished twice, and then if he will not cease and desist, he should be excluded promptly. If you fail or refuse to do that, then you are a rebel- rebelling against the laws of the King of Zion. Heresy is like a canker (cancer); it will eat. The only remedy is to cut it out, or put a plaster on it that will kill it and take it out. To let it run on, it will destroy and kill. Better attend to it quickly, as the imperative law of the King commands and requires. If Universalism is the truth, then the doctrine of election is not the truth. Election means that some are chosen out of and from among others. If all the race are saved, then there was and is no election, no choice. No use to cite Scriptures here to prove the doctrine of election. The man who advocates Universalism denies the doctrine of election, and is a heretic. He should be excluded for heresy and for denying the faith. If Esau represents the flesh, then God hates the flesh of His children. Jacob had flesh, as well as Esau; but God loved Jacob. On this question read the article on page 482 of Editorial Writings, Volume IV Paul tells us plainly in Romans ix. that this was election-not flesh and spirit. To deny this is to deny the Bible. It seems to us that in

some places the church is becoming entirely too loose in her discipline regarding the doctrine the church has always stood for. The devil is evidently working on the inside for the destruction of the church of God and God's doctrine. But there will be a few faithful ones, who will stand for the truth, in every age of the world. But if you want the church to stand in your community, and do not want the candlestick removed, you had better be awake to the situation, and administer the laws the King has given you. "Awake, thou that sleepest." C. H. C.

A Short Trip

---November 16, 1939

We left home Thursday night before the fourth Sunday in September for Tupelo, Miss., where we attended the Tombigbee Association Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. To us it was a wonderful meeting. The preaching was all in the spirit of the Master. Then on the following days, including Thursday, we filled some appointments in the bounds of the New Hope Association, and then on Thursday night in Jackson, Tenn. Friday morning we went with Elder W. A. Bishop to the Mississippi River Association, which met with Mt. Moriah Church, near Friendship, Tenn. The congregation was small on Friday and Saturday, on account of rain. But it was a fine meeting. The following week we filled appointments at West Plains, New Hope, Rutherford, and Union City Churches. Friday morning we went from there to Paducah, with Brother A. E. Luten, to attend the meeting of the Soldier Creek Association, held there. This was a wonderful meeting, yet some sadness on account of the fact that Brother C. K. Hopper was confined upon his bed in affliction. He had counted so much on being in the meeting. The last word we had from him a few days ago he was improving. We trust he may soon be restored to his usual health. May the Lord bless him and his loved ones, is our prayer. From the Soldier Creek we filled appointments at Middle Fork, Puryear, and Harmony. Then to the Greenfield Association, held with Bethel Church, near Fulton, Ky. This was another good meeting. From there we came home, filling an appointment in Memphis Sunday night, arriving home about 2 o'clock Monday morning, finding all as well as usual-the family meeting us at the train. We were glad to see them once again. The meetings were all good and pleasant. Fellowship and love abounds among the brethren in that country. May the Lord help them to continue in peace and love. Let us live right, and the Lord's blessings will follow. We were glad to visit that section once more before we go hence. They were all good and kind to us. We shall not forget your kindness, though we feel unworthy. C. H. C.

Great Body Not Gone

---November 16, 1939

We do not think the great body of Baptists have ever gone astray at once. True, there have been irregularities, and some have departed from the faith; but still "What is Baptist is Scriptural." Troubles have been brought into the church by some failing to follow Christ, and some of us followed the preacher instead of following Christ. But at no time did the great body of Baptists follow the preacher, or preachers, who went wrong. If we follow what is, and has been, recognized as Baptist doctrine and practice all along the line, we think we will be following the Master and His teaching. May the Lord help us all thus to do. Pray the Lord for us, that He will help us to walk in that "good old way" the Lord has directed. C. H. C.

Preaching and Singing Article Number 7

---December 7, 1939

We feel like we should call attention to a few more words in some of our songs which convey a wrong idea, sentiment that is altogether wrong and untrue. Take a serious look at these lines: In fellowship of joys and woes, We'll bear the common strife, And onward press thro' all our foes, And win eternal life. Do we win eternal life by our own efforts? or by pressing onward through all our foes? That is not the way we read our Book. We read in our Book language like this: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." - **(Romans 6:23)**. We are aware of the fact that the apostle said, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." -(Galatians 6:7-8). It is most certainly true that one reaps in and from the same field where the sowing is done. It is also true that one reaps the same thing that he sows. What he sows is multiplied, and he reaps what he sows. This being true, if one reaps everlasting life by sowing to the Spirit, he must have had everlasting life before the sowing was done. That is what one sows, if he sows to the Spirit; and then he reaps what he has sown. Then, it cannot possibly be true that one has to do the sowing in order to procure, or to obtain, or to win, everlasting life. Study this text. Here is another line we wish to call attention to: My nature is so prone to sin, Which makes my duty so unclean, That when I count up all the cost, If not free grace then I am lost. Our duty is what the Lord has required of us. Does the Lord require something unclean? Certainly not. What the Lord requires-what is our duty to do-is clean. But sin is mixed with all we do. Hence, it is our doing that is unclean. Put the word doing in the second line, instead of the word duty, and then you will sing the truth. Here is another instance: Lord, submissive make us go, Gladly leaving all below; Only Thou our leader be, And we still will follow Thee. If the Lord makes us go in the path of duty, in following Him, then we are not going submissively. If we are made to do a thing, it is done against our will, or our will has but little part to play in the matter. We are made to be children of God, and our will has nothing to do with it. But God requires a willing service. "If any man will come after me," etc. "If his offering be a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord." -(Leviticus 1:3). God works in His children to will-not the will, as we have sometimes heard it said; but He works in them to will. God gives them the divine life, and the will springs from the life, and they will to follow Him. Hence, if they render acceptable service, it is a willing service. They serve God because they love His service, and then it is acceptable to Him. Then, let us sing it this way: Lord, submissive we would go, Gladly leaving all below; Only Thou our leader be; And we still will follow Thee. One more we wish to mention in this article, and that is the song titled, "Death Is Only a Dream." There are four stanzas in the song, and they end this way: "And yet 'tis no more than a dream;" "For death is no more than a dream;" "They find it no more than a dream;" "To wake with glad smiles from their dream." If the title of that song, and the last line in each stanza be true, then death is not a reality. A dream is "a series of thoughts, images, or emotions occurring during sleep; any seeming of reality or events occurring to one sleeping," etc. A dream is a seeming reality. If "Death Is Only a Dream," it is only a seeming of reality, and is not a reality. But, according to God's blessed Book, death is an awful reality. Death in sin is a reality. Physical death is a reality. Our loved ones who have gone down into the dark valley went down into an awful reality. Jesus died for our sins. **{(I Corinthians 15:3)}** If that song and the title of

it be true, Jesus only dreamed; it was only a seeming reality! The whole thing is a myth! Nothing but a dream- just an imaginary thing! Lord, help us all to think; help us to study and to consider the teaching of thy Book, and help us to consider what we are setting forth in our songs as well as in our preaching. Lord, help us to "contend earnestly for the faith that was once delivered to the saints." Let us be found "speaking the truth in love" in song as well as in preaching. We may write some more later on. C. H. C.

Holiday Greetings

---December 21, 1939

The holidays will soon be here, and we wish every reader may have a "Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year." May the coming holidays bring joy and gladness to every heart. May the New Year bring renewed hope and courage to you, to last all the whole year through. May many joys be yours, with little sadness and sorrow. We would say no sadness or sorrow; really that is what we wish for you; but we know some sadness comes to each person along life's pathway. We would be glad to send a Christmas card to each one; but we cannot do that, as the cost would be too much for so many; but we can try to express our good wishes for you this way; and we desire this to be a personal message to each reader. May the Lord's richest blessings be yours to enjoy, is our sincere prayer and wish for you. Just here we would suggest a year's subscription to The Primitive Baptist for some poor widow, or to your pastor, or to some afflicted saint, would be a very acceptable and appropriate gift. So, also, would a Bible, or a Testament, or one or more volumes of Editorial Writings. No better gift could be made. Either of these would bring help, and comfort, and joy, and satisfaction to the recipient. If you wish to do something for some person that will be of real help or benefit, consider this suggestion. And may the Lord help us to scatter flowers in the pathway of His children. C. H. C.

Moved To Thornton

---December 21, 1939

Brother M. B. Claggett and daughter, Sister Grace Claggett, have moved to Thornton from Newark, Ohio. Sister Grace will work in our office, and will help the editor and wife with our work. Many things have needed to be done which we have had to allow to go undone because there was more to do than we could possibly get done. We trust that Sister Claggett will be a great help to us in our work in the office, both to the editor and the wife; and we trust that she will also be pleased with her position with us, and will not have cause to regret making the change, and that neither she nor her father will ever have cause to regret moving into our midst. We ask our readers to pray the Lord to bless all our labors to the good of the cause of the Master. C. H. C.

Desire Expressed

---December 21, 1939

This is the last paper to go out in 1939. I wish for each reader the very best of the season's Greetings. In bidding adieu to 1939, and thinking of a few of my many blessings, I feel that my desire and aim for 1940 is: to be more devoted and more loyal, first, to my heavenly Father, then to my family, brethren, sisters and friends. Then, almost instantly, the question arose,

How can one be devoted and loyal to God? Is not some of the ways "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together;" and "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me?" If we are not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together, would we not receive blessings from Him when we assemble in the house of God, to honor and praise His great and holy name? I feel now, and have felt all along, that the dear Lord will meet with us at our church here on January 4, 1940, and that each one present will receive His blessings. The Primitive Baptist, dated January 4, 1940, will be mailed a week late. We wanted to give an account of our meeting in that issue of the paper. In order to do this, the paper will be late. We feel to know that the paper carries a message of cheer, comfort and instruction to many of the Lord's children; yea, to many who are shut-ins on account of afflictions, as well as to those who are well, physically. Then, this being true, is not the paper a help to the Lord's people? Please continue to beg the dear Lord to be "merciful unto us, and bless us; and cause His face to shine upon us." And "O let the nations be glad and sing for joy." "Let the people praise thee, O God; let all the people praise thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase; and God, even our own God, shall bless us." In hope, Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

Will You?

---December 21, 1939

Recently a friend, a wellwisher, of the Primitive Baptists and of The Primitive Baptist paper, while passing through our town, stopped at our office for a few minutes. His conversation, in short, was: "Congratulations, Elder Cayce. The Lord willing, I aim to be at your January meeting. Here is a dollar and a half for the paper to be sent to * * *, a new subscriber. Tell your members that I am not a member of any church, but I want to head the list for each present subscriber to send one new subscription in, and thereby, in a small way, show our appreciation for the long, useful life you have spent and devoted to the cause of the Master." We appreciate our friend's visit, and appreciate his interest in the paper. Do you approve of his suggestion? Will you do as he did-each present subscriber send one new subscription? Will you? Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

Close of Volume 54

---December 21, 1939

We are nearing the end of another year. The closing record of another year's work is now being made. Another volume of The Primitive Baptist is being completed with this issue.. As the obligation to write an article for the close of this volume is presented to us, the feeling comes over us that perhaps our writing along this line has become stale to our readers. While wondering in mind as to what we shall write for the close of volume fifty-four, and that perhaps we have written along the same line each year, for several years past, and that perhaps our expressions have become stale, we thought of the language of the poet (Good Old Songs, No. 365): Since man by sin has gone from God, He seeks creation through, And vainly hopes for solid bliss, In trying something new. Suppose we should find "something new" to write about, would it be worth anything to the readers, or to us? "For all the Athenians and strangers which were there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing." -Acts xvii. 21. These people were worshipers of idols-were idolatrous worshipers. They were always seeking after some new thing. But the poet continues: The new possessed, like fading flowers, Soon loses its gay hue, The bubble now no longer stays, The soul wants something

new. So, if we should find something new to tell our readers, the new thing would soon disappear like a bubble. The same old principles of truth are as good now as they ever were. May we not, then, well apply the fifth stanza to the present situation:

The joy the dear Redeemer gives, Will bear a strict review; Nor need we ever change again, For Christ is always new. History repeats itself. Every year brings its joys and sorrows. There are days and nights in every year, and they average up about the same length. Sometimes the nights are longer than the days; and then the days are longer than the nights; but they follow each other in succession. Some nights are darker than others. Some days are brighter than others. We do not see the sun every day. Sometimes the clouds hide the sun from our view. But the sun is shining behind the clouds, even if we cannot see it at the time. There are some cloudy days, as well as sunshiny days. Without the clouds we would have no rain; and without the rain, the earth would not be watered; the vegetation would wither and perish. After a few cloudy and dismal days we can appreciate the sunshine, and enjoy the sun's pleasant rays. When the sun sets clear we look forward in anticipation of another bright and pleasant day. While we have had some dark days during the past year, we feel that the sun is setting clear in the close of this, another day, and we are hoping that it will rise bright and clear and beautiful in the morning of the year 1940. We bid you a kind farewell, hoping to greet you again in the New Year, the next issue to be dated January 4, 1940. Please bear in mind, however, that the next paper will be sent out a few days late, for the reason given by our dear companion. Pray for us. C. H. C.

END OF VOLUME SIX

1940

Editorial Writings From The Primitive Baptist

January, 1940 - December, 1942

By Elder C. H. Cayce Volume VII 1977

CAYCE PUBLISHING COMPANY THORNTON, ARKANSAS

TO

My Beloved Wife who has untiringly labored with me and for me during these many years, and TO My Dear Children who are so attentive to their poor old father, and TO My Sainted Father and Mother who cared for me when I could not care for myself, and TO My Dear Brethren and Sisters who have been so kind and good to poor me all these years is this and all previous volumes Lovingly Dedicated

PREFACE

We have received many words of endorsement of the previous volumes of our Editorial Writings. We have also had some words of criticism. Every reader has not indorsed everything that each volume contained. We could hardly expect that they should. But we are trying to faithfully reproduce what we said in our editorial writings in The Primitive Baptist during the years since we began the work of trying to edit the paper. Our dear companion insisted for several years that we undertake this work, before we could "muster up the courage" to undertake it. Her opinion was that it would be of benefit to the cause of the Master. This volume, with the previous volumes, will show that our people - the Primitive Baptists - are still standing where they have always stood. They will also show, conclusively, that we have occupied the same ground during all our public life. Some things herein will be of value, from a historical standpoint, in the years to come. If we know our poor heart our desire in the publication of these volumes is the glory of God and the

advancement of His blessed cause, and the benefit of His humble poor. The price we have been selling the books for is clear proof of the fact that the making of money is not the object in view. We desire that the Lord's dear children who are blinded by false teachers may be enabled, by the reading of some of these pages, to see where the true church is, and where the truth may be found. May the blessings of our Lord rest upon the reader, is the humble prayer of The Author.

Introduction to Volume 55

---January 4, 1940

Here we come again, with the same old stale expression, "With this issue we begin another volume of The Primitive Baptist." This issue is the beginning of Volume Fifty-five. Many papers have been started and many have passed out of existence since our father sent out the first issue of The Primitive Baptist; but by the help of the Lord this periodical has continued on through all these years, standing upon the same platform and the same principles upon which it stood from the first. The Abstract of Principles, which appear on another page, which have been in most every issue of the paper from the beginning, were in the first issue, January 1, 1886. The eleventh article was added by our father on January 29, 1900, now forty years ago. That position, as expressed in the eleventh article, was not a new thing, or a new doctrine; but had been held to all along the line. It was a known principle held to by Primitive Baptists all along the line. A few years ago we wrote in an introductory to one of the volumes calling attention to the second article in our Abstract of Principles, calling attention to the fact that this article underlies all the others. Let us quote that second article again here from the Abstract of Principles: That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are a revelation from God, written by inspiration, and that they are the standard of faith, and the only rule divinely authorized for Christian practice, teaching, as they do, all that we ought to believe, know, or practice religiously. This is a well known principle held to by the Primitive Baptists all along the line. If we should contend that we may teach or practice something which the Bible does not teach, we would thereby depart from this fundamental Primitive Baptist teaching and belief. We propose, by the help of the Lord, to continue to stand by and upon that principle during the coming year in the columns of the paper, and so we promise to endeavor to stand upon the same principles we have been contending for during the past. May the Lord help us so to do. If you endorse these principles, will you show it, and help us, by doing what you can to get others to subscribe for The Primitive Baptist? May the Lord bless you, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Double Size

---January 4, 1940

This issue of The Primitive Baptist is twice the regular size. We usually have sixteen pages in an issue, but this issue has thirty-two pages. This was necessary in order to get the full account of our meeting on the same date of this paper, which our companion desired should be in this issue. Our regular readers are aware of the fact that usually the pages of the paper are trimmed at the top and sides. This is not the case with this issue, as our folding machine will not trim a paper of thirty-two pages. Our readers will have to cut the pages apart at the top or sides, or where they need to be cut apart. Of course, we could have done this, perhaps, on another machine, but the time would have delayed still further the sending of the paper to the readers. Besides, the expense would have been most too much. Please

do your own trimming, either with a knife or scissors. The reading will be just the same as if we had trimmed the pages for you, and will be but little trouble to you. We trust that you will enjoy the contents of this issue, and that if you are not already a subscriber, you will send in your subscription right away, and try the paper for a year. May the Lord bless each reader, is our prayer. And please pray the Lord in behalf of the editor and family. C. H. C.

Fiftieth Anniversary

---January 4, 1940

Sometime ago, when I first began to think and plan our January meeting, Elder Cayce said I might have January 4th paper as I wished-that is, I might have "the say" as to what should go in this paper. Therefore my desires were: First, to have his sermon of the first day's meeting in the paper. Fifty years from the time he made his first effort to speak in the name of his Master, in the home of Sister Morris, in Wayne County, Tenn., he preached at our church, Cane Creek, here in Thornton. The discourse was taken down in shorthand by Sisters Grace Claggett, Anice Pilkington, and Gladys Cottle. Then his closing remarks, at the close of the meeting on Sunday, were taken down. Both sermons are in the paper. Second, in his first effort he used the song "Amazing Grace!" and the song was sung to the tune of New Britain. I have heard that song sung in other tunes. So I wanted the song and the same tune in this paper. Third, I wanted you to see just how he works in getting The Primitive Baptist to you. Therefore, we had his picture taken at his desk while he was working on the manuscript for this issue of the paper. The books in the background are the books in his personal library. Fourth, I thought you would like to see a picture of the office, the office force, and the mail bags carrying The Primitive Baptist to you. The mail bags contain December 14, 1939, Primitive Baptist papers. All along, my prayer-if indeed I have ever prayed-has been that the dear Lord would meet with us, and that His sweet presence might be manifested; and each of us feel to know that it was good to be there. I believe many came praying; and many wrote that they could not meet with us, but were begging the dear Lord to be in our midst. Surely He was here, and His sweet presence was felt, and His dear name was glorified, and His children were comforted and edified. Praise God, from whom all blessings flow, Praise Him, all creatures here below. Would you like to know how so many were cared for in such extremely bad weather? Well, that was easy. No burden, only a pleasure. Meals were served at our home. The oldest and most feeble ones were seated at a long table. Others were served cafeteria style. After filling their plates, the house was theirs to find as comfortable place as possible to eat. Every one present seemed to have plenty and enjoyed themselves. At night, the crowd was slept in different homes. Many letters and telegrams were received containing word pictures of appreciation and well wishes. They were appreciated by Elder Cayce and all of us. We trust you will enjoy this issue of the paper, and each and every issue of this year. Please continue to remember us in prayer. Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

Kind Remembrances

---January 4, 1940

The editor and family have been the happy recipients of many kind remembrances during the holidays. Many beautiful cards and many nice and valuable presents have been sent and given to us. We feel to be unworthy of such manifestations and expressions of Christian love and sweet fellowship. While it is true we have trials to

endure, and hard things come our way that have to be encountered and endured, yet such manifestations of Christian love and fellowship give us renewed strength and courage to continue to press onward in the strife to serve the Lord and His humble followers while He lets us stay in this old world. Such things bring us sweet comfort and consolation. May the Lord bless each one who has so kindly and lovingly remembered us, is our humble prayer. Please let this be a personal note to each one of you. And please pray the Lord to give us strength and courage for the battles of life which may confront us in this New Year of our Lord, 1940. Editor and Family.

A Tribute to Elder Cayce (1 of 2)

---January 4, 1940

Remembering, as we do, that on January 4, 1940, Elder Cayce will have completed his fifty years in the ministry, and feeling that he well deserves a word of praise, we have composed this little poem to be published in the paper, which also is published on the above date: Fifty years ago today, When our brother was a youth, He entered into the Master's service, As a herald of His truth. It was early in the morning He began this truth to tell; He has served his Master faithful; He has served Him long and well. He has gone throughout the nation Bearing tidings for the poor; He has preached a full salvation; He has made his calling sure. It can be said of our dear brother, As it was of Paul of old, He has fought a good warfare, And the truth he's never sold. He has met the wise and noble To defend the Lord's great cause; After fifty years of labor, He deserves this little applause. He has been a little David, With the smooth stones in his hand; He has conquered many a foe Before his face they could not stand. Oft he has gone away from home, Leaving his loved ones all behind, To serve the Lord, whom he loves, And who to him has been so kind. We hope he still has many years In which to preach the truth, That is as precious to him now As when he was a youth. And when his work on earth is done, And he no more this truth can tell, May he be resigned to the Father's will, And say, "My Jesus hath done all things well." J. H. Keaton.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY MEETING

Commemorating the Fifty Years of Service in the Ministry by Elder C. H. Cayce Held at Thornton, Ark., Jan. 4, 1940 January 4, 1940 Elder Cayce: It is impossible for me to express my feelings on this occasion. I wish to say, before we proceed any farther, those of us who are at home understand that I am the moderator of the church here, Elder Harris frequently being elsewhere on our regular meeting time; but I am glad that Brother Harris is with us and expects to be with us during this meeting, and I trust that I rightly appreciate (I don't know that I do, but I trust that I do rightly appreciate) the fact that Macedonia Church, which Brother Harris serves, dismissed their meeting at this time, Saturday and Sunday next, on account of this special meeting, and Brother Harris being with us; and as I know that it will be satisfactory with the church, I am going to ask Elder Harris to act and serve as moderator pro tem during this meeting. I believe I will make it not only for today and tomorrow, during this special meeting, but throughout the entire meeting for the four days and three nights. It is not announced that we would have services Sunday night. So I am going to ask Brother Harris to take charge of the meeting as moderator. It is a cross to me to serve as moderator or pastor of the church at any time, but I just couldn't in this meeting. To see this gathering here

this morning, notwithstanding the unfavorable weather conditions, and the different states that are represented here today, I don't know just how to say what I feel. What is it all about, anyhow? What is it for? Why should such an assembly be gathered from all these states here today on the fiftieth anniversary of my first effort to speak in the name of the Master? What has that service amounted to? And why should such a gathering be? I do not know whether I can do anything more during this meeting than to say what few words I have said. I am going now to leave the matter in the hands of Brother Harris as moderator. Of course, I understand the arrangement is for me to preach the first discourse of the meeting. I understand that. Elder Harris: I wish to make this statement, that I feel glad indeed to meet all the precious Old Baptists from different parts at this time; and so far as being appointed moderator of this meeting, I would have been glad if someone else had been appointed for this place, because I do not know whether I know exactly how to conduct this meeting as it should be or not. Of course, the arrangements are, as we all know, or most of us know, Brother Cayce is to preach the introductory sermon, and I just feel that we ought to give him the privilege, if he desires to, to have someone to introduce for him, to make the selection among the brethren to suit himself. Go ahead, Brother Cayce. Brother Cayce: As I said a moment ago, I do not know how to express my feelings. I want to read a few lines from a hymn that I believe comes as near expressing my feelings as I know how to find language to express them. I am not going to use that as an introductory hymn, but I wish to read a few words from it-No. 491: Poor, weak and worthless tho' I am, I have a rich, Almighty Friend; Though I feel my weakness and my poverty this morning, this assembly is assurance to me that I do have a rich, Almighty Friend, who has been so good to me all these years and gives me a place in the hearts of this great people gathered from the different states of our nation. Jesus, the Saviour, is His name- He freely loves, and without end. If that were not true, His love to me, a poor sinner, would have ceased before today. He ransomed me from hell with blood, And by His power my foes controlled. And I know I have had them (foes) all these years. He found me wandering far from God And brought me to His chosen fold. He cheers my heart, my want supplies, And says that I shall shortly be, Enthroned with Him above the skies- O what a Friend is Christ to me. I will never have another fiftieth anniversary of my service, and today my mind goes back to the time and place where I made the first effort; and as far as my knowledge extends, there is just one person living today who was present and heard that first effort, and that person is Elder G. L. Pilkington, sitting over there, present here. That was in Wayne County, Tenn. A few years ago, traveling along the highway with my family, we stopped at the place. We went in and viewed the spot where I stood. On that occasion it fell to my lot to introduce the service and then to try to talk. I did not consume much time in my talk. The song that I used was No. 294. In that day the custom was to read two lines of the hymn and then sing those two lines, and then read another two lines and sing those two lines, until they got through. That is what they called "lining the hymn." However, I will say here (parenthetically) that the Primitive Baptists in that age were not the only people who did that. I presume the custom got started on the account of the scarcity of books. Nearly all of you have books here today and it would not be necessary on account of the scarcity of books to sing this song like they did then- two lines at a time-but as this is in commemoration of that service that I endeavored to engage in in the beginning of my ministry, fifty years ago, I want you to sing this song that way. I want to line it for you, and then you sing those two lines when I shall have read them; when you sing those two lines I will read two more, then you sing that way until you get through. Now you are not accustomed to that. When you sing through two lines, do not forget and run on.

But when you sing the two lines, you stop. Fifty years ago that song was a favorite of mine. The sentiment expressed in that hymn was the very sentiment of my heart, and that same thing is true today, as I stand before you. Please sing as I line. (Congregation sang Amazing Grace.) As already stated, fifty years ago it fell to my lot and it was placed upon me to introduce the service. I used that hymn and tried to spend a few moments in prayer. My feeling then was that I would much rather someone else had offered the prayer. That is my feeling now. I would rather hear any of these brethren pray. I feel that I need their prayers; but to endeavor to hold this service as that was held fifty years ago, I will take the burden. I have been a burden-bearer fifty years. Sometimes it is sweet to bear the burden; sometimes it seems the burden is too great, but in bearing the burden and carrying it, I have found along the way sweet rest and peace. Will you bow with me while I try to spend a moment in prayer, and you try to pray while I do? PRAYER Holy, thrice holy, art thou, the great all-wise Creator of all things that are created, and who up-holdeth all things created by the word of thy power; supremely great, superlatively good, transcendently glorious; if we are not deceived in our poor hearts this morning, we desire to come before thee in gratitude and thankfulness to thy great, matchless and adorable name for every expression of thy love and mercy, and continual forbearance with us all along the pathway of life. Thy mercies have followed us all these many years, and we have never seen an end of thy goodness. We thank thee, heavenly Father, that thou hast cared for us and brought us from infancy to youth and to manhood and womanhood and some of us to old age. Thou hast cared for us when we could not, and did not, care for ourselves. Thy loving kindness has followed us all the days of our lives. We confess, heavenly Father, that notwithstanding the multitude of thy mercies, that we are unworthy, of ourselves considered, the least of thy favors. We confess our sinfulness, our forgetfulness, our waywardness, our many sins and transgressions that we have committed against thee all the days of our lives, but notwithstanding our sinfulness and forgetfulness, thou hast never been forgetful or unmindful of us. We thank thee, heavenly Father, for the unspeakable gift of thy dear Son, who came into this world a man of sorrows, acquainted with grief, who took upon Himself all the sins of thy dear people, bore them in His own body on the tree of the cross and put them away by the sacrifice of Himself. We thank thee, heavenly Father, that thou didst, in the years gone by give us in our hearts to realize the hatefulness of sin and the depravity of our hearts, the corruption of our hearts, and that thou didst lead us gently along to try our efforts in our own deliverance, and that thou ledest us to realize for ourselves that all our efforts were a failure. We thank thee, heavenly Father, that in the moment of despair, when all hope seemed to be gone, that thou didst then reveal thyself to us and manifest thyself to us as our Redeemer, our Saviour, and by thy grace gave us a good hope, through grace, of a home beyond this vale of sorrow and tears. We thank thee, heavenly Father, that, if we are not deceived, we find in our poor hearts a love for thy people, a love for thy cause, and for thy blessed truth. We thank thee, heavenly Father, for the sweet fellowship of thy people, and for their company and association, and that we are counted worthy to have a name with this, thy people, and have been permitted all these years to have a home and resting place with them. We thank thee, heavenly Father, that thou hast preserved us through these years and kept us to this good day, and that we have the privilege-the blessed heaven-given, blood-bought privilege -of assembling together on this day in this place from so many different parts of the country. We trust, heavenly Father, that our only aim is to glorify thee. If there is one in this assembly that has come to this place to glorify man, Lord grant to remove that desire from their hearts. We must confess, if one is permitted to speak for all in divine presence, individually or personally, of ourselves, we are

nothing in thy sight. There is nothing in man to glory in; but help us, Father, to glory in thee and in the cross of Christ Jesus and to praise thy name and to bless thy holy name that we have been counted fit, through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, our Saviour, to go and continue in thy service during these years. Lord, help us and keep us what few days we have to live in the world. Lord, bless us, that thy hand may lead us, thy power restrain us, thy love constrain us, in thy blessed service, who are endeavoring to unite thy people in sweet peace and fellowship and love while we live in this world. We pray thy blessings to rest upon this assembly, individually and collectively. Thou knowest our hearts and thoughts. Thou knowest what we need better than we ourselves.

Some of us may be separated by many miles from loved ones. We pray thy protecting care to be thrown about them, and fill the absence of loved ones with thy holy presence and permit each one to return to loved ones at home and find them enjoying sweet peace and communion with thee. We beg thee, heavenly Father, that this meeting may be one long remembered. Go with us through the journey of life; stand close by us in death, and in death receive our departing spirits unto thyself in glory; watch over our sleeping dust until the morning of the resurrection. In mercy grant that in that morning these mortal bodies may be raised from the dead, made immortal, fashioned like the body of Christ, through the merits of the blood of Jesus Christ, where and when we trust we shall be divinely elemented, permitted, qualified, and capacitated to sing praise perfectly to thy name in all the ceaseless ages of eternity. These mercies, blessings and favors we trust we ask in Jesus' name and for His sake. And Amen.

SERMON

Fifty years ago this day when I made the first effort to speak in the name of the Master, the ministers present were my father, Elder S. F. Cayce, Elder J. P. Pilkington, father of our Brother Pilkington here, and Elder M. L. Rhodes. They are now trying the reality of the truthfulness of the doctrine that I have tried to preach during these years. At that time I loved the doctrine of grace. My only hope of ever enjoying the glory of the heavenly world was alone in the grace of God, and that is all I have now. I will have to ask you to be as patient with me as you can while I try to talk to you. I do not know how long I shall talk, nor how soon I shall quit; but, of course, I cannot help but see these stenographers before me to take down the words that I speak, and this in compliance with the wish of that good woman, that good wife, who has labored with me and for me and been a help to me these years, and who loves the cause that you love, and who labors for the cause many a night when most of you are asleep. For the benefit of the Lord's children scattered over the country she wanted this discourse to be published in *The Primitive Baptist*, which was due to have been mailed out this week. The regular time of our publication date, Thursday, January 4, is just fifty years from the day that I made the first effort to speak in the name of the Master. She wanted this discourse to be put in that paper, delaying mailing the paper out for a few days in order that this be done. Now it may be that it is a pity I did not study up and have outlined a "good discourse" to deliver on this occasion, when I might have had time to read it over after writing it, so I might correct the language and the sentences, and as far as possible have every sentence in it correct from a grammatical standpoint, and all the sentences well rounded, but I have not done that. For several days, I have, of course, been thinking about this occasionally, and wondering what in the world will I do? what will I say? and what course shall I pursue? I expected brethren to be here from different states, and feel so thankful to see them, and that they are here.

I feel like, if the Lord would help me, I ought to use the same text I used fifty years ago in the beginning of my ministerial labor; and yet, when I, in my mind, look around over the country in different directions and see the conditions that exist, and how many things that should be spoken about and presented and considered by our people as a body, should I pursue that course? What should I do? But my mind is to read to you the same text I used fifty years ago, and you will find it recorded in the eighth and ninth verses of the second chapter of Paul's letter to the church at Ephesus: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." That is text enough for a discourse all right, and I suppose I am not going to have the opportunity of preaching another time in this meeting. I must say my say at this time, if the Lord will help me. I do not expect, in the time I occupy, to bring out and enlarge upon every point that is embraced in this language. If I had spent all these fifty years in preaching right on this text and the direct connection with it in this chapter, I should not yet have been able to have told it all. It would take eternity to do that, and that has no end; so it will never all be told. In this, notice, please, just three words in the beginning of the language, "For by grace." "By grace." There is something here which the apostle is just about to mention and bring out, which he knows and most positively and emphatically declares to be by grace. Now it is either by grace, or it is not by grace- one way or the other. Fifty years ago I believed and tried to preach it in that first effort that this was something that was by grace. Now I do not believe that, and have not believed it during these years, just to be peculiar or just to be different from somebody else. The reason I believed that the salvation here mentioned by the apostle was by grace was because I had learned it to be so by experience. Before having experienced the truthfulness of this for myself, I thought I believed that salvation was by grace. When people would talk in my presence about how sinners were saved in heaven, and would tell me there was something the sinner had to do in order to reach heaven, and enjoy heaven, I would say, "I think you are mistaken." I had in my possession a little pocket Testament which my sainted father gave to me. I have it today in my library, and intended to bring it with me, but forgot it. I read that Testament some, and if I am not very much mistaken this text may be found marked in that little Testament that I read and marked in my childhood days. I thought I believed that the, sinner was saved by grace, and yet when I would think of myself and how I should ever reach heaven and immortal glory, while I thought I believed salvation was by grace, yet I thought there was something I had to do. That was what I thought about myself-something I had to do; there was something I must do in order that I ever be saved in heaven by grace. I learned by experience that all that I could do, that I might do, that others might do for me, would never, never, never bring me to where the Lord would save me. At the age of eight years, one night when all the family had retired, suddenly, unexpectedly, unlooked for, and undesired by me, I realized that I was a poor, lost sinner, ruined and undone. So great was the trouble that came over me that I burst into a flood of tears, and father, who had retired across the room on his bed, said, "Son, what is the matter with you? What are you crying about?" I made him no answer. He got up from his bed and came to my bedside; leaning over my little body, he said, "What is the matter? Papa wants to know what is bothering my boy? What hurts you?" I said, "I am a poor, lost, ruined sinner. If you can, I wish you would pray for me." Time after time, father would call the family around the fireside, read to us something in God's good Book, go down on his knees in prayer to God, and always father would remember to mention before God and to God in his prayer the poor sinful boy. That failed me. Many times in the dark hours of night, when others were wrapped in silent slumber, that sainted old mother who so

many times, in this building, before it was moved here, when we had a little church over at Fordyce, occupied that seat, Sister Keaton, where you are, over against the wall-many times in the dark hours of night when everybody was asleep but mother, and she thought I was asleep, she came to my bedside. I could feel the tender touch of mother's loving hand when she came to see if all was well with her boy and she thought I was asleep, and she would kneel down on the floor by my bedside and pray to God in behalf of her poor boy. I know by experience something of what it is to feel and to know and have the assurance of a mother's love and care. I know you mothers pray for your children. I know you do. Every other friend in the world may forsake the child, but the good mother never will; but yet, instead of this poor boy feeling like Jesus was my Saviour, I sank deeper in despair. Mother prayed for me and father prayed for me and the Lord did not hear. He did not save me; I was a lost sinner. If ever saved, how can I be saved? Just one answer -by grace. By grace, not through my own efforts or labors. Oh, I tried that. Sometimes when the neighbors would be in our home I would hear a neighbor man, for instance, talking to my father. They did not know I was hearing, and I wasn't trying to eavesdrop, but I was close enough to hear; and I would sometimes hear some neighbor man speaking to my father about his boy. They would say, "Claud is a good boy. I wish my boys were as good as your boy." That would make me go away in some secluded place feeling that "They do not know. Their boys are open and above board in the things they do, yet they are not so wicked or lawbreaking, but my heart is as wicked as theirs, and in addition to that I am only a hypocrite, making them believe I am something and am nothing." Poor sinner; lost. "I will do better. I am going to live in such a way as to merit the praise that they bestow. I am going to do better, so as to have assurance from the Lord that Jesus is my Saviour." Did I get better? If I did, I could not tell it. It might be illustrated by the poor woman who had an issue of blood for twelve years, and spent all her living on physicians of this world, and grew no better, but rather grew worse and worse, until the blessed Jesus came that way, and by His Spirit and the virtue that was in Him was she healed. I grew worse in every effort. Now I am speaking from personal experience, my own feelings in the matter; every effort I made-asking preachers to pray for me; mother's prayers, and father's prayers, and all that-I just sank deeper in despair. Each time there was one less thing left to trust in until they were all gone-nothing left. My own prayers and the prayers of others had failed; and then, unexpectedly and un-looked for, somehow that burden left, and I believed then that salvation is by grace. I knew that if I should ever be landed safely on the sunny shores of eternal bliss, it was alone, wholly and solely, by the grace and mercy of God. Now I have tried to talk to you a little from an experimental standpoint. I want to look at this from another standpoint. "For by grace are ye saved." I might put in a little time in talking about the word ye. Just two letters in that little word ye. That, we understand, is a personal pronoun and refers to persons -persons addressed; people like we are, folks, sinners of Adam's race. By grace are you-you-saved. Oh, that brings it home to us individually, personally- you. "By grace are ye saved." Let me tell you that it is the height of folly-and I might even use rougher language than that-not only the height of folly, but I believe I will say, stark naked ignorance, if you will excuse the expression, to say the pronoun ye, in that text, means anything else other than sinners of Adam's race, persons, sinners of Adam's race. You are saved, not something else saved. He was not talking about something being saved that is not a sinner of Adam's race. "Ye are saved." If ye are saved, you are not only a child of Adam, but you are also, at the same time, a child of God, "a child of Jehovah, a subject of grace, of the seed royal, a dignified race." You, you, have been taken out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in the Lord Jesus Christ -and that is not something you did for

yourself; you did not climb out; you did not, by your strength, hang on to something that somebody sent down to you, and another human being raised you out-not that-but you have been brought out by the work of the Spirit of God, the Spirit of God coming in contact with your spirit, and thus imparting to you a higher order of life, raising you up out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in the Lord Jesus Christ. How is that done? By grace. "By grace are ye saved." Let me give you what I one time heard a colored preacher say; he quoted this text (and he had the negro brogue all right); he said: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God!" it is a "gift," not a "git." I said "thank you." The salvation in this text is "by grace" and it is the gift of God. It is not something that you get by your efforts and labors, but it is God's gift to you. In connection with this, let me read the twenty-third verse of the sixth chapter of Paul's letter to the church at Rome: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." What does the word wages mean? Now, if I am mistaken about it, when I tell you my idea of what it means, I will thank you to correct me. I think the word wages means that is what you get for what you do. Isn't that it? Wages means something you get for what you do. What is sin? I think it was John who said: "Sin is the transgression of the law." Isn't that John's language? What is sin, then? That is something that you do; it is something that we have done; and it is something that we still do. It is the transgression of the law-God's law-that is sin. That is what we have done; that is what we do. Do you get anything for that? Yes, you get paid for it. "The wages of sin is death." That is what you get for what you do, and that is one side of the question. What is the other side? "But the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." I heard an old darky say, one time, concerning that expression, "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord;" "That means by grace; God gives it to you; it is free, gratis, for nothing, and besides that, you don't have to pay for it." "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." A good friend one time said to me: "Elder Cayce, you certainly must be wrong and mistaken in your idea that what we do has nothing whatever to do with our reaching heaven, that it is all by grace and nothing that we do has to do with that." I said, "Well, I may be wrong. If I am, I want to be right." I said, "Is it your idea that if I don't do something, I will go to the bad place?" He said, "Yes, that is it, exactly." "Then, your idea is, in order that I go to heaven, the good place, I have to do something." "Yes, that's exactly right." I said, "Well, I may be wrong and you may be right; but if I understand you and what you have said to me in regard to my own case, I suppose if it is true in my case, it is true of every other person in the world?" He said, "Yes." "Then, if I understand you, in my case, if I do nothing I go to the bad place." "That's right." "Then in order to go to heaven, I have got to do something. Then, I understand, it is your idea that salvation is by works and damnation is by grace." He said, "What?" I said, "It seems to me that if I do nothing I would go to the bad place, that would be damnation by grace; and if, in order to go to heaven, I have got to do something, that is salvation by works. Is that what you believe?" He said: "Lord, have mercy!" I said, "You do not seem to agree with Paul. Paul said, 'The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.' That is damnation by works and salvation by grace; but you have it salvation by works and damnation by grace. You do not agree with Paul." He said, "Look here, Cayce, I guess Paul was right." I said, "Paul and I agree; then if Paul was right, and I agree with him, salvation is by grace. 'For by grace are ye saved through faith.'" If there has ever been a time in all my life of these fifty years of service in the Master's kingdom that I should be so candid and sincere, is it not today, above every day that is in the past?-Honest, candid and sincere in that which I present. Certainly it looks that way to me. I am nearing the

end of the way. I am nearing the end of the journey. I will not serve another fifty years-won't live long enough to do that. I do not know how long all you brethren in the ministry have been serving. If there is one present who has been trying to preach the unsearchable riches of the Master for as long as fifty years, will you please raise your hand? Is there one here? I see no hand go up. I have been longer in the ministry than any of you. You know I am very far down on the western side of the hill, and if one should be candid and sincere and plain, does it not look like it would be when I can realize I am coming near the end of the way? Now, if I should refer to something that is contradictory to the viewpoint held by any of you, our brethren, friends or neighbors, let me say it is in all kindness and love; and I realize, if possible, more than ever, in all these years, the great responsibility that rests upon me to present the truth, as I see it, and as God's blessed Book teaches it to me, and as I have learned it by experience along life's way, of which I have been speaking to you already, and shall not go back and rehearse that. Notice, now, the reading of our text, "For by grace are ye saved" - not by grace are ye brought into a state whereby you may be saved, "but by grace are ye saved" -not by grace that an effort was made to save you; not by grace that the way of salvation was opened up; but "by grace are ye SAVED." I wish I could emphasize that and sound it out so loud that it might be heard to earth's remotest bounds and sink deep in the heart of every child of grace and every lover of God in this wide world. "By grace are ye saved." Do not forget that, please. But, I remember once, when I was a lad of a boy, hearing two men in discussion, in a public debate, and one of them quoted this text-that is, the eighth verse. He did not quote the ninth, but quoted the eighth verse, or part of it, this way: "For by grace are ye saved through faith, and faith is the act of the creature." That is the way he quoted it. That was in Kentucky, when I was just a lad of a boy; I remember it very well. That was before I ever joined the church, and I remember so well what came into my mind when he used that language. I thought, "Now you have fixed it, haven't you!" He said faith is the act of the creature. We do no violence to language, we do no violence to the Bible or its teaching, if we take a word, or expression, or clause, out of a sentence and put in place of it the true meaning of the word, expression, or clause, removed. "For by grace are ye saved." What is grace? A short definition of it is, "a favor bestowed upon unworthy or undeserving characters - an unmerited favor bestowed upon undeserving or unworthy characters." "By an unmerited favor are ye saved." You were undeserving; you were unworthy; you deserved nothing good from the hand of the great God of the universe. What we really deserved was everlasting banishment from His peaceful presence. "By an unmerited favor are ye saved" -not banished from His presence, but delivered from everlasting destruction, from everlasting banishment from the presence of God, by an unmerited favor. "By an unmerited favor are ye saved through the act of the creature." If faith is the act of the creature, we do no violence to take the word faith out and put act of the creature in its stead. "By an unmerited favor are ye saved through the act of the creature; and that not of yourselves, but it is through the act of the creature; it is the gift of God, but it is through the act of the creature; not of works, but it is through the act of the creature." What kind of a mixture of language would we have in that? The very language, in itself, is such a conglomerated mess, if you will excuse the expression, that as ignorant as some say Old Baptists are, we know better than that; and if the Old Baptists, in their ignorance, can see the folly of it, does it not look like smart folks ought to see it? "By an unmerited favor are ye saved through the act of the creature; not of works, but it is through the act of the creature; it is the gift of God, but it is through the act of the creature." Do you know that won't work? Some years ago, when I lived in Tennessee, there were three men who conducted a meeting in a county over there, not in the same county

I lived in, but near by, in another county. Three men held the meeting. One of them did the praying, another did the singing, and another did the preaching. In that meeting one of them said: "I stole one soul the devil thought he had," when someone made a "profession." When the meeting was over a fellow living in the community brought out a new translation of our text. One of those men was named Potts; another was named Droke; another was named Franklin. The translation the young man gave us of **(Ephesians 2:8-9)**, was: "For by Potts are ye saved through Droke; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of Franklin." I thought this translation suited the occasion very well. Let me give you a translation to suit modern theology -the doctrine the gentleman I referred to advocated in my case, that I, in doing nothing, would go down to the bad place, and that in order to go to heaven I had something to do. I will read the text to harmonize with that doctrine: "For by works are ye saved through the act of the creature; and that of yourselves: for it is not the gift of God: for it is by works: therefore let every man boast all he can." It seems to me that if salvation is a matter of works, something accomplished by my efforts and my labors, and I have attained to salvation thereby, that the language would have to read something like that. Instead of that, the apostle has it, by the moving power of the Spirit of God, just as it is. He was moved by the Spirit to write what he penned down in the original language: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." But let us notice that from another standpoint- the standpoint of faith. The world has it that it is by grace through faith, and that unless we exercise faith we can never attain to that saving, or that salvation. Now, I have heard that-I am not misrepresenting anybody. Of course, if you do not think that way I am not talking about you. I am talking about the fellow who told me that you must exercise faith, and that unless you exercise faith, then you cannot attain to that saving. "It is through faith, and so one must exercise the faith." I turn over to another statement made by this same inspired writer, and I find this language recorded in his letter to the Hebrews: "For all men have not faith." Now in that expression he does not, to my mind, convey the idea that no man has faith, but there are some who do not have faith. Question, please: As there are some men who do not have faith, and some men who do have faith, what is the difference between those men who have not faith and those men who have faith? There must be a difference. Now what is that difference? Certainly there is a difference; and as some men do not have faith, please tell us what class of men those are who do not have faith. Well, they are unregenerate sinners. That is what is the matter; but they must exercise faith in order to obtain eternal salvation. But the sinner does not have faith to exercise. Now please tell me how under heaven a person is going to exercise something that he is not in possession of? Suppose this brother (pointing to a brother) has his right arm cut off at the shoulder. He is destitute of a right arm; but I say to him, "Exercise your right arm; exercise your right arm, I tell you." Do you think it would be possible for him to exercise his right arm, seeing he has no right arm? In order that he be able to exercise his right arm, he must be in possession of a right arm before he can exercise that right arm. In order to exercise his right arm, he must have a right arm, and then exercise his right arm. It is too late then to exercise his right arm in order to attain the end designed; the end is reached when the arm is bestowed and given to him. Now since it is impossible for him to exercise his right arm, when he has no right arm to exercise, if his home in heaven depended on it, would it not be a foregone conclusion, and an absolute certainty, that heaven he could not see? It closes heaven's door forever against that man who is destitute of a right arm, if he must exercise the right arm in order to salvation. All right; I take the other matter, and I come to this man who is destitute of faith and I tell him that his home in heaven

depends upon him exercising faith. Suppose I tell him, "Unless you exercise faith, heaven you can never see; you are doomed to everlasting punishment and banishment from the presence of God, and to suffer everlasting burning, unless you exercise faith," and he does not have it to exercise, would that not make salvation a matter of absolute impossibility to that man, and close heaven's door against all the race of Adam? They are in a state of unregeneracy and it makes heaven a matter of impossibility for them. Talk about a hard doctrine! I am glad salvation is not like that. I am glad it does not depend upon that. I am glad the apostle says, "By grace are ye saved through faith." Somebody might say, "You are denying faith; what do you say it is?" All right; I think that is a fair question, a fair demand. There is nothing unfair about that, not a thing; and so I shall endeavor, for a little while now, to tell you about that. I go to God's Book and I find where Paul says, again in his letter to the Hebrews, I believe the eleventh chapter and first verse, "Now faith is;" he tells us what it is. As sure as heaven is happy, as Elder Hopper used to say, Paul tells us what it is; we won't have to guess at what faith is when we read that. What do you think about it? "Faith is;" and notice that the word is, that is an ever present truth. He did not say faith was; he did not say faith will be, but faith is. It was so when he said it, and there has never been a second of time from then to now it was not that way; it is still that way, and it will be that way when this old world comes to an end; "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Let us examine this text. Paul here gives us two things which faith is—one is "the evidence of things not seen;" When you were given a good hope through grace, perhaps in your childhood days, or in youth, the blessed evidence was brought into your heart that Jesus is your Saviour. "Evidence of things not seen;" the blessed evidence was given you in your very soul that there is a better place over yonder, there is a better home beyond this vale of sorrows and tears, and that when you are done with all afflictions incident to this life you shall share the glories of that home. "Evidence of things not seen;" you cannot see that home; you have evidence of it, that there is something better over yonder. You can't see it, but you have the evidence of it. Having the evidence of it, sweet hope springs up in your heart. Then that hope is made up of expectation and desire. Somehow, from that time back yonder, maybe you can't remember when, expectation sprang up in your heart of something better; expectation of something better was yours. Then you began to look out in hope, hops, hope. "We are saved by hope; but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." Hope is made up of expectation and desire. Sometimes I hear people say, "I hope this, and I hope that," when they have no hope for it in the world, for they are not expecting it. In my youthful days I hoped that some day I would be wealthy in the goods of this world. I expected it, and I desired it; but I have lost that hope. That hope has been destroyed—not that I have lost the desire. I wish I had a million dollars to put in the cause of my Master. And let me tell you, brethren, if I know my heart, I love the cause of my Saviour, and I thank God for the privilege and blessing of putting into this meeting everything I shall put into it; it does my heart good. I am glad to have you in my home. I am glad for you to sleep in my home, eat at my table, eat up everything you can find there. I want to tell you it is free. I want that, but I am not expecting to be rich. I have the desire all right, but I am not expecting it; hence I am not hoping for it. I have lost the expectation; hence, my hope is lost. "If we hope for that we see not." The blessed evidence is given us, and so we expect something better beyond. And that divine life which God has implanted in your soul is the fountain from which the desire springs. So there is the desire and expectation. Then you are hoping, and with patience wait for it. Now there is faith, the evidence of things not seen—that blessed evidence that came to

you, perhaps years ago. Sometimes you want more evidence. "Lord, increase our faith." That is what some said in ancient days; and I have sometimes thought I have had the same desire they had, as expressed in that language. "Increase our faith." Give me more evidence, more evidence, and more evidence to strengthen my hope, and, like the line in the song, "His word my hope secures." I believe that is the way it reads. Now that does not mean that the hope secures His promise, but His promise secures the hope; it makes it sure. That hope is based on the promise of God, and you rest on that; and I am willing to risk His promise-blessed assurance, blessed hope, blessed evidence of things not seen. But that is not all. The apostle told us that faith is the substance of things hoped for. Sub is a Latin prefix which means under. Stance is from the Latin sto, which means to stand. Substance, then, is something which stands underneath. Now let us read our text, "By an unmerited favor are ye saved through the evidence of things not seen; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." "By an unmerited favor are ye saved through the substance of things hoped for; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Now let me read it again, "By grace are ye saved through something which stands underneath: and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Oh! what is it that stands underneath? Faith, in the sense of our text, is something that stands underneath. What is it that stands underneath? Let me ask the poor tempest-tossed pilgrim here in the world-let me ask you- What is it that stands underneath you? What is it that has stood underneath you along life's way? What is it that has held you up and sustained you in your afflictions, in your sorrows, in your troubles, in your distresses, even in soul sorrow? "My soul," Jesus said, "is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." The worst suffering a poor mortal knows is soul suffering. Oh, what is it that has stood underneath you and held you up? What is it? Can you not answer, "The hand of the Lord Jesus has been underneath me, I trust, all these years, and has held me up, and sustained me, and kept me to this good hour." Jesus says, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." His hand is underneath, to uphold and sustain them all along life's uneven pathway. "By an unmerited favor are ye saved through the hand of Jesus Christ," who will bring you at last unto His Father in eternal glory. "Grace, grace unto it." Is it any wonder the poet wrote language like this: Grace, 'tis a charming sound, Harmonious to the ear! Heav'n with the echo shall resound, And all the saints shall hear. Grace first contrived the way To save rebellious man; And all the steps that grace display Which drew the wondrous plan. Grace first inscribed my name In God's eternal Book; 'Twas grace that gave me to the Lamb, Who all my sorrows took. Grace led my roving feet To tread the heavenly road, And new supplies each hour I meet While pressing on to God. Grace taught my soul to pray, And made mine eyes o'erflow; 'Twas grace that kept me to this day, And will not let me go. Grace all the work shall crown, Through everlasting days; It lays in heaven the topmost stone, And well deserves the praise. Brethren, that doctrine of grace shows how a man is degraded and is abased; but it exalts and honors God; and I love Him for His grace. I love Him because He has done so much for me. "Oh, how I love Jesus, because He first loved me." I now conclude. I do not know how long I have been standing before you; but grace, the doctrine of grace, and the praise of God for His grace, has been my meat and drink for these fifty years. If this should be the last discourse that I ever deliver in this world - and I know that soon I am going to deliver the last one-I want to tell you I am willing to risk it; I am willing to go into the dark regions of death relying upon His grace. It is by grace: "not of works, lest any man should boast." "Nothing in my hand I bring;" I am just a poor sinner saved by the grace of God. I love every child of God, because I believe he

will reach heaven, and be saved in heaven by God's grace. You may not see everything as I do. If the doctrine of grace does not embrace me, I am gone-I am ruined. No other way will ever reach a sinner like me. Remember me in your prayers. The Lord has been good to me these years. I am not worthy of this. If I could illustrate to you how much I amount to, as near as I know how, it would be this way: If I had a blackboard here, and I write on the blackboard a zero or cipher, I ask you what that is? You would say, "nothing." Well, I am less than that, of myself considered. How can I get that illustrated on this blackboard? That zero is nothing. Then, I, myself considered, am less than that. How in the world can I show on the blackboard how that is? The only way I know how is to rub the zero out. Soon I am going to be rubbed out. When I am gone, this old world will continue. The sun will continue to rise in the east and set in the west. The stars will continue to shine in the heavens, and the old church will move on, and God will have somebody in the world to bear witness to the blessed truth of the doctrine of grace. I want it to be where my children can get it and enjoy it. Oh, how good the Lord has been to me. He has put it in the heart of my oldest boy to come to the church and ask for a home with us, and I believe-Oh, children, may I tell it on you? The good Lord has so wonderfully blessed me as to touch the heart of everyone of my children. I believe He has; I believe every one of them has been touched in their hearts with the finger of God. The Lord has been good to me, and merciful to me. "Grace, grace unto it." "Grace upon grace;" grace all along the line. I want to serve Him because He has been so gracious to me and so good to me. I want to see my children come home. I want to see every child of grace come into the old church; then I want to see them trying to live in a way to honor God when they get in there. That is my desire. May the Lord bless you. I could talk all day and not get through. Brother Harris, take charge.

A Tribute to Elder Cayce (2 of 2)

PROCEEDINGS

After the close of the discourse above, it was agreed that the deacons of this church, together with other deacons present, act as a committee to arrange preaching during the meeting. Then a motion was made and seconded and unanimously carried that a committee be appointed from the various states represented to draw up resolutions of appreciation for the fifty years of service rendered by Elder C. H. Cayce. Those appointed were: Elder R. F. Pierce, Quitman, Ark.; Elder S. E. Angle, Waynesville, Ohio; Elder J. L. Ceilings, Abilene, Texas; Elder J. H. Keaton, Huntington, W. Va.; Elder Leon H. Clevenger, Excelsior Springs, Mo.; Elder Elbert Holdren, Syracuse, Kan.; Elder W. A. Shutt, Nashville, Tenn.; Elder J. O. Dodd, Englswood, Colo.; Elder H. L. Golston, Brush Creek, Tenn.; Deacon B. B. Lawler, Brownsboro, Ala.; Brother W. R. Hammett, West Monroe, La.; Elder G. L. Pilkington, North Little Rock, Ark.; Elder J. D. Holder, Tupelo, Miss.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

We, the undersigned, being a committee appointed by the acting moderator of Cane Creek Primitive Baptist Church, of Thornton, Ark., at a special meeting on January 4, 1940, which meeting was held in honor of Elder C. H. Cayce, and to pay some tribute to him in consideration of his fifty years as a minister, editor, etc., beg leave to submit the following to be presented to the church, and, if approved by the church, to be published in the next issue of The Primitive Baptist: He began editing and publishing The Primitive Baptist in the year of 1905, following the death of his father, Elder S. F. Cayce, who founded the paper in 1886. He has been untiring in his effort to publish a good clean paper, and to be of general help to the cause. The Primitive Baptist has a wide circulation in the United States, as well as in some foreign countries, and is considered a representative paper among the Baptists at

large. We appreciate him for the collection, correction, arrangement, publication and distribution of a song book that has been, and will continue to be, a source of consolation and joy to all lovers of the truth, and for his labor of love in putting these songs within the reach of everyone. We appreciate him for his earnest, careful, and prayerful study of the Word of God, especially in its application to his brethren in the ministry, his kindness to the aged, the middle-aged, and especially, his kind, fatherly manner of exhorting, instructing, correcting, and encouraging the young ministers among us. Elder Cayce's ability as a defender of the cause of the Master in His vineyard has not been excelled by any man. He has always been ready, when a Goliath challenged the army of Israel, to meet the enemy without fear. He has studied to prove himself a workman, and one who should not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. The Baptist family have never been afraid or fearful of their interest when the same was placed in his hands, but like David of old, he has always come out victorious over the enemies of truth, and he has met the giants of every denomination when the Master's cause has been challenged. We have never known an elder more faithful as a pastor, nor a more able church builder. He has gone through heat and cold, rain or shine, to visit the churches of his care, always taking heed unto himself and also to the doctrine, continuing in them, thereby saving himself and those that heard him. We don't know of a servant of God that has been more virtuous, sincere, honest and true, all his life, in his deportment and dealings with his fellow man. His life is an open one, true in all respects. It would be well for his children and all that love their dear Redeemer to follow the example of Elder C. H. Cayce's life. Elder C. H. Cayce's labors as an evangelist, or traveling preacher, have been continuous during the past fifty years. He has helped to establish and constitute, on a true Bible basis, a great many churches, covering territory reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. He has visited among the Primitive Baptist Churches in nearly all localities in the United States and many places where there were no churches. He has been well received everywhere, and his preaching has been helpful and binding our people closer together on a true Bible basis. As a peacemaker, he has been sent for many times where there was confusion or division, and his influence and wise counsel in these peace meetings and elsewhere have been of much value to bring our brethren together in the right way. We believe he has done the work of a true evangelist through the grace and help of the Lord. We would not forget to mention in these resolutions the earnest and faithful co-operation of his godly companion and dear children in all his labors. We do thank God for them and their noble labors in assisting him in all his ministerial work and in publishing and distributing our good paper and other publications, and for their hospitality and kindness to the brotherhood. Signed: Elder H. L. Golston, Chairman. Elder J. H. Keaton, Clerk. Elder J. L. Collings. Elder Leon H. Clevenger. Elder W. A. Shutt. Elder R. P. Pierce. Elder S. E. Angle. Elder Elbert Holdren. Elder G. L. Pilkington. Elder J. D. Holder. Elder J. O. Dodd. B. B. Lawler. W. R. Hammett. The church sat in conference on Thursday, January 4, 1940, at 7 p.m., when the foregoing was read and unanimously approved and adopted by the church in conference, and approved unanimously by the entire assembly, and ordered the same to be placed in the church record with a request that it be published in The Primitive Baptist as of date January 4, 1940. Elder John R. Harris, Mod. protern. L. H. Miller, Church Clerk. ELDER CAYCE'S CLOSING DISCOURSE, JAN. 7

If I should endeavor to express my feelings at this time, words would fail me. My knowledge of language is not sufficient to command words to express just what I

feel. This meeting has been one of joy to me, and has brought gladness to my heart. And I trust that I am thankful for the sweet evidence of appreciation I have received and the assurance that I have had from those assembled in this meeting of their love and esteem and fellowship for poor me. This meeting began on Thursday, that day being the fiftieth anniversary of the day I made the first effort to speak in the name of the Master, and according to the arrangements and plans that were made, as you are aware, it was placed upon me to preach the opening discourse of the meeting in commemoration of that first effort. There is only one man living today that I know who was present on that occasion fifty years ago, and he was present Thursday, and he is present today. So far as my knowledge extends, there is no other person living who heard that first effort. I used the same text Thursday, as you know, that I used fifty years ago. The same doctrine that I tried to preach then, so feebly, I still endeavor to promulgate, with the ability the good Lord has seen fit to bless me with, to this good day. I realized several years ago that I had reached the top of the hill, and for several years I have realized the fact that I was going swiftly down the western slope toward the sunset of life. In my younger days, I looked forward to the noontime of life, to the blessings and joys in life, and the pleasures in life; but for several years I have not done that. The forward looking to blessings and joys in life has gradually grown less, and less, and less, so that I have come to the place now that I look forward to joys in life very little. Sometimes I look back over the road that I have traveled, and sorrows are remembered, trials are remembered, heartaches are remembered, difficulties are remembered, and they bring sadness. I think of them with grief; but sometimes I remember some of the joys along life's way, the pleasures that have been mine, the sweet things that have come my way; that brings gladness to my heart. Sometimes I try to count up the Lord's mercies and blessings to me, and I cannot enumerate them. One picture that one of the brethren drew, I will refer to. It was last night in Brother Clevenger's discourse, how that the Lord's children have their trials here, and difficulties here, and sorrows here, but their joys unending are beyond this life. He drew this picture, those of you who were present will remember: In married life, the young couple starting out with nothing, with poverty, struggling along for something better later in life. I felt that so befittingly pictured the life of this poor sinner that stands before you. My greatest and hardest struggles and trials and conflicts and battles were in my younger days. Some of you brethren who have been associated with me along these years know how true that is; but now I am living in my last days, and the Lord has so wonderfully and graciously blessed me. Sometimes when we have lived through the day, and the day is drawing to a close, the sun sets behind a cloud, the evening is gloomy and dark; but sometimes the sun sets clear, and it looks bright and shines bright until it goes behind the western hill, and then night comes. Oh, do I know how to praise my Master as I should, that, as I am coming near to the sunset and the evening of life is coming to a close, if there is a cloud in the sunset, I cannot see it. It is true that I may live several years. I do not know about that. If it is God's will to spare my life, I want to stay here, if He sees fit to bless me that I may be of some service to His little children and to His kingdom. I do not know why-I cannot understand it-but His children from different parts of the country, north, south, east, and west, come to me and write to me for advice and instruction in this matter and that, as pertains to the kingdom here, wanting advice as to how the Lord has said we should do in this particular case or that. I do not know what the experience of each one of you brethren in the ministry has been, but I do know this, in my own experience in life, sometimes when I have granted requests of that sort it was rightly used. Sometimes they have been abused, and not only have those things been abused, but they have used those things to abuse the one that was

endeavoring to give them what they were asking for, in fairness, sincerity and honesty. I realize that, and I realize, too, that what few remaining days may be left to me to serve here in the vineyard of my Master that bonds and afflictions abide me. During this meeting, there has not been a minister in attendance, not one present, who has been in the service as long as I have-not one. Not many ministers among us have been. In my young days, they called me the "boy preacher," but now, sometimes, they refer to me as "old man Cayce." I realize this- that in many ways that I have served, in the days gone by, the things that I have engaged in defense of the Master's cause, I cannot do now. As some of the brethren have referred to the matter, I have met the enemies of our cause and doctrine in face to face combat; and I am not saying it boastfully, but the man has not lived in this world before whose face I have been afraid to stand in defense of the doctrine of God our Saviour, as we understand it. I am not saying that boastfully, not at all. But that man has not lived, and he is not living today; but I realize that age has crept upon me, and in some respects I have failed-my memory is not what it once was; my mind is not as active as it once was; I cannot think as quickly as I once thought; and, so, for that and other reasons, I have declined to debate any more. When I quit it, I looked around over the country-I looked the situation over, and I wondered if God would send some that could and would take up the standard, and, thank God, He has. That man there (pointing to Elder J. D. Holder) is one of them. He preached first this morning. I have realized and recognized the fact that he is not the only one-there are others. You remember this thought, here, that God ceased to send prophets to Israel of old, because of their wickedness and rebellion against Him. If we desire the Lord to send ministers in His vineyard in this age of the world, you had better be careful how you disobey Him-or better be careful not to do that, but do as He has commanded in His Word. In ancient times, God withheld the rain on account of the wickedness of His people; and in this age of the world, He may withhold the gospel rain on account of the wickedness of His people, and He has done it in some sections of the country. I wish I could admonish every young minister to be faithful and true to the trust and true to your God. You may have trials along the way; you may not know how you are to live and get through in doing what God has said do, but it is not your business to know how you will do that. It is yours to do what God said do and leave the result with Him, and He will take care of the situation. The Lord has taken care of me. I know I do not have to guess at that- I know the Lord has taken care of me, marvelously good to me, and if I am permitted to still live and grow still older, I will, more and more, be laid upon the shelf. You know they do not have much use for an old man any more anywhere. In business, they do not have any use for an old man. If you apply for a position, you are asked, "How old are you?" "I am so old." "Well, you are too old; got to have a young man." That is true in the churches. When they want a man to serve them as pastor, they want a young man that is full of life and energy and vigor; but if there has ever been a time in the history of civilization that the world needed old men, it is today. They need the conservatism of the old man in business, in the business world. We need the conservatism of an old man at the head of this nation today. Look at Germany today. An old man would not do-got to have a younger man, and he plunged the nation into ruin. Look at Russia today. The younger man at the head of that government plunged her into ruin- freedom gone, not allowed to worship God as we do here today. No matter what their religious faith was, their churches were burned and destroyed; whatever may have been their religious proclivities, their privileges were taken away and denied them- in Germany and in Russia and in every nation like them. They need a conservative man. And they need conservative men in business to hold in check, to prevent the wild, reckless way of living and conducting business affairs. We need conservative

men in the church of God today to hold in check and prevent the wild and reckless going to ruin of the church of God. You may need the young man to pull up hill-you may need his strength to pull, to climb the hill; but when you get to the top of the hill you need the old man to put on the brakes to keep you from plunging into ruin or destruction. But the old men are laid on the shelf; I realize that; and let me tell you, brethren, that I am beginning to realize and to recognize something of the feeling of our old people. This precious old brother here (Brother M. B. Claggett) said just a few words to me about how he felt when he asked the church where his membership was to appoint someone else and ordain them to the office of deacon. He could not work like he used to; he was not as active as he used to be, and getting to feel like he was in the way. So many times, while my mother was yet living, she would say, "Son, I feel like I am just in the way." Sister Miller, do you feel that way-just in the way? Let me say, if I could say it and say it in the right way, we realize the fact that these old folks cannot work like they once did; they cannot labor like they once did; they cannot do the things they once did, but they are not in the way. I have never felt like one of them was in the way. Father (B. B. Lawler), you are not in the way. God bless your heart! If ever you get to the place where you do not have a home, you have got a home while I live. I would love for you to come and let me look at you. You will not be in the way as long as I have eyes to see you. As long as I have eyes to see them and look at them, and remember their prayers and the things they have done in their younger days, the old folks will not be in the way. Now I do not want to talk long-oh, yes, I do; but I won't. While Brother Collings was preaching and telling about his experience along the way, and his observation of some of the Lord's little children in their going home to the church and some of them not, I remember a circumstance that I was brought in contact with a number of years ago in Tennessee. There was a sister-I call her a sister, and I believe it is true that she was a sister in the Lord; she loved the Lord; she loved the blessed Saviour, and she loved the old church; but, on account of a feeling sense of her own unfitness and her own personal unworthiness and weakness, she never had the courage to come to the church and ask for a home there. She was stricken with a sickness unto death. She had a daughter about grown, and that daughter had a good hope in the Saviour, and just before the spirit left her body, she called the family all around her bedside and told them good-bye; and she said to them, "It is all right on the other side. Everything on the other side is bright and glorious, and I am going to be carried presently by the Lord and His angels into the heavenly world in spirit. I am not afraid about that. It is all right, and I don't want any of you to grieve for me." Then she turned to that daughter, who was standing by her bedside with tears streaming down her cheeks, and said, "Daughter, don't do like mother has done. While I am perfectly reconciled to the fact that all is glorious for me beyond death, but your poor mother dies with regret because I have not followed my Saviour and my Lord in baptism. Daughter, don't do like mother has done. The Lord has blessed you with a sweet hope in Him; for your sake, and for mother's sake, and for Jesus' sake, go, with what God has given you, to the church and deny yourself and follow your blessed Saviour, and miss what I am having to regret. Don't live as mother has lived, out of the church. I will have that to regret in my dying breath." Brother, that is something for us to think about. Today some of us who are alive and in full vigor and strength, tomorrow may find our bodies lying in the casket. We know not. "Today is the day of salvation." "If you will hear His voice, harden not your hearts." Today, while you have the opportunity, is the time to serve your Master; today, while the opportunity presents itself, is the time for you to do what God commands and requires at your hands. Now, I have had joy, sweetness, and pleasure out of this meeting. What is it worth to you? Yes, I put something into it, indeed I have,

certainly I have; from different standpoints, I have put something into it. Are you sorry I did? I am not. Every moment of the time, from the beginning to this moment, has been sweet to me. Brethren, I have enjoyed having you in my home; have enjoyed seeing you surround our table; I have enjoyed seeing you eat of the things that were provided and placed on the table to satisfy your natural appetites. I did not furnish all of it; no, I did not; but let me tell you, there is some left over. We expect to eat one more meal there today. The good lady has already said, "They are not going to eat near all I have." You know, I am not afraid of you eating all I have. If you should have eaten all I had yesterday, my God has promised "You shall be supplied." And I believe my God is just as able today to send meat and bread to me, if it is His good will to do so, by a raven as it was for Him to do that for Elijah. It makes me think about (I do not know whether I ought to tell it or not, but I will) an anecdote I heard once. A poor old widow, destitute, without riches, went down before her fireplace, begging the Lord to send her something to eat. "Send me something or the poor old servant will perish." Some wicked boys, passing by, heard it, and they went and bought something and carried it there and knocked on the door, and she opened the door. They said, "Here's some provisions for you." She commenced clapping her hands. "Thank God! I begged Him to send me something." "The Lord didn't do it, we did it," "My God sent it to me if He did send it by the hand of the devil." My Lord is able. The world and the fullness thereof belong to Him, and if my God puts it in my heart to put whatever He has blessed me with in His service and I put it there, my God is able to supply again what I may need for the next day. I am willing to risk Him; are you? Are you willing to risk Him? What I have got out of this meeting is worth more than money could buy. I believe it was on yesterday-I do not remember now the circumstances, and how it came up exactly, and just how much, but I had a little money in my hand, and I believe it was that good woman that has been laboring untiringly and praying for the success of this meeting in my home-she asked me if I would take that much for what I got out of this meeting. I said if I were to sell out I would be the gainer, because what I have got out of this meeting, I would still have it, and would have the money, too. You know, you can't sell that in that way. You may sell out by disobedience. We are to receive the blessings in obedience that God has put in the pathway, and when you sell this, you sell for nothing, and you get nothing; you have lost it all, but in this there is something that is worth more than the world knows about or can comprehend. Jesus said one time, "I have meat to eat that you know not of." The Lord's little children in His kingdom and in His service have meat to eat that the world knows not of. If we could we would tell it to you to make you understand it, and realize it; there is only one way to realize it in full, and that is to obey, go in the service of God. That is the only way to know it. I have felt so unworthy for such a meeting as this to be held in commemoration of my fifty years of service. It seems I have been able to accomplish so little, and sometimes, when it seems I have been able to accomplish a little, I see so much more that needs to be done that it seems my service amounts to nothing after all. But when I think again of some of the joys along the way, and when I think of the quietude of conscience that is mine today, I would not exchange it for the world. I trust that if I still live, I may be able to say when the end comes, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith." Brethren, that means something-to keep the faith-that means something. Let us not deny the faith in word or deed. To keep the faith means more than to preach the truth. You may preach the truth, but deny the faith in your works. Let us live in harmony with the doctrine of God our Saviour, and then you can say, "I have kept the faith." I believe I can say that. My writings will show where I have occupied all these years-and, let me say one

more thing here, and that not boastingly. There is not a man living today who can find two things which I have written on any point of the doctrine of God or the practice that God requires of His people that contradicts another thing I have said-not one-and I am not boasting about it. I do not mean by this that I have never, in any way, presented some viewpoint in regard to some particular passage of Scripture that I see now as I always did. I do not mean that. I have before now, expressed some view on some particular passage that I do not see now as I did then. At one time in my younger days I held to the idea that when the Saviour said, "If it were possible they would deceive the very elect," that it had reference to the Lord Jesus as the very elect, but, my brother, I do not see it that way now, and haven't for a long time. That very elect embraces the servants that God has chosen to be witnesses for His blessed truth that He will not suffer to be deceived and led astray by Satan or the Judaizing teachers of this world. I believe God has reserved some to Himself as witnesses for His truth that He will not suffer to be deceived, and we may say that is a remnant of His children. "There is a remnant according to," in harmony with, "the election of grace." They are God's specially chosen witnesses. Now we should prove by our life and conduct, and by our teaching, that we are His witnesses, and not let our life be smeared over with wrong doing or wrong living. The life of the servant of God, the minister of Christ, and his character and reputation are as easily soiled as is the character and reputation of a virtuous girl. They need to be careful of the way they live and the way they act, and so do we. Now I must come to a conclusion. It is a sad moment. This meeting has been sweet to me. I felt unworthy-I feel unworthy now-of the eulogy that has been placed upon me., I feel unworthy of this gathering of the Lord's servants from about twelve states. The first service, if I remember correctly, Thursday night, there was a man placed on the stand from West Virginia on the east, far in the east, and another man from the very extreme western part of the state of Kansas (this was a mistake. It was Elder J. O. Dodd from Colorado), the extreme points of the compass, brought together in this meeting, preaching together here near the center of the dividing line between them, the same glorious truths that feed our hungry hearts, here and everywhere; and from different states they have come-Ohio and Arkansas; there is the north and south yoked up here in the service of God, proclaiming the same rich truths. East, west, north and south, standing here, side by side, preaching the same glorious doctrine of God our Saviour; and then they have come from Missouri, Mississippi, and Tennessee, and from different sections of the country. What do we learn here? We learn that God's people are really one. God's family is one family. Old Baptist people are one. Brethren, how would it look now, in this late age of the world, for us to have names applied to us in this late age that have been applied to some of the other orders? For years, since the dividing of the country in what was called the Civil War (I would not call any war a Civil War. There has never been a war fought with carnal weapons but what it was an uncivil war), it was "the Church North" and "the Church South;" the "Northern Convention" and the "Southern Convention;" north this and south that; and now, after all these years, are we going to pattern after them, and say Northern Primitive Baptists and Southern Primitive Baptists? What do you think about it? As for me, I am going to tell you, please, excuse me. Our fathers considered the Baptist family, the nation over, as one family; and when they come together, as we have in a meeting like this, you can feel that oneness, you can feel that unity and drawing close together-one family; and we should have things in common and engage in the service of God and quit our foolishness, and God will pour out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to contain it. Now let me bid you farewell. I don't want to say "good-bye;" that seems too much like we won't meet any more, we won't see each other any more; that teems too much like

a separation that will last always. Now we will soon be scattered to the different portions of the country, and go where our duties call us to go, separated from this place, but as we are separated from this place, we have something to fare well upon. Farewell! Farewell! Brethren, I hail you happy in the Lord. I love you for the truth's sake and for your own sake. I trust that I appreciate you. I love your sweet fellowship. I love your company. I love your association. I am glad to have had you in our humble home. I am glad to share our hospitality with you, and I ask you, when you take your journey away to go to your places and to fill your stations in life, that you let your mind and your heart and your affections still abide with us, and keep us in your mind and in your hearts and in your affections, and do not forget us in your prayers. Not only do I ask that for my poor unworthy self, but I ask that for that good companion, that good wife, who first conceived the idea of this meeting, and somehow I feel like the Lord put it in her heart, who has prayed for the meeting and for the success of it, that God's name might be honored and glorified first and above everything else in the world. Remember her in your prayers; and not only do I ask that, but brethren, will you pray for our children? Oh, will you pray for them? I believe the Lord has been good to bless them in touching their hearts with the finger of His love. I have seen some evidence of it in everyone of them. I believe the Lord has been good to them in that way, and if it could be God's will that they might have the courage this day, before this meeting is all over and we are gone, we would be glad to see some of them coming to the church and asking for a home. I have asked some of them if they had a desire to come to the church and there has been an admission that "I have sometimes felt that way;" and I want to say to you, my child, if that is your desire, there is a place here for you. The God of heaven placed the life in the soul from which that desire springs; it does not come from beneath-it does not come from there. Not only my children, but I think I have seen some evidence in some of your children, you brethren here. I believe there are children here, young folks, who love the church, whose hungry hearts have been fed by gospel preaching, whose hearts have been comforted by it; and that being so, there is a place for you in the old church. Come into the church, where you can enjoy the sweet fellowship and communion of God's children, to walk with you, hand in hand; and when you stumble and fall they will lift you up and help you to run life's journey along the way, to the praise and glory- of your Lord and Master. There is a place here for you. Farewell, If we meet no more in this world, I believe in my soul today that I will meet you over yonder. I can't say I will know you as Jesse Collings over there. I do not know about that; but if you are there, and I believe you will be, I believe I will know, and you will know, Jesus as our Elder Brother, and God as our Father, and each other as the family of God, God's family; God is the Father, and Jerusalem which is above, is the mother. They are the children of the same Father and mother; it is a divine relationship. There it will be the family of God, and there will not be one missing. We have our family reunions here, and all the children come home. I have met with some since the holidays, and asked, "Did you have a good Christmas?" "Yes, a good Christmas. All the children were at home." All the family at home. Over yonder, in glory, all the family will be at home after awhile. They will not be separated any more. Farewell songs will not be sung; good-bye will never be said. One eternal day of solid bliss and joy forever in the presence of God, and I believe all the family of God will sing over there. They can't all sing here. The Lord hasn't seen fit to give me a tongue to join you in singing the songs that you have been singing during this meeting; the Lord hasn't seen fit to give me a tongue to sing the songs of Zion here, but in the eternal world, I trust my tongue will be tuned to sing His praise and I will be permitted to join with you to sing anthems of praise to His blessed name, and there will be no discordant note sounded in that

song of redemption forever and ever. Farewell, brethren. Perhaps what I have said is not appropriate, but it is the best I could do. Brother Harris, take charge.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

At the conclusion of the service, as above, an opportunity was extended for any to come forward who had a desire to live in the church and to let their desire be known, and also the privilege was extended for all to take the parting hand who had a desire to do so. Our second son, Fleming, came forward and expressed a desire for a home in the church. He said he had desired a home in the church for a long time. He was joyfully received. While the hand of fellowship was being extended to him, young Sister Adell House, daughter of Brother and Sister Homer House, came and asked for a home with us. She was also joyfully received. While extending the hand to her another young sister, Rhoda Mae Hannah, daughter of Sister House, and stepdaughter of Brother House, came forward asking for a home. She was also gladly and joyfully received. It is impossible for us to describe the joy of the meeting. As soon as possible after dismissal we all went to the water, and Elder John R. Harris buried Sister Adell beneath the yielding wave, and then we buried our precious boy and Sister Rhoda Mae beneath the yielding wave, each candidate having their preference as to who should administer the ordinance to them. On Friday, at the close of the preaching service, Sister Grace Claggett and her father, Deacon M. G. Claggett, presented letters from the Primitive Baptist Church at Newark, Ohio, and were joyfully received on their letters, and the hand of fellowship extended to them by every Old Baptist present. AH rejoiced together, some shouting praise to our Lord and Master. There was shouting on Sunday, too. The meeting will long be remembered. Surely, the Lord has been good to us. Why should we not serve Him? Who can forbear to love A God so good and kind? Sure He is worthy to be loved By me and all mankind. Seventeen ministers, besides the unworthy writer, attended the meeting, though some of them were present at only one service. We tried to preach, the best we could, Thursday morning, as others arranged. Then there were two discourses each day and night until Sunday, when the deacons had arranged for two discourses, and then the closing by the writer. The ministers present during the meeting were: Elders S. E. Angle, Waynesville, Ohio; L. H. Clevenger, Excelsior Springs, Mo.; J. L. Collings, Abilene, Texas; R. F. Pierce, Quitman, Ark.; T. C. Ford, Louisburg, Mo.; H. L. Golston, Brush Creek, Tenn.; W. A. Shutt, Nashville, Tenn.; Elbert Holdren, Syracuse, Kan.; J. II Keaton, Huntington, W. Va.; J. A. Littlejohn, Daila:., Texas; J. O. Dodd, Englewood, Colo.; G. L. Pilkington, North Little Rock, Ark.; J. D. Holder, Tupelo, Miss.; J. T. George, Little Rock, Ark.; John R. Harris, Thornton, Ark.; J. W. Guest, Rolla, Ark.; and E. W. Hargett, El Dorado, Ark. The last three are in our association. Thirteen states were represented during the meeting. Many were prevented from coming on account of the cold weather, the rain, fleet, and snow. It seemed that all who were present were glad they were here. We feel to be so poor and unworthy of the eulogy passed upon us. If we have any worthiness it is in Him who gave Himself for us, and who is, of God, "made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." We have nothing of ourselves to glory of; but we do desire to glory in the cross of Christ. Please pray the Lord to help us to live in such a way as to retain the love and respect and sweet fellowship of our brethren what few days we may have left to us here on earth; and pray the Lord to bless and sustain our dear companion who helps us so much to labor in the vineyard of the Lord; and please pray for our two boys who have come to the dear old church, that they may be enabled, by grace, to "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they have been called;" and please pray for our other three children, that the dear Lord may, in mercy, lead them in the right way, that they may never bring reproach on their

name and character, and that they may be led to follow the Lord here below. Again, please remember us in prayer. C. H. C.

Some Flowers

---January 4, 1940

Dear Brother and Sister Cayce: Since it is impossible for me to be with you at your meeting the first Sunday, I will try to represent by letter, which will, at least, let you know that I am thinking of you on this notable occasion with wishful and silent prayers for blessings and joys which only come from the merciful hands of Him whom you both love and serve so faithfully, and who has so graciously sustained you in your untiring struggle for, and defense of, the sacred cause which you have loved and held above everything else in the world. Hand in hand you have gone, through heat and cold, in trials, and tears, and often in the face of opposition and persecution. None of these things have ever moved you; neither have you counted your own lives dear unto yourselves for the glory of God. Perhaps not many who will be present on this eventful occasion will better understand the sacrifices and labors of your lives than the poor, unworthy writer. Were it possible, I would reach over the wide expanse of mountains and valleys and drop a little bunch of flowers on the sacred pulpit before you, which I would wish to bloom and cheer you until you come to say, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith, I have finished my course, I am now ready to be offered." Precious brother and sister, I trust it will be of some comfort to you to know that, though in a foreign land, your poor little brother and sister, who once shared your association and the comforts of your good home, and the joys of the dear old church there, wish to extend the hand of greeting and Christian love as you meet together in praise and service to our merciful God. And, if not asking too much, we desire that you remember us when you approach the throne of grace. May the dear Lord so manifest Himself at the meeting that it will be one never to be forgotten, is our prayer. Please remember us to the brotherhood. Your little brother, T. L. Webb.

Well Spent Life

---January 4, 1940

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.- (**Psalms 23:6**). In our efforts to be a true soldier of the cross and fight the good fight of faith, it is helpful to study the lives of the men of God of old and see how God cared for and delivered those who feared and obeyed Him. The quotation above was used by David, a man after God's own heart. God had chosen him for the work he did. God preserved and delivered him from many dangers, and had manifested His love and mercy in so many ways that he could proclaim, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want." David felt assured that the good Shepherd that gave His life for the sheep, was his Shepherd. He could embrace the precious promise, "I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." -(John 10:28-29). Feeling this promise to be his, David could truthfully say, "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever." I feel sure that Elder Cayce has served and worshiped the same God that David loved so well, during the fifty years he has spent in the ministry. I trust that the God of all grace will continue to sustain, uphold, strengthen and comfort Elder Cayce, and bless him to live many

more years to carry on the great work he has been engaged in, lo, these fifty years. I fear that we as Baptists do not appreciate Elder Cayce as we should. Let us scatter some flowers along the pathway he is traveling while he lives. I desire to offer this suggestion, without consulting Elder Cayce: let everyone who reads this issue of The Primitive Baptist send in one new subscriber. In hope, G. W. Lewis.

For The Trumpet Baptists

---January 18, 1940

We wish to kindly ask the Trumpet brethren to tell us if the following was all an orderly practice: On page 55 of the History of the Primitive Baptists of Texas and Oklahoma, by Elder J. S. Newman, and published by the Baptist Trumpet, then at Tioga, Texas, in 1906, we find the following: In 1863 the Concord Association met with Sugar Loaf Church on Friday before the second Sunday in September. Elder Jesse Graham preached the first sermon, who was chosen moderator, and Squire Haggard, clerk. The Association this year appointed a committee of thirteen to meet with Concord Church to try to adjust some trouble between Elder J. H. Russell and B. Payne, that had been suffered to be introduced into the association from Zion Church, in Burnett County. In 1864 the association met with Shiloh Church September 24, 25, 26. The first sermon was preached by Elder J. H. Russell. Elder Jesse Graham, moderator, and S. Haggard, clerk. On page 56, the record, of same year, says: "Before the committee met, that was appointed by this association last year, with Concord Church to settle the trouble between Elder J. H. Russell and B. Payne, Brother Payne died. To make satisfaction, the committee, however, met, and in the absence of Elder J. H. Russell, excluded him. When the association met, and the time had come, Elder J. H. Russell got up to preach the introductory-sermon, according to the order of the association, and Elder G. W. McDonald objected to Elder Russell preaching it. Elder Jesse Graham, who was moderator, called Elder McDonald to order; he, however, refused to keep order, and withdrew from the assembly, calling on all that stood with him in the exclusion of Elder Russell to follow him. The association declared McDonald and all that went with him in disorder. 'This association prays the powers that be to discharge our brother, Elder D. W. Russell, for the churches greatly need his services as a preacher, and he is a weakly man, a member of Captain Car-rington's Company, Foard's Command.' " On page 59, of the same book, we find the following record of the same Concord Association for the year 1880: "The association met with Bosque Church on Friday before the fourth Sunday in August. The first sermon was preached by Elder Jesse Graham, who was moderator, and W. B. Hedgpeth, clerk. 'We, the association, advise the churches to meet the brethren that went off from us (in 1864) and called themselves Concord Association, by messengers, at Salem Church, Coryell County, on Friday before the fourth Sunday in October, 1880.' It will be remembered that this association divided in 1864. After the division the contending parties were known as the 'Lower wing' and the 'Upper wing' of the Concord Association. Both factions, by their messengers, met at Oglesby, Coryell County, October, 1880. After both parties having confessed their wrongs, the 'Lower wing,' by motion and second, dissolved; after which, the churches that were in the 'Lower Wing' of the Concord Association, and, likely, others organized the Regular Primitive Baptist Association." Here is a case on record of a division which lasted for sixteen years, which was settled by mutual confession of wrongs and all coming back together. Please bear in mind, too, that the party who went off from the association were called the "Lower wing." Bethel Church, at Killen, was in the

"Lower wing" of the Concord Association. On pages 130 and 131 we find the following history of that church: "Bethel Church was organized in Coryell County, likely in 1864 or 1865. I notice that the church was a member of the 'Lower Concord' Association in 1866, with W. C. Maples, E. Ivey and A. Walters, as messengers. It is believed that the following members were in the constitution of the church, viz., E. Ivey, Ruth Ivey, Violet Doss, A. Walters, Matilda Walters and Hannah Jeffreys. In 1870 Elder Moses H. Denman was a member of the church and likely the pastor of the church. Elder Denman, B. Ellis and M. D. Galloway were messengers to the Concord Association in 1870. Elder Denman remained a member of this church till 1874, when he was dismissed by letter, and he and Elder M. Whitely constituted Cedar Grove Church July 15, 1874. Elder Denman then joined the church by letter from Bethel Church. He died a member of Cedar Grove Church. In 1878 and 1879 Elder M. Whitely was the pastor of Bethel Church. "I have no means of knowing who served the church from 1879 to 1891. In October, 1891, Elders J. B. Downing and W. Y. Norman were called jointly to the pastoral care of the church. In 1898 Elder J. S. Newman joined the church by letter from Pilgrim Rest Church, in DeWitt County, at which time Elder A. V. Atkins was pastor of the church. In 1900 J. S. Newman was dismissed by letter. W. J. D. Bradford was ordained to the ministry August 5, 1903, by Elders A. V. Atkins, W. Y. Norman, E. R. Robinson, S. A. Paine and J. S. Newman. Elder Bradford is the present pastor of the church. The church is now at Killeen, in Bell County. The church first joined the 'Lower Concord' Association, with which it remained till the Lower and Upper Concord settled their trouble in 1880. The church was then in the constitution of Primitive Association. In 1888 the church joined the Little Flock Association, of which it is still a member." We presume the editor of the Trumpet is a member of this Bethel Church. Is he, or is he not? Elder Morgan, you said you did not know so much about the history of the Baptists. Did you, or do you, know that your church was in this trouble and settlement of the same? Do you not know that the trouble was settled by mutual confession of wrongs and a coming together? If that kind of settlement throws the whole thing in disorder, please tell us where your order is now? How about it, Brother Ball, seeing you disclaim any connection with anything of the kind, and seem to think that because our people-the Peace Baptists, as you term us-have had just that kind of settlement, that we are all in disorder. Does not the language in **((65:5) (Isaiah 65:5))** describe you brethren pretty well? Read it: "Which say, Stand by thyself, come not near me; for I am holier than thou." Would it not be much better for you brethren to get down off of your "high horse," and the brethren and churches come together and worship together as they did before the unholy war was engaged in, and before the un-called-for trouble came? If not, do you not think it would be consistent for you brethren to stay on your own side of the fence which you have put up? C. H. C.

The Book of Life

---February 1, 1940

We see an article under the above heading in The Good Samaritan of November 1, 1939, published at Vidalia, Ga., by Elder T. E. Sikes, for the Progressives. It seems to us that the sentiments contended for and set forth in that article are a radical departure from the teaching of the Scriptures and from what has been the teaching and sentiment of the great body of Primitive Baptists all along the line. To our mind it virtually denies that Christ made atonement on the cross, and virtually sets forth the principle held to by many Arminians that the atonement is made in heaven now

when one accepts Christ, or when one believes on Christ as his Saviour, that then Christ makes atonement for him in heaven. True the article does not say that, but we see no real difference in this position and what is contained in and set forth by the article in the Good Samaritan. Let us examine, carefully and kindly, some things we find in that article. Here is one statement therein: In (Revelation 13)it mentions the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. This passage does not signify that the name was written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, but this book of life was that belonging to the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If we are not mistaken about the matter, this is the position taken by the great majority of the Arminian world. Have the Primitive Baptists been wrong and the Arminians right all along the line? We are not yet ready to say so. The truth of the matter is that the teaching of this text is precisely what the writer above says it is not. The Interlinear Translation of **(Revelation 13:8)** reads as follows: And shall do homage to it all who dwell on the earth of whom have not been written the names of the founding of the world in the book of life of the Lamb slain. This makes the matter clear that the writing of the names was from the foundation of the world; and the names were written in the book of life; and the book of life was the book of life of the Lamb slain. He was not slain from the foundation of the world. True, it was in the mind and purpose of God that He should lay down His life, but that was not done until nearly two thousand years ago on Calvary's hill. It is an evident fact that the book of life, as here called, was and is the same as the covenant that was ordered in all things and sure. That covenant does not grow. According to the writer of the article we are objecting to, the covenant grows, for the writer has it that names are being written in that book now. He says: I love to believe that He is actually saving people today, and that our heavenly Father's ear is still open to human petitions in behalf of the salvation of sinners, and a sinner who is today born into the spiritual family, of which Christ is the head, that sinner's name is written in the Lamb's book of life. It is the divine record of the beginning of his spiritual life; he was not an heir of heaven until he was born into the spiritual family; and I do not think it is dealing fairly with truth and with divine facts, as God brings them to pass, for us to suggest that any sinner had his name recorded in the book of life, or that he had any spiritual standing in this divine family, until he is born into this family. According to this when a person is born from above, then his name is written in the book of life. If this is true, then the book grows larger and increases in size all along as persons are born into the family. This is a positive contradiction of the language found in **((Sam 23:5) (II Samuel 23:5)**: Although my house be not so with God: yet He hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things, and sure: for this is all my salvation, and all my desire, although He make it not to grow. Not one shall ever be added to this. The heirs of promise were all embraced in this everlasting covenant-they were named in the will, or in the covenant; and it does not grow-not one has ever been added there, and not one ever will be added. Again, David, in impersonating or representing the Lord Jesus, said: My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.-((9:15) (Psalms 139:15-16). According to this language of David all the members of the mystical body of Christ were written in God's book before they had existence-" when as yet there was none of them." If they are written in the book at the time they are born into the family, then they were born into the family before they had existence, for they were written before they had existence. If David was correct in his statement, and he was correct, then they were written in the book before time was, or from the foundation of the world, before they had

existence, and not when they are born again. This expression forever settles the matter, also, as to whether they were, or are, eternal children. If the doctrine of eternal children be true, then they always existed. But David says they were written in the book "when as yet there was none of them." As they were written in the book before they existed, then they did not always exist. But they were chosen in Christ, and their names written in the book of life, written in the everlasting covenant, before they existed, before time was, even from the foundation of the world. Another idea in the above last quoted language from the Good Samaritan, if we read the language correctly, is that our prayers may have something to do with the eternal salvation of poor, lost, ruined, unregenerate sinners. The writer says he loves to believe that "our heavenly Father's ear is still open to human petitions in behalf of the salvation of sinners." According to this, if we pray for the salvation of sinners, then God may save some that He would not otherwise save. If this does not make the peopling of the heavenly world depend upon what human beings do, upon their efforts and prayers, we confess that language is meaningless. It makes the eternal salvation of sinners to depend upon the efforts and the prayers of the church and preachers. If our prayers are instrumental and a help in the eternal salvation of sinners, is not our preaching also instrumental and a help in the same? If not, why not? The writer quotes the language of James, **{(6) (James 5:16)}** "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," and applies that to the eternal salvation of sinners. If the writer and his people, with whom he is identified, believe the statement made by James, and believe that application of the statement to be the truth and the correct application of it, why do they not unite in prayer, and bombard the courts of glory, and prevail upon the Lord to save all these wicked sinners who are in the world today, and thus put a stop to the work the devil is carrying on, and make this old world a better place in which to live? But James was not talking about the eternal salvation of sinners when he used the language quoted. He said: Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. This was to the brethren and concerned differences and troubles among them. The confession of faults one to another and praying one for another, avail much toward healing their difficulties and differences and troubles among themselves. But the promulgation and the advocating of a false doctrine will not avail anything to that end. But there is nothing in the language that even intimates that we may, by our prayers, get some saved who would otherwise be lost. The writer refers to Paul's language in **(Romans 10:1)**, and makes it appear that Paul was praying for the eternal salvation of the people mentioned, or that he was praying that they might be regenerated. This is the position of the Arminian world. Let us here quote **(Romans 10:1-3)**: Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. What was Paul's prayer, and for whom was he praying? Was he praying for alien sinners, that they might be born again? No; he was praying for Israel. National Israel was a type of spiritual Israel. What was the condition of these Israelites for whom the apostle was praying? They were in ignorance. They had a zeal of God. He did not say that they have a zeal for God, but a zeal of God. As the zeal they had was of God, then they had already been born of God, they were already children of God. Hence, it was too late for the apostle to be praying for them to be born again. He prayed that they might be delivered from the ignorance they were in. It might not be much out of line with the prayer of Paul for some to pray that way now for the writer of the article we are here commenting on, which was in the Good Samaritan. If we are not

mistaken as to who the writer of that article is, we think he is a good man, after the way we speak of some men, and we believe he is a child of grace, but we think he is badly wrong in the sentiment he has set forth in that article. We cannot agree with him. It has never been Primitive Baptist doctrine. Advocating such doctrine has always caused trouble among the Primitive Baptists, and always will do so. And we wish to say, kindly, yet frankly, that our people cannot afford to unite with the Progressives, or to form a union with them, while they have that sort of doctrine advocated among them; for it would only mean to unite with more trouble. The Primitive Baptists have had enough trouble already, it seems to us, without doing something that would cause more. We would be glad to see all true Primitive Baptists united and living together in peace and fellowship, but that cannot be accomplished by uniting with a false doctrine. This article is written in kindness and love, we trust. May the Lord add His blessings. C. H. C.

Organs in Churches

---February 15, 1940

In the Banner-Herald for January, 1940, the main organ of the Progressive Baptists, we find an article over the signature of J. W. H., one of the editors, under the heading, "Singing in Worship with an Instrument," in which the writer makes an effort to prove that we are commanded in the New Testament to use instruments in the church service. In order that no one may have room to say or to even think, that we misrepresent the teaching of the brother in his article, we reproduce the article below, just as it appeared in the columns of that paper: After all that has been said and done about singing in worship with or without an instrument, would you be interested to know that the Bible teaches definitely that we should sing with an instrument? Brethren, upon my reputation as a scholar, I affirm positively that the Bible does teach the use of an instrument in sacred singing in the church. This statement is not based upon Old Testament teaching, but upon that which is taught in the New Testament. Singing is mentioned but twelve times in the New Testament, as follows: (Matthew 26:30); ((26) (Mark 14:26); ((25) (Acts 16:25); (Romans 15:9); (I Corinthians 14:15); (Ephesians 5:19); ((6) (Colossians 3:16); (Hebrews 2:12); ((3) (James 5:13); (Revelation 5:9,3); (15:3). The various forms of "sing" in the New Testament are translated from three separate words in the original Greek. These words are, *ado*, *psallo*, and *hymneo*. Corresponding words in English are, *ode*, *psalm*, and *hymn*. The first word, *ado*, means to sing an ode, or simply to sing. I am quoting Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible and Liddell & Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, seventh edition, revised and augmented. Quoting again from the same authorities, the word, *psallo*, means to sing praise with a musical instrument, or to touch sharply, to pluck, pull, twitch as with the fingers in playing a stringed instrument. The word *psalma* in the Greek (English *psalm*) means "a tune played on a stringed instrument." The word, *hymneo*, means to hymn, or sing a hymn, to commemorate in a song. In the use of the first and third word, nothing is said about the use of an instrument. In **(Matthew 26:30)** and **((26) (Mark 14:26)**, the expression is the same in the original and in the translation, "they sang a hymn." There was no instrument there, we feel sure. In **((25) (Acts 16:25)** and **(Hebrews 2:12)**, the third word is used, *hymn*, and there is not the remotest possibility that an instrument was used or referred to. In the three passages in Revelation, the first word, *ode*, is used, and could be rendered literally as follows in the three passages respectively: They oded a new ode, they oded a new ode, they

oded the ode of Moses, etc. In all human probability no instrument was used or referred to in these passages. And by the way, taking those last three passages in Revelation, it is very likely that no instruments will be used in heaven, just my opinion. In the other five passages, namely: the one word that always occurs is psallo, in one form or another. In **(Romans 15:9); (I Corinthians 14:15)** and **((3) (James 5:13)**, the word is psallo alone, and means to sing praise with an instrument. So Paul and James both told us to sing with an instrument. In (Ephesians 5:19), all three words are used in order and the first and second are repeated. So there Paul really tells us twice in that notable passage to sing praise with an instrument. In **((6) (Colossians 3:16)**, all three words are used and the first one repeated. So there, in that beautiful passage, Paul tells us most solemnly to admonish one another with psalms, songs sung with an instrument. Now brethren, please consider what I have written. No matter what you believe, if it is not true, you certainly ought to give it up. No matter how you feel about it, you want the truth. Jesus said some very pretty words about the truth. No matter what you have been accustomed to, if not according to truth, you ought to be willing to let the custom go. If not familiar with the Greek, please secure the services of any available Greek scholar and verify or refute my statements before you approve or condemn. If my conclusions are correct, and I affirm that they are, we may sing with or without an instrument in our worship, just as we please, and be doing the will of God. J. W. H. The first thing we wish to call attention to is the authors the writer gives as proof of his position that the apostles authorize the use of musical instruments in church service. One of the authors relied upon is Young's Analytical Concordance, a copy of which we have in our library. Here is what we find concerning Young in the Encyclopedia Britannica, ninth edition, which is given up to be as reliable authority as can be found: Young, Robert, LL.D., biblical scholar, born at Edinburg, Sept. 10, 1822, bred a printer, was superintendent of the Mission Press at Suratt (1856-61), thereafter devoting himself to the preparation, the printing and publishing at Edinburg, of a long series of meritorious books of somewhat narrow but remarkable biblical scholarship, working with unbroken industry down till his death, Oct. 14, 1889. Among his books is the laborious Analytical Concordance to the Bible, giving 311,000 references. Here we have the plain statement that Mr. Young's works are narrow. Evidently Mr. Young wished to do just as the writer of the above article from the Banner-Herald-try to find something to justify the use of musical instruments in church worship. The next is the lexicon he gives as authority. Evidently this is a small lexicon, and is not complete. We have before us Liddell & Scott's Unabridged Greek Lexicon, eighth edition. This is conceded to be the highest authority on classical Greek; and be it remembered that this is not a lexicon of New Testament Greek, But it says that psallo (primary meaning) is "to touch sharply, to pluck, pull, twitch," etc. And "II mostly of the string of musical instruments, to play a stringed instrument with the fingers, and not with the plectron." So, if the brethren propose to take this definition as authority, they should get a musical instrument with strings and pluck the strings with their fingers. It seems to us that a banjo would come more nearly meeting the situation than the organ they use. The organ is a wind instrument, and is not a psallo at all, taking the brother's own authority on the matter. But the lexicon says that it was "later, to sing to a harp." It gives this as Epic dialect, and cites **(Ephesians 5:19)** and **(I Corinthians 14:15)**, the latter of which is translated, in our King James translation, "I will sing with the Spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." Let us translate this according to the brother's contention and the definition he accepts of the word, and we would have something like this: "I will play a stringed instrument with the fingers, and not with the plectrone, with the Spirit, I will play a stringed instrument with the fingers, and not

with the plectrone, with the understanding also." Put that with the first part of the verse now, "I will pray with the Spirit," etc. Now, what kind of "stuff" do you have, pray tell us? Let us here give the definition of the Greek psallo by well recognized authority on the meaning of New Testament Greek. Thayer's New Testament Greek Lexicon says: Psallo; future, psalo; a. to pluck off, to pull out; b. to cause to vibrate by touching, to twang; * * * to sing to the music of the harp; in the New Testament, to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song, **((3) (James 5:13)**, in honor of God, **(Ephesians 5:19); (Romans 15:9)** "I will sing God's praises indeed with my whole soul stirred and borne away by the Holy Spirit, but I will also follow reason as my guide, so that what I sing may be understood alike by myself and by the listeners," **(I Corinthians 14:15)**. The same Lexicon gives the definition of psalmos as follows: A striking, twanging; spec, a striking the chords of a musical instrument; hence a pious song, a psalm, **(Ephesians 5:19); ((6) (Colossians 3:16)**; the praise eckei psalmon is used of one who has it in his heart to sing or recite a song of the sort, **(I Corinthians 14:26)**; one of the songs of the book of the Old Testament which is entitled Psalmoi, **((33) (Acts 13:33)**; plural, the (book of) Psalms, **((44) (Luke 24:44)**; biblos psalmon, **((0:42) (Luke 20:42); ((0) (Acts 1:20)**. Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon gives the definition of psallo as follows: To move by a touch, to twitch; to touch, strike the strings or chords of an instrument; absol. to play on a stringed instrument; to sing to music; in New Testament to sing praises, **(Romans 15:9); (I Corinthians 14:15); (Ephesians 5:19); ((3) (James 5:13)**. The same Lexicon defines psalmos as follows: Impulse, touch, of the chords of a stringed instrument; in New Testament a sacred song, psalm, **(I Corinthians 14:26); (Ephesians 5:19)**, et al. So much for the definition of the word in the New Testament. It is clearly evident that the word psallo nor the word psalmos have no such meaning in the New Testament usage as that an instrument, either a harp or an organ, was intended to be used. If there is any such intention that a musical instrument was to be used in the worship, it is clear that it was not an organ, or a wind instrument, which an organ is, but an instrument with strings, and the strings were to be played with the fingers. Hence, you brethren do not, therefore, have Scriptural authority for the use of the organ, even if we grant that the Book authorizes the use of an instrument at all in the worship -but this we do not grant. If any such meaning is to be given, please be so kind as to inform us of a good reason why Gill, the most learned commentator since the days of the apostles, did not tell us about it in some of his writings. In his comments on the various passages referred to, Gill does not tell us that, by the use of the word psallo by the apostle, an instrument of music was meant, but he tells us that the meaning was the singing of hymns and the Psalms of David, or psalms in the Old Testament. Why did not Matthew Henry, in his Commentaries, tell us that was what was commanded by the apostles? In Matthew Henry, on **((6) (Colossians 3:16)**, we have this: To teach and admonish one another. This would contribute very much to our furtherance in all grace; for we sharpen ourselves by quickening others (quickenings is not used here in the primary sense, of imparting life, but in a secondary sense of stimulating, etc. -C. H. C), and improve our knowledge by communicating it for their edification. We must "admonish one another in psalms and hymns." Observe, Singing of psalms is a Gospel ordinance; -the Psalms of David, and spiritual hymns and odes, collected out of the Scripture, and suited to special occasions, instead of their lewd and profane songs in their idolatrous worship. Religious poesy seems countenanced by these expressions, and is capable of great edification. But, when we sing psalms, we make no melody unless we sing with grace in our hearts, unless we are suitably affected with what we sing, and go along in it with true devotion and understanding. Singing of psalms is a teaching ordinance as well as a praising

ordinance; and we are not only to quicken and encourage ourselves, but to "teach and admonish one another," mutually excite our affections, and convey instructions. We trust our readers will consider and ponder well what is here quoted from Matthew Henry. In **(3) (James 5:13)** the apostle uses the word psalleto, which is the third person, singular, present tense, indicative mood of psallo, and it literally means to sing praise. In the Interlinear it is so translated, "let him sing praise." On this text Matthew Henry says: In a day of mirth and prosperity "singing psalms is very proper and seasonable." In the original it is only said, "sing" (psalleto), without the addition of psalms, or any other word. And we learn from the writings of several in the first ages of Christianity-particularly from a letter of Pliny's, and from some passages in Justin Martyr and Tertullian - that the Christians were used to sing hymns, either taken out of Scripture or of more private composure, in their worship of God. Though some have thought that St. Paul's advising both the Colossians and Ephesian to "speak to one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs," means only the compositions of Scripture; the Psalms of David being distinguished in the Hebrew by Shurim, Tehillim, and Mizmorim, words that exactly answer those of the apostle. Let that be as it will, this however, we are sure of, that singing psalms is a gospel ordinance, and that our joy should be holy joy, consecrated to God. Singing is so directed to here as to shew that if any be in circumstances of mirth and prosperity, he should turn his mirth, though alone, and by himself, into this channel. Holy mirth becomes families and retirements, as well as public assemblies. Let our singing be such as to "make melody with our hearts unto the Lord," and no doubt God will be well pleased with this kind of devotion. Notice what the brother says about **(Ephesians 5:19)**, and remember his contention is that the word psallo in the New Testament means to play on an instrument. We have shown above that the original meaning in classical Greek was to "play a stringed instrument with the fingers, and not with the plectron." Let us quote the text, now, and try it by such definition: Speaking to yourselves in psalms (psalmois) and hymns (humnois) and spiritual songs (odais), singing (hadontes) and praising (psallontes) with your heart to the Lord. Now suppose you try "speaking to yourselves in playing on a stringed instrument with your fingers," and "playing on a stringed instrument with your fingers with (or in) your heart to the Lord," and see how you get along with it! Such is not real good nonsense. Notice that the brother says: "In **(6) (Colossians 3:16)** all three words are used and the first one repeated." In this statement he is absolutely wrong; for psallo is not repeated. That text reads, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms (psalmois) and hymns (humnois) and spiritual songs (odais), singing (hadontes) with grace in your hearts to the Lord." There is no successfully disputing the fact that in doing what is here instructed by the use of the words psalmois, humnois and odais is all summed up in the "singing (hadontes) with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Playing a stringed instrument with the fingers is not singing; but psalmois is included in the word singing in this text by the apostle. Is it not a pity he did not have a "scholar" there to inform him better than that? Be it remembered, too, that the apostle did not say, "playing a stringed instrument with the fingers and singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord;" but he did say to sing - sing what? Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, and to sing them with grace in your hearts to the Lord - not with grace in your musical instruments to the Lord. The instruction is definite and specific-nothing left to vain speculation or the invention of some man's device or whim. From Neander's History, Volume 1, pages 302 and 303, we find that the worship which was brought over from the Old to the New Dispensation was the synagogue worship, and this consisted of reading the Scriptures and expounding the same. This was equivalent to reading a portion of

the Old Testament, and then preaching. Of course, in the synagog worship they had only the Old Testament Scriptures. On page 304 we find this language: Church psalmody, also, passed over from the synagogue into the Christian Church. The Apostle Paul exhorts the primitive churches to sing spiritual songs. For this purpose were used the psalms of the Old Testament, and partly hymns composed expressly for this object, especially hymns of praise and of thanks to God and to Christ; such having been known to Pliny, as in customary use among the Christians of his time. In the controversies with the Unitarians, at the end of the second and the beginning of the third centuries, the hymns were appealed to, in which from early times Christ had been worshiped as God. The power of church melody on the heart was soon acknowledged; and hence such as were desirous of propagating peculiar opinions of their own, like Bardasanes or Paul of Samosata, seized upon this as an instrument well adapted to their purpose. This shows clearly that the worship which passed over from the old to the new was the synagogue worship and not the temple worship. It is a well-known fact that there was no such thing as any sort of instrument used in the synagogue worship - nothing there but prayer, the reading of the Scriptures, singing and preaching. Instruments such as harps, cymbals, etc., were used in the temple. So, also, did they, in the temple service, slay their beasts and make their offerings, sprinkling the blood of the slain beasts on the mercy seat and the vessels used in the service. If you are going to have instruments, harps, organs, etc., in your worship, then why not go all the way, and have your beasts slain and make the bloody sacrifices also? If one part of that service is done away, then the whole thing has been done away, and temple worship and service is no more, and no part of it is to be brought into the gospel church. In a foot note on page 128 of Volume 3 of Neander's History we find this statement: From the French church proceeded the use of the organ, the first musical instrument employed in the church (Catholic Church.-C. H. C). On page 439 of Philip Schaff's History of the Church we find this language: The use of organs in churches is ascribed to Pope Vitalian (657-672). Constantine Copronymos sent an organ with other presents to King Pepin of France in 767. Charlemagne received one as a present from the Caliph Haroun al Rashid, and had it put up in the cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle. The art of organ building was cultivated chiefly in Germany. Pope John VIII (872-882) requested Bishop Anno of Freising to send him an organ and an organist. The attitude of the churches toward the organ varies. It shared to some extent the fate of images, except that it never was an object of worship. The poetic legend which Raphael has immortalized by one of his master-pieces, ascribes its invention to St. Cecilia, the patron of sacred music. The Greek (Greek Catholic) church disapproves the use of organs. The Latin church (Roman Catholic) introduced it pretty generally, but not without the protest of eminent men, so that even in the Council of Trent, a motion was made, though not carried, to prohibit the organ at least in the mass. The Lutheran church retained, the Calvinistic branches rejected it, especially in Switzerland and Scotland; but in recent times the opposition has largely ceased. In the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Volume 3, page 1961, we find this language: Sanction of instrumental music in worship is supposed by many to be found in **(Ephesians 5:19)** and **((6) (Colossians 3:16)**, where occurs the word psallo, which, it is alleged, means to sing with the accompaniment of a harp. But this argument would prove that it is as much a duty to play as to sing in worship. It is questionable whether, as used in the New Testament, psallo means more than to sing. But, even admitting that it retains an instrumental allusion, we may hold, with Meyer and others, that it does so only figuratively; the heart being the seat or the instrument of the action indicated. The absence of instrumental music from the worship of the church for some centuries after the apostles, and the sentiment regarding it which pervades the writings of the Fathers, are unaccountable, if in the

apostolic church such music was used. It is a fact as clear as noonday, when the sun is shining in all his glory and splendor, that instrumental music was not used in the early churches, just after the days of the apostles, as well as in their day. To say that the New Testament authorizes the use of such instruments is to charge the apostles themselves with failing to do what they commanded, and to charge the early church, for several centuries, with either open rebellion or the darkest ignorance. And, furthermore, it is an admission that since the days of the apostles the Roman Catholics were the first body of people claiming to be Christians who obeyed the divine injunction. Where does one really belong who will contend for a thing which has such an admission in it? On page 491 of Volume 2 of Benedict's History of the Baptists, published in 1813 (which was before the Missionary division, you know), we find a letter written by a body of Baptists in reply to a letter they received from the Episcopalians. The Episcopalians had made a proposition to the Baptists for a union of the two bodies. The Baptists objected to such a union, whereupon the Episcopalians said it was a matter of (to put it in our own words) stubbornness on the part of the Baptists that they refused, and that there was no sound reason for such a refusal. A letter was written to the Baptists by some Episcopalian calling for their reasons for refusing to go into such a union. The letter was dated September 26, 1698. That was 241 years ago last September. The Baptists wrote a letter in reply, which was dated March 11, 1699- 241 years ago on March 11, 1940. In this letter written by the Baptists they asked the Episcopalians to show, among a number of other things, "that instruments of music are to be used in God's worship, under the New Testament." They said: These are some of the things we desire you to prove and make plain to us by the Holy Scripture. But if the case be such that some or all of them cannot be thereby proved; then the second thing necessary to our reconciliation with your church is, That you will give us clear and infallible proof from God's Holy Word, such as will bear us harmless in the last day, that our Lord Jesus Christ hath given power and authority to any man, men, convocation, or synod, to make, constitute, and set up any other laws, orders, officers, rites and ceremonies, in His Church, besides those which He hath appointed in His Holy Word; or to alter or change those, which He hath therein appointed, according as may, from time to time, to them seem convenient; and that we are bound in conscience towards God, by the authority of His Word, to yield obedience thereunto; or whether it will not be a sore reflection upon the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, and a high defamation of the kingly and prophetic offices of Jesus Christ, to suppose such a thing. Here we have the plain and unmistakable evidence that the Baptists would not have organs in their churches 241 years ago. It is plainly and unequivocally contrary to Baptist belief, usage, or practice to have musical instruments in their churches. They held that such was contrary to New Testament teaching, and unauthorized by the Word of God. We also see very plainly from this that they held it a violation as well as a reflection upon the Master, to practice anything the Bible does not authorize. Some of the Progressive brethren have lately been, in a way, suggesting an effort to get a reconciliation between them and our people upon the ground that "where there is no law, there is no transgression;" that a thing not expressly forbidden may be allowed and practiced. Upon that principle, we might have all the societies the world has, for they are not mentioned in the Bible. Upon that very ground (for one thing)-that they are not mentioned in the Bible-the Primitive Baptists have always rejected them and refused to fellowship them. Hence, it is conclusively true that to fellowship and use any of those things would necessarily be a departure from original Baptist principles. On pages 205 and 206 of Fifty Years Among the Baptists, by Benedict, the Baptist historian, who was with the Baptists in the time of the Missionary split, and who went with that party in the division, we find this language

(we are quoting from the edition published by Newman and Collings. Benedict wrote the book in 1859): The Introduction of the Organ among the Baptists.-This instrument, which from time immemorial has been associated with cathedral pomp and prelatical power, and has always been the peculiar favorite of great national churches, at length found its way into Baptist sanctuaries, and the first one ever employed by the denomination in this country, and probably in any other, might have been seen standing in the singing gallery of the old Baptist meeting house in Pawtucket, about forty years ago, where I then officiated as pastor; and in process of time, this dernier resort in church music was adopted by many of our societies which had formerly been distinguished for their primitive and conventicle plainness. The changes which have been experienced in the feelings of a large portion of our people has often surprised me. Staunch old Baptists in former times would as soon have tolerated the Pope of Rome in their pulpits as an organ in their galleries, and yet the instrument has gradually found its way among them, and their successors in church management, with nothing like the jars and difficulties which arose of old concerning the bass viol and smaller instruments of music. Note the expression, "dernier resort," which means "last resort, or expedient." In this expression the author admitted that it was not authorized by God's Book. Note, too, please, he wrote this in 1859, and says the first organ in a Baptist Church was forty years prior to that date, which would run back to 1819. Here was the first one placed in or used by a Baptist Church. It was one of the new measures introduced by the Fullerites in their departures. Note, also, please, that the instrument gradually found its way among the Baptists. That is the way with all heretical doctrine or practice-it starts very small, but it grows. "Their word doth eat as a canker." - **(II Timothy 2:17)**. Cancers will grow; better kill them in their very incipiency. And, please, note carefully, that "Staunch old Baptists in former times would have as soon tolerated the Pope of Rome in their pulpits as an organ in their galleries." How about you Progressive brethren in that respect? Are you like those staunch Old Baptists? Verily, not. Others of the Primitive Baptists may be ready to go "courting" with you, but this little editor is not, until you renounce that instrument of Rome and put it from you. May the Lord help us all, and enable some of His little children to "touch not, taste not, handle not." C. H. C.

Is Ours A Christian Nation?

---March 7, 1940

The above question is asked on page 240 of the Minutes of the Southern Baptist Convention held at Louisville, Ky., in 1909. The question is in headletter type, and stands over the chart, which we copy below, and beside the chart we give, also, what they had under the same:

It will be observed that there are ninety squares in the picture, each square representing about one million people. At that time the estimated population of the United States was about ninety million. The first permanent settlement in the territory now known as the United States was made in 1607 by the English on the banks of the James River, in Virginia. Many of the first settlers of this country came here seeking a place of security, or a place where they could worship God in quietude, according to the dictates of their own conscience. They were endeavoring to get away from persecution. The first settlers were already "Christianized." Hence, in the first settlement of this country, if a chart should be made to represent them, they would be all white squares. But in all these years they have not "kept even." In their labors to evangelize or Christianize the world they had fallen behind fifty-eight million in 302 years. According to their own

figures, counting all the white and shaded squares, there were just thirty-two million evangelized, or saved, persons in the United States in 1909, and fifty-eight million unevangelized, or unsaved. Remember that the Catholics were the first to send out missionaries to convert and to save the unregenerate, or the lost. At this rate, how long will it take these missionary fanatics to "take the world for Christ?" In the same book, on page 180, may be found this statement: "A million a month in China are dying without God." These fanatics do not know, seemingly, that God is everywhere, and that He works in the heart, and is not dependent on their money schemes to perform His work of regeneration in the heart. If they confess this, they give up their money schemes, and lose their fat jobs. "We are not as many which corrupt the word of God." The word corrupt, in that text {(II Corinthians 2:17)} is from a word which primarily means deal deceitfully with. Hence, "We are not as many which deal deceitfully with the word of God." Their problem reminds us of a problem a teacher once gave to a boy in school. The teacher said, "Johnnie, if a frog falls into a well that is fifty feet deep, and he climbs toward the top one foot each day, and falls back two feet each night, how long will it take him to climb out of the well?" The boy worked all day on the problem and still did not have the answer. So, next day the teacher required him to continue all that day working on it. At closing time the teacher asked, "Johnnie, do you have the answer to that problem yet?" The boy answered, "No, sir; but if you will furnish me with paper I think I will have him in hell by this time tomorrow." The way the missionaries seem to be progressing with their work it seems to us that in the course of time they will have this country in hell, unless divine providence intervenes and delivers us from the downward course we, as a people, are going. May the Lord deliver us. C. H. C.

Preaching and Singing Article No. 8

---March 21, 1940

Our last article under the above heading was in our issue of December 7, 1939, which was our seventh article under that heading. It has not been our intention in writing these articles to wound the feelings of any of our dear brethren, yet it seems that some have taken exceptions to some of the articles written. We wish it to be understood, too, that we have no desire to be in such a work as "asserting a matter of opinion as if it were a fact, or asserting a matter of fact without due evidence." We have endeavored to give what we deem to be good reason for our objection to words in our songs which are not correct words to use. We are well aware of the fact that more latitude is allowed in poetry than in prose; but it seems reasonable to us that when better words can be used to convey the truth, it would be better to use such words. Some good brethren have seen fit to "take us to task" on some things we have written along this line. Very well; we are not writing for controversy, or to stir up strife or controversy. We have no desire to engage in a war with anyone; but our desire is to encourage the use of sound speech both in preaching and singing. Paul said to Titus ((Titus 2:7-8)), "In all things shewing thyself a pattern of good works: in doctrine shewing uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech, that cannot be condemned." We have received the following note from a dear brother in the ministry since our last article on this subject:

Dear Brother Cayce:

I know, as do all, that we should be very respectful to the feelings of all, and especially to our dear brethren; but I was very forcibly reminded in your recent

comments on the song, "Death Is Only a Dream," of the words of Mr. A. J. Buchanan, the man who wrote the music and refrain of that song. I don't know if Mr. Buchanan is still living or not. But twenty-five years ago I was personally acquainted with him. He has been in my home many times. I have heard him sing and play that song, and used almost the exact words you did, saying that death was not a dream but a reality. Let us be kindly affectioned one toward another. We think- the writer of this penned it for our columns, but we withhold his name, as we may be mistaken about him writing it for the paper; it may have been meant for us personally. But if the writer of the music and the refrain (or chorus) said that death is not a dream, then are we to be censured for saying the same thing? No place in the Bible is death called a dream-that is, not that we remember to have seen, or that we can find. But we do find that death is called a sleep. Perhaps it is just as irreverent to say what the Bible says as to say what it does not say. If one thinks so, he does not think of God's Book as we do. We understand God's Book to teach that because of what Jesus did for His people He has made death to be only a sleep to and for them. God Himself called death a sleep. **(Deuteronomy 31:16)**" And the Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers." And Paul said, "Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." -(I Corinthians 15:51-52). And again he said, "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." -((Th 4:13) (I Thessalonians 4:13-17). Sleep is not a dream; it is a reality. One rests in sleep, if the sleep is undisturbed by restless dreams. In death the Lord's children rest. Their spirits do not die; but they do die in body. The body dies and goes to the grave; and in body they sleep a sleep that is undisturbed by restless dreams. They rest from all their labors. In the morning of the resurrection they will be called forth from their graves, and will awake out of their sleep - not a dream. It will be real. Death is real-sleep is real-not a dream. The waking will be real, too; it will not be a dream. And we rejoice to believe it is and will be real-a reality. Yes, people have a legal right to sing what they please, whether it is the truth or not; but we sincerely doubt the Lord's people having a Scriptural right to either preach or sing something that does not conform to sound speech. We are glad of something, too; and that is that we have a right to call attention to matters we are sure are not according to right, even at the expense of being called a dictator. What a pity all do not consider well the instruction given in **(Romans 12:3)**. C. H. C.

An Abomination

---March 21, 1940

There are some things in the world, and some things done in the world, that are bad; and there are some things that are extremely bad-they are an abomination. Let us read **((6) (Proverbs 6:16-19)**: These six things doth the Lord hate; yea, seven are an abomination unto Him: a proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, an heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift

in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren. Here are six things which the Lord hates. They are bad; they are detestable. A proud look is detestable. So is a lying tongue. So are hands that shed innocent blood. If there is a man running around over the country trying to injure and destroy his brother minister, he is one who would shed innocent blood. Frankly, we have no desire for a preacher to come into our section who spends a lot of his time talking derogatorily of a brother minister. It savors most too much of a heart that deviseth wicked imaginations. It looks to us too much like being swift in running to mischief. Too much along that line causes us to suspicion that perhaps he is not a really true witness. The preachers going over the country, if they are true ministers and true witnesses, should spend their time in telling of the goodness of God, and the truths of the Bible, which have a tendency to unite the Lord's children in love and fellowship. To do otherwise is to sow discord among brethren-and that is an abomination unto the Lord. We have, a few times in life, been in company with preachers who would spend much of their time in trying to turn some against another preacher. That is detestable to us, and the Lord hates it. An abomination is anything hateful, wicked, or shamefully vile; it is a hateful or shameful vice. If you have been guilty, quit it at once, if you have any respect for yourself or for that which is approved of the Lord. May the Lord deliver us from such preachers, or such persons. C. H. C. Suppose we should call you our good and worthy brother in public, and yet refuse to make appointments for you, or to recognize you, or to receive you, would you think we were acting according to **(Romans 12:9)** "Let love be without dissimulation?" C. H. C.

Quietly Passed Away

---March 21, 1940

Today (March 15) we are in receipt of a card from Mrs. Grace Thompson Pentecost, Tipton, Ind., saying that her father, Elder John M. Thompson, quietly passed away at midnight on March 6. She said he failed rapidly since January 1, and that when he could no longer use his pencil and reading glass he soon slipped into coma. He was past ninety years of age. As long as he was able he was active in the service. He traveled many miles among the brethren and the churches of the south, as well as other states, preaching the gospel of the grace of God. He was firm in his convictions. We have associated with him much in the years gone by. Our last time to be with him was at Indianapolis in September, 1938. He enjoyed the service much. We were together after the service in the home of Elder Earl Daily. When we bade him farewell we felt that we would never meet again in this world of trouble. We had hope then, and do yet, that we will meet in that better country beyond the river. May the Lord bless his loved ones who are left behind to weep and mourn. And may the Lord send others to fill up the ranks as the older ones are called to come up higher. We have an article in type written by him which is to appear in this issue. C. H. C.

Covenant Breakers

---March 21, 1940

When we unite with the church we thereby enter into a covenant that we will attend the services of the church unless we are providentially prevented. This is equivalent to taking a solemn oath before God that we will do this. When we neglect attending the services of the church, and try to find some excuse for not being there, do we not become covenant breakers? If you will read Paul's

description of the ungodly, as recorded in Rom. i., you will find that he draws an awful ugly picture of them. When we break our covenant do we not make ourselves to look much like the ungodly world? It is mighty ugly and unbecoming in the Lord's little children to do that way. Perhaps some of us can mend our ways in regard to this matter, if we will only try. Let us awake to our duty along this line. It will be a help to us to do so, and a help to the church; and our influence will be better in the community where we live; and it will be honoring to our Lord, who has done so much for us. Try this for at least a year, and see how much better you get along, if you have been breaking your covenant. C. H. C.

Memorial to Convention

---April 4, 1940

We have before us a minute of the meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention at Kansas City, Mo., in 1905. On pages 42-45 appears what is termed "Tex-arkana Convention Memorial," with the Convention's answer to the same. This Texarkana meeting, from which this memorial went up to the Convention, was on March 22, 1905. From this memorial it appears that the Missionaries had been having, and were then having, some dissatisfaction in their ranks. It appears that some had become dissatisfied with the way the Convention were doing things, and the way they had been doing all along. Here is one thing the memorial says: First, we want the money and the associational basis of representation eliminated from the Constitution and a purely church basis substituted instead. * * * * There is other and greater work to do than the handling of cash, and the money basis is the lowest and most unscriptural that is possible to ask Baptists to co-operate on. We can never agree to it and would rather suffer division than to submit to it. * * * Let us impress upon your minds the fact that those who presented this memorial had been working with the Convention and the Board all along. But suddenly they have discovered that the money basis of representation is altogether unscriptural and is such a "low down" thing. Perhaps some of the trouble was as to who should handle the cash. Let it also soak into your system that the writers of this memorial say, "We would rather suffer division than submit to it." They had not divided then; but threatened a division unless the convention would change their constitution, upon which they had been operating for sixty years. The title page of the minute says this was the fiftieth session and the sixtieth year. But the Convention refused to make the change here which they demanded. The memorial also says: We object to the power put into the hands of the Boards by the Convention to appoint and remove missionaries at pleasure without giving them the right of appeal to the Convention, as has been seen in some cases; we ask that this power be taken away from the Boards of the Convention. The answer by the Convention to this was: It (the Board) reserves to itself absolutely, subject to the instructions of this Convention, the whole matter of the selection of field appointment and of missionaries. But these disgruntled fellows would submit to this no longer. They must have some power and authority as to the missionaries themselves. They have formed an association since then, and the association has a committee, and we understand that committee has the right to choose, select, and appoint missionaries to the field, and the missionary must go where the committee says go. What the difference is we are, as yet, unable to see. If we are going to "hire out" to preach, it seems to us there would be no difference whether the employer be called a "Committee" or a "Board."

It seems to us that it would be about the same to "eat the devil as to drink his broth." In the memorial the writers complained that a couple of missionaries had

been dismissed, and so they said: We cannot agree to that sort of thing, and we would rather suffer division than to do it. They further say: Fifth, we attach hereto a copy of our statement of principles and methods of work. We do not ask that you adopt these in full, but send it with this communication so that you may see that we, while we ask you to concede two or three points for the sake of harmony and peace, are really conceding more than we ask you to concede. We are not asking you to make all the concessions; we are willing to meet you as brethren on half-way ground. At the same time we are stating the least we can ask of you. If you reject this at this session we shall consider that we have done our duty and shall trouble you no more. This memorial was signed by B. M. Bogard, J. B. Selman, J. K. P. Williams, J. T. Tucker, A. J. Robins, J. H. Kuykendall, and J. Y. Freeman. Let the reader observe that the parties who sent up this memorial agree to concede more than they asked the Convention to concede, so they said. The question naturally arises: Were the things they agreed to concede to Scriptural, or were they unscriptural? If they were Scriptural, then they confess that what they were holding, but which they offered to surrender, although Scriptural, they would surrender. If unscriptural, then why hold to them? If unscriptural, were they not proposing to surrender something of the devil's invention? If Scriptural, then were they not proposing to give up something from heaven in order to stay with the devil's inventions? All the above reminds us of a little couplet we heard in our boyhood days: Lord, save us, and bind us, And put us where the devil can't find us. C. H. C.

Not Their Faith

---April 4, 1940

Since our article on "The Book of Life," in our issue of February 1, it seems that the position taken by the editor of the Good Samaritan is not the position taken by the other ministers among the Progressives. From the evidence we have received we feel safe in saying that probably no other minister among them holds to that view. They all probably agree with us that the names of the Lord's children were written in the book of life before the ages of time began. We are glad that this is true, and that they are sound in the faith on this question. C. H. C.
Following Rome

---April 18, 1940

In the minutes of the Southern Baptist Convention of 1905, held at Kansas City, Mo., we find some reports of their work in different parts of the world. Beginning on page 100 we find reports of their work in Southern Mexico. On pages 103 and 104 appears a report of the Leon Field, by R. W. Hooker, M. D. Under the head of "School Work," on page 104, he says: During the month of December, Mrs. Hooker and Felippa Perez, the girl above referred to, canvassed the neighborhood in the interest of establishing a day school and secured the promise of some twenty children outside of the one or two in our congregation. In this way we are touching new homes and not only getting a chance to educate the children of our members but also taking advantage of the same powerful means the Romanists use everywhere, the educational principle, to train them up under our religious influences. Aside from what is here admitted, that they are following Romanists in her tactics, it also shows that money begged from the people under the pretense of using it to pay for preaching the gospel to the lost in order that they may be housed in glory is used to furnish the inhabitants of other countries with free schools, free medicines, free doctors, free instructions how to farm, blacksmith,

and other secular matters. God pity such hypocrisy! And that, too, under the pretense of saving lost souls from eternal damnation and eternal burnings! But, note the admission, that they are "taking advantage of the same powerful means the Romanists use everywhere, the educational principle," etc. Of course, they will and do follow Rome in her inventions in these measures. Be it remembered that the first advocates of these mission measures among the Baptists said, on page 429 of the Minutes of the Philadelphia Association: It is, however, a very remarkable circumstance, that in modern missions Papal Rome has led the way. "When the Roman Pontiff," says Mosheim, "saw their ambition checked by the progress of the Reformation, which deprived them of a great part of their spiritual dominion in Europe, they turned their lordly views toward other parts of the globe." The society, which in the year 1540, took the denomination of Jesuits, or the company of Jesus, were by the Pope chiefly employed, at first in India, Japan and China, after which they spared no pains in propagating their erroneous sentiments in the West Indies and on the continent of America. There you have it! Papal Rome led the way! Jesus did not lead the way! The apostles did not lead the way! God did not authorize it! Papal Rome invented it! If their admission-the admission of these early votaries-be true, the whole thing came from hell, and the devil is the author of it! No wonder they adopt and use Rome's tactics! The whole business is from Rome, and those who are following in her means and measures are no more the church of Jesus Christ than Rome herself-and they claim that Rome is Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots, the beast spoken of in Revelation. Since they pattern so closely after Rome, if Rome is the Mother of Harlots, they must be one of the harlots which Rome is the mother of. May the Lord pity and have mercy on the poor dupes who are blindly following these missionary fanatics in the path marked out by Rome. God says to His little children who are entangled in her meshes, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." -(Revelation 18:4). C. H. C.

John 3:8

---May 2, 1940

The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.-(John 3:8). Brother J. M. Simmons, 1168 S. Schuyler Ave., Kankakee, Ill., has asked us to write an explanation of this text. In compliance with his request we will try to write some of the thoughts we have had in connection with the language. This is a part of the conversation our Saviour had with Nicodemus. The conversation was most certainly concerning the matter of the new birth, or being born again, or from above. The word again, in the preceding verses, primarily means from above. Hence, being born from above and being born of the Spirit mean the same thing. To be born of the Spirit is to be born from above; and to be born from above is to be born of the Spirit. The word translated wind in this text frequently means spirit, though it sometimes means wind, and is so translated here in our King James Version. The word listeth means sovereign will or pleasure. Hence the wind blows sovereignly, or where it pleases to blow. Our will or pleasure does not have a thing in this wide world to do with the blowing of the wind. It blows where it pleases, whether we like it or not. Not only does the wind blow sovereignly, where it pleases, so far as we are concerned, but it also blows when and how it pleases. It ceases to blow when it pleases to do so, and we cannot make it to blow, no matter how much we might desire to feel its enlivening breeze,

especially during the hot summer days. And it blows how it pleases. If it pleases to blow in a gentle zephyr breeze, it just blows that way. If it pleases to blow in a gale, or in a tornado, it just blows that way. No doubt many would stop the blowing of the wind when it blows in the tornado or cyclone, if they could. But people have no control over the wind, or over the way, or the how, or the when, it blows. Just as the wind blows sovereignly, so the Spirit operates sovereignly-just when and where and how He pleases. As the word translated wind, in this text, is frequently translated spirit, and frequently means spirit, this text evidently means that the Spirit breathes when and where and how He pleases. If it pleases the Lord to suddenly strike one down, as He did Saul of Tarsus, He does so. If it pleases the Spirit to operate as the gentle breeze, so that one can scarcely tell a difference in his feelings, He does so. No human being can tell where the wind comes from, and no human being can tell where it goes. "So is every one that is born of the Spirit." There is something about the work of the Spirit in regeneration that no human being can tell. It may be that you can remember when you first felt to be a poor sinner in the sight of God; or it may be that you cannot tell. Whether you can tell that or not, there is one thing about it that you do not positively know-you do not certainly know that it was from the Lord. If you but knew that, then you would certainly know that you are a child of God, and you would have no more doubts to arise in your mind concerning that matter. Neither do you certainly know that the work thus done in your heart will finally land you in the glory world. If you certainly knew that, then you would no longer walk by faith, but by sight. But if you love the Lord, and love His cause, and love His service, it is because something has been done for you that you could not do for yourself. You know you have felt something, but you do not certainly know where it came from, nor where it goes to. But it caused hope to spring up in your heart, and that hope is an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast. It is our stay in and through all the troubles and trials of this life. "We love Him because He first loved us." He loved you first, and shed abroad His love in your heart, whether it was done gently and quietly, or like a torrent. It was the same love of God in your soul, whether it came upon you gradually or suddenly. And, no matter whether the Spirit operated the one way or the other, you cannot tell "whence it cometh, or whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit." It is a universal fact; there is no exception. One might say, "Show me a leaf in the forest the wind has not blown upon, and I will show you a person upon whom the Spirit of God has not operated." Very well; we reply, "Show us a leaf, or a twig, or a limb, or a tree, in the forest that has ever resisted the blowing of the wind, so that the wind has taken its everlasting flight, and will operate, or blow, upon it no more, and we will show you a sinner that has resisted the operation of the Spirit, so that the Spirit has taken His everlasting flight, and will operate upon that sinner no more." The Saviour was not talking about the universality of the operation of the Spirit, or the extent of it, but the effectuality of it. The wind blows effectually; and the Spirit operates effectually. He accomplishes that which He pleases. We are glad the Lord works sovereignly and effectually in the salvation of poor hell-deserving sinners. If it were left to the will and whims of poor sinful human beings, no one would ever be saved. It is all of His own sovereign will and mercy. And all the praise and glory are due to His matchless name. C. H. C.

Streamlined Religion

---May 2, 1940

We are in receipt of a clipping from a county paper over in Alabama containing a little article about some preachers engaged in a meeting and who have adopted

what the article calls streamlined methods. This is just another and a later name for modern religious practices. The article before us says that "it is a time when the thoughts and emotions of people are keyed up to a high pitch and they are looking for things highly thrilling and sensational. To meet this propensity of folks, automobiles came out streamlined." "We believe that the phase of life lagging behind most and being slowest to pick up step with the fast age is religion." "Not all religious denominations are in the old ruts, however." "Have put the streamlined effect to their religious work." "It might be well for other denominations to catch on and adopt a few streamlined methods too. Their people-young people, especially-might like it and manifest more interest." We copy the foregoing statements from the article. The gentleman who wrote that article may not know it, but all worldly religionists have adopted streamlined methods as fast as they have been able to learn them. But there is one order of people who remain in the "old ruts," and the Lord will have some followers all along the ages who will not forsake the good old way. "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." -(Jeremiah 6:16). Some of us prefer to walk in the good old way and find rest for our souls, rather than ride in your "streamlined religion" inventions. They are not of the Lord's making. Such streamlined things are of men and devils, and are not the Lord's way. His way is one. He knew what would be for the good of His people in the beginning of the age, when He set up His kingdom, and left nothing out that would be for their good. The devil's religion has to be "improved" on and changed and new and novel methods adopted all along the line. The more streamlined methods the world invents in their religion, of course the better the world will be pleased-and the devil too. But God's children are commanded to come out from the world and to touch not such things as the world invents in religious matters. Streamlined religion! Things that are streamlined meet with less resistance. We suppose streamlined religion meets with less resistance from the world and the devil. Of course the world and the devil will not resist the things that they like and invent. But God's truth has never been loved by the world nor by the devil. We do not suppose any of the devil's folks would get mad at "streamlined religion," but they got mad at Stephen for preaching God's old-fashioned truth, and stoned him to death. Paul was a "streamlined religionist" until the Lord changed him. Then he desired the "good old way" of the Lord. So has it been in every age of the world, and we suppose it will still be that way as long as the world stands. C. H. C.

A False Claim

---May 16, 1940

We have received a letter from a brother in which he says: I heard a man preach on Sunday, February 18, who claims to be a Primitive Baptist. He said that if a church lives in peace a long time there is something wrong; and if a man does anything wrong, to just go on and do all the meanness he can. He gave this Scripture to justify what he said, "he that is guilty of the least is guilty of the whole." He also said that everybody has eternal life. The brother asks us to answer these things through The Primitive Baptist. It is very evident to us that the man who preached such heresy as the above is not a Primitive Baptist. If a church does not live in peace it is very evident that there is something wrong. How does such a sentiment as the preacher expressed compare with this language by the inspired writer, (**James 3:14-18**): But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts,

glory not, and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descend-eth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace. From this language it seems to us that the inspired apostle classes such a claim as is made above as being a lie against the truth. Where there is strife and confusion in the church, it is evident from the teaching of the apostle, it proceeds from beneath, and is not good, but devilish. The man who brings the strife and confusion, then, is a devilish man. He makes confusion and strife instead of peace. The Lord of glory did not say, "Blessed are the trouble makers," or "blessed are the strife and confusion makers;" but He said, "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." -**(Matthew 5:9)**. If the peacemakers shall be called the children of God, what may those be called who are not peacemakers? May it not be said of them, or to them, with propriety, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it?" -**(4)** (John 8:44). If there is something wrong when the church continues to live in peace, can any intelligent reason be given why the apostle would say, "Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you?" -**(II Corinthians 13:11)**. The next idea expressed, "if you do one wrong, just go on and do all the meanness you can," is also as foreign from the truth of the teaching of God's Word as hell is from heaven. The text cited does not read that way, anyhow. The apostle said, "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." -**(James 2:10)**. The teaching is that if one transgresses, or offends in one point, he is a violator and transgressor of the law. Note the next verse: "For He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." Does that mean that if one commits adultery he is at liberty to kill? According to such teaching as that of the preacher, if he should step aside in one point, then he is at perfect liberty to run away with another man's wife, or to take the life of his fellow-man. We frankly say that we would not want to sleep in a room with such a man. God's instruction is, "Let him that stole steal no more." - **(Ephesians 4:28)**. But this preacher's teaching reverses that instruction and would say, "Let him that stole steal all he can." Such doctrine is from hell and is fathered by the devil, the father of lies. "Everybody has eternal life!" It is very evident that the persons addressed in **((4) (John 8:44))** did not have eternal life. Those who have eternal life are of God; but these persons were not of God. Therefore, these persons did not have eternal life. "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." - **(I John 5:12)**. It seems to us that such preachers as advocate such sentiments as set forth above are plainly described by the inspired Apostle Jude, in **((Jude 1:25) (Jude 1:25))**: "But these speak evil of those things which they know not: but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core. These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear: clouds they are without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." Sure this is a dark picture for such men. May the Lord pity His poor children who are deceived by such infamous men posing as preachers. C. H. C.

Our Trip East of River

---June 6, 1940

We are late about writing a little account of our trip in Southwest Alabama, Southeast Georgia, and East Tennessee in April. The first appointment was at Ramah Church, near Banks, Ala., in the Choctaw-hatchee Association on Tuesday, March 26. Then at the following places: Antioch, Pleasant Grove (Ozark), Union, Little Vine, and Piny Grove, in the same association, and then at Mars Hill, in Harmony Association. Five brethren-Brethren S. E. Cope-land, V H. Copeland, and a Brother Heath, and Elders J. N. Bobo and H. P. Copeland-met us at Ramah, and went the round with us until the meeting at Little Vine, March 31. They returned home from there. Elder S. W. Etheredge, who made the appointments for us, stayed with us through the whole time of these appointments. Brother Copeland has already written some account of the meetings during the time he was with us. We also met and were with Elders W. T. Cook and J. D. Putman. Elder Joseph Hobbs and Elder Hall, of the Pulaski Association, were with us at Mars Hill, and so was Elder A. A. Garrett, of the Flint River Association. Elders R. D. Dodgen and J. K. Everett, of the Patsaliga Association, met with us several days. We think they left us on April 5, from Olive Grove, in the Flint River Association, to return home. At all the places, up to and including Mars Hill, they had service in the morning and afternoon, with lunch on the ground. We had the pleasure of meeting dear old Elder T. E. McGowan once more at Little Vine. He is old and feeble in body but still strong in the faith. May the Lord bless him in his latter days. From Mars Hill we filled appointments in the bounds of the Flint River Association at Shady Grove, Union (Miller), Olive Grove, Piedmont, Tired Creek, Pisgah, and Trinity. Besides these, some appointments were made at night at other places. Elder M. L. Gilbert, of Florida, met us at Piedmont on April 6, and was with us at the places named following that place. We were also with Elders A. A. Garrett, T. R. Crawford, L. Z. Folmar, R. K. Blackshear and R. G. Lewis. We had the pleasure of being in the home of each one, except Elder Lewis. From there we went to Chattanooga, Tenn., to fill appointments arranged by Brother D. M. Raulston, at Friendship, near Ringgold, Ga., Chattanooga, Lookout Valley, Walnut Grove, South Pittsburg, Sweeten's Cove, Bethlehem, and then at the Sequatchie County High School, in Dunlap, on Sunday, April 28. We met Elders J. W. Dempsey, W. R. Abernathy, H. L. Golston, M. A. Hackworth, W. J. Harwood, J. W. Clemons, and Fred Stewart. Elder Golston met us at Chattanooga, April 14, and was with us the remainder of the trip. All the meetings, throughout the entire trip, were pleasant to us, and we enjoyed some pleasant seasons with the dear saints. We do not remember making a trip that we enjoyed more, at most of the places we went. The brethren were all good and kind to us- much better than we felt to deserve. Our companion and three of the children-Fleming, Ilene, and Hartsel-were at the service at the High School in Dunlap. Wife's father was there with them. We saw him as we went into the auditorium, but did not see them, as they were in a different place. We did not have any idea of their presence until after the service was dismissed. They were within a few feet of us before we saw them, or had any idea they were nearer than Thornton, Ark. It sure was a great surprise-and we were glad to see them, of course. We spent the night with father and family, at Brownsboro, Ala., then drove home on Monday. We were glad to get back home again. Work had "piled up" much while we were away, and we have had so much to attend to, getting corners rounded up again, that we have not had the time to write about the trip. And now, we feel that what we have been able to write is hardly worth the space it

will take in the paper. May the good Lord bless all those we met and with whom we had the pleasure of associating and conversing and engaging with in the sweet service of our heavenly Master. We feel to thank the good Lord for His mercies extended to us. We are doing this writing on Friday, May 31. Our regular meeting time here at home is tomorrow and next day-Saturday and Sunday. We are due to leave home Sunday at one o'clock for a long trip out west. May the Lord bless our labors. Remember us and our loved ones in your prayers, please. C. H. C.

Jeremiah 7:17-20

---June 6, 1940

Brother W. H. Dearman, of Chunky, Miss., requested us to give our views on **((7) (Jeremiah 7:17-19))**. Somehow, we do not have a mind to write on the language recorded in the verses referred to. Perhaps it may be of some benefit to our readers for us to give them the benefit of Gill's comments on the language. So we give below his comments on ((7) (Jeremiah 7:17-20)). C. H. C.

THE COMMENTS

"Seest thou not what they do in the cities of Judah," etc. Not in one city only, but in all of them, and particularly the chief of them; as follows: "and in the streets of Jerusalem?" these words, with what is said next, show the reason why the prophet was forbid to pray for this people, and the Lord was so provoked with them as to cast them out of His sight; and He appeals to the prophet; and to what He saw, or which He might see; for what was done was done not in secret, but openly, in the very streets of the city; by which He might be sufficiently convinced it was but just with God to do what He determined to do with them. "The children gather wood," etc. In the fields, or out of the neighbouring forest; not little children, but young men, who were able to cut down trees, and bear and carry burdens of wood: "and the fathers kindle the fire;" take the wood of their children, lay it in order, and put fire to it; which shows that they approved of what their children did, and that which they did was by their direction and order: "and the women knead their dough;" so that every age and sex were employed in idolatrous service, which is here intended; the corruption was universal; and therefore the whole body was ripe for ruin; nor would the Lord be entreated for them: and all this preparation was, "To make cakes for the queen of heaven;" the moon, as Abarbinel; which rules by night, as the sun is the king that rules by day; and which was much worshipped by the Heathens, whom the Jews imitated. Some render it, "to the work, or workmanship, of heaven;" that is, to the whole host of heaven, sun, moon, and stars, which were worshiped in the cities of Judah, and in the places round about Jerusalem, **((Ki 23:5) (II Kings 23:5))**, The Targum renders it, "to the star of heaven;" and Jarchi interprets it of some great star in the heaven, called the queen of heaven; and thinks that these cakes had the impress of a star upon them, see **((Amos 5:26) (Amos 5:26))**; where mention is made of "Chiun, your image, the star of your god." The word "chiun" is akin to the word here translated "cakes," and thought to be explained by a star; see also **(Acts 7:43)**; but it seems rather to be the moon, which is expressly called by Apuleius the queen of heaven; and often by others Coelestis; and Urania by the Africans, as Tertullian and Herodian affirm; as also Beltis, by Abydenus; and Baaltis, by Philo-Byblius, or Sanchoniatho; which have the signification of queen; and these cakes might have the form of the moon upon them, and be made and offered in imitation of the shew-bread: "and to pour out drink-offerings unto other gods;" not different from the queen of heaven, and the hosts thereof; for to her and them drink-offerings were poured out, **(Jeremiah 44:18-19)**; but other gods besides the one, only,

living, and true God, "that they may provoke me to anger;" not that this was their intention, but so it was eventually. "Do they provoke me to anger? saith the Lord," etc. No: He cannot be provoked to anger as men are; anger does not fall upon Him as it does on men; there is no such affection in God as there is in men, His Spirit cannot be irritated and provoked in the manner that the spirits of men may be; and though sin, and particularly idolatry, is disagreeable to Him, contrary to His nature, and repugnant to His will: yet the damage arising from it is more to men themselves than to Him; and though He sometimes does things which are like to what are done by men when they are angry, yet in reality there is not such perturbation in God as there is in men; "do they not provoke themselves to the confusion of their own faces?" the greatest hurt that is done is done to themselves; they are the sufferers in the end; they bring ruin and destruction upon themselves; and therefore have great reason to be angry with themselves, since what they do issues in their own shame and confusion. The Targum is, "do they think that they provoke me? saith the Lord; is it not for evil to themselves, that they be confounded in their works." "Therefore thus saith the Lord God," etc. Since these are their thoughts, and this is the fruit of their doings: "behold, my anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place;" like fire, to consume and destroy it; meaning Jerusalem, which was burned with fire; as an emblem of God's wrath, and an instance of His vengeance upon it, for sins; which came down in great abundance, like a storm or tempest: "upon man and upon beast;" upon beast for the sake of man, they being his property, and for his use; otherwise they are innocent, and do not deserve the wrath of God, nor are they sensible of it: "and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of your ground;" which should be blighted by nipping winds, or cut down and trampled upon by the Chaldean army: "and it shall burn, and shall not be quenched;" that is, the wrath of God shall burn like fire, and shall not cease until it has executed the whole will of God in the punishment of His people.

John 10:16

---June 6, 1940

In August, 1939, Elder G. B. Sutherland, of Haysi, Va., asked us to write our views on **(John 10:16)**. In the language of the Apostle Peter, to the lame man, as recorded in **(Acts 3:6)**, we would say, "such as I have, give I thee." The text reads, "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd." He had some sheep which were not of the Jewish fold. He had some people among the Gentiles, as well as among the Jews. The Jews thought the Lord's people were all among the Jews, but they were not. Jesus must bring them-His people who were among the Gentiles as well as those who were among the Jews. He could bring them the same way He brought those who were of the Jews; "they shall hear my voice." He did not say "they shall hear my words;" but "they shall hear my voice." It is by the power of His voice that poor sinners were raised out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ, and it was that way then. It has always been that way, and it will never be any other way. They are all-both Jews and Gentiles-brought into divine relationship with Him by the direct work of the Holy Spirit - by the Lord speaking directly to them, and thus raising them out of death into life. Paul said to the Ephesians- the Gentile Church at Ephesus-" And you hath He quickened." They were in a state of death before they were thus quickened; but after they were thus quickened they were not in a state of death in sin, but were alive. "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the

Son of God: and they that hear shall live." -(John 5:25). The Lord saves His people among the Gentiles the same way He saves His people among the Jews. Now there is one fold and one shepherd. The Gentiles are admitted into the privileges and blessings of gospel worship and service. Under the law the oracles of God were committed to the Jews; but now the Gentiles have the blessings and privileges of gospel worship and service. This brings us to another field. We wonder if we appreciate those blessings and privileges as we should. They may be taken from us some day, as they were taken from the Jews. But we will not write on that matter here. May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of our readers. C. H. C.

Preaching and Singing Article No. 9

---June 6, 1940

In what we have written concerning the matter of unsound sentiment which we have seen in some of the songs, which our people have been accustomed to singing in some places where we have been, it has been far from us to be faultfinding. Neither have we had such a thing in mind as to find fault with any certain book. Neither have we had any desire to engage in any such thing as destructive criticism. As for any of our work or procedure in the fifty years we have been in the ministry, or the nearly thirty-five years we have been editing The Primitive Baptist, we have never felt to take offense at anyone who had the kindness to offer constructive criticism. We take it that if we use language which does not properly express the true thought, if a brother will kindly point out the mistake to us, we will take it as a favor. But it seems that if we endeavor to do a thing like that some take offense at it. But this one thing we know, according to the English language, we have not misconstrued, or placed a wrong construction on a single sentence we have called attention to. Yet we confess that we are imperfect, and that we make mistakes. Perhaps we had better not call attention to any error again in anything we find in public print, because we are imperfect ourselves. If that position be a correct one, then it would be a grave wrong for anyone to ever attempt to convince us of any error we might make, unless that person is perfect and makes no mistakes himself. For the present time we have accomplished what we desired to do, even if some have seemed to resent what we have said. If we have offended anyone we are sorry of that, but we feel an ease of conscience that we have tried to do our duty in the matter as best we knew how. We still have the right of free press under our government. But we do not have the right to use copyrighted matter without permission of the owner of the copyright. It seems to us that it is a sad day for our Zion when a man cannot call attention to an error in public print without his brethren becoming offended and saying hard things about him for it. May the Lord pity some folks. With love for the truth and righteousness we conclude our articles on this question, reserving the constitutional and Scriptural right to point out any error we see. C. H. C.

Messenger of Zion Sold

---June 6, 1940

The Messenger of Zion, which has been edited and published by Elder J. D. Shain at Madisonville, Ky., will be edited by Elder Ariel West, of Luling, Texas, in the future. We understand the paper will still be printed and mailed at Madisonville, Ky. Elder West has just taken over the work of editing the paper. We wish Elder West success in his undertaking, and trust it will be for the good of the cause of the Master. Elder West is a young man, but is well received by the Baptists where he

goes, so we have learned. May the Lord bless him in his labors, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Something Different

---June 6, 1940

How would you like to have a Primitive Baptist periodical conducted along a little different line from any other? There has been such a publication-one along a different line from any other-under consideration. The editor, or the one to have it in charge, is expecting to have the printing and mailing done from our office here in Thornton. The periodical would probably be published monthly, and would be in pamphlet form of about thirty-two pages each issue. Each issue would contain one or two discourses delivered by some of our ministers-taken by a shorthand writer, and published in this periodical. In addition to one or two discourses in each issue, there would be articles written, and sometimes some discourses delivered years ago, to be copied from old books and old papers, showing thereby what the Baptists believed and taught in the years gone by. The prospective publication would be along a different line altogether from anything our people now have in the field. It would contain sermons that would be both comforting and instructive, as well as old writings that would be both comforting and instructive. The price would have to be about \$1.00 a year, at least until a subscription list could be built up large enough to be self-sustaining at a lower price. We agreed to make an announcement of this in our columns, and to ask our subscribers to write us a card and say if you will place your name as a charter subscriber for such a publication. Do not send any money; but if you would like to have such a periodical, just write us a card and say, "I will be one of the charter subscribers for the new publication, to contain one or two discourses, and other good matter, each month," and sign your name with your postoffice address, and mail to us. Please do this at once, so we may have an idea about how our people feel in regard to such an important publication. We will appreciate it if our other Primitive Baptist papers will copy this article. May the Lord direct us in the way that will be for the advancement of His precious cause. C. H. C.

The Term Church

---June 20, 1940

Dear Brother Cayce: I would like for you to answer these questions through The Primitive Baptist:

1. Is the church visible or invisible?
2. Can it be said that the church consists of the saved of all the earth?
3. The Bible speaks of local churches, such as the church at Ephesus, the church at Jerusalem, etc. It speaks of the church as having been purchased by the blood of Christ. **{(0:28) (Acts 20:28); (Ephesians 5:25)}** Christ promised perpetuity to His church. **{ (Matthew 16:18)}** Paul speaks of the general assembly of the church. **{(Hebrews 12:23)}** Does the word church mean the same in all these different places?
4. Is the word church ever applied to believers, except when they are assembled?
5. Is there any difference in the kingdom of God and the church of God?
6. How can those who believe in eternal and unconditional election consistently use the term "offered grace?" The London Confession of Faith says that the Lord freely offered unto sinners life and salvation (Chap. XII-of God's Covenant).

Martin Luther, although a Calvinist, says that the gospel is an offer of grace.
What do they mean by this? Yours in Christ, Wyoming, W. Va. J. M. Thornbury.
REMARKS

We will try to answer the questions, as best we can, without taking them up by number, singly. Sometimes the word church embraces all that Jesus died for, and so may include all the finally saved, when used in that sense. In **(Ephesians 5:25-27)** we are told that Christ gave Himself for the church, that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, etc. Those He gave Himself for will finally be presented to Himself without spot; they will be landed safe in glory. In **(Hebrews 2:9-13)** we are taught that those for whom Jesus gave Himself, those for whom He tasted death, will be brought to glory; and they are there called brethren, the church, and the children which God hath given Him. So the word church, as here used, embraces all the finally saved. But the word does not always embrace all the redeemed family; sometimes it simply refers to the local assembly of the saints who are gathered together, and united together, for their mutual benefit and for the worship and service of God. To know what the writer means by the word church, see subject under consideration. I think the Scriptures teach that the church, as a body embracing and teaching the doctrine of the Bible, will continue to exist on earth until Jesus comes again. It may become extinct in this or that locality, but it will then be moved to some other place, so that it will not become entirely extinct. We think this answers question four also; as believers may be a part of the church, even when the church is not assembled in a local body. They are in the church when the word is used to designate or describe those for whom Christ gave Himself. Sometimes the kingdom of God means the church, and sometimes the word church has reference to the kingdom as an organized body, or to the body authorized by the Lord to execute His laws, which He gave to govern in His kingdom, or church. Concerning the expression in the London Confession of Faith, we here give the interpretation placed upon that by the brethren assembled in the meeting at Fulton, Ky., in 1900: By the words of "offereth unto sinners life and salvation," etc., we do not understand that the gift of eternal life is offered to alien sinners, but should be understood as meaning the assurance or enjoyment of spiritual or divine life, as is taught in **(0:30) (John 20:30-31)** and **(Galatians 6:7-8)**. The following places in the Confession describe the alien sinners as being unable to accept an offer of life: Chapter XX, Sec. 4; Chapter IX, Sec. 3; Chapter III, Sec. 6; and for further explanation of the doctrine herein set forth and from which said doctrine is deductible, see Confession, Chapter XVII, Sec. 3; Chapter XVIII, Sec. 3 and 4; Chapter X, Sec. 4; Chapter XX, Sec. 1 and 4 **(II Peter 1:10-11)**. This is the explanation put upon that by those brethren there assembled. As to what Martin Luther said and taught in his use of that sort of expression, we cannot say, as we do not have all his writings. We have some of his works, but not all, and just now we do not find that language in the books we have containing some of his writings. We do not mean to say the expression is not in the books we have containing his writings, but we do not find it in the limited time we have to search for it now. Trust this may be of some benefit to you, Brother Thornbury, as well as to others of our readers. C. H. C.

Respecter of Persons

---July 4, 1940

Brother Pleasant Brown, of Bloomington, Ind., requested us in March, 1939, to write some in regard to the matter of God being no respecter of persons. Peter's language, recorded in **(0:34) (Acts 10:34-35)**, is often quoted by the Arminian world to prove that one must fear God and do righteous works in order that God save him. Peter said: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him." This was said by the apostle at the house of Cornelius. Cornelius, who was a Gentile, was described "as a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway." -((0:2) (Acts 10:2). This was before the apostle went to his house. The word translated devout in this text is translated godly in **(II Peter 2:9)**, which says, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations." Cornelius was a godly man before the preacher got there. As he was a godly man, he was a child of God. Before the apostle went to the house of Cornelius he was shown in a vision that God had a people among the Gentiles. Three days before Peter got to Cornelius he saw this vision. See ((0:9) (Acts 10:9-20). In that vision a voice from heaven said to him the third time, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." What God hath cleansed-not what God will cleanse after, or when, you go there and preach to them. When Peter got to Cornelius, and heard what Cornelius had to say about what had occurred with him four days before, and how that he had sent for him, as the angel had instructed, then Peter used the language quoted above, as recorded in ((0:34) (Acts 10:34-35). "Of a truth I perceive." This expresses the thought that he can now see plainly the truthfulness of what was shown him in the vision. It is a clear manifestation of the truth of what he had heard said in the vision-" What God hath cleansed." It was thus taught him that God had a people among the Gentiles, and the teaching confirmed by what he was here brought in contact with. "God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation," etc. People are accepted with the Lord among the Gentiles, as well as among the Jews. This Gentile, being a godly man, who feared God, and the works which he did, and his praying to God, all proved that he was accepted with God. Nationality makes no difference in this matter. Peter, as well as other Jews, thought none of God's people were to be found among the Gentiles-that God had no people only among the Jews. He is here shown and convinced that what he and other Jews had thought was wrong. If the Arminian position is right, then God is a respecter of persons. Their view in regard to the matter of being saved is that Cornelius had to hear the preacher preach, and believe and then obey that preaching in order that he become a child of God, or in order that God save him. If that position is true, then God would respect and save Cornelius for what he had done, and he would be a respecter of persons. But as God is no respecter of persons, the Arminian doctrine is wrong. God does not save sinners, or give them eternal life, as a result of what they do, or in consequence of what they do. He does not save them on certain stipulated conditions performed by them. There is a sense in which God does respect persons. Let us notice the first offerings made unto the Lord. See **(Genesis 4:2-5)**: And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground. And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering: but unto Cain and to his offering He had not respect. Cain made an offering of the fruit of the ground, the labors of his own hands, his own works; but the Lord had not respect unto Cain and his offering. God did not accept such an offering. When a man offers his own works today as a ground of acceptance with the Lord, the Lord does not accept it. Abel offered the firstlings of his flock. Blood was shed in the offering which Abel made. This was a type of the offering made by the Son of God

on Calvary's cross. God accepted Abel's offering-He had respect unto Abel and to his offering. Abel did not become righteous by making his offering. He did not become a child of God by making his offering, but he obtained witness by it. "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts." -Heb. xi. 4. Abel had the faith before he made the offering. Faith is a fruit of the Spirit. Hence, he was in possession of the Spirit, and was already a child of God before the offering was made. God accepted the offering, and thereby Abel obtained witness that he was a child of God. May the Lord bless these thoughts to the good of our readers. C. H. C.

Trip Northwest

---July 18, 1940

After our meeting at home on the first Sunday in June we left home at 1 o'clock to fill appointments in Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, and Iowa, as made by Elder J. Q. Jones, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, and others. We arrived at Syracuse, Kansas, at 3:40 Monday afternoon, June 3. Elder Elbert Holdren met us at the train and conveyed us to his home, where we spent the night very pleasantly. His wife was not well and was not at home, just leaving a hospital a few days before and was at the home of his sister in Holly, Colorado. We had meeting at his church Tuesday and Wednesday-all day meeting both days. Elder L. E. Thompson was present at the Wednesday morning service. The meeting was pleasant each time. Sister Holdren was able to be at the services Tuesday and on Wednesday afternoon. We trust her health has much improved. On Friday a Brother Loomis conveyed us and Elder Holdren to Lamentations Junta, Colo., to the home of Elder Ralph Fry. In the afternoon he and his family and Elder Holdren and Brother Loomis went with us to Kim, where an appointment had been made for us for that night. We had a very pleasant meeting there, after which we all returned to Lamentations Junta, and spent the remainder of the night in the home of Elder Fry. Saturday morning we all went to Ordway, where we had an all-day service. Sunday morning we went to Fowler, where an all day service had been arranged at the home of Brother Fry, father of Elder Fry. After service that afternoon he conveyed us to Colorado Springs, where we had service that night, and also on Monday and Tuesday nights. This is the home of Elder Ira Fry, who is the pastor there. From Colorado Springs we went to Denver, where we had services on Wednesday and Thursday nights. Elder J. O. Dodd lives in Englewood, a suburb of Denver. We spent Wednesday night in his home. Elder A. G. Johnson, of Greely, met us here and conveyed us to Kimball, Neb., on Friday. There are but few members at Denver, but they are a faithful little band. Elder Dodd went with us to Kimball, where we had service Friday night, and both morning and afternoon Saturday and Sunday. This was their regular communion time. The meeting was pleasant and delightful. Saturday morning Elder Ira Fry came and was present the two days. Elder Fry is the pastor, and they esteem him highly. Elder Fry's son was just recovering from a very serious illness, resulting from sticking a nail in his foot. We trust he is well by this time. From Kimball we went to Cozad, Neb., where we had service on Monday night, Tuesday, and Tuesday night. Elders W. S. Craig and Leslie Henry live here. Elder Craig has been in very poor health for some time, and was not able to be out, or to attend the service. We called to see him Tuesday afternoon. We trust he may soon be restored to health, and pray the Lord's blessings may rest upon him and his family. Elder Henry was with us in each service. He is a precious and promising young gift, and is much loved by his brethren. Brother Frank Newman and wife met

us at Cozad and conveyed us to Arnold, their home. We had service there two days. Elder Henry is their pastor, and was with us there. From Arnold Brother and Sister Newman conveyed us to Battle Creek, Neb., where we had service Friday night, Saturday and Sunday. This was their communion time, and the meetings were delightful. Elder J. Q. Jones met us here and conveyed us to his home in Council Bluffs, Iowa. We spent Monday visiting with him, and in the afternoon he conveyed us to Missouri Valley, where we spent a pleasant night in the home of Brother P. S. Bunch. On Tuesday and Wednesday we had all day service at Loveland (Council Bluff Church). Elder J. Q. Jones, the pastor, and Elders Vincent, G. J. Jones, A. W. Thompson, and W. A. Holmes were present here. From Loveland we were conveyed by Elder Holmes to the home of Elder Thompson, in Casey, Iowa, where we visited on Wednesday, June 26, with Elder Vincent, in the home of Elder Thompson. On Thursday we had service at Sharon Church, the home church of Elder Thompson. Elder C. M. Harris, of Marion, Ill., was on a visit to some relatives near there, and was present at the service, as also was Elder Vincent and Elder Holmes. Elder Holmes conveyed us from Sharon Church to his home in Newton, where we spent Saturday very pleasantly. An appointment had been made at Mt. Pleasant Church, near Grinnell, for us for Saturday night, by request of some of them. We had a very pleasant meeting there. On Sunday there was an all day service at Des Moines River Church, near Eldon, Iowa. It was a delightful meeting. Elder Holmes is the pastor, and was with us. Three cars, loaded with passengers, were there from Salem Association, in Illinois, among them being Elder Claud Webb's son, Brother and Sister Hopkins, Brethren Earl W. Poland and E. K. Symmonds, and Sister Ethel Byler. There were others whose names we do not now recall. After the service, Elder Holmes went with us to the home of a Sister Thompson, near Ottumwa, for supper, where we spent a few hours visiting. Then he conveyed us to Albia, where we boarded a train at 11:15 that (Sunday, June 30) night for home. We arrived in Little Rock Monday evening at 6:05, where we were met by three of our children (Florida, Fleming, and Hartsel) and Sister Grace Claggett and Sister Mildred Morrow. Sister Mildred lives in Newark, Ohio, and is here visiting Sister Grace. We arrived home safe at 8:05 that evening, and found all well as usual, for which we trust we are thankful. The trip was pleasant and delightful. The brethren were all kind and good to us, and received us heartily, and manifested that they endorsed our little efforts to speak in the name of the Master, and endorse our labors for peace in our beloved Zion. They want no new things, and are satisfied with the sweet doctrine of grace and the order of God's house, as the Master left it. The churches are small in number and somewhat far apart in miles, but we found them to be united in bonds of sweet fellowship. May heaven's richest blessings rest upon them, is our humble prayer. We trust they will remember us at the rich throne of grace. Many of them we will never meet again on earth. We trust that, by the grace and mercy of God, we shall meet them in that blessed home where sorrows and separations never come. We feel a warm fellowship in our hearts for them. C. H. C.

Lest We Forget

---July 18, 1940

Are you interested in a Primitive Baptist periodical conducted along a little different line from any other? Elder Cayce told you about such a publication being talked of in June 6 paper. A few have written us that they were interested and that they wished their name placed as a charter subscriber for such a publication; but we have not heard from near all of you. Write us at once if you approve of such a

publication and if you will be a charter subscriber. I know of a fact that a number of sermons have been taken down as they were delivered from the pulpit. One or two such sermons are to be in each issue of the proposed paper - depending, of course, on the length of the sermon. Would you like to read one or two sermons each month, as well as a reprint of "long ago?" Then write us now. Will you? Yours in hope, Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

Acknowledgement of Error

---July 18, 1940

Dear Brethren Everywhere: It is with much joy and thanksgiving that I am privileged to correct an error that I (at the time of making it) was honest in. Some time in December, 1939, I wrote some of my thoughts to the Zion's Landmark on the subject of predestination and conformation. This article appeared in the January 1, 1940, issue of the Zion's Landmark. The error appeared in the eleventh paragraph, and the second clause. I was honest in my conviction that the word ordain, as it appears in that Scripture, where the apostle thus speaks, "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them," was referring to (and that exclusively) the term walk. And, while it is true, no doubt, that 'God leads His people by His Spirit to walk in the paths of righteousness, and by the same power influences them for good, yet ordain, in the sense of this text, means prepared. When I was cited to this error by some faithful brethren, and understood the great import of it, I had a desire to write a correction, and make myself plain, lest some poor little lamb of God may mistake my error for truth and be led astray. I wish to say, ordain has reference to the term works, and not walk, in the above mentioned text; for He is our example of good works, and we should follow the great example. May God pardon error, and turn mistakes to His glory, is my prayer. T. R. Crawford. Cairo, Ga.

REMARKS

How commendable it is for us to acknowledge our mistakes when it is brought to our attention that we have made them. Dear brother, your course in this has drawn us closer to you than we ever were before. How good it would be if every one of us had the courage to acknowledge our mistakes, and how much better off we would be. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon you, dear brother. Our prayer is that this will be blessed to the good of Zion. The above should have appeared sooner, but was delayed while we were away from home. We are sorry of the delay. C. H. C.

John 14:2-3

---August 1, 1940

Elder J. E. Alderman, of Stringer, Miss., requests us to give our views on **(John 14:2)**. (John 14:2-3) read as follows: "In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." For the satisfaction of this dear old father in Israel we are willing to give him such as we have, and trust the same may be of some consolation and comfort to him. He is a precious old servant to us. There is a sense in which this house, or kingdom, was prepared from the foundation of the world. "Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

-(Matthew 25:34). The glory world was prepared for His children from the foundation of the world. In the Father's house are many mansions, or dwelling places. In the heavenly world the redeemed will dwell in God's love in peace, in happiness, in rest, in the presence of Jesus, their Redeemer and Saviour. But in the language of the Master here recorded we see a special place to be prepared for each one of the redeemed. "I go to prepare a place for you." He has gone to the Father in heaven to prepare a place for each of you, His children. He had each one, individually, in mind and purpose, and in His heart. He went there, Brother Alderman, to prepare a place for you, personally, individually. It was especially for you, and for each one of His children, that He went to His Father, to the Father's house, to the home in glory, to prepare a place for you, each, one of you, specially and individually. What He did for one of His children, in this respect, or in regard to this, He did for each one individually. And His promise recorded here is precious and dear to our hearts. He has gone to prepare a place for you in that home, which home was prepared from the foundation of the world; and He is coming back for you, and will take you to live with Him in that glorious home. A precious promise this is. A few more trials here, and your sorrows will end. May the sweetness of these truths comfort your heart, dear brother, and also comfort the heart of each reader, is our prayer. C. H. C.

A Great Loss

---August 1, 1940

Brother G. A. Craft, of El Dorado, Ark., was with us at our meeting the first Sunday in July. He enjoyed the service much, as we all did. It was a delightful meeting. On Monday night following our meeting he started to write a letter to us, which he did not finish. On Saturday, July 13, he passed away very suddenly, with heart trouble, and was buried on Sunday. His funeral was conducted by Elders John R. Harris and E. W. Hargett. We would have attended the funeral, but were away from home, at Atkins, Ark. The following is the letter Brother Craft wrote, as far as he got with it, which was the last writing he did on this line: El Dorado, Ark., Monday Night. Dear Brother Cayce: While reading tonight in your Editorial book, No. 2, I felt that I must write you a few lines. I have thought of writing you and Sister Cayce many times; but, realizing my poor and imperfect way, I have hesitated to do so. Yet, if the good Lord would direct my mind I would like to tell you how I appreciate your love and kindness shown this poor boy from time to time. I feel that I could never express my thankfulness. There he stopped. Brother Craft was a true and faithful member of the church. He had many friends, and will be greatly missed. We loved him much. May the good Lord bless and sustain his bereaved wife and children, and the church of his membership. C. H. C.

Isaiah 14:20

---August 1, 1940

Sister M. P. Bradford, of Primm, Tenn., requests our views of **((20) (Isaiah 14:20)**, which reads as follows: "Thou shalt not be joined with them in burial, because thou hast destroyed thy land, and slain thy people: the seed of evildoers shall never be renowned." This prophecy was against the king of Babylon, while the Jews were in captivity there. The king was not buried as other kings; his death was not mourned as was the death of kings, usually; nor did he have the burial which kings usually had. His burial was as the burial of the poor and common people. And his family were destroyed. "The seed of evildoers shall never be

renowned." That is, their renown shall not last long. Shame and disgrace is sure to follow as a result of their evil doings. These are just a few of our thoughts in connection with the language here recorded. C. H. C.

Ambassadors

---August 15, 1940

And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.-(II Corinthians 5:18-20). What all things are of God? Does that expression mean that all things which exist are of God? We think not. The all things in this verse are the same all things which are mentioned in (II Corinthians 5:17): "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." The same all things which are become new are of God; and then the apostle says, "who hath reconciled us to Himself." "Hath reconciled" is in the past tense; it is something which has already been done. No part of that work of reconciling us to Himself is to be accomplished in the future, either by what we do, or by what the church does, or by what the sinner does. It has already been accomplished; it has been finished; it has been completed. This work was fully accomplished-fully done-by Jesus Christ-not by Jesus Christ and the preacher; not by Jesus Christ and the sinner; not by Jesus Christ and the church; not by Jesus Christ and any society or set of men under heaven-but by Jesus Christ alone. Then He "hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation." The ministry of reconciliation is the work of a servant, in the sense of an ambassador, for he says we "are ambassadors." It is, therefore, necessarily true that the work of the minister, or of the ministry, has no part in the work of reconciling. That has already been done; God has already "reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ." Now, having already done this, He gives to men, of His own choosing and calling, the ministry of reconciliation. Their work is to tell what the Lord has already done, which is "that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." God was manifest in the flesh; Christ was God manifest in the flesh. God accomplished the work of reconciling His people unto Himself. He did that work in Christ. He did not impute their trespasses unto them. Their sins were not charged to them. Their trespasses were imputed to Christ. Their sins were charged to Him, for He was their surety. As He was their surety, He took their law place. He was responsible for all their transgressions, all their sins. They were all imputed to Him; they were all charged to Him. As such, He met all the demands of the law for them and in their stead. When the demands of the law were thus met, the just and righteous law of God was satisfied, and God was satisfied; and thus He reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ. No wonder, then, this same apostle could, and did say: "For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." -(Romans 5:10). In the original language the expression, being reconciled, is in the past tense; and in our present day English it strictly means "having been reconciled." Now, God having done this, He hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation-that is, He "hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." He has not committed unto us the - work of reconciliation, but the word of it. He has placed upon somebody the duty and the obligation to tell the news of what the Lord has done. The word, of

reconciliation means the news of it-tell it, and tell about it; tell what the Lord has done. To do this is to proclaim glad tidings; it is to tell the good news. It is to tell the Lord's humble poor, those for whom Jesus laid down His life, that He has made perfect and full and complete satisfaction for all their sins; they have been reconciled to God by Jesus Christ. Having been reconciled to God by Jesus Christ, He having met all the demands of the law for them, and the law having been fully satisfied, they are sure to finally enjoy all the bliss and glory of the heavenly world. This all being true, now "we are ambassadors for Christ." It is not the business or work of an ambassador to persuade persons to cease to be citizens and subjects of one country and to become citizens or subjects of another country, or a foreign country. If the United States should have an ambassador in Germany, or in any other foreign country, who should begin to endeavor to persuade the subjects of that government to renounce allegiance to that country and to become subjects of the United States, not only would that foreign government send him out of that country immediately, but he would be immediately recalled by the United States government. That is not the work or business of an ambassador. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us." The Lord sent us to you; we are messengers whom He has sent; and He sent us to you. The work we are to do is to beseech you, plead with you, to persuade you-not to persuade you as aliens, to cease to be citizens and subjects of Satan in his kingdom, and to become citizens and subjects of the Lord's kingdom, or to become children of God; for the people to whom these ambassadors were sent were already children of God. They were sent to the Corinthian brethren, not to the aliens in that country, or in any other country. In this letter the apostle wrote to "the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia." - **(II Corinthians 1:1)**. The Lord sent them as ambassadors to His own people who are dwelling here below, in a foreign country. This country is not their home; their home is in heaven, and they are fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God. But some of them had been deluded, and, so, were divided. "Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ." -(I Corinthians 1:12). They were not reconciled to God-that is, some of them were not; for they claimed that they were of Paul, or Apollos, or of Cephas. They claimed that the preacher had something to do with their being saved, or being made children of God. They did not say, "I am for" the preacher, but "I am of" the preacher. To be of Paul is one thing, and to be for Paul is another thing. They are two different things entirely. One may be for England in the present conflict between that country and Germany, and yet be not of England. If the Corinthians were of Paul, then they should be baptized in the name of Paul. They were not baptized in the name of Paul, but in the name of the Lord-in the name of the Trinity. Hence, the apostle, as an ambassador sent of God, would beseech them to be reconciled to God- to give up the false notion or idea that the preacher or the church, or society, or any set of men, or their own doings, had anything in the world to do with their eternal salvation, or had anything in the world to do with their birth from above, or to do with their sins being removed. "Be ye reconciled to God." Be satisfied with what He has done for you. Do not be trying to do, or trying to get done, what the Lord has already accomplished for you in the finished work of the crucified and risen Redeemer. If all the Lord's children were reconciled to God, were satisfied with the Lord's work, what He has done, and what He commands His children to do, they would stop the work many of them are trying to engage in, in "saving souls," and trying to "take the world for Christ," trying to help sinners to be born again, and would be coming home to the Old Baptist Church; and then they would be busy doing what the Lord has commanded to be done in His church by His children. They would be behaving themselves in the church of God, which is His

body, the pillar and ground of the truth. They would be enjoying His approving smiles, and peace and fellowship would reign throughout the borders of Zion, and the world would be a better place in which to live. May the good Lord help us to "be reconciled to God." C. H. C.

Which

---August 15, 1940

Which is the "biggest" -a preacher who says he does not want a certain other man to preach at his church, or the church? Which should be the boss- the preacher, or the church? Does the church belong to the preacher? Or, is the preacher supposed to belong to the church? Please read (**II Corinthians 4:5**). C. H. C.

Remarks to Emerson McAfee

August 15, 1940

It is a Bible truth that there is a warfare which continues in the child of God as long as he shall live in this world, for the plain and Scriptural reason that in regeneration he is made partaker of the divine nature, as Brother McAfee says, and the old sinful nature is not removed, or taken out of him. But he will not have that old sinful nature when the body is brought forth from the grave in the resurrection morning. Glad to hear from you, Brother McAfee. C. H. C.

John 1:11-13

---September 5, 1940

He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.-(John 1:11-13). (John 1:11-12) of the above quotation are frequently used by the Arminian world to try to prove that one must believe on the Lord in order to be born again, or in order to become a child of God. They always stop their quoting with the expression, "even to them that believe on His name." If that were the end of the sentence their argument would be very plausible. But the writer continues the sentence by saying, "which were born," etc. The word believe is in the present tense, denoting present time. That is, those who are believing now, in the present time. The expression were born is in the past tense, denoting something which was done in time past; something that was done in past time-not something done in the present time. They were born at some time in the past, and are now believing, at the present time. There is not a man in the whole wide world who can take that text and analyze it, or parse it, or diagram it, or treat it any way in the world according to the rules of language, and make it appear that believe, in the present tense, precedes, or comes before, were born, in the past tense. The birth is first; it comes before believing. They were first born of God, then they believed on His name; and then He gave them power to become the sons of God. But the power to become sons of God must, necessarily, be in some other sense than becoming sons by birth, for the plain and simple reason that they were already born of God, and they were, therefore, already sons by birth. Hence, it must, necessarily, be true that persons are first born of God -and this is of the sovereign will and work of God, without any condition or work on the part of the person-and then they believe on Him; and then He gives them power to become the sons of God in a manifest sense, by rendering obedience to Him as their

heavenly Father. If any man will take that language and prove by it that belief precedes the birth, we will join his church, and will preach for them the remainder of our few days on earth and not charge one penny for it. C. H. C.

Point Remove-New Hope Association

---September 5, 1940

Brother R. J. Taylor and Elder E. W. Hargett, with two other brethren, of El Dorado, came to our home on Thursday, August 15, and took us in the car with them to the home of Elder J. H. O'Neal, of Atkins, Ark., where we spent the night pleasantly. Friday morning we took Elder O'Neal in the car with us to the Point Remove-New Hope Association. The meeting was held with Little Flock Church, a few miles west of Paris. Elder J. H. O'Neal and Elder J. L. McClellan are their home ministers, and were both at the meeting. Elder McClellan was re-elected moderator, and served efficiently. The visiting ministers were: Elders J. F. Autry and Lewis N. Barrow, of Mena, Ark.; G. P. Neisler, Abbott, Ark.; D. W. Witt, Mansfield, Ark.; E. W. Hargett, El Dorado, Ark.; G. D. Owens, Olio, Ark.; M. A. Norman, Oden, Ark., and C. H. Cayce. The introductory sermon was preached by Elder McClellan. The preaching was all a unit, from start to finish. Not a discordant note was heard. Though the weather was not good on Saturday, on account of rain, yet the people were well cared for, and every service was pleasant and delightful. The meeting will be long remembered, we are sure. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon those who so freely and pleasantly cared for the people, and upon those who were in attendance, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Editorial Writings

---September 5, 1940

Volume six of our Editorial Writings will soon be ready to send out, provided there is no unforeseen accident to delay the work. The printing has all been done, and we are now at work on the binding of the books. This volume is larger than any of the previous volumes, it containing 582 pages. On account of the increase in cost of production we may have to sell this volume at a little better price than the previous volumes. The wage and hour law hampers us in our work, and makes the cost higher than it would be. The number of hours we can work our employees is limited, and we do not have work to employ any more experienced workers, and learners are an expense and are in the way. Hence, we have to employ only such as can produce the work. Notice will be given through our columns as soon as the books are ready to mail out. C. H. C.

Mountain Springs Association

---September 19, 1940

We attended the Mountain Springs Association, held with Fullers Chapel Church, North Little Rock, Ark., the first Sunday in September, beginning on Friday before. The following named visiting ministers were in attendance: J. L. McClellan, Ozark, Ark.; W. A. Bishop, Jackson, Tenn.; W. C. Moak, Memphis, Tenn.; S. E. Angle, Waynesville, Ohio; James Bibler, Newark, Ohio; John R. Harris, Thornton, Ark.; A. H. Garner, Ruston, La.; W. H. Eubanks, Poplar Grove, Ark.; H. E. Black, Merigold, Miss.; J. H. O'Neal, Atkins, Ark.; C. M. Harris, Marion, I11.; E. L. Cur-neal, Fairfield, I11. Their home ministers in attendance were: E. N. Crider, Quitman, Ark.; B. Isaacs, Rose Bud, Ark.; J. L. Pilkington, North Little Rock, Ark.; L. G. Montgomery,

Bee Branch, Ark.; J. T. George, North Little Rock, Ark.; F. M. Russell, Heber Springs, Ark.; S. J. Hall, Enola, Ark.; R. F. Pierce, Quitman, Ark. The preaching was all a unit, a perfect chain, all linked together, from the start to the finish. No quarreling or mote hunting was heard by us throughout the meeting, and the Lord blessed the brethren who occupied the stand from time to time to speak to the comfort and benefit of His children and to the glory of His name. During the meeting three were received by experience, one by letter, and three restored to the fellowship of the church. It was a wonderful meeting, and we are sure it will be long remembered by those present. May the Lord be praised for His wonderful blessings upon the children of men. C. H. C.

Salem Association

---September 19, 1940

We had the privilege of attending the Salem Association once more. The meeting was held with Mt. Pleasant Church, near Waltreak, Ark., beginning on Friday before the second Sunday in September, and closing on Sunday about noon. The visiting ministers present were: R. M. Fowler, Tribby, Okla.; A. D. West, Ada, Okla.; J. L. McClellan, Ozark, Ark.; James Bibler, Newark, Ohio; H. E. Black, Merigold, Miss. Their home ministers present were: D. W. Witt, Mansfield, Ark.; G. D. Owens, Olio, Ark.; M. A. Norman, Oden, Ark.; G. P. Neisler, Abbott, Ark. This was another wonderful meeting. We do not have language to describe it. The Lord blessed each one who was appointed to preach to speak in such a way as to comfort, encourage, and instruct His humble poor, and to the glory of His blessed name. His divine presence was manifested all during the meeting, and all were happy and rejoicing in the Lord. Nine willing ones came forward during the meeting, asking for a home and a resting place in the church. They were joyfully and gladly received. Each one expressed a feeling sense of unworthiness, but as having a love for the church, and a desire to follow the Saviour in baptism. The meeting was well cared for. May the richest blessings of heaven rest upon each one we met at the meeting, is our prayer. Just as we go to press, we learn that three more joined at the water Sunday afternoon. C. H. C.

Sugar Creek Association

---September 19, 1940

We left home on Thursday, August 22, in company with Brother L. H. Miller and wife, and went to Ozark, Ark., where we spent the night in the good home of Elder J. L. McClellan. On Friday morning we took him with us and went to the Sugar Creek Association, near Rogers, Ark., which association was held on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. The following ministers of that association were present: O. E. Coones, G. W. Reed, and T. J. Crist. Elder Reed preached the introductory discourse. The following named visiting ministers were present: O. E. O'Dell, Centralia, Okla.; D. F. Coones, Lebanon, Mo.; Tom Scoggins, Springfield, Mo.; J. L. McClellan, Ozark, Ark.; O. M. Cummings, Oklahoma City, Okla.; W. Y. Haire, Springfield, Mo.; T. A. Parsley, Lead Hill, Ark.; J. F. Autry, Mena, Ark., and the writer. Each minister present filled the stand at some time during the meeting, and the Lord was good to each one. It was a pleasant and delightful meeting all the way through. "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." May the richest blessings of heaven rest upon each one present, and upon each home represented, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Went Back To Trumpet

---October 3, 1940

Not long ago Elder L. R. Huckaby, of Mena, Ark., left the Trumpet folks and came to our people at New Prospect Church, Board Camp, Ark., and then moved his membership to Mena. While he was with our people his young son joined the church and was baptized by Elder Huckaby. But he attended the Rich Mountain Association, which we think met on Friday before the fourth Sunday in August. During that meeting he went back to the Trumpet Baptists. Three writers had something to say about it in the last issue of the Trumpet. We copy the following paragraph from an article written by Elder Huckaby's daughter, in that paper of September 5, 1940: Saturday morning Elder L. N. Faught introduced service, followed by Elder Monroe Denton, who was blessed to preach to our comfort for over an hour, after which shouts of praises could be heard when my precious father, Elder L. R. Huckaby, and my brother Addison, came begging for forgiveness for joining and affiliating with the Peace Baptists. God alone knows the joy we felt to be re-united once more. Mother, Laura, and I remained with what we deem the true order, and constantly prayed that we may all be again re-united this side of heaven; and those prayers were answered when we saw daddy lead little Billy into the beautiful Ouachita River Sunday morning and administer that sacred ordinance of baptism. Billy is our baby brother, whom daddy had formerly baptized into the Peace Baptist Church. Poor Billy! One or the other of the times that he was led by his father and laid beneath the yielding waves, he was led by his daddy into a solemn mockery! Wonder if daddy does not feel a glow of heavenly glory in his heart for thus leading his trusting child! But the reader can see the name that they give our people. In the same paper Elder J. M. Denton calls us the "peace" or consolidated Baptists. The writers in that paper frequently refer to us as the Peace Baptists. As they claim to be the opposite sort of Baptists, we suppose they are not Peace Baptists. What is the meaning of the word peace? Webster gives this meaning of the word: A state of quiet or tranquility; freedom from disturbance or agitation; calm; repose; specifically, 1. Public quiet, order and security; public tranquility and obedience to law. Hence, that public order and security which is commanded by the laws of a particular sovereign, lord, or superior, etc. 2. Harmony or concord between individuals; freedom from personal strife or quarrels, etc. As they accuse us of being Peace Baptists the foregoing is the condition they accuse us of being in, and we would be grieved to deny the charge or accusation. Evidently they accuse us in the epithet of being in obedience to law, and in a state of quiet or tranquility. Of course they, thereby, lay claim to be in an opposite state or condition. Tumultuous is an opposite to peace, of course. Webster tells us that word means: Full of, characterized by, or conducted with, tumult or uproarious disorder; turbulent; as, a tumultuous assembly or meeting. 2. Agitated, as with conflicting passions; disturbed. Synonyms of tumultuous are: Disorderly, irregular, noisy, confused, turbulent, violent, agitated, boisterous, lawless, riotous. Synonyms are words of similar meaning. But, as peace means "public tranquility and obedience to law," and as they do not claim to be Peace Baptists, and say that we are Peace Baptists, then we are in tranquility and obedience to law. It, therefore, follows that they must be a lawless set. Webster tells us that lawless means: Without law; not based on, or regulated by law; having no laws. Not restrained or controlled by the law of morality or society; unruly; disorderly; licentious; sometimes, illegal. We have been aware, for some time, that in some measure this was their condition and conduct-some of them-but they have unwittingly admitted

it. May the Lord open the eyes of His humble poor who are deluded by some self-willed leaders, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

South Arkansas Association

---October 3, 1940

Our association (the South Arkansas) met with Harmony Church, Bradley County, Ark., on Friday morning, September 13, and closed on Sunday, September 15. Elder W. H. Lee was appointed to preach the introductory sermon, but was delayed in getting there, on account of not being well. After the people assembled, Elder John R. Harris, of Thornton, was appointed to preach the introductory, which he did, to the satisfaction of the hearers. The Lord was good to him, and blessed him to preach to the comfort of those present. There were eight visiting ministers present during the meeting, as follows: Leslie Henry, Cozad, Nebr.; D. W. Witt, Mansfield, Ark.; H. E. Black, Merigold, Miss.; W. E. Wright, Alma, Ill.; J. H. O'Neal, Atkins, Ark.; G. P. Neisler, Abbott, Ark.; A. D. West, Ada, Okla.; R. M. Fowler, Tribbey, Okla. The home ministers present were: John R. Harris, Thornton, Ark.; W. H. Lee, Donaldson, Ark.; and the writer. The Lord wonderfully blessed each one as he came to fill his place in the preaching arrangements, and they were enabled to speak in a way to comfort and instruct the Lord's humble poor, and to the glory of His name. Sweet peace and fellowship abounded. We do not think we ever witnessed a meeting more universally enjoyed by the people present. One dear brother came forward during the meeting and asked for a home with the church, and he was gladly and joyfully received. Elder Harris administered the ordinance of baptism on Sunday afternoon. May the Lord be praised for His wonderful blessings. The next session of this association is appointed to be held with Cane Creek Church, in Thornton, which will be the one hundredth annual session. The association agreed that it be a four days meeting if the church desired to have it so. At present it is the mind of the church to hold the meeting for four days. We wish to celebrate the centennial meeting at that time. We desire to have a large attendance at that meeting. Begin now to lay your plans and get ready to come. May the Lord spare us to see that time, and bless us then to have a wonderful meeting, and to enjoy His blessed felt presence. C. H. C.

Hard on "Hardshells"

---October 17, 1940

We have received a copy of a paper published in Little Rock, called the American Baptist, of July 15, 1940, on the front page of which appears an article under the heading, "Mo. Minister Uses as Subject, 'Hard on Hardshells,'" by Elder Max Pendley, of Southwest City, Mo. If we may be excused for calling him such, we will say that the gentleman certainly does manifest anything else but a Christian spirit. Nobody made any attack on him, and no personalities were used by the writers whom he so freely attempts to abuse in his article. Note the following: Is salvation conditional? As I write these lines I have before me a paper called The Primitive Baptist, in which I find an abstract of principles. Article four states that the election of saints is unconditional. This is contrary to the teaching of God's Word, and if believed, would damn souls. Not only is salvation conditional, but every promise in God's Word is conditional. **(II Corinthians 1:20)** says, "For all the promises of God in Him are yea, and in Him (Christ) Amen, unto the glory of God by us." There you are! All those who believe that the election of the saints is unconditional are

doomed to eternal damnation, according to this man. And, according to that sort of logic, or that sort of reason, no one can be saved in glory unless he believes as this man does. If that is not real "narrowness," we confess that there is no such thing. He says that every promise in God's Word is conditional, and then quotes a text which proves to the very contrary. (II Corinthians 1:19) says, "For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, even my me and Silvanus and Timotheus, was not yea, and nay, but in Him was yea." Then (II Corinthians 1:20): "For all the promises of God in Him are yea, and in Him Amen, unto the glory of God by us." If they are yea and Amen, as the inspired writer says, then they are not all conditional. God made promise unto Noah that He would never again destroy the earth by water. Was that a conditional promise? If it depended upon the obedience or faithfulness of Noah or his offspring for its fulfillment, we know there would have been another flood long before this time. God said by Isaiah ((4:9) (Isaiah 54:9-10)), "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me: for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee." Here God has told us that the covenant of His peace is as His covenant with Noah. The promise made unto Noah that He would never again destroy the earth by water was an unconditional promise. And He said "this is as that." Hence, this is also an unconditional promise or covenant; and this covenant was the covenant of His peace. This means that there is, and was, an unconditional covenant of His peace. The gentleman is wrong in his statement that every promise in God's word is conditional. It is true that God has made conditional promises; but that does not prove that every promise He made is conditional. Here is a conditional promise: "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." -(9) (Isaiah 1:19-20). But there was no promise of eternal life in this. This promise was made to Israel - persons who were already God's people-a living people. If they were willing and obedient, they should eat the good of the land; but if they refused and rebelled, they should be devoured by the sword. The gentleman also says: In this same paper, page 24, column 3, in reference to the new birth, quote: "This relation came about independently of human effort." No greater untruth or soul destroying doctrine ever came from the pits of hell. Jesus taught men to seek the kingdom of God. Then the gentleman cites **(Matthew 6:33)**, though he does not quote this text. It reads: "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." What things shall be added? Is eternal life one of the things to be added? No; but what ye shall eat, what ye shall drink, and wherewithal ye shall be clothed-the needs of this life in the natural realm. This was in the Sermon on the Mount, and was addressed to the disciples, and not to the multitudes. Look at the beginning of chapter five, and see for yourself. Then he cites **((5:6) (Isaiah 55:6))**, which was to Israel, and no promise of eternal life in that. He also cites (Matthew 11:28-29), and **(Luke 13:24)**. The language there was to the disciples and not to alien sinners. There is no command anywhere in God's Book telling alien sinners to do a single thing in order that they receive eternal life, or in order that they be born again. But the gentleman says that "no greater untruth or soul destroying doctrine ever came from the pits of hell." We will see whose doctrine came from the pits of hell. This gentleman's doctrine is that alien sinners must hear, believe, and obey the preaching, or the warning given by him and his kind, in order to escape the torments and pits of hell. Note the case of the rich man in hell and Lazarus in Abraham's bosom; **(Luke 16:19-31)** (Luke 16:22-23): "And

it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom." In (Luke 16:27-31) we have recorded some of what was said, beginning with the rich man's request to send Lazarus to his father's house: "I pray thee, therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house: for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." This doctrine that people might be kept from going to hell through the preaching done by men was believed by the man in hell. Abraham did not believe that doctrine, and he was in heaven. Then, whose doctrine is it that came from the pits of hell? The same doctrine promulgated by this self-righteous Pharisee, Max Pendley, and all the whole motley crowd. The doctrine they preach is from hell; and they are, therefore, hell-sent preachers. But he continues: This same writer says, "Every expression of Scripture that relates belief with spiritual life is in evidence of it only, and in no case a condition of receiving it." This damnable heresy would destroy the vital element that makes salvation possible so far as we are concerned for it is belief in Christ that saves sinners. (First John 5:1) "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." The word translated is born in the text the gentleman quoted is gegennetai, and is in the third person, singular number, perfect tense, indicative mood, and passive voice. The passive voice clearly and unmistakably shows that the thing born is passive in being born, and does not have something to do in order to be born. What wonderful wisdom this simpleton displays! According to his theology and logic, he had to do something in order to be born of his parents! He had to believe on his parents in order to be born of his parents! Such a contention is either fit for a hypocrite or a lunatic! The word is in the perfect tense, which "conveys the double notion of an action terminated in past time, and of its effect existing in the present." See Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon, page xlii. Section xxxix. Those who are now believing, in the present, were born, at some time in the past. The birth was completed, it was terminated, at some time in the past, and the effect (believe-present) continues unto the present. The gentleman reverses the order. He puts the present before the past. He puts action before life. He puts thunder before the lightning. He puts the effect for the cause. He puts the fruit for the tree. He refers to **(John 1:11-12)**, but ignores verse 13. He knows that the whole sentence is diametrically opposed to his devil-invented theory. John there says: "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Were born is in the past tense, and believe is in the present tense. If this blatant blustery blow-horn will parse that language; or treat it any way possible by the rules of language, and make it appear that believe, in the present tense, precedes and comes before were born, in the past tense, we will join his church, and will preach for his folks as long as we live, and never charge one penny for it-and this he will not do; and then we will whip every Old Baptist in the whole country with that text-and this he could not do, even if his home in glory depended upon it. May the Lord have mercy on his poor benighted soul. He manifests as much ignorance as any man we have ever read after. C. H. C.

Associations Visited

---November 7, 1940

We left home on Friday night, September 25, to fill appointments in Georgia as had been arranged by Elder Joseph Hobbs, and as published in our columns. We attended five associations while on the trip. We arrived at Cochran, Ga., on Friday morning at 12:20, and were met at the train by Elder J. F. Dykes, and conveyed to his pleasant home, where we had needed rest until time to get a good breakfast and go to the meeting of the Ebenezer Association, near Empire. If we made no mistake in getting their names, there were fourteen visiting ministers and ten of their home ministers at the meeting. The visiting ministers were: Elders J. H. Daily, Macon, Ga.; J. B. Wilson, Summit, Ga.; R. L. Cook, Social Circle, Ga.; Robert Barron, Zebulon, Ga.; J. B. Glisson, Clax-ton, Ga.; Isaac Wilson, Garfield, Ga.; R. M. Riner, Graymont, Ga.; S. H. McCorkle, Ellaville, Ga.; G. A. Hill, Pineview, Ga.; Wm. Moody, Lamentations Crosse, Fla.; Joseph Hobbs, Pitts, Ga.; J. W. McMillan, Enigma, Ga.; O. E. Wiggins, Smithville, Ga.; and C. H. Cayce, Thornton, Ark. Their home ministers present were: A. J. Banks, J. H. Sanders, E. D. Bryant, J. H. Chance, Joel C. Bryant, J. F. Dykes, T. L. Graham, J. B. Lord, E. J. Maddox, and L. G. Powell. Brother Robert M. Lord was chosen as moderator, and Brother Homer Corbitt was chosen as clerk. Since the association Brother Lord has been called to his long eternal home. He was a great man, and was dearly loved, and will be greatly missed. He left a large family, who are deeply grieved on account of their great loss, and all the brotherhood in that section mourn for him. May the Lord bless and sustain each of the bereaved ones by His grace, is our humble prayer. The next association we attended was the Pulaski, which was held on October 1, 2, and 3, with Cedar Creek Church, near Cordele. Elder G. A. Hill was chosen moderator, and Brother Bartlett A. Barker was chosen clerk. The following named ministers were at the meeting: J. A. Monsees, Atlanta, Ga.; J. H. Daily, Macon, Ga.; Ariel West, Luling, Texas; S. W. Etheredge, Ozark, Ala.; Z. Stallings, Milan, Tenn.; A. J. Banks, Macon, Ga.; L. Z. Folmar, Pelham, Ga.; A. A. Garrett, Arlington, Ga.; J. A. Fagg, and J. R. Worrell, Winston-Salem, N. C.; W. A. Beasley, Orlando, Fla.; O. K. Sheffield, Fort Pierce, Fla.; Lewis Sheffield, Vero Beach, Fla.; W. T. Cook, Dothan, Ala.; P. H. Byrd, Vidalia, Ga.; E. D. Bryant, Danville, Ga.; T. L. Graham, Chauncey, Ga.; J. B. Glisson, Claxton, Ga.; E. S. W. Holland, Fort Meade, Fla.; Wm. Moody, Lamentations Crosse, Fla.; O. T. Jones, Reidsville, Ga.; T. V. Mann, Marietta, Ga.; B. A. Phillips, Alpharetta, Ga.; J. F. Dykes, Cochran, Ga.; O. A. Knight, Valdosta, Ga., and the writer. Their home ministers present were: G. A. Hill, Pineview; Joseph Hobbs, Pitts; M. A. Hall, Arabi; and T. W. Cox, Omega. There were thirty ministers, in all, present during the meeting. The next association we attended was the Original Upper Canoochee, held with New Hope Church, near Lexsy, Ga., October 4, 5, 6. Elder J. B. Wilson was chosen moderator, and Elder V. H. Hooks was chosen clerk. The visiting ministers present were: O. A. Knight, Valdosta, Ga.; A. J. Banks, Macon, Ga.; J. F. Dykes, Cochran, Ga.; W. J. Green, Gray, Ga.; Joseph Hobbs, Pitts, Ga.; E. D. Bryant, Danville, Ga.; and the writer. Their home ministers present were: P. H. Byrd, Vidalia; J. B. Wilson, Summit; V. H. Hooks, Lexsy; R. M. Riner, Graymont; J. B. Glisson, Claxton; A. E. Temples, Statesboro; D. R. Temples, Vidalia; O. T. Jones, Reidsville, and Isaac Wilson, Garfield. The next association we attended was the Harmony, which was held with Liberty Church, Sumter City, October 11, 12, 13. Elder W. I. Kelly was chosen moderator, and Brother Gerald Wiggins clerk. The visiting ministers present during the meeting were: J. A. Fagg and J. R. Worrell, Winston-Salem, N. C.; Z. Stallings, Milan, Tenn.; J. A. Monsees, Atlanta, Ga.; J. H. Chance, Cochran, Ga.; Joseph Hobbs, Pitts, Ga.; J. E. Shackelford, Tishomingo, Miss.; A. A. Garrett, Arlington,

Ga.; R. K. Blackshear, Donalsonville, Ga.; Cayce Phillips, Ellaville, Ga.; Hugh Connell, Jacksonville, Fla.; Ashley Griffin, Ocilla, Ga.; W. H. Hancock, Macon, Ga.; J. B. Lord, Dudley, Ga.; B. F. House, Phenix City, Ala.; and the writer. Their home ministers present were: W. I. Kelly, Edison, and O. E. Wiggins, Smithville. The next association we attended was the Union, which was held with Concord Church, near Lenox, October 18, 19, 20. We were there on the eighteenth and nineteenth only, as the appointments arranged for us had us billed to be at another place on Sunday, the 20th. Elder J. W. McMillan was chosen moderator, and Brother V V Fletcher, clerk. The visiting ministers present were: W. R. Rhoden, McClenny, Fla.; G. A. Hill, Pineview, Ga.; A. J. Banks, Macon, Ga.; J. H. Chance, Cochran, Ga.; M. A. Hall, Arabi, Ga.; Cayce Phillips, Ellaville, Ga.; L. Z. Folmar, Pelham, Ga.; Wm. Moody, Lamentations Crosse, Fla.; E. S. W. Holland, Fort Meade, Fla.; S. W. Cox, Omega, Ga.; O. E. Wiggins, Smithville, Ga.; B. F. House, Phenix City, Ala.; Hugh Connell, Jacksonville, Fla.; J. H. Sanders, Danville, Ga.; J. F. Dykes, Cochran, Ga.; H. L. Moody, Lamentations Crosse, Fla.; T. R. Crawford, Cairo, Ga.; and the writer. Their home ministers present were: J. W. McMillan, M. D. Tucker, O. A. Knight, Ashley Griffin, L. A. Davis, J. F. Parish, C. C. Smith, and L. L. Register. The meetings were all good and delightful. We never heard a discordant note sounded. The Lord blessed the ministers who filled the stands, from time to time, with liberty to speak in His name to the comfort and joy of those who were present, and all seemed to be encouraged to press on in the same good old way. Good and orderly congregations were present at each service. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon them, individually and collectively, is our humble prayer. We tried to get the name and address of each minister at each of the foregoing meetings. If any were not obtained, it was unintentional, for we tried to get them all. We will try to write an account of the trip, other than the associations, in our next issue. We arrived home at about 1:40 on Tuesday morning, October 29, and do not have time to write more concerning the trip for this issue of the paper. We trust the dear brethren, sisters, and friends, whom we met, will remember us in their prayers. C. H. C.

Experience and Call to the Ministry

---November 7, 1940

We hereby acknowledge receipt of a pamphlet, the title of which is "My experience and Call to the Ministry," by Elder J. A. Moore, 1676 Eighty-fifth St., Los Angeles, Calif. It is an interesting pamphlet, and is worth the price asked for it, which is only 15 cents. Send 15 cents to him and get a copy of the same. C. H. C.

Trip in Georgia

---November 21, 1940

In our last issue we gave a report of the associations we attended while on our recent trip in Georgia, and stated that we would try to write another article for this issue concerning the trip. We left home on Wednesday night, September 18, to fill the appointments, as arranged by Elder Joseph Hobbs, and as published in our columns. Some few other appointments were made, besides those published in that list. One was at Sardis, near Macon, on Monday night, September 23. Another was at Mt. Pisgah on Monday, October 14. Another was at Gordon on Friday night, October 25. The last was at Bethlehem, in Macon, on Sunday night, October 27. The arrangement was at first made for us to be at Trail Branch on Saturday and Sunday, October 26 and 27; but this was changed, for us to be at Camp Creek (if

we remember the name of the place correctly) on Saturday and at Trail Branch on Sunday. Besides the places above named, and besides the associations attended, we were at the following named churches: Bethel, Mt. Nebo, Mt. Paran, Red Hill, Lebanon, Hazlehurst, Valley Grove, Fitzgerald, Eureka, New Providence, New Bethel, Emmaus, Mt. Olive, New Hope, Christian Hope, Hawkinsville, Pleasant Hill, Oakey Grove, Sweet Home, Bay Spring, and Cool Springs. There were good congregations at most every place, even though it was a busy time. Much interest seemed to be manifested in the service. Frequently brethren and sisters were present from a great distance. Many of the brethren in the ministry were with us at different places. By experience we know what it means for a poor traveler to have the brethren in the ministry with us. Elders Joseph Hobbs, M. A. Hall, and G. A. Hill were, especially, very attentive to us. They were with us much of the time, and we spent some time in their good homes. We were in the good homes of many others of the dear brethren in the ministry, but these brethren took special interest and care in going with us and conveying us from place to place. All the dear brethren, sisters, and friends were especially good and kind to us on the entire trip. They took special care to see that we had a good and comfortable place to rest when crowds were present, especially at the associations. This was a great help to us in enabling us to continue on the long trip and to fill all the appointments, and to get back home feeling as well and as strong as when we left, seemingly. We shall never forget the many acts of kindness and consideration shown us on this trip. They manifested the fact that they took into consideration the fact that we were not as young as we once were, and that old folks cannot hold out like young folks can. We never enjoyed a trip more-so it seems to us now. We would be glad to give the name of each one in whose home we were cared for, but cannot do that. Some brethren have sometimes, apparently, taken pains to tell about the good meals served at places where they went. It seems to us that this should be, and will be, taken for granted by the readers. At each place we went it seemed to us that they all took special pains to have good and wholesome food prepared for us-such as one should have who is "just fixing to be old." And they were careful to have good beds for us to sleep on. Then they were careful to see that we had the rest which we so much needed. They were good and kind and considerate in every way. May the good Lord bless them, is our humble prayer. We arrived home at 1:40 on Tuesday morning, October 29, and found all well, for which we trust we are thankful to the good Lord. Again, we say, may the Lord abundantly bless all those dear brethren, sisters, and friends, is our humble prayer. We trust they will not forget us, and that we may have an interest in their prayers. We would be glad to hear from any of them who may feel disposed to write us a line. We appreciate the good letters which some wrote to our dear companion while we were on the journey. C. H. C.

Meeting in Memphis

---December 5, 1940

We left home on Thursday afternoon, November 14, for Memphis, Tenn., to attend the three days meeting, beginning on Friday, celebrating the eleventh year of services being held in their building. Their first service in their building, at Walker and Pennsylvania, was held there eleven years ago. Ten visiting ministers were present during the meeting, which began Friday morning, and continued three days- Friday morning, Friday night, Saturday morning, Saturday night, Sunday morning and Sunday night. The visiting ministers were: Elders J. T. George, Little Rock, Ark.; J. W. Hipp, Prim, Ark.; W. V McDonald, Coffeville, Miss.; W. L. Smith,

Oxford Miss.; D. W. Witt, Mansfield, Ark.; W. C. Davis, McEwen, Tenn.; W. H. Eubanks, Poplar Grove, Ark.; W. A. Bishop, Jackson, Tenn.; J. O. Dillon, Ramer, Tenn.; and the writer. Their two home ministers (Elders E. C. Holder and W. C. Moak) were also present. They had two discourses each morning and night. It was a good meeting, and much enjoyed by all who were present. The crowd was large on Sunday and Sunday night. Two united with the church during the meeting—a brother and sister. The sister was baptized on Sunday night by Elder Moak. The brother is to be baptized later. The church is full of life and is prospering. They are a faithful band. May the good Lord bless them, and enable them to continue on in love, peace, and fellowship, as they have in the past. We shall never forget their kindness to us. We visited in several of their homes during the meeting. Again we say, may the Lord's richest blessings continue with them. C. H. C.

About At An End

---December 5, 1940

Brother Z. W. Lofton, of Lincoln, Ark., asks us this question: "Doesn't it look like our publications and liberty is about at an end?" We are fearful that this is so. We are sure that the trend is that way, if we are to take the past as an indication of what is in the future. History repeats itself. We would suggest that our readers study the path traveled by Hitler, in Germany, and see where things are in that country, and then compare the same with the trend elsewhere, and then draw your own conclusions. Without there is a change in the trend of events in the near future, there will be a time of great persecution to come upon our people before many more years. May the good Lord pity us. When this persecution comes, many who now seem to be bent on ruin will be brought to see the folly of the course they have been pursuing. "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured by the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." This is just as true today as it was when it was penned by the Lord's prophet hundreds of years ago. "If ye sow to the wind, ye shall reap the whirlwind." The spirit of war and bloodshed is in the world. May the Lord have mercy on His poor and afflicted people, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Do You Want It?

---December 5, 1940

Announcement has been made a few times in our columns concerning the matter of publishing a monthly periodical containing one or two sermons delivered by some of our ministers, as well as sermons that were delivered and published in the past. The price of the proposed periodical is to be only one dollar a year. A number have written us they would subscribe for the proposed periodical; but we have not received as many promises as we feel we should have in order to undertake the work. So we are asking one more time that you write us if you would like to have such a periodical. Do not send any money, but just write that we may put your name down as a subscriber. A postal card will do. How many will write at once? Will you? C. H. C.

Agents

---December 5, 1940

A few brethren have agreed to act as agents to solicit subscriptions for The Primitive Baptist, and remit the same to us. You will find a list of them following the

names of our corresponding editors. Of course, the corresponding editors are authorized to solicit subscriptions for us; but some of them have done very little along this line. Even so, some of them do very little writing for the paper. We wish we knew how to wake some of them up.

We trust these brethren will all get busy and do all they can to help to extend the circulation of the paper. We will appreciate it. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 55

---December 19, 1940

For two or three days we have been trying to get our mind settled on a line of thought appropriate to the close of the volume. It seems that it is all in vain. We have even spent some time reading over the articles we have written at the close of previous volumes. Still, we could not have a leading of thought for an article on that line. Then we turned to Volume 19 and read the article on the close of that volume, which was written by our sainted father thirty-six years ago. It was his last article on the close of the year's work, close of the volume. Somehow, as we read it we felt a desire to copy that article and adopt much of it as our own at this time.

So, instead of trying to write an article for the close of Volume 55 we copy the article written by our father in 1904 as the close of volume 19. C. H.C.

THE ARTICLE

Another year with all its sorrows, disappointments, mournings of soul and bleedings of heart, as well as its joys, pleasures, gladness of heart and rejoicing of soul, has passed and gone, and the year 1904 will have passed before another issue of The Primitive Baptist reaches your homes. Not only so, but we are all, both editors and publishers, and readers, one year nearer the end of our pilgrimage on earth. As the year 1904 has passed and all the occurrences and happenings of same are, or soon will be, numbered with the things of the past, so also will we all soon be numbered with the dead; the times and places that know us now will soon know us no more forever. Many who wrote for the columns of The Primitive Baptist during the first year of its publication, 1886, and many dear brethren and sisters who were readers of our first volume have stepped off the stage of action, been called to try the realities of a world unknown to us; their souls being present with the Lord and their bodies being asleep in Jesus. Every year only brings us that much nearer the end of our journey, or stay, in this world. How careful, therefore, we all ought to be to make good use of our time and talents while life lasts. Let us all remember that the Saviour says, (Matthew 7:26-27), "Every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell." Let us remember, too, that Paul says, (**I Corinthians 3:15**) "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss," and that the same apostle says also, (**Galatians 6:7-8**) "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption." Still realizing our weakness and imperfections we wish to repeat what we said a year ago - or quote from our editorial, "Close of Volume Eighteen," as follows: That we have erred and made mistakes, in different ways, is no more apparent to others than to ourselves, for we do most assuredly "groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body;" yea, we "groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked." But this is the great question; "Will I be found naked?" Oh, how naked, how naked, we will be if not

clothed upon with the imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ! Within ourselves considered, we feel to be "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." Realizing, thus, our weakness, sinfulness, and inability, we, therefore, feel conscious of the fact that we have made many, yea, very many, mistakes in our editorial career, and we do, therefore, most earnestly request our readers and patrons to "throw the mantle of charity over us," and to hold us up in your prayers. No doubt we have made blunders, both in our editorial work and as publishers. Not only so, but our bookkeeper and subscription clerk has, doubtless, made mistakes also, and it may be that our, and his, mistakes, some of them at least, have been observed by our patrons. But, notwithstanding we are weak, and have, therefore, made many mistakes, and feel willing to confess our faults and to ask the forbearance and forgiveness of our brethren and sisters-our patrons who may have observed, or been worried over, our mistakes-yet our God is perfect, and the Lord has been good to us, and we feel under renewed obligation, more and more every year of our life, to serve and obey Him, as best we can, in all things-all things required of us-all His holy commandments. We believe the servants of the Lord, the ministers of Christ -those who are called of God to preach the gospel-are commanded to "teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;" and we feel that this command is to us, and that the Lord, who called us to this work, has been so good to us, of such tender compassion toward us, and, if we are not deceived, has done so much for us, that we feel under renewed obligation, every year of our life, to do all we can in that direction. To this end-or for this reason-we not only try, in our weakness, to preach the gospel, or occupy the pulpit, but this is the incentive, if we are not deceived again, that prompts us to edit and publish a weekly paper for the benefit and instruction of the dear children of God. Not only are the ministers of the gospel commanded to teach, but they are also commanded to "feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood;" and this we are trying to do, not only in the pulpit, but through the press also. We say, again, if not deceived in our own heart, that, our greatest object in editing and publishing a weekly paper, as well as in trying to preach the gospel, is to instruct and feed the children of God, and if not deceived the incentive that prompts us to do these things is that we feel that we have been called of God to the work of the ministry, and we feel under great obligation to the Lord to do all we can in that direction. Not only have many of our readers and correspondents who were with us during the first year or succeeding years, we might say, of our publication passed away, but a great many changes have taken place, in various ways, since we began editing and publishing The Primitive Baptist nineteen years ago. Among other changes which have taken place during the publication, or progress, of our nineteenth volume, we bought, about Oct. 1, 1904, the subscription list of the Gospel Light, and have since then been sending The Primitive Baptist to Elder Todd's subscribers, his paper having suspended, and he, since the suspension of his paper, having joined the Missionary Baptists. But while many changes have taken place during these nineteen years, and some, even, during the last year, yet, as stated a year ago, and as we all know, "principles never change," and as we feel to occupy, on all parts of the ground, both doctrinally and practically, just where we did nineteen years ago, believing on all points of doctrine, church polity, religious service, mode of worship, church government, etc., just as we did then, we repeat what we said a year ago, in "Close of Volume Eighteen," as follows: The doctrine of God our Saviour is the same now that it was then, and we love, have tried to preach, defend, and publish the same doctrine-on all parts of the ground-during our eighteenth volume (now nineteenth) that we did during our first volume, or that we did eighteen (now

nineteen) years ago. But while this is true, "as true as gospel," so to speak, and while it is also true that the doctrine which we try to preach, and are publishing abroad, the doctrine believed and advocated by all true Primitive Baptists, the doctrine of God our Saviour, we might say, will stand as unsullied truths "amidst the wreck of worlds and the crush of nature," yea, stand untarnished after everything else, as we humbly believe, has failed, yet we feel that we will soon be done battling for these blessed truths, that we will soon have to "lay our armor by," that our race is almost run, that we will soon reach the end of our journey, that all our labors will soon be numbered with the things of the past, for we have reached and passed over the top of the hill of life and are fast going down, as it were, on the other side. Besides, our physical frame and constitution has been greatly impaired by the ravages of disease, having passed through three or four very long spells or attacks of sickness. Hence, we desire to be faithful in the discharge of our duties what little time remains for us to spend in the service of God, and in trying to serve His people. It is very painful indeed-a great cross to our nature-to differ from those we love, especially so, if it be those that we esteem highly, for their work's sake, as faithful and able ministers of the gospel of Christ; but it sometimes becomes our duty-or at least we feel it to be our duty-to do so. But whenever we differ from our brethren on any point of doctrine, practice or church polity, we wish to do so in love and in all good feeling, having all due respect for them and their opinions. In conclusion, we would ask you all, all our readers, all the dear brethren, sisters and friends into whose hands this may go, to remember us at a throne of divine grace; remember us in your prayers to "the God of all grace." We bid you adieu for the year 1904, praying the Lord to bless you all, and to bless this article to your good. S. F. C.

1941

Introduction to Volume 56

---January 2, 1941

It becomes our duty, according to custom, for us to try to write an article by way of an introduction to another volume of The Primitive Baptist-the beginning of volume 56. We feel to be entirely at a loss, altogether at sea, as to what to say. We do not even know how to begin such an article at this time. Personally your editor feels to say that, here and now, we try to again rededicate our life and strength and energy all to the service of the Master. We shall try, to the very best of our ability, to conduct THE Primitive Baptist, during the coming year, and through as many years as our life may be spared, if we may still be allowed and permitted to continue the publication of the same, in such a way as to comfort, instruct, console, and encourage the Lord's humble poor, and for the advancement of His cause and kingdom here in the world. We shall endeavor to keep all things out of our columns that would have a tendency otherwise than to be of benefit. We shall try to publish only such matter as will tend to unify, comfort, console, encourage, and strengthen the Lord's dear children. It seems that a spirit of war and bloodshed is rampant in the whole world. It seems that a spirit of destruction is abroad in the whole world, and it seems that this same evil spirit has permeated the ranks of the Lord's church. It is not only in the governments of the world, but it is in the so-called churches, and is apparently in the true church. Such a spirit brings sure destruction

to every kingdom which is infested with it-unless there is sure and speedy repentance. The dark and lowering clouds tell us, if we are not mistaken in the "signs of the times," that there is great trouble just ahead of us, and that great destruction is just ahead of us. But we do not wish to be a party to the bringing of it. Do you, dear reader? If you do not, then will you join with us, and help us, and let all of us try to forget the past, as much as lies within us, and let us, together, labor and strive for peace and unity of Zion, and for the unifying of the Lord's dear children. Let us talk about, and labor for, and do the things that will have a tendency to this end. Let us remember that patience is a great and wonderful virtue. Have we all been as patient as we should have been? It is so easy to become impatient when we observe something which is not just exactly to our liking, or to our way of seeing. We may not know all the circumstances in the case. We would do well to remember that we are directed to "be patient toward all men." -((Th 5:14) (I Thessalonians 5:14). In the next verse the apostle says, "See that none render evil for evil unto any man; but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves, and to all men." If this were strictly observed by all of us, are you not sure that we would all get along much better than some of us have been doing during the past several years? May the Lord pity and help all of us to remember the golden rule, and to practice the same more than we have in the past. Will you try to pray the Lord to help us to follow this right teaching and instruction in the few remaining days we may have upon earth? And will you join with us in a "New Year's" resolution to try to conform our lives to the same, and each and all of us try to reduce the same to practice in our lives? Brother, reader, are you with us in this? May Heaven's richest blessings rest upon you, dear reader, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Remembrances

---January 2, 1941

The editor and family have been the happy recipients of many kind remembrances during the holidays. Many beautiful cards and many nice and valuable presents have been sent and given to us. We feel to be unworthy of such manifestations and expressions of Christian love and sweet fellowship. May the dear Lord bless each one who so kindly and lovingly remembered us, is our prayer. Please let this be a personal note to each of you. Please pray the Lord to give us strength and courage for the battles of life which may confront us in this new year, 1941. Editor and Family.

A Good Old Letter

---January 2, 1941

The following letter is real good, and is timely now, as we believe. It is copied from The Primitive Baptist of May 15, 1886-more than fifty-four years ago. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

Elder S. F. Cayce:

Dear Brother-I have received five numbers of The Primitive Baptist, and have read them very carefully, and can say I truly endorse the sentiments advocated in your paper as the doctrine of the Primitive Baptist Church. I have had a name in that church about sixty years, and have passed with her through many wars, trials and afflictions. I have witnessed the rise of New Schoolism, of Campbellism, Two-Seedism, and a host of other isms that have caused strife and division; but in the

midst of all we had faithful men who have stood at their post, and fearlessly displayed the banner of truth before their enemies. I have witnessed their afflictions and have mingled my tears with theirs when error, like a flood, was sweeping over the land, and the voice of weeping and lamentation was heard in every part of Zion. The clouds were dark and threatening; our harps were upon the willows; the enemy was strong, and in our midst, making rapid changes upon us, calling us Anti-nomians, antimeans, and ignorant bigots; that we were opposed to the spread of the gospel, and doing all we could to keep the world in darkness, and prevent the salvation of men. But, thank God, we had a few noble spirits who counted not their lives dear unto themselves, and refused to bow to the image of the old beast, or to take its mark, or live in fellowship with its unscriptural institutions; and, like their brethren of the 12th century, declared non-fellowship for all unscriptural institutions and inventions of men unknown to the gospel, and gotten up as auxiliaries to the church. These resolutions produced a division, and gave birth to what is now called the New School or Missionary Baptist Church. Before this split, there was no such a body in existence. This I know, and every other man that has been a Baptist sixty years knows by his own personal observation, and is acknowledged by such men as Wayland, Graves and Wood. Such unprincipled historians as Benedict and Ray may try to conceal these truths and claim that they are the Primitive stalk of Baptists, but to do it they have to convict their most learned and honest men of falsehood or ignorance. I am prepared to give the testimony of those men, and a host of others, of the modern date and unscriptural characters of the practices and institutions that produced them as a separate sect. The sect calling themselves the "Christian Church" are a little older than the "New School Baptist," and came out of the Presbyterians, and received their ministerial ordinations and baptisms from them (See the life of Dr. Pervoynce, one of their founders). They and the New-School Baptists both preach a conditional salvation, and that the preached word is the means of giving spiritual or eternal life to the sinner dead in sin. They both teach that the preacher is the medium through which eternal life is given to the dead sinner, and that without the preached word there is no salvation; and I think that a just inference, according to their preaching, is that there is no damnation; for they say that "it would be unjust to damn the sinner unless the gospel is preached to him, and a chance given him to repent and believe and obey the gospel," so without the gospel, he could not be condemned; but by it, he has a chance to be condemned; and, to my mind, both parties make the gospel a curse to the world, for all will not believe and obey it. For rejecting these things and teaching that the gift of God was eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord, and through no other medium, we were called anti-means and Anti-nomians; but none of these things moved us while we found that Paul and the other apostles taught the same truth, and were persecuted for it. To be a Primitive Baptist we must observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded, and reject all the inventions and traditions of men. The order and discipline of Christ's church must be maintained, for He, as the Head and Leader, has, by His teachings and specific commands, given us the doctrine and order to be observed in His church, and it is rebellion on our part to add anything to it, or to take anything from it. In the last few years I have traveled extensively among our churches from Maryland and Virginia, to Kansas and Texas, and I find our churches in a more prosperous and united condition than they have been in for the last fifty years; and I feel that a better day is before us if we abide in the word of our Lord and keep ourselves unspotted from the religion of the world and its institutions. My work is about done; I shall soon lay my armor down, and rest from my labors; but while I live I shall love the Primitive Church and its primitive gospel, and shall pray that God may bless and prosper you and all who are laboring for that blessed

cause. May His Spirit guide you as editor, and your correspondents, so that truth may be proclaimed, and the saints comforted, and the peace of Zion maintained. G. M. Thompson. Ashland, Mo., April 8, 1886.

Is It Sufficient?

---January 16, 1941

On page two of the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight of December 25, 1940, we find a "Radio Sermon" by Ben M. Bogard, under the heading, "The Bible is the All-Sufficient Rule of Faith and Practice." For a wonder to us the "Reverend" "Doctor" Bogard has, one time, put out a real good article for him. Wonder how he happened to stagger on to the truth and to stick so closely to it in one article? Most of the whole article is real good, to come from Bogard. In the article Dr. Bogard says: The Bible claims to be a perfect rule of faith and practice. In **(II Timothy 3:16-17)**, we read that the Scriptures "are given by inspiration of God, that the man of God may be perfect; thoroughly furnished unto all good works." If the Scriptures thoroughly furnish us unto all good works we certainly do not need any additional furnishing. * If the Bible is not a perfect guide then it is worse than useless, because it might even mislead the people. If it is a perfect guide, then we should each one take it as the man of our counsel, as a "lamp to our feet and a light to our pathway." This is all good and true. What a pity that all professed Christians do not observe the fact, and conform their practice to the same. If a man conforms his life to the truth set forth in the Doctor's Scriptural teaching in the foregoing, as well as in what he has set forth in the entire sermon on the same line of thought, he will practice nothing as a professed Christian which the Bible does not authorize. Does the Doctor practice what he has preached in this sermon? Let us turn another page in this paper and see if he does. On page four we find another article from the Doctor, under the heading, "One Thousand Dollars a Month Net Profit." In that article the Doctor says: First, let the Sunday School literature profit pay all the expense of the mission office, pay the salary of the Secretary-Treasurer, and every thing else that can be called expenses, so that we can look the world in the face and tell the truth when we say that every cent in our missions ACTUALLY GOES TO THE MISSIONARIES, both in the home land, and on the foreign field. Where, in the Bible, does the Doctor get the authority for a Sunday School? And where does he get the authority for the Sunday School Literature? Where does he get the authority for the church to engage in any kind of publishing business? Where does he get the authority for any such officer as a Secretary-Treasurer? What is the person a Secretary-Treasurer of, any how, and where is the authority for such? But, alack and alas! Here is a confession, as we take it, that they have not been telling the exact truth all the time in regard to this business. It seems that they have been claiming that all the money went direct to the missionaries, or that it does actually go to them; but here is an admission that the claim was and is false! Where in the Book, Doctor, do you find the authority for making such a false claim? Where, in the Book, Doctor, is your authority for a "mission office?" In the days of the sojourn of the Saviour on earth, when His apostles were personally with Him, there was one who carried the bag. That one was Judas, and he was a thief-so the Book says. Doctor, is that your authority for having one to carry the money, as treasurer? If so, do you try to find a Judas to keep the funds? May we reasonably judge so, since it has not been so long since you accused one of your treasurers of stealing the Sunday School money? Doctor, did you wish to change officers so as to give another an opportunity to "get a finger

in the pie?" But the Doctor continues: It would be encouraging to the churches to contribute if they really knew that ALL OF THE MONEY THEY SEND IN FOR MISSIONS ACTUALLY WENT TO FEED AND CLOTHE THE MISSIONARIES. Doctor, how in the wide world could they know that all the money sent in actually goes to feed and clothe the missionaries, since you have exposed, or claimed to expose, the "cold fact" that some stealing of the money sent in for literature had been going on? How could they know that there is not yet a little stealing going on? Honestly, Doctor, we really could not help having some little doubt about the matter, when the thing is gotten up and carried on in the name of church business, especially when it is being engaged in by those claiming to conform to the "perfect rule," since there is nothing in the "perfect and sufficient rule" concerning such a thing. But the Doctor continues: Then when the Secretary-Treasurer went out among the churches to collect mission money he could TRUTHFULLY SAY that not one cent he collected went to him personally but every cent went to the missionaries. As it is now, when the Secretary-Treasurer goes out to collect, somebody will say that he is out trying to collect his own salary, and in one sense that is true. Has the Secretary-Treasurer been telling the people that he was out to collect mission money, and not to collect his own salary? It seems so, from what the Doctor says. And the Doctor's language leaves the impression that the Secretary-Treasurer was lying to the people when he made such a claim; for the Doctor admits that the accusation that he was out to collect his own salary was true in one sense. If true in one sense, we wonder if it is not in a true sense! Strange admissions some men will make! Let us here make a lengthy quotation from the Doctor's article: Second, we should use the rest of that money to spread our principles by putting at least TEN MISSIONARY EVANGELISTS in the field. They can be paid ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS A MONTH out of this net profit, with the understanding that they collect on the field as much as they can where they preach and let what they collect be added to the hundred dollars up to not more than fifty dollars a month, making the salary of these missionary-Evangelists at least \$150.00 a month. Ten good men can be secured at that rate, and it would mean that they can go to places of destitution and stay there until they build up the work by either increasing the membership of weak churches where we now have none. Where, in the Book, does the Doctor get his authority for such teaching as he put forth in this? These fellows need the money to put ten missionary evangelists in the field. They can do it with the money-yes! But they would do this, for the simple reason that the Lord does not put men in the field for them! These men must have a salary, and know that they are to be supported by men before they will go into the field. If they will guarantee the sum of \$150 a month they can get ten good men with the money at their disposal. If they were to depend on the Lord for their preachers, they might not get good ones; so they may offer to pay that sum of money, and then they can get men-not men of God's choosing and sending, but men of their own choosing, selecting, and sending! Ministers are witnesses. Here is a proposition to hire witnesses. But a true witness will testify to the truth without money and without price. But by paying the price they can get good witnesses-witnesses who will, of course, testify what the employer wishes to be told. So, Doctor, you will hire men to testify what you folks want testified to! The witnesses who testified that the disciples stole the body of the Lord from the sepulcher were hired to tell that story. They were paid large money. You will pay a good sum of money, too, will you, Doctor? Evidently your principles are not being spread by ministers sent by the Lord, so you must send them for that purpose, or your principles will not be spread. Of course, that is right, for the Lord is not in your business, any how. Doctor, please tell us who was Secretary-Treasurer in the mission office from which Paul was sent to Ephesus? to Galatia? to Philippi? to

Rome? or to any other place where he went and preached the gospel? Who was Secretary-Treasurer of the band who sent Timothy, or Titus, or Barnabas? Who sent Philip "toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert?" Who sent Peter to the house of Cornelius? What Secretary-Treasurer held the funds out of which he was paid to make the journey? How much did they pay him out of the treasury for making that trip, Doctor? Doctor, is it not a fact that the business you folks are engaged in is simply a merchandising and money-getting and money-making proposition with you, any how? Is it not a fact that it is money which you are really interested in, and not the preaching of the gospel, or even the salvation of souls? "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" But let us have two more short paragraphs from the Doctor's article. Before quoting any more, however, let us say that all the emphasis in the foregoing quotations from the Doctor is his own. He emphasized by placing words in capital letters, and we have followed his own emphasis. But hear the Doctor again: Third, we should get out many thousands of tracts, cheap booklets, and scatter them all over the country. Such distribution of good literature will do much for our work and it will mean the salvation of souls. The results of such an enlarged program will be that new churches will be established, new Sunday Schools will be organized, new Young Peoples' Training Courses started, and that will mean an increase in the sale of the literature and thus make the net profit even greater. The sale of literature will increase as the work enlarges. We shall be getting somewhere then.

Of course, if they "shall be getting somewhere then," they are not "getting somewhere" now! We agree with the Doctor again. They are getting nowhere. The only thing we will agree that they are getting is that they are getting money to accomplish a thing that money will not accomplish, and getting some of the Lord's children deceived-leading them to believe that the eternal destiny of poor sinners depends upon their liberality; thus placing the eternal salvation of poor sinners in the hands of wicked and deceitful money hunters! May the good Lord pity and have mercy on their poor deluded followers! Doctor, will you please give the citation where the "all-sufficient Rule" says for the church, or any others, to engage in any such practice as you and your crowd are engaging in? Where is your authority for the church to print thousands of tracts for the salvation of souls? Where is your authority for the teaching that the distribution of tracts will result in the salvation of souls? Is that not "tract salvation?" Doctor, suppose we revise **(Acts 4:11-12)** as follows, so as to agree with your teaching in the foregoing: "These are the tracts which were set at nought of you builders, which are become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there are no other tracts under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved!" Take your medicine, Doctor. It may taste bad, and it may make you vomit-if you are not too far gone for your stomach to be affected. Honestly, Doctor, you really need to "puke up" a whole lot of stuff you have been eating for, lo, these many years. Your heart may be all right, Doctor; we do not claim to have made a close examination of that organ, here; but your head and stomach are sure in a bad fix. Doctor, have you tried the remedies of some of your own "doctors" in your case? If you have, you have only been spending your means on the "physicians of this world." The "All-Sufficient Rule of Faith" teaches us, Doctor, that one who does that gets not relief from such "Doctors;" they only grow worse. Doctor, if you wish to get well of such "bellyaching" as you have been afflicted with for all these years, just take the pills as are prescribed in the "All-Sufficient Rule," and quit your merchandising business, and your stomach will get quiet, and your "poor old head" will stop aching. Really, Doctor, we are sorry for you, but sympathy will not effect a cure nor bring relief. Taking the straight medicine, as given by the Great Physician, in His

Prescription Book, will give relief for such disorders. Good-bye, Doctor, for the present. Be a good boy, and take your medicine, and perhaps you will improve along the line set out in your radio address. C. H. C.

Trip in Georgia

---January 16, 1941

We left home at 1:40 on Monday morning, December 2, for a trip of three weeks in Georgia. The first appointment was at Phenix City, Ala., on Tuesday, December 8, at eleven o'clock, and Tuesday night. Then we went to Georgia and filled appointments at Providence, in Roberta; Sardis, near Macon; then to a church which was not in the regular list, which we believe was Mt. Carmel. We failed to note the name of the church, and so we may not have the name correct. Then at Elizabeth (in Macon), Pine Ridge, Camp Creek, Rock Springs, Mt. Paron, Bethany (in Atlanta), Union, Big Creek, Boiling Springs, Harmony, Cross Roads, Corinth, and West Atlanta. When the list was made out an appointment was made for Sardis December 13, but that was called in, and we remained at Mt. Paron two days-December 12 and 13. The appointment at Corinth was an extra appointment for Saturday morning, December 21, and the meeting at West Atlanta was in the afternoon, same day, and again Sunday, where the trip closed out. At Elizabeth Church a young sister, Elizabeth Carolyn Bagley, united with the church on Sunday, December 8, and was baptized by Elder J. A. Monsees on Sunday night before the service. Then at the close of the service Sister Barbara Harden asked for a home in the church. She was received, and her baptism was to be attended to at the next regular meeting. The young Sister Bagley is the daughter of Elder Leo V Bagley. Sister Barbara is the daughter of Sister Cordie Harden, of Gordon. Both were gladly and joyfully received by the church. We met a number of ministers on the trip, but failed to make a note of their names. We may not recall the name of each one now, so we will not try to give their names. We are sorry we did not make a note of their names. We were with Elder B. F. House, at Phenix City. He is the pastor there. He could not go with us to other places on account of the poor health of his wife. We trust that she is much improved before now, and pray God's blessings upon them. Elder Monsees was with us at several places, and we were in his good home several nights. We shall never forget the great kindness shown to us by him and his dear companion. Elder B. A. Phillips was with us several days, and conveyed us to several places. We shall never forget his great kindness to us. We spent one night in the home of Elder J. Harvey Daily. Since we were in Georgia, Elder Daily and wife and daughter were at our place. He preached at our little church here on December 24, at night, and on the 25th at eleven o'clock. The Lord blessed him to preach good. He left here the morning of the 26th for Texas, to fill the appointments which had been arranged for him by Elder Ariel West. The crowds were small at most of the churches we visited, but the services were usually interesting and pleasant. The brethren, sisters, and friends were all good and kind to us-much better to us than we feel to deserve. We wish we could name each one of the ministers we had the great pleasure of being with, but we deem it best not to try to give their names, as we might overlook some of them. But we shall never forget their kindness and manifestations of Christian fellowship and brotherly love. May the good Lord richly bless each minister, each brother, and each sister, and each friend we met on the trip, and may He bless and prosper each church, and grant that love and fellowship may continue to abound among them. We are sure we met many on this trip that we shall never meet again in this poor old world, but we hope to meet them in that better place, that better country, where sorrows, trials, afflictions, and separations

never come. We trust they will not fail to remember us in their prayers. We feel to be poor and needy, and need the prayers of the Lord's dear children. Pray the Lord, please, that we may have grace and strength for our every trial, and grace to sustain us in the hour of death. C. H. C.

Another Editor

January 16, 1941

At our request Elder J. Harvey Daily, of Macon, Ga., has consented for his name to be added to our editorial staff. We have known Elder Daily for more than thirty-five years. He was present at the funeral of our sainted father, Elder S. F. Cayce, at Martin, Tenn., in August, 1905. We have never forgotten his great kindness to us in our great sorrow. Elder John R. Daily, the father of Elder Harvey, was associated with us as one of our corresponding editors for a number of years, and he was a great and good man. We love the Daily family. We are glad to have Elder J. Harvey Daily added to our staff of corresponding editors. He will write for the paper, and will also solicit subscriptions and forward the same to us. You will find an article from him on another page of this paper. He is a good writer, and is also an able minister of the New Testament. May the Lord bless him in all his laudable undertakings, and bless our labors together for the good of His great cause, and for the unifying of His dear children, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Acts 18:24-28 AND Acts 19:1-6

---February 6, 1941

We have been requested to write on the above citations of Scripture, but we feel that it would be better to copy what Gill said on the same from his Commentaries. It is rather long, but we feel that what this eminent man said on these verses will be worth the space. C. H. C. GILL'S COMMENTS ((8:24) (Acts 18:24). "And a certain Jew named Apollos," etc. Who by some is thought to be the same with Apelles, (**Romans 16:10**), his name is Greek, though he was a Jew, not only by religion, but by birth, being of a Jewish extract; "born at Alexandria;" in Egypt, which was built by Alexander the Great, from whence it had its name; it was the metropolis of Egypt, and the seat of the kings of it; great numbers of Jews were in this place; here lived Philo, the famous Jew; "an eloquent man;" in speech, as well as learned, wise, and "prudent," as the Ethiopic version renders it: and "mighty in the Scriptures," of the Old Testament, particularly in the prophecies of them concerning the Messiah; he had thoroughly read them, and carefully examined them, and could readily cite them: as well as had great knowledge of them, and was capable of explaining them; he was "skillful in the Scriptures," as the Syriac version renders it; or he "knew" them, as the Ethiopic; he had large acquaintance with them, and was well-versed in them: it is a Jewish way of speaking; so Ahitophel is said to be "mighty in the law;" the same is said of the sons of Reuben: this man "came to Ephesus;" after the departure of the Apostle Paul, and while Aquila and Priscilla were there; the reason of this coming hither was to preach the Word, and he did. ((8:25) (Acts 18:25). "This man was instructed in the way of the Lord," etc. Which John, whose baptism he only knew, came to prepare: the word here used signifies "catechised;" and suggests, that he was trained up by his parents in this way, who might have been the disciples of John, though afterwards removed from Judea to Alexandria; and that he only had been taught the

rudiments of the Christian religion, or doctrine of the gospel; here called the way of the Lord, or which directs and leads unto Him, as the only Saviour, and is the path of faith and truth; or as some copies read, "the word of the Lord;" and which accounts for what is afterwards said of him: "and being fervent in the spirit;" either in or by the Spirit of God being made so by Him. who is compared to fire, and who, in the form of cloven tongues of fire, sat upon the disciples at the day of Pentecost, and upon others; among whom this Apollos is by some thought to be, though without any reason; however, he might be inspired with zeal by the Spirit of God: or "in his own spirit," as the Ethiopic version renders it; his soul was inflamed with zeal for the glory of God, the honour of Christ, and the good of souls; his ministry was very affectionate, warm, and lively; see **(Romans 12:11)** "He spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord;" or "of Jesus," as read the Alexandrian copy, the Vulgate Latin, Syriac, and Ethiopic versions; according to the measure of light and grace he had received, he spake out freely and fully, and taught the people with great industry, and with all the exactness he could, the things he knew concerning the person, offices, and grace of the Lord Jesus: "knowing only the baptism of John;" which must be understood, not of the ordinance of baptism singly, as administered by John, but of the whole ministry of John; as of that ordinance, so of his doctrine concerning repentance and remission of sins; and concerning Christ that was to come, and concerning His being come, and who He was, whom John pointed at, and taught the people to believe in: but perhaps he might know very little, if anything, of the miracles of Christ, or of His death and resurrection from the dead, and the benefits and effects thereof; and of the pouring out of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles, and the light and knowledge which were communicated thereby. ((8:26) (Ver. 26). "And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue," etc. Of the Jews at Ephesus; using great freedom of speech, and showing much intrepidity and greatness of soul, and presence of mind; not fearing the faces of men, nor the revilings and contradictions of the Jews: "whom when Aquila and Pris-cilla had heard;" they attending at the synagogue, and having observed what he delivered, that there was some deficiency in it, though they took no notice of it publicly; partly on their own account, it not being proper, especially for Priscilla, to speak in public, nor was it allowed in the Jewish synagogue for a woman to speak there; and partly on his account, that they might not put him to blush, and discourage him; and chiefly on account of the gospel, that they might not lay any stumbling-blocks in the way of that and of young converts, and give an occasion to the adversary to make advantages: wherefore "they took him unto them;" they took him aside when he came out of the synagogue, and privately conversed with him; they had him "to their own house," as the Syriac version renders it: "and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly;" these two doubtless had received a considerable measure of evangelical light and knowledge from the Apostle Paul, during the time of their conversation with him; and as they freely received from him, they freely imparted it to Apollos, with a good design to spread the truth of the gospel, and to promote it and the interest of Christ in the world: and as on the one hand it was a good office, and a kind part in them, to communicate knowledge to him, so it was an instance of a good spirit, and of condescension in him, to be taught and instructed by them; especially since one of them was a woman, and both mechanics, and made but a mean figure: and from hence it may be observed, that women of grace, knowledge, and experience, though they are not allowed to teach in public, yet they may, and ought to communicate in private, what they know of divine things, for the use of others. ((8:27) (Acts 18:27). "And when he was disposed to pass into Achaia," etc. The chief city of which was Corinth, and whither Apollos went, as appears from ((9:1) (Acts 19:1). What disposed him to go hither, after he had

received a greater degree of light and knowledge, was no doubt that he might communicate it to the good of others, to which he was moved by the Holy Ghost, who had work for him to do there: according to Beza's most ancient copy, there were Corinthians sojourning in Ephesus, who when they heard him (Apollos), besought him that he would go with them into their country; to which he agreeing, the Ephesians wrote to the disciples at Corinth to receive him, as follows: "the brethren wrote, exhorting the disciples to receive him;" that is, the brethren at Ephesus, among whom Aquila was a principal one, wrote letters of recommendation to the brethren of the churches in Achaia, particularly at Corinth, not only that they would receive him into their houses, and hospitably entertain him as a Christian man, but admit him and behave toward him as a preacher of the gospel: "who when he was come;" into Achaia, and to Corinth: "helped them much which had believed through grace;" the phrase "through grace," is omitted in the Vulgate Latin version, but is in all the Greek copies, and may be connected either with the word "helped;" as the Syriac version, "he helped through grace;" and then the sense is, that Apollos, through the gifts of grace bestowed on him or by the assistance of the grace of God, or both, greatly helped and contributed much to the advantage of the believers in those parts; as to the encouragement of their faith, and the increase of the joy of it; for the quickening, and comforting, and establishing them in the truths and doctrines of the gospel, by his affectionate, fervent, and nervous way of preaching, or it may be connected with the word "believed," as it is in the Arabic version and in ours; and the meaning is, that he greatly assisted such who were already believers; and who became so, not of themselves, but through the grace of God; for faith is not of nature, nor the produce of man's free will, but is the gift of God's grace; it is a fruit of electing grace, an instance of distinguishing grace, it is owing to efficacious grace, and comes along with effectual calling grace, through the word preached, the means of grace; and is supported and maintained by the grace of God; the Ethiopic version renders it, "he preached much to them, who believed in the grace of God;" that is, in the gospel, the grace of God, which they received and professed; or in the love and favor of God, they were rooted and grounded in, and persuaded of. ((8:28) (Acts 18:28). "For he mightily convinced the Jews," etc. His reasoning was so strong and nervous, his arguments so weighty and powerful, and the passages he produced out of the Old Testament so full and pertinent, that the Jews were not able to stand against him; they could not object to the texts of Scripture he urged, nor to the sense he gave of them, nor answer the arguments founded upon them; he was an overmatch for them; they were refuted by him over and over, and were confounded to the last degree: and that "publicly" in their synagogue, before all the people; which increased their shame and confusion; and was the means of spreading the gospel, of bringinng others to the faith of it, and of establishing them in it, who had already received it: "shewing by the Scriptures;" of the Old Testament, which the Jews received and acknowledged as the word of God: "that Jesus was Christ;" that Messiah, which these Scriptures spoke of, whom God had promised, and the church of God expected; and which was the main thing in controversy between the Jews and the Christians, and it still is. ((9:1) (Acts 19:1). "And it came to pass while Apollos was at Corinth," etc. Whither he came after the Apostle Paul; and where he watered what the apostle had planted, and where he became very famous and eminent; insomuch that he was set up, though not with his will, at the head of a party, in opposition to the chief of the apostles, Peter and Paul; see (**I Corinthians 1:12**), and (I Corinthians 3:4-5,6), and (I Corinthians 4:6). "Paul having passed through the upper coast;" that is, of Phrygia, Galatia, Pontus, Bithynia, Lydia, Lyconia, and Paphlagonia; "came to Ephesus;" into Ionia, of which Ephesus was the chief city, and lay near the sea; wherefore the other

countries are called the upper coasts; hither he came, according to his promise in ((8:21) (Acts 18:21). "And finding certain disciples;" such as believed in Christ, made a profession of Him, and had been baptized in His name, for such were commonly called disciples: these do not seem to be persons, who were either converted by Paul, when he was at Ephesus before, or by Apollos, who had been there since, and was gone; but rather some who came hither from other parts, since the apostle was at this place; though indeed his stay at Ephesus before was short, they might be here, and he not hear of them. ((9:2) (Acts 19:2). "He said unto them, have ye received the Holy Ghost," etc. Meaning, not the special, regenerating, and sanctifying grace of the Holy Ghost, for that is supposed in their being disciples and believers, but the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, for it follows, "since ye believed?" that is, in Christ; which is taking for granted, that they had received the special grace of the Spirit of God; for this believing is to be understood of true, spiritual, special faith in Christ: "and they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost;" by which they could not mean the person of the Holy Ghost; for they must have known that there was such a divine person as the Holy Ghost: from the writings of the Old Testament, with which they were conversant: and from the ministry of John into whose baptism they were baptized; who saw the Spirit of God descend on Jesus, and bore witness of it; and declared, that Christ, who was to come after him, would baptize with the Holy Ghost: nor could they mean the special grace of the Spirit, which they themselves had received; but the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit of God, which they at present knew nothing of, and which were afterwards bestowed upon them: they knew that there were prophecies in the Old Testament, concerning the effusion of the Spirit in the last days, in the days of the Messiah; but they had heard that these had had their accomplishment; they had heard nothing of the day of Pentecost, and of the pouring out of the Spirit upon the apostles then, nor of any instance of this kind since; they did not know that the Holy Ghost was yet, **((9) (John 7:49)**; they knew He was promised, but not that He was given; the Ethiopic version, to avoid the difficulty of the text, renders it, "we have only heard that there was an Holy Ghost." ((9:3) (Acts 19:3). "And he said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized?" etc. The apostle takes it for granted that they were baptized, since they were not only believers, but disciples; such as not only believed with the heart, but had made a profession of their faith, and were followers of Christ; but asks unto what they were baptized; either in whose name they were baptized, since Christian baptism was administered in the name of the Spirit, as well as in the name of the Father and of the Son; or what attended or followed their baptism, seeing sometimes the Holy Ghost fell upon persons, either before baptism, or at it, or after it: "and they said, unto John's baptism;" some think they had never been baptized at all with water-baptism, only had received the doctrine preached by John concerning repentance and remission of sins, and so were baptized into him, professing the same doctrine he did, just as the Israelites were baptized unto Moses; others think they were baptized, but very wrongly, being baptized in the name of John, and not in the name of Jesus Christ; and so, as it was not Christian baptism they had submitted to, it was right to baptize them again: but neither of these are probable, for it is not likely that they should receive John's doctrine, and not his baptism; that they should be his disciples and followers, and not attend to the more distinguishing branch of his ministry; and it is still more unlikely that they should be baptized in his name, who preached Jesus Christ to his followers, and pointed out to them the Lamb of God, and declared Him to be greater than he; it seems rather that they were baptized, and that they were baptized in the name of Christ, as John's disciples were, as the apostle affirms in the following words. ((9:4) (Acts 19:4). "Then said Paul," etc. In reply to their

answer, understanding them that they were baptized by John, he takes it up, and gives an account of John's baptism; showing how agreeable it was, and that it was the same baptism with the baptism of Christ, being administered in His name: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance;" which required repentance antecedent to it, and was a fruit and effect, and so an evidence of it: "saying unto the people;" the people of the Jews, the common people, the multitude that attended on his ministry: "that they should believe on Him, which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus;" so that he preached faith in Christ, as well as repentance towards God; and made the one as well as the other a necessary prerequisite unto baptism; which shows, that his baptism and Christian baptism are the same. ((9:5) (Acts 19:5). "When they heard this," etc. That is, the people to whom John preached, his hearers, when they heard of the Messiah, and that Jesus was He, and that it became them to believe in Him: "they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus;" not the disciples that Paul found at Ephesus, but the hearers of John; for these are the words of the Apostle Paul, giving an account of John's baptism, and of the success of his ministry, showing that his baptism was administered in the name of the Lord Jesus; and not the words of Luke the Evangelist, recording what followed upon his account of John's baptism; for then he would have made mention of the apostle's name, as he does in the next verse; and have said, when they heard this account, they were baptized by Paul in the name of the Lord Jesus: the historian reports two things, first what Paul said, which lies in ((9:4) (Acts 19:4-5), then what he did, ((9:5) (Acts 19:5), where he repeats his name, as was necessary; as that he laid his hands upon them, which was all that was needful to their receiving the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, having been already baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus: which sense is the more confirmed by the particles *men* and *de*, which answer to one another in ((9:4) (Acts 19:4-5), and show the words to be a continuation of the apostle's speech, and not the words of the historian, which begin in the next verse. Beza's ancient copy adds, "for the remission of sins." ((9:6) (Acts 19:6). "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them," etc. They having been before baptized, not by him, but by John, or one of his disciples, in the name of the Lord Jesus; just as Peter and John laid their hands upon the believing Samaritans, who had been before baptized by Philip, **(Acts 8:14-15,16-17)**, and the same extraordinary effects followed; "the Holy Ghost came on them;" in His extraordinary gifts, whose special grace they had before an experience of: "and they spake with tongues;" with other tongues, or in other languages, which they had never learned or had been used to, as the disciples did at the day of "Pentecost: and prophesied;" preached, having an extraordinary gift at once, of explaining the prophecies of the Old Testament, and also foretold things to come.

Temperance Facts

---February 6, 1941

The above is the title of a little book published by the "Minnesota Temperance Movement," 204 Hodgson Building, Minneapolis, Minn. It is not a book of arguments, but a book of facts. It is well worth reading. It gives facts, and states the authority for the same -for each fact. If you wish to know, for certain, what the liquor business is, and what the effects of drink are, even in small quantities, and the facts as to the benefits in tax payments to the government, you should get one of these books. Send 25 cents to the publishers and ask them to send you a copy. Five copies may be had for only one dollar. We are giving this notice free, because we desire that our readers may know where to get correct information concerning the facts about the liquor business. C. H. C.

Waldensian Confessions

---February 20, 1941

We have been requested to publish the Confession of Faith of the Waldenses. They put forth a Confession of Faith in the year 1120. This Confession was as follows:

1. We believe and firmly maintain all that is contained in the twelve articles of the symbol, commonly called the apostles' creed, and we regard as heretical whatever is inconsistent with the said twelve articles.
2. We believe that there is one God-the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.
3. We acknowledge for sacred canonical Scriptures the books of the Holy Bible.
(Here follows the title of each, exactly conformable to our received canon, but which it is deemed, on that account, quite unnecessary to particularize.)
4. The books above-mentioned teach us-That there is one God, almighty, unbounded in wisdom, and infinite in goodness, and who, in His goodness, has made all things. For He created Adam after His own image and likeness. But through the enmity of the devil, and his own disobedience, Adam fell, sin entered into the world, and we became transgressors in and by Adam.
5. That Christ had been promised to the fathers who received the law, to the end that, knowing their sin by the law, and their unrighteousness and insufficiency, they might desire the coming of Christ to make satisfaction for their sins, and to accomplish the law by Himself.
6. That at the time appointed of the Father, Christ was born-a time when iniquity everywhere abounded, to make it manifest that it was not for the sake of any good in ourselves, for all were sinners, but that He, who is true, might display His grace and mercy toward us.
7. That Christ is our life, and truth, and peace, and righteousness-our Shepherd and Advocate, our Sacrifice, and Priest, who died for the salvation of all who should believe, and rose again for their justification.
8. And we also firmly believe, that there is no other mediator, or advocate with God the Father, but Jesus Christ. And as to the Virgin Mary, she was holy, humble, and full of grace; and this we also believe concerning all other saints, namely, that they are waiting in heaven for the resurrection of their bodies at the day of judgment.
9. We also believe, that, after this life, there are but two places-one for those that are saved, the other for the damned, which (two) we call paradise and hell, wholly denying that imaginary purgatory of Antichrist, invented in opposition to the truth.
10. Moreover, we have ever regarded all the inventions of men (in the affairs of religion) as an unspeakable abomination before God; such as the festival days and vigils of saints, and what is called holy-water, the abstaining from flesh on certain days, and such like things, but above all, the masses.
11. We hold in abhorrence all human inventions, as proceeding from Anti-Christ, which produce distress (alluding probably to the voluntary penances and mortification imposed by the Catholics on themselves.-Jones), and are prejudicial to the liberty of the mind.
12. We consider the Sacraments as signs of holy things, or as the visible emblems of invisible blessings. We regard it as proper and even necessary that believers use these symbols or visible forms when it can be done. Notwithstanding which, we maintain that believers may be saved without these signs, when they have neither place nor opportunity of observing them.

13. We acknowledge no sacraments (as of divine appointment) but baptism and the Lord's Supper.

14. We honor the secular powers, with subjection, obedience, promptitude, and payment. On page 277 of Jones' History is an epitome of the Waldensian Confession in the twelfth century. It is not the Confession itself, but a summary, or epitome, of it. It is as follows: The Centuriators of Magdeburg, in their History of the Christian Church, under the twelfth century, recite from an old manuscript the following epitome of the opinions of the Waldenses of that age. In articles of faith the authority of the Holy Scriptures is the highest; and for that reason it is the standard of judging; so that whatsoever doth not agree with the Word of God, is deservedly to be rejected and avoided. The decrees of Fathers and Councils are (only) so far to be approved as they agree with the Word of God. The reading and knowledge of the Holy Scriptures is open to, and is necessary for all men, the laity as well as the clergy; and moreover the writings of the prophets and apostles are to be read rather than the comments of men. The sacraments of the church of Christ are two, baptism and the Lord's Supper; and in the latter, Christ has instituted the receiving in both kinds, both for priests and people. Masses are impious; and it is madness to say masses for the dead. Purgatory is the invention of men; for they who believe go into eternal life; they who believe not, into eternal damnation. The invoking and worshipping of dead saints is idolatry. The church of Rome is the whore of Babylon. We must not obey the pope and bishops, because they are the wolves of the church of Christ. The pope hath not the primacy over all the churches of Christ; neither hath he the power of both swords. That is the church of Christ, which hears the pure doctrine of Christ, and observes the ordinances instituted by Him, in whatsoever place it exists. Vows of celibacy are the inventions of men, and productive of uncleanness. So many orders (of the clergy), so many marks of the beast. Monks are a filthy carcass. So many superstitious dedications of churches, commemorations of the dead, benedictions of creatures, pilgrimages, so many forced fastings, so many superfluous festivals, those perpetual bellowings, (alluding to the practice of chanting) and the observations of various other ceremonies, manifestly obstructing the teaching and learning of the Word, are diabolical inventions. The marriage of priests is both lawful and necessary. They put forth a third Confession of Faith in the year 1544, as follows:

1. We believe that there is but one God, who is a Spirit- the Creator of all things- the Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all; who is to be worshipped in spirit and in truth- upon whom we are continually dependent, and to whom we ascribe praise for our life, food, raiment, health, sickness, prosperty, and adversity. We love Him as the source of all goodness; and reverence Him as that sublime Being, who searches the reins and trieth the hearts of the children of men.
2. We believe that Jesus Christ is the Son and image of the Father- that in Him all the fullness of the Godhead dwells, and that by Him alone we know the Father. He is our Mediator and Advocate; nor is there any other name given under heaven by which we can be saved. In His name alone we call upon the Father, using no other prayers than those contained in the Holy Scriptures, or such as are in substance agreeable thereunto.
3. We believe in the Holy Spirit as the Comforter, proceeding from the Father, and from the Son; by whose inspiration we are taught to pray; being by Him renewed in the spirit of our minds; who creates us anew unto good works, and from whom we receive the knowledge of the truth.

4. We believe that there is one holy church, comprising the whole assembly of the elect and faithful, that have existed from the beginning of the world, or that shall be to the end thereof. Of this church the Lord Jesus Christ is the head-it is governed by His Word and guided by the Holy Spirit. In the church it behooves all Christians to have fellowship. For her He (Christ) prays incessantly, and His prayer for it is most acceptable to God, without which indeed there could be no salvation.
5. We hold that the ministers of the church ought to be unblameable both in life and doctrine; and if found otherwise, they ought to be deposed from their office, and others substituted in their stead; and that no person ought to presume to take that honor unto himself but he who is called of God as was Aaron-that the duties of such are to feed the flock of God, not for filthy lucre's sake, or as having dominion over God's heritage, but as being examples to the flock, in word, in conversation, in charity, in faith, and in chastity.
6. We acknowledge, that kings, princes, and governors, are the appointed and established ministers of God, whom we are bound to obey (in all lawful and civil concerns). For they bear the sword for the defence of the innocent, and the punishment of evil doers; for which reason we are bound to honor and pay them tribute. From this power and authority, no man can exempt himself, as is manifest from the example of the Lord Jesus Christ, who voluntarily paid tribute, not taking upon Himself any jurisdiction of temporal power.
7. We believe that in the ordinance of baptism the water is the visible and external sign, which represents to us that which, by virtue of God's invisible operation, is within us- namely, the renovation of our minds, and the mortification of our members through (the faith of) Jesus Christ. And by this ordinance we are received into the holy congregation of God's people, previously professing and declaring our faith and change of life.
8. We hold that the Lord's Supper is a commemoration of, and thanksgiving for, the benefits which we have received by His sufferings and death-and that it is to be received in faith and love-examining ourselves, that so we may eat of that bread and drink of that cup, as it is written in the Holy Scriptures.
9. We maintain that marriage was instituted of God-that it is holy and honorable, and ought to be forbidden none, provided there be no obstacle from the divine Word.
10. We contend, that all those in whom the fear of God dwells, will thereby be led to please Him, and to abound with the good works (of the gospel) which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them-which are love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, gentleness, sobriety, and the other good works enforced in the Holy Scriptures.
11. On the other hand, we confess that we consider it to be our duty to beware of false teachers, whose object is to divert the minds of men from the true worship of God, and to lead them to place their confidence in the creature, as well as to depart from the good works of the gospel, and to regard the inventions of men.
12. We take the Old and the New Testament for the rule of our life, and we agree with the general confession of faith contained in (what is usually termed) the apostles' creed. Thus we have in the foregoing what were the principles held to by the ancient Waldenses. It is the same doctrine and order held sacred by true Primitive Baptists today. C. H. C.

What Is That To Thee?

---March 6, 1941

Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on His breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee? Peter seeing him saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me. - (John 21:20-22). God's Book is the most wonderful book that has ever been written, or that ever will be written. There is something in it to fit the station and condition and doings of all people in every age of the world, and especially the life and experience and doings of His children. In the above text the Apostle Peter manifested a concern as to what John should do. He was, seemingly, at that moment more concerned about what another should do than he was about what he should, himself, be doing. It appears that he was making himself concerned about the affairs and doings of another, more than about his own affairs and his own doings. Our Lord's answer, summed up in our present day English, would be about this: It is none of your business what this man does. You attend to your own business-follow thou me. In the present time it seems that almost the entire world is manifesting great interest and concern as to what the other fellow does. That spirit is greatly manifested in and among the nations of the world, as well as among individuals. Nations are meddling with other nations, and seem to be much concerned about what they are doing and what they intend to do. How much better would all material things be if all would attend to their own business, and quit meddling with other folks and their affairs! The same spirit is frequently manifested in the true church today. We see so many who are manifesting so much concern as to "what shall this man do?" instead of "attending to their own business," and, for themselves, doing as Jesus said, "Follow thou me." On one occasion, recorded in **((9:38) (Mark 9:38-39)** and **((9) (Luke 9:49)**, we have an instance of the disciples meddling with another. "And John answered Him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbad him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me." "For he that is not against us, is on our part. For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward." How much better would it be for us if we would all be engaged in giving even a cup of water instead of "grumbling" so much about what someone else is doing. May the Lord pity us. C. H. C.

For The Poor

---March 6, 1941

For some time you have heard something about a new publication - something on a different line. Finally, we have succeeded in getting out the first issue. The name of the publication is For The Poor. The first issue, dated January, 1941, contains the following: A sermon delivered by Elder Cayce, at Atkins, Ark., July, 1940; taken down by Sister Grace Claggett; subject, "Moses Led the Flock;" a sermon delivered by Christmas Evans at an association in Wales in 1817; subject, "The Demoniack of Gadara;" "And Yet There Is Room," by Gideon. The last two were published in Zion's Advocate in 1899 and 1870, and a poem copied from the same paper in 1857. The February issue will contain a sermon delivered by Elder J. L. Collings; subject, "Gathering Up The Fragments," and some good articles published long ago. Turn to the last page of this paper and read the club offer for the two papers. We have a few copies of the first issue on hand. We will start your subscription with the first issue as long as we have any. We aim to have a picture of the present day

preacher in the paper when we can. I am sure you will enjoy reading For The Poor. Try it and then tell me. Will you? In hope, Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

Little Things

---March 6, 1941

Elder Webb has given the title of "Little Things" to his book containing much of his writings. Work is progressing on the book in our office now. He is working in the office doing some of the typesetting. A number of pages have already been printed. Many of the articles the book will contain were published in our columns in the past few years. We think it is going to be a good book, well worth the price it will sell for. Any who have given him their names as subscribers for the book will oblige him if they will send their remittance to him now for the book, or for any number you agreed to take. It will help to pay for the material which has been purchased for the book, and will help to pay for the labor being done. The work will be carried on as fast as possible, so that the books may all be finished up as quickly as it can be done. We recommend the work to our readers. C. H. C.

1 Corinthians 2:9-10

---March 20, 1941

But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.-(I Corinthians 2:9-10). We have been requested to write some on the ninth verse, which ends with the word him. There are some things which cannot be discovered or found out by the seeing with the natural eye. Neither can they be learned by the hearing with the natural ear. Neither can they be discovered by searching. They never even so much as enter into the heart of the natural man. "The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God; God is not in all his thoughts." -((0:4) (Psalms 10:4). The things that pertain to God and godliness are not in his thoughts. They have never entered into his heart, and never will. Something must be done for such a person (the wicked), not something done by him, but for him, before he will ever even think upon the name of the Lord, in a right way. He must be changed from his state of wickedness, must be brought out of that, before spiritual thoughts or desires ever enter or proceed from his heart. His heart must be changed first. Who can change a man's heart? The heart is the seat of affections. Who can change a man's affections, and cause him to love the things he now hates, or to hate the things which he now loves? "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh." -((26) (Ezekiel 36:26). "The preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, is from the Lord." -(Proverbs 16:1). From these expressions we learn that the Lord is the One who can and does change the heart. He gives a heart of flesh. He prepares the heart. Without this preparation of heart, without this heart of flesh, one does not, and cannot, desire or love spiritual things. "Eye hath not seen." Here is something which cannot be learned, or known, or discovered, through the power of natural sight or vision. True, with the natural eye, we can and do behold many of the wonders in the realm of nature. We can see the great mountains, and valleys, the broad rivers, and expansive plains; we can see the stars which bedeck the heavens; we can see the moon, which rules the light by

night; we can see the sun, the great center of the solar system; we can see the great variety of minerals in the earth, upon which we live and move; but we cannot see the invisible things of God. "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth His handywork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard." -(Psalms 19:1-3). These material things which we see speak in thunder tones, by day and by night, in all the habitable parts of the world, and declare that God is, and that He is the God that He is-the great, infinite, eternal, all wise, omnipotent Jehovah God, the great Creator of all material things. But the wicked, unregenerated sinner cannot see beyond these visible material things. The great and wonderful spiritual blessings which God has prepared for His humble poor are not discovered, they are not found, they are not learned by the power of natural sight. "Eye hath not seen." That is just as true today as it was when it was written. It is not true then because it was written; but it was written because it was true. It had always been that way; it was that way then, and it is that way now; and it always will be that way. No sinner, then, ever has learned these precious things which God has in store for His afflicted people by reading any book, or by reading any man's writings, or by reading the tracts which men print and circulate, or by reading and studying their Sunday School lessons. They are not discovered or learned that way. "Nor ear heard." These things cannot be learned by the hearing of the natural ear. One hears the sound of the preacher's voice, when he is preaching, with the natural ear. It is a natural voice, and it is heard with the natural ear. But these are things that are not imparted by the organ of hearing, for it is true that "nor ear heard." Jesus said to some wicked unregenerated Jews, "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." -(John 8:43). They heard the vocal sound of His voice; but they did not understand His teaching. Why did they not understand it? Because they could not. The understanding does not come that way. They had hearts of stone; they did not have the hearts of flesh. One must have a heart of flesh, an heart of understanding, in order to be able to understand. If such characters, or such persons, could not understand the preaching which Jesus did while He was here in the world, preaching His own glorious and everlasting gospel, do you suppose we have any preachers in the world today who can do a better job in making them understand than He did? If a preacher does preach in such a way as to make the world understand and "fall in" with his preaching, it can be for no other reason than that his preaching is of the world. "They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error." - **(I John 4:5-6)**. The inspired writer here gives an infallible rule by which we may know a man who is of the world in his preaching. If he preaches so the world hears and believes his preaching, it is because he is of the world in his preaching. John tells us his preaching is the spirit of error. It is not the truth; he does not preach the truth. He preaches false doctrines of men-and perhaps the doctrines of devils. But the world does not hear those who are of God in their preaching; the world does not hear those who preach the truth, as God has given it to us in His Book. If one does hear us, why does he hear us? Can it be for any other reason than that he was first made to be of God, seeing it is true that "he that knoweth God heareth us;" and "he that is not of God heareth not us?" "Nor ear heard." "But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit." If you know and realize something of the greatness, the love, the justice, the majesty, the righteousness, the glory, the mercy, the riches, the presence of God, it is because some of these things have been revealed to you by His Spirit. If you have been given to know something of the glories which await the Lord's humble poor beyond

this vale of tears, it is because something has been revealed to you by His Spirit. It is by the Spirit of God that you have been given to know something of the things of God. Hence, though you be poor in spirit, and hunger and thirst after righteousness, you have the Spirit of God dwelling in your poor heart; and all the good things which God has in store for His humble poor are yours, and they are yours to enjoy in all eternity beyond this world of sorrow and trouble. May the Lord graciously bless the reader, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Elder Pittman Passed Away

---March 20, 1941

At about nine thirty on last Friday night, March 14, we received a message from Sister Pittman, of Luray, Va., that Elder Pittman passed away that afternoon at 6:50. It was a great shock to us. We do not know, at this writing, whether he had been ill, or if he was stricken and passed away suddenly and unexpectedly. For several years he had been editor and publisher of the Advocate and Messenger. We have been together often, and our association with him has always been pleasant to us. We have always co-operated in our labors as editors and publishers of our periodicals. We have always looked forward to receiving each issue of the Advocate and Messenger. Elder Pittman was untiring in his labors for peace, and encouraged the brotherhood to "strive for the things that make for peace" in Zion. He labored to encourage brethren to steer clear of extremes. We loved him dearly. We deeply sympathize with Sister Pittman and the family. We have had trouble in our journey along the path of life, and therefore we know how to sympathize with those who are in trouble. In our sorrows and troubles we have been given, from time to time, to experience the truthfulness and certainty of the Lord's blessed assurance given to the eminent Apostle Paul, that "My grace is sufficient for thee." His grace is sufficient in every time of need and in every trouble. May His consoling presence be sweetly manifested to this dear family in this sad and trying hour, is our humble prayer. We sorrow and grieve with them. Surely another great man has fallen in Israel. May the good Lord grant, in mercy, to fill up the broken ranks. Lord, grant to give us men who will, like Elder Pittman, meekly and humbly, yet fearlessly, stand for the eternal principles of truth. May the Lord grant to shower down His rich blessings upon the bereaved family, and upon the churches our dear brother served. C. H. C.

Special Service

---March 20, 1941

Our church here in Thornton agreed at our last meeting to have song service on Saturday morning, from ten to eleven; then the regular preaching service; then dinner on the ground; then song service in the afternoon. Then song service Sunday morning from ten to eleven; then the regular preaching service; then dinner on the ground; then song service in the afternoon. This on Saturday and first Sunday in April. Brother A. A. Gentry, Quitman, Ark., has been requested to be with us to help in the song service, and we have a promise from him that he will try to be with us. All are invited to come and be with us. May the Lord bless the service to our good and to His glory. C. H. C.

Book Wanted

---March 20, 1941

Years ago Elder J. R. Respass wrote a pamphlet on the book of Esther. He was then editor of the Gospel Messenger, which was published at Butler, Ga. The articles contained in the pamphlet were also published in The Gospel Messenger. We are anxious to get a copy of that pamphlet. Will you please search your place and try to find a copy of it for us? We would also be glad to get all the old copies of that paper that it is possible to get. Will you please make a search for any of them? Please write and tell us what you want for the pamphlet or the papers. C. H. C.

By Grace

---March 20, 1941

The following article by Elder G. T. Mayo, then of Palmersville, Tenn., but now of Dresden, Tenn., was published in The Primitive Baptist of November 26, 1890, under the above heading. As principles never change, what was a principle of truth then is a principle of truth now. Further comment is unnecessary. C. H. C.
THE ARTICLE

There are some claiming to be Baptists in our land who love to quote the above and dwell on it all the time and we think it one of the grandest themes that ever engaged the attention of the human family, but this same few have an erroneous idea of salvation. They think that a saved man can be at ease while others are carrying the news to all the world and bearing all the burdens, while they themselves are doing all in their power to hinder the spread of the gospel. Were it not for these who proclaim the gospel, this same few could not claim an existence in the world. All now composing that select few were converted under a people who have the gospel for a lost world. Why don't they quote the whole verse: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Why don't they go entreating men and women to repent of their sins and believe in Christ to the saving of their souls? There are Baptists in all countries and have been through all the ages and it is remarkably strange that this same few were never heard of or known in any country but the United States. Do you know this people?

REPLY To the readers of The Primitive Baptist-The above article appeared in that great sheet which is published in the town of Martin, and one would think from the name it wears that it would take things clean where it goes; it is called the Baptist Reaper. I guess they will attach a binder to it by another season; they would attach one now if it was in their power and bind all that refuse to take part in their modern man-made institutions of saving sinners. But will say that the above is headed "By Grace," as you will see, and goes on to say that there are some claiming to be Baptists in our land who love to quote the above and dwell on it all the time. Notice he says "we think it one of the grandest themes that ever engaged the attention of the human family." I will say, then, that this few must be right, according to his views, when they are quoting and dwelling on this grand subject. So they are right so far. But you will see that he says this same few have an erroneous idea of salvation; and he says "they think that a saved man can be at ease while others are carrying the good news to all the world, and bearing all the burdens." Notice, he says "they think that a saved man can be at ease." I will say that we think that the saved have as good a right to be easy as the unsaved. But he says, "while others are carrying the good news to all the world and bearing all the burdens." I will ask, Who does he mean by others? He goes on to tell what these few think, and says "they think the saved can be at ease while others must do the work." Does he

mean that we think the unsaved must do the work that he speaks of? It seems that he does. Now I will say that we don't think the unsaved could do much work for the Lord, though he leaves the impression that that is what we believe. If you think so, you are sadly mistaken, my brother. But he says "these few are doing all they can to hinder the spread of the gospel." Now I will have to differ with the brother here, and say in reply, that these few whom he says are doing all they can to hinder the spread of the gospel are the only people who proclaim the gospel, but not another which is not another, but a perversion of the gospel, as some do who claim to be doing so much, like the writer in the Reaper. Though I will say, in reply, that if this few have ever done anything to hinder anyone from spreading what he calls the gospel, I never heard of it. I don't think they ever stopped any man's mouth, or even tried to; but will say that "If it seems evil unto you (and your people) to serve the Lord, choose ye this day whom you will serve; but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." But the writer of the above says, "if it were not for those who proclaim the gospel, this same few could not claim an existence in the world." To this, I will say that you are right in that, for if it were not for those who proclaim the true gospel, we could not claim an existence in the world, for just such sheets as the Reaper and its followers would kick us out, quick. But this same few whom he hates so bad, are the people who proclaim the gospel of the Son of God, and so we have an existence in the world despite all the fiery darts that may be hurled at us from the author of the above. I am sure if it was left to him that he would never preach anything that would give this few an existence, but he would do all he could to preach them out of existence. Can't the reader see that from the tone of his article? But I will say to this good brother that the gospel is being proclaimed by this few, and they will be here, when you are done in this world, proclaiming the same true gospel, "salvation by grace," as they are doing now. So don't fret, but keep cool, for you can't get rid of us, for God said He would not leave Himself without a witness. But the writer says, "all that compose this select few are those who were converted under a people that have the gospel for a lost world." Of course he means by this that they are the people that have the gospel, therefore this few were converted under them. Now let me ask the brother how he found that out? Have you seen all this few, and did they tell you of this, or did some of your brethren tell you that? If they did of course that would make it so and give you the right to say so; but I will say that you might be mistaken about this; but if you think these few were converted under your people, I think you could be heard to sigh and say that we made a great mistake in that part of the work, as you think this few are doing so much to stop the gospel. However, we were not all converted under your preaching, as you would have the reader believe, but we were converted by the power of Him who speaks and it is done, commands and it stands fast, and works when and where He pleases. And we are thankful to say this is what gives us our existence, and not you, nor your people, as you claim. I will relieve you of that burden, knowing that you can't stay His hand nor say unto Him "what doest thou?" But enough on that. He goes on to say, "why don't they quote the whole verse?" "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Now let me say this text tells exactly how we came to have an existence in the world, as I have shown above. It is the gift of God, not of ourselves or of any other people, as the brother wants it, but "the gift of God," as the text reads. But the reader will see that he claims that we were converted under the preaching of a people who he claims has the gospel for a lost world. So you see he can't swallow the whole verse, after quoting it, as it does not suit his work system. But let me ask the writer, as he is so strict about taking the whole, why he did not quote the next verse, which reads: "Not of works, lest any man should boast." Ah! he knew where to stop. He knew that would blow his work

system wide open. Let me ask who are boasting over their works? Is it these few, who, he says, don't do anything, or is it those whom he says have all the burden to bear, and who, he says, are the cause of our conversion? Let me say that he clears us from boasting. So you see these few are identified by the next text. It would have been far better for you, my brother, if it had not all been quoted, for it cuts his little system off, according to your own statement. The very thing you hold against us is the very thing that puts us in harmony with the text; for it is the gift of God, "not of works, lest any man should boast." Please remember this, and stop your boasting, or just say that this few can have this Scripture, as you are bound to do. But a few more remarks and I am through. He says "this few have an erroneous idea of salvation." Let me ask him whether he knows what kind of an idea they have? I will say that an erroneous idea is a false idea. Now we will see who have the erroneous idea. "This few" he speaks of believe that salvation is the gift of God; the apostle believed the same. Is this erroneous? If so, the apostle had an erroneous idea. "This few" believe that salvation "is not of works, lest any man should boast." And this is what the apostle said. Is this erroneous? If so, the apostle had an erroneous idea of salvation. Now, my brother, you say that this few "let others bear all the burden, therefore do all the work." Now this is your idea of salvation, i. e., that it depends upon our works. Hence, I will ask, whose idea is erroneous-this man and his brethren who claim to be doing so much, and who contend that salvation depends upon their works, or the people who stand identified with the apostle, when he says "not of works, lest any man should boast?" Now I think the brother can see where he is off about this idea of salvation. Again, he says, "why don't they (this few) go entreating men and women to repent of their sins, to believe in Christ to the saving of their souls?" I would say to that, "this is the work of God that ye believe on Him (Christ) whom He hath sent." -John vi. 29. Don't you see, my brother, that it is the work of God, and not your work or mine to make people believe? Neither can you dispute this without disputing the above Scripture. Let me say here, you are showing again who have an erroneous idea of salvation. Remember that Christ came to call sinners to repentance, and this is not in your power nor mine. This is why "this few" don't engage in your work system. I hope you understand this. But he likes to call us "a few." I guess he thinks this will make someone feel little; but let us see what Christ said; "Fear not, little flock, for it's the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." -(Luke 12:32). My brother would like it better if it would read "fear not, big flock, for it is the Father's good pleasure to offer you the kingdom, if you will carry the good news and bear the burden." But let's see a little more about "the few." I call you to **((3) (Matthew 7:13-14))** "Enter ye in at the strait gate, for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat. Because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." You have given us the right name, my brother; we will not fall out about that. You see where "the few" go to and also where the many go to. So I will close by quoting the text, "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." But he winds up by saying: "Do you know this people?" I will say, yes, my brother, every person in this country knows who can take the above Scripture as it stands. It is "this few" you speak of, and they are the only ones that can. So, my prayer is that God may give the brother repentance to the acknowledging of the truth, and remember that God will do His work. Yours in hope of eternal life. G. T. MAYO. Palmersville, Tenn.

Matthew 19:16-26

---April 3, 1941

We have been asked to give our views on **(Matthew 19:16-21)**, but it is necessary to go on down to (Matthew 19:26) in order to get the whole lesson. (Matthew 19:16-26) reads as follows: And, behold, one came and said unto Him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And He said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto Him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The young man saith unto Him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions. Then said Jesus unto His disciples, Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. When His disciples heard it, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, Who then can be saved? But Jesus beheld them, and said unto them, With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible. In **((0:25) (Luke 10:25))** we are told that this young man was a lawyer, and his question is there recorded in this language: "And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted Him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" It is to be clearly seen from this that the question as recorded by Matthew, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" is in the sense of inheriting. That is, "that I may have," or obtain or inherit, eternal life. All this shows that this young man thought that he could get to heaven, or be saved, or inherit eternal life by what he did. He believed that being saved in heaven depended upon the good things he did. Please carefully note his question, as recorded by Luke: "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" His idea was that here is an inheritance which comes by doing something-that there is something to do in order to inherit eternal life. An heir is one who inherits an estate. There are just two ways by which one may become an heir. One way is to be born into the family, born of the one who owns the estate. The other way is by adoption. This being a fact, then it is absurd to say that one may inherit an estate by doing something. It is absurd to say that one has to do something in order to be born into a certain family. Even the will of the one born is not consulted; he has no will in the matter at all. The same thing is true in the matter of adoption. It is silly to talk about the one who is adopted having something to do in order to the adoption. When a man adopts a child of another into his family, the child is not consulted. It is of the will of the one who does the adopting. The child does not do something in order to be adopted. There is no law for the child to comply with in order to the adoption. All the law is complied with by the one who does the adopting. The one who does the adopting makes his own selection, does his own selecting, and does all the complying with the law. But the one thus adopted thereby becomes an heir to the estate of the one who did the adopting. The child had nothing whatever to do with becoming an heir, whether it be by birth or adoption. If you had a case in court would you want an attorney to represent you in the court who knew no more than to think that one becomes an heir by doing something, or that one inherits an estate by the good things he might do? Do you think such an attorney would be competent, really, to practice law even in the lowest court of the land? If you

wished to adopt a child into your family would you want to engage the service of a lawyer who did not know any more than to claim that the child had something to do in order that you might adopt him, or in order that he might be adopted into another family? Frankly, we would not. So much for that. We see what the idea was which this man had. Notice, too, that Luke tells us that this man came to the Saviour, not as an honest searcher for truth, but "tempted Him." Hence, when he said "Good Master," it was a hypocritical expression. He believed, as other Pharisees, that the Master was an imposter and a deceiver and not that He was the "Good Master." The Lord knew his thoughts and his hypocritical approach, and hence said, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God." This Pharisee did not believe that Jesus was the God-man; and so it was hypocrisy in him to say "Good Master." The Lord tried the man on his own platform- showed from his own claim that he could not be saved in the way that he thought. If one is to be saved by the good things he does, of course he must keep the law. Hence, the Saviour said, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." The young man asked, "Which?" Then the Master repeated the commandments, one of which is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The young man then said, "All these things have I kept from my youth up." We are persuaded there are many in this day who claim to be doing many good things, who are just like this young man was. He claimed to have done something which he had not done. If a man loves his neighbor as himself he will not keep a dollar when his neighbor needs it. If one loves his neighbor as himself, he would be as glad for his neighbor to have a dollar as to have the dollar himself; if he has a dollar he would be as glad for his neighbor to have it as to keep it himself. He had not kept all these from his youth up. There is no man in nature who loves another as he loves him-helf. Human nature is not built that way. Self preservation is said to be the first law of nature. A man may feel that he loves his wife as he does himself, yet under certain conditions and circumstances he will forget the wife and endeavor to protect himself. These things are facts, brought about by the depravity of the human heart. It is, therefore, a fact, an everlasting truth, that the young man could not be saved on his own platform. The young man went away sorrowful. Thus he proved that he did not love his neighbor as himself. He was not willing to sell what he had and give to the poor. Then the Lord said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." He did not say that "it is easier for a camel to go through the needle's eye;" but "through the eye of a needle." We have heard a dodge on this language like this: "There was an opening in the wall around Jerusalem called the needle's eye, and if a camel was stripped of his burden, and was not too large, he could just squeeze through that opening, by getting down on his knees," etc. But Jesus did not say the needle's eye, but the eye of a needle. The disciples understood that it was impossible for a camel to go through the eye of a needle. And yet the Saviour said this impossibility is easier than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. That is, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a man to be saved, or to inherit eternal life, by doing good things. Let us remark here that it is easier for the largest camel that ever was on earth to go through the eye of a cambric needle than for one to be saved in heaven, or to inherit eternal life, by doing good things. The disciples were exceedingly amazed, and asked, "Who then can be saved?" No one can be saved the way this young man thought they could. The Saviour answered, "With men this is impossible." What is impossible? The thing they were talking about, of course, which was being saved. With men it is impossible to be saved. Could language be any plainer or any stronger than that? Yet, in the face of this plain, positive, and emphatic statement of the blessed Son of God, vain men will still say it is possible with men, and that all men could be saved,

if they will only exercise their own will in the matter; that it has been made possible for all men to come to Jesus and be saved. But the statement made by the Lord still remains unchanged, "With men this is impossible." If the matter had been left just that way it would have been a dark picture; but it was not left that way. Jesus said, "But with God all things are possible." Again, What all tilings? Certainly, all tilings necessary to the salvation of the sinner. With God it is not impossible for a sinner to be saved; but with the sinner it is impossible. The Lord is mighty and able to save. His love is eternal, and as immutable as Himself. His love is stronger than death. He was able to save Saul of Tarsus. He was able to save poor illiterate fishermen. He was able to regenerate John the Baptist before he was bora of his mother. He was able to make David to hope while he was upon his mother's breast. He was able to sanctify a prophet from his mother's womb. Yes, and He is still able to save. He was able to reach your case, dear child, and give you a blessed hope of immortality beyond the grave. He is able to save our children, and our neighbors, and their children. And He is able to keep all His children unto eternal glory. "His mercy endureth for ever." Praise be to His holy name. May His blessings rest upon the reader, and may these thoughts be blessed of the Lord to your consolation. C. H. C.

Hope and Belief

---April 3, 1941

We have been requested to write on the difference between hope and belief. Hope is made up of expectation and desire. Hope means to expect and desire. We desire things which we do not hope for, because we do not expect them. We may believe that certain things will be a certain way, but we do not desire that they be that way. Hence, we are expecting them, but not desiring them; hence we are not hoping for them. One definition of belief is "strong conviction that a thing is true." We may have strong conviction that a thing is true, and yet not desire it; so we are not hoping for that thing. We may not desire that it be that way; but we believe it is that way. The evidence is such as to convince our judgment that the proposition is true, and that a certain thing will be a certain way; and yet we may wish it were not true, or that it will not be that way. Hence we are not hoping for it, but we are believing the proposition. We believe some folks are going to do some very bad things; but we are not hoping for them to do those things, for we are not desiring that they do them. These remarks are sufficient, we think, to show some of the difference between belief and hope. C. H. C.

For The Poor

---April 3, 1941

For The Poor is the title of the new publication now being sent out from our office. It is a monthly publication, containing discourses delivered by some of our ministers of the present and discourses delivered years ago, and articles copied from old publications. Read what some have to say elsewhere in our columns, about this new publication. We are sure you will enjoy reading this new magazine, if you are among the great army of the poor. The price is only one dollar a year, or in club with The Primitive Baptist, only two dollars for both for one year. The price of For The Poor is so low that we cannot afford to have a delinquent list. It is only one dollar a year, and is strictly in advance. Names will be dropped when the time paid for expires. Subscribe now and get the back numbers beginning with the first issue, January, 1941. C. H. C.

Hebrews 9:27-28

---April 3, 1941

And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation.-(Hebrews 9:27-28). We have been asked for our views on verse 27, which ends with the word judgment. We quote both verses because they are so closely connected together. Note the word as in verse 27, and the word so in verse 28. "As it is appointed unto men once to die, so Christ was once offered," etc. Just as it is appointed unto men once to die, so was it appointed for Christ to be once offered. Christ was offered by appointment. The expression "but after this the judgment," seems to be a kind of after thought. The judgment comes after the appointment. And there is a judgment which comes after death. In that judgment the Lord will separate His people from the goats, those who are not His children. These are just a few of our thoughts in connection with the language. Of course, we have not here gone into the subject matter further contained in (Hebrews 9:28). Much could be written in connection with that, but we desist. We recognize the fact that we may be wrong in the way we see this matter, as it is a complex and difficult subject. C. H. C.

Another Good Man Gone

---April 3, 1941

Elder W. H. Lee, of Donaldson, Ark., passed away on Monday evening, March 24, at about 8:20, and was buried on Tuesday afternoon near his home. The funeral was conducted at the church in Donaldson by Elder Jno. R. Harris, Elder McCorkle (a Missionary brother) and the writer. He had been in feeble health for some months, gradually declining. He was not quite fifty-five years of age. He had been living in Donaldson for several years, and served the church there as pastor. He was also pastor of Harmony, near Warren, and of Mt. Paran, near Fordyce, and Mena, Ark. He will be greatly missed by the churches which he served, and by the brethren of this section. He was a faithful and true servant, and a devoted husband and father. We deeply sympathize with his bereaved family, and pray that God's rich blessings may rest upon them in this sad and trying hour. He was a good and true and faithful and devoted friend to us, and we feel our loss keenly. It seems that many of our true and faithful servants are being called to their better home, and that the ranks are being thinned out. May the Lord grant to give us men that are faithful and true to fill up the ranks. We need men in the ranks who love the cause of the Master, and who are true and faithful. C. H. C.

Romans 5:6-10

---May 1, 1941

For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled,

we shall be saved by His life." -(Romans 5:6-10). Much is contained in the above quotation from Paul's letter to the church at Rome. Something was done for somebody when they were without strength. Certainly the apostle does not mean that they were without physical strength. Human beings, who are living the natural life, have natural, or physical strength. But in a state of nature they are without spiritual strength. Being without spiritual strength, they are unable to perform any spiritual act, either of the mind, or outward act. They must first have spiritual strength in order to perform any sort of spiritual act. But Christ died for them when they were without strength. His dying for them was in the past, and was when they were without strength. He died on Calvary's cross upwards of nineteen hundred years ago, now. It is too late now for one to do something in order that this death be for them. When He died, about nineteen hundred years ago, He either did die for you, or else He did not die for you. It is too late now for you to do something in order that the death be for you. Christ died in due time. It was at an appointed time. It was neither too early nor too late to accomplish the object for which He died. Those for whom He died were ungodly. Here is a display of grace and mercy- that the sinless and spotless Son of God would condescend to die for ungodly persons - that the Father would give His darling Son to die for ungodly persons - poor guilty sinners of Adam's lost and apostate race. Was it for crimes that I had done, He groaned upon the tree? Amazing pity, grace unknown, And love beyond degree! Perhaps there are some who would die for what is called a good man, but not every person would do that. "Scarcely for a righteous man will one die." Perhaps you would die for your best friend; but not one of us would die for an enemy. "But God commendeth His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." The word Christ means the anointed one. He was anointed with the Holy Spirit without measure. He was the anointed Son of God- the God-man. He was God manifest in the flesh. He was the Word that was made flesh, and dwelt among us. Here is a manifestation and proof of the love God the Father had for His chosen ones, the objects of His pity and grace. He gave His darling Son to leave the shining realms of bliss, the glory He had with the Father before the world was, and come into this low ground of sin and sorrow to suffer and to bleed and die on Calvary's cruel tree for them, though they were sinners- ungodly sinners, and without strength to serve and glorify His name. What wondrous love is this! What wondrous love is this, O my soul! O my soul! What wondrous love is this, O my soul! What wondrous love is this, That caused the Lord of bliss To bear the dreadful curse for my soul! To bear the dreadful curse for my soul! "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." - **(I John 4:9-10)** "Much more then." Much is great in quantity, extent or degree. More is greater; superior; increased; added or additional. Used with an adjective or adverb (as with much) to form the comparative degree, and is besides; in addition; further. So, now the apostle brings out something in addition, something greater. "Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him." In addition to being justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. Who shall be saved from wrath through Him? Those who are justified by His blood. Who are justified by His blood? Those for whom He died. We will digress here just a little to ask: How could any be saved from wrath through Him, if there is no such thing as wrath hereafter for them to be saved from? If there is no such thing as a place of wrath, then no one is saved from wrath through Him, nor could anyone be saved from wrath through Him. He did not save anyone from an eternal hell, if there is no such thing as an eternal hell for them to be saved from. If there is no such thing as a place of future punishment, or

torment, then Jesus did not save a single one of the whole race of Adam from anything at all. To deny that there is any such place, or any such thing, as a place of torment after this life, is to deny that Jesus saved anyone of all the race from anything. It is to deny the virtue and work of His atoning merit and blood. "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." In this verse we have the plain declaration that some were reconciled to God by the death of the Lord Jesus. He did not simply make reconciliation possible, but He actually reconciled them to God. He made reconciliation. "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ." -(II Corinthians 5:18). Will some great modern theologian; some D. D., or some D. D., LL. D., please tell us what can hinder the final deliverance and salvation from eternal ruin of any poor sinner who has been reconciled to God by the death of His Son? If one has been reconciled to God, what can hinder or prevent his salvation, or deliverance from eternal woe and misery? In this verse the apostle uses the words much more again. The words being reconciled are translated from a word which is in the Greek aorist tense, which is in constant use in the narrative of past transactions. Literally, then, the original word means having been reconciled. Who shall be saved by His life? Those who were reconciled to God by His death. Who were reconciled to God by His death? Those for whom He died. Could the inspired apostle have used words that could possibly have expressed the truth of the fact any stronger than "all for whom Christ died shall be saved?" He positively affirms in this Scripture, in these verses, that all for whom Christ died shall be saved. Christ died for the very purpose, the express purpose, that they be brought to God. "For Christ hath also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God." -(Pet 3:18) (I Peter 3:18). This was the purpose which was designed to be accomplished by His death-that these be brought to God for whom He died. Do you, dear reader, believe that the purpose of His death shall be a failure? The Lord, speaking through the Prophet Isaiah concerning the Lord Jesus and His work, said, "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon Him: He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause His voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall He not break, and the smoking flax shall He not quench: He shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till He have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for His law." -(Isaiah 41:1-4). As He shall not fail, it follows that each one for whom He laid down His precious life on Calvary's cross will finally be brought to God, and given to live with Him in eternal glory. It is not only true that He shall not fail, but He shall not even be discouraged. He knew that the purpose designed to be accomplished by His death would most certainly be fulfilled. Thanks be to His blessed and glorious name for the certain and sure deliverance of all the poor sinners of Adam's race for whom He laid down His precious life. Dear dying Lamb! thy precious blood shall never lose its power, Till all the ransomed church of God Are saved to sin no more. When this poor, lisping, stammering tongue Lies silent in the grave, Then in a nobler, sweeter song I'll sing thy power to save. He is worthy of all the praise and adoration and service which poor sinners, who have been blessed with a sweet hope in the merits of His atoning blood, can render unto Him here in this world of sadness and sorrow. Lord, help us to love thee more and serve thee better while we are permitted to continue to live in this old world. C. H. C.

Elder Webb's Book

---May 1, 1941

We are now at work on Elder Webb's book, which he has named "Little Things." It will be approximately 300 or 400 pages, printed in good clear type, and on good paper, with a good paper cover. The price will be only one dollar for one book. It will contain his writings, most of which have appeared in the columns of The Primitive Baptist during the past number of years. It will be good and instructive reading, and is well worth the price asked for it. In fact, most books of not more than half the size of this book sell for that much or more. Any of our readers may send a dollar to us for one of these books and one will be sent to you as soon as they are ready to mail out. Work is progressing with it as fast as possible. You can enclose a dollar for this book when you are renewing your subscription, and thus save some expense of sending an extra letter for the book. Do not fail to send your order soon, as only a limited edition will be printed. C. H. C.

Are They God's Choice?

---May 15, 1941

On page 164 of the Zion's Landmark of April 15, 1941, is an article signed by Thomas W. Kimsey, of High Point, N. C, in which he is trying to argue that God fixed and arranged everything in eternity that transpires in time. There is just one expression which we desire to call attention to. Mr. Kimsey says: "We cannot speak a word unless God chooses the words." It seems to us that here is about as grave a charge as we have ever heard or read against the Lord of glory. Let us kindly examine such sentiment just a little. In **(0:7) (Exodus 20:7)** and **(Deuteronomy 5:11)** the Lord, in His law, said, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain." It is positively and expressly forbidden by the Lord to take His name in vain. But Kimsey says "we cannot speak a word unless God chooses the words." Some men do take the name of the Lord in vain; some men curse and swear, and bitter and bloodcurdling oaths proceed out of their mouths. If Brother Kimsey is right in his statement, God made choice of the blasphemous oaths which men utter, and they could not have uttered such words unless the Lord had made choice of the words-yet the blessed Lord has expressly and positively forbidden the use of such language! According to Brother Kimsey, the Lord chose the words they used, or spoke, and they could not have spoken the words unless the Lord had made choice of the words-and this in the face of the fact that He forbade such. The inspired Apostle Paul must have known that some would teach such things as Brother Kimsey has affirmed in this statement quoted from him; for he says, in **(I Timothy 1:3-4)** "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine, neither giving heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith: so do." A fable is a "legend; fabrication; falsehood." A fabrication is an invented story. This statement that "we cannot speak a word unless God chooses the words" is an invented story. If Brother Kimsey be correct in his statement, then God chose the words of the fabricated story, and a man could not speak such words unless God chose' them; but the apostle admonished to not give heed to such. Hence, if Brother Kimsey is right, then the inspired apostle has directed that no heed be given to the words which God chose for the speaker to say. Jangling is a "discordant sound; idle chatter; quarreling." Such a statement that "we cannot speak a word unless God chooses the words" is, most surely, no better than idle chatter. That is the most charitable view we can possibly take of the matter. In verses 9 and 10 the apostle

speaks of some very vile persons, and among them he mentions profane persons, and liars, and perjured persons. A profane person is irreverent, blasphemous, unholy, impious. If one uses blasphemous language according to Brother Kimsey, the Lord chooses the words for him. If a man lies, God chooses the lying words for him; and he could not lie if God did not choose the lying words for him. A perjured person is one who is guilty of the crime of giving false evidence, especially when under oath. But Brother Kimsey says that "we cannot speak a word unless God chooses the words." If that be so, then a man could not be guilty of the crime of giving false evidence unless God chooses the words. If that be true, then every false oath that men have ever sworn came directly from God. If God put such words in the mouths of men who have perjured themselves, would He not just as consistently swear a lie Himself? If not, why not? Jesus tells us that the devil is the father of lies. But if Brother Kimsey told the truth in his statement, then the devil is not the father of lies, but God Himself is the father of them. We might go on, ad in finitum; but this is sufficient. If one will not believe the testimony of the apostle, as here given, he would not believe, though one should rise from the dead. We remember, very well, the former editor and publisher of the Zion's Landmark, the beloved and lamented Elder P. D. Gold. We have been with him in his day, and preached with him, and talked with him. We know very well that he did not believe any such teaching as that "we cannot speak a word unless God chooses the words." We remember well that we were at an association with him once in North Carolina, and that we tried to preach just after he had delivered a sweet discourse. Our text was **(I Timothy 4:16)** "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." We showed that Timothy was already a child of God and a minister of the gospel; and that it was, therefore, too late for him to become a child of God by doing this, but not too late for him to save himself from false doctrines, etc. Elder Gold heartily endorsed our discourse. We regret to see such teaching as that set forth by Brother Kimsey appearing in the Landmark. We wonder if all the editors on the staff endorse such teaching. It brings trouble and confusion in the true church, and we would be grateful and thankful if such teaching were not permitted to appear in Elder Gold's paper, for we are sure he would not endorse it if he could speak to us now. May the Lord pity His poor bleeding Zion. C. H. C.

A Serious Charge

---May 15, 1941

In the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight of April 25, 1941, the Rev. James MacKrell brings some serious and grave charges against some of his Missionary Baptist brother preachers. He accuses some of their leaders with stealing and defrauding creditors. Note this paragraph which we copy from his article: You can now realize I am sure why such a leadership would DEFRAUD AND STEAL THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN A BANKRUPT ACTION WHEREIN THEY PAID THEIR OBLIGATIONS AT 35c ON THE DOLLAR and to this day have not made nor from all outward indications have no intention of making any effort whatever to repay this money. The emphasis is his. This looks to us like a very serious charge he has brought against his brethren. But the above is not all. Here is the next paragraph in his article: When we were building our tabernacle in Little Rock I went to every bank in Little Rock and North Little Rock and a few individuals who were financially responsible and sought to borrow a little money to help put up the tabernacle. I was told in EVERY INSTANCE that they could no longer loan ANY CHURCH a single dime because of the disgraceful way BAPTISTS had defaulted their debts. I told them I had always paid them any sum they had loaned me and THAT NOT A

SINGLE MISSIONARY (association) BAPTIST CHURCH in Little Rock owed anyone a dime; they said they appreciated this fact, but the reputation of Baptists in general was so bad, THEY COULD NOT AFFORD TO LOAN A BAPTIST ONE CENT. It certainly does look bad that no bank or man of means in Little Rock would loan a Missionary Baptist one cent. They must be a mighty bad set of folks, that they cannot get any credit at all in the capital city of our state. These folks certainly do have a bad reputation, according to the Rev. Dr. MacKrell. Yet the gentleman stays with the Missionary Baptists. True, he brings these accusations of dishonesty against the Board Baptists; but his statement confesses the fact that the faction he has now aligned himself with (the Association Baptists - the Bogard stripe) are all put in the same class as other Missionaries by the banks and those who have money to lend - "the reputation of Baptists in general was so bad, they could not afford to loan a Baptist one cent." Of course, these Baptists were Missionary Baptists. If the gentleman's accusations are true, they must be a motley crowd. We would certainly be ashamed to have to admit that our people were such a motley crowd and had such a bad reputation. We are thankful that the people with whom we stand identified have a better reputation than that. We confess that they do wrong and make their mistakes, but they do have the reputation, in general, of being an honest and a debt-paying people. How can any set of folks who have such a reputation as MacKrell says his people have, be the church of Christ? God pity the church, if that is it! C. H. C.

A Pleasant Trip

---June 5, 1941

We left home on Thursday, May 1, for a trip through the Harmony Association in Southeast Missouri and Northeast Arkansas. We arrived in Jonesboro, Ark., at 9:25 p.m. Sister Harwood and her husband, and others, met us at the train. An appointment had been made for us there that night, but we missed a bus, and failed to get there in time for service. We were sorry of the disappointment. We spent the night in the home of Mr. and Sister Harwood. Left Jonesboro Friday morning at 6:45 and arrived at Senath, Mo., at 8:30. Elders R. G. Whitwell and A. M. Braden, and others, met us at the train. We attended the union meeting, held in Senath, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, May 2, 3, and 4. Elders A. M. Braden, R. G. Whitwell, W. C. Kirk, and W. F. Inman, of that association, were present in the meeting, besides two licentiates-Brethren Gibbons and Davis. Elder W. J. Shaffer, of Mayfield, Ky., was also in attendance. They had service both day and night during the meeting. The preaching was all in harmony and the services were enjoyed by all present. On Monday night we filled an appointment in the courthouse in Blytheville. Elder E. H. Rhodes lives in Blytheville, and we had the pleasure of meeting him once more. We knew him years ago in Tennessee. We also met his son, a young brother who is also now engaged in the work of the ministry, but do not now recall where we met him on the trip. Some of the brethren told us they are counting on building a house of worship in that community very soon. May the Lord bless them in the undertaking. On Tuesday night, May 6, we were at a schoolhouse, near the home of Brother Emmett Russell, near New Madrid. They have an organized church in the community, and we believe they hold their regular service at the schoolhouse. There was a shower of rain about the time to go to the meeting, but a good crowd gathered anyway. On Wednesday morning we were at Bethel Church, near Dexter. The congregation was small at this place, only a few members out. We were at that church years ago, v/hen we lived in Tennessee, while Elder Reed was pastor. We are sure not many of the present members of the

church were there then. On Wednesday night we were at Gray Ridge. Sister Dixie Inman asked for a home in the church, and was joyfully received, and her baptism was to be attended to on May 11. On Thursday morning, Thursday night, and Friday morning we had service at New Hope Church, near Fredericktown, the home church of Elder W. F. Inman, who was present. On Friday night we filled an appointment at the home of Mrs. Mittie Logan, an afflicted sister, in Doniphan, Mo. On Saturday and Sunday we attended the meeting at Buffalo Church, near Bennett, Mo., and on Saturday night at the home of Brother Coley Bell. The Church had agreed to have their communion service at this meeting instead of on the regular time, the third Sunday. We served this church years ago- about forty-four years ago. We baptized a number of members for them while we were serving them. Nearly all who were living and members then are gone to their long home. At that church we baptized Elder P. E. Whitwell and his first wife, who have been called to that better home. On Sunday of this meeting three willing souls came to the old church, wanting a home and resting place from the things of the world-Will Whitwell, a son of Elder P. E. Whitwell, G. C. Whitwell, brother of Elder R. G. Whitwell, and Mrs. Dora Hodo. The baptism was set for the third Sunday in June. Brother Will requested us to baptize him, as we had baptized his father and mother. So we agreed, the Lord willing, to be with them on their regular meeting the third Sunday in June, and Saturday before. On Sunday night we were with the church in Rector. Elder B. D. Bryant, of Tiptonville, Tenn., is pastor, and was with us here. We were glad to see him again. Elder R. G. Whitwell met us at the train at Senath, and he and Elder A. M. Braden went all the trip with us. We enjoyed having them with us. Elder Whitwell was as kind and attentive to us as he could have been to an own father. We shall never forget the great kindness shown to us at each place we went. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon them, is our humble prayer. We trust they will remember to pray for us and our loved ones. We left Rector on Monday morning, May 12, at 5:28, and arrived home at 1 p.m., and found all well at home for which we felt to praise the good Lord, and to take courage. May the Lord bless you, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Isaiah 42:3

---June 5, 1941

Brother Obe Tingen, of Apex, N. C, has asked us to give our views of the bruised reed and smoking flax, as used in the above citation, and which quotation we used in our editorial in The Primitive Baptist of May 1. Just now we do not have much mind to write-we feel to be rather dull and sluggish. So we will give Gill's comments on the verse cited, as follows: C. H. C.

GILL'S COMMENTS

" A bruised reed shall He not break," etc. The tenderness of Christ to weak and ignorant persons is here and in the next clause expressed; by whom young converts or weak believers seem to be designed: who are compared to a reed, because worthless with respect to God, whom they cannot profit; and in the view of men, who reckon them as nothing; and in themselves, and in their own view, who judge themselves unworthy of the least of mercies; and because they are weak, not only as all men are, of which weakness they are sensible; but they are weak in grace, especially in faith, and have but little hope, their love is the strongest; and because they are wavering like the reed, tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine, and shaken with the temptations of Satan, and disturbed with many doubts and fears; and are like a bruised reed, that is squeezed, and almost broken to pieces, and so of no use; those are broken in heart, under a sense of sin and

unworthiness; whose spirits are bruised and weakened with it, and whose hearts are contrite on account of it. On these Christ does not lay His iron rod, but holds out the golden sceptre of His grace to them; He does not call them to service and sufferings beyond their strength; but strengthens, supports, and upholds them with the right hand of His righteousness; He binds up their broken hearts, having poured in the balm of Gilead, His own blood, and the wine and oil of His love; He encourages them in their application to Him for salvation, and manifests His pardoning grace, and restores comfort to them, and revives their souls: "And the smoking flax shall He not quench;" or, "The wick of a candle;" which just going out, has some heat, a little light, smokes, and is offensive: so the persons intended by it are fired or lighted by the divine Word; have some heat of affection in them to spiritual things, but have but little light; into the corruption of nature; into the glories of Christ's Person; into the doctrines of the gospel; into the everlasting love of God, and the covenant of grace; and but little light of joy and comfort., and this almost gone, and seeming ready to go out; and yet Christ will not extinguish it, or suffer it to be extinct; He does not discourage small beginnings of grace, or despise the day of small things; He blows up their light into a flame; He increases their spiritual knowledge; supplies them with the oil of grace, trims, snuffs, and causes their lamps to burn brighter. The Targum is, "the meek, who are like to a bruised reed, shall not be broken; and the poor, who are as obscure as flax (or a lamp ready to go out), shall not be extinct;" "He shall bring forth judgment unto truth;" which some understand of Christ's severity to wicked men, in opposition to His tenderness to His own people; see **((4) (Isaiah 11:4))**; others, of the gospel, as preached by Him in truth, as in ver. 1; but rather it designs the power of His Spirit and grace accompanying the word, to the carrying on of His own work in the hearts of His people; which, though attended with many difficulties and discouragements, shall go on, and be performed; grace will break through all obstructions, and prove victorious at last; see **((0) (Matthew 12:20))**.

What Unity!

---June 5, 1941

In the Western Recorder of May 15, 1941, on page 2, W. W. Hamilton, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, says, "If we are to "win the world to Christ, then we must be good soldiers of the cross," etc. This implies that they propose to win the world to Christ. As is well known, it has been the claim of these Missionaries, from the time of their birth, that under certain conditions - if they had money enough, etc. - they could take the world for Christ. But after a little more than a century of labor in their work, the world is in a worse condition today than at any time since they began their merchandising methods. They are not progressing very fast in their proposed feat of taking the world for Christ, or in Christianizing the world, or converting the world to Christ. But let us look at how well they are agreed. On page 4 of the same paper we see this statement by J. J. Robinson, of Louisville, Ky.: "The whole world is not to be converted by the preaching of the gospel. Our Lord said, 'I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me.'" If the whole world is not to be converted by the preaching of the gospel, then why scrape the country over to raise money for that very express object? They will tell us one thing at one time, and another thing, directly opposite, at another time. It just depends-as to what these people tell us. C. H. C.

Revelation 5:1-3

---June 19, 1941

In August, 1940, Elder G. D. Owens, of Olio, Ark., asked us to write on **(Revelation 5:1-3)**. We have never had much mind, or inclination, to do much writing on Revelation; but we will offer a few thoughts in connection with the text, which reads: And I saw in the right hand of Him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. The seven seals are the same as the seven Spirits of God, mentioned in verse 6. In this verse is mentioned the Lamb, having seven horns and seven eyes, "which are the seven Spirits of God," etc. Seven, in Scripture, is a full, complete number. The book was sealed with the divine attributes of Jehovah. "No man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book." Man, as a fallen son of Adam, could not meet the requirements. He could not open the book.

The book, we are sure, meant the covenant of God's peace, the everlasting covenant. All the chosen ones were embraced in that covenant; they were given to the Son in the covenant. But they were the offspring of Adam; they were sinners of Adam's fallen and apostate race. God's just law had been violated; and God was offended. Satisfaction must be made to divine justice, if they ever enter heaven. Man was a sinner, and could not meet the demands. "No man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book." But the Lamb was both man and God. Divinity and humanity were joined together in this one Person. As the God-man He could reach both, the offended God and the offending man. He could meet all the divine attributes of Jehovah. He could and did prevail. See (Revelation 5:5). Another thought here: Any doctrine or theory of salvation which does not harmonize with all the divine attributes of Jehovah cannot possibly be the truth. The doctrine of grace is the only doctrine which does that, or which can do so. C. H. C.

Is It Deception?

---June 19, 1941

Suppose a brother is accused of some immoral conduct, and the matter causes disturbance in his church. Suppose the brother thus accused, when the matter is causing disturbance in his own church, or with sister churches, demands, or requests, that his church withdraw from him, and, perhaps, to get them to do so, he declares against the church. Then suppose the church withdraws from him on that account. Suppose the brother later returns to the church and asks that he be forgiven for what they have on record against him. Then suppose dissatisfaction arises, at once, and disturbance springs up again between that church and some sister churches on account of this matter. Then suppose the church of the brother's membership calls for a council to come and investigate them. Then suppose the council convenes and investigates the record, but do not go back of that to arrive at the matter as to what caused all the trouble, or what gave rise to it, and declare that the church is in good order, and that her acts are orderly, etc. Now, what? If the brother is guilty, is not this a plain case of palming off immorality on the church? On the other hand, if the brother is not guilty, has he received justice? If he is innocent, is it not due to him, as a simple matter of justice, that the council should have investigated that matter, and then to declare him innocent? Should not this be done for the honor of the church, too? But to smooth over and hide the real facts in the case -is it not practicing deception on the Baptist family? Do you

approve, or endorse, a procedure of that sort? We are frank to say that we do not. Furthermore, we do not propose to speak for another person on earth, but we do say, for ourselves, personally, that we do not endorse it, nor will we lend it any sanction, if we know it. That's plain, but we suppose it can be understood. May God help us all, as His professed followers, to deal honestly and openly and in a straightforward way with the things of the kingdom. No wonder conditions are no better in some places than they are. May the Lord deliver us from ourselves. C. H. C.

Requests Not Answered

---June 19, 1941

We have received several requests to write on certain portions of Revelation. We have no mind to write on the passages some have requested us to write on. If you do not see an answer to your request, just bear in mind that we have no mind to write on your text, or that we cannot get to it, and please excuse us. C. H. C.

A New Pamphlet

---June 19, 1941

We have just finished printing a new pamphlet for Brother A. H. Roden, of Glen Rose, Texas. The title is, "A Tribute to the Late Elder J. S. Newman." It is a nicely printed pamphlet, in good clear type, and contains a good picture of Elder Newman. We all remember the good writing done by this great and good man, and many can remember the sound of his musical voice as they listened to him proclaim the riches of God's grace. The little pamphlet is worth having in any home. The price is low-only 15 cents for one copy, or eight copies for only one dollar. Order from us or from Brother Roden. C. H. C.

Church Organized

---July 17, 1941

We left home on Thursday night, June 26, for Champaign, Ill., by special request, arriving there about six o'clock Friday afternoon. The purpose of our going was to help in the organization of a Primitive Baptist Church at that place, which we were specially requested to do. We were met at the train by Elder N. F. Graves, and accompanied to his good home, where we had a good night's rest. On Saturday afternoon service was held at the new meeting house for the purpose of organizing a Primitive Baptist Church. Elder W. E. Wright was called upon to introduce the service, and then the writer was called upon to preach to the people, which we endeavored to do, with the help of the Lord. The service was enjoyed by those present. After this the ministers and deacons present organized themselves into a presbytery to organize the church. After the church was organized they went into conference and gave the name New Liberty to the newly organized church, and elected Elder N. F. Graves to serve as pastor and moderator for the coming year. They also made choice of a clerk to serve for a year. We failed to make note of the name of the clerk. They have a real nice new building erected, though it is not yet fully paid for. The Lord has wonderfully blessed them, and they are a united band, and feel thankful for the blessings the Lord has bestowed upon them. On Sunday the house was just about full, and the service was sweet and delightful. Surely the Lord's gracious and manifest presence was felt. May His name be praised for His wonderful works among the children of men. We feel that the minutes of the

proceedings in the organization, as well as their Church Covenant, Articles of Faith and Rules of Decorum, will make interesting reading, so we append the same below. May the Lord's rich and abundant mercies and blessings rest upon this faithful little band, is our humble prayer. We trust they will remember us in their petitions at the throne of grace. C. H. C.

MINUTES OF ORGANIZATION

Some members of the Primitive Baptists living in Champaign, Ill., and vicinity, met at the Primitive Baptist meeting house in the city on June 28, 1941, for the purpose of organizing a church of the Primitive Baptist faith and order. Services were opened by Elder W. E. Wright, of Alma, Ill., and then preaching by Elder C. H. Cayce, of Thornton, Ark. Then we, the following named elders and deacons, being requested to do so, formed ourselves into a presbytery to organize them into a church, and proceeded as follows: Names of Presbytery: Elders O. L. Weatherford, C. H. Cayce, W. E. Wright, A. D. Brumfield and D. H. Knight; and Deacons Thomas B. Clapp, Fred B. Williams, J. D. Allen and Chas. Walker. Chose Elder O. L. Weatherford as moderator, and Elder C. H. Cayce as clerk of the presbytery. The Covenant upon which they agreed to be constituted was read, and signed by all the parties entering into the constitution, and is recorded below. Called for the letters of those desiring to go into the constitution, which were presented and read, as follows: Elder N. F. Graves, Deacon Otis Pile, Deacon Olad Allen, Licentiate Loyd Clapp, Brother Bennie Graves, Sisters Bernice Allen, Norma Clapp, Martha Pile, Clara Graves, Betty Jane Graves, Pearl Graves, Mary Graves, Helen Hayes, Nova Fox and Nona Higgins, The letters and bearers were received as being in order. The Articles of Faith were then read, and found to be sound. The Rules of Decorum were read, and found to be in harmony with Baptist practice. The members of the church then extended the hand of fellowship to each other. The presbytery and visiting brethren and sisters then extended the hand of fellowship to the church, the presbytery declaring them to be a gospel church organized in order. Signed: Elder O. L. Weatherford, Moderator; Elder C. H. Cayce, Clerk; Elders W. E. Wright, A. D. Brumfield and D. H. Knight; Deacons Thomas B. Clapp, Fred B. Williams, J. D. Allen and Chas. Walker.

CHURCH COVENANT

On June 28, 1941, we, Primitive Baptist members living in Champaign, Ill., and vicinity, met and entered into the following covenant: Forasmuch as Almighty God, by His grace, has been pleased, as we hope, to call us out of darkness into His marvelous light, and we all having been regularly baptized on profession of our faith in Christ Jesus, and have given ourselves to the Lord and to each other in a gospel church way, to be governed and guided by a proper discipline, agreeable, as we believe, to the Word of God; we, therefore, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by His assistance, covenant and agree to keep up the discipline of the church of which we are members in the most brotherly love and affection toward each other, while we endeavor, punctually, to observe the following rules: In brotherly love to pray for each other; to watch over one another for good; and, if need be, in the most tender and affectionate manner, to reprove each other; if we discover anything amiss in a brother or sister, to take the directions given by our Lord in Matthew xviii., and not to be whispering and backbiting; we also agree, if not providentially hindered, to attend our church meetings, and especially not to absent ourselves from the communion service without a lawful excuse; and not to neglect the defraying of the expenses of the church, and not to depart from the fellowship of the church without a regular dismissal. These things we covenant and agree to observe and keep sacred, in the name and by the assistance of the Holy Trinity. Signed: Brethren Otis Pile, Ben Graves, Olad E. Allen, Lloyd W. Clapp,

Elder N. F. Graves. Sisters Martha Pile, Mary Graves, Helen Hayes, Pearl Graves, Betty Jane Graves, Clara B. Graves, Norma Clapp, Bernice Allen, Nona Higgins, Nova Fox.

ARTICLES OF FAITH

First. We believe in the existence, immutability, omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, and eternal perfections of the one only true and living God, who exists in the three-fold, yet undivided and indivisible substance of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; who was and is the sovereign Creator, Upholder, Governor, and Judge of the Universe.

2. We believe that the Old and New Testament Scriptures are the perfectly inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule, or standard, of faith and practice; and that, as such, the Bible teaches all that we ought to know, believe, or practice religiously.

3. We believe in the doctrine of total depravity-that is, the entire human family are justly condemned, all having sinned in' Adam; and that our life received by virtue of the natural birth is poisoned with sin; and that in nature the man is sinful in all his parts, and all are dead in trespasses and in sins.

4. We believe in the eternal and personal and unconditional election of the saints unto glory; that they were chosen in Christ by the Father before the world was-before they had any actual existence; that God predestinated them unto the adoption of sons, and that they should be conformed to the image of His Son; and they will all be finally and ultimately saved in glory. But we do solemnly deny that God predestinated sin. He has determined to overrule and punish sin. Those whom God has not, or did not, predestinate to be conformed to the image of His son are left to act in their own sins to their just condemnation, to the praise of God's glorious justice.

5. We believe that the atonement and the redemption by Jesus Christ are for the elect only, and that they are justified in the sight of God by the imputed righteousness of the Son alone.

6. We believe in the direct, immediate, sovereign, irresistible, and, in all cases, the effectual work of the Holy Spirit in calling, regenerating and sanctifying the elect of God, and that in His own appointed time and way. The work of regeneration is an instantaneous and internal work, and is accomplished by the work of the Spirit of God on the spirit of the sinner.

7. We believe in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead-that is, that the bodies of all who die will be raised at the final windup and consummation of all things. We mean by this that it is the body that dies, and it is the same body which dies that shall be raised from the dead. The bodies of the saints will, at the resurrection, be changed, made spiritual, immortal, and re-united with their souls, and taken into the glorious presence of the Lord, and their happiness will be unending. The others will be cast into eternal torment, and their punishment will be unending.

8. We believe that baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances of Jesus Christ, and that true believers (those who have been born again) are the only proper subjects for baptism, and that Scriptural baptism is a burial in water; that the ordinances of the church are in the hands of the church for keeping; and that baptism is not valid unless administered by one authorized by a gospel church to administer the ordinances. Unleavened bread and wine (grape wine) are to be used in the Lord's Supper. We believe we should engage in washing each other's feet, following the example of the Master, as He said "I have given you an example."

9. We believe that baptism is the first ordinance, and that no one has a right to the Lord's Supper unless he has first been baptized by the proper authority, and is in order with his brethren at home.
10. We believe that the Lord's children (those who have been born again) are under parental law to the blessed Lord, and that He has promised blessings in His Word to His children who obey Him, which He has not promised to others, and that these blessings thus promised cannot be attained to or enjoyed any other way only by obeying Him-doing the things commanded by Him. On the other hand, He has promised chastisement-suffering, sorrow, trouble and distress-upon their rebellion and disobedience.
11. We believe that a gospel church is a body of baptized believers, who have banded themselves together to keep house for the Lord, and who maintain the true principles of doctrine and practice as laid down in the New Testament. Yet a true church may err from the right way; and when they do so, the Scriptural injunction is for them to repent. The church was set up by the Saviour during His personal ministry on earth, and this church has an unbroken succession unto the present day, and it will remain on earth some place until our Lord's second personal coming. The Lord established His kingdom, or church, for a home for His little children. He gave all the laws and rules and regulations to govern in this kingdom. We have no right to make new laws-laws not found in His Book; nor do we have a right to disobey or dishonor the laws which He gave.

RULES OF DECORUM

- Rule 1. The church shall be composed of members of her own body, but members of sister churches of the same faith and order who may be present shall be invited to seats by the moderator.
2. Conference shall be opened and closed by praise and prayer to God.
3. The church shall choose a pastor and moderator annually, who shall serve when present, unless objection be made, or one appointed to act as moderator pro tem, whose duty it shall be to keep order and extend invitations for the reception of members.
4. A clerk shall be chosen annually whose duty it shall be to make a plain record of all business transacted by the church, which record shall be read at the next conference, and all necessary corrections of the minutes be made.
5. Every member, when he rises to make a speech, shall address the moderator by the appellation of "Brother Moderator." The member thus speaking shall not cast any reflection on former speeches, nor digress from the subject under consideration; and shall give his views in as plain manner as possible; nor shall he speak more than three times on any subject without permission of the church.
6. No member shall be received into our body, or dismissed from us by letter, without the unanimous vote of the members present; but a transgressing member may be excluded by a majority of the members present; and a majority shall rule in all other cases, except as specified in Rule 17.
7. No complaint respecting grievances of a private nature shall be brought into the church against any transgressing member, unless the aggrieved party has complied with the directions given in **(Matthew 18:15-16,17)**.
8. Every motion made and seconded shall come under the consideration of the church, unless withdrawn by the person who made it.
9. If a minority shall be aggrieved at the decision of the majority, the same should be made known to the church immediately; and if satisfaction cannot be obtained, it may be necessary to call for help from sister churches.

10. The moderator shall be entitled to all the privileges of speech, the chair first being filled, but shall not vote, except there be a tie; then he shall give the casting vote.
11. Any members who are absent from the regular church meeting should have good reasons for the same; and if they miss three meetings in succession, it shall be the duty of the church to inquire their reasons.
12. No member shall go to law with another member, on any account, without permission of the church.
13. If one member be aggrieved with another, and, instead of laboring with the said brother or sister, should be whispering and backbiting, such member shall be under censure of the church.
14. No member shall vacate his seat in time of conference without permission.
15. Whereas, Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and His humble followers are much persecuted, therefore we cannot take evidence indiscriminately from the world; but when reports of unmistakable facts are in circulation against one of our members, we think it right to take such testimony as is valid.
16. We agree that our regular conference meetings shall be held on Saturday afternoon before the first Sunday in each month, and that the first Sunday in May and October shall be our communion season.
17. Alterations, additions, or amendments may be made to the foregoing rules at any time by a two-thirds majority of the members present, after a month's notice shall have been given of any intended change, except in the instance of Rule 6; and Rule 6 shall never be changed.
18. The foregoing rules shall be read when thought necessary.

What To Do

---August 7, 1941

Elder C. H. Cayce:

Dear Brother - Please answer the following questions through The Primitive Baptist for the benefit of some of our dear brethren:

Question 1. If an association or individual church has a preacher member, and while with them is sound in the faith and doctrine, but after moving away some 500 or 600 miles, staying away for years, but holds his membership at his former home, and dives deep into the doctrine of the world, preaching Universalism, or no hell doctrine, and his home association and church are notified and warned of his false teaching, time and again, by sound Old Baptist preachers who are known to be in good standing, then and there should his home church do something?

Question 2. Should his home church wait for some church 500 miles away to bring charges against this preacher or his home church before they do something with him?

Question 3. If his home church has plenty of witnesses, Old Baptist members in good standing, even some of them deacons and ministers, that these reports are true-that they have heard this preacher preach these things in the stand, and talk with him privately, and he contends this stuff is Bible doctrine- should his church still hold him in full fellowship, and have to appoint a committee of three of their own home members to go 500 or 600 miles to see him in person; and if his home church writes him, and he denies all these reports, whose word shall his church take-a dozen sound Old Baptists or this preacher, with all these reports on him? Please answer. Your little brother in hope, B.

OUR ANSWER

It seems to us that it is very clear and evident as to what should be done in such a case. In the first place the time has been when it would not have been considered good order for one to let his membership stay at his former place of residence, some 500 or 600 miles away, when he has moved near to another orderly Old Baptist Church. It does not look good. One may be ever so sincere in doing that, and may consider that he has good reasons for so doing; but it looks to others as though he prefers to have his membership stay where his home church may not know of his conduct or way of doing. Hence, we say it does not look good -and it is not right. Next, if he has been proven by witnesses, who are considered good, to have departed from the faith, and to be advocating such heresy, the church most certainly should take the matter in hand. Noticing particularly question 2-why should the church of the brother's membership wait for a church 500 miles away to bring charges against the preacher, if the church already has proof of his guilt? Should the church wait for another church to bring charges against her member if he is already proven to be a heretic, or as having departed from the faith, and to be preaching heresy? Since question 3 says he has been talked to privately, it seems that he has been admonished as the Scriptures require. If it should be claimed that these private talks do not meet with the requirements, then his church should admonish him at once and require a solemn promise that he will cease advocating such a doctrine, and if he will not then do that, or does not quit it at once, then he should be withdrawn from immediately. But here is another point in the matter: If the brother is disturbing the church where he is located, then that church, as a church, should, as a faithful church, notify the church of the brother's membership; and let them know that the brother has been labored with by them, and then his church should deal with him as the case may demand. If the church where the brother lives does not notify the church of his membership, then they are not dealing faithfully with their sister church. If a man has a case in court, accused of committing a certain deed, but denies his guilt, yet it is proven by a dozen or so good witnesses, will the court of justice take the word of the accused, or take the word of the dozen witnesses? To refuse to take the evidence of such a number of good witnesses is to disregard the law. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established." There is entirely too much disregarding the Lord's laws and requirements in His kingdom in these days. No wonder there is so much war and bloodshed in the world. May the Lord pity us and have mercy on His rebellious children, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Hebrews 13:10

---August 7, 1941

In October, 1940, Brother R. A. Ray, of Water Valley, Miss., asked for our views of **(Hebrews 13:10)**, which reads: We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. The tabernacle service was engaged in under the law. That was a law worship and service. Law worship and law service had been done away, and none of it is admitted in gospel worship and service. No one has a right to bring any of that into the gospel worship and service. The gospel kingdom, or church had already been established, and all law worship and service had been fulfilled and done away. No one has a right to gospel worship and service with law service. The beasts were required to be slain and offerings were to be made under the law, which were all a type of Christ and the one offering He would make. He had made that one offering for sin, and no more offerings were required. No one has a right to bring those things into the gospel kingdom. C. H. C.

Our Association

---August 7, 1941

Our Association, the South Arkansas, is appointed to be held this year with our home church here in Thornton. The usual time is Friday, Saturday and third Sunday. But a year ago the association agreed to have a meeting of four days this time, if the church here desired it. The church agreed, by unanimous consent, in their regular meeting in October, 1940, to have a meeting of four days of the association this year. So the regular associational meeting will begin at ten o'clock on Thursday morning before the third Sunday in September, and will close on Sunday. We expect to have service on Wednesday night, also, but the associational meeting is to begin on Thursday morning. This meeting of four days is to be held as a celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of the South Arkansas Association. This will be the one hundredth annual session of the association. The membership of the church are making preparations to care for a large crowd. We are expecting many from a distance, and from different states. We want you to come. And we will appreciate it if those who expect to come will write us and let us know, and tell us how many you will have in your company. We desire to know about this, if you can let us know, so we may make some certain arrangements beforehand, as we want to take care of all who come. We earnestly desire that we have a regular Old Baptist reunion at this meeting. We ask you to pray the Lord to be with us, and that we may have such a meeting as will tend to unify the Lord's humble poor, and that will be to the honor and glory of His name who has done so much for us. We do not expect for anybody to air his troubles at this meeting. We invite all to come and worship with us; but if you have troubles at home, leave them there, and come to the meeting to worship and serve the Lord. If we do this, the Lord will bless us. We are praying and trying to labor to that end. Please let us hear from you. Do not put off writing, but let us hear from you as soon as possible. C. H. C.

Associations Attended

---August 21, 1941

We received word on Saturday, August 2, that wife's father, Brother B. B. Lawler, was seriously ill. So we left home on Sunday morning, August 3, for his home, near Brownsboro, Ala., with the wife and some of our children. We arrived there at 8 o'clock that evening, and found him some better. He continued to improve, and was able to be up and getting around pretty well when we left there on Thursday morning, August 14. On Thursday, August 7, we went to Chattanooga to attend the meeting of the Sequatchie Valley and Collins River Association, which was held with the Chattanooga Church on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, August 8, 9, 10. Twenty-three ministers were in attendance. We would give their names, but we do not have space to spare, and we are late in getting this ready for the printer, so it may be in this issue of the paper. It was a great meeting. Two broadcasting stations gave some time to them over the radio. Station WAPO gave thirty minutes each morning, from 8:30 to 9 o'clock, and another station, the name of which we do not now recall, gave fifteen minutes each afternoon at about one o'clock. We have some of the sermons delivered over the radio, which we intend to publish (probably in For The Poor) when opportunity permits. It was a great meeting, and the Lord blessed the ministers to speak to the comfort and benefit of His humble poor. On Thursday morning, August 14, we left the home of wife's father to go to Memphis,

Tenn., to attend the Tallahatchie Association, which was held in that city with Morris Memorial Primitive Baptist Church. We had considerable tire trouble on the way, and arrived in the city at about seven o'clock, and went to the good home of Brother O. L. Hawkins, where we spent the night. The meeting began on Friday morning, and closed on Sunday. Twelve ministers were in attendance. Elder W. C. Moak, the previous moderator, was afflicted, in the Veterans' Hospital, and was not able to be present. He requested that the ministers present at the meeting visit him in a body at the hospital, which was granted. May the good Lord grant that he be restored to good health again, is our humble prayer.

The meeting was an enjoyable one. The preaching was usually good, and was enjoyed by those present. No one seemed to have a hobby to ride, and there was no "shooting" at others by any of those who occupied the stand. The church in Memphis is a lively band, and are faithful, and desire to continue to "stand in the ways, and see, and to ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and to walk therein." The Sequatchie Valley and Collins River is to meet next year with the church in Sweeten's Cove, near South Pittsburg, Tenn., and the Tallahatchie is to meet with Pleasant Grove, near Como, Miss., each at their usual time. We have been attending these associations and visiting their churches for many years. We may never be privileged to meet with them again in this world; but we hope to meet them, with all the redeemed, in a better world than this. May the richest blessings of heaven rest upon them, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

A Good Fight

---August 21, 1941

The above is the title of a pamphlet of sixty-six pages which we have just finished for Sister Grace Claggett. It is a story written by Elder G. B. Green, of Indianapolis, Ind., and published in The Primitive Monitor. The pamphlet has the picture of Elder Green and wife in their young days, and a late picture of them. The pamphlet is printed on tinted egg shell paper, a good quality of paper, with an extended green paper cover. It is a real neat book, and the contents make good reading. The price is only twenty-five cents a copy, and it is worth more than the price asked. Orders may be sent to Sister Grace Claggett, Thornton, Ark., or to Elder G. B. Green, 3736 W. Tenth St., Indianapolis, Ind., or to us. C. H. C.

Beautiful Feet

---September 4, 1941

Sermon preached by Elder C. H. Cayce at the Tallahatchie Association, Memphis, Tenn., August 16, 1941.

I am glad of the opportunity and privilege of meeting with you once more in the old Tallahatchie Association, an association I have been visiting from time to time for many years. When I first began to meet with this association I was called the boy preacher, but now I sometimes hear people refer to me as "Old Man Cayce." There are but few who are identified with the association now and who meet with you in these services that I met in this association in my young days. All of the old preachers are gone, and now most of those whose faces I see are different from those I used to know. I realize that soon I shall do as those older ones have done. I shall soon step off the stage of action, and I may never be permitted to attend another session of the old Tallahatchie Association, and to some of you I may be speaking what will be to you my dying words; and if the good Lord would graciously

bless me to speak to you today I want to leave with you my dying testimony of the great importance of the servants of God, those professing to be God-called, and God-sent ministers, living the lives that become those that profess to be soldiers under the blood-stained banner of King Jesus. There is a great responsibility resting upon those professing to be ministers of the gospel of Christ; and not only is there a great responsibility resting upon them, but there is a great responsibility resting upon the church to whom God gives His ministers. In treating upon this great and important subject I hardly know just how to begin or just what should be said and just how it should be said. The perpetuity of a church in a community and the good influence of that church rests almost, if not altogether, upon the way that we live, the way that we conduct ourselves. Now before I proceed farther in making remarks and calling attention to these truths I want to ask you to be patient with me, for I must, if I am able to talk to you, endeavor to speak deliberately, and I know that what I say, I want it to be said so I may be heard and understood. It is stylish or fashionable to read a text, whether a man has any use for it or not. If there is any special text on my mind to use as a starting point it is a portion of (Romans 10:15), but I want to read (Romans 10:13-15). "For whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." That is a statement of fact. "Whosoever" - that is, everyone who- "shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Then in the next verse the inspired writer asks the question, "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed?" That question is asked in such a way as to admit of but one answer. It is a negative question, requiring a negative answer. "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed?" They cannot. A question stated in such form as to require a certain definite answer, either affirmative or negative, is the very strongest way possible that a proposition may be stated. It is not possible in our language to state the proposition any stronger, that a man cannot call on Him in whom he has not believed. Belief is a prerequisite in order that you can call on Him in the sense of this text. Then another question, "And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" They cannot. That is another negative question, requiring a negative answer, that they cannot believe in Him of whom they have not heard. Then follows another negative question, "And how shall they hear without a preacher?" They cannot. Here are three negative questions and each requires a negative answer, and each of them gives the proposition in the very strongest possible way of stating that they cannot. And then in (Romans 10:15), the apostle presents another question, "And how shall they preach, except they be sent?" That is another negative question and requires a negative answer. They cannot. It is a matter of impossibility for one to preach except he be sent. He may be sent by the power of Satan, and if he is he will usually preach Satan's doctrine. He may be sent by the power of men, and if he is he will usually preach the power of men. He may be sent by some board of men, and if he is he will usually preach the power of the board. He may be sent by the church, or some institution called a church, and if he is he will usually preach the power of that so-called church which sent him. If one is sent by the power of God he will preach the power of God, unless he is a traitor. Let me say to you, as easy as I know how, that I am of the opinion that there have been some men who were called and sent of God that proved traitors to the cause. When one does that it is the indispensable duty of the membership of the church to be well enough informed in regard to these matters that they may be able to discover the fact that such a man is a traitor, and then dispose of him as such. Now if you want me to modify that and will let me know that you do, I will try to modify it in such a way as to make it stronger, if possible. Men are sent to preach sometimes by one authority and sometimes by another. In the law dispensation of time, the Lord called and sent prophets into the world. However, He did not send

them to the Gentiles, but sent them to Israel. Unto the Jews were committed the oracles of God. The law and the prophets were all committed to the Jews. Satan saw and observed these prophets which the Lord gave and sent, and then he got busy, and he also called and sent out prophets; and he called and sent out many more prophets than the Lord had. But every prophet which Satan sent was a false prophet, but they were sent all right. He sent his false prophets among the Israelites. Now in the gospel age, in the setting up of the gospel kingdom and the ushering in of the gospel dispensation, the Lord called and sent out some preachers. He did not send them to the Gentiles in the beginning. He said to them, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach." I wish that I could emphasize that expression. I wish that it could be so emphasized that it would burn into the heart of everyone that hears me this day or that it comes before in public print, "As ye go, preach." That is, preach as you go. How important it is in this day of darkness and heathenism that the servant of God preach as he goes, not necessarily preach with his lips, but preach with your feet. "As you go." You do not walk with your lips. You do not walk with your tongue. You walk with your feet, and in going you use your feet to go. How necessary it is that your walk be straight. "As ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." The Lord personally called, that is the Lord Jesus in person, by direct work of the Lord Jesus, the second Person in the adorable Trinity, while He was in the world, in setting up His gospel kingdom and ushering in the gospel dispensation, called the twelve and the seventy and sent them out. From the time that He was crucified and buried and rose again and ascended to His Father in glory, it has been the office work of the Holy Spirit, the third Person in the Trinity, to call and send out the gospel ministers. When the Apostle Paul was about ready to leave this world he called the elders of the church together at Ephesus, and said, "Take heed to yourselves." How important that is! "Take heed to yourselves." If every man professing to be a gospel minister in the old church today had observed that instruction-" Take heed unto yourselves" -there would have been less strife and confusion and division and discord in the church of God than there is today in many places. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." That is the office work of the Holy Spirit-to make men overseers of the flock of God. Many men who profess to be, or propose to be, ministers of the gospel and overseers of the flock of God are importers. You may think that is plain, but I have an idea that you can understand what I mean. No imposters are needed in the church of God, and it is necessary that the membership of the church be on duty and awake that they may be able to discover that imposter; track him to see if you can tell what direction he is going. Had you ever thought about it? You cannot tell by the track of a goat which way he is going. You can track a sheep all right, but you cannot track a goat. Look at the track of that imposter and you should be able to tell by his track whether he is an imposter or not, whether he is a goat or a sheep. "How shall they preach, except they be sent?" It is God's work to call and send His ministers into the world. As we look upon the harvest and see that the harvest is great and that the fields are ripe unto harvest, and seeing that, then seeing how few laborers there are, we begin to get alarmed, we get distressed and conclude that we must get busy. We have some brethren in the church who can stand in the conference or in our church meetings and read and explain some portion of God's Book and deliver a good, warm, feeling exhortation that revives our spirits, and we turn in and try to make a preacher out of him. Why, yes, Old Baptists have made preachers, such as they are, and when they get one made, they don't want him and no one else will have him. He is sent, all right; but he is sent by the wrong authority. You have no more right or authority

from the eternal God to make a preacher and send him out in the world than you have to try to regenerate sinners, not one whit more. This is a work that the eternal God has reserved unto Himself, and no man can do that. The Lord made and sent out preachers, and He has been doing that in every age of the gospel dispensation; from the time that the gospel dispensation was ushered in up to this good day the Lord has been making and sending out preachers. He has not made an assignment and someone appointed as receiver to carry on and wind up His business. He has not gone into bankruptcy. He is as rich and powerful today as He ever was in the world. He is still rich. Well, old Satan saw what the Lord was doing, that the Lord had quit making prophets, that that dispensation had come to an end, and now He has brought in a new dispensation, and He is making preachers and sending them out and so Satan got busy again, just like a monkey. Any of you know anything about a pet monkey? If you do, you know that a monkey will watch you and see what you do, and everything you do he will try to do that thing. So old Satan got busy and he began in the early day to make preachers, and send them out. We are warned in God's Book, that "Many false prophets are gone out into the world," and old Satan is still busy. He has many more preachers today than the Lord has. They are somewhat like the fellow that made them. If the ministers of Satan be transformed as ministers of righteousness they look very much like them. They get in the old church, all right. If Satan himself be transformed into an angel of light, no marvel that his ministers be transformed as ministers of righteousness, and they bring trouble into the church. The true God-called ministers must be watching out for those things. I have heard it said, possibly I have said it myself, that nine hundred and ninety-nine times out of a thousand when there is trouble, strife, and confusion and discord in the church of God, some preacher is responsible for it. I want to modify it and say it this way, that some preacher or preachers are responsible for getting it started and the churches are responsible for not stopping those preachers. I went to a place one time, having been called on to do so, and they were all disturbed, fellowship broken, and they asked me what I thought they ought to do. You young preachers, I want to tell you something; they will want you a whole lot in your young days, they sure will; but after awhile when you get old and not as strong as you once were, and not able to endure things as you once did, they will still have use for you—they will call on you in time of trouble, and then they won't need you any more until they have some more trouble. They asked me what I thought they ought to do. I told them I thought they ought to exclude both of the preachers. They said, "No, we won't have any preaching then." I replied, "God knows you ought not to have any more of the kind you have been having, and tear your church to pieces." They should be put on the outside of the pen, and if they are what they ought to be, they will soon realize the position they are in, and will be ready to "shell down the corn" and quit that foolishness. "As it is written," or "As it has been written," more strictly, literally translated, "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!" Under the law there were certain specific requirements which must be met in order that one be capacitated or permitted to render service that was commanded and required in the tabernacle, and one was that the one who was put in that place must have straight feet. Many times, as you know, if his natural feet were looked at you would not say, "How beautiful are the feet of that man." Now, when the apostle wrote this and used this expression, "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace," I am sure that he did not have reference to the natural looks, size and shape of these natural feet with which we walk. I remember a little foolishness. One time when a man was preaching sweetly and I was listening to him, I thought about this text, and then I looked at his feet, and I thought he had the ugliest feet of any man I had ever seen in my life, and I

thought, "no matter how sweetly he preaches he cannot be a gospel preacher because of his ugly feet." But he was not talking about the natural feet, how nicely formed, but "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace." Not that your natural feet are clean, but your walk. "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace." I have heard men preach before now with whom I was well acquainted. I knew the way they acted. I knew the way they conducted themselves, and I knew how little confidence some people had in them. I sat under the sound of their preaching when folks that did not know them would be shedding big tears and their faces all lighted up, just drinking it down, and shout out loud, "Praise God," but it did not have that same effect on me. It never made me happy; it never made me rejoice. Instead of that it made me feel like an ice house would not be as frigid as that was. Did you ever have a piece of ice put down your back? Cold, freezing to death. What's the matter? His feet were not beautiful. In order that his message be glad tidings and good news to me, if I am acquainted with him, it is absolutely necessary that his walk has been right. I have often heard it said, and some of you have perhaps read it, and perhaps you have heard me say it, that "where there is so much smoke there is mighty apt to be a little fire." Where there is so much smoke to be seen over the country, and especially in a community where so much is said about the preacher's ill conduct and ungodly living, there is mighty apt to be some fire. "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace." I am frank to tell you that when a man has so lived and so conducted himself as that he has lost his good influence in the community, if he ever had any, I don't want to hear that man preach. That is frank, but I don't want him to ask me to make appointments for him. I don't want him to visit my home churches, and I am going to tell you frankly that there are some men posing as preachers in the Primitive Baptist ranks, if they were to come to my home, and the weather was stormy, the thunder roaring, lightning flashing, I would not ask them to stay all night in my home. Is that too plain? Is that too rough? No wonder we hear complaints from every direction that our churches are diminishing and that places that you and I have known where once the candle of the Lord was planted, where God's name was honored and glorified, the glorious gospel was preached, shouts of joy and praise and thanksgiving to God went up, but that now they are gone, churches are gone down, the candlestick removed, and if the old house stands it is inhabited by the owls and bats. Why is it? My brother, there is a cause. It is for the simple reason, one is, that men who are of immoral repute and unsound in their teaching and in their preaching have been permitted to go on and occupy the sacred desk, and people have found out such men and do not want to go to hear them, and the cause dies down and goes out. That is one reason. The churches have gone to sleep on the job, and instead of requiring men to walk uprightly and to walk circumspectly who occupy the sacred desk, they put up with just anything. "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace." Another requirement-a man could not serve back there that had a crooked nose. His "smeller" would be out of fix. He could not smell the stench of some filthy thing that might be brought into the camp. The "smeller" of the servant of God must be so that he can smell the stench of false doctrine, false theories and false ways, for there is always a stench from everything that is rotten. And when you discover a man that cannot smell the stench of rotten doctrine you better take him out of your stand. Another requirement-his eyes must be straight and in the front part of the head. If they are crosseyed they look both ways and will not be able to see anything distinctly, and if you knew the facts in the case, it might be like the Irishman when he was going to cut the head off the chicken, or rather, hold the chicken for the head to be cut off. The fellow holding the axe was cross-eyed. The Irishman looked up into his face and said, "Wait a minute. Do you hit where

you look?" The fellow said, "I sure do." The Irishman said, "Faith and if you do, you will hold the chicken yourself." He could not tell where that fellow was looking. He was cross-eyed. You must have a minister whose eyes are straight to look straight ahead, and when you look at him you may know what direction he is looking, and if you cannot tell what direction he is looking by the life he is living you better get rid of that preacher. There is another requirement. I will express it this way-his "taster" must not be out of fix. You know David said, "Taste and see that the Lord is good." But if my "taster" is out of fix, I could not see that the Lord is good by tasting. The "taster" must be all right, so that he will understand and know the doctrine of grace or doctrine of God our Saviour. His hands must be straight. If his hands are not straight, he would not rightly handle the Word of God. "Not handling the Word of God deceitfully," the apostle said. The man that handles the Word of God deceitfully has crooked hands; and if you have a preacher that handles the Word of God deceitfully, the sooner you get rid of that preacher, the better it will be for you and the cause in general. "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace." They must handle the Word of God in sincerity and in truth. They must look straight forward into the depths of God's grace and commandments. Their tongue must be right, so that they speak the truth of God in soberness. Their "taster" must be right, so they are able to distinguish the taste of the truth from that which is error. They must make straight paths for their feet, so that their walk is upright before men. When their life is like that and that way they "bring glad tidings of good things." Glad tidings that feeds the hungry hearts of the Lord's children. It binds up their broken hearts and revives their drooping spirits. It brings renewed evidence to them of their acceptance with God, and binds them together in love and fellowship and sweet union, and makes the old church a delightful place, a delightful place to live-makes the church an inviting place. I have been in some homes, not only on this trip but at other times when I have been in the city, and will say to you that your homes, as far as I have observed in them, and been with you in them, have been inviting places to me. I love to go to your home, brother. I enjoyed being in your home. It is a delightful place, an inviting place. If I were to go to your home when the lightning is flashing and clouds are rolling and the thunder roaring, and I wanted a place of shelter from the storm, and I knock on the door (I know there is somebody in there because I hear a noise in there), and the door may be slightly ajar; I may look in, and you don't answer to my knock, and I see you and your wife in a dispute, and I see the children lying on the floor engaged in combat, fighting each other, do you think I will push the door open and walk in? Instead of that, I will take another look at the cloud, at the approaching storm, and my conclusion will be that I prefer, I believe I would a little prefer, to be in the storm on the outside than to be in the storm in there. When God's little children who may be standing around, out in the world, where the storms are raging, and the lightning is flashing, and the thunder roaring, and they are looking for a place of shelter, a place of rest, and they approach your place of service, and as they look in and behold what is going on there-see you in strife and confusion and discord, and see that ungodly preacher that they have little confidence in, do you think they will want to push the door open and come on in? No, they will conclude they would just as soon be in the storm outside as to be in the storm in there. Let us make the church an inviting place for the Lord's little children. If we would do that we would not have to persuade them so much to come in. They want a resting place. "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!" Good things in the kingdom of God. Now I believe you are in peace here at this church. I believe sweet fellowship abounds. Somehow when I go to a place, if things are not right, I can feel it pretty soon after I get there. I may not know what it is that is wrong. I may

not know what the trouble is, but I can feel it. I can feel that something is wrong. And so I can tell it when I go to a place where love flows from heart to heart and fellowship abounds. That is your condition here, and so I say that we can tell the Lord's little children that there are good things here in the kingdom of God. He has put every good thing, from a spiritual point of view, in His kingdom that you need in the church. He put everything in the natural world that man needs. "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!" Peace, peace, peace. There is nothing in the world that compares with peace. The world is in a turmoil today, as we know. Peace is disturbed, the whole world, almost entirely, engaged in war, and it looks like every day that this country will be drawn into it; we are getting closer and closer to it, every day that we live in the world. Go to the old world and tell me—could you assemble together in Germany today and engage in the service of God as you do here? or in Russia? or any country that Germany has captured and controls? The time is swiftly approaching that these blessings and privileges will be taken from us. Do we appreciate them as we should? "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace." I love peace in the home. Wife and I, when we were first married, agreed that whatever we did we were not going to quarrel. Sometimes she tells me, "Don't preach me; don't preach us, but preach Jesus." But I want to say this, and she is present. She may take me to task for it, but I am going to risk it this once. She is larger than I am. I don't want her to sit down on me, but maybe I can beat her running. With all my shortcomings and all my misgivings, with all my faults and all my mistakes, we have been living together a little more than twenty-four years, and she has never yet given me a cross word. The Lord has been so good to me, so gracious to me, so merciful to me. He has blessed the Old Baptists with a spirit of forbearance for me, and they have permitted me to live with them now fifty-two years. It has been fifty-two years ago last Sunday since I asked for a home with them, and they have been so good as to let me still live with them; and, while I have had enemies, and do have enemies among them, yet, as a body of people, they are good and kind to me. They have proved that they love me. If I should be sold, and if what I have should be sold, if all my material possessions were sold, it would not be enough to repay the Old Baptists for what they have done for me. Let my last testimony be that I want to die in their fellowship and in their love; and if something should be said over my grave, or over my body, when I am silent in death, let them say it, and let their hands lay me down in my last long resting place. Will you pray for me? "As it is written (it is a true written statement), How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace." Brethren, let us try to live that way. Brethren, be on your guard. "Watch thou in all things." And may God grant to give you grace and courage and fortitude for your day and trial. I bid you farewell. May the Lord bless you. C. H. C.

Should Be Careful

---September 18, 1941

It is an easy matter for any of us, in our preaching, to form a habit of misquoting the Scriptures. This may be done without any intention of placing a wrong construction upon what the Book says, but it is wrong. Some critic may be present, and our motives or intentions may be misjudged by them. Some honest searcher or enquirer may be present, and may know we have not quoted the passage as it reads, and this may cause his confidence to be shaken. You know, very well, that when we hear men of other orders preach, and they do not quote the Book

correctly, we wonder if they have some wrong motive in view in thus making wrong quotations. We should remember that others may be the same way toward us; and for this reason, if for no other, we should be careful to quote just as it reads in the Book. If we are not sure the passage reads just precisely as we quote it, we should make it clear and plain that we are not sure it reads that way. Here is a passage we have often heard misquoted: And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." - **((Dan 2:44) (Daniel 2:44)**. We have often heard it quoted, "It shall break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms." The prophet did not say all other kingdoms, but all these kingdoms. The word these could not possibly embrace any other kingdoms than those represented in and by the image which the king had seen, and which Dainel tells him of. Those kingdoms were none others than the kingdoms embraced in the Roman Empire which were in existence when Christ came into the world and when He established His kingdom, or church, and which were reigned over by the Caesars. As proof of this read **(Luke 3:1-4)**, and **(Mark 1:1-5)**. These kingdoms were broken in pieces and destroyed, but some others were not. Informed persons know that to be true. So we should not use the word other for the word these when we quote that text. Let us give no occasion for criticism which can be avoided. We have called attention here to only one text which we often hear misquoted, though there are others. In calling attention to this we do not wish to leave the impression that we never do that ourself, but that we should try to be more careful in our speech. We love our brethren in the ministry, and desire that they be careful to abstain from and to avoid everything that is calculated to injure their influence and usefulness in the Lord's kingdom. When we frequently misquote the Scriptures we plainly show that we have not studied the Scriptures as we should; we show that we have not applied ourselves; we have not used the talent which the Lord has blessed us with. In this, we have neglected the obligation which the Lord has placed upon us. Let us wake from our lethargy and slumber, and apply ourselves in a way that will prove we are what we profess to be. C. H. C.

Ahead Of Time

---September 18, 1941

This paper is dated September 18, but we are mailing it out ahead of time, as our association begins on this date, and no work is to be done in our office during the week of September 15 to 20. We will be busy on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday getting ready for the meeting, and as the meeting begins on Thursday morning and continues until Sunday, we will then be busy in the meeting. So we are mailing this issue out ahead of time. The next issue will be dated October 2, 1941. C. H. C.

Baptists In All Ages

---September 18, 1941

The above is the title of a book just published by Elder Ariel West. It contains articles on church history and other subjects written by the late Elder J. S. Newman. The book is well worth the price asked for it, which is only one dollar. It is a valuable v/ork. We are glad these writings have been brought together and put in book form, a book of 198 pages. We are glad to recommend the work to any who are interested in knowing the truth regarding the history of the church, as well as on some fundamental points of doctrine. It clearly shows the folly of the doctrine some are so radical on-that God did, from all eternity, absolutely and

unconditionally predestinate all things that come to pass, good, bad, and indifferent. You may order the book from us or from Elder Ariel West, Madisonville, Ky. C. H. C.

A Wonderful Meeting

---October 2, 1941

Yes, it was a wonderful meeting. This but faintly describes the meeting of the South Arkansas Association, in her one hundredth annual session, held with Cane Creek Church, here in Thornton, Ark. It was agreed and understood one year ago that this session would be a meeting of four days, celebrating her centennial session. We had service Wednesday night, September 17, but this was just an extra appointment, and was not the beginning of the associational meeting. Quite a number of visitors came in on Wednesday, so we had preaching that night by Elder A. D. West, of Ada, Okla. He was blessed to preach a good sermon and the meeting started off good in that way. At ten o'clock Thursday morning the introductory discourse was delivered by this writer. He apologized for consuming so much time, and does the same thing here again. After lunch was served the association convened in her business session. As the congregation voted their desire to witness the business transactions of the body, no preaching was had until the business was gone through, which consumed most of the afternoon, on account of the reading of the historical sketch which the moderator and clerk (Elders C. H. Cayce and John R. Harris) were appointed last year to have prepared for presentation to the body at this session. The sketch was adopted by unanimous vote of the body, and unanimously approved by every Primitive Baptist present. A new church had been organized near Pine Bluff, called New Bethlehem. She presented a petitionary letter for membership in the association. Another church had thought, two years ago, to represent in another association, but came back to this body at this time. They were both gladly welcomed among us. A committee was appointed as usual, to arrange the preaching during the meeting. This was done by the moderator upon a motion being made that the moderator appoint such a committee, and that the moderator and clerk serve with them. The committee arranged for each service throughout the meeting. Thursday night the stand was filled by Elder N. F. Graves, of Champaign, Ill., followed by Elder W. W. Fowler, of Dallas, Texas, of Chambers Creek Association. Friday morning the association convened at 8:40 and finished up the business. After the business session was done, the stand was filled by Elder A. D. Pitney, of Maumee, Ohio, of the Sandusky Association, and Elder R. E. Wilson, of Italy, Texas, of Chambers Creek Association. In the afternoon the stand was filled by Elders M. A. Hall and G. A. Hill, of the Pulaski Association, of Georgia. By request, Elder J. D. Holder preached in Fordyce that night. The stand was filled at night at the association ground by Elder M. A. Norman, Oden, Ark., of the Salem Association, and Elder L. Z. Folmar, Pelham, Ga., of the Flint River Association. Saturday morning the stand was filled by Elder W. F. Inman, Fredericktown, Mo., of the Harmony Association, and Elder F. M. Russell, Heber Springs, Ark., of the Mountain Springs Association. Saturday afternoon the stand was filled by Elder W. T. Richie, Blossom, Texas, and Elder A. J. Banks, Newton, Miss., of the Bethany Association. Saturday night the stand was filled by Elder A. D. West, Ada, Okla., of the First Primitive Baptist Association of Oklahoma. At the conclusion of the preaching service one brother came forward asking for a home with us, and was received by relation, or recommendation. He said he was tired of being identified where he had no recognition by the Baptist family. He was gladly received. Then five others came forward asking for a home, and they were gladly received. Two of

them were baptized Sunday afternoon, and one is to be baptized at Elizabeth on the fourth Sunday, and two are to be baptized here on the next first Sunday afternoon. Sunday morning the stand was occupied by Elder J. D. Holder, Tupelo, Miss., of the New Hope Association, and Elder J. W. Hardwick, Booneville, Miss., of the Tombigbee Association. At the conclusion of the preaching service another came forward asking for a home in the church, and was gladly received. She was baptized in the afternoon with the other two, by Elder John R. Harris. The parting hand was then taken, with a mixture of joy and sorrow-joy for such a wonderful meeting, and sorrow that we were to be separated by many miles, perhaps to meet no more here on earth. The preaching was all of one piece. Not a discordant note was sounded in the whole time. If any had any troubles they were left at home. It was a grand reunion, meeting together from the north and south and east and west, and all of one accord. May the Lord be praised for His wonderful blessings. "His mercy en-durath for ever." May His rich blessings attend the pathway of each one, is our humble prayer. An extra number of the minutes of this meeting are to be printed. If you want one or more copies of the same you can get them free by writing us and asking for as many as you want. We will be glad to mail them to you, especially on account of the historical sketch which will be in them. C. H. C.

Characteristics

---October 16, 1941

A characteristic is a distinguishing mark or trait. Sometimes one will have to know a person pretty well in order to know his characteristic marks or traits. Sometimes one can talk as though he loves you dearly, and as though he loves the peace and fellowship of the brotherhood, and the peace and unity of the churches. He may say that he prays for the peace of Jerusalem; but it is characteristic of some of them to work privately and under cover in such a way as to destroy the peace of the brotherhood and the churches. He will strive with all his ability, possibly, to break fellowship between brethren. But while he is doing that he can put on a very pious outward appearance. They may have on the outward clothing of a sheep, but inwardly they are ravening wolves, and are destroying the peace and union of some of the churches and the brotherhood. The Master has warned us of some such characters. They were abroad in the land in the days of the apostles, and there are evidently some such in the world today. How about a man telling you, face to face, or by private personal letter, that he thinks a great deal of you, and pray for your prosperity, and the Lord's blessings upon your labors, and, at the same time, laboring to destroy your work and labor and good influence with others? Is that observing the instruction given by Paul in **(Romans 12:9)** "Let love be without dissimulation?" Dissimulation is hypocrisy, pretense. It is simply a pretended love which he has for you when he tells you such as that. And when he tells how much he loves the cause of the Master, and how he desires the peace of Zion, and, at the same time, is doing what he can to destroy the peace of the churches and the brotherhood, it is plain and simple hypocrisy. It is true that many people with whom he comes in contact, and with whom he associates, may not know that he is thus pretending, yet it is a fact just the same. And so much the worse that some do not know it, for he thereby deceives some of the Lord's humble poor, and leads them away from the right path, and destroys the peace of the brotherhood. We have known some who were always busy looking after and attending to their own business; but some of that sort whom we have known seemed to make it their business to attend to the business of others, and try to get help along that line; and usually they find some who are willing to help. Some brother may do

something which is perfectly legitimate and right, and that might have a tendency to unite brethren more strongly in ties of fellowship; but this busy fellow will get busy in an effort to destroy the brother who has taken the step which he does not like. Yet the step taken was designed for the bringing together more closely the brotherhood, and to the unifying and edifying of the body of Christ. Still, he may say that he is so anxious for brethren to dwell together in peace. Dissimulation! Al Capone had never been arrested, until he was caught the first time. Saul of Tarsus had never been arrested until the Lord arrested him when he was on his way from Jerusalem to Damascus. Many criminals, who are free today, have never been arrested, because they have not yet been caught. We have wondered sometimes if it were possible that a fellow might have a person excluded in order that no charge be brought against him in the church. We wonder sometimes about the Pharisee who prayed thus with himself, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess." -(Luke 18:11-12). "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." -(Matthew 23:27-28). May the good Lord pity and deliver His poor and afflicted people from such, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Two Parents

---November 6, 1941

In the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight of October 10, 1941, is an article by T. A. J. Beasley, New Albany, Miss., under the heading, "One Birth: Two Parents or Agencies," in which the writer says: "The two parents or agencies in every physical birth are the father and mother. The two agencies in every spiritual birth are the WORD (or the gospel) and the HOLY SPIRIT." The writer does not tell which is the father or which is the mother in the spiritual birth. We wonder if he thinks the Holy Spirit is the Father, or is the Holy Spirit the mother? If the Holy Spirit is the mother, then the mother is in the masculine gender, for the Bible speaks of the Holy Spirit as He-" But the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." If the Holy Spirit is a He, then the Holy Spirit is not the mother; and if the Holy Spirit is not the mother, then we suppose the writer means to teach us that the gospel is the mother. If the gospel is the mother, then every child of that family is born out of wedlock-and you know what a child is that is born out of wedlock. Ishmael was born out of wedlock; he was not the son of the married wife. We would just remark here that the world today is full of Ishmaelites-children born out of wedlock. Ishmael was a mocker-and there are many mockers today. "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord." -Isa. liv. 1. God's children are not born out of wedlock. They have a mother, too, who is virtuous. Their Father and mother are both virtuous. God is their Father. Who is their mother? "For it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free-woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount of Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But

Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that beareth not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." -(Galatians 4:22-31). According to the writer in the so-called Searchlight they are children of the bondwoman-Agar (Hagar) is their mother. They are born out of wedlock. But Jerusalem which is above (the covenant of promise), and is free, is the mother of God's children. They are children of promise, and are legitimate children, being the children of the married wife. You folks have our sincere sympathy. Poor fellows, your mother is not a married wife, according to your own teaching and contention. C. H. C.

Let God Be True

---November 20, 1941

EXPLANATION IN ANSWER TO QUESTION

Please explain ((Pet 3:19) (I Peter 3:19)-Mrs. W. A. Holt, Rogers, Ark.

Answer: The words are: "By which he also went and preached to the spirits in prison." The explanation is in the following verse, where it says; "Which were sometime disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was preparing," etc. When was the preaching done? While the ark was preparing. Jesus preached through Noah to the spirits that are now in prison, preached to them before they went to the prison and the fact that they refused to believe Noah they were put in prison of hell. When was the preaching done? I quote the exact language of Peter for the answer. When was the preaching done? "WHEN ONCE THE LONG SUFFERING OF GOD WAITED IN THE DAYS OF NOAH WHILE THE ARK WAS PREPARING." That inspired answer beats any thing I could give. Certainly Jesus did not go to hell and preach at any time. Those who are in hell, God's great prison (Penitentiary) are where preaching will do them no good. Instead of guessing that Jesus died and during the three days his body was in the grave he went to hell and preached, instead of making such a guess don't you think it better to take the inspired answer as I gave it exactly without changing a word as I have given it above?-B. M. B.

REMARKS

The above article by the "Honorable Right Reverend Ben M. Blowhard, D. D., LLD.," is copied from the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight of October 10, 1941, just as it appeared in that sheet. What a powerful searchlight that sheet is! "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness." The thing really does not give as much light as a firefly. Note that this learned (?) gentleman says that "Jesus did this preaching through Noah to the spirits that are now in prison, preached to them before they went to prison," etc. If that were the truth, then He did not preach to the spirits in prison. But the apostle says that He preached to the spirits in prison. If they were not in prison when the preaching was done, then He did not preach to the spirits in prison. They were in prison while the ark was a preparing, and He preached to them while the ark was a preparing. But did He do the preaching through Noah? Bogard says He did; but the apostle did not say so.

What did the apostle say about that? He said, "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison." The apostle says He preached unto the spirits in prison by the Spirit; but Bogard presumes to know more about it than the inspired Apostle Peter, for Bogard says He did the preaching through Noah. "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar." -(Romans 3:4). Bogard says "the fact they refused to believe Noah they were put in prison of hell." If that does not make the preaching of Noah the ministration of damnation, then language does not mean anything. If Noah had not preached to them they would not, and could not, have refused to believe the preaching; and if they had not refused to believe the preaching, they could not have been sent to hell for refusing to believe it. So, according to Bogard, if no preaching had been done, they would have all been saved in heaven! Such is the beauty of Blowhardism! According to Bogard, all who were drowned in the flood, not believing the preaching of Noah, were sent to hell. They all went there, according to Bogard- men, women, children, babies, and all! Who advocates the idea that there are infants in hell? Not the people Bogard delights to call Hardshells, and whom he delights to slander-but Bogard himself. "Thou art the man." The preaching unto the spirits in prison in Noah's day was done by the Lord Himself, and by that preaching they were delivered from the prison house of sin. Sinners were delivered from sin and from its ruinous consequences in Noah's day the same way that they were when the Saviour was here in person, and the same way now that they were then. Sinners have been delivered from the prison house of sin the same way, and by the same power, in every age of the world. They were saved the same way before there were any preachers that they are now; and they are ' saved now the same way that they have been saved in every age of the world. Let us read **((61:1) (Isaiah 61:1-3))** "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord has anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that He might be glorified." Now let us read **((6) (Luke 4:16-21))** "And He came to Nazareth, where He had been brought up; and, as His custom was, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto Him the book of the Prophet Esaias. And when He had opened the book, He found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He has anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And He closed the book, and He gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on Him. And He began to say unto them, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." This shows clearly, if language means anything, that it is the Lord Himself who delivers out of the prison house of sin. He sends no others to do that work for Him. He does not do this by proxy. It would please the Pope of Rome no more to find that the Lord does His work by proxy than it would please the "Reverend Doctor" Blowhard. But such teaching is not in the Book. It emanated from another source. May the good Lord have mercy on his poor soul. C. H. C.

Tour In Illinois

December 4, 1941

We left home at two o'clock on Sunday morning, October 19, 1941, for Illinois, to fill appointments as arranged by Elder W. E. Wright, of Alma, Ill., and others. We went direct to Greenville, Illinois, from home, arriving at that place at about 5:15 Sunday evening. Brother Mike Mollet and Elder A. D. Brumfield met us at the train, and conveyed us to Brother Mollet's home. Then service was held at Mt. Nebo Church that night, and also on Monday, Monday night and Tuesday. Then we filled appointments at the following named places, or churches: Girard, Waverly, Champaign, Hindsboro, North Fork at Willow Hill, Dundas, Long Prairie, Crooked Creek at Iola, Liberty at Alma, Mt. Vernon, home of a Brother Shuster, New Hope and Rector. The last appointment was at Rector Church on Sunday, November 16. For two weeks or more, from the beginning of the trip, the weather was extremely bad - rain almost every day or night. We are sure that the weather being so bad kept many away from the meetings. We met the following ministers along on the trip: A. D. Brumfield, L. E. Sutton, Baxter Hale, N. F. Graves, Chas. Moore, W. E. Wright, D. H. Knight, A. T. Weatherford, O. L. Weatherford, E. L. Curneal, R. F. Upchurch, and Ariel West. Besides these, we met several brethren who are exercising in a public way who have not been ordained. One of these was Brother L. P. Lockhart, of Granite City, Ill, whom we knew years ago in the bounds of the West Tennessee Association. We were glad to see him once more. We also met Brethren Lloyd Clapp, of Champaign, H. C. Allen, of Springfield, and Joel Wright, of Vandalia. There were probably others, but we kept no record of their names, and we may not remember the names of all. But we love and appreciate them, just the same. Elder W. A. Shutt, of Nashville, Tenn., was with us two days at Girard.

Some of these churches we remember to have visited in the years gone by. We were at Waverly (Head of Apple Creek is the name of the church) in December, 1913. Elder J. A. Conlee was living there at that time. Account of that trip may be seen on page 211 of Volume 2 of our Editorial Writings. We were also at Mt. Nebo Church on that same trip. Elder John Willeford was living there then. We loved both of those brethren, and esteemed them highly. Brother Mike Mollett married a daughter of Elder Willeford, and they are living at the old home place. We also met Elder L. E. Sutton on that same trip. Most of the preachers we met on that trip are gone to their long eternal home. Those people love the doctrine of grace, and the principles of truth which have ever characterized the Primitive Baptists as being a peculiar people, different and separate from the world, and they appreciate the minister who will go among them preaching peace by Jesus Christ. They were kind and good to us. They proved by their actions that they love the glorious principles which we have been trying to contend for during the fifty-one years of our ministry. May the Lord bless them and sustain them in all their trials and conflicts, and give them strength and Christian courage to continue to "stand in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein," and continue to find rest for their souls, {see **(Jeremiah 6:16)**} is our humble prayer. We humbly ask that they please remember us and our loved ones in their prayers. We trust some of these brethren in the ministry will have a mind to come this way some day; and may the Lord thus direct them. We trust the Lord may spare us to meet again on earth; but if we are not permitted to meet again in worship and service here, we have a sweet hope that we will meet in that better country, where separations and wars never come. C. H. C.

Close of Volume 56

---December 18, 1941

We now come to the time to write an article at the close of another volume of The Primitive Baptist. This issue completes the fifty-sixth volume, the fifty-sixth year of the publication of this periodical. What changes have been wrought during these fifty-six years! Not many are now living who were members of our churches fifty-six years ago, or who were readers of the first issue of this publication. Words are not sufficient to express our deep regret that we do not have the first book containing the names of the subscribers who received the first issue of this paper. We wonder if there is a present subscriber who has a copy of that first issue of The Primitive Baptist? If so, we sure would be glad to hear from that subscriber. Although there have been so many changes, yet there are some things which have not changed. The God of Israel has not changed. His love has not changed. His power has not changed. His faithfulness has not changed. His mercy still endures, "for His mercy endureth for ever." He is still longsuffering. He is the same loving heavenly Father that He has ever been. Notwithstanding our many shortcomings, our many wrong doings, our waywardness, our un-kindness to our brethren and to one another, our forgetfulness of Him, our many sins and transgressions - notwithstanding all these things, yet He still remembers us in mercy. What great reasons we do have to be thankful to Him! When we think of the sad and distressing conditions which exist in the old world, the great war that is going on in the old country, and of the slaughter of the millions on the other side of the great waters, and remember that we still have the great and wonderful and blessed privilege of assembling ourselves together, as it were, under our own vine and figtree to endeavor to worship and serve our God as we understand His Word to teach, and according to the dictates of our own conscience, where none dare to molest or to make us afraid - How thankful we should be! and should we not consecrate our lives anew to His blessed service? It is deplorable that there is such a spirit of war and bloodshed, which seems to be pervading the whole known world. That spirit seems to be pervading all the nations, and it seems to be prevailing even in our own land, in a great measure. Think of the immense sums of money being spent in preparation for war, calling it defense measures, and of the young men of the nation being called from their homes, from the company and care of the mothers and fathers, and taken to camps and receiving military training-teaching them to kill and how to kill, and how to use weapons of warfare most effectively! Think of what all these things mean! Lord, help us, we pray. Then think of the spirit of war and destruction that pervades the ranks of the old church-the kingdom our Master established while He was on earth, for a home and resting place for His poor little crippled children while they tabernacle here in this world of sin and distress. Men have crept in who write as if they are for peace, and yet secretly work for the destruction of the brethren, and do things which they certainly should know can only bring strife and war and division. Some things have been done that there was no excuse for the persons doing them to not know they would be destructive to the peace and unity of the brotherhood. Some will say that they are for peace and unity, but will reject brethren whose life has been an open book, and who have never brought confusion among the churches. These things we know to be true. It is sad and deplorable that these things are true. But God will not leave Himself without witness. There have been troubles, trials, wars, conflicts, distresses, dark and cold days, and lowering clouds along the years of the past. We do not, and we need not, expect to reach a time in this poor life when there will be none of such things to endure and to pass through. As long as we stay here in this old world we may expect to have such things to encounter. But, thank God, the troubles the

Lord's poor and afflicted people have to endure are all in this life. Many of our friends and loved ones have already crossed over the river and are now at rest. The gathering storms, the lightnings, the thunderings, and the noise of the guns on the battlefields—none of these things disturb them now. Their souls are resting in the presence of the Lord, and their bodies are quietly sleeping that sleep which knows no disturbance. And we will soon reach the end of the way. All our readers—may God bless you—will soon come to the end of life's toilsome journey. We are all one year nearer to the last end of our warfare than we were when we wrote, or copied, the article at the close of the fifty-fifth volume, one year ago. Many of our brethren, sisters and dear friends have passed on during the past year. We miss them. We loved them, and we know they loved us. Our hearts are sad that we will greet them no more on earth. But we anticipate the blessed day when we shall meet them in a brighter, better world above. Let us try to thank and praise our Lord that things are no worse with us than they are. They may grow worse—and, in some things they likely will. But let us try to remember that our Lord will never forsake His little ones. How poor and needy we feel to be. We are not ashamed of the principles we have tried to contend for in these columns or from the sacred desk. Those principles are eternal, and will stand when time is no more. We are willing to trust our destiny on those principles. May the Lord bless you, dear brother, and help us to strive for the things that make for peace in Zion, and for the unity of the whole brotherhood. Jerusalem is a quiet habitation. Let us try to do nothing to disturb the quietude of that habitation. And please do remember us and our loved ones in your prayers. Farewell until 1942. C. H. C.

Church Organized

---December 18, 1941

A number of brethren and sisters living in Shreveport, La., and vicinity sent a request to Cane Creek Church, in Thornton, Ark., and some other churches to grant their ordained help to meet with them in Shreveport on Saturday and the fifth Sunday in November for the purpose of organizing a Primitive Baptist Church in the city. In compliance with that request, fourteen brethren, ministers and deacons, met with them on Saturday afternoon, November 29, at the American Legion Hall, near the home of Brother S. B. Price. We had service at 2:30. They had agreed among themselves that the work of organization be attended to that night, as some who expected to go into the organization could not be present that afternoon. On Saturday night quite a congregation assembled, and the brethren and sisters desiring to go into the organization expressed themselves as being satisfied with the brethren present to organize themselves into a presbytery and to organize them into a church. Accordingly, the following named brethren, being present, some of them by request sent to their churches, and some by personal request, formed themselves into a presbytery for the purpose stated: Elder A. H. Garner, Ephesus Church, near Ruston, La.; Elder J. F. Autry, New Prospect Church, near Mena, Ark.; Elder W. J. Blackmon, Cool Springs Church, near Logansport, La.; Elder C. H. Cayce, Cane Creek Church, Thornton, Ark.; Deacons M. B. Claggett, Cane Creek Church, Thornton; J. B. Webb, Fellowship Church, East Mountain, Texas; T. W. Kent, R. L. Sawyer, and J. W. Kent, Bethel Church, Shreveport; J. L. Hammett and H. A. Wiggins, New Providence Church, Jamestown, La.; and J. L. McBride, Jesse Swanner and Henry Swanner, Zion's Rest Church, near Jonesboro, La. The presbytery organized by electing Elder A. H. Garner, moderator, and Elder C. H. Cayce, clerk. The covenant upon which they agreed to be constituted was read, and signed by all parties—eighteen from

Bethel Church, near Shreveport, and one from New Providence Church, near Cameron, Texas, and one from Fuller's Chapel Church, North Little Rock. Their letters were presented, and recognized as being in order by the presbytery. Then the Articles of Faith and Rules of Decorum were read, and recognized as being sound and in accord with Baptist practice. Then the members extended the hand of fellowship to each other. Then the presbytery pronounced them to be a Primitive Baptist Church organized in gospel order, and the hand of fellowship extended to them by the presbytery and the visiting brethren and sisters present. The church then went into conference, and agreed that the name of the church should be Temple Primitive Baptist Church, and that their regular meeting time should be Saturday night and fourth Sunday in each month, and that their communion season should be in May and October. They made choice of Elder J. F. Autry as pastor and moderator, and Brother T. W. Foshee as clerk. On Sunday morning they met for service, and had preaching by Elder Garner and the writer, after which the opportunity was extended for any to present themselves for membership who might wish to unite with them. Three came forward with letters from Bethel Church, and three offered themselves for membership, desiring baptism. They were joyfully received. It was a most delightful meeting. Brother Claggett and Sister Grace and the writer had to return home that afternoon; but we learn they had another delightful meeting Sunday night, and that one more united with them by letter and one more by experience. The four were to be baptized on the first Sunday in December, at the regular meeting at Bethel. This starts them with twenty-eight members from the first meeting. May the good Lord prosper and bless them, and enable them to keep house for the Lord in such a way as to be pleasing to Him and to make it a delightful place for the Lord's poor pilgrims here on earth, is our prayer. C. H. C.

1942

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUME 57

---**January 1, 1942**

With this issue we are entering on the fifty-seventh volume of The Primitive Baptist. The war clouds are hovering all over and around us. After we wrote the article as the close of the fifty-sixth volume, our own country was plunged into the dreadful world-wide war. Japan made an unwarranted and a surprise attack on some of our islands in the Pacific. They made this attack while their representatives were in Washington in a pretended effort at peace with our president and secretary of state. Of course, there was nothing left for our country to do but to fight, or to meekly give up and surrender to such pirates. Well, of course, there has been no surrender. Every man, woman and child will be called upon to do our utmost to help win the war against the Axis powers. May the good Lord help us; and may He grant that peace may finally prevail, and the blessed privilege of freedom still be handed down to our children and children's children, for generations to come. In the ages of the past, as well as in some countries at present, many have been and are, denied the privilege of the freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and the freedom of worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, which we are yet permitted to enjoy. These blessings and privileges are priceless. They are blood-bought. The blessed privilege of the freedom of worship was bought for us by the blood of the crucified and risen Redeemer on Calvary's cross; and they were bought by the blood of our ancestors, who laid down their lives on the bloody

battlefields, that freedom and liberty might be gained, and the same be handed down to us of this present day. We wonder if we appreciate these blessings and privileges. Again we are called upon to give our sons, and to give what we have, that these blessings may not be taken from us. May God grant that these blessings may be continued. God grant that when the war is over that these blessings may still be for us or for our children to enjoy. There would be little left worth living for without these glorious blessings. May the Lord pity us all and help us to consecrate our lives anew to His service, and to the things that are worth while, and that are to His glory, and to the help and benefit of one another while we are permitted to still live in this sad world of turmoil. May we endeavor to do as the apostle said, in **(Philippians 3:1-14)**: Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. The apostle did not claim that he had attained unto a state of perfection; "but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." There is something before-not behind-that is worth while. There is a race set before us; and it will continue to be before us until we reach the end of our journey here. "Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." - (Hebrews 12:1-2). There is a race set before the Lord's children, and we are admonished to run the race. Let us endeavor to forget the things which are behind, and let us reach forth unto those things which are before; let us endeavor to press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling. May the Lord help us, as your editor, and those who are associated with us in the publication and sending forth of The Primitive Baptist, thus to do, is our humble prayer. And will you pray for us to this end, and that the Lord will help us, and that He will bless every reader throughout this New Year, and all through the journey of this life, and finally receive us all in a better world, where there are no wars, no troubles, no bereavements, no distresses; but one eternal day of unsullied bliss and glory, where all the redeemed will have and enjoy eternal rest. C. H. C.

Longing For A Home

---January 1, 1942

Dear Brother and Sister Cayce: Esteemed Friends

If indeed I have any right to relate myself as such. I have, and have had for a long time, a desire to make known unto you, as near as I may have words to express my feelings, how much I hope and trust I appreciate your humble lives as an example, though I am not supposed to be a judge. I feel very deeply that we never will, or never have had any better. Brother Cayce, there is only one who knows how much good it does me, how edifying it is to my soul to hear you preach the truth with such given power as you have. Yet, like a little girl in The Primitive Baptist, "Why can't I rejoice without tears?" How I have secretly prayed that you might be spared many years, and given strength through grace to fight on as nobly as you've done in the past. I do not have the pleasure of attending many sweet meetings, but it seems that every added one is sweeter than the one before. It

gets harder and harder for me to go on without them-without being one of the little band I love so dearly. I can't think of anything more beautiful than the picture of-----marching so anxiously down to the water for baptism. Maybe you know how much I wanted to go; but something held me back-I know not what. I am sometimes so uplifted and happy that it seems that it would be easy to go before my friends and ask for the home I hope I desire. Then the next moment I am fraught with fears that I am only deceived and would be a disgrace to the church, and that my own conscience would call me a hypocrite. If that isn't why I don't even want my own mother to think I am even interested I don't know why it is. Did you ever know anyone so wicked? Brother Cayce, will you, if you can stoop so low, pray for me, that if indeed I have the duty to go forward and ask for a home, that I may do so, and that I may never do anything that would be shameful and dishonoring to the dear old church- Primitive Baptist? If I can have that courage while you live here in this world are you willing to baptize such a creature as I? We all need your prayers. Come this way whenever you have a mind. Your visits are so encouraging. I feel that I should not take so much of your time. A little sister in Christ, I hope, P. S. By no means is this for print or an answer.

REMARKS

If such as the above is not from a child of grace, we confess that we do not know what such evidences are. See, the statement that the letter was not for print or an answer. How could we answer the question? Well, the above is the letter; but all names are omitted, so no person can know who the writer is, but the writer and us. What is the evidence when one so much enjoys and loves to hear the truth preached? Let us see what God's Book says about it. Let us read (**I Corinthians 2:11,14**): For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. The apostle plainly teaches us in this a matter which we all know to be true, that one knows the things of a man by the spirit of man which is in him. We all know very well, in nature, that one must have the spirit, or life, of a man in order to know the things of man. One must have natural life in order to know, or to comprehend, natural things. The same thing is true in grace; for the apostle says, "Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." Even so means just like that. Just as the one is true, so is the other also true. This being a fact, one must first be in possession of the Spirit of God in order to know the things of God. Note, too, that the apostle says, "Which things also we speak." We speak the things that are of God. If the minister really speaks the things that are of God, and you know them, it is because you already have the Spirit of God. This is clear and positive evidence that you are already a child of God; for "He that hath the Son hath life." The apostle also tells us, emphatically, that "the natural man receiveth not the thing's of the Spirit of God." The things of the Spirit of God here under consideration by the apostle are the things which we speak. The natural man is the unregenerate man. The unregenerate man does not receive the things of the Spirit, which things we speak. If you do receive them with joy and gladness of soul, it is because you are a child of grace, and you have the Spirit of God, which enables you to receive them.

Gospel preaching is foolishness to the unregenerate, so the apostle here informs us. If he told the truth, and he did, and the glorious gospel of the grace of God is not foolishness to you, then you are a child of God; and you should come out from the world and enlist under the banner of your King, to engage in His delightful service while you stay here in this world of turmoil and sorrow. There is sweet and delightful rest for you in company with His humble followers. Let us here have some of the language recorded by the beloved disciple. In **(I John 4:4-6)** we have this language. Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is He that is in you, than he that is in the world. They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error. The they who are of the world are the false prophets, or false teachers. Being of the world, of course they speak of the world. The doctrines they preach are of the world; and the world hears them, of course. Then the apostle says "we are of God." The true gospel minister is of God in his teaching. He preaches the doctrine of God; he preaches the truth. Who does not receive the preaching of this man of God? The people who are included in the term world; those who are not of God; those who know not God. Who receives the preaching of this man who preaches the truth? Those who know God; those who have been born of God; those who know the Lord in the free pardon and forgiveness of their sins. Just as sure, then, as the apostle told the truth, and he did, and as sure as the minister is of God in his preaching, and is preaching the truth, and it brings peace and joy and consolation to you, and feeds your hungry soul, just that sure you are a child of grace. Here is blessed and sweet assurance to you. In speaking to some unregenerate persons the Saviour said, in **(John 8:43)** "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." Those people did not understand His speech; they did not understand His teaching. The Saviour said the reason why this was so was because they could not hear His word. Why could they not hear His word? The Saviour answers this question in ((7) (John 8:47): "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." Then, one must be of God, must be born of God, must be a child of God, in order to hear God's words. Then, if one does hear God's words it is because that one is already of God. If the gospel of God's grace is heard by you with joy and gladness, if it brings joy and comfort to your soul, it is because you are one of His children; it is because you are of God. Again, the inspired Apostle John says, in **(I John 3:14)** "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." If you love the humble followers of the Lord; if you love those who give you evidence that they are children of God, this is evidence given you by the inspired apostle that you have passed from death unto life. This is God's blessed and eternal truth, and is just as true as that God lives and reigns in glory. And if you love the Lord, you also love His children; and if you love His children, you also love Him. "Everyone that loveth Him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of Him." - **(I John 5:1)**. If you love the one, then you also love the other. And Jesus has so kindly and lovingly and tenderly addressed you in this language, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." -(John 14:15). The best way in the world to show and to prove that we love Him is by keeping His commandments-" go home to your friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee." Yes, we tried to hide our feelings, too, when we were traveling the road you are now traveling. We tried to keep the matter hid from our precious sainted father and mother; but they knew more about it than we thought they did. No doubt in our mind but that your dear mother has seen and knows more about how you feel than you may think she does. You are afraid you will deceive her by telling her your feelings and desires in these matters which so

much concern you; but you would not deceive her that way. No doubt you would get some relief by unbosoming yourself to her, who is your best earthly friend, instead of trying to keep the matter from her. Yes, if you would offer yourself to the church, and obtain fellowship with them, manifestly, and they receive you (which we confidently believe they would do), and it should be your desire for the unworthy writer to baptize you, and the church should be willing to grant your wish in the matter, we would cheerfully go with you down into the water, and bury you in baptism, for you to rise to walk in newness of life. We are sure you would enjoy a peace of conscience you will never enjoy any other way in the world. Any of our ministers would cheerfully baptize such a one as you manifest yourself to be in the above letter. You tell the feelings of those who have been born again. You speak the language of Canaan. May the good Lord bless you, and all those who are dear to you, and give you grace and strength and courage to go home to your friends, and to live in that good home, and to live in such a way as to be an honor to the cause you love, is our prayer. C. H. C.

Remembrances

---January 1, 1942

We have received a great many kind holiday remembrances - Christmas and New Year cards. Besides, some tokens of Christian love and fellowship of a financial nature. We do not have words to express the thankfulness and gratitude of our poor hearts for these kind and good expressions of love and fellowship from our dear friends, brethren and sisters. We know there were many who were thinking of us, and these things have drawn us closer to you. We wish we could write to each one of you personally and tell you how much we appreciate your kind thoughtfulness of us, but that would be a great task and would take much time and expense, as there were so many of them. Will each of you take this as a personal note from us, and be assured that we hold each one of you in high esteem and love you dearly for Jesus' sake, and for the truth's sake? May the good Lord shower down His richest blessings upon each one of you and upon all those who are dear to you, is our humble prayer. C. H. Cayce and Wife.

Advocate and Messenger Sold

---January 1, 1942

We received our copy of the Advocate and Messenger for December, 1941, and find the announcement therein that it has been sold to Elder T. P. Dalton, son of the late Elder T. S. Dalton, of Catonsville, Maryland. The magazine will still be printed and mailed out from Front Royal, Va., as formerly. Elder T. S. Dalton was the editor of Zion's Advocate for a number of years. This was a number of years ago. We are sure that Sister Pittman has labored under great and many difficulties in sending the Advocate and Messenger out since the death of dear Elder Pittman. We wish Elder Dalton success in his undertaking. The Primitive Baptist and the Advocate and Messenger have labored and co-operated together during the past many years, and we trust the same cooperation may be continued with that good magazine under the new management. May the Lord bless you, Brother Dalton, in your undertakings and labors in His vineyard. The foregoing was written just as we were going to press with our last issue, but too late for that issue. C. H. C.

Ordination of Deacons

---January 15, 1942

AT OAK GROVE, LOUISIANA, DECEMBER 14, 1941

Examination by Elder C. H. Cayce of the Brethren to be Ordained.

There are not only some qualifications laid down in the Bible for the deacons, but there are also some laid down for their wives-not that we expect to ordain their wives. I have known places where, when they ordained the deacons, they ordained their wives, but I don't so understand the Book to teach. But there are qualifications that need to be looked into concerning the wives of the brethren to be ordained. I want to read some, and as I read I will call attention to a few things, and will also ask the questions that I may think of, or that come into my mind. Here in the sixth chapter of Acts we find the record where the first men were put into the office of deacon. "And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations." Daily ministrations means the daily distribution of the funds that were contributed to be used for the purpose of relieving the widows; and this rested, up until this time, in the hands of the apostles, and they attended to that business; but the disciples were multiplied in number so that the apostles could not attend to their work as ministers and to this also; and hence the complaint that some of their widows were neglected. "Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables." That is, it is unreasonable. "Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report." Now, the word seven is a complete number, a round number, a full number. That is, look out among you every one that is qualified. Now, if you have brethren in your midst, in your membership, who possess the qualifications, then it is, your duty to follow the example- set them apart to that office. If one does not possess the qualifications, you will no more make a deacon of him by ordaining him, than you will make a preacher out of one by ordaining him as a preacher. You are not authorized to ordain a man to the work of the ministry unless he possesses the qualifications; neither are you authorized to ordain a man as deacon who does not possess the qualifications. What are those qualifications? "Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report." That is the first qualification that the inspired apostle laid down here-" of honest report." That is, that his reputation is that he is an honest man. If there is a place in the church of God that a man should fill and should have the report that he is honest and upright in his dealings, it is the office of deacon. Why should that be important? Ordinarily it would be taken for granted that to be a member of the church he should be of honest report. Why, then, should it be more important for a deacon? For the reason that the deacon is a man that is to handle the finances of the church. The church has no business in the world putting her finances into the hands of a man who is not of honest report. If he does not possess this qualification, some might say he is not of honest report, and the church has put money into the hands of a man whose honesty is questionable, and suspicion may arise that the money is not rightly used or rightly applied. If he is of honest report nobody will have that suspicion. He must be of honest report. Brother Griffis (spokesman for the church), are these brethren of honest report? Yes, sir, I think so. Brother Griffis, let me say this. We are going into something now that is important. Tell me, do you know these men are of honest report? Yes, sir. That is the way I want you to answer. "Of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom." Is the evidence such that you feel sure in your heart that the Holy Spirit, in its divine influence and power, dwells in the hearts of

these brethren? Yes, sir. Have they manifested the fact that they have wisdom in conducting the affairs that belong to the church of God? I think so. Not only wisdom in the management of the affairs that pertain to the church, but in the management of the affairs that pertain to their homes and in their dealings with their fellowmen? Yes, sir. "Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business." That is a business matter-not commercial-but it is business that pertains to, and belongs to, the house of God, the church that our blessed Redeemer established while here in this world. "But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch: whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." In Paul's first letter to Timothy, (I Timothy 3:1-7), he gives the qualifications that should be, and must be, possessed by one set apart for the work of the ministry. "This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity: (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." Then, beginning with the eighth verse, "Likewise must the deacons." The deacons, just like the ministers, "must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." "Likewise must the deacons be grave." The word *must* is in italics, supplied by the translators, to give the full meaning that is in the original language. *Must* is a very emphatic word. "Must the deacons be grave." Do they possess that qualification? Yes, sir. "Not double-tongued." Do they talk one way today and another way tomorrow? I have not found them that way. "Not given to much wine?" No, sir. "Not greedy of filthy lucre?" No, sir. Greedy means to possess an inordinate desire. They don't have that for filthy lucre? No, sir. They do not engage in questionable practices for financial gain? No, sir. "Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience." That faith that was one time for all time delivered to the saints-do they hold to that in a pure conscience? Yes, sir, to the best of my knowledge. "Let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless." Then here is something about their wives. "Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things." Do they possess these qualifications? I don't think we have any that beat them. They don't tell tales on folks? No, sir. Are they sober in their conduct and in their way of living, modest, quiet, and faithful in all things? Yes, sir. "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well." Do they fill that qualification? Yes, sir. "For they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." "Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience." The one who speaks for the church in answering these questions could answer every question fully, except one, and that was to the best of his knowledge, and that is as to these brethren holding to the faith; to the best of his knowledge they do. I think it is prudent and well to ask these brethren themselves some direct questions as to their faith and belief. That becomes necessary for this reason: As officers in the church of the Lord and Master, they are, in a measure, to guard that church against the intrusion of false teachers, and to exert their best

efforts and their influence to keep such things out of the church. In order that they be able to do that, they themselves should know something of the doctrine, what this Book teaches, and what God has authorized to be taught in the gospel of the Son of God. Hence I am going to ask some questions of these brethren that they themselves can answer, and no one else can answer positively but them. You may have heard them speak along this line or that line; but now we come to a solemn thing, and a place that is sacred in the house of the blessed Master, and they should answer these questions without equivocation. I am not going to examine them as fully as I would if we were ordaining them to the ministry; and I am not asking the questions, or going to ask them, because I don't love you brethren. If I know my heart, I love you brethren, and you have my deepest sympathy, for I know that in endeavoring to fill an office in the house of God there is a great responsibility, and there will be trials along the way. Brother Jones spoke something about the trial.." There will be things to endure. Brethren, do you believe, or not, that there is an eternal, ever-living, self-existent being that we call God? Do you believe that this God has all power? Do you believe that He possesses all wisdom and knowledge? Do you believe that He has ever learned anything? Has He ever forgotten anything? Do you believe that this God is present everywhere, at one and the same time, and nowhere absent? (One brother answered: Can't believe anything else and believe the other.) I wanted to see if you would catch that. Do you believe that God is a God of mercy? Do you recognize Him as a God of justice, as well as a God of mercy? Do you believe that there are three persons, if we may so define it, in the Godhead? that there is just one God. and that this one God is composed of more than one, expressed in the Book as the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost, and that these three are one? Do you believe that they are one in purpose, one in power, one in divine essence and one in glory?

Do you believe that this God, in the office of Father, made choice of sinners of Adam's race to salvation, that they should be saved in glory - that they were chosen and embraced in covenant? Do you believe that covenant was an everlasting covenant between Father and Son? Do you believe that as the Father made choice of persons that the choice embraced a definite number? Do you think any could be added to it or taken from it? Do you believe that in the morning of time the eternal God spoke this world into existence by the word of His power, created all material things, the earth, the sun, moon, and stars, all beasts and fowls of the air? Do you believe, strictly, the Bible account of creation? You don't believe, then, that the first appearance of life was in some little something that is not big enough to be seen by the natural eye, and that this little something divided and subdivided, then "evoluted" up to man? Do you believe that in the morning of time God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and that man became a living soul, or a living being? Do you believe that God gave that man a law? Do you believe that the law God gave was a just law? If He gave a law that was just, then man could have kept that law, could he not? If he could not have kept the law, then the law would not have been just. A law that is just is one that can be kept. He did not have to violate the law. The man violated that law without constraint. The penalty of that law was death, was it not? Do you believe that when the man violated the law that man died in trespasses and in sins, and the life that man lived became poisoned with sin? The law being just, the man becoming dead in trespasses and in sins, if he is ever delivered out of that state or condition, must not that be alone, wholly and solely, by the grace and mercy of God, or can the man himself do something to get out? It is all of God's grace then, is it? Do you believe that God saved sinners in Noah's day just like He does now? Do you think God is making experiments and that He

may try some other way later on? Just one way. God is one and His way is one. Do you believe that when Jesus died on Calvary's cross He made complete, full satisfaction and atonement for the sins of His people? The Father made choice of them and gave them to the Son, and now He has made atonement for them. Do you believe it is the work of the Holy Spirit now to make this known to the subjects of that atonement and to regenerate sinners, and does He do that work through any outside agency? He does that work then alone, wholly and solely. It is accompanied by the operation of the Spirit of God upon the spirit of man. Is that work always effectual? Then do you believe that all of these that the Father chose and gave to the Son and the Son atoned for, will be regenerated by the Holy Spirit here in time, and do you believe that they will all be finally saved in glory? Do you believe when the Saviour was here in the world that He was the second Person in the Trinity, Jesus the anointed Son of God?

Do you believe that He was the anointed Son of God born of the Virgin Mary? Do you believe He established a kingdom or a church? How many did He establish? Just one. Well, do you think that if He had wanted any more than one that He would have established more? I don't think He has changed His mind about it. Was that church established or set up to be a home for His children here, a resting place for them? And was that for their glorification? God's glory. It is the place where we can give glory to Him while we are here, is that it? That is the place for His children then. Do you believe that His children, when the opportunity presents, should become identified with that church and then live in that church in a way that is honoring and glorifying to their Master? Do you think that ministers are given to that church? Were those ministers meant to be lords and masters over the church? Were they given to be servants? Is it not a fact that every office that the Lord has put in His kingdom, that those filling those places as officers in the church, are servants of the church, as well as servants of the Lord? Do you brethren believe that this is a great responsibility? Do you sisters think that this is a great responsibility? Do you sisters realize the fact that there is an obligation now resting on you to be helpers to your husbands that they may fill the office that God has placed them in and that the church sets them apart to? Many times there will be an obligation resting upon them, a duty to discharge in their service in the house of God that they will need your help, that they will not only need your encouragement, but they will need your help to go right with them in the discharge of some of those duties and obligations. (The questions were all answered satisfactorily.) Brethren, I am satisfied, and am willing to proceed. (Elder C. O. Stegall suggested that the candidates be questioned as to their belief in the eternal punishment of the wicked.) They have answered that the Lord made choice of His people and made atonement for them, and that they will all live with God in eternal happiness. Our Saviour instructs us in Matt. xxv. that He is going to divide the people, separate the sheep from the goats, divide the sheep from the goats, that He is going to place the sheep on His right hand, the others, designated as goats, on the left hand. And of these on the left hand He says "These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." Regardless of our feelings in the matter, and regardless of what men may teach, here is the statement laid down by our Master. The word here translated everlasting is the same word, letter for letter, mark for mark, dot for dot, which is translated eternal in the same verse with reference to the life of the righteous, It is a word in the original language frequently used in speaking of God, the everlasting or eternal God. If the life of the righteous is of endless duration, the same word being used in

regard to the punishment of the wicked, then that is also of endless duration. It is the same word, and if it means that the righteous are going to always live and never die, it also means that the others are going to suffer punishment that will never end. One must be of equal duration with the other. Now, if there is no such thing as eternal punishment, punishment of endless duration, then Jesus did not save anybody from anything; for we all have our sufferings here; we have our sorrows and afflictions and disappointments and bereavements here; and if Jesus died and He did not save anybody from these things, and there is no eternal punishment, then He did not save anybody from that. If there is no place of eternal torment, or eternal punishment, then there was no such thing for Him to save them from, So if He saved them from anything at all it was from eternal punishment. If He did not save them from that He did not save them from anything. Do you brethren believe that? Universalists will tell you there is no such thing as that. Most of you remember Elder W. H. Lee. I frequently think of what I heard him say more than one time. I made a trip in his country before he united with the church. He was a Universalist. That was his belief, and he "scrapped" with the Old Baptists on that, and with other folks, too. He could whip the other folks. When I came through that country he came out to hear me and I got on that point in my discourse that day. I did not know there was any Universalist there, but I said I would measure platforms with anybody - "I will measure platforms with the Universalist and I will show that my platform is broader than his, better than his. Brother Universalist, did Jesus save anybody from suffering? No. Did He save anybody from sorrows? No. Did He save us from having troubles? No; we all have our troubles. Did He save any from natural death? No; we all have to die. The Brother Universalist says there is no such place as eternal punishment, no such place as that, no use for that; for we are all going to heaven when we die. If there is no such place as that, if there is no such place as an eternal hell, according to the Universalist platform, or doctrine, then Jesus did not save anybody from anything." I knocked all of the Universalism out of him. It was not long until he joined the Old Baptist Church. How faithful, true and devoted he was! But I thank the Lord for it. Denying that very principle of truth has brought more disturbance and confusion in the minds of the people than any one thing in this country, and whenever that is introduced in the Old Baptist Church, brethren, I advise you to keep it out. Brother Burch: This is one particular place that I would like to have an expression of every one of the brethren that we are agreed on this point. I could not work with anybody that does not believe that point of the doctrine of God our Saviour. I could not work with anybody that does not believe the punishment of the wicked is of equal duration with the joys of the righteous. If the Bible does not teach that they are of the same duration, I have no knowledge of the teachings of the Bible. I ask that it be recorded here today. I would like for it to show that this church is firmly established that the punishment of the wicked will be of the same duration as the joys of the righteous. Just one point I would like to stress in the Scripture that Brother Cayce read. I think there is one thing of particular interest to every child of God holding membership in the church. He says they shall be on His right hand. In referring to the goats, they shall be on the left hand-not on His left hand, but on the left hand. I am certain that if the goats were on the left hand of God that would be worth something, but they were not to be on the left hand of God. Elder Cayce: Let me call your attention to the fact that these that shall be placed on the left hand-that they are left out. They are on the left hand and they are left out. They are left out on the left hand. Do any of the rest of you have any questions? This one more statement; if the punishment of the wicked ends, the life of the righteous will end in the same instant. The rule of our own language, the English language, to say nothing about what the words mean in the original, the rule of our own language is that when two things are set

up in opposition, one to the other, that the one must be of equal duration as the other. That is the rule of our language; and if we take a position in which we have to deny language to sustain it, then the position is wrong. One must be of equal duration with the other. It follows that just as long as the righteous live, and that will be without end, just that long will the punishment of the wicked continue. If the punishment of the wicked ends, the life of the righteous will end. I repeat, one is of equal duration as the other. Another point; the goats are on the left hand, left out. If the position be correct that has been advocated by some, that these goats are merely disobedient children of God, in the final windup the disobedient children of God will be left out, and that is final apostasy, for they are left out. Those on His right hand enter into life eternal and those on the left hand are left out. They do not enter into life eternal. If they had it one time, now they have lost it, for they are left out.

Charge Delivered by Elder C. H. Cayce to the Church and to the Brethren Ordained to the Office of Deacon, at Oak Grove, La.

---DECEMBER 14, 1941

The apostle, when delivering the charge to Timothy, a young preacher, said, "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead." The charge delivered to the deacons should be before the same divine authority; not simply before men, but before God, for there is an obligation that is placed upon you brethren by the Lord of glory. While, in a measure, you are responsible to the church (in some things you are), but first and primarily you are responsible to your God. The first thought and the first consideration which should be had by you in filling your office, or endeavoring to do so, is as to what would be well pleasing to your heavenly and divine Master. I want to present to you brethren this Book in this way that you let this be the man of your counsel. What God's Book teaches, let that be your instructor. In order to do that it is necessary that you study it-not just simply read it casually- but to study it; and to study it it is necessary that, as you read it, you study what each sentence means, and what each word in that sentence means, that you may be sure as to what that language teaches. It is true, in order to get the full conception of it and to see the spiritual import and the right application of it, in a measure, and what the results will be, you will need wisdom from on high. Hence, as you study and meditate, it becomes your duty, as well as your sweet privilege, to approach the throne of grace and ask God to give you wisdom-not knowledge. Wisdom is one thing and knowledge is another. God gives wisdom and understanding. By searching and studying we get knowledge. So we need wisdom in order to get knowledge, and the Lord gives wisdom and understanding. So you have the privilege, as well as a duty, to go to Him in prayer and ask Him to give you wisdom that you may understand; and then it is your duty to study the Book, and take that and what it teaches as the man of your counsel. Now there is not only a charge that should be delivered to these brethren, but there is a charge that should be delivered to the church. You said by your action in making choice of these brethren to put them into the office of deacon, that you wish them to serve you in that capacity; and then today you have said by your act, in the presence of God and before us as witnesses, that you are satisfied with them to set them apart to that office and you have said that you are satisfied with the presbytery. When you said

that you were satisfied with them and to put them in office, you not only said that in our presence as witnesses, but before God. His all-seeing eye beheld and is beholding all that transpires. In the presence of God you said that. In saying that you want them to serve you as deacons, you have thereby obligated yourselves that you will make them able to do what you have put them in office to do, and if you don't do it, these brethren are not responsible for that, except they should become negligent of what their duty is in insisting on you doing what you obligated yourselves to do. They have a right-not only a right, but it is a solemn obligation resting upon them-they are put under an obligation from which there is no discharge until the final wind-up with them-to insist on you doing your duty. God has never required at their hands to discharge the duties that rest upon you. Now notice at the very beginning of the examination of these brethren, the very first requirement that God's Book put down for their work was for the ministration of help to widows. That is the first thing that gave rise to it, to distribute the means that were contributed for that purpose, not that they were to go down in their pockets and administer those things to the widows, or that they were to furnish the things to those widows, but they were to distribute the funds that the church supplied. Now if you do not supply them with funds, you tie their hands and don't let them do the things you said you wanted them to do. Now, if you want them to do what you said you want them to do, there is but one way under heaven for them to do it, and that is for you to furnish the things to do that with. You have solemnly obligated yourselves that you will stay behind them and work with them, and that you will enable them and put them in a position that they may do the things that you set them apart to do. If you don't do it, you are the one that falls down on the obligation; and if you don't furnish them with the means for them to discharge that obligation, don't you go to complaining or rinding fault with them, don't you go to saying hard things about your deacons, or that they are no good, when you are the ones that are no good. Amos I too rough on you? That is God's truth. Now if we are not guilty it won't hurt us. If we are guilty, the Lord knows we ought to quit it. It makes me think of one time when a fellow told me he was going to leave his church and join the Old Baptists. He said, "Every time I go to my church, all I hear is money, money, money, and I am tired of it. When I go to the Old Baptist Church, I don't hear that. For that reason I am going to leave my church and join the Old Baptist Church." I said, "Is that the only reason you are going to join the Old Baptists?" "Yes," he said, "that's the only reason." I said, "For God's sake don't do it. We have enough stingy ones already." Another fellow told me once that he had belonged to the Old Baptist Church twenty years and in all that twenty years it had cost him only twenty-five cents. Do you know what I said? I said, "May God Almighty have mercy on your stingy old soul." Now, the primary work of the deacon pertains to the financial affairs of the church. Suppose, before your next meeting time, suppose during this coming week, the deacons learn of some poor widow or of some orphan children in the community, that some of them are sick, and they need some medicine and need a physician, and they need him right now, and they have nothing in their hands to supply the wants with. Are they going to have to wait until the next conference and report it? The poor widow may be dead by that time. Are you going to do what you said you would when you set them apart? Are you going to have funds in their hands to administer to such cases at the time it is needed? Are you going to do it? That is what you promise when you do this. What about it? If you don't use the deacons you have; if you don't use the five that you now have, let me ask you kindly -and I want it to go down in your heart, not to wound your feelings-if you don't use the five you now have, for God's sake don't call on me to help ordain any more. The financial affairs should be handled by your deacons. That is what the Book teaches. They are to serve tables-

not just one table-but tables, in the plural. Whatever table pertains to the finances of the church, these deacons are to serve in that capacity. You have testified that they are in possession of wisdom, and if they have not the wisdom to administer the funds that you solemnly obligate yourselves to supply them with, then you put them in a place that you said by putting them there that they are capacitated to fill; and now when you don't supply the funds, you say you don't think they have the capacity to fill it. You have crossed yourselves. Are you going to do that? There is more of a charge to be delivered to the church than to the deacons. They cannot do anything unless you supply them. It is an obligation now that rests upon you to see that they are able to discharge the duties of the office where you put them. All of the finances of the church ought to be handled by the deacons and attended to through them. Even what you do for your pastor should be done through your deacons. How many of you know what was done for me when I was pastor here? I am not complaining. Do you know what was done for me? Do you know whether my gasoline bill was paid or not? Do you really know? If there is one that knows, raise your hand. You don't know, do you? I am not complaining. You did well by me. You did much better than I feel to deserve. I loved you then and do yet; but what you do for your pastor should be handled through the deacons. I am going to give you an illustration. Suppose a few members of the church donate to your pastor, assist him on his way, help him. There is more resting upon the pastor than simply coming to the church and preaching for you once or twice a month. That is a small part of the job. We have but few men who really do the full work of a pastor. Suppose just a few help him along, contribute to him, and there are some who do not. I will tell you what human nature is now, if you don't know, and I know by several years' experience. He will think, or feel, that "this brother and that brother appreciate my service, for they help me along." He will get to thinking that the brother who helps him appreciates his service. He will say to himself, "I appreciate that, and I love those brethren." What's the matter? Why, that is just human nature. It is just bred in the bones. It is right there to stay. Instead of looking upon that church as a body and feeling that the whole church appreciates his service, they appreciate his efforts. But if the work is done through the deacons, he will feel that "I know the church appreciates my service and labors, because they contribute to me as a whole; so I love that church;" otherwise, I love these brethren. Instead of causing that brother to think more of the church as a body, it will cause him to think more of some individuals. In order that there be a full co-operation from the membership it is necessary that the whole church think of the pastor, and the preacher be thinking of them as a body, and not as individuals. So it should be handled through your deacons. At my home church the deacons have charge of the finances, and we keep some funds, not a great big amount, but we keep something in their hands. Every meeting, in conference, one of those deacons who keeps the record makes a report to the church how much has been paid in and paid out. He has a record of how much is paid in and how much is paid out and the balance on hand in the treasury. If a visiting preacher comes along, the deacons have the money to help him along. If you are not willing to risk the deacons, you have no business to put them in the office. We have electric lights in our church house, and it is necessary to pay the light bill. Sometimes it is necessary to have a little work done around there, and the deacons have the money.. We made an agreement in our church, an obligation between ourselves, that, in addition to this regular fund in the hands of the deacons, for the regular routine matters, we have an agreement that we would set aside a special fund, lay by for some unexpected thing that might come up. Brother Claggett is the one appointed to take charge of that special fund, not to go in the regular expense of the church. We expect to help our association next year out of this fund. He reports the balance on hand at each meeting. The

funds for the regular routine expense is also in the hands of the deacons. I think we are going along on the right line and that we are following the Scripture, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him." That does not mean to put it in something for your own use, but for matters that need to be attended to in the service and in the house of God. If we will do that, whenever some necessary expense should be attended to they have the money. They don't have to wait until the church meets in conference. It might be all over with by the time the church meets again. I want to charge you brethren to administer those funds, and ask God to give you wisdom that it may be done right and proper and in the right way and to the right person. In addition to that, I want to charge you that it is an obligation resting upon you as an officer in the church of God to look after, see after, to encourage, any poor little trembling child who is discouraged, and feels to be alone in the world, who may feel he is of no use anywhere, no benefit anywhere, and that he had as well stay at home. Encourage them to come to the house of the Lord. Let them know there is something here for them. Let them know that the church loves them. We are prone to get down in the valley, in doubts and fears, and feel that we are not worth anything, and that nobody cares for us, and feel' like giving up. I have been there myself, and I know what it means. Go to see them and encourage them to come out. Let them know that the church thinks of them and that there is something here for them, that they cannot get anywhere else; and if there is something in the way, hindering them, help to remove it. Maybe it is necessary to go and inform some of the other brethren and get some of them to help you remove whatever difficulty there is in the way. It is your duty to keep in touch with the membership of the church, and to know something of the attitude and feeling of the membership of the church, and thus to labor with your pastor, and help him along in the service; and when you meet together you can say that everything is all right, and that is encouraging to him, and will be encouraging to the church and good for all parties concerned. Brethren, I could talk to you for an hour longer about these things, the solemn obligation that is resting upon you, but I must quit. May God bless you, give you grace, courage and fortitude to discharge the duties of your office well, for in that you purchase to yourselves a good degree. Study God's Book that you may know its teachings, that you may be able to meet the arguments of the world against the principles that you stand upon. May the Lord bless you, is my prayer for you.

Question on Divorce

---January 15, 1942

Dear Brother Cayce: Where a wife departs from her husband and sues for a divorce, would the church of her membership (both being members) be taking right steps to prefer charges against the sister -or a brother of the same character? Please answer through The Primitive Baptist for my information and for the good of any who might be interested. I am, I hope, your brother in Christ. J. E. Chastain. R. 3, Edmond, Okla.

OUR REMARKS

It has always, so far as our knowledge extends, been against the rules of the Primitive Baptist Church for one member to go to law against another member for any cause without the consent of the church. Under this rule, if a person forsakes the companion and sues for divorce, the church should prefer a charge against that person for going to law against the other member. The church would do this, if they observe that rule. If both parties are members of the church, and they are willing to fellowship each other as members of the church, and as Christians, although

they cannot live together in peace as husband and wife, there is nothing for the church to prefer a charge against them for, so long as they continue to live single, or without another companion, and do not bring suit at law against the other. They may live alone, and fellowship each other, and still retain membership in the church. Someone might say, or think, the church would have a right to prefer a charge against them for not living together. That would not do, for the simple reason that people may have Christian love and fellowship for each other, and yet not be suitable to each other as companions, or as husband and wife. Do you not know some whom you love and esteem as Christians and as members of the church, and yet it would be horrible for you to think you had to live with them as husband and wife? C. H. C.

Messenger of Zion Bought

---February 5, 1942

It may come as a surprise to some of the Messenger of Zion subscribers, but we have bought the subscription list of that paper from Elder Ariel West, and consolidated that paper with The Primitive Baptist. The consolidation takes effect with this issue of The Primitive Baptist, and those who have been receiving the Messenger of Zion will receive The Primitive Baptist instead. Elder West will be assistant editor of The Primitive Baptist. He will be associated with us, and will make his home in Thornton. The Messenger was published only once a month, so that those of you who were taking that paper and were not taking The Primitive Baptist have been getting only one paper a month; but as this paper is published twice a month, you will now get two papers each month. Please note that this paper is dated the first and third Thursday of each month, and not the first and fifteenth days of the month. By this you may know about what time to look for your paper. Those of you who were taking both papers will get full credit on our books for the time you had paid to on either or both papers. A letter sent to the Messenger of Zion subscribers will explain this more fully. No subscriber will lose anything by this combining of the two papers. We humbly trust that this move will prove to be for the good of the cause of the Master, which we profess to love. And we trust that all those who were subscribers for the Messenger, and who worked for the extending of the circulation of that paper, will now do your very best to help in extending the circulation of The Primitive Baptist. We are aware of the fact that some of you brethren have worked faithfully for both papers, and we appreciate what you have done. We are sure that in this we also voice the sentiment of Elder West. But if we all work together now for one end and toward one purpose, perhaps we can accomplish more. May we rely on you to do your best? We believe in you, and have confidence in you, and fully believe that you will not disappoint us, or Elder West, either. Both Elder West and the writer will be disappointed if we do not have your full co-operation now in our earnest effort to labor for what we both feel is for the good of the cause of our Lord. As stated above, Elder West is moving to Thornton, and will be associated with us as assistant editor, and will have an interest in the paper. We humbly pray that the move we are making in this matter will prove to be for the good of our beloved Zion. We have been with Elder West quite a lot during the past year or so, and we have freely exchanged views with each other as to what we understand to be the teachings of the Bible in both doctrine and practice, and as touching the order of God's house. If there is a matter upon which we do not agree, or which we do not see and understand alike, we do not recall it. This being a fact, all our readers may be assured of the fact that the policy of The Primitive Baptist will not be changed, but that the paper will still be

published along the same lines that it has been for the past fifty-six years, even from the first issue on January 1, 1886, by our sainted father. The writer will still have editorial management and control of the paper, but will have the assistance of Elder West. And we are trusting that this assistance will be of help to your editor, who is now growing old and needs more rest than he once did. Besides this, Elder West being now associated with us as assistant editor, he will get some experience, in addition to what he has obtained since he began editing and publishing the Messenger, which may be of help to him in carrying on the editorial work of The Primitive Baptist, when we can no longer do the work-if that work should fall upon him. Many and various things were thought over and considered, and we tried to pray over the matter, before we took the step we have here announced. May we have an interest in your prayers? And may we have your help in every way that you can help? We would be glad to hear from each one of you, especially those who were subscribers for the Messenger; and may heaven's rich blessings rest upon each one, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Corresponding Editors

---February 5, 1942

In taking over the subscription list of the Messenger of Zion we do not take over the editorial staff. There would be several reasons for not doing so, of course. It might not suit them for us to do so. They might not desire to be on the editorial staff of The Primitive Baptist. And as Elder West is to be associated with us as assistant editor, it may not suit those who have been on our editorial staff to continue under the new set-up. We have not been in a position to consult with them in regard to the change we have made in taking over the Messenger. After trying to carefully and prayerfully consider the matter we have decided, just as we are ready to go to press with this paper, that the best course to pursue right now is to remove all corresponding editors and start all over again with a clean slate in the new set-up-start "from scratch." We humbly trust that not one of those who have been associated with us as a corresponding editor will feel that we have not treated them with due respect in taking this step, for we are not meaning the least disrespect toward a single one of them. Our association with them has been pleasant and delightful on our part. We trust that they will continue to write for the paper, and we hope they will also take an interest in working to extend the circulation. Some have written very little, and some have done very little in the way of sending subscriptions to us. Others have written for the paper, and some have done good work in sending subscriptions. We appreciate what each one has done, and pray God's richest blessings to rest upon each one and upon the labors of each one. We trust we may meet each one again some day. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon you; and please pray the Lord to direct us aright, and to give us grace and strength to walk therein. C. H. C.

Receiving the Word

---February 5, 1942

A brother has written us and requested that we write on receiving the Word. He says a preacher told him that receiving the Word was a condition on the one receiving it. We are sure that preacher has sometimes received word of something, or concerning something, which he did not want to receive. Why did he not refuse to receive it, and not do so, according to his free-will doctrine? A man receiving the word of a thing is absolutely passive in receiving the word, or news, of the thing. If

one is passive in receiving a thing, then it ceases to be a condition on the part of the one receiving it. Performing a condition, or complying with a condition, requires activity on the part of the one performing or complying with the condition. If the preacher knows anything about grammar, as he claimed to know, he knows this is a fact; and if he is an honest man, he will admit it. How can the unregenerate sinner receive the word, or receive the gospel, since Paul has said **{(I Corinthians 2:14)}** "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned?" How can he receive them, since he cannot know them? If this is a condition which he must perform in order to receive eternal life, and he cannot perform the condition, how could he ever receive eternal life? This would forever close heaven's doors to the last one of all the race of Adam-unless they do that which they cannot do; or unless they perform that which they cannot perform. Poor preacher! He is trying to get people to do what God's Book says they cannot do, thinking they will get to heaven by doing that which inspiration says they cannot do! Poor preacher! He sure has a hard job on hand-trying to get people to do the impossible thing. C. H. C.

John 11:48

---February 5, 1942

We have been requested to give our views on **(John 11:48)**, which reads: "If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation." This is recorded just following the account given of the raising of Lazarus from the tomb, and how that many believed on Him. The chief priests and the Pharisees desired to put Him to death, because they hated Him-not because He had done them any injury or harm. In verse 47 they said, "He doeth many miracles." The miracles which He performed proved that He was divine and from heaven. The more people who believed on Him, the more they were angered, and the more they desired to put Him to death. But though they did finally crucify Him, yet they did not put an end to His people believing on Him. Those wicked people were fearful that He would become a king over national Israel, and that they would lose their job. They did not know that His kingdom was not, and is not, of this world. It is a spiritual kingdom, and is not a natural kingdom. C. H. C.

Luke 2:52

---February 5, 1942

We have been requested to write some on this text, and the question was asked, "Just why the expression, 'In favor with God?'" The verse reads: "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." Remember that Jesus was verily man, as well as God. He was both man and God. As man He increased in wisdom; as God, He never learned anything. As man, He grew in stature, as other people do who are born into this world. Being both God and man, as man He grew in favor with God-God's blessings were showered upon Him, and it was manifested, from time to time, that He had the favor of His Father. This was shown by Him being enabled to, and blessed to, perform the miracles which He performed. More and more the love of the Father was manifested as resting upon Him; and more and more people were brought to love and adore Him and to follow Him. C. H. C.

Unconditional Election

---February 19, 1942

A brother has written us that he has always believed that one of the fundamental principles upon which Primitive Baptists base their faith is God's unconditional election. He says there are some who believe and are beginning to preach that it was God's foreknowledge of the faithfulness and good works He foresaw in the elect, rather than in the non-elect, induced Him to make the choice. He says they use **((Pet 1:2) (I Peter 1:2) and (John 6:29)** as proof texts. He asks, "Can these Scriptures or any others be so construed?" We do not know who it is in our ranks that believe such as this. It is Fullerism, pure and simple. It is the doctrine preached and advocated by the rank and file of the Missionary so-called Baptists. It is not the doctrine of the Primitive Baptists, and never has been. That doctrine denies every principle of grace in salvation, and makes the salvation of the sinner depend upon righteous works done by him. Let us look at **((Pet 1:2) (I Peter 1:2)** "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied." The elect means the body of persons chosen of God for salvation. They were chosen according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, and this was through the sanctifying work of the Spirit, and was unto the obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. It was that they might be made partakers of the benefits of the obedience and blood of Jesus. They are made partakers of the benefits of the obedience and blood of Jesus because the Father made choice of them to that end. If the Father made choice of them, elected them, because of a foreseen good thing they would do, then they are not made the beneficiaries of the obedience and blood of Jesus because God made choice of them to that end, but because of the good thing God saw that they would do. The other text referred to **{(John 6:29)}** reads, "Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." Suppose it be true that one does the work of God in believing on the Son of God, does that prove that one is embraced among the elect of God because God knew he would believe? If one is embraced among the elect because God foreknew that he would believe, and the elect are all saved, and none are saved, but the elect, then they are not saved because God elected them to salvation, or because God chose them to salvation; but they are saved because they do what God foresaw they would do. This not only makes their election to be based on their doing, but it makes the whole of their salvation to be based on what they do. Hence, it destroys the very idea of grace in their salvation; it is a flagrant denial of the doctrine of salvation by grace. But the Saviour meant to teach no such idea in **(John 6:29)**. Let us look at **(Ephesians 1:18-20)** in connection with the text above: "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of His calling, and what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power, which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him on His right hand in heavenly places." Paul here having told the truth about the matter, it follows that it is by the working of the same mighty and divine power in the heart of the sinner which was wrought in the body of the Christ when He was raised from the dead that one believes in Him. This being true, is just as the Saviour taught in the above reference, that it is by the working of the divine power of God in the heart that a

poor sinner believes in Him. This all being true, it is preposterous to say that the sinner was elected because God foresaw that he would believe. It is the height of folly to say that the sinner was elected to salvation because God foresaw he would do anything-believe, or do anything else. The truth of the matter is that God made choice of the sinner, and then, in time, according to, and in harmony with, and because of, that election He works in the heart of that chosen sinner and causes him to believe in Jesus, from an experimental knowledge of Him, as his Saviour. Thus the salvation of the sinner is all of grace; his election (being embraced in the number of the elect) is of grace; it was of grace that God made choice of him; it was a matter of grace that God predestinated that same sinner to be conformed to the image of Jesus; it is grace that this same sinner is regenerated, born of God, born from above; it is a matter of grace that this same sinner is preserved in Jesus Christ, kept by the power of God unto eternal glory; it is a matter of grace that Jesus shed His precious blood for him, and thereby redeemed him all the way to God; it is a matter of grace that when the body of this unregenerated sinner dies a natural or physical death, his soul or spirit will go to God who gave it, and will be permitted to rest in the presence of the Lord until Jesus comes back to this earth again to raise the sleeping bodies of His saints; it is a matter of grace that the body of this saved sinner will be raised from the dead and made spiritual and fashioned like the body of his blessed Redeemer; it is a matter of grace that then all the redeemed family will be taken into the presence of the Lord, and will be glorified, and by grace permitted to eternally live with Him in unsullied bliss and eternal glory. It is "grace for grace" -" grace upon grace." This is all of grace -not a mixture of grace and works. We might go on and on showing that the Lord did not choose sinners to eternal salvation because of what was foreseen as good in them. God looked down one time upon the children of men, and none of them did good when He looked that time. Did He take another look? If so, where is it so recorded? Where did you get your information? If you have such information, you must be "wise above what is written." We say this in kindness, but it is true. If one (among us is advocating such a doctrine, we would kindly admonish such a one to quit it at once; and we will say, also kindly, that if you refuse to do so, the church should admonish you as many as two times, and if you do not then quit it at once they would be obeying the divine injunction to withdraw fellowship from you. May the Lord add His blessing. C. H. C.

Ishmaelites

---March 5, 1942

In the so-called Apostolic Times, published in Nashville, Tenn., by one self-opinionated James A. Allen, who is a typical Campbellite preacher, the gentleman takes it upon himself to copy a few extracts from an experience written by one of the Lord's humble followers and published in our columns some time since and to comment on the same. Such effusions as the writer put out, we consider to be unworthy of notice, and we would not notice the same were it not a fact that we have been requested to do so. Such blatant mockery and evident stooping beneath the dignity of one professing to be a Christian, much less one professing to be a minister of the gospel, is not worthy the notice of people professing to be respectable, to say nothing of the dignity of Christianity. Who would expect a "water-soaked" Campbellite preacher to know anything about an experience of grace, or to have any experimental knowledge of the Lord's dealings? Who would, or could, expect anything else than that an Ishmaelite would mock? The Campbellite church was born out of wedlock. Alexander Campbell is their

ecclesiastical daddy, for he is the founder of the sect. He carried with him on a trip abroad a letter of introduction written by Henry Clay, in which Mr. Clay said: "Dr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his successful devotion to the education of youth, for his piety and as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States." -Memoires of Alexander Campbell, by Robert Richardson, Vol. 2, page 548. Alexander Campbell acknowledged the statement to be true, that he was the head and founder of this sect, by taking this letter with him on his journey. Campbell acknowledged, and plainly stated, that his movement was a project. He said: "None of us who got up or sustained that project was then aware of what havoc that said principle, if faithfully applied, would have made of our views and practices on various favorite points." - Preface to Christian System, by Campbell, Jan. 2, 1835. Not only did Campbell admit in this that his movement was a project, but it is an admission that he had changed in his views on various points. He and several others formed themselves into a so-called church at Brush Run, Washington County, Pa., on May 4, 1811. On June 12, 1812, Alexander Campbell and several other members of his congregation were baptized by Elder Matthias Luce, a Baptist minister. In 1813 he and his church united with the Redstone Baptist Association, upon a written statement of their principles-a "confession of faith." Opposition arose in the Redstone Association to the new ideas and doctrines which he began to preach among them, so he left that association and united with the Washington Association in the Western Reserve of Ohio in 1823. In 1827 the Baptist Churches withdrew fellowship from him and his followers. In an article furnished by Mr. Campbell for the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, after telling of the Baptists withdrawing fellowship from them, he says: "Thus by constraint, not of choice, they were obliged to form societies out of those communities that split upon the ground of adherence to the apostles' doctrine." Thus, we see clearly and plainly the origin of the Campbellites. They are no more the church of Christ than the Catholics are. The Catholics are several centuries older than the Campbellites. The Campbellite so-called church is a sect born after the flesh, just as Ishmael was born after the flesh. Ishmael was a mocker, and was born out of wedlock, being a son of Hagar. Sarah got uneasy about the promise of God being fulfilled, and gave Hagar, her handmaid, to Abraham. The result of this coming together of Abraham and Hagar was the birth of Ishmael, a mocker. The Campbellite church is far too young for Christ to be the husband. As He is not the husband, she is a woman without a husband, and the desolate hath many more children than the married wife. The man who makes sport of an experimental knowledge of the Lord only manifests the fact that he does not have such experimental knowledge and that he knows nothing about it. We pity him in his lost state- lost to a true knowledge of God; and we pity him in his dark ignorance of the truth and the true teachings of God's Book. C. H. C.

What School?

---March 5, 1942

We often hear the question asked, "What school are you attending?" Upon the answer we can formulate an idea as to what that special individual is interested in. For, usually, one studies or devotes more time to those things he is especially interested in. This is true in natural things. How about spiritual things? A few months ago, Elder Clevenger wrote a series of articles on "The Lord is my Shepherd." The articles were published in The Primitive Baptist. How comforting! How beautiful! A few times in life I have felt that the Lord was my Shepherd. I

feasted upon those articles. Where did Elder Clevenger get such beautiful thoughts? What school did he attend? Have I gone to the same school? Can we sing the same Alma Mater? In looking through some old copies of Zion's Advocate, I came across an article written by Elder J. R. Daily, in 1898. The article is "The Lord is my Shepherd." Did Elder Clevenger and Elder Daily attend the same school? Have you and I attended the same school? Elder Daily's article will be in the March issue of For The Poor. If you are not a subscriber to For The Poor, subscribe now and compare these articles and see if you have attended the same school? Mrs. C. H. Cayce.

May Be Too Late

---March 19, 1942

We expect, if not providentially prevented, to get the next issue of The Primitive Baptist printed a week ahead of time. The next issue will be dated April 2. The regular time for printing it would be Monday, March 30, and the regular time for putting it in the post office would be Wednesday, April 1. But in order to get that issue of the paper off the press to make way for other work we need to do on the press, we expect to print that issue of the paper on Monday, March 23, but it will not be mailed out until the regular time, April 1. As we expect to print the paper a week ahead of time, it will be necessary for any notice needing to appear in that issue to be sent to us at least a week earlier than would otherwise be necessary. If you have any appointments or other notices you want in that issue of the paper, remember that you must hurry them to us in order to get them in that paper. Please bear in mind the following facts, always, not only in this case, but always: On account of the Federal labor law, we work our employes only five days a week. We do not work them on Saturdays. Hence, when a paper is due to come out on the following Thursday, the last type set for that paper is on the Friday before, and the type is made up and made ready to put on the press Monday morning, and the press runs on Monday. Hence, in order to get a notice in the paper it is necessary for it to get to us on Thursday, just one week before the date of the paper. Sometimes we do delay the running of the press on Monday morning in order to get something of importance in that issue, but that entails extra expense, and we are having to eliminate that expense. So, remember that anything reaching us later than Friday before the day of going to press will not get in that issue-it will be too late. In this case-the next issue-matters reaching us later than March 20 will be too late for next issue-April 2. C. H. C.

Church News

---March 19, 1942

By request of the brethren involved in a disturbance in Antioch Church, Birmingham, Ala., and the other churches in the Wetumpka Association, a meeting was held at New Harmony Church, Lomax, Ala., for the purpose of investigating and adjusting the trouble between them. Elders J. A. Monsees, Atlanta, Ga.; J. R. Wilson, Martinsville, Va.; J. W. Hardwick, Booneville, Miss.; W. A. Shutt, Nashville, Tenn.; S. W. Etheredge, Ozark, Ala.; B. F. House, Phenix City, Ala., and the writer were requested to serve as a committee to hear the evidence and to make recommendations to them whereby they might come together in peace. The committee heard all the evidence, the meeting continuing through Friday, January 23, to Monday, January 26. On Monday the recommendations were read twice in the open meeting and unanimously approved by all present. On the third Sunday in

February, in accordance with the recommendations, all who were members of Antioch Church when the trouble started met together at the place where they have always held their meetings, and unanimously adopted the recommendations, thereby all confessing and forgiving all wrongs, and came together in a meeting of joy. We are glad the trouble is adjusted, and trust they will journey together in peace in that section. According to the recommendations there will be but one Wetumpka Association held this year, which will be at the Coosa River Church at the regular time, as was agreed in 1940 before the trouble came up. This will be the one hundredth session of the association. At the meeting at Antioch, just mentioned, a brother was restored who had been out of the church for some few years. May the Lord be praised for His mercy, and may He bless these good people. C. H. C.

Eternal Punishment

May 7, 1942

On January 26 to 28 inclusive a meeting was held at New Harmony Church, Lomax, Ala., to investigate and adjust differences which had caused trouble in the Wetumpka Association. Elders J. A. Monsees, J. R. Wilson, J. W. Hardwick, W. A. Shutt, S. W. Ether-edge, B. F. House and C. H. Cayce composed the committee of investigation. The recommendations of the committee were unanimously approved in the meeting, and the adoption of the same by the churches resulted in a burial of the trouble and all coming together and peace being restored. They are all again united in peace and fellowship. An account of this was given by us in our issue of March 19. On a point of doctrine the following was in the recommendations of the committee, and we believe the same should have careful reading and study by our readers. Hence we reproduce the same for the benefit of the readers. C. H. C.

ON A POINT OF DOCTRINE

Now, as to the doctrine, permit us to say that the doctrine that there is no such thing as eternal torment, or eternal punishment, for the wicked after this life is not Primitive Baptist doctrine, and never has been. If that doctrine is true, then the Primitive Baptists, as a body, have always been wrong; and if they have always been wrong, then the Primitive Baptist Church is not the church of Christ, and never has been. There are some passages of Scripture which have always been relied on by Primitive Baptists to prove the doctrine that there is an eternal punishment for the wicked beyond this life. If those Scriptures do not prove what they, as a body, have always said they do, then the Primitive Baptists have been wrong all the while; and if this be true, then again they are not the church of Christ. But they have not been wrong all along the line, and the Primitive Baptist Church is the church of Christ. To prove the doctrine that there is an eternal punishment they have always relied upon such passages as **((5) (Acts 24:15); (17:31); (John 5:28-29); (Matthew 25:31-46); (Revelation 20:12-15); and (Revelation 20:10)**, besides other Scriptures along the same line. Remember that there cannot possibly be any such thing as torment, punishment, or suffering without conscious existence. Remember, too, that there is such a thing as always dying; that is, never ceasing to die. The very primary meaning of the penalty of the law God gave to Adam had that very idea in it. Our translation says, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The literal meaning of that expression in the original is that "dying thou shalt die." That is, always dying, or never ceasing to die. That very penalty can mean nothing short of eternal or

endless suffering of death. The Scripture recorded in **(Matthew 25:31-40)** most clearly and positively teaches this doctrine. In that place the blessed Master uses the sheep and the goats as representing the two classes. One class He calls His sheep. Did the Saviour know what to use to show His teaching? Would He use the sheep and goats to represent two classes if sheep and goats are all one class, the only difference being that one class was His disobedient children and the other class being His obedient children? If they were all children of God, and this was the only difference, then He did not lay down His life for His disobedient children, for He said, "I lay down my life for the sheep," and "The good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep." To say that the goats were His people in disobedience is to deny that He laid down His life for them. If He did not lay down His life for them, then there is no salvation for them. This would involve the idea of final apostasy. If the sheep and the goats are the same people, only one being obedient and the other disobedient, why did the Saviour use two different words-one word, the goats, and the other word, the sheep? These two words which the Saviour used are entirely different words and are in no way related. Would the Saviour use two words, which are in no way related to each other, if they were all His children? If the Saviour made no mistake in using two words which are in no way related, then does it not follow as an inevitable conclusion that the goats and the sheep are in no way related in a spiritual point of view? It is bound to be Scripturally and inevitably true that the goats and the sheep are two different classes. This is also true from a true scientific standpoint. Things of the same species can be crossed; but there are impassable gulfs between species, so that it is impossible to cross different species. Different species may have some things in common, but they will not cross. Goats and sheep will not cross, for the simple reason that they are different species in the lower animal kingdom. The Saviour said, in verse 41, that He would say to those on the left hand, the goats, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Everlasting is translated from the same word which is used throughout the New Testament in describing the life of the righteous as being an endless, or eternal, life. The same thing is true in verse 46. The same word translated everlasting is the word translated eternal. If one is endless, so is the other endless. There cannot possibly be anything else true in the matter. The Primitive Baptists have been right in this all along the line, and it is the true church of Christ. Whatever may have been your understanding, or misunderstanding, of each other during and in the confusion which has been among you, we humbly beg you to accept these truths, and let this be the end of the matter. It is no comfort to us that the Scriptures teach, or to believe, that there is such a thing as eternal punishment beyond this life; but it is a great comfort and consolation to us to believe that Jesus has saved us, and will save us, from that eternal punishment.

For Our Boys

May 7, 1942

We are sure that many of our boys are in the service of our country who would be glad to get The Primitive Baptist. It is being sent to a few. Many county newspapers are being sent free to the boys in the army from the communities where those papers are published. In that way the boys get news from their home communities. We are sure there are not a few who are in the service who would be glad to get news from their brethren and sisters in the Lord. We appreciate those boys who are in the service. We appreciate the great sacrifices we know they have to make. We are sure they need the comfort and consolation and encouragement they may be able to get. As our heart goes out to them, we desire to be all the help to them that we can. To this end we ask our readers to send us the name and address of any of

the boys who are dear to you, and that you think would appreciate reading this paper, and we will gladly put their names on our list and send The Primitive Baptist to them for the duration of the war, or as long as we can do so. This is a free service we desire to render for those boys. If your boy is in the service, and if he would appreciate reading this paper, send us his name and address, and we will be glad to send the paper to him. May God bless and keep those dear boys, and comfort the hearts of the dear fathers and mothers, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Romans 8:8-10

---May 21, 1942

A brother has asked us to write our views on **(Romans 8:8-10)** and **(Matthew 9:17)**. We wrote an article on **(Matthew 9:17)**, which was published in our issue of September 19, 1935, and may be found on page 131 of Volume 6 of our Editorial Writings. An article on the same subject, but in connection with **((21) (Mark 2:21)**, may be found on page 181 of Volume 1, and was in The Primitive Baptist of May 14, 1907. It is not necessary to take space to write on this again. You can get what we had to say on that subject from either of these books, especially Volume 6. We will try to write a little on the text in Romans, which reads as follows: So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. To be in the flesh, in the sense of this text, is to be in an unregenerate state. One who has not been born from above is in the flesh, in the sense of this text. If one has been born from above, that one has the Spirit of God dwelling in him, and he is then not in the flesh. That is, one who has the Spirit of God dwelling in him is not in the flesh. When the Spirit of God takes up His abode in the heart of a poor sinner, then that person is no longer in the flesh, but in the Spirit. "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." - **(I John 5:12)**. That one who has been born again, born from above, who has the Spirit of God dwelling in him, can please God-can do something other folks cannot do. They have been capacitated to render acceptable service to God. They have been brought into the spiritual realm and are thereby capacitated to do spiritual works. Spiritual works are such things that the Lord has commanded to be done in the spiritual realm, and it is pleasing to the Lord for them to do the things which He has commanded. Without the Spirit of God it is impossible for one to please God, for "they that are in the flesh cannot please God." If those who are in the flesh cannot please God, then what can they do in order to be born again, or in order to become children of God? Who can tell us about what time one can do that which he cannot do? If one cannot do a certain thing, is it not impossible for him to do that thing? When will, or when can, one do that which is impossible for him to do? If the unregenerate sinner, one who has not the Spirit, must do something pleasing to God in order that he be born again, or in order that he enter heaven, is it not a fact that heaven's door would be forever closed against the whole race of Adam? Does it not look like it is a hard doctrine to teach that one must do that which he cannot do in order to become a child of God? What could possibly be a harder doctrine than that? Are you not glad this is not the doctrine of the Bible? "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." In this statement the apostle affirms the negative side of the question. "He is none of His" simply means that he is not one of His. He has not been brought into divine relationship with Him; he has not been born into the

heavenly family. The other side of the question, the affirmative side of the question, would necessarily be, "If any man have the Spirit of Christ, he is one of His." He has been brought into divine relationship with Him; he has been born from above; he has been born into the spiritual realm; he has been born of God; he has been raised up out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ Jesus. He has been capacitated to do that which he could not do before; he has been capacitated to do that which is pleasing to God; he can now please God, by doing the things which God has commanded to be done in the spiritual realm. He now has the Spirit of Christ dwelling in him. "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin." If means "in case that; granting, allowing, or supposing that; -introducing a condition or supposition." -Webster. Hence, "in case that Christ be in you, the body is dead." Then, in case Christ is not in you, what then? If the apostle meant that "if Christ be in you, the body is dead in sin," then the body is not dead in sin if Christ is not in you. To be dead because of sin and to be dead in sin are two different things entirely. To be dead in sin is one thing, and to be dead because of sin is another thing. Jesus was once dead because of sin, but He was never dead in sin. He died for our sins-He died because of our sins, and to make satisfaction for our sins; but He never did die in sins-He was never dead in sins. Neither does the apostle teach any such thing as that the body is dead to sin. There are two things the apostle brings to attention here-one of those things concerns the body and the other concerns the spirit. If he means to teach that the body is dead to sin- apart from the spirit-then the spirit is not dead to sin. There is one thing brought out concerning the body and another thing concerning the spirit. What are they? The true literal meaning of the apostle's teaching in this text is that "If Christ be in you, though the body dies on account of sin, yet the spirit lives on account of righteousness." This text is an everlasting death knell to the soul sleeping doctrine. But the apostle does tell us, in **(Romans 6:11)** "Likewise reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." That one who has the Spirit of Christ dwelling in him, that one who has been brought into divine relationship with God, has been killed to the love of sin, and is, therefore, dead to sin. Yet, although he is dead to sin, the body is still mortal and corrupt and subject to physical death, and will die that physical death, and will return to dust from whence it came. Although the mortal body, the physical body, of the child of God does die, and goes to dust, yet the spirit does not die. The body dies on account of sin; but the spirit lives on account of righteousness-righteousness of Christ. The spirit (or soul) goes to God who gave it, and continues to live as a conscious entity in the presence of God and His Christ, where it will remain until Jesus comes back to this earth again to raise these bodies from the grave. He will raise their bodies again, and they will be changed, and made spiritual, and the child of God will then, in soul, body and spirit, be given to dwell with the Lord, and be like Him, and sing perfect praise to Him, in all the ages of a never ending eternity. May this be the happy lot of the reader, is our humble prayer, for Jesus' sake. C. H. C.

All Alike

---May 21, 1942

In our debate with Mr. Srygley in Nashville, Tenn., in 1911 we said that there are two kinds of sinners -saved sinners and unsaved sinners. We believed that then, and we believe that yet. So far as we know, there was no Primitive Baptist who objected to that then. We never heard of one objecting to that then. Unsaved sinners are all sinners alike by nature. Unsaved sinners are unregenerated sinners,

and all un-regenerated sinners are unsaved sinners, and they are all alike by nature. "And were by nature children of wrath, even as others." -(Ephesians 2:3). While in an unregenerate state they were just like all others by nature. The nature they possess while in an unregenerate state, and the only nature they possess, is a nature that is poisoned with sin. All men in an unregenerate state have that same nature. They receive that nature by inheritance in the natural birth. They all spring from the same source-from the same parentage. In generation and birth, the thing generated and born receives the same nature and life of the parent. The first parent of the human race transgressed God's law; and when he did that, the nature and life which he had became poisoned and contaminated with sin. All his posterity, springing from him, and being reproduced from him, are born into this world with the same poisoned life and nature which he had. His children are bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. They are only Adam multiplied. Hence, they all have the same poisoned life and nature which he had. It is, therefore, necessarily true that, so far as nature and life are concerned, they are all alike. There is no difference, so far as nature and life are concerned. It is true that on account of different environments, different training and restraints, they do not all practice sin and wickedness to the same extent. They are not all alike so far as activity is concerned; but they are all alike by nature; they all have the same nature. One crabapple tree may bear more apples than another, but every crabapple tree is of the same nature as all the other crabapple trees. And no crabapple tree bears sweet crabapples. The crabapple tree bears crabapples because it is a crabapple tree. It does not bear crabapples in order to become a crabapple tree. No amount of training or cultivation will change that tree and cause it to bear sweet apples. This is not brought about by training or cultivation. The tree must receive another nature before it can ever bear any other fruit than crabapples. Transplanting the tree in the orchard with sweet apples will not bring about that necessary change. A higher power must act sovereignly upon that tree in giving it another nature; and with the crabapple tree this is done by grafting. The sweet apple bud is grafted into the old stock. Then that tree may bear sweet apples. The sweet apples spring from the sweet apple nature which has been grafted in, or imparted to it. The tree must first be made good in order that it bring forth good fruit. And remember that without this change being wrought all crabapple trees are alike by nature. When the Lord placed Adam in the garden of Eden He gave him a law, which law said, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." -(Genesis 2:16-17). The real literal meaning of the expression, "thou shalt surely die," is "dying thou shalt die," which means always dying. That is "thou shalt be always dying." This was the penalty of the law. As all the race of Adam are simply Adam multiplied, this is the condition of the whole race as they stand related to Adam and under the law. They are all alike in this respect. The only difference is what grace makes. By the mercy and grace of God, and by His own divine power, He takes some out of that deplorable and lost and dying condition, and gives them a higher order of life, brings them into divine relationship with Himself, and prepares them to live eternally with Him in glory. May the Lord bless these thoughts to the comfort of some poor reader, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

From A Soldier Boy

---May 21, 1942

Elder C. H. Cayce:

I guess you will be surprised to hear from such a poor worm of the dust as I feel to be. I have been thinking about writing to you ever since I have been over here, but have just gotten to it. I received your paper one day this week, which was very highly appreciated. I have read nearly all of the paper, and certainly did enjoy it. I was surprised to hear that you and Elder West had gone together in the interest of the cause through one paper. I certainly hope you can be as successful together as you were when separated (separated in publishing two papers, he means. -C. H. C.) Two great men as I feel you both to be should be able to do great things in the interest of one cause, with the help of our Maker. When I left the U. S. I did not think I would be able to get the reading matter from you that I have always enjoyed. Since I have been able to read I have been reading your wonderful paper, and rejoicing in the fact that such a weak person as I could say that he had some of the same thoughts pass through his mind that were revealed through your paper. I do not remember when I first began loving those great principles, but I have loved them ever since I can remember. I have learned to appreciate and respect them more and more as I have grown older. I have not been able to learn half as much about them as I would liked to have done. I hope some day to be where I can get more of the joys out of the good old Book that I love so well today. It seems since I have gotten away off over here that I am alone in the world, with no church of my belief, that I know of, to visit. I certainly would love to hear some of you able ministers back there deliver a sermon again. I wish I was able to put in words my feelings, but I don't suppose it is intended for me to have that ability. I wonder, most of the time, can a person be a child of God without having an experience of grace, or experiences as I have heard told when I was sitting around listening to you older people talk. I have often wished I could have a proof like I have heard told. I know I love the truth in my mind, but whether it is of the Lord or of the teaching I have always received. I hope it is of the Lord. I have tried to believe otherwise, but I just can't see that there is any possible way that it can be any way except "as it is written." Why people get all mixed up on the truth is a mystery. I am writing you this because I have confidence in you. There are things in this letter that I have never mentioned to anyone-not even to my most beloved wife. I don't guess I would have written them to you, but they have been bearing on my mind, and I thought maybe I could relieve it by writing to someone. Please excuse me for taking up so much of your valuable time, but if you can find it in your prayers to pray for me, please do so. And write to rue if you have time. A letter from you would be highly appreciated by this humble body. Your friend in the Lord, I hope, Warren Etheredge. My address is Pvt. Samuel W. Etheredge, Co. B, Armored Force, Schofield Barracks, T. H.

Remarks-

We have written a private letter to this dear boy. He has been taught in the school of grace. We have taken liberty of giving this letter to our readers. We are sure he would enjoy reading a letter from any of you brethren who may feel a desire to write to him. May heaven's richest blessings rest upon the dear boy, and may he be brought safe home to his wife and loved ones, is our humble prayer. And may God grant that his service in defense of our country may not be in vain, and may our religious freedom be continued for him and his children and our grandchildren to enjoy, is our-humble prayer. C. H. C.

Recent Survey

---June 4, 1942

The Religious News Service has recently made a survey of the religious press. They sent questionnaires to editors of religious publications and others connected with the

work. The questionnaires were sent to thirty-three representative national church magazines. The survey reveals some interesting matters. Very few are self-sustaining, and many are largely supported by subsidies from churches and others—that is, by donations and help from other sources than the income from subscriptions and advertising. The survey was made by Kennet W. Underwood, Yale Divinity School student. This survey only shows the fact again that very few religious publications are self-supporting. Most all of them must have help from some other source than their subscriptions in order to stay in the field. Church papers have a “hard row” to weed in order to stay in the field. Loking this fact in the face, we feel to thank the Lord, to take courage, and to feel that the Lord has been good to us. The Primitive Baptist is self-sustaining, and the only income is from the subscriptions. We have only two advertisements in our columns that pay—the others are free, to help our brethren or some poor widow, and to aid in the distribution of good religious literature. In 1941 we received only \$69.75 for advertising. That amount does not go very far in paying the cost of getting the pajper out. Although the paper is self-sustaining, yet the subscription list is not what it should be. We should have twice as many subscribers on our list as we do have. It is by the very strictest economy and cutting out every expense possible that we make the subscriptions pay the cost of publication, and by the members of our own family working hard, often late at night, in order to save expenses. Our wife works in the office, and makes a “full hand,” whether we are away or at home. Often we both work late at night to keep the work going. But the Lord has been good to us, and we trust we feel thankful to Him and to our loyal subscribers. May the Lord bless each one of our subscribers, and may He help us to publish His truth in our pages, that the same may be of spiritual benefit and help to each one. Will you pray for us, to this end? C. H. C.

We Will Do Thee Good

---June 18, 1942

And Moses said unto Hobab, the son of Raguel the Midianite, Moses' father-in-law, We are journeying unto the place of which the Lord said, I will give it you: come thou with us, and we will do thee good: for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel.--(Num 10:29) (Numbers 10:29). This language was spoken by Moses while the children of Israel were in the wilderness as they were journeying to the land of Canaan, the land which the Lord said He would give to Abraham and his seed after him. “And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land.” -(Genesis 12:7). “For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever.” -(Genesis 13:15). This land was a goodly land. “And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey.” - **(Exodus 3:8,17)**. The Lord gave this land unto Abraham and to his seed after him for an everlasting possession. The land belonged to the Jews, the Israelites. It was theirs by gift and by birth. But though it was theirs by gift and by birth, it was necessary that they obey the Lord, keep His statutes and His ordinances, in order that they be permitted to enjoy the blessings of the land. They had to do what God said do in order to eat of the milk and the honey. The milk and the honey is the glory of the land. The blessings of the land were in that land, not in another place. In the land were vineyards which they did not plant. The fruits of the vineyards were to be had no other place, only in that land. They had to go over Jordan and enter into that land in order to eat the fruits of the vineyards. The Lord

commanded them to cross over Jordan and to take possession of the land which the Lord had given them. So, they had to do what the Lord said do in order to have and to enjoy the blessings and fruits of the land, which were in the land. This land cannot, or could not, represent heaven, for no one enters heaven by doing something. Poor sinners are saved in heaven by what Jesus has done for them; this is all of grace and mercy, and is wholly the work of the Lord; but they entered into the land of Canaan and enjoyed the fruits of the land-not in order to become Israelites, or in order to become children of God, but in order to enjoy the blessings of the land. They were already children of God, as a nation. The Lord had made choice of them, and brought them out of Egypt. He had made choice of them, to put His name among them. Then He gave them the land of Canaan as a delightful place for them to live and serve Him and glorify Him. But they rebelled and served idols, and the chastening rod was laid upon them. Yet they are still His people. "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." - **((Sam 15:22) (I Samuel 15:22))** "Come thou with us, and we will do thee good." In order that the little child of God enjoy this good it is necessary to "come with us." True, there are trials and conflicts met with along the way in the service of the Lord, in traveling the way He directs; yet there are sweet and precious promises also met with along the way, and they are not to be enjoyed elsewhere. They are worth more than the whole world combined. "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer afflictions with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompence of the reward." -Hebrews xi. 24-26. Turn to your Book and read the context. Here is a reward which is worth more than all the treasures of this poor world. Heaven is not a reward, but an inheritance, and is all of grace; but here is a joy and a richness in the service of the Lord. "Come thou with us." We have rich things that the world knows not of. "We will do thee good." You need the company and association and fellowship of the Lord's little children, His humble followers. Come and cast your lot with us, and "we will do thee good." We cannot do thee such good until and unless you come with us. For almost fifty-three years we have been with the Lord's humble poor in His kingdom, the antitype of the land of Canaan, and they have done us good- more good than we are able to tell, or ever will be able to tell. True, there have been trials and conflicts along the way; but, with all that, they have done us so much good that we have no desire to turn away from going with them. "Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God: where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried: the Lord do so to me, and more also, if ought but death part thee and me." -((Ruth 1:16) (Ruth 1:16-17). If they will bear with us, in our weaknesses and imperfections and shortcomings, we shall stay with them the few remaining days we have allotted to us to remain in this world of troubles and distresses. We have already lived out our allotted "three score years and ten," and one more beside-now living on what is called "borrowed time." Perhaps the "borrowed years" will not be very many, and it will not be many years for them to bear our mistakes and shortcomings. They have done us good all these years. "The Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel." May His richest blessings rest upon the reader, is our humble prayer; and will you pray the Lord to keep us what few days we yet have to stay here? C. H. C.

A Stranger

---June 18, 1942

My Dear Mr. Cayce:

It seems to me I want to talk to someone of your belief, as I do not live close to a Primitive Baptist Church. I have what I think to be one of the strangest cases of anyone on this old earth. First of all I want to tell you I was reared by Primitive Baptist parents, and very well remember seeing both of them baptized. I remember the good old days when we would go to the church once a month and listen to different ones preach, and would look forward to the coming of some visiting preacher that was to be at the old church at a certain time. In my early youth when I would sit and listen to these men preach I decided that the doctrine they preached was the only one that would reach my case. I would read every text they would have and follow their discourse as best I could; and would go and hear other denominations preach, and they would preach so different it would make me think more of the Primitive Baptists. My parents have been gone from this world for a good many years, but they both lived and died as strong in that faith as they could, and would not have anything to do with that which did not sound according to the Bible. I would enjoy hearing them, and the neighbors talk on the Bible. I remember hearing you preach twice in life. I can never forget somethings you said, although that has been more than thirty years ago; they are still very plain to me. I have never heard any other denomination preach that way. I have always found this difference. It is what makes me love the doctrine of salvation by grace. I once lived at a place, and all the preachers heard I was not a member of any church. They began to invite me to come to the church; and as there was a big revival going on, the preacher set Sunday for me to be sure and attend and he would preach a special sermon for me. So I promised I would be there, and as I walked in the church he motioned me to a certain seat which was in plain view of him. His text was **(John 3:16)**. He preached for a good long time. He was a highly educated man, and all the while he was preaching he did not seem to take his eyes off of me. As he was closing he pointed a finger at me and made these remarks: "You know how well you love your children. Well, God loves you seven times better than you love your children; but before He would save your soul, unless you make the step, He will see you die and go to an eternal hell." I became more disgusted with that than with all of his other sermon, and did not go any more. Mr. Cayce, what seems to make my case more strange to me is, as I have said before, I truly love the Old Baptist doctrine. I love them as a people, and truly believe that the doctrine of salvation that they preach is according to the Bible. I have never joined any church, for two reasons-first, I did not believe the other fellow's doctrine, because it did not suit my case; and the reason I cannot join the one I love is due to the fact that I simply am not worthy, and feel like I would be a dishonor instead of an honor; and as I am growing old I am unworthy to have a home anywhere on this old earth. So what will become of a poor sinner like me? The trials grow harder as the years roll on, on account of our world conditions today. I have two boys in military service and don't know that I will ever see them again. I began to take your paper, The Primitive Baptist, last September, and enjoy it very much. I wish I could write and talk of the good things of life as some of the writers do. I feel when I read their letters that they are the children of God, and how I would like to have a hope in this world like them, but I feel there is no hope for me. I hope you will pardon me for taking up your valuable time with this letter. This is just the thoughts of one who is growing old and too unworthy to live with the people I love, and do not see how God would answer the prayers of one so vile as I. If it is not asking too much of you, please remember me while at the throne of prayer, for my sins are like

mountains, and am too vile to ask for my own self. Yours truly, L. L. Connor.
Vaiden, Miss.

Remarks.-

Paul claimed that he was less than the least of all saints, and that he was the chief of sinners. If that is your feelings, and if it was his, and he was a child of grace, then so are you. John said "We know we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." You cannot bear any better evidence than that, we think. Go to the church and tell them of your feeling of unworthiness, and let them be the judges as to whether you are entitled to membership or not. C. H. C.

Is This The Morning Or Evening Of Civilization?

---June 18, 1942

The following is an article written about twenty years ago by John W. Hedgepeth as an editorial in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal. Mr. Hedgepeth is now one of the publishers of the Enterprise, at Ripley, Tenn., and recently reproduced the article in that paper. It is good and timely, and we think it is worth reading, and then worthy of careful consideration. There is need of a great awakening in this land of ours. Read the article, and hand it to others to read. We are copying the article from the Publishers Auxiliary. C. H. C.

THE ARTICLE

We are living in a great age, but what are we doing to safeguard civilization? Is it a fact that the pleasure god has the whole nation bowing at his shrine? Have we sidetracked the big things of life and become an amalgamated bunch of money-chasers? Are we indulging in wanton extravagance and spending more than we make? Is work really held in disrepute? Is the soul, conscience and heart of man keeping pace with the wonderful development of the intellect? Are we training our boys and girls in the school of nature as well as giving them higher education? Are we teaching the coming generation the dignity of labor and the importance of work? Are we drilling the youngsters in right thinking and Christian living? Are we holding up the Christ, the Master Mind and the world's greatest Servant as an example to the growing child, emphasizing His virtues and marvelous teachings? Have we allowed the American home, the one institution that has largely made American civilization, to become a cafe where the inner man is satisfied and the soul is dwarfed for want of spiritual nourishment? These are some questions worth pondering over. In the 20th century wonderful discoveries and inventions have been unfolded, astounding to the human mind. Are we schooling the people how to conserve these multiplicity of "implements" of civilization to the good of humanity and the glory of God? They are as miraculous to our generation as was the walking of the Master on the sea to those Galileans some two thousand years ago. No, we stand amazed at the pace the old world is traveling as the Author of Life and the Builder of the universe whispers into the mind of man and reveals to the geniuses, one by one, the hidden mysteries that have been in the mind of the Infinite from the beginning. God is simply telling men how to perform the "impossible," that's all. A century ago we had no railroads, no telephones and no telegraphs. Now the earth is belted with railroads, telegraph and cable lines. In this good day we can cross the ocean in the magnificent floating palaces in from four to five days; we can reach every civilized country by telegraph and cable; we can talk across our continent; we can speed by rail a mile a minute and fly in an airplane at the rate of over one hundred fifty miles per hour. We can ride at a moderate speed in automobiles or run a mile a minute, if we do not value our life and have no concern for the safety of others. We can sit in our home or office and receive the market

reports by radio and listen to a prima donna sing five hundred miles away. These are a few of the many great things of this age. There is a great army of men delving into the bowels of the earth bringing out to light evidences of buried civilizations that perished thousands of years ago. Discoveries are being made that give a pretty fair insight of the peoples and their customs centuries past. It is claimed that armies can now be annihilated with poisoned gas and great cities laid waste by the same force. If we learn how to use and control the mighty discoveries and inventions for the pleasure and uplift of humanity, they will prove a blessing; otherwise many of them will be as hazardous as placing an automatic pistol in the hands of a six-year-old boy. If we educate the heart and soul along with the intellect it will be well. If we become reckless, through lack of understanding, the colossal forces and energies turned loose within the past century and less, may prove a means of our own unmaking, and we will have to pay the penalty. The divine plan is to run this old world without friction. But man, unless he is in harmony with the motives and purposes of the Infinite, can play havoc. In perfect accord with the will of God, man can conquer and make all things serve him. We must also get back to fundamental principles. Under the Constitution, the greatest document extant, every man has a right to work and seek happiness so long as his efforts do not interfere with the inalienable rights of others. A deeper respect for the Constitution is needed. The country must ever hold patriotism as a cardinal virtue. We must love the American flag and the protection the flag offers. Whether this be our native country or the land of our adoption, we must swear allegiance to the American government, American institutions and American ideals. So long as we claim citizenship in this country we must love and, if need be, die for the perpetuation of our band of brotherhood and democracy, the wonder and admiration of all nations. We have a complex population, a diversity of interests. This country is great in natural resources and possibilities. No matter what your avocation or profession, opportunity extends the glad hand to every citizen every morning and challenges your best efforts to work and contribute to the greatness of this republic. We must remember no country can long exist without keeping morally pure and patriotically sound. Let's not abuse our privileges of living in the greatest country under heaven. May our people be teachable, thoughtful, prayerful. Let us learn how to conserve the stupendous forces and energies of this age and make them build rather than destroy civilization.

Election and Predestination

---July 2, 1942

These two subjects are very closely connected, or interwoven with each other. The doctrine that God did, before time, make choice of, or elect, a portion of the human race, and predestinate their salvation, is and has been a distinctive doctrine of the church all along the line. The Primitive Baptists hold to this doctrine. Baptists believed and preached this doctrine before John Calvin was born. But Calvin, one of the great Reformers, did advocate that doctrine. He went further with his teaching, however, on that line than the Baptists did. The old Westminster Confession of Faith (the Presbyterian Confession by John Calvin) said: By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. We quote this from the "Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, Containing the Confession of Faith," etc., published in 1822. When the Baptists met together to frame the London Confession in 1689 they copied the Presbyterian

Confession as far as they could conscientiously do so. The way they put this down in the London Confession reads this way: By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated or foreordained to eternal life, through Jesus Christ to the praise of His glorious grace; others being left to act in their sin to their just condemnation to the praise of His glorious justice. Notice the difference in the reading in this matter. The Baptists did not believe in the doctrine of unconditional reprobation-or that some of the race were foreordained to everlasting death. God's predestination or foreordination has never injured anyone. When God made choice of some He did nothing to the others. They are simply left where they are by reason of sin and transgression. The Lord simply passes them by, so far as this matter is concerned. Yet, in nature all are alike. All are sinners, and God is, or was, under no obligation to do anything for any of the race. What He has done, and does do, and will do, is all a matter of grace-a stoop of mercy. In His mercy, and by His grace, He made choice of some of the race, and predestinated their salvation -predestinated that they should be conformed to the image of His Son. In this we find that election and predestination are joined closely together-that is, if this doctrine be true. What we here have in mind to do is to candidly investigate this doctrine, especially from a Bible standpoint. If this doctrine be true, then it follows that the Primitive Baptists are right in the principles which they hold to. If it is not true, then they are altogether and entirely wrong. And if they are wrong, we wonder, who, or what people, are right? The people who contend that there is something which the sinner has to do in order to become a child of God or in order to be born again, differ as to what and how much the sinner has to do. If we go to them to find out from them what one must do in order to have eternal life, we find a perfect babel. It seems reasonable to us that if they are right in their contention that there is something for the sinner to do in order to obtain eternal life, then they might be able to agree as to what it is the sinner must do in order to that end. It seems reasonable to us to conclude that if the sinner must obey one command required in the Bible in order that he obtain eternal life, then he must obey every command laid down in the Book. If he must obey one of the commands in order to that end, then he must obey each and every one of those commands in order that the end be reached. So it seems to us. Another inconsistency which we have seen in some who hold that the sinner must do something in order to obtain eternal life is this: Some of them teach that the sinner can and must "get salvation," and then claim that after he gets it he cannot lose it. It has always seemed reasonable to us to conclude that if a man can get a thing, he can lose it after he gets it. What a man can get, he can also lose. It seems inconsistent to teach that a person has to do something in order to obtain a thing and then to deny that he has something to do in order to keep that thing. Surely, if a man has to exert himself to get a thing, he would have to exert himself in order to keep that thing after he got it. It seems logical to us that if a person has to perform a condition in order to obtain salvation, he would have some sort of condition to perform in order to keep that salvation. Hence, it is inconsistent to teach that sinners have to perform certain stipulated conditions in order to obtain eternal life, and then to teach the final preservation of the saints, and that it is impossible for a child of God to fall away and be finally lost. This makes the salvation of the sinner conditional upon his part before he is born again, or in order to be born again, and then makes his final salvation in heaven after regeneration to be unconditional on his part. It seems to us that if one is conditional the other is also conditional; or, if one is unconditional on the part of the person, so is the other. Not one of these inconsistencies are encountered in the doctrine of personal and unconditional election of sinners to be saved in glory. We have had in mind for several days to write a little article on the doctrine of election and predestination.

As we began the writing these matters came into our mind, and this article is now long enough for one issue of the paper. So we stop here with the promise to try to look into the subject more directly in next issue. C. H. C.

Election and Predestination

---July 16, 1942

In our last issue (July 2) we promised to try to write more on this subject for this issue. In order to an intelligent investigation of the subject it is well to first see what the word election means, and what the word elect means, and what the word elector means. We will take the last word first. Elector is one who elects, or has the right of choice. If persons of Adam's race were chosen to eternal life, or chosen to be made children of God, or to be conformed to the image of Christ, we may ask, Who did the choosing? Who did the electing? If such choice was made, then someone must have made the choice; someone must have done the electing, or the choosing. They either did the choosing themselves, or some other party must have done it. If they did the choosing, then they themselves would be the elector. If they constitute the elector, then they must have existed before the electing was done. Elect, as an adjective, means chosen; taken by preference from among two or more. Theologically it means chosen as the object of mercy or divine favor; set apart to eternal life. An adjective is a descriptive word. If the word elect is used any place in the Bible to describe any person or persons, it is there used as an adjective. If the Bible speaks of any person, or persons, as the elect of God, as a descriptive term, the word is there used as an adjective, and it means that they were chosen as the objects of mercy or divine favor; it means that they were set apart to eternal life. Elect, as a noun, means one chosen or set apart. Theologically, one elect; -now only as collective; as, "Shall not God avenge His own elect?" -Luke xviii. 7. Elect, as a transitive verb, means to select; to determine by choice; to decide upon; to choose; to select or take for an office by vote. Theologically, it means to designate, or choose, or select, as an object of mercy or favor. Election is the act of choosing; choice; selection. Theologically, it means divine choice; especially, as one of the "five points" of Calvinism; predestination of individuals as objects of mercy and salvation; also, those elected. The foregoing definitions are taken from Webster's International Dictionary, which is conceded to be authority on the meaning of words in the English language. The dictionary gives the meaning of words according to their accepted use in the language. This being true, we are aware of the fact that such definitions as we find in our dictionaries are not always the same as the words meant in the original languages in which the Bible was written. The Old Testament was written in Hebrew, and the New Testament was written in Greek. Those languages are dead languages, and have undergone no change since the Bible was written. The English language is not a dead language, and is undergoing changes all the time. Some words are going out of use, and others are being coined, and some words are used today in a different sense than they were years ago. As an example of this, take Webster's definition of baptize. He gives it as from the Greek word "baptizo, to dip in water," and then defines the word baptize as "to dip or immerse in water, or to pour or sprinkle water upon," etc. This shows that the meaning of the original word in Greek was to dip in water, which is to bury or immerse; but in later years some have engaged in sprinkling or pouring water upon a person and called it baptism. But what the word meant in the Greek language when the New Testament was written is just what the word means in that language today. This all being true, it is well that we look into the original language now and see what the words elect and election mean in that

language. Let it be remembered that what the words meant when the New Testament was written is what they mean now. That language, or the meaning of words in that language, has undergone no change in all these centuries. In every place in the New Testament where we find words elect, elected, or election, the word is translated from a word which means "to pick out; to choose, select; to choose out as the recipients of special favor and privilege; chosen out, selected; chosen as a recipient of special privilege; elect; specially beloved; possessed of prime excellence; exalted; choice; precious; the act of choosing out, election; election to privilege by divine grace; the aggregate of those who are chosen, the elect." These definitions are given in Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon. We have not taken space to divide up and give each different ending and case of the word, for they all sum up to the same thing. Strong's Exhaustive Concordance gives the meaning as "to select; make choice, choose, choose out, chosen." Liddell & Scott Unabridged Greek Lexicon gives the meaning thus: "To pick or single out, to pick out for one's self, choose out." In Thayer's Lexicon we find this, in defining the original word: "To pick or choose out for one's self; * * * so that the ground of the choice lies in Christ and His merits. * * * **(Ephesians 1:4)**" It seems that we have here produced sufficient testimony as to the meaning of the words; and if one will not believe, from the evidence here produced, neither would he believe, though one rose from the dead. The doctrine that God has made choice of a certain, or special, people, without regard to their works, or special fitness, may be repugnant to human nature, and contrary to the exalted opinion one may have of self; but that is no argument or evidence that it is not the truth. Let us next look into the meaning of the word predestinate. Webster defines the word as an adjective thus: (From Latin praedestinatus, perfect participle of praedestinare, to predestine; prae, before; destinare, to determine.) Predestinated; predestined; foreordained; fated; theologically, foreordained by God's decree or eternal purpose." As a transitive verb he defines it thus: "To predetermine or foreordain; to predestine; theologically, to appoint or ordain beforehand by divine purpose or decree; to pre-elect." The word in our English is translated from the Greek word pro-or-id-zo, which means "to limit in advance, predetermine; determine before; ordain, predestinate." The word is from pro, "in front of, prior to; above, ago, before, or ever;" and horidzo, "to mark out or bound, to appoint, decree, specify; declare, determine, limit, ordain." These definitions are taken from Strong's Concordance, and we find the same in the other Lexicons which we have before us, as Bagster's, Thayer's and Liddell & Scott's. This is sufficient as to the meaning of the word. With these facts before us, do we need to refer to the Scriptures and quote what we find recorded therein in order to prove the doctrine we maintain in this matter? If you would read for yourself, and keep these definitions in mind, it seems to us that no argument would be needed to convince one that the doctrine is taught in the Bible. But we do not wish to let the matter go at that. But we have written enough for this issue already, and will promise to write more on the question for the next issue. C. H. C.

To Our Soldier Boys

---July 16, 1942

We are sending The Primitive Baptist to several of our soldier boys in the camps. We wish to make this special request of each one of the boys who are getting this paper: If you should be moved, and your address changed, please notify us at once where the paper should be sent to, so that you may not fail to get it. If you enjoy the paper, and desire to read it, we are glad to send it to you. We wish to do all we

can to help you to bear your burdens and to help you on the way. We are always glad to hear from any of the boys. May the good Lord be with you and protect you and finally bring you safe home, is our prayer for you. If you die away from home, or on the battlefield, remember your Master is there and will take you to that better country, where there are no wars. May God bless you. C. H. C.
Election and Predestination

---August 6, 1942

In our last issue (July 16) we promised to write some more on this subject. So we will try to comply with that promise. There are so many passages in God's Word treating upon this matter that we hardly know which passage to introduce first. Suppose we start by reading the following: Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God. For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake.--(Th 1:4) (I Thessalonians 1:4-5). Please bear in mind that the beloved Apostle Paul penned this language by inspiration of God-that he was moved by the Holy Spirit to pen the language in the original which is translated as above. Paul said, "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God." If he did not know it, then he was moved by the Holy Spirit to say he knew what he did not know. If he was not moved by the Holy Spirit to say he knew what he did not know, then he did know their election of God. Remember, too, that the Thessalonians were not apostles. It has been said by some that the Lord did choose or elect the apostles, but not others. But the Thessalonians were not apostles, and Paul said he knew their election of God. Their election was of God. As it was of God, then it was not of themselves. God is the one who did the choosing or electing; hence their election was of God. Since Paul knew their election was of God, then he knew that the doctrine of election was the truth. As we said in a previous article, this doctrine may not suit our carnality, or the doctrines of men, but Paul knew it was the truth. If it was the truth then, it is the truth now. Principles are eternal and never change. How did Paul know their election of God? He tells us how he knew it: "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." The gospel comes to unre-generate persons in word only; it does not come to them in power; nor does it come to them in much assurance. The unregenerate man may hear the words uttered by the minister as he proclaims the riches of God's grace, and as he tells of God's work in the salvation of poor lost sinners, but it is an idle tale to such persons. True gospel preaching is foolishness to them. "The preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness." -(I Corinthians 1:18). The gospel comes to such persons in word only. But to the Thessalonians the gospel did not come in word only, but also in power. They not only heard the words, but there was a power in it to them. This was a sure evidence to the apostle that they were of the elect of God. They were not the elect of God because the gospel came to them in power; but the fact that the gospel came to them in power was proof to the inspired apostle that they were the elect of God. This same inspired man said, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." -(Romans 1:16). Please take notice of the fact that Paul did not say "it is the power of God in order to salvation" -but unto salvation. How under heaven could the gospel of Christ be the power of God unto salvation if salvation did not already exist in the person before the gospel got there? How can one thing be unto another thing if the other thing is not already in existence? The gospel is the "power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." It is not the power of God unto salvation to one who is not a believer. A

believer is one who has already been born of God. "Even to them that believe on His name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." - **(John 1:12-13)**. Those who now believe, in the present, were born of God, in the past. So the gospel coming to one in power proves that such a one was born of God before the gospel thus came to him; and one who has been born of God was chosen of God before he was born of God. Being born of God and the gospel coming to him with power is inspired proof of the fact that such a one was embraced in the election of God. The gospel does not bring assurance to those who have not been born of God, or who are not of the elect of God. But it does bring much assurance to some. To whom does it come with much assurance? It comes with much assurance to those who are of the elect of God, and who have been born into the heavenly family. If the gospel has come to you with much assurance, it is an infallible proof, according to the inspired apostle, that you are embraced in the number of God's elect. The same which was said to the Thessalonians by the inspired apostle in our text may just as truly be said to you, "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God. For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." The eternal God, in His mercy and grace, made choice of you, elected you to salvation through Jesus Christ our Lord; and the apostle has said that he knew this fact, and knew it to be a fact. Well, we have only brought out one leading text in this article, but we feel that we have taken enough space for this time, and will stop for the present, with the promise that we will try to write more on this subject for the next issue. C. H. C.

Election and Predestination

---August 20, 1942

In our last issue we promised to try to write some more on this subject for this issue. We will try to fulfill that promise. In this article we will call attention, first, to **((9:15) (Psalms 139:15-16))**: My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them. In this language David was representing the Saviour speaking; he was impersonating the Lord Jesus. His substance is the same as His members; that is, the members of His body. These members of His body, His substance, are those He gave Himself for. They go to make up the number for whom He gave Himself. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." **(Ephesians 5:25-27)**. The washing of water by the word is the washing, or cleansing, by the power of His speech. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." - (John 6:63). The Father saw every member of Christ's mystical body, though the number is beyond the power of man to enumerate. It is an innumerable company, which no man can number. He saw them before any of them existed. They were not hid from Him. The father saw them when they were yet unperfect, when they were not completed, or when they did not yet exist. All these members of His body, the finally saved, those who shall finally live with Him in glory, were written in God's book "when as yet there was none of them." This was before they had existence. As it was before they had existence, it was too soon for them to do something in

order to be written in that book. And as it was before they had existence, then they did not always exist-that is, they did not always have being. As they were written in that book before they had existence, or "when as yet there was none of them," it follows, as a necessary conclusion, that God made choice of them before they existed, even before time, and wrote them in His book. That is, it is necessarily true that God made choice of them whom He did write in His book. They were fashioned in His mind and in His choice before they were brought into existence, before the foundations of the earth were laid. This text being true, it follows that the doctrine of salvation wholly by the grace and mercy of God, without any works of any creature, is true. They being written in God's book before there were any of them in existence, God making choice of them and writing them in that book, it follows that even this was of His mercy and grace; and they are finally brought home to glory by His grace. This is all of grace, from first to last. It is grace upon grace. "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom He hath chosen for His own inheritance." ~(Psalms 33:12). That nation whose God is the Lord is that people whom He hath chosen for His own inheritance. If a person is embraced in the inheritance of the Lord it is because God has chosen that person. If God has not chosen a people for His own inheritance, then the Lord has no inheritance. All those people who go to make up the inheritance of the Lord are those people He hath chosen for His inheritance. Does the Lord want all His inheritance? If not, why not? And will not the Lord get all His inheritance? If not, why not? And if the Lord does not get His inheritance, who will get it? If Satan is able to get a part of the Lord's inheritance, could he not get all of it if he wanted to? If not, why not? If Satan gets a part of the Lord's inheritance, and does not get all of that inheritance, and the Lord gets only a part of His inheritance, does it not follow that the Lord gets only that part which Satan would not have? Would it not be true, then, that those who are finally saved are saved by the grace of Satan, and not by the grace of God? If not, why not? The Lord has chosen a people for His own inheritance; and Jesus redeemed them by His blood, and sends His Holy Spirit into their hearts and thereby regenerates them, brings them into divine relationship with Himself; and they are preserved in Jesus Christ, and kept by the power of God unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time. Hence, they will all be finally landed on the shores of eternal bliss, and will be glorified and will live with Him in all the ceaseless ages of eternity. "Blessed is the man whom thou chooseth, and causeth to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts: we shall be satisfied with the goodness of thy house, even of thy holy temple." -((4) (Psalms 65:4). The reason why any poor sinner has ever approached the Lord, or ever will approach Him, is because God had made choice of that sinner, and caused him to approach unto Him. No one is perfectly satisfied in this world of sorrow and turmoil. We may have a moment of satisfaction here, but it is only for a moment, and even then it is not perfect satisfaction. But the glorious day is coming when some will be perfectly satisfied. Who will be finally perfectly satisfied? Those whom the Lord has chosen and caused to approach unto Him. If we object to the doctrine of God's choice, we object to the very principle upon which a poor sinner ever approaches the Lord, and upon which any poor sinner will ever reach heaven and be satisfied. Those who approach the Lord, and who will finally reach heaven and be satisfied, are those whom the Lord has chosen and caused to approach unto Him. If you have ever approached the Lord, at the footstool of His mercy, realizing your need of His mercy and grace, and have implored His mercy from a feeling sense of your need, it is because God had made choice of you and caused you to approach unto Him. And all such persons shall be satisfied with the goodness of His house, the house not made with hands, and which is eternal in the heavens. You will be satisfied, after this poor wearisome life is over, with His holy temple. You will be prepared

and qualified and capacitated to live with Him in glory, and you shall be satisfied. Surely, that will be enough. Well, we are not through with this subject, and will try, the Lord willing, to write more for the next issue. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon you. Remember us in prayer. C. H. C.

Complainings

---August 20, 1942

For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil. The Son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners!- (Luke 6:33-34). There were some people in that day who were not satisfied without they were busy complaining and finding fault. They did not like it because John neither ate nor drank. The Saviour both ate and drank, and then they were not satisfied with that. We often wonder what it would take to satisfy some folks, and how it would be possible to please all. If an editor of an Old Baptist paper publishes some experiences some will complain about that, and say the experiences should not be published, as they often discourage some child of God who has not experienced such things in his own life. Others sometimes say they enjoy the experiences of grace in the paper, and that they would rather read the experiences than anything else in the paper. So, what shall the editor do? Is it not a pity that some who object to a bright experience being published were not present to tell Paul that he should not write and leave on record such a bright experience as he had, because it would discourage many of the Lord's dear children, and cause them to feel that they are not children of God, because they did not have such an experience? David said, "Thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts." -((9) (Psalms 22:9). Is it not a pity that some were not there to tell David to not put that down and publish it for the generations following to read, for many of them have no such experience, and they will become discouraged by reading such as that? The experiences of the Lord's children are pictured in the book by the experiences different ones of the ancient worthies had. Surely these things are left on record for the comfort and encouragement of others who have traveled the same road. If it were right for such experiences to be put on record then, why is it not right now? Who are you that would complain and object to such things? What is the editor to do?

If an editor should publish an account of the life and experience of some of the Lord's servants who are yet living, for the comfort and encouragement of the Lord's humble poor now-perhaps one who is fearing to take up his cross to endeavor to speak in the name of the Lord--or if he should publish an account of the life and experience of a dear old servant of God, who was faithful in the house of God; one who may yet be perhaps remembered by some old saint of God yet living, and who may read that account, and thereby have comfort and joy by refreshing his memory, and thus be encouraged in his declining days--will you complain about it? Why do you complain? Are you so selfish that you want nothing in the paper only what you most enjoy? Are you thinking more of self than of your poor old brother or sister who has stood the heat and burden of the summer's day, and who so much enjoys remembering the days of joy in the past of their lives? Do you object to having the minds of the Lord's children called to those old servants who bore the burdens in the past that the church might be handed down to you as it was? Do you appreciate the labors and the service rendered by those old servants who have already been called from the walks of men? If so, would you complain about the

space being taken in a paper giving an account of their lives, their experiences, and the Lord's dealings with them? Do you appreciate the servants the Lord has blessed you with in the present? If so, would you object to reading about the Lords dealings with them, as they write of some of their experiences along life's rugged way? Or, do you cave anything about the Lord's dealings with others than yourself-and even in that, do you wish to say just what shall come your own way, and that everything must be as you choose and to your liking? Perhaps an editor may publish something in his paper about some trouble some place, other than where you live. Perhaps you complain about that, even though you do not know all the circumstances, and that what the editor does in that line puts some of the Lord's children wise, so that they do not become entangled with some trouble. Then perhaps there may come some trouble your way, but the editor does not deem it wise, for certain reasons, to allow it to appear in the columns of his paper. Then do you complain about that? If it should be published, there will be complaints. Then what shall the editor do? Should he not follow what he conscientiously believes to be the right course in the matter? Will you still complain and find fault? Constructive criticism is good, and we invite it. But if you have any to offer, come to the editor with it, and try to help him to be a better editor and to publish a better paper; but if you have respect for the Cause of the Master do not be whispering among others. Do not be a "kicker." Do not be a complainer. Do not be a faultfinder. May the Lord help us all to exercise more the spirit of forbearance, and help us all, as His humble followers, to pull together for the advancement of His blessed cause, and for the comfort and consolation and encouragement and help of His humble poor. Suppose you try to run an Old Baptist paper for awhile. Can you do a better job of it than our editors are doing-at least some of them? Perhaps there is no preacher which the Lord has made that is just to your liking. Suppose you try looking at two sides of a matter for a short time. Suppose you try to get the viewpoint of the other fellow, that you are complain-in about. Perhaps the Lord would put a better feeling in your heart, and you might not be so free to find fault and to complain. No man can please all the people. Frankly, we are not going to try. As for our-self, our desire and effort shall be to please the Lord, and to do what we feel in our heart He would have us do. May the Lord pity His poor bleeding Zion, and have mercy on us poor complainers, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Election and Predestination

---September 3, 1942

We promised again in our last issue to try to write some more on this subject for this issue. We will try to do as promised. The last text we used in our last article was ((4) (Psalms 65:4), which reads as follows: "Blessed is the man whom thou choosest, and causest to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts: we shall be satisfied with the goodness of thy house, even of thy holy temple." We also used this text: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom He hath chosen for His own inheritance." -(Psalms 33:12). We wish to refer to these passages again because it has been argued by some that it is not persons, abstractly, that God made choice of, but that He chose character and not persons: thus teaching that one must be of such and such character in order to be embraced in the election. For instance, it has been argued that one must be a believer in order to be embraced in the election; that God chose only such as become believers; that the choice is, or was, based on the fact of them becoming believers; thus contending that it as not persons, as such, that He chose, but such and such characters.

Let us here call attention to the fact that David said in **(Psalms 33:12)**, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord; and the people whom He hath chosen for His own inheritance." A nation is composed of people; people, not character, make up and compose a nation. That nation whose God is the Lord is a blessed nation And David, most emphatically, says the people are blessed whom the Lord hath chosen for His own inheritance. If David told the truth, and he did, then God chose people; and people are persons of Adam's sinful race. Hence, God made choice of sinners of Adam's race for His inheritance. And in ((4) (Psalms 65:4) he said, "Blessed is the man whom thou chooseth, and causeth to approach unto the." It is the man which God chooses, and not character, and then He causes that man whom He has chosen to approach unto Him. If one approaches unto Him in repentance and faith, or in faith and repentance, it is because God had made choice of him and caused him to thus approach unto Him. It was not the faith and repentance which God hath made choice of, nor because of the faith and repentance that God made the choice; but God chose the man and then caused the man to approach unto Him. The choice was first, the man was chosen, and the faith and repentance were some of the ends to be reached as a result of the choice and the Lord causing the one chosen to thus approach unto Him. Hence, the faith, or belief, and repentance are evidences-inspired evidences-that the person was chosen of God. If one approaches the Lord, it is because God had made choice of that person and caused him to approach. God made choice of him first, and then, after the choice, caused him to approach unto Him. No poor sinner has ever yet approached the Lord, or ever will approach unto Him, upon any other principle other than that the Lord had made choice of him and caused him to approach unto Him. If any poor sinner ever has approached the Lord, or ever will approach unto Him, upon any other principle than this, then it was not necessary for the Lord to make the choice and cause the person to approach unto Him; and if it was not necessary, then the Lord has done an unnecessary thing. A thing done which was not necessary to be done is a thing; by which no good is accomplished. But good is accomplished by that which the Lord has done and does do. It is good for the Lord to possess His inheritance. Hence, it was not an unnecessary thing for God to choose sinners of Adam's race and cause them to approach unto Him; and as a result of the choice which God has made, and the work which He does in causing poor sinners to approach unto Him, He will have all His inheritance, and will bring all of them home to glory; and they shall be satisfied. This is consoling to poor sinners of Adam's race who have been given to see and to realize their lost condition by reason of sin-that, notwithstanding their deplorable condition. God made choice of them and caused them to approach unto Him, and will finally bring them off more than conquerors through Him that loved them and gave Himself for them. Let us here quote **(Luke 18:1-8)**: And He spake a parable unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint; saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man: and there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me. And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge His own elect, which cry day and night unto Him, though He bear long with them? I tell you that He will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth? In this Scripture we have the lesson taught us that the unjust judge avenged the widow who cried unto him. It was not done by him as an act of mercy,

or because he feared God or regarded man; but it was because he might be wearied by her continual coming to him. But this is not the reason why God will avenge His own elect. God is not an unjust judge, nor is He unmerciful. He is both just and merciful. He will avenge His own elect because He loves them, and hath mercy on them; and He will avenge them speedily. "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." - **(Romans 12:19)**. Here is language uttered by the blessed Son of God Himself. In it He tells us that God has an elect. As God has an elect, He made choice of them; He did the electing or choosing, and they are His own. How may they be distinguished from others who are not of His elect? They cry unto Him day and night. They do not cry unto Him in order to become elect, or in order to be elected. If so, they cry before they are elected; and if they cry before they are elected, then some cry unto Him who are not yet elected. And if some cry unto Him who are not yet elected, then the Saviour made a wrong statement when He declared that His elect cry unto Him day and night. Those who cry unto Him are those who have already been elected, already chosen. God had made choice of them, and now they cry unto Him. Have you been brought to cry unto the Lord? If so, the Saviour here describes you as one of the elect of God, and assures you that the same one who has chosen you will care for you and project you, and that He will arrange your adversary. He will preserve and keep you, because He loves you with an everlasting love, and He changes not. "I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." - **(Malachi 3:6)**. Blessed and glorious promises and assurances are these which the Lord, in His love and mercy, hath given for the comfort, consolation and encouragement of His little ones here in this low ground of sorrow. Dark clouds are hanging over the world today; but God will take care of you, dear children. His elect, the objects of His love and choice. We often wonder if we are embraced in that number. These things here have been of some comfort and consolation to us along life's ragged way. and we feel today to be willing to risk it, and to rely on His precious promises. May the Lord bless you, and comfort your hearts in this dark and cloudy day, is our prayer. We will try to continue the subject in our next issue. C. H. C.

What Will Men Not Say?

---September 3, 1942

While we were in Memphis on the second Sunday in August, 1942, the following clipping from a paper published in that city was handed to us: God has a plan for every life, Rev. Charles L. Morgan, will say in his sermon, "The Peril of Resisting God," at 10:50 a. m. tomorrow at Prescott Memorial Baptist Church. "All who believe the Bible agree that God has a plan for every life," he will say. "All nature tells us of a planning God. All revelation teaches it. We have the message direct from the lips of our Lord, 'As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.' "God had a noble purpose for Pharaoh to begin with. The reason he ended as he did was not because God did not love him. God did love him and did His infinite best to save him, "It was because Pharaoh resisted and resisted, rebelled and rebelled, till at last he threw himself a corpse upon the shore of the Red Sea. "The message we hear from his clammy lips today is this, 'Look at me and see what a terrible things it is to rebel against God,' " Training Union of the church will have a social Tuesday night at Overton Park and members will meet at the church at 5:30 p. m. to go in a group. In our youth, when some fellow would make some rash, or far-fetched, statement, some person might say, "That takes the cake." We would say that the foregoing takes the whole bakershop! According to the statement of "Rev. Charles L. Morgan," whoever that "reverend" gentleman may be, the Lord has a plan for

every life, and as evidence of it he quotes the language of the Saviour, "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." Of course, he intends to teach that the Master sends all men, or would send all men if they would consent to go, or to be sent. But the Master never said that to a multitude, but to His i'ew disciples, as recorded in **(0:21) (John 20:21)**. Take your Bible and read the chapter and you can plainly see for yourself how the language is misapplied. We honestly believe the preacher knew better. Now read the next paragraph. "The reason he (Pharrah) ended as he did was not because God did not love him. God did love him and did His infinite best to save him." Go and read the ninth chapter of Romans and see for yourself what God's Book teaches concerning the matter. Two classes are shown forth in that chapter, represented by Jacob and Esau; and God emphatically said, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." God did not love Esau, and neither did He love the people Esau represented; and the apostle emphatically declares this to be "that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth." The "reverend" preacher declares that it is of works. According to this modern divine the reason why Pharaoh was not saved was because "he resisted and resisted, rebelled and rebelled, till at last he threw himself a corpse upon the shore of the Red Sea." But of all the great and wise (?) sayings which we have ever read, this outranks them all: "God did love him, and did His infinite best to save him." According to tha: statement God exerted His infinite power, a power that is without limit or capacity, to save Pharaoh, and yet Pharaoh would not let Him save him! Pharaoh, according to that, had a power above a power that is without limit or capacity, and in the exercise of that power which is above a power that is without limit or capacity, he "resisted and resisted, and rebelled and rebelled, till at last he threw himself a corpse upon the shore of the Red Sea!" How under heaven could any being have a power above a power that is infinite, a power that is without limit or capacity? If Pharaoh had such a power, perhaps he tore hell ail to pieces after "he threw himself a corpse upon the Red Sea." God saith unto Pharaoh, "And in very deed for the cause have I raised thee up, for to shew in thee my power; and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth." -((9:10) (Exodus 9:10). In **(Romans 9:17)** Paul quotes that language as follows: "For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." God was not fooled nor thwarted in the matter. He carried out His purpose, and fulfilled it; and Pharaoh did not thwart God's plan or purpose. May the Lord pity such men who will teach such stuff before and to a pro essedly intelligent people. Folks who will drink down such rot and tomfoolery must be as ignorant concerning the teaching of God's Book as the most ignorant Jap, Chinaman. Hindoo, or Hottentot. May the Lord pity them! Why will not some people read the Book for themselves, instead of paying some deceiver a high salary to preach such rot? C. H. C.

Election and Predestination

---September 17, 1942

We promised again to try to write some more on the above subject; so we will try to write a few more lines on the same, This time we will begin by quoting **(Deuteronomy 7:6-7,8)**: For thou, art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not set His love upon you, nor choose you, because yo were more in number than any people; for ye were the

fewest of all people: but because the Lord loved you, and because He would keep the oath which He had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh King of Egypt. Here we have the plain statement that the Lord had chosen Israel to be a special people unto Himself. He set His love upon them, and chose them, not because they were more in number than other people. Neither did He choose them because they were a good people, or better than other people.

(Deuteronomy 9:6) "Understand therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness; for thou art a stiff necked people." The Lord did not choose them because they were better than other people. True, this choice was not unto eternal life, but they were chosen by Him as a special nation, and He set His love upon them as a nation. But national Israel were, a typical people, and typified spiritual Israel. Abraham was chosen of the Lord, and was the father of this great nation. God promised him that He would make of him a great nation, and promised him an heir. Isaac was the promised heir. "Now, we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." -(Galatians 4:28). Ishmael was not the child of promise. He was born after the flesh. His mother was a type of the old covenant given on Mount Sinai. Sarah was a type of the covenant of grace; so, in the type, Isaac represented the children of the covenant, the children of God, the children of promise. "And if ye be Christ's, then ye are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." -(Galatians 3:29). So was Jacob a promised child, and was a type of the Lord's children. The Lord made a promise concerning Jacob before He was born, and even before he was born God said He loved him. "The Lord's portion is His people; Jacob is the lot of His inheritance." -(Deuteronomy 32:9). The Lord chose Jacob, to bestow the blessing upon him, and passed Esau by, and did not love Esau. He did Esau no harm, but simply left him alone. He was under no obligation to bless either Esau or Jacob; but He saw fit to bestow mercy and grace upon Jacob, and bestowed the blessing upon him, God loved Jacob and chose him before he was born to bestow the blessing upon him. Jacob's name was changed to Israel. "And God said unto him, Thy name is Jacob: thy name shall not be called any more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name." -(Genesis 35:10). Israel, as a nation, were God's chosen nation, and were a type of spiritual Israel, God's chosen people. God did not choose national Israel because they were good, or because they did good, nor because they made choice of Him. This choice was without any condition on the part of Israel, and without any good in them causing Him to choose them. But He made choice of them that they be a peculiar people unto Him. This being true, the Lord made choice of His spiritual Israel without any good in them causing Him to make the choice. The choice was made without any reference to good in them. He did not choose them because they were better than other folks, but of His own will and good pleasure. It was just because it was His will thus to do; it seemed good in His sight. If sinners in nature were left to themselves not one would ever choose the Lord. One would necessarily be compelled to first think upon the Lord in order to choose Him. David says, "The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God: God is not in all his thoughts." -(Psalms 10:4). If the Lord had not chosen the sinner, and after the choice, and according to that choice, given the sinner a new heart and a new life, that sinner would never have even one good thought about the Lord; for while he is yet in that wicked state God is not in his thoughts. It follows, then, as a necessary fact and conclusion, that the sinner must be changed first in order that he have one right thought of the Lord. It is the Lord's work to give the sinner a new heart; and as it is His work to do this, He certainly has chosen to do that work when He does it; and if He has chosen to do that work, He has, most assuredly, chosen the ones in whom He does the work. If

you are Christ's then you are a child of promise. God the Father promised you to His Son; He gave you to His Son. "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." -(Psalms 2:7-8). The Father gave some to the Son. But this was before we had existence. So you were given to Him before you had existence. The Son chose those whom He asked for, and the Father chose those whom He gave to the Son. The choice of the Father and the Son were the same. And the Son has left this statement on record for our consolation and comfort and assurance: "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which He hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." -(John 6:39). Paul's hope of living with God in the glory world was based alone on the promise of God and His power and faithfulness to perform and to fulfill His promise. "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." -(Titus 1:2). From this we see very clearly that Paul's hope was based alone on the promise of that God who cannot lie. We also learn from this that God promised eternal life before the world began. He did not bestow or impart eternal life to anyone before the world began, but He made the promise before the world began, and eternal life was the thing promised. As He made this promise, persons who did not yet exist must have been embraced in the promise. He either promised eternal life to all the race of Adam, or to a part of the race, or to none of the race. If He made the promise to none of the race, then none of the race will receive eternal life. But either some of the race or all of the race will receive eternal life. If all the race receive eternal life, then Universalism may be the truth. The Universalist says there is no such thing as an eternal hell, or place of eternal punishment. If there is no such place as that, then the Lord Jesus did not save a single one of all the race of Adam from anything at all; and so His death was all in vain, and He accomplished absolutely nothing by His suffering and death. This virtually denies that He was the Son of God, and to deny that He was the Son of God is to virtually deny the Bible being the truth; and to deny the Bible being the truth is to virtually deny the very existence of God. But some of the race receive eternal life. As God cannot lie, and as He promised eternal life before the ages of time began, then all who were embraced in the promise will receive eternal life. He promised eternal life to all those who were given to the Son. It must be true, then, that He made choice of those who were embraced in the promise. If your hope of heaven is based alone on the promise of God, and His faithfulness and power to perform what He promised-based alone on the work of the infinite Jehovah God, and not on any worth, or merit, or righteousness of your own- not even your thinking on His name, nor on your choice, nor your acceptance of Him, or anything under heaven that you have done, or can do, or may do- just as Paul's hope was based alone on the Lord, then you are a child of promise, and God made choice of you before you ever had existence; and He has brought you into divine relationship with Himself by the work of the Holy Spirit, the third Person in the Holy Trinity; and the Lord Jesus will raise you up at the last day in His own image and likeness; and eternal joy and bliss will be yours. May His richest blessings rest upon you, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Carcass and Eagles

---September 17, 1942

For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.-
(Matthew 24:28). The above is the language of the Master. He certainly knew what

He was talking about; and in this we have a lesson that would do us good, if we but take heed to its teaching. But let us get a better idea of the eagle before proceeding further to get the lesson here by turning to **((Job 39:27) (Job 39:27-30))** and reading what the Lord said to Job, as recorded therein: Doth the eagle mount up at thy command, and make her nest on high? She dwelleth and abideth on the rock, upon the crag of the rock, and the strong place. From thence she seeketh the prey, and her eyes behold afar off. Her young ones also suck up blood: and where the slain are, there is she. Here we have it that her young ones suck up blood- they are blood-suckers. They destroy life; they kill; and "where the slain are, there is she." They eat dead carcasses-rotten meat. They feed on carrion. That is the characteristic of this kind of eagle. They are akin to a vulture; they are of the family of the buzzard. A dead carcass sends forth a stench; and where the dead carcass is and the stench is being sent forth, there the buzzards gather together. These things are facts, and no sort of argument can possibly set aside or destroy facts. Where facts are presented, or where facts exist, arguments cease. No fact can be argued away. What lesson may we get from these facts? Where there is a stench, as the stench of a carcass, and we see a gathering there, and those gathering at the place manifest a delight, and that they are pleased with the things they find, what do they manifest? Evidently they manifest the disposition of the eagle, a buzzard. If one does not have the disposition of a buzzard, who makes his appearance on the scene where there is such a stench, he is not pleased with such, and instead of approving and being delighted with what he has come in contact with, he will either have a strong desire to get away, and will get away from that place, or else he will endeavor to put the stinking thing out of sight. It should be burned or buried, so that the stench will forever cease to give offense. Look out for a preacher who likes such stinking things, and beware of the bunch of preachers who mix and mingle around where the stinking carcass is. They would look like a bunch of buzzards to us. Can there be anything more like a carcass than immorality practiced by a preacher? If it is an evident fact that a preacher has been guilty of immorality-and can it be more evident if a preacher confesses that he is guilty of immoral conduct?-how much could a thing in the church of more like a stinking carcass? Now, to us, for a lot of folks-preachers included-to gather around such a person and approve him being retained in the fellowship of the church, and aiding and abetting such a man, who is guilty of immoral conduct,-to us they appear like a bunch of buzzards. It is an old saying', and conceded to be a true one, that "birds of a feather flock together." If you desire to "flock together" with a thing like that, you have a desire which we confess we do not have. We also confess that if the church of our membership should have such a desire as that, we would not wish to retain membership in that body. It seems very evident to us that we are now living in a time that the Apostle Paul warned us of, and of which he told us, in **(II Timothy 3:1-9)** "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come, For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away, 'For of this sort ate they winch creep into houses, ana lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Now as James and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth; men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further: for their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as their's also was." If the apostle does not here well describe a large per-cent of the people of this time we confess that words do not mean anything. Not only does the apostle

warn us here that; such folks are in the world, but he warns us that they will creep into houses, and lead captive silly women, Certainly the word houses may well be taken to mean churches, and silly women led astray certainly means silly churches are led astray by such men. The apostle tells us in **(Romans 16:18)** how they manage to do this. He says: "For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." In (Romans 16:17) he says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." What is the doctrine which ye have learned? Is it that ungodly and immoral conduct should be practiced and upheld in the church which the Master established here in the world? We do not so read the Book. How can the church let her light shine by pursuing such a course? Let us look, for a moment, at the description of some persons, given in the text quoted above from Paul to Timothy: One epithet he uses is incontinent. That word mean's "unable to contain, keep, or restrain; uncontrolled: not restraining the passions or appetites, particularly the sexual appetite; indulging unlawful lust; unchaste; lewd." The apostles also say, "for their folly shall be manifest unto all men." Of course he means such men as do not approve of such conduct, and who will not condone such in the church of God. Folly means:" 1. State of being foolish' want of good sense; levity, weakness or derangement of mind. 2. A foolish act or idea; an inconsiderate or thoughtless procedure: weak or light-minded conduct; foolery. 3. Scandalous crime; sin; specifically, wantonness; lewdness." We frankly confess that where there is evidence of immoral conduct in a preacher we do not wish to associate with him. If you wish to do so we know of no civil law prohibiting it, but we do know that "water seeks its level;" and we have no desire to go down with you. We would much rather see you "pull up stream" and keep good company. "A man is known by the company he keeps." If you are determined to keep bad company, we prefer not to keep company with you. We know this is plain, but plainness becomes the house of God. "For this I know, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." -((0:29) (Acts 20:29,31). Webster tells us that the European wolf is "crafty, rapacious, and very destructive to game, sheep, and cattle. It is usually cowardly, but sometimes attacks man. Wolves readily breed with dogs." Evidently they are of the same species, and we are told to beware of dogs. May the good Lord help us all to keep His house as He gave it to us. C. H. C.

Election and Predestination

---October 1, 1942

We promised again in our last issue to try to write some more for this issue on the subject of election and predestination. We will now try to comply with that promise. This time we will call attention to **(Ephesians 1:1-5)** "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus: grace be to you and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love: having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will." In this language we find Paul embraced, and the saints at Ephesus are embraced, and all the faithful in Christ Jesus are embraced. The expression, "Faithful in Christ Jesus," means all those who are full of faith in Christ Jesus. That

includes all who are full of faith in Christ Jesus in every age and every clime, in all the habitable parts of the world. The word our embraces Paul, the writer, and the saints at Ephesus and all those who are full of faith in Christ Jesus. It embraces the writer and those he was writing to—all the persons addressed. God is our Father; and the Lord Jesus Christ is ours. It is our Lord Jesus Christ. Paul's language means that "He is mine, and He is yours." Then the word us embraces the same people, the same number—no more, and no less. He "hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." Has He done this according to what we have done? Has He done this according to, or in harmony with, or in consequence of, some good thing done by us? No. What, then, is it according to? "According as He hath chosen us in Him." The pronoun Him refers to Christ; "according as He hath chosen us in

Christ." He hath chosen in Christ the Apostle Paul, the saints at Ephesus, and all those who are full of faith in Christ Jesus. Did He choose them in Christ because they first made choice of Him? No. They did not exist before the foundation of the world, and they would have to be in existence before they could make choice of anything. He made choice of them before they had existence, for He made that choice "before the foundation of the world." Before the foundation of the world was laid He made that choice. The expression, "before the foundation of the world," literally means "before the ages of time began." Before time was, before time began, He made choice of them. The choice was in Christ, for He chose them in Christ; and He did this before the ages of time began. God did not save people before the ages of time began; but persons who did not then exist were chosen in Christ before time was. The Father had a definite purpose in view in making this choice. What was that purpose? Was it to give them an opportunity to become children of God? Was it to give them an opportunity to be saved, or to become holy and without blame by doing His commandments? No; that was not the object of the choice. What was it, then? It was "that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love." He chose them to be holy, and not because they were holy, or because they would be blameless by their doing. The end of His choice was that they be made holy and without blame, and not that He chose them because they became holy and without blame. The choice was first, and they are made holy and without blame before Him as a result of that choice. To say that they were chosen in Him as a result of, or because of, them becoming holy and without blame reverses the order and puts the effect for the cause, and the cause for the effect. God's choice is the cause; and the effect of that cause is that they are made to be holy and without blame before Him in love. It is because God loved them, and not because of something in them. There is no cause of God's love, as here brought out, outside of Himself. The cause is all within and of Himself. Certainly, language could not be any plainer that God made choice of persons of Adam's race; and that this choice was made before the ages of time began. We remember being in conversation years ago with a man who denied the doctrine of election. We read these verses to him, and when we read the fifth verse we read it this way: "Having predestinated us unto the apostleship by Jesus Christ to Himself." He interrupted us to say, "There it is; you see He did not predestinate that people should be saved: but He predestinated to make some apostles." Well, you know, we had to laugh right in his face. Then we read the text just as it is in the Book, and as quoted above: "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself," The apostle here plainly tells us that some were predestinated unto the adoption of children. How many were predestinated unto the adoption of children? All those who were chosen in Christ before time began. God determined beforehand that all the chosen ones should be adopted and brought into His

heavenly family. He predestinated them unto the adoption of children. Those who are made to be His children, those who are finally brought into His heavenly family, were chosen in Christ to that end, and the choice and purpose existed before time began. They are brought into divine relationship with Him, and will be adopted into His family in heaven, as a result of His choice and predestination. God does not save sinner;; by accident; but He saves them on purpose, and according to His choice. God purposed to save the sinner that He does save, and the purpose was before the saving was done. God intended to save the sinner before He does the saving'. It was God's purpose and intention to save every sinner that He does save. If any are saved who were not embraced in God's choice, and that God did not purpose to save, then some must be saved that God did not choose to save, and that He did not intend to save. If any are saved that God did not choose and intend to save, then God does not save them. And if God does not save them, please tell us who does save them? God has a place to put all those whom He saves-and that place is called heaven. Where will those be placed that God does not save? Some other place will have to be fixed up for them, because the place God has fixed will be filled with those that He saves. Where is your faith fixed? Are you depending on societies, churches, preachers, or some other human being for your salvation? Do you expect to get to heaven by and because of what you do, or can do, or expect to do? If so, is your faith in Christ? If your faith is in Christ, then your dependence is all in Him: your whole trust and confidence is in Him; you are depending alone upon Him and upon what He has done. and is doing, and upon what He has promised to do, for your home in heaven-that place where His people will finally be landed. And if your faith and hope and trust and confidence are all in Him, then it is true that you were embraced in God's choice. God made choice of you before time began, and predestinated you unto adoption of a child. You will be taken home to live with Him in eternal glory, when all the trials and conflicts of life are over. You will live with Him in that world where sorrows and trials can never be. There will be no wars there. There will be no sin there. He wept that we might weep; Each sin demands a tear: In heaven alone no sin is found, And there's no weeping there. There'll be no sorrow there; There'll be no sorrow there; In heaven above, where all is love, There'll be no sorrow there. The Lord willing, we will try to write some more on this subject for next issue. May the Lord's richest blessings rest upon you, is our humble prayer. C. H. C.

Election and Predestination

---October 15, 1942

In our last issue we again promised to try to write more on the above subject, So we will try to carry out the promise. Before we proceed, we wish to say that the article on this subject in the last issue was numbered wrong. It should have been marked "Article No. 7." And the article in September 17 was also numbered wrong; it should have been marked "Article No. 6." If you are keeping your papers, find those issues and mark the articles correctly. We regret the error. We will here call attention to what Paul said in **(Romans 9:7-16)**: Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children; but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. For this is the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son. And not only this; but when Rebeca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac; (for the

children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works; but of Him that calleth;) it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For He saith to Moses. I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth but of God that sheweth mercy. Here is text enough for more than we will be able to write for this issue. The first thing we wish to call attention to is the fact that Isaac was a promised child, and that he was born contrary to nature. Abraham was old and Sarah was past the age of child-bearing. But God made promise that at a certain time He would come and that Sarah should have a son. That son was Isaac. Ishmael was born of Hagar, and Ishmael was not the promised heir. He was born after the flesh. His mother was a type of the law covenant, and he was not to be heir with the child of the free woman. Isaac was a child of promise; and so is every child of God a child of promise. "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." - **(Galatians 4:28)**. Turn to the book and read the chapter, especially from (Galatians 4:21 to the end of the chapter). "And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." -(Galatians 3:29). This is a clear and positive demonstration of the choice and purpose of God. The efforts of Sarah and her handmaid did not result in the birth of the promised child; but resulted in the birth of a mocker. Even so to this day-the efforts of all the societies in the world and the works of men do not result in the spiritual birth of one into the heavenly family. God comes, as He did then, in the power and might of His Holy Spirit, and the promised child is born into the heavenly family; and Jerusalem which is above, and is free, is the mother. This Jerusalem is the covenant which is everlasting, and is ordered in all things and sure. They were embraced in that covenant before they had existence, "when as yet there was none of them." Here is the doctrine of election, God's choice, and God's purpose clearly demonstrated. Then the apostle refers to Rebecca, the wife of Isaac To Rebecca and Isaac two boys were born, and they were twins. It seems that Paul was not satisfied to demonstrate and show forth the doctrine of God's sovereign choice and His predestination by the use of Isaac and Ishmael, so he now brings out two more boys -twin boys, who had the same father and the same mother. Though they were twins, yet Esau was born first. Under the law the family blessing was always to go to and be bestowed upon the elder, or the oldest boy. But God had not so chosen in this case. Before the boys were born the Lord told their mother that "the elder shall serve the younger." The word elder literally means the greater and the word younger literally means the lesser. Here is a promise of God concerning these boys before they were born. God made choice of the lesser, or the younger-Jacob-that he should serve the greater, or the elder-Esau. Here is a display of God's choice in the matter; and it was not the law by which it was manifested or done, but it was a display of His mercy and grace and His sovereign choice. God loved Jacob and bestowed the blessing upon him. God hated Esau, He did not love Esau, and passed him by and bestowed the blessing upon Jacob. This was not done because Jacob had done good and Esau had done bad, for it was before they were born, and neither of them had done any good or evil. "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth." -(Romans 9:11). Here the apostle positively and unequivocally declared that in this is the doctrine of election and God's purpose or predestination set forth. Why try to "wrest" this to try to make it teach something else? When and if one does that, is it not a clear demonstration of the fact that he is not satisfied with the teaching of God's Book?

Years ago a lady said to us, "I do not believe that doctrine; I do not care if it is in the Bible." Why not be candid about the matter, and do as that lady did, just say positively that you do not believe the Bible? God made choice of Jacob, and Jacob was a type of all God's people. "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. For the Lord's portion is His people; Jacob is the lot of His inheritance." - (Deuteronomy 32:8-9). Jacob, then, represented the Lord's portion, the Lord's people, the Lord's inheritance. God loved Jacob before he was born; and He loved His people before they existed. He loved them from everlasting, and will love them to everlasting. His love is eternal. He loved them from eternity, and made choice of them, and purposed to save them in eternal glory; to deliver them from the curse of the law-to save them from their sins. Just where the Lord found Jacob is where He finds all His people-in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness. And as He did with Jacob, so He does with each one of them. "He led him about, He instructed him, He kept him as the apple of His eye." Is there unrighteousness with God because He does all this? Some people think so; for some will tell us that if God thus makes choice of one and saves that one without conditions upon his part, and does not give all the others a chance, that He is unjust. We have even heard some say that if He does this He is meaner than the devil. But the inspired apostle did not thus view the matter. He asks the question, in anticipation of what some say about the matter, even in this so-called enlightened day, "What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God?" Then He answers the question in positive language, "God forbid." It is God's sovereign prerogative to make choice of a poor sinner and deliver that sinner from eternal destruction from His presence-from eternal suffering in an endless torment. Hence "He saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." In His declaration to Moses He declared His sovereign choice of sinners and His purpose to save them. He saves whom He wills to save. He has compassion on whom He wills to have compassion. He has mercy on whom He wills to have mercy. And it is alone the mercy of God by which a poor sinner is saved, and not what the sinner does. And God bestows that mercy upon whom He wills to bestow it. He has made choice of them, and saves them according to that choice and purpose. He made choice of them, and predestinated to save them. Hence He bestows His mercy upon those He has chosen and predestinated to save. Hence the salvation of the sinner is "not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." The unregenerate sinner has a will, but his will is wrong; he runs, but he runs in the wrong way. The will the sinner has, and the running which he does, has nothing under heaven to do with his salvation. "It is of God that sheweth mercy." His salvation is all of God, and not partly of God and partly of his own will or work, or running. Have you learned and felt this truth in your own heart? If you have, you have been taught of God. God was your teacher in bringing you to know this great truth. And if God has been your teacher, then you are a child of God; for the prophet said, "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children." -((4:13) (Isaiah 54:13). Everlasting peace is yours beyond this world of turmoil and war. So by experience I do know There's nothing good that I can do; I cannot satisfy the law, Nor hope, nor comfort from it draw. My nature is so prone to sin, Which makes my doing so unclean, That when I count up all the cost, If not free grace, then I am lost. May Heaven's blessings rest upon you, is our prayer. Pray for us. We will try to write some more on this subject for next issue. C. H. C.

Election and Predestination

---November 5, 1942

Again in our last issue we promised to try to write more on the above subject. So we will try again to comply with the promise. This time we will start our little article by calling attention to **(Zechariah 13:1)**, which reads as follows: In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness. The word shall is used in different ways or senses. Sometimes it is used in the sense of prophecy—simply telling beforehand what will come to pass at some time in the future. Sometimes it is used in the sense of a mere statement of fact. Sometimes it is used in the sense of a command, or in the giving of a command. Sometimes it is used in the sense of determination; it carries with it the idea of determination on the part of the speaker. Let us look, for a few minutes, at **((Dan 12:10) (Daniel 12:10))** “Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.” In this text the word shall is used in the first place in the sense of determination—“many shall be purified, and made white, and tried.” This is not something which they do themselves. It is something to be done by another, and done for and to them. They “shall be purified, and made white.” The Lord determined that they should be thus made—made pure; they “shall be purified.” Poor sinners are made pure by the work of the Lord. God the Holy Spirit makes the application of the blood of Christ to them, and thus they are purified and made white. The Lord determined to do this; and He chose those for and to whom this would be done. He chose those whom He would purify from their sins, and make white in the blood of the Lamb. The next clause says; “but the wicked shall do wickedly.” They do not do wickedly because God determined that they should; but they do wickedly because it is their nature to do wickedly. Hence, that is simply a statement of a fact. It was that way when the language was written; it was that way before the language was written; and it is that way yet, and it will continue to be that way. The wicked have always done wickedly because it was their nature to do wickedly; and they will always do wickedly because it is their nature to do that way. The next clause says: “and none of the wicked shall understand.” Why is it that none of the wicked shall understand? The Saviour answers that question for us very plainly. In **(John 8:43)** He said to some wicked Jews, “Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word.” The reason why the wicked shall not understand is because they cannot hear His word—they cannot understand it. “None of the wicked shall understand” because they cannot understand. Something must be done for the sinner which he cannot do for himself in order that he be able to understand—he must be changed first, in order that he understand. In our text at the beginning of this article the Lord declares that in a certain day a fountain shall be opened. This carries with it the idea that the Lord had determined the fountain to be opened, or that it should be opened. He was going to see to it that this would come to pass; He was going to bring it to pass. This certainly carries with it the idea that the Lord determined this beforehand. That is God's predestination. Not only did He determine that this fountain should be opened, but He determined that a certain end should be reached— a certain thing should be accomplished by, and as a result of, the opening of this fountain. Note, carefully, that the text says “in that day.” This signifies a certain day, a fixed day—not “in those days,” but “in that day.” The Lord determined to do this, or that it should be done, in a certain day. The day was fixed, or determined, as well as the thing to be done was determined. The Lord determined that this should be done at a determined time—in a certain day. “In that day there shall be a fountain opened.” The Lord determined to do

what He does, and determined the time that He will do it. When the Lord does a thing, it is but the fulfilling, or bringing to pass, what He determined beforehand to do; and He does it at the time He determined to do it. He never gets behind with His work, nor does He get ahead with His work. He always does His work on time, and at the right time. It is always at the right time for the thing to be accomplished which He determined to be accomplished. The Lord did not say, in this text, that the fountain should be opened for the benefit of all mankind, or that all mankind might have access to it. Neither did He say that it would be free for all who would accept it; but it "shall be opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem." The fountain is opened to these special people. It was not to be opened to the Amorites, the Hittites, the Jebusites, or the Perizzites, or the Hivites-but to the Israelites; the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The Lord made choice of those to whom the fountain should be opened. The fountain was not to be opened a part of the way, and they to come the rest of the way-but the fountain was to be opened to them; it was to reach them, and to benefit them. It was to do something for them and to them, or in them. The fountain was not to be opened in order that there might be sin and uncleanness; but to take away sin and uncleanness. "The blood of Jesus cleanseth us from all sin." It is not baptism that takes away sin, or that cleanses from sin; but it is the blood of Jesus which does that. A fountain is self-sustaining. It requires no power outside of itself to sustain it. A fountain is self-purifying. Place poison in the fountainhead of a stream, and the fountain will remove and carry the poison away itself. No power outside of itself is needed in order that the poison be removed. All the sins of the chosen people of God were laid on Jesus. "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." -Isaiah liii. 6. But the fountain has carried all those sins away into the land of forgetfulness, and the Lord has said, "and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." -(Hebrews 8:12). When the blessed Redeemer hung on Calvary's cross and bowed His head and gave up the ghost, and poured out His blood on Calvary's hill, the fountain was opened. It is self-sustaining. It needs not the help of men or angels in order that it be sustained; nor does it need the help of men or angels to make it sufficient to carry sins away into the land of forgetfulness. "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." - **(Matthew 26:28)**. The blood of Jesus is sufficient to remit sins; hence baptism is not necessary in order to the remission of sins. This fountain was opened to, and for the benefit of, all spiritual Israel, the chosen of God; and He predestinated their salvation; He predestinated that all their sins and iniquities should be taken away by the efficacy of this fountain, and that they should all finally be brought home to glory, to live with Him in that glory world. He predestinated that they should be glorified. There is a fountain filled with blood Drawn from Immanuel's veins. And sinners plunged into that flood. Lose all their guilty stains. The dying thief rejoiced to see That fountain in his day; I hope that blood was shed for me, And washed my sins away. Dear dying Lamb! Thy precious blood Shall never lose its power, Till all the ransomed church of God Are saved to sin no more. E'er since by faith I saw the stream Thy flowing wounds supply, Redeeming love has been my theme, And shall be till I die. When this poor, lisping, stammering tongue Lies silent in the grave, Then in a nobler, sweeter song I'll sing thy power to save. We will try to write some more for next issue on this subject, the Lord willing. May His rich blessings rest upon you, and may these articles be blessed to the good of the readers. Please remember us in prayer. C. H. C.

No Objection Then

---November 5, 1942

In March, 1913 (see The Primitive Baptist of March 11, 1913), we said; For five years we worked on this hymn and tune book, and do not hesitate to say that we believe it to be the best that can be found. Every song has been selected with the utmost care, and dozens of books have been examined in making these selections. We have tried hard to get every line of unsound sentiment out. Our people have depended on books, for years, containing songs that have been changed by others to suit their theories. We should sing the truth, as well as preach it. If it is wrong to preach heresy it is wrong to sing it. We heard no objection to this then. If one objects now who did not object then, is he like he was then? We still hold to the same sentiment today as was expressed by us in the foregoing, as to singing the truth, and that was nearly thirty years ago. We here copy from an article written by Elder Lee Hanks, which appeared in the columns of The Primitive Baptist of January 28, 1913: Our esteemed brother, Elder C. H. Cayce, has gone to much expense and given much of his time, too, in getting up one of the best hymn and tune books I ever saw. He has selected the good old music from the old Sacred Harp, Christian Harmony and Southern Harmony. It contains between 700 and 800 songs, embracing all the good old songs that we so much love to hear, in Lloyd's and other books. All of us should put' our shoulders to the wheel and aid him in this laudable undertaking. It is a shame to hear these little fast Freewill songs in an Old Baptist Church. We should sing the good old songs that correspond with what we preach. All who want this book send Brother Cayce the money at once.---Every family should have one or more, and our churches should have a number of them.---We need a singing school taught in this book in every Old Baptist Church. Principles are eternal and never change. What was truth then, is truth now. The Good Old Songs is the same book now that it was when first published, except several songs were added in the second edition. If you want a book that is free from Freewillism, and music suited to the "city of our solemnities," use the Good Old Songs. C. H. C.

Election and Predestination

---November 19, 1942

Again we will try to write a few lines on the above subject, according to the promise we made in the last issue of The Primitive Baptist. This time we wish to call attention to **(Romans 8:28-33)**, which reads as follows: And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Before taking up a line of thought in connection with the subject of election and predestination, we wish to say a few words concerning another matter contained in the Scripture above quoted. We wish to say a few things concerning the words all things in the text. Here is a real need of rightly dividing the word of truth, as the Apostle Paul taught Timothy, in **(II Timothy 2:15)**, where he said, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." To rightly divide is

to rightly apply-apply each Scripture where it belongs. To quote a text and apply it where the Lord did not put it is to wrongly divide the word of truth. To put it where it belongs, and apply it to what the Lord has applied it, is to rightly divide it. He did not say to divide truth from error. That will take care of itself when the truth is rightly divided, or rightly applied. Everything taught in the Bible is truth. The Bible is the truth. But every truth in the Bible belongs just where God has placed it. Let us illustrate this fact in this way: In **(II Timothy 1:9)** the apostle said, "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." Here the apostle tells us, emphatically, that this is a saving which is not according to our works. Our works, whether good or bad, do not have a thing in the whole wide world to do with this saving. The things which we do, or the things which we may leave undone, do not have a thing in the world to do with this saving. This is a saving which is not according to what we do. Can we rightly divide the word of truth by saying there is no saving at all that what we do has nothing to do with? Let us see what the same apostle has said in **(I Timothy 4:16)** "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." In this text the apostle tells Timothy he would save himself and them that hear him by doing this. Here is a saving, then, which this minister was to accomplish by doing what the Lord here commanded him to do, or by doing that which he was instructed to do. Timothy would not save himself in heaven by doing this. He would not make himself to become a child of God by doing this. It was too late for him to save himself in the sense of being regenerated by doing this, for he was already a child of God and a called minister of Jesus Christ. He had already been born from above; and hence it was too late for him to do this in order to be born again. But it was not too late for him to save himself from false doctrine, or from the doctrines and commandments of men, by doing this. It was necessary that he do this in order to save himself from false doctrines, or from the doctrines and commandments of men. By doing this, he would not only save himself from these things, but he would save them that hear him. The word hear, as it is used in this text, means to take heed, or to observe the teaching. It does not simply mean to hear the vocal sound of your preaching, but to take heed to it. This means to understand and then to observe the teaching. The unregenerate cannot understand gospel preaching, or gospel teaching. "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." - (John 8:43). Jesus said this to some wicked unregenerated Jews. In ((7) (John 8:47) He said, "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." One must first be of God in order to be able to hear God's words, or to hear the gospel. "We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us." - **(I John 4:6)**. Those who really hear the gospel preaching are already of God; and the true minister is to save such persons, as well as himself from false doctrines, from the doctrines and commandments of men. This matter is very important for the benefit, instruction, and comfort of the Lord's humble poor, as they are pilgrims and strangers here; but this does not have a thing in the world to do with them reaching heaven, or with their happiness in the glory world. One time when we were in discussion with a gentleman he asked, "What in the world do you preach for? Why do you spend so much time in that work, and so much labor in that line? You say that no one is saved as a result of the preaching you do; then what do you preach for, if it is not to save somebody?" We replied that we do try to, and expect to save some folks, by our preaching, the Lord helping us. He then wanted to know what we expected to save them from. We replied by saying, "We expect to save some from the heresy which you teach." We are sure that by the Lord's help many of His little children

have been saved from heresy here in the world by the preaching which has been done by the Lord's true ministers. Here is a plain distinction which shows clearly the necessity of rightly dividing the word of truth. We need to apply the word saved where it belongs where and when we find it in God's blessed Book. The same thing is true regarding other things taught therein. Suppose we apply the expression all things, as found in our text, to everything that exists in the world. If we do that, we are sure we would not be rightly dividing the word of truth. Will it do to say that God and Satan are working together? We were told, once, of a preacher who said, "God cannot lie; but He raised up a nasty little devil to do His lying for Him." God did not raise Pharaoh up to lie, but to show His power in him, and that His name might be declared throughout all the earth. If that preacher told the truth, then God wanted some lying done, but was ashamed to do it Himself, so He "raised up a nasty little devil" to do that for Him. The only job the devil has, according to that, is what God raised him up to do, and what God wanted him to do-the things the Lord is ashamed to do Himself. So, according to that, they must be working together. Perhaps, according to that, they went into partnership, and are working harmoniously together, and God is as well pleased with the devil and his work as He was, or is, with the work of His dear Son. This may be true, but we confess that we have not so understood God's Book to teach. Satan has been working, from the first account we have of him, contrary to God; and he is doing that yet. Again, we are told of two things which do not work together: "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." -Gal. v. 17. Here are two things which are contrary the one to the other. As they are contrary the one to the other, they are not working together. They are working contrary to each other. Here is wherein there is a warfare going on in the child of grace. That one who has been born of God, or from above, still is in possession of that old sinful nature, the flesh, and he is also in possession of the Spirit; and these are contrary the one to the other. From hence arises the warfare within; and this is a warfare that will never cease while they live here in the world. These two things are contrary the one to the other. It has always been that way, and always will be that way, here in this world. They do not work together. One influences and leads in one direction, and the other leads and influences in the opposite direction. We cannot rightly divide the word of truth by applying the expression in our text, all things, to these two things which are contrary the one to the other. The all things in our text, then, does not mean all things numerically, but it applies to the all things under consideration-to the all things which the Lord will give us, as expressed in verse 32, which the apostle says, or teaches, that the Lord will give us. We have now just reached the text, or the part of the text, bearing directly upon the subject, but we have written enough for this time; so we will try to continue the matter in our next issue. Perhaps we have written enough on this subject. Unless our readers desire that we continue the subject further, we may try to conclude with our next article. May the Lord bless our readers. Please remember us in prayer. C. H. C.

Election and Predestination

---December 3, 1942

In our last issue we promised to write again on the above subject. We did not get through with writing on **(Romans 8:28-33)**. In order that the reader may have the text before him. we will here quote the language again: And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to

be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all. how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose." Those who love God are those who are the called according to His purpose. They do not call themselves. They are called by another, and God is the one who does that calling. "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me His prisoner; but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God; who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." -(II Timothy 1:8-9). God does this calling, and He does it according to His purpose. He does not call a poor sinner out of death into life, or out of nature's darkness into His marvelous light, by accident. He does that on purpose. He purposed to do the calling before He does it. If and when a sinner is called with this holy calling, God does that according to His own purpose and grace. It is a fulfilment of His purpose. It is but God doing what He purposed, or intended, to do. Those who are thus called by the Lord of glory, by the Holy Spirit's work, are thereby brought to love God; and the all things the apostle is talking about in our text work together for their good. The Father will, with Christ, give to these same persons the all things which work together for their good. "How shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" This last statement is in the form of a question, and is the strongest way of saying that "He will with Him also freely give us all things." Here is God's purpose, plainly stated by the apostle. To purpose to do a thing is to predestinate to do that thing. Remember that predestinate means to determine beforehand. To determine a thing beforehand is to purpose a thing before it is done. As those who are called according to His purpose, and God does the calling, then God purposed to call those who are called. As some of the race are called, and some of the race are not called, it follows that God made choice of those He does call. Here is election and predestination; and no one can dispute it without disputing the plain and positive and emphatic statements of the Word of God. And if this part of the Bible is not the truth, who can tell whether any of it be true or not? "For whom He did foreknow." There is a sense in which God foreknew and does foreknow all things- everything that has ever yet existed, or that will ever exist; everything that has ever yet transpired, or that ever will transpire-but here is a particular sense in which He did foreknow some that He did not foreknow others. The apostle did not say "what He did foreknow" -but "whom He did foreknow." He foreknew that every person would exist that ever has existed or that ever will exist. But these were foreknown in His everlasting covenant of grace, and the others were not. They were embraced in the covenant, and thus foreknown. He made choice of them and gave them to the Son in the covenant. "For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son." Those who love God are those who have been called; those who have been called, and who love God, are those He foreknew in the covenant; they are those whom He chose and embraced in the covenant; and those He foreknew He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son. He determined beforehand that these same people should be conformed to the image of His Son. He predestinated that somebody should be conformed to the image of Jesus; and He calls every one that He predestinated. Every person that He predestinated to be conformed to the image of Jesus, He also calls out of nature's

darkness into His marvelous light. "Whom He called, them He also justified." How did the Lord justify them? "Much more then, being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him." -(Romans 5:9). They are justified by the blood of Christ. Who are justified by the blood of Christ? Those for whom that blood was shed; and He shed His blood for every one the Father predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son. And every one that is justified by His blood shall be saved from wrath through Him. What is the final end to be accomplished through all this? "Whom He justified, them He also glorified." The final glorification of each one whom He foreknew in the covenant is the end to be reached. He predestinated just as many to be conformed to the image of His Son as He did foreknow; and He calls just as many as He predestinated; and He justified as many as are called; and as many as were justified will be finally glorified. There will be just as many in the number glorified in the final windup as were in the first thing mentioned. There will be no increase in the number, nor will there be any decrease. Sure enough, "what shall we then say to these things?" What do you say, dear reader? Do you object to being conformed to the image of Jesus? Do you object to being glorified and qualified to live with God in glory? Do you love God? If you love the Lord, it is because God made choice of you before time was, and embraced you in His covenant-knew you beforehand in the covenant-and predestinated that you should be conformed to the image of His Son; and Jesus died for you on Calvary's cross, and justified you by His blood; and the Holy Spirit has called you out of nature's darkness into divine relationship with Him, and thus brought you to love Him; and as certain as God lives you shall live also; and you shall live in a glorified state beyond this vale of tears. You shall live with Him where there are no wars, no bloodshed, no sorrow, no pain, no sickness, no sin, and no death. There will be no dark seasons there. Loved ones will not be called away to war. There will be no night there. "If God be for us, who can be against us?" If God be for you in foreknowledge, in predestination, in calling, in justification, and in the final end of it all, your glorification, then who can be against you? Satan, with all his emissaries, can never be able to drag you down to eternal night. The Lord will, with His Son, freely give you all things necessary to your final glorification, and you will see Him as He is, and be like Him. Since the Father delivered up His Son for you, how shall He not with Him also freely give you all things necessary to your final glorification and your eternal happiness beyond this life? These people the Father delivered up His Son for are His elect. "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" God has an elect people-they are people-folks-sinners of Adam's fallen race! they are persons; not some imaginary, invisible, intangible something; but tangible human beings. They are God's elect; He chose them; He embraced them by choice before the world was, before they had existence; He foreknew them as His in the covenant; He predestinated them unto the adoption of sons; He justified them by the blood of Jesus; He calls them out of a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ; they are preserved in Christ Jesus; He will see to it that they are all finally glorified. Since it is God that justifies them, who can lay any thing to their charge? Who can condemn one that God justifies? If one be condemned that God justifies, then the case must be appealed from God's high court in heaven to a higher court than His. Is there a higher court to which the case of one the Lord justifies can be appealed? Since God's court is the highest court, then there can be no appeal taken. And as no appeal can be taken to another, or to a higher court, then their justification is an eternal or everlasting justification-it will never be any other way only that they stand justified before the Three-One God-the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. It is God that justifieth. God does this. God is the supreme Judge in His court, and His court is the Supreme Court. God Himself, through what His Son has done for you, justifies you; He absolves you and makes you free from

all guilt. Your guilt has been removed through what Jesus has done for you. "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered." - (Romans 4:7). The righteousness of Jesus is imputed to you and covers all your sins; and thus you are made pure in the sight of the Father. As your sins are covered, put out of His sight, He declares you innocent. The righteousness of Jesus is yours and in His righteousness you are innocent; and you stand justified in the sight of God. Well might the poet say:

Let me, my Saviour and my God,
On sovereign grace rely;
And own 'tis free, because bestowed

On one so vile as I
Election! 'tis a word divine;
For, Lord, I plainly see,
Had not thy choice prevented mine,
I ne'er had chosen thee.
For perseverance, strength I've none,
But would on this depend,
That Jesus, having loved His own,
Will love them to the end.
Empty and bare I come to thee
For righteousness divine;
O! may thy glorious merits be
By imputation mine.
Free grace alone can wipe the tears
From my lamenting eyes,
And raise my soul, from guilty fears,
To joy that never dies.
Free grace can death itself outbrave,
And take the sting away;
Can sinners to the utmost save,
And give them victory.

We beg the Lord's richest blessings to rest upon you; and may He bless what we have written to the comfort of His poor and afflicted children who may read the same, is our humble prayer. We beg an interest in your petitions at the throne of mercy. We do not promise now to write more on this subject for the present. That depends upon the way we may feel impressed to write when the time comes. C. H. Cayce.

Then and Now

---December 3, 1942

In The Primitive Baptist of April 8, 1913, under the heading, "Do You Love the Truth?" we said the following: If so, you should love to hear it sung, as well as preached; it matters not in what way it appears, it is the truth just the same. There is not an Old Baptist anywhere but what honestly and conscientiously believes that we, as a people, preach the truth. It is edifying, upbuilding and comforting to the Christian, because it is truth and he is of the truth. Now, it is inconsistent to preach the truth and sing songs tainted with Arminian sentiment. There is a tendency among our people in some sections to drift into Arminianism in their song service- they sing Arminian songs, when they would not endorse or fellowship a man who

would preach the same sentiments they sing in their worship. We appeal to every Old Baptist everywhere to contend for and sing the good old songs our fathers and mothers sang. They are sound in sentiment, and call to memory the sacredness and solemnity of our song service in bygone days. In order to perpetuate those good old songs and stop the encroachments of Arminianism into our raiuis in the form of fast "Yankee Doodle" songs, we have worked hard for five years for something to meet that demand, and we've got it-a hymn and tune book of 420 pages and containing 715 of the good old songs, with not a single Arminian sentiment in all of its makeup. We are doing this writing today-October 22, 1942 - just 29 years, 6 months and 14 days since the above appeared in print in our columns. We heard no complaint then among our people concerning the sentiment we expressed at that time. We stand now just where we did then. Do you stand on the principles now that we set forth in the foregoing more than twenty-nine years ago? If you stood there then and do not stand there now, you are not like you were then. How about it? Where do you stand now? Have you "wobbled on the gudgeon?" May the Lord help us all to stand true to His cause and blessed truth. C. H. C.

Election and Predestination

---December 17, 1942

In our last issue we did not promise to write more on the above subject, but that our doing so would depend upon the way we felt impressed when the time came to write. We have had so many requests to continue the subject that we have decided to write a little more on the same. This time we will call attention to the following language: Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness; in hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began; but hath in due time manifested His word through preaching, which is committed unto me according to the commandment of God our Saviour.-(Titus 1:1-3). Here we have it that Paul was a servant of God. He served the true and living God. He was a loving servant. He was not this by nature, or while in an unregenerate state. While in an unregenerate state he thought he should do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, which things he has told us he also did. But the Lord, in His rich mercy and grace, arrested this poor sinner and changed him from a persecuting Saul to a praying Paul. The Lord made him a prisoner; "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me His prisoner." -(II Timothy 1:8). While it is true that he was a prisoner, he was brought to love his Captor. He was brought into divine relationship with God, and thus brought to love the Lord. Hence he was made to be a willing prisoner. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." -((0:3) (Psalms 110:3). God's power was manifested in turning this man from his evil way, and made him to become a willing servant. Paul was not only a servant of God, but he was an apostle of Jesus Christ. There were already twelve apostles-one for each of the twelve tribes; but this man was made to be an apostle to the Gentiles. He was our apostle. God had a people among the Gentiles, as well as among the Jews, and in the person of this man the Gentiles had representation in the office of the apostleship. In the work of an apostle to the Gentiles the Lord had a work for an educated man, to do; and He knew where to find the man, and He was able to call him and to put him into the ministry. He was able to make him a minister-He did not need the aid or assistance of any man or set of men to make this man an able minister; He did not need the aid of some

theological school to give him the finishing touches. When the Lord has a work for an educated man to do, He knows where to find the man, and He is still able to call the man and to put him into the ministry. "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the word to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in His presence." -(I Corinthians 1:26-29). This was according to the faith of God's elect. God had an elect; His elect were, and are, His chosen people. As they were God's elect, God did the electing, or the choosing. They were chosen in Christ before the ages of time began; see **(Ephesians 1:4)**. They were chosen before they did either good or evil. As the choice was made before they did either good or evil, it necessarily follows that the election was unconditional upon their part. They were chosen too soon for them to do good in order to be elected; but they were the elect of God. God cannot lie, and He promised eternal life. As He promised eternal life, persons must have been embraced in the promise. Persons were embraced in the promise before they had existence, for the promise was made before the world began. The phrase, before the world began, literally means before the ages of time. Before time began the Lord made promise of eternal life. He promised eternal life to all the race, or top. part of the race, or to none of the race. If He promised eternal life at all, as the apostle says He did, then He must have promised eternal life to a part of the race or to all the race. If He promised eternal life to all the race, then all the race will receive eternal life. If all the race receive eternal life, then the doctrine of election is not true, and God does not have an elect. To elect one is to choose that one and leave others. As God has an elect, then He chose them. They were embraced in His choice. Then as God has an elect, He did not promise eternal life to all the race, but He did promise eternal life to some of the race, and they were His elect who were embraced in the promise. As God cannot lie, it follows that every one will receive eternal life who was embraced in the promise; or eternal life will be imparted to every person who was embraced in the promise; every person who was embraced in His election or choice will receive eternal life. Certainly God did not promise eternal life without any intention of fulfilling the promise. He certainly intended to fulfill the promise when He made the promise. If He made the promise without an intention of fulfilling it, then He would be guilty of double dealing. As He cannot be guilty of double dealing, because He cannot lie, then when He made the promise, His intention was to fulfill it. It was God's purpose to do what He promised. He predestinated to do what He promised-give eternal life to each one embraced in the promise. As He does not change (see Malachi iii. G), then He will not decide later to do some other way than the way He promised. Paul's hope of life eternal was based alone on the promise of God and His power and will to fulfill the promise. Was his hope well grounded? Upon what is your hope based? Is your hope of eternal life, your hope of living with God in glory, based upon your good deeds? Is it based upon the good things you have done, or may do, or can do? If so, your hope is not based upon the same thing Paul's hope was based upon. Is your hope of heaven and eternal glory based alone upon the promise of God, and His power and will to fulfill that promise? Is it based alone upon the Lord, and what He has done and what He has promised to do for poor sinners? If so, then your hope has the same foundation the apostle's hope had. Was Paul a child of God? Yes, most assuredly. If Paul was a child of God, and your hope is based upon the same thing his hope was based upon, then so are you a child of God, and you were embraced in His election; you are one of the objects of His sovereign choice, and you will be given to live with Him in eternal glory. May

He give you more and sweeter assurance of your acceptance with Him, especially in these dark and gloomy times, is our humble prayer. We may try to write more on this subject, if we feel impressed so to do. Please remember us in prayer. C. H. C.

Holiday Greetings

---December 17, 1942

From our earliest recollection it has been a custom during the holidays-Christmas and New Year-for people to say, "Merry Christmas and Happy New Year." We confess that at this time we hardly know how to say that-and yet we wish for each one of you a "Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year." While we really and sincerely wish this for you, yet we are well aware of the fact that this will be a sad Christmas for the inmates of many homes into which this paper goes. But we wish for you as sweet and pleasant a time as the circumstances and conditions will allow. May God grant that each sorrowing and grieved person who reads this may have the blessed and sweet manifestation of His glorious and divine presence to soothe your sorrows, to ease your aching hearts, and to give you blessed peace in your souls. May His richest blessing rest upon each one of you, and those who are dear to you, is our sincere wish and prayer for you. May He give you grace to trust Him, and to rely upon Him, and may Hosea bless you with the assurance that He will not leave you nor forsake you. C. H. C.

CLOSE OF VOLUME 57

---December 17, 1942

This issue closes the fifty-seventh volume of The Primitive Baptist. When it has been our lot at times to write an article for the close of a volume we have sometimes wondered if that would be the last article on that line for us to write. We know we are another mile on our journey to the end of our pilgrimage on earth. We have had trials during the past year, as in every year of our pilgrimage. We believe we knew something of what Paul was talking about when he spoke of the perils of false brethren. We know what it is to be persecuted by men claiming to be the ministers of the Lord Jesus. We know what it is to be misrepresented. We know what it is for things we have written and said to be garbled, and what it is to be accused of saying things we did not say, and that we had no thought of saying. We know what it is to be accused of knowing things we did not know. But, thank the Lord, He is the Judge of men's hearts. We are glad that the Lord knows; and we are glad that He has said, "Vengeance is mine: I will repay, saith the Lord." A year ago our beloved country was plunged into the awful world conflict. We have had trying times during the past year, with almost the whole world engaged in the bloodiest war that the world has, perhaps, over known. Battles are being fought on land, on sea, and in the air. Our young men have been taken from the fond embrace of fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, sweethearts, wives and children; and many more will be called before the awful conflict is over. We have a son-in-law who is somewhere in the distant lands. We have two boys who may be called to the colors before the conflict is over. They have been deferred to finish training that they have been taking. May the good Lord bless and keep them all who are on the bloody battlefields. We are sure that the Lord is in all the habitable parts of the world, and He is able to reach them, no matter where they are, by the power and presence of His Holy Spirit, and to save them from eternal ruin and destruction, Men may kill their bodies, but they cannot kill the soul No other but the Lord can shield and protect and save then. Our feeble prayers go out for them, and for the loved ones

who are left behind. It is professed that we are fighting for our freedom. May God, in mercy, grant that our freedom may not be taken from us. We may all truthfully confess that we have been unmindful of God and His goodness to us. We have not all been as faithful as we should have been. Many have tried to destroy each other, instead of trying to live as close to each other as we should, and have disobeyed God's righteous law. when we should have been walking uprightly. If we will but consider the wickedness in the world, we may not be amazed that we are being visited with the judgments of God. May the Lord help us to repent in dust and ashes-not only as individuals, but as a nation. May God have mercy, and pity His poor and afflicted people, is our prayer. And may His blessings rest upon our readers. Our prayers go out, especially, for the boys w7e have in the bloody war in distant countries.

With this we bid you all farewell for this year. The year with us now passes into history. The pages are written, and cannot be unwritten by us. Farewell, C. H. C,
END OF VOLUME SEVEN