

THE HART-MANSFIELD DEBATE

FIRST PROPOSITION

The Scriptures teach: That it is right for members of the Church of Christ to meet together on Sunday, divide into classes and teach the Word of God, using human helps, and have women teachers in such congregations.

Lee P. Mansfield affirms.

J. M. Hart denies.

SECOND PROPOSITION

The Scriptures teach: That God has given us members of the Church of Christ a method by which we are to direct all the services of the Church.

J. M. Hart affirms.

Lee P. Mansfield denies.

Red Fork. Oklahoma, October, 1924.

Part of the

Jimmie Beller Memorial eLibrary

www.TheCobbSix.com

PREFACE.

Dear Reader:

Seeing the divided and warring condition of all believers in Christ, and recognizing the sinfulness of such division, both J.M. Hart and Lee P. Mansfield mutually agreed to discuss the above propositions, using and recognizing the Holy Scriptures as the standard of proof.

No doubt each of the disputants recognize the truthfulness of the statement: "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself, it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps."— Jer. 10:23.

As such we see, this discussion was not for the purpose of determining what particular way any one may think to be right in the sight of God. Seeing the inability of man to direct his steps, may ye who read, carefully and prayerfully study this discussion and be moved alone by the Word of God.

We pray that each side will hoist the flag of truce and return again unto the Word of God and there learn anew the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace: that there may be one Shepherd and one fold.

Kind Reader, duty to yourself, your family, your nation, and your God demand that you judge aright who is in harmony with the Word of God.

THE AUTHOR.

SUBJECT

The Scriptures teach that it is right for members of the Church of Christ to meet together on Sunday, divide into classes, and teach the Word of God, using human helps, and have women teachers in such congregations.

Lee P. Mansfield affirms.

J.M. Hart denies.

MANSFIELD'S FIRST SPEECH.

Introduction:—Those things about which we agree are not under consideration in this discussion. We both believe that it is right to teach the Word of God to both old and young. We both also agree that it is right to teach the Word of God **on** Sunday. We are both agreed that it is wrong to organize any kind of human society to do the work of teaching. The Church is the only society through which we are to teach the Word of God. We both agree that God has commanded the Church to assemble for worship on each Lord's Day. This meeting of the Church for worship is not under discussion. I take the position that members of the Church can meet—at an hour when it does not conflict with the worship of the Church—and engage in teaching the Word of God to both old and young. When Paul told Timothy to “Preach the Word” (II Tim. 4:1-3), he also told him to do it “In season and out of season.” There are no restrictions placed upon one as to the time of teaching. He can teach at the worship and he can teach at other times. When we meet for worship, we are told just what to do. I am sure that Brother Hart will agree with me as to the truthfulness of the above statements.

Argument One.

There are two ways to teach. One by speaking and the other by writing. There are also two ways to teach by speaking. One by preaching or delivering a public discourse, the other by asking and answering questions. We have divine examples of both ways. Peter preached on Pentecost and Paul preached before Agrippa. But both Peter and Paul wrote letters of instruction to the churches and disciples. If Paul could and did write lessons of instructions to Christians, why can't we do likewise and have a divine example as our guide? But you say that was inspired writing. Yes, I know that, but their preaching was also inspired preaching. If you refuse and object to teaching by letter because the example is inspired, why don't you quit preaching because you only have inspired preaching as

your example to guide you? If Brother Elam comes to your place and teaches the Church by preaching to you, you think it is all right because you say we have a divine example in the Word of God, but when Brother Elam tries to teach the church and others by letters— quarterlies— you say that is wrong and you object. Pray tell me why? Does he not have a divine example as his authority for so doing?

Argument Two

There are two kinds of commands in the Bible. One is generic and the other is specific. The command to “Go preach” is generic. The command to “Sing” is specific. When God gives a generic command, he does not give the method of carrying out that command. But when God gives a specific command He tells how to do that. Take the command "Go into all the world." Does God tell me how I am to go? Can I not select my own mode of “going”? I can walk, go on a boat, a train, or any way I may select. I should go the quickest and best way to carry out the command of God. Therefore, in carrying out the command of God to “Teach all the nations,” I am free to select the best method of teaching. The written page and the class system is by far the best method of teaching children we have today. If you will read “New International Encyclopedia, ” Vol. 18, page 700, under the subject of Sunday School, you will find the same methods used by the Jews and early church that we are using today.

Argument Three.

Neh. 8:1-8. Fourteen men sent among the crowd to make them understand the law. Here you have the very thing practiced by the Jews we contend for today. Here we have a class method. There are three classes God wants taught His Word: Christians, Aliens and Children. God made the classes and we simply recognize what God has done. We feed “Milk” to the babes and “Strong meat” to men (I Cor. 3:1-3). It is a waste of time not to have classes and we are taught not to be wasteful (John 6:12).

Argument Four.

Study the following diagram:

Command	Essentials	Non-Essentials
Sing	Song-Book	Instruments of Music
Teach Bible	Class Helps	Organized Societies

In the above it is essential that we have a song-book in order to obey God in singing; but it is not essential to have an organ.

In obeying God's command to teach it is essential that we have helps because, "No man can read a passage in the Bible without the aid of human helps." Brother Hart will not even try to do so.

Dear Reader, will you just stop and think for a moment and tell me what passage you can read and understand without using human helps. All we know we have learned by the help of others. We could not even read if it had not been for the help of others. Since you are indebted to others for all you know, then pray tell me why do you object to others being taught the same way? Is it not our duty to teach others the way of life, using all the helps we can get to do so? If not, why not? The Bible is the thing to be taught, but in teaching the Bible we should use all the helps we can get to teach it.

Brother Hart cannot carry on his part of the debate without human help.

Woman and Her Work.

There are some things a woman can do and there are some things she cannot do. The things God forbids her doing she must not do, that is if she desires to please God. But there are things which God commands her to do, and she cannot fail in those things without also displeasing the Lord. Let us get before us the things she cannot do:

1. She cannot be an elder, because elder is to be husband—I Tim. 3:2.

2. She cannot be a deacon, because deacon is to be husband—I Tim. 3:12.

3. She cannot be an evangelist, because men are always selected to do the work of an evangelist.

These things are the only three things she cannot be and

therefore she cannot do the work that belongs to the elders, deacons, and evangelists. But some will ask, what can she do?

1. She can pray—I Cor. 11:15.
2. She can prophesy—I Cor. 11:5.
3. She can sing—Col. 3:16.
4. She can commune—Acts 20:7.
5. She can give—I Cor. 16:2.
6. SHE CAN TEACH—Titus 2:3-5.

The Following Statements Cannot be Called in Question.

1. God placed prophets in the early church.—I Cor. 12:28.
2. No prophets were in the early church but God-appointed prophets.
3. These prophets were placed in the church for edification, comfort and consolation.—I Cor. 14:3; Eph. 4:12.
4. Prophets were not simply teachers, they were divinely qualified teachers. Paul makes a distinction between teachers and prophets.—Eph. 4 :11.
5. Paul addressed a class in the church called prophets. —I Cor. 14:29.

It is also certain that Paul recognized WOMEN in this class as well as men.—I Cor. 11:5. Therefore, it follows that some women existed in the church that were made prophets by the divine appointment, and were qualified and did instruct the church. It is not prophesying or praying that Paul condemns, but the manner of their appearing.

In I Cor. 15:10-11, Paul calls the work of teaching “Laboring in the Lord,” and in Rom. 16:12 he mentions two *women* and says, “Who labored in the Lord.” He did not say they helped me in my labors, but they did the work themselves. He mentions about two women in this chapter who were workers in the cause of Christ.

Some examples of Godly women in the Bible:

Miriam—Ex. 15:20. was a “Prophetess.” She led the song.

Huldah—II Kings 22:14. She was in the college of the prophets.

Deborah—Judges, 5th chapter. Judged Israel.

Phoebe—Rom. 16:1-2. She was a deaconess in the church

at Cenchrea, the "Mother Church."

In the establishment of the church at Jerusalem, Joel said: "Your sons and DAUGHTERS shall prophesy."—Joel 2:28. In the fulfillment of this prophecy, Peter says: "Your sons and DAUGHTERS shall prophesy."

If the women are to take no part in the teaching, then this prophecy is unfulfilled. It is a fact that the women did prophesy and did it by the commandment of God. He who would prevent her today, stands between her and her DUTY to *God*. *He* causes her to stumble or offends her and Jesus says: "It would be better to have a millstone tied about, the neck and be drowned in the midst of the sea." "Thou art the guilty man," because you do all in your power to keep her from doing her God-given duty.

My duty to God does not embrace one day in the week and one service on that day, but it embraces every day and every hour of each day. I am to pray without ceasing and I am to teach the Word of *God* every opportunity I have. These duties are just as binding on my wife, my daughter, and my sister. In Christ, "there is neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus." My good sister, God demands that you be "a soul winner for Jesus." How can you win people to Christ without teaching the Word of God?

Questions.

1. Do you believe it is right to teach by the class system at any time when it does not interfere with the worship?

2. Do you ever use human helps in teaching the Bible?

3. At what place and under what circumstances can a woman teach?

4. Is there any time or place where we can teach by the class method and not violate any Scripture?

5. Is it Scriptural for a woman to sing in the Assembly? Please give chapter and verse.

6. Can one sing and not teach? If so how?

7. Can you have "Congregational Singing" and one speak at a time? If so, how?

8. Do not the words Saint, Disciple, Christian, and Brethren always comprehend the idea of male and female?

9. Can a woman teach the Bible in the public school and not

sin?

10. Can we assemble for Bible study at any hour that does not conflict with the worship and not sin?

We preachers have just been preaching half of the truth. We tell the stories of Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Jonah, Peter, James, John, Paul, Timothy, and Titus, but you never hear us tell the stories of Sarah, Miriam, Huldah, Deborah, Ruth, Mary, Martha, Phoebe, Lois, and Eunice. God has placed side by side in His Book the life stories of faithful *women* with the faithful men to teach us that women should be our co-workers in the Lord. Oh, woman, thou who goes down into the shadow of death that we may live; thou who was the first at the cross and the first to tell of the Savior's resurrection, thou who art purer, better, and more holy than we men, and thou who art the first to greet us with a kiss of love and the last to give up hope; we need your help in the cause of Christ.

J.M. HART'S FIRST REPLY.

Respected Friends:

It now becomes my duty as the negative speaker to reply to the speech you have just heard. But before we proceed, I desire to express thanks, not only for this opportunity, but to my opponent for the genteel manner and attitude in which he opened this discussion. Let me emphasize in the beginning, this conflict is not between men, for I am sure as brethren, we entertain none but the kindest feeling. Therefore it follows, it is a matter of principle; principles of such magnitude as to rend asunder the greatest believers in Christ since Apostolic days. Error may be found on both sides of this question. But one thing is certain, we both cannot be in the right.

Just at this juncture, I desire to call your attention to the first three words in his proposition. "The Scriptures teach." Therefore, we see my Brother is affirming the Scriptures to teach: Division into classes, Human helps, and Women teachers. Occupying the negative as I do, makes it evident that I do not believe the Scriptures so teach; hence it follows the pivotal point on which this question must turn is the point of authority. By whose authority are these practices performed as a religious observance? I am glad we are to measure this question by the one and only divine measuring reed, the Word of God. Kind Friends, there is one fact that we will all admit. The Scriptures do or they do not so teach; if they do so teach, we have a right to know it; if they do not so teach, we should also know it.

In as much as Brother Mansfield holds the affirmative idea, my only duty as a logician and reasoner is to closely examine his evidence adduced as proof and if possible show that it does not sustain his contentions. With this in mind, we now desire to pay our respects to the arguments adduced as proof. I note from his proposition he indorses human helps, but in his opening remarks he condemns human societies. Naturally, we wonder, where is the difference? Both human, purely human,

and both used for the identical purpose, that of teaching God's Word. Why, Brother Mansfield, do you endorse one human act and condemn the other, as both are endorsed as essential to teaching the Word. Noting from Argument Number One, Brother Mansfield, in an effort to sustain human helps (quarterlies), places Paul and Brother Elam on a par. That is, he contends by reason of the fact that Paul wrote to the primitive churches, Brother Elam and others have a perfect right to follow the divine example. Very well, we do not object to Bro. Elam's good work by use of the pen. But the question is: Have you got the moral or religious right to force personal explanations to the Word of God by Bro. Elam into the work and thereby rend the Church of Christ asunder? Have you or have you not, that's the question.

Leaving this for your consideration, we will now note from Argument Number Two. Here Brother Mansfield says there are two kinds of commands: specific and generic, and declares "go preach" is generic. If he is right and the command "Go preach" is general to the church, there can be no exception, hence it applies to both men and women. Therefore, all men and women who do not go preach will be lost for disobeying God's general command. Now the fact of the matter is: The command "Go preach" always was and always will be specific. Note Mat. 28:16-20. A specific command to the eleven, no more, no less (Mark 16:14-15), specific to the eleven, no more, no less. And ever since Apostolic days, the command "Go preach" was limited to faithful men. See II Timothy 2:2. Brother, I wish you would tell the brethren where to find the command "Go preach" that is not specific to a man, a group of men, or a class of faithful men. Now, if you fail to find it, the command stands specific. To faithful men as in II Tim. 2:2, and is also in harmony with Paul's statement, "I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence," I Tim. 2:12. "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak," I Cor. 14:34. "It is a shame for a woman to speak in the church," I Cor. 14:35. Therefore, as a specific command, Brother Mansfield has admitted that God has stated the method for all specific commands. Right you are,

Brother Mansfield, and also in harmony with Paul's statement, "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe," I Cor. 1:21. Paul says, "How can they hear without a preacher?" Rom. 10:14. Paul did not seem to think they could hear without a preacher, and said it was God's appointed way to save souls (I Cor. 1:21), and listen Brother, this is the only method mentioned in the Bible that God has placed His stamp of approval on and said it pleased Him. Bearing from this, let us pay our respects to his Argument Number Three. I note in an attempt to justify the class system, he quotes from Neh. 8:1-8, and says 14 men was sent out among the crowd to make them understand the law. I did not see where the 14 men were sent out. However, I wish you folks would turn and read for yourselves. I did notice that the congregation came together as one man, and I did not find where they divided them up. But suppose they had? Whatever deed they done was done under the law, and Paul says, "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified," Rom. 3:20. "Christ is become of no effect unto you whosoever of you is justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace," Gal. 5:4. And right in the face of these passages of Scripture, Brother Mansfield tells you that the very things the Jews practiced back there is just what he is contending for today. Then he speaks of the milk for the babes and the meat for the men. Yes, we recognize the two classes of food, and so did Paul and the other Apostles. But I do not locate where they adopted your system of feeding. Leaving this matter for your consideration, we will note his diagram:

Command	Essentials	Non-Essentials
Sing	Song-Book	Instruments of Music
Teach Bible	Class Helps	Organized Societies

He said study this diagram. I did, and the result was surprising. First, you see, he has placed the Bible in the command column, therefore it is not an essential. Brother Mansfield, the Bible is not a command. It contains the commands and is an essential to teaching. That is, we cannot teach without, it. Therefore, it belongs in the essential column. We can teach

without the class helps, therefore they belong in the non-essential column.

Command	Essentials	Non-Essentials
Go Teach	The Bible	Classes
“	Mode of Travel	Human Helps (Quarterlies)

If this is not right, show us the error. Again, in an effort to sustain human helps, he says no man can read a passage without the aid of human helps. Should I admit such, then his reasoning would exclude his quarterlies, tracts, and the like. For teaching the congregation, let's see, I am commanded to study and teach God's Word. Education and the Bible are essentials, for I cannot carry out the command without them. But I can carry out the commands without the quarterlies and tracts. Therefore, they are non-essentials. I am commanded to teach. The Bible is essential. I can teach a congregation without dividing them, therefore, to divide them is a non-essential practice. With this in mind, let me ask, what has divided the church, essentials or non-essentials? Kind reader, you may judge.

Next we will notice his woman and the work argument. After he had noted several things a woman could not do, he affirmed some things she can do, namely: pray, sing, give, commune. I concur to these things, therefore, they are not under consideration in this discussion. But he says she can teach. Titus 2:2-5. Yes, but verses 3-5 tell her what to teach, and none of the things mentioned included the Gospel. Well, you say, Paul said teach good things, and is not the Gospel a good thing? Yes, but not for a woman to teach. See I Tim. 2:11-12. Paul placed the restriction. Also I Cor. 14:34-35. No doubt, if I had been fixing it, I would not have placed it there, but I am not fighting the commands of God. Therefore, as far as I am concerned, it will have to stand. We now will notice some of the things which he says cannot be called in question, viz: God placed prophets, both men and women, in the early church, I Cor. 12:28; for the edification of the church, I Cor. 14:3; Paul recognized woman prophets as well as men, I Cor. 11:5; therefore, there were some women prophets in the early church by divine appoint-

ment. He says, this is the fulfillment of prophecy, Joel 2:28; therefore, he concludes, if women are to take no part in teaching today, the prophecy of Joel is yet unfulfilled, and to prevent her today is to stand between her and her duty to God. Are you talking about what Paul said I Cor. 14:34 and I Tim. 2:12? If so, you and Paul for it, but I would like to follow up your line of reasoning and see what follows. God set apostles in the early church, I Cor. 12:28; therefore, there are Apostles in the church today. You and the Mormons agree. God set prophets in the early church therefore, there are prophets in the church today. Again you and the Mormons agree. God set gifts of healing in the early church; therefore, there are gifts of healing in the church today. Again you agree. God set diversity of tongues in the early church, therefore there are diversity of tongues in the church today. Now, he is with the Holiness; God set miracles in the early church; therefore, there are miracles in the church today. And all for the edification of the church. Therefore, if there are not Apostles, Prophets, miracles, gifts of healing, helps, and diversity of tongues within the church today, the prophecy of them are unfulfilled. And he that stands between Apostles, miracles, tongues, gifts of healing in the church today, stands between folks and their duty to their God.

Now, Brother Mansfield, neither you nor I want to concur to such logic as that, so let us get the truth of this matter. Listen, in fulfillment to prophecy, "God placed in the early church, first, Apostles; secondarily, Prophets, both men and women; thirdly teachers. After that, miracles and gifts of healing, helps, governments, and diversity of tongues. I Cor. 12:28. Now, listen; prophecy ceases to be prophecy at complete fulfillment. These things were all supernatural it all for the edification of the Apostolic Church. Peter said the fulfillment of this prophecy began at the establishment of the church. See Acts 2:16-17. Paul said it would cease with the Apostolic Age. Listen; "but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; tongues, they shall cease; knowledge, it shall vanish," I Cor. 13:8. "But covet earnestly the best gift, yet show I unto you a more excellent way," I Cor. 12:31. Did he do it or did he not? Paul is dead and gone to his reward. If he did not show the church "a more excellent

way" than these supernatural gifts, then he died with a promise to the church unfulfilled. But what was left for the church after these things had failed? Faith, hope, and love, and a perfect law of liberty to guide us. May God help us to accept it without the man-made helps.

Speaking to the women, Brother Mansfield says: "Your duty to teach the Word is just as binding on you as it is on me. God demands that you be a soul winner for Jesus." But he failed to quote us the passage that says so. He quotes, "There is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ," Gal. 3:28. Brother Mansfield, if you think that teaches God has made no difference between male and female in teaching His Word, why don't you say so; and I will handle the passage in my next speech. This is an inference you at first told us you did not believe. In your first speech you made a difference by quoting several things that a woman could not do, which shows clearly you do not accept the passage literally without the context. Most every one knows Paul had reference to the circumcision of the male Jews, the non-circumcision of the Greeks and the circumcision not made with hands, which applied to Jews and Greeks, male and female, showing that they were all baptized into Jesus Christ alike.

Now, Brother Mansfield, as far as I know, the church is agreed upon the song service, and you state in the beginning things we are agreed upon are not under discussion. Your questions five, six and seven pertain to the song service. Now to the questions and I shall close:

Question No. 1, Proposition No. 1 covers;

Question No. 2, Essentials to commands are included, therefore not of human intent, No;

Question No. 3, if you mean teach the Gospel in public, there is none;

Question No. 4, if you mean teach the Gospel of Christ, there is none;

Questions No. 5, 6, and 7, the song service is not under consideration;

Question No. 8, not always;

Question No. 9, she has no command to publicly teach the

Gospel;

Question No. 10, we do not condemn the Assemblage of the Church to teach the Word of God at any time or place. The practice after assemblage is what we are calling in question.

With thanks, I close.

J. M. HART.

MANSFIELD'S FIRST REPLY.

Dear Reader:

You have just, read my first affirmation and Brother Hart's first reply. Can you tell me why any one wants to dodge the real issue? I tried to bring before you the real difference between us. I stated the things that were not under discussion. We are not discussing what women should do in the assembly or can a woman preach. But we are discussing "Can Christians meet, for Bible study and in such meetings can women teach a class and use human helps?" This meeting to be at an hour when it does not conflict with the worship. Brother Hart does not object to such a meeting, but he could not debate if he did not raise a false issue. Now, before giving you any new matter, let me notice some of the supposed replies he made.

Questions.

No. 1, He did not even try to answer.

No. 2, I asked you, do you ever use human helps in teaching the Bible? What did he answer? Read it. He does use human helps. Why did he not say so like a man? Now, is that not a dodge?

No. 3. I asked at what place and under what circumstances can a woman teach. And he answers, "if you mean teach the gospel in public..." What kind of teaching are we debating about? Are we talking about Bible teaching? Let me put the question to you again. Is there any place or circumstance where a woman may teach the Bible to a class of boys or girls and not sin in so doing? Now, Brother Hart, will you please give a fair answer to this question in your next reply?

Nos. 5, 6, and 7 he answers by saying "Song service is not under discussion." I wish you, dear reader, would turn back and read those questions again and then read his answers. The Bible says we teach when we sing. Hart admits this. In all their church work they have singing, and they have the women to sing. I only ask, "Can a woman sing and not teach"? If so, how? Brother Hart teaches that you must teach "One at a time." I ask.

“Can all sing at the same time and teach “One at a time?” If so, how?

Notice his answer to question No. 10. I ask, “Can we assemble for Bible study at any hour that does not conflict with the worship and not sin?” Brother Hart answers, “We do not condemn the assemblage of the church to teach the Bible at any time or place. The practice is what we are calling in question.” Well, that is the very thing we are contending for. You now say it is not wrong to so meet and teach the Bible. We are agreed that it is not wrong; and when we do so, we do not sin. I am glad you are seeing the truth. Will you not, now, join me in trying to get all Christians to meet often and study the Bible and teach it to their children and neighbors’ children?

Brother Hart says why condemn “Human Societies” and endorse human helps. One is non-essential and the other is essential. Listen, Brother Hart. You cannot read, neither can you talk or teach one word of the Bible without the aid of “Human helps.” It is impossible to teach the Bible without human helps is why I endorse them. Anything we get from humans is human helps. The knowledge of reading, writing, and language is not given us from God. We learn such things from uninspired people. Why fight a thing you can't do without? Will you please tell me just one thing you learned from the Bible that you learned without human helps? Just one, please? Let's get this one point fixed. You never carry your Bible to church with you without taking human helps along with you. You never spoke a word at church in your life without using human helps. Brother Hart, did you ever hear a man “cussing” his boy for “cussing”? Well, that is just what, you are doing. You fight human helps with human helps. You remind me of the quack who fights the use of medicines and then tells his patient to take a big dose of castor-oil. If it had not been for human helps you would still be in your sins knowing nothing about the Bible. In fact, you would not be able to carry on a conversation in common English.

What you say about the command to “Go” being specific is mere twaddle and advertises your ignorance. Do you mean to tell us that God wants and tells us to go by a certain method? How does God tell us to teach? There are three ways of teach-

ing; writing, speaking and acting. If "Go teach" is specific, then only one way is right. Which is it? But you say the command to go preach or go teach was only given to men. Then a woman can't teach her child about Christ. She can't sing because we teach in song. If the command "Go teach" is to men only, then you believe it is sinful for a woman to tell her child about the Savior. Did Priscilla do wrong when she helped teach Apollos the way of the Lord more perfectly? Acts 18:26. Does not prophesy mean to teach and does not the Bible tell us that "Daughters did prophesy"? Then God did wrong by letting those women teach if He gave the command to men only. Pray tell me who it was that taught Timothy the Word of God because it is said of him "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures"? Did not his faithful mother and grandmother do this work? If they did, then you say they did wrong because God has given the command to teach to men only. Shame, shame.

There are two ways by which we can carry out the command to teach. One is by preaching or delivering a public discourse. This way belongs to men only. But there is another way and that is by asking and answering questions, or giving instruction without discourse. Women can teach this way. When she is teaching a class of boys or girls, she is not delivering a discourse but is imparting the information to them without the discourse. There are some things you can't do. You can't sing a song without a tune. Neither can you teach the Bible without human helps or without a class. Your class may not have but one in it, but whoever it may be, he belongs to a certain class. But you could not find any class in the following: aliens, babes, young men, old men.

Command—Teach Bible.

Essentials—Class helps.

Non-Essentials—Human Societies.

Brother Hart says I have the Bible in the column of command and says I *do not* make the Bible essential. The Bible is the thing to be taught. Sing is the command but song is the thing you must sing. Teach is the command, the Bible is the thing we must teach. We are discussing the things that are es-

sential to teach the Bible. A class is essential because you cannot teach without a class to teach. Helps are essential because you cannot even read without helps and human helps at that. In Brother Hart's arrangement, he has the Bible on the par with the mode of travel and the song book. SHAME. When classes arrange so that each will be in his or her class, that is not dividing the church. Division is where two contend with each other over something about which they differ. When we meet for Bible study and the crowd is arranged in its classes, they are still united and not divided, because they are not contending one with the other over something.

In Titus, Paul says: "Let your aged women be teachers of good things." But Brother Hart says she is commanded to TEACH but what she is to teach does not include the gospel. Titus 2:2-5. It is not a part of the Gospel the woman should "Love their husbands," "be keepers at home" and to "be chaste." Don't you think a man is hard-pressed that will take such a position? The truth is, we need good women who will teach the young women in the church many Gospel truths that are needed to be taught today. Some mother in Israel is the only proper one to do the teaching that young women need. God commanded to do this work and she cannot do her duty and fail to teach the "younger women."

Brother Hart, let me tell you and the readers some very unpleasant truths—unpleasant to you and your brethren oh that side. We have never tried to force any one to take Elam's comments on the Bible. We have everything arranged so that no one is forced to accept them unless they want to do so. The thing we object to is being forced to accept your comments each Sunday to the exclusion of other good men who have made the Bible a life's study. The church is not divided over this question. No, sir. There are some who are angry because the church will not let them do all their teaching and submit to their comments. You ask if I don't think the church is divided over this question? No, I do not, and neither do you. I think there is a crowd of dissatisfied ones who have left us because they could not have their own way about who should make the comments on the lesson. You went out from us because you

were not of us. Let's see where we differ and in what.

We differ about the following, which is right?

1. We must use helps. You use helps.
2. Use them at church. You do the same.
3. Women can teach in song. You do the same.
4. Use human comments in lesson. You use YOUR COMMENTS, they are human.
5. Elders should rule. You want to be the elder.
6. We have classes. You have the same classes.
7. We meet and worship. You meet for the same purpose.

We differ about the following, which is right?

1. We never make methods a test of fellowship. You do.
2. We use system in study. You do not.
3. We submit to God's law. You make a law of your own.
4. We believe all the Bible. You a part. I Cor. 14.

Why I Believe in Bible Studies.

1. God wants us to adopt the best methods at our command to accomplish the greatest amount of good in the shortest time. The class system is the best system known to man today to save time and reach the greatest number.

2. I believe in all preventives of all diseases. I think it is right to vaccinate the child against small-pox. I think it is right to vaccinate the child by teaching it the Gospel of Christ.

Brother Hart, let me put you to the test. Last Sunday in my Bible class, we had the third chapter of Philippians for our lesson, and in the second verse Paul says: "Beware of the concision." Now, will you please tell me just what that word "CONCISION" means? You must not use any human helps in finding out what it means. You must tell me just what the Lord says. You must not speak it to me, because humans taught you to talk and that would be human helps. You must not write it to me because you learned to write by the aid of humans and that would be human helps. Leave off all human helps and tell me what it means.

Summing Up.

I have showed the following to be true:

1. We are at liberty to use more than one method in teaching the Bible.
2. God made the classes.
3. Women can teach the Word of God to others.
4. Children should be taught the Word of God.
5. Christians are commanded to teach the Word of God to all nations.
6. The word CHRISTIANS embraces both men and women.
7. Women cannot be elders, deacons, and evangelists.
8. She can do everything in the church that a man can do outside of these three things. In the same chapter where you find she is commanded to be in silence you will find God commands men to be in silence too.

What I have written is the kindest feeling to all. To get you to think and study and know that it is wrong to hinder the teaching of God's Word to others. We can and must teach God's word at all times. Think, my Brother, before you hinder others in doing what God commands.

LEE P. MANSFIELD.

J. M. HART'S SECOND REPLY.

Respected Friends:

I am before you at this time for the purpose of replying to the speech of Brother Mansfield, which you have just read, which will close this question. First, I notice the fact that Brother Mansfield was disappointed with the result of his first effort, and especially so, the questions he propounded. In his first speech he declared, "Things we are agreed upon are not under consideration in this discussion," but it seems he forgot this statement, as no doubt, he saw, as he thought, a trap for me in the song service teaching. Therefore, he propounded three questions on the song service and took exception to the manner in which I handled them. Everyone knows that our initial proposition clearly covers question number one, so the questions on the song service is all that he could hope to have anything in. So I will here answer it. And to save space I am going to admit that a woman can teach in the song service. The question naturally arises, why can she so teach? My answer would be, because she has the authority, Col. 3:16. But why can she not teach the word in the congregation? For the good reason she has no authority and is forbidden to do so, I Cor. 14:34-35; I Tim. 2:11-12. I would like to call your attention to the fact that teaching the Word of God was the thing that was under consideration, I Tim. 2:11-12, and the Apostle declared, "I suffer not a woman to teach." Teaching the Word was under consideration, I Cor. 14:34, and the Apostle declares, "*Let your women keep silence in the churches.*" Note the fact that he said "CHURCHES," in the plural, showing conclusively that the prohibition was not limited to the church at Corinth; but applied to all churches of Christ. Now, my Brother, you cannot cloud the real issue that confronts us with the song service. Paul either meant what he said in the three above passages, or he did not. One of the TWO, show me he did not mean what he said in these, and by your own law I will show that he meant nothing he said at all, Brother Mansfield.

Prophesying was the thing under consideration, I Cor. 14:31-35. You said in your first speech that Prophets were teachers. We notice that Paul said for them to speak one by one. Therefore, according to you and Paul both, the class system violates this command. Thank you. He thinks that he has found something in my answer to question number 10. He says I admitted that they could meet at any time or place for the purpose of studying the Word of God. Sure, I did. But where did I admit of classes, literature, and women teachers when they did meet?

In answer to my question, why condemn human societies and endorse human helps? He says, because the human helps are essential. You all know I exploded this in my first reply. But it looks like I will have to put a bomb under the fragments. So here goes. Now, Brother Mansfield, I am talking about divided classes, quarterlies, and tracts. Brother Mansfield, can you take your Bible and teach a congregation of people the Word of God and not divide them into classes? Not give them class literature, if you can? You know and I know and everybody else knows they are not essential. Again, if you can prove that I cannot take my Bible and teach the Word of God to a congregation without dividing them into classes and using quarterlies, my hat is off and my hand is out. These are things that stand between us. I say, can we teach the word of God without them or can we not? If we can, the truth forces you and your brethren to admit that they are non-essentials, and as such are holding the church asunder. That looks plain enough, so let it rest.

Yes, I said "Go teach" was a specific command, and proved it. Why did you not quote us the Scripture that proved it to be generic? Suppose he forgot, as he had quite a bit of unfinished business to attend to he still worries about. A woman cannot preach, but she can teach. I wish I could find where he gets the difference. The only three places where it alludes to a woman teaching in the assembly flatly forbids such teaching by her. Brother Mansfield, I am going to let your diagram alone for this reason. Everyone knows "Go teach" is the command, and the Bible is the essential thing to carry it out with, and that the

quarterly is the non-essential thing as is also the division into classes. He says I put the Bible, song book, and mode of travel all on par. "Shame," says he. Sure, I did. Now listen, I always am willing to help a fellow out when I have time; GO, the mode of travel is essential; SING, the song book is essential; TEACH, the Bible is essential; that's all.

Still he seems not to be satisfied with what is taught in Titus 2:5, and exclaims, "What we need is good women to teach young women in the church." I suppose he forgot about Paul saying it was a shame, I Cor. 14:34-35. Brother Mansfield says we don't make method a test of fellowship. My Brother, you are only placing yourself on par with the denominations. They don't either. Again he says, "We submit to God's law." I wonder whose law he thinks I Cor. 14:34-35 and I Tim. 2:12 is; whose laws are they? I notice you do not submit to them. Again he says, "The class system is the best system known to man today to teach." Glad to hear that man knows it to be good, for it seems not to have been known to God at all. He asks me without the aid of human helps what the word "concion" means. I am sure I do not know whether it means human helps or dividing the classes.

Summing up, he decides that God made the classes. My Brother, we all realize that; but the thing we are trying to find out is, did he authorize you to divide them or not?

Again he says in the same chapter where I found it said for a woman to keep silent it also said for a man to keep silent. Yes, I found that, but it said the man could speak in the church if he had an interpreter; but I could not find where the woman could speak even with an interpreter. Brother Mansfield, can you tell us where to locate that passage?

Dear Reader, there are many things that I would like to call your attention to, but space will admit of only a few. One in particular is the fact that. Brother Mansfield says his reason for endorsing human helps is because we cannot read the Bible without them. Language, he says, is not given us of God. But I notice the gift of speech was given at the same time, and by the same power, and for the same purpose. And in fulfillment of the same prophecy as his women prophets that he so ardently

clung to in his first speech, Acts 2, but he has given that up now, so we will notice his next theory; says he, we cannot read, write, or speak without the aid of human helps. This seems to be all the foundation he has left for the entire system, and I am determined that he shall not hide his human practices behind the commandments of God. He asks me to tell one thing I learned from the Bible without human helps. As an answer I ask Brother Mansfield; tell us one thing you have learned from the Bible without obeying a command of God? God said study. God said read. But don't forget, you said the thing necessary to obey the command was included in the command. We are agreed upon that. As such, education is necessary to obey God's command. As such a part of the command, therefore included in the command, hence not of human intent. As such, God has incorporated it into his plan of salvation to man. As such it is divine and not human. Plainer yet, individual education to study God's word is essential that the individual may study God's word. Therefore, individual education to study God's word becomes part of the command to study God's Word; hence a part of God's plan, therefore not human. Now will you give up? 'Fraid he won't. Therefore, I ask, is a command of God a human help? Everyone says no.

All right, let me prove that education is a command of God. The words Edify and Educate mean the same thing; Edification and Education mean exactly the same thing. "Edify (educate) one another as ye also do," I Thess. 5:11. Twenty-two times in the New Testament the term edify (educate), edification (education), edified (educated), is used and endorsed by the divine writers. Now, will you give up? No, he says you have to have a human education before you can accept a divine education. All right, then the human education is an essential to the acceptance of the divine education. As such, you have agreed it becomes part of the command and is incorporated in the command of God's plan; therefore not a human help, but a help that *God* has endorsed and incorporated in his divine plan to man, and down goes your human help theory to everlasting defeat. But where, O where did God ever endorse, incorporate, or command division of classes to teach?

But he says, how about the tracts, and quarterlies? They are means of edification and learning. Paul wrote, Peter wrote, and many others. Therefore, we have a divine example for them. I beg to advise the things the divine writers wrote were incorporated in, and became God's code of laws. Again we learn with these divine writings God's law became complete and perfect, and Peter said they wholly, completely, entirely furnish us. But still he insists the example is there. Again I beg to advise that we have no divine example of any uninspired man writing instructions to the church explaining the Commandments of God, but he says we will have to quit preaching then, as we have only example of inspired men preaching. Again I beg leave to advise that the divine power of God committed the preaching of the Gospel to faithful men that should follow after the Apostolic age was past, II Tim. 2:2. Therefore, we see uninspired writings were never commanded, were never included in the divine plan of God, and there is no example of their use in the Church of Christ.

My Brother, God left your system out of His book, I did not do it. But again, to show that Brother Mansfield has surrendered the proposition completely, I want to call your attention to his statement relative to the quarterlies, tracts, etc. He says we have everything so arranged that no one is forced to accept them unless they want to do so. Now listen, Brother Mansfield, you have fought all through this debate to show that the practices of class division, quarterlies, tracts, etc., with women teachers was God's chosen way to teach. But now you say you have so arranged that no one has to accept of them if they do not want to. In other words, you have so arranged that members of the Church of Christ do not have to accept God's way of teaching unless they want to. Tut, tut. Many of the denominations have so arranged that folks do not have to accept of God's mode of baptism unless they want to do so; they have arranged it so folks can be sprinkled if they would rather.

Brother, the thing I want you to see is this; you are trying to occupy a middle ground between the Church of Christ and the denominations which is so pointed that you cannot stay there. You are bound to slide off on one side or the other. Here is

hoping and praying that you slide off on

the Gospel side. Again you say you do not think that the Church is divided over these things. Suppose you could prove that the Church did not divide over these things, would that help your case any? We are not discussing the things that the Church divided over, we are discussing the things that exist between the Church now. No wonder your drowning proposition grabs at a floating straw, and has cried for aid in vain. Down, down it has gone with a gurgling sound,

The bubbles rose and burst around;
But error and it in death
They did not dare to sever;
It was its home when it had breath,

'Tis now its home forever.

Sleep on, sleep on, thou mighty dead,
A glorious tomb we have found thee;
The word of God about thee spread,
The boundless ocean around thee."

J. M. HART.

PROPOSITION NO. 2.

The Scriptures teach that God has given us (Members of the Church of Christ) a method by which we are to direct all the services of the Church.

J. M. Hart affirms.

Lee P. Mansfield denies.

J.M. HART'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Brethren and Respected Friends:

As the affirmative speaker, I now assume the responsibility of proof, *ON* the subject you have just read, and I shall make an effort before we proceed to, if possible, so clearly define my question that there will be no room for doubt as to my position on the question that I am to affirm.

When I say the Scriptures teach, I mean the writer has proclaimed in direct words, or has used terms which so clearly imply as to leave no room for doubt, or has taught by example.

When I say method, I mean a way outlined. This does not mean that I do not recognize essential details (we both admit this), but when I say essentials, I mean the thing, if removed, would destroy the act of carrying out the command of God. The affirmative idea in this question is to

the effect that God's law is perfect by which he directs the Church of Christ; I further maintain that this rule of action was completed with the Apostolic age, and at no time since has God permitted man to supplement that law.

My first argument is based on the fact that all services of the Church are a work of righteousness, and as such a good work. Paul told Timothy, "all Scripture given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," II Tim. 3:16-17. Here Paul plainly states, the Scriptures are for instruction in righteousness, and through the Scriptures we are furnished unto all good works. To the end that the man of God may be perfect, hence it follows, any work performed in the Church service not furnished by the Scriptures is not a good work. Now, if Brother Mansfield can show a work in the Church service which the Scriptures do not furnish, and prove by the Scriptures that it is a good work, then he can prove that Paul was mistaken, and through that mistake misinformed Timothy.

But, and if, he should fail to show such a work to be good

and permissible in the Church, then my contention is sustained, and God has given us a method by which we are to direct all the services of the Church.

My second argument is based upon the fact that all services of the church are a work which pertains "unto life and Godliness." If so, the Apostle Peter says, "according as his divine power has given unto us all things that pertain unto life and Godliness," II Peter 1:3. Just here I would like to call your attention to the word "all." It means wholly, completely, entirely. As such, Peter declares that the divine power of God (the Gospel) has wholly, completely, entirely furnished us all things which pertain unto life and Godliness. It follows then, things not found in the divine power of God (the Gospel) do not pertain unto life or Godliness. Now, if Brother Mansfield can show a doctrine or practice, and show it to be permissible in the Church by divine authority, not mentioned in the divine power of God (the Gospel), he can prove that Peter was mistaken.

But, should he fail to so show, we will again be forced to conclude that God has given us a method by which we are to direct all services of the Church.

My third argument is based upon the fact that there are only three sources of authority existent: The authority of God, the authority of man, and the authority of Satan. These are the only sources of authority that ever did exist, and there never was an act performed by man that did not have as its prompter one of these sources of authority. God, in His wisdom and power, has seen fitting to allow man access to all three sources of authority; but God has always opposed the authority of Satan. But God has seen it good to tolerate the authority of man in all temporal actions, just so long as it does not conflict with the divine law of God. But God has always rejected both the authority of man and Satan in matters pertaining to the Spiritual life of man.

"Now" the Church of Christ is a spiritual institution, composed on earth of Godly men and women; but all practices in that Church are prompted by either God, man, or Satan. If the authority of God prompts your action, safety is sure, but if the authority of Satan prompts the action, it is rejected of God; and

should the authority of man prompt the action, Jesus says, "In vain do they worship me teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Mat. 15:9. Again I beg to conclude that God has given us a method by which we are to direct all services of the Church.

My fourth argument is based on the fact that, if God has not given us a method, then the method must be of man, and as such a human method. I object to human methods in the Church for the following reasons: If the method of doing the work is not found in the teachings of God, and you have the right to use the method you think best, God certainly would not allow you this privilege and not allow me the same privilege. Should I think the organized Sunday School system was the best method of teaching God's Word, why would I not have the same right to enjoy it, seeing it is a human method of teaching same as yours? But John Jones thinks the Christian Endeavor society is the most efficient way to teach; has he not got the same God-given right to employ it as we have our human methods? If not, then God is a respecter of persons.

Now, Brother Mansfield, you cannot fail to see that under such conditions and logic we are forced to tolerate as right any and all human methods in order to nurse our own human method; and as such we have placed ourselves on the boundless ocean of human tradition with not even a rudder to steer us ashore. Not only so but we must cast to the four winds our heaven-born plea, speak where the Bible speaks.

Is that all? No we hand to the sectarian world a club with which to extinguish our Spiritual lives, "Hear O Isreal, Hear." "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death," Prov. 16:25. In the face of this we are forced to conclude that God has given us a method by which we are to direct all services of the Church. Furthermore it does not take a Doctor of the law to see that by the same logic that human methods can be introduced into the church to help teach will also admit human instruments and other human helps into the song service as an aid in, and a help to the most efficient singing in the Church.

To place any non-essential in any of the work or worship

lays down the bars, and by the same law I can place any human help or non-essential method in any work or worship of the Church.

Kind Friends. it has been said and truly so, the darkest hour of the dark ages was caused by ambitious men substituting the traditions of man for the commandments of God. Why, O why, do we want to have our way when God has given us a perfect way. James says, "But whoso looketh into that perfect law of liberty and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed," Jas. 1:25. As we have learned that law is a rule of action, and as such James declares it is a perfect rule of action, then how can we add to or diminish therefrom, without frustrating the grace of God and rendering his law imperfect? But again James says it is a perfect law of liberty, and what does liberty mean? It means freedom from any power, or to forbear any particular action. Thus we see that the law of God is not incumbent on any outside conditions, but is a perfect law for what God intended it. That is to guide his Church in walk, work, and worship while on this earth. No wonder Paul said to the Church at Philippi, "Whereunto we have attained let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing. Brethren, be ye followers together of me and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an example," Phil. 3:16-17.

My fifth argument is based upon the fact that God will reject our service if the authority of such service is not found in the teachings of Christ. Dear reader, the method we use in the Church is either found in the teachings of Christ or it is not one of the two--there is no middle ground to occupy, and if the method is of man it is a departure from the teachings of Christ. John says, "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teachings of Christ hath not God," II John 9. "Abideth" means to remain steadfast, but "goeth onward" teaches we can go beyond what Christ teaches and God will not be with us. The point I want to make just here is this. We teach folks for the purpose of saving souls, but if it takes more than the teachings of Christ to save them, then it follows that the teachings of Christ is not enough to save folks. Again the teachings of Christ

is the power of God unto salvation, Rom. 1:16. Therefore if we need human helps to teach and save souls, the conclusion is that the power of God (The Gospel of Christ) is not sufficient to save souls.

Now Brother Mansfield, we have learned that law is a rule of action, as such God's law is his rule of action. And David said, "The Law (Rule of Action) of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul, Psalms 19:7. As such, and in view of the fact that you have been fighting the denominations all your life for praying for God to send down converting power, you manufacture it right in the Church. I would much rather defend their case than yours.

But just here I am going to suppose that we could add human methods to the work of the Church in teaching the word of God, it being a human method no doubt from human standpoint, and would do great good. But to further expose your theory I am going to suppose that great material good did come from the use of human methods in the Church, and the congregation was much supplanted, and great numbers were won to Christ by and through the workings of these human methods. Congregations all over the country that were small are now made great. New Church houses are being built. Preachers all over the country are well supported, and sent to destitute places to preach, all through and by human methods of teaching that we have injected in the work of the Church.

The above mentioned situation is just what Brother Mansfield and others are striving for, but alas when it is obtained, I ask, who is entitled to the Glory? Man, and Why? because he devised the plan or method. God is not entitled to the glory because he devised not the plan or method that brought the results. Whose inscription is on your method, God's or Man's? I say, whose superscription does the method bear? If it is a human method, it necessarily bears the human superscription. Now to the law and to the testimony. Again who does the tribute belong to for the many good results of your human methods? Jesus said, "Show me the tribute money, and they brought to him a penny, and he said unto them, 'Whose is this image and superscription,' and they said unto him, 'Caesars,' then

said he unto them, 'Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's,'" Mat. 22:19-21.

Dear reader I object to human methods in the Church because it robs God of the Glory that rightly belongs unto him.

God refused to allow old Faithful Moses to enter the promised land because he used his own method, Num. 20:11-12. God refused the incense of sacrifice offered by Nadab and Abihu, because they offered strange fire that God commanded them not, See Lev. 10:1-2.

God has changed his Law (Rule of Action), but his principle of dealing with man has always been the same. We cannot be justified by the deeds of the law, but Paul said they were written for our admonition and learning. Therefore the principle involved when God dealt with man in Moses' time is the principle with which God deals with man today. God always did and always will require man to a strict obedience to his law (Rule of Action). God always did and always will reject the services of man when going beyond his law, to

declare we must add human methods to the law of God to make it operate better is a slap in the face to the Apostles that declared it was perfect and thoroughly furnished us unto all good works.

In the face of these facts we are again forced to conclude that God has furnished us a method by which we are to direct all services of the Church Of Jesus Christ, the pillar and ground of the truth.

In hope of eternal life through the perfect law of liberty, I close.

J.M. Hart

MANSFIELD'S FIRST REPLY

Dear Reader:—

After you have read Brother Hart's first speech do you really think he knows just what he is trying to prove? Will you read over again his proposition. Notice what he is trying to prove. I will here quote his proposition and give in capitals the words under discussion. "The Scriptures teach, God has given to us, members of the Church of Christ, a METHOD by which we are to direct ALL the SERVICES of the Church." He is not to prove just what the services are, but he is to prove that METHOD is taught in the Bible. Now read again his speech and see if he tries to prove anything. Now let me make clear just what I mean. There are certain things taught in the Bible that we call acts of service in the church, such as teaching each other, singing spiritual songs, communing, giving, and praying.

Now Brother Hart, is there a METHOD by which we are able to do these things? The Bible says to lay by in store on the first day of the week, I Cor. 16:2. We both believe this is right. But what is the METHOD TAUGHT? Are we put it on the table, in the hat, in a basket, in a box, or roll it down a crack? Singing is the command but where is the METHOD? Shall some sing Tenor, some Bass, some Alto, and some Soprano? Shall we have a Solo or Duet? Then, who shall lead the songs?

When you meet in the church you have someone to read a chapter and then have prayer. Where is this method taught in God's Book? You say it is taught; please tell us just where we will find it?

It is right to partake of the Lord's supper. Here we agree, but Brother Hart says there is a METHOD taught how you shall conduct that service. Will you please tell us WHERE? Shall we stand, sit, or kneel while giving thanks for the loaf and cup? Shall we pass the emblems around among the members or shall each come to the table and partake of it himself? Should the deacons wait on the congregation? Tell us, where we will find these instructions?

Again God Says, "Go ye into all the world." Now that is a command of God himself and is binding on us today, but where has God told us the method of going? Did he say walk, ride a horse, camel, train, auto, or flying machine? Say Brother Hart, you are supposed to find the METHOD by which you are to do all the services. Don't forget your proposition, please. Remember that we are not discussing the METHOD on how to teach but on all the services. But you can't find a METHOD on how to teach to the exclusion of all other methods. Try it and see.

Now let us notice his supposed argument's and see how near he came of even mentioning the subject under consideration.

Argument one, based on II Tim. 3:16-17. All scripture is given by God and furnishes us unto all good work, namely, doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness. But Brother Hart, where does that passage mention METHOD? Does it say that the word of God furnishes us with the METHOD? It does tell us what to do but does it tell us how to do it? You are telling us that the Bible tells us the METHOD.

In your second argument you missed it again by supposing that a method was necessary to Life and Godliness. God did give us all things that pertain to life and godliness, but where did God give us a method by which we are able to conduct the services?

In your third argument you missed it again. It is true that all we should do is given us from God, but you say that some things are left to man. Now in order for you to prove your proposition, you will have to show where God gave a METHOD and what the METHOD was. Webster says the method means a plan or way of doing a thing. Now tell where do you find your conclusion to each argument, that God has given us a method, plan, or way of conducting all the services. Just take one service and give us the detailed instructions on how to do that service.

Now let me make clear to you just the difference between Brother Hart and myself on this question. To illustrate: Suppose we are going to make an offering. Brother Hart says we must put it on the table and I say no, we must pass a hat.

Now if I make my way a law, I do wrong. If Brother Hart

makes his way a law then he does wrong. But you ask which way is right? I answer that it would be right to do it either way so long as you did not make the way the law.

Your conclusion is that we are forced to admit the societies if we contend that we can do the teaching our way. You miss it in not knowing what we fight as to the societies. I do not fight the work nor method of the MISSIONARY SOCIETY, but I fight the organization. I believe in the work that the Endeavor Society does, but I fight the institution through which all the work should and must be done.

Yes Brother Hart, there is a way that seems right, but the end is the way of death. Now tell us where we find your way of conducting all the services. I am not asking you to find the services but the way of doing the services. Your way no doubt seems right to you, but unless you can find your way in the Bible, then you may be in that way whose end is death. You quote Jas. 1:22-25 and tell us that God has given a perfect law, and then conclude that God has given the method in the Law. But you do not tell us where to find where God tells me how to conduct a Prayer meeting, the communion service, the song service, or the giving service.

I know that God's law is perfect. It contains all things that pertain to life and Godliness, but just here I want to ask you a question: Is the method necessary to life and godliness? If it is then you will have to find the method given or we cannot be saved.

Your fifth argument also missed the mark a thousand miles. Let me show you where you miss it. You say that, "God rejects our services unless the authority for such service is found in the teachings of Christ." Hart, my brother, that statement is true but you are not affirming on the service, but on the METHOD of rendering such service. Why don't you stay with your subject? I believe we should teach the truth and nothing but the TRUTH, but in teaching that truth can I use chapters and verses?

Can I use chapters and verses in the services? If so then I have a method untaught in God's book and you say God will condemn me if I do so, because any method untaught in the Bi-

ble is of MAN and is going on and not abiding in the doctrine of Christ. Is it right for the deacons to pass the bread and wine to the congregation? If so, please give me chapter and verse. If not then that is wrong and will condemn you before God. You remember you said that any method untaught, was of MAN. It would be going beyond and not abiding in the doctrine of Christ.

Yes, we teach folks for the purpose of saving their souls. But that is not the question you are affirming. Brother Hart. You are affirming that the METHOD IS ESSENTIAL TO THEIR SALVATION. Stay with your subject, PLEASE.

Brother Hart let me quote you just one passage that has method in it and then you can make it fit your case. Heb. 1:1 "God, who at sundry times and in divers (different) manners (methods, ways), spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets..." Can you use this passage? No, because it talks about many methods. Then again, it is not what I practice and teach that is called in question now, but what you do. It is not even what I think about what you do or the way you do it, but is the way YOU DO IT taught in the Bible. I admit the THING you do is taught but I deny that the WAY you do it is taught. We teach the same thing that you teach, but we differ on the way of doing what we teach. You say the METHOD is taught and I say it is not taught. Now it seems to me that the thing you ought to do is find a METHOD for doing ALL the services of God or else say the method is untaught.

Now I will make you this offer. I want to go to heaven when I die. I want to please God while I live. If you will read me just one passage on the METHOD of how to take up the contribution on Sunday, I will practice it that way. And every time you read me a passage telling HOW TO DO ANYTHING GOD TELLS ME TO DO, I WILL JOIN WITH YOU IN DOING THAT THING just that way. Brother Hart you say God tells us how to do every thing. Now if you don't tell me where and I am lost, you are responsible.

Dear reader I have now shown that every argument he has introduced has not even referred to his proposition. I have tried for years to get one of these brethren to affirm this prop-

osition, but failed, and Brother Hart is the first to even undertake it. Now he has failed to find one passage in the Bible that even mentions METHODS. He said in defining his proposition that the Bible either said so in so many words or was taught so that we could not have a doubt in our minds about it. I have examined carefully every passage he has introduced and do not even find METHODS referred to. God gave us a perfect law to guide us in all our service to Him. God never gave us a method in carrying out our obedience to many of his laws.

When God gave the great commission to the Apostles, He said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Now there are two things to be done in this command of God. First: "Going into all the world," and second: "Preaching or teaching the Gospel." The mode of traveling in that day is not the mode of traveling now. Must I travel now like they did then? Do I violate any command of God by adopting the present-day method of "Going?"

We also have ways of teaching now that were unknown in those days, such as the "Printing Press." Do I violate any command of God by adopting the present day methods of teaching the GOSPEL? Remember the GOSPEL is the thing to be taught. When Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper they reclined around a table. That was the METHOD of partaking of it then. Do I violate any command of God when I partake of the Lord's Supper in our present day METHODS of so doing?

In the temple there was a treasure box into which all cast their offerings. That was the, METHOD in that day. Must I build a treasure box for the church and have all to cast their offerings into it? Do I violate any command of God by putting my offering into a collection plate which is passed to me by one of the deacons? But Brother Hart says one of these things are not the things about which we differ. Pray tell me why? Are they taught? If not, then you do things untaught. Physician heal thyself!

Brother Hart seems to think that the way we do things is like the Sects and we can't fight them unless we do it different. Must I oppose a thing because the sects do it? The Sects read the Bible, Pray, Teach, and Sing. Must I quit these things just

because they do them? But Brother says No. It is not the thing they do but their METHOD we should fight. All right. They stand on their feet when they preach; then am I to stand on my head just to be different? They kneel when they pray. Must I lie prostrate on the ground when I pray just to be different?

Our methods should always correspond to our surroundings. If a few members meet for worship and Bible study, it would be alright to sit around a table and engage in all the services. But if the congregation is large it would be alright to have someone wait on the congregation, so that all things may be done "Decently and in order." If just a few meet to "break bread" it would be all right to have just one plate and just one cup, but if the crowd is large then it would be just as Scriptural to have more than one plate and one cup. So doing would violate no scripture, and save the church from a lot of unnecessary criticism.

Brother Hart makes methods a part of the teachings of Christ and in so doing makes methods a test of fellowship. They will not meet and commune with those who do not adopt their methods. Yet Brother Hart has failed to find his methods taught in the Bible. Then it follows that Brother Hart is making an untaught thing a test of fellowship. By so doing he becomes guilty of legislating where Christ has not legislated. Then he has usurped the authority that belongs to Christ and has become a rebel against him. When we make untaught things a law then we become LAW-MAKERS. Christ is the ONLY LAW-MAKER. I know that is a serious charge, but so long as you fail to find your way in the Bible this charge will be true. Let me beg you my brother, that you cease to make untaught things a part of the LAW of Christ. But you say they are TAUGHT. WHERE? Will you tell us in your next reply?

Lee P. Mansfield.

J. M. HART'S 2ND. SPEECH

Respected Friends: I am before you for the last time in this discussion, and before we notice any arguments adduced, we will notice some assertions my Brother has made. He says I missed my proposition all the way through a thousand miles. There is no doubt I missed what he thought was my proposition. His statements would make one believe that he had gotten somewhat bewildered. Possibly he has, thinking of our first proposition, but we will straighten him out once more with some plain English.

Illustration: Suppose I affirm that John Jones is in jail. When I prove that John Jones is in jail, I will have proven my proposition. I do not need prove what they put him in for, neither need I prove how they put him.

Now listen. I affirm that God has given us a method that I must prove but I am under no obligations to prove what the method is.

Brother Mansfield, I want to call your attention to the fact that there are three elements which enter into all performances. First: "Essentials," second: "Method," third: "Incidentals." You never mentioned method in all your speech, but put in the entire time talking about incidentals. I care not about the incidentals. They never violate God's law. We all know that an incidental is without design. What we are talking about is Method, established practice. We have no method as to who leads the song. We have no method as to the part of the song I sing. We have no method as to the exact place to put the contribution. All such are incidentals and never violate God's Method.

The Jews had established a METHOD of washing utensils as a religious observance. Jesus told them such METHODS were traditions of men, and as such transgressed the law of God. Mat. 15:9. All know that a tradition is an established practice which is unwritten. When written, it becomes a law. Traditions of Men transgress God's law. Mat. 15:8-9. I have proven by Tim. 3-16-17, that God wholly, completely, entirely furnished all es-

tablished practices of God. I also have proven by Pet. 1:3, that God has furnished all Practices (Methods) which pertain unto life and Godliness. Paul said he kept back nothing that was profitable. Acts 20:20. I also proved by Jas. 1:2-5, that God has given us a perfect rule of action. Jesus and Paul both condemn traditions of men. And why? Because God has completely furnished us.

But you say God had traditions. Yes, but not since Apostolic days. It is all written now and we have a perfect rule of action. Jas. 1:2-5.

I have before me a book, "LIVE SERMONS BY LIVE MEN." I desire to quote from the pen of Brother Mansfield. In his sermon, "BY EVERY WORD," speaking of the denominational world, he says: "They never read the Bible to find out what Jesus did, but they ask their hearts, and follow the dictates of their conscience." and says, "God did not intend for us to be governed by our consciences or our hearts, because our way (Method) is not the Lord's way. God has left us a written way to guide us."

Bro. Mansfield, why do you repudiate? Today you tell us that God has left us no method (way) to guide us in the Church, and says he chooses the method he thinks best to carry out the commands of God. No doubt old faithful Moses chose the method he thought best in carrying out the command of God. See Num. 20:11. But God rejected his method, and he died on the mountain outside the promised land. Paul says, "If the word spoken back there was steadfast and every transgression (going beyond) and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape? Heb. 2:2. God says, "My thoughts are not your thoughts neither are your ways (methods) my ways (methods), saith the Lord." Isa. 55:8.

Bro. Mansfield, you admit in your speech that God has told us everything we should do. You also admit that God has furnished us all good works, but you say, "Bro. Hart, how are you going to do these things?" James says, "if any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God." Jas. 1:5.

Paul declares he kept back nothing that was profitable. Acts 20:20. Bro. Mansfield says he kept back the method, the way,

the manner of doing.

Paul says God furnished us all good works. 2 Tim. 3:16-17. Bro. Mansfield says the Method is a good work but is not furnished in the Bible.

James says God furnished us a perfect rule of action. Jas. 3:25. Bro. Mansfield says the method is a rule of action but not found in the Bible.

If Bro. Mansfield is right, the Apostles are wrong, that's all. Anyway, it is apparent that he does not agree with them.

But that is not all. I notice he does not agree with Jesus any better than he does with the Apostles. Listen. He said he fought the Endeavor societies as an institution, but he endorses the work they are doing as a good work. In other words, the tree is evil but the fruit is good. But I notice Jesus says, "A corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit." Mat. 7:17. Jesus says. "Neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Mat. 7:18. My Brother, if you cannot agree with the Lord or any of his Apostles, how do you hope to agree with the church?

Is that all? No. I have shown conclusively by quoting from his pen that he does not even agree with himself.

Is that all? No. He has introduced Scriptures which prove absolutely that my position is correct. Listen, "God, who at sundry times and in divers (different) manners (methods, ways) spoke in times past unto the fathers by the prophets. Heb. 1:1. What does that teach? It teaches that God furnished many methods speaking to the fathers through the prophets. Bro. Mansfield, that is exactly what I am affirming; that God has furnished the methods through the chosen men of God. To suit your case it would have to read thus: "God, who at sundry times spake unto the fathers allowing the prophets to choose their own methods."

But is that all? Now don't forget that you said manners are methods. I looked it up and it does mean methods. You are correct. And as such I notice Method, Methods, is used in the Bible one hundred and twelve times. And I notice over in Samaria, God sent lions and they slew many of the Samaritans, because they knew not the methods of God. 2 Kings, 17:26-27. Again I notice Paul was taught, according to the perfect method

of the law of the fathers, Acts 22:3.

Now Bro. Mansfield, I notice you promise me that every time I read where God has told how to do a thing that you will join me in doing it just that way. Here is where I shake hands with you, brother. This may not get the Church together but it will force them to hunt something besides literature, divided classes, and women teachers to fuss over.

God commanded all nations to be taught the Gospel of Christ, Mark 28:19. Bro. Mansfield, myself, and every other faithful man is trying to carry out that command of God. But where is the method, he asks. Here it is. Listen: "And Paul, as his method was went in unto them, and reasoned with them out of the Scriptures. Acts. 17:2. This proves without doubt, that Paul's method of teaching the word of God was to go into the congregation and teach them out of the Bible. Brother Mansfield says he will join me in doing it just that way. Thanks. We will then be obeying Paul's command when he said, "Be ye followers of me," I Cor. 14:16.

Again, God committed the teaching of the Gospel to faithful men. II Tim. 2:2. All faithful men are trying to carry out that command of God, but how must it be done? Listen. Here it is: God said the method of preaching pleased him. And through that method he would save all them that believed. I Cor. 1:21. Brother Mansfield says he wants to save souls and he will join me and we will do it just that way. Thanks, Brother, and we will still be following Paul, for that is the way he did it. And it is all to gain and nothing to lose. For God never did promise to save anyone through the teaching of the Sunday School system.

Again, God made another command, and in that command he said, "I suffer not a woman to teach," I Tim. 2:12. All faithful men and women are trying to carry out that command of God. But, where is the method, he asks. Can she sing? Can she pray? Where is the method? Here it is. Listen. In the church at Corinth when the word of God was being taught, Paul said, "Let your women keep silence in the churches," I Cor. 14:34. Brother Mansfield says when I read how to do it he will join me and we will do it just that way. I cite the above to show that we are agreed on the work and teaching of the Church.

But I note further: he insists that one method to the exclusion of all others is wrong. Well, we will have to straighten this out, and I am sure it is a statement that Brother Mansfield will hardly stay with. In fact I do not think he was talking about methods when he said it. I rather think he meant that incidentals might differ and neither be wrong. Anyway, if he meant what he said, I want to state that we believe that immersion is the method (mode) of Baptism. Now, Brother Mansfield, does the mode of immersion exclude all other methods? You say YES. The Methodists say NO. Now listen. The command, Teach and Baptize, are joined together. Remove one and you defeat the purpose of the other. Now you prove that immersion excludes all other modes of baptism and I will take your law of logic and prove that the word Preach excludes the Class system.

My Brother, I do not, want to appear in the attitude of browbeating you, but you are my brother and it is my duty to show you, if I can, that you are overriding the law of God and being overcome with the traditions of men.

You worry about the Lord's supper, and ask for the method, just as if it was not in the Bible. It is even plainer than the method of baptism. Let's get the essentials first, which are: The Loaf, the Fruit of the Vine, and the Cup (Container). Now the method, which is: Each Lord's Day, giving of thanks, and dividing it among the disciples. That's all. The incidentals will take care of themselves and always be in harmony with God's law. But you demur again and say someone will get offended because we divide it into two cups after thanks. Very well, I can carry out the command with one cup. And Paul said, follow after the things that make for peace. I Cor. 14:19. Just here I would like to ask you: When Paul commanded to follow after the things that make for peace, did that exclude all things that cause division? When Paul commanded to sing Spiritual Songs and Hymns, did that exclude love songs and

Patriotic airs in the Church? When Christ commanded the Bread and Wine did that exclude meat and beans? When God gave us the Holy Scriptures and declared that they were perfect and thoroughly furnished us and commanded us to preach

the word, did that exclude any other method of teaching? Now the fact of the matter is this: Any method not taught in God's word is excluded. But if God has taught one, two, or three methods of teaching, we are at liberty to use either, but to say we can use a method untaught is to lay wide the gate to untaught methods. Pray tell me what is the difference in an untaught method of teaching and an untaught mode of baptism. The world knows there is none; if you can supplement God's method of teaching, you can also supplement His method of baptizing by the same law.

My Brother, you have already been forced to endorse the denominational method of teaching which is an organized Sunday School Missionary societies, salary for preachers, annual conferences, disciplines and all. The only thing you are fighting now is the society that does the work. They will tell you plainly that it is the Church at work, and truly so it is. They have the same right to call their society a missionary society as you have to call yours a Systematic Bible Study. If not, why? You are now where you have admitted that your practices are not Scriptural, have admitted they are of your own making, and untaught in the word of God, many of them.

"Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen and repent and do thy first work, or else I will come unto you quickly and will remove thy candlestick out of his place except thou repent." Rev. 2:5.

My Brother, you have repeatedly charged me with making laws. Just here I want you to name a law that I have made. I have no law for the Church of God. I am trying earnestly to obey the law that God has given for his people. My law would be no better than your law. The thing I am doing is earnestly and brotherly begging you to obey God's law instead of the traditions and commandments of men.

Now, my Brother, I am through. I have, as far as I know been fair to God's word and to you. If you see where I could have been kinder to you, I beg your pardon.

If I have been harsh I assure you and all that it was unintentional. I have tried to teach as a mother would her child. There is an Open Grave just ahead of us both. I am ready to

meet mine and also the blessed Son of God, the righteous Judge with every argument I have made. With kindest regards and love to all believers in Christ.

I thank you,

J.M. HART.

MANSFIELD'S LAST REPLY.

Dear Reader:—You have carefully read all that Brother Hart has said on his proposition, and now in my final speech I wish to point out to you where Brother Hart has missed it.

You will notice in his last speech he spent much time trying to show I was wrong on the method of teaching. We discussed that subject in the first part of this discussion, and Bro. Hart had two speeches in which to answer my arguments, but he seems to be dissatisfied with his efforts, and in his last affirmation goes back to the first proposition. If I had made as great a failure to prove my proposition as he did, I would have said, "I can't prove it," and quit.

Bro. Hart, why did you not discuss your proposition in your last speech? You have had two speeches, and in all those speeches you have not given us one passage that even refers to the thing you are affirming. Let me suggest to you, my Brother, that you are not affirming that the Bible tells us the way to go, but the method of going on that way. But Brother Hart thinks he has found something that is unanswerable. He says there are three elements which enter into all performances. Granted. Then he names them. Essentials, Methods, and Incidentals. Well, Bro. Hart, how can Methods be Essentials when you place them in a different class? Don't you see that you have been affirming all the time that methods are essentials and now you put them in a class by themselves and say that they do not come under the head of things essential. Well, I think you are right in that, because that is just what I have been contending for all along.

Bro. Hart also give up his whole proposition when he said, "we have no method as to the exact place to put the contribution." Amen. Bro. Hart, you have admitted you have no authority for doing it your way. But, he says that is an Incidental. Webster says that Incidental means liable to happen unexpectedly. Then Bro. Hart, when you go to contribute you do it in an unexpected way. Yes, I believe you and your brethren do

everything just that way. If you were to do it some other way, some of your members would object and you would have a fuss over the way of doing it. Brother Hart's (un)argument about Incidentals is all baby twiddle.

Bro. Hart, I can't believe that you believe any such stuff. If there is no method taught, as you admit, why not do it like we do and all be together? Why pull off and make a faction over a thing you say yourself is not taught in the Bible?

Bro. Hart quotes from my sermon in "Live Sermons by Live Men," and says I have gone back on what I taught in that sermon. Wrong again, Bro. Hart. I still preach that sermon just like it was written in that book. But the trouble is you have not gotten the idea that I preached. When the Bible speaks about God's way and man's way, it is talking about the road we are traveling. Like a highway. It is discussing the things we are doing, and not talking about the manner of doing that thing. I was talking about one thing and you about a different thing. Why did you, in quoting my statement, put words in my mouth that I did not use? After the word "way" you put "Method" in parenthesis; why did you do that? Is that fair? I was not discussing methods in that sermon.

Bro. Hart quotes Paul, saying "He kept back nothing that was profitable." Act 20:20. Then he says Bro. Mansfield says he kept back the method. Then. Bro. Hart ought to have shown that Paul gave a method of doing the thing he taught. But you did not do that. Where did Paul ever teach you how to take up the collection? Then the method is untaught and down goes your proposition.

No, Brother Hart, the Apostles are right, but you do not agree with the Apostles, because you are teaching things and doing things untaught by the Apostles. Thou art the man.

But Brother Hart did find a method on teaching. He says the method is preaching.

That is one method, but that does not exclude others. Jesus said "preach," but he also said "teach." These words do not have the same meaning. But he says that faithful men are to teach. Yes, that is right, but the same Apostle says for Aged Women to be teachers. Tit. 2:5.

Of all the blunders I have ever met with in all my life, Bro. Hart's statement that immersion is the method of baptizing takes the cake. Now, really, did he mean that? Bro. Hart, don't you know that there is no mode by which you perform baptism. Baptism is immersion. Immersion is baptism. Bro. Hart, the thing you want to find is, Must we baptize in a baptistry tank, pond, or river?

I have now noticed everything that Bro. Hart has said on his proposition except his long admonition to me. If Bro. Hart had used that space in giving us some Scripture that taught the method of doing all the services of the Church it would have been better for his case. But he seems to have realized his failure and in order to cover up that failure he gives a long exhortation for me to get right. Bro. Hart, let me assure you that I am right and you are wrong. Every reader of this debate can see that you have made a complete failure.

Let me sum up the things I have proven. By so doing they can tell just who is in the wrong and who is in the right. In the beginning, I proved by the Bible and gave chapter and verse, where a woman can sing. Col. 3:16; Pray, I Cor. 11:5; Give, I Cor. 16:2; Commune, Acts 20:7; Prophecy, I Cor. 11:5; Teach, Titus 2:5.

Brother Hart and his brethren admit she can and must do all these things to please and honor God. Then dear reader, what are they fighting over? Oh, they say she could not teach in the assembly. Well, we so practice that she can teach when she is not in the assembly. That's all we want a woman to do. Then I showed that God made the classes and Brother Hart does not deny that. I also showed that we can not even read without human helps. Hart does not fight helps. He uses them himself. There are no grounds here, my Brethren, for division. Then why pull out and form a faction over human helps since we all must use them? How can we bring harmony out of all the divisions that exist over untaught questions? There are some that say we must commune after night, because supper is at night. There are others that say you must put the contribution on the table and not in a plate. Others say that you must not let a woman sing, and still others who say you must not teach a

class or use any helps in teaching a class. And again, others say you must have just one cup on the Lord's table. All these are untaught questions and should not divide us in our work and worship. Paul says to avoid unlearned and foolish questions which gender strife. When any man tells you that you must have this or that service this way or that, he is prating about things which are untaught.

Brother Hart in his affirmation has not introduced one passage that teaches the things that he is contending for in this debate. I have shown in my reply to his speeches that his Scripture he has introduced did not even refer to the subject under consideration. He affirms that the method by which we are to conduct all the services of the church is taught in the Bible, but he spends his time showing that the services are taught, and no one denied that. We are not discussing what are the services, but what is the method by which the service must be performed. He gave us some passages that told us about the services, what they are, but he never gave one passage that told how to perform the service. He quoted where it says that all things that pertain unto life and Godliness are given. No one denies that. But I do deny that the method is given or is necessary to life and Godliness. He quotes where it says perfect law of liberty. He quoted where the Scriptures thoroughly furnish unto all good works. Yes, I know, and do not deny it. But where does it tell us the method of doing these good works? He has made the most signal failure I have ever heard in all my life.

Dear Reader, what do you think about a man contending that methods are taught and when in debate say that there are methods given by which you are to take up the collection? This collection is one of the services of the Church and is taught in the Bible, I Cor. 16:2. But the Bible is silent as the tomb about how to gather up the collection the saints are commanded to make on the first day of the week. I have asked Brother Hart if all the methods are taught, where to find the method for this service; did he find one? If he did not, then, dear Reader, he failed to prove his proposition, because he is affirming that methods for all services are taught. Here is one service without a method.

Again the Bible tells us to break bread. This is to be done on the first day of the week, Acts 20:7. This is what we call the communion service. But how are we to prepare and partake of this service? Brother Hart says the method is found in the Bible. Where, Brother, where? Where is the method? Does it tell us to stand, sit, or kneel while partaking? Who should wait on the congregation, or should each come to the table and partake?

Brother Hart, the missionary society is not a method, but an organization. They may use the same method that the Church uses. It is not the method or work we are fighting, but the organization through which they do the work. In order that I may get you to think, dear Reader, along this line, let me ask some questions just here.

(1) Is it right for a Christian man or woman to teach the Word of God when he or she is not in the assembly?

(2) Would it be right for a good woman to teach some girls at her home?

(3) Would it be right, for a man to teach some boys at his home?

(4) If this would be right, then would it be right for them to teach in the same house but in different rooms?

(5) Now, suppose this teaching is on Sunday and at an hour before the Church assembles: would it be wrong?

Remember that our teaching is not confined to one day or one hour in the day; we are to teach every day and everywhere and in every way. He that limits you to just one hour or one method is fighting God and his holy commandments.

Dear Reader, which had you rather do on Sunday, gather with your children and the neighbors' children at the meeting house and there spend an hour or two teaching those children the Word of God, or stay at home and let the children spend their time playing? Would it be wrong, do you think, to so gather and teach before the Church assembles or after the worship of that Church? Do you think it would be wrong to stand while partaking of the Lord's Supper? Yet the Bible does not tell us to stand. Would it be wrong to put your offering in a plate passed to you by one of the deacons for your conven-

ience? Yet the Bible does not tell us to do it that way. Brother Hart has been contending that the method of doing all the services of the Church is taught in the Bible.

Brother Hart, it is sad to see a man of your ability teaching, and by such teaching divide the Church over things untaught in the Bible. It is a dangerous thing, my Brother, to legislate where Christ has not legislated. You know as well as I do that the method for all services of the Church is not taught as well as I do. Then, My Brother, why do you so teach? I love the cause of Christ above everything on earth and for more than a third of a century I have been fighting for that cause. The way that God has ordained that men should be converted is through teaching. When you oppose the teaching of God's Word you are opposing the way God converts sinners. You fight Brother Elam, Nichol, and Showalter in their efforts to teach God's Word. Let me beg you, my Brother, you are doing wrong and should quit it. With a prayer that this debate may be carefully read by all and be a means of getting the truth before you, because the truth makes free.

With the kindest of feeling to Brother Hart, and you, dear Reader, I beg to remain yours for the whole truth and nothing but the truth, but I want all the truth and not just a part:

Fraternally,

LEE P. MANSFIELD.