IT IS WRITTEN

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT CARLSBAD, NEW MEXICO

EDITORS

COY GARRISON.....533 S. Center St., Grand Prairie, Texas
L. E. ATCHLEY.....625 Happy Valley, Carlsbad, New Mexico

DECEMBER, 1951

"THE PROOF OF YOUR FAITH"

ARTICLE TWO

"For anyone who merely listens to the message without obeying it, is like a man who looks at his face in a mirror and then goes off and immediately forgets what he looked like, **but** whoever looks at the faultless law that makes men free **and keeps looking,** so that he does not **just listen** and forget, **but obeys and acts upon it that man will be blessed in his deed."** James 1:23-25. A man's faith is limited by the word of God the mirror of the soul. Rom. 10:17) consequently his faith is effective only if it is complete or perfect, as is the complete mirror. A fragment will reflect at a visual distance only a partial image. The power to visualize is weak in most individuals and a distinct image is hard to retain mentally even in persons we are so well acquainted with as ourserves. To retain the impression one must **continually** look. The idea is both scriptural and scientific.

As faith "operates by love" (Diag.) "or worketh by love," (Am. Stan.) then operative faith and labor of love **becomes** practically one and the same thing. Thus the labor or work of love from an operative faith is the proof of one's faith. (I John 5:1,2) **"By this we know** that we love (i.e. by faith) **that he laid down his life for us."** (Love is conditioned on faith in the Fatherhood of God, consequently the brotherhood of man.) (see verse I, Rom. 5:6-10) "We love God because he first loved us." (I John, 4:10, 19) "But if **any one** has this world's goods and sees his brother **in** need, yet closes his heart, (seat of the emotions) against him, **how** does the love of God abide **in** him?" "Let us love **not in word or speech, but in deed and truth."** By this, (thusly) we shall know we are of the truth, **and reassure our hearts** before him. For God is greater than our hearts and knows all. The expression of fellowship—distribution of funds in the deed is indeed an expression of love. By such work of love **we know** we are of the truth.

When one does not love in deed and in truth, the heart condemns because the faith is not perfect, being without it's complement, Works. Words and speech are powerless to reassure in such cases, because we **realize** our faith is not credible, cannot cause us to feel justified. Our conscience remains unsatisfied. As Abraham we do not realize "the obedience of faith," till completion of the act. But if our hearts do not condemn us we have confidence towards God. "Beloved let us love one another; **for love is of God.** He who does not love does not know God, **for God is love." In this** (knowledge) **the love of God** was **made manifest** among us, (i.e.) **that** God sent his only son into the world, so **that** we might live through Him. "In this is love, not that we loved God but **that** he loved us.—No man has ever seen God, (although by faith Heb. 11:1,6) **if** we love one another, God abides in us, and his love is perfected in us." By **this** (faith) we **know** that we abide in him and he in us because he has given us of his own Spirit." (I John 4:7-13. I Cor. 2:10). So we **know and believe** the love God has for us. **God IS love** and he who abides in love abides in **God."** In this, (by abiding) is love perfected with us **THAT** we may have confidence in the day of judgement, **because** here in this world we **are living,** as he **lives.** (I John. 4:17.)

"There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear, **for fear** suggests punishment and **no one who feels fear** has attained perfect love." Fear arises from guilty feelings, particularly in our relations with a loving Father who sent his Son to die for those who were enemies in their mind by wicked works. (Titus 3:4) Paul felt no fear of the future state, desiring to depart and be with Christ, because he had the full assurance of faith. (II Cor. 5:1-6. Heb. 10:22. II Tim. 1-12) and knew in whom he had believed.

A perfect love which is complete gives confidence for the day of judgement. He who fears has an imperfect faith, which is incredible and leaves a sense of guilt. But the Christian being motivated by that cardinal principle of love, love of God and **also** those who are his children for **every one** who loves the parent loves the child. (I John 5:1) "If **anyone** says I love God and hates his brother, he is a liar." This is the love of God, **that** we keep his commandments. By this, (keeping his word) we **may** be sure we are in Him." **But whoever keeps his word,** in him **truly** is love for God perfected. By this (keeping his word) WE MAY BE SURE we ARE in Him." I John 2:3-5.) Hence love is perfected only in the obedient. Servile fear the compulsion of the old letter is banished, (Heb. 2:14,15) for Christians who serve in the newness of the Spirit and not in the oldness of the letter. We have the old commandment the spirit of the law and the new the spirit of the gospel, that we should love one another. (I John 2:7-12. II John 5. John 15:10-15. 13:34. 3:11. Matt. 22:40. Rom. 13:8. Gal. 5:14.) This is strictly in accord with Matt. 5:23,24. One's relationship to God is definitely the relationship to His children.

Thus the proof of one's faith is the obedience of faith, (Rom. 1:5) which operates by love. Thus John, Paul and James teach

that faith is perfected by works (James 2:22) and love perfected by deed and truth, by abiding in God. (I John 3:19,20, 4:17) by doing the deed. Thus confidence is acquired.

Then faith operates or worketh by love and by the work or labor of love, the faith is proved; tested; justified; made credible; made to live; otherwise it is dead. (James 2:24. Gal. 5:6. I Thess. 1.3.)

By A. L. Shaw, Rochester Mills, R.D.I., Penna.

LOVE

Since love is a commandment of God, it should be well worth a little consideration. We read in Mark 12:30, "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength." That command covers all our loving ability, and we cannot obey that command and just love in part. We notice again in Deut. 6:5 "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." Deut. 11:1, "Therefore thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and keep his charge, and his statutes, and his judgments, and his commandments, always." With the above scriptures, it is easy for us to see that God is the one for us to love, and with all the loving ability we have, and to keep his commandments always, not just on the first day of the week, but always.

Now if we should ask ourselves the question, do we love the Lord? We would all answer, "yes." But suppose we let the Lord tell us whether we really love him or not. Here is what he says, Jno. 14:23, "If a man loves me he will keep my words." Not should or ought to, but **will.** We should be mindful to keep his words, otherwise we don't love him. Matt. 5:44. "But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you." This is the Lord's words, and he tells us if we love him we will keep them. (Jno. 14:23). "This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you." Jno. 15:12. This is some more of the Lord's words, and if we love him he says we will keep them. I Jno. 4:20,21, "If a man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God love his brother also." How do we know we love God? I Jno. 5:2, "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments." Jesus told his disciples. Jno. 13:35. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have loved one another."

We cannot in this short article cover all that we are to love, but there is something we are commanded not to love. I Jno. 2:15, "Love not the world, neither the things of the world, if any man love the world the love of the Father is not in him." Amos 5:15 also tells us, "Hate the evil, and love the good." I Jno. 2:15 and

Amos 5:15 are some of the Lord's words, and he tells us in Jno. 14:23 that if we love him we will keep his words. I Jno. 2:16, "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world."

The scriptures I have given in this article are a good rule to measure ourselves by. If we keep God's word, we know we love him and the brethren. If we love God, and the brethren, we know we are keeping his words, for we can't keep one without keeping the other also. When we love the world, and follow the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, which most assuredly bring the teaching, and doctrine of men, and various things taught by men, through the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, such things that are not found in the teachings of Jesus Christ, then we are in love with the world, and not with the Father as in I Jno. 2:15. Neither are we keeping the words of Jesus, as in Jno. 14:23.

Let's measure ourselves daily, for there is danger that we may have shrunk some since last measured. Be sure that we first read it in God's word, then practice it.

Yours in love of Christ,

W. E. Daniels, Ozone, Ark.

THE COMMUNION

Brothers Garrison, Atchley, et al:

IT IS WRITTEN is at hand. It seems you brethren are springing an entirely new one on us relative to the communion or the Lord's supper. Therefore, I feel like I want to write a little on the communion as I see it, hoping it may be helpful to some in their study of the subject. Since it is a fact—**Jesus** bound this memorial on his disciples, the high points in its observance, is to eat of unleavened bread, broken in memory of the broken body of Jesus, and to drink of the fruit of the vine, in memory of the **warm fresh blood of Jesus** as it flowed from the dying and dead body of Jesus.

This memorial is meant for all consecrated followers of Jesus, but why cavil over words of no purpose; directing sentences, and transplanting words, with a view to form sentences to one's liking; since the apostle Paul in few words too plain for questioning, with direct instruction from Christ, (I Cor. 11:23) says, "I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the **communion of the blood of Christ?** The bread which we break, is it not the **communion of the body of Christ?** For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we have all partaken of that one bread." (I Cor. 10:16,17). The foregoing settles this point with many, and I am sure every loyal Christian blesses the cup of blessing in their hearts, and presents to our

Lord an acceptable token of love, loyalty, and allegiance, when they have each broken and eaten of the consecrated loaf according to the example endorsed by the inspired instructor, and is in keeping with "decently and in order" (I Cor. 14:40). But according to your custom your attendant at the Lord's table must break bread for them all, with your idea of imitating the action of Jesus, but according to your contention he must refrain from partaking of this supper himself, on the grounds of your contention that Jesus only serves. What is the difference to us whether Jesus participated in this rite or not? I see nothing in this as sufficient grounds for a new sect.

Yours for all truth,

S. E. Weldon, 3935 Inez St., Beaumont, Texas

NOTICE TO THE BRETHREN AND OTHERS

I published in the October issue of *IT IS WRITTEN* an article on the bread breaking, by H. E. Robertson published in the O.P.A., page 96. I have been misunderstood by some, that I didn't believe that Acts 20:7 and Acts 2:42 was the Lord's supper. I am sorry that I didn't make that as plain as I should. Sure I believe that was the Lord's supper just as much as any one does. The point that I was making, was if it were not for Matt., Mark, Luke, and I Cor. the breaking of bread would be all they were doing, that is called the Lord's supper. But any Bible reader knows that they came together to eat the Lord's supper, and to break bread, implied the Lord's supper, the whole communion, and the breaking of the bread was done by the one waiting on the table, and not by the whole church. We go to Matt., Mark, Luke, and Cor. to find the pattern, and not to Acts of the apostles. Hoping this clears everything, I remain, as ever, your brother in Christ, and thank you for your correction, and ask you as Christian brethren to correct me at any time if you don't understand me.

Thanking you again,

R. C. Clements, Box 731, Broken Bow, Okla.

WHAT IS A CUP?

Because of the fact that the water is so muddied by the cups people in order to have something to say when "THE CUP" in the communion service is under consideration, a great many people have become confused and are asking: what is a cup? I have a letter before me asking: what is a cup? He states that some are contending if the cup has no handle; it cannot be defended from the standpoint of the Greek.

I will give the definition of cup, as glass, tumbler, goblet, and

chalice in both the Greek and the English. The Greek word "POTERION" is the word from which the word "CUP" is translated in the New Testament when the communion service is under consideration. We will take the Greek first, and in it we will investigate "CUP" only as other words, glass, etc., will be settled whether they are a "POTERION" (Cup) or not. POTERION—Mr. Young defines it "DRINKING VESSEL". Mr. Berry defines it "A DRINKING CUP". Mr. Thayer defines it, "A CUP, A DRINKING VESSEL". Mr. Harper defines it, "A VESSEL FOR DRINKING, A CUP." There is nothing in the above definitions to tell us a "POTERION" (cup), **must** have one handle, two handles, or no handle. Neither is there anything to show it **must** have a foot and stem, or **must not** have a foot and stem. Neither is there anything to make us know what material it **must** be made of. It does not exclude earthen ware, glass, pewter, silver, or any other material from which "A DRINKING VESSEL" could be formed. Hence, if we restrict it to any particular style or material of which a "POTERION" (drinking vessel, cup) is made; we are restricting where God has not. This should forever settle the question, but we now come to the English.

"CUP". Mr. Webster says: "A small open bowl shaped vessel used chiefly to drink from, with or without a handle or handles, a stem and foot, or a lid; as, a wine cup; a communion cup, ... " "CUP" Encyclopaedic dict. says: "A small vessel for liquids used to drink from; A drinking vessel." Do the above definitions describe one drinking vessel more than it does all other drinking vessels? **NO.** Does it favor any particular material from which to make a CUP above all other materials from which a "DRINKING VESSEL" could be formed? **NO.** Does it exclude earthen ware, glass, or pewter? Nay verily. Then why try to become a gospel legislator?

"GLASS" Mr. Webster says, Def. 4: "Anything made of glass; as a glass vessel; specifically, a glass drinking vessel; a tumbler; a goblet . . . . ." Encyclopaedic Dict. I (B9), "A drinking vessel or cup made of glass". Since a glass is a drinking vessel made of glass; and since a **poterion,** cup is a drinking vessel; how can you exclude any drinking vessel made of glass?

"GOBLET." Webster Dict. 1. "A kind of cup or drinking vessel without a handle; loosely, any wine cup. 2. a drinking glass with a foot and stem." Encyclopaedic Dict. "A large cup or drinking vessel without a handle".

"CHALICE." Webster Dict. 1. "A drinking cup; esp. the cup used in the sacrament of the Lord's supper . . . . " Encyclopaedic Dict. "A cup or drinking vessel."

"TUMBLER." Webster Dict. 4. "A drinking glass without a foot or stem, orig. made with a pointed or convex base so that it could not be set down until empty." Encyclopaedic Dict. "A drinking glass of cylindrical form, or the form of the frustum of an inverted cone; so called, because formerly, of its base ending in a point, it could not be set down till completely empty of liquor."

Brother, which of the above from the definitions in both Greek and English is **not** a "DRINKING VESSEL?" Which material of which drinking vessels are commonly made are excluded from the above definitions? Is either earthen ware, glass, or pewter excluded? Do the above definitions show it must or must not have one, two, or more handles, or a foot and stem?

This smoke screen of our cups brethren is rather a cute trick. If they can keep us busy pointing out just what is a cup and just what is not a cup; the discussion over the number to be used by an assembly will not be discussed, and of course error under these circumstances comes out winner.

I am always ready to use any style of "DRINKING VESSEL"; composed of any of the various materials of which a "DRINKING VESSEL" is composed for the conscience of any individual who may be worshipping with me. But to say that one of those "DRINKING VESSELS" is any more a "DRINKING VESSEL" than all those other "DRINKING VESSELS," is to mis-state the facts. Or to say that any of those various materials from which a "DRINKING VESSEL" is formed, is excluded under the above definitions in both Greek and English is to mis-state the fact in the case. Now since the Bible does not state any particular style of "DRINKING VESSEL" nor any particular material out of which it should be formed; in both cases it is **unrestricted.** Hence, we should not restrict where God has not restricted. We should not add to nor take from—. Rev. 22:18,19; Phil. 1:27; II Jno. 9; I Pet. 4:11; Coll. 3:17; Phil. 4:19; II Tim. 3:13,17.

Since the figurative use of the word "CUP" was not under consideration in the above discussion, the figurative uses in the definitions were not given. Only, what is a CUP?

May God bless us all to be satisfied with what is written in God's holy word and not become wise above that which is written is my prayer.

Your brother in Christ,

J. S. Bedingfield, Rt. 1, Rox 100, Cave Junction, Oregon

CHURCH ACTIVITIES

As I have just received *IT IS WRITTEN*, and read the good letters from different brethren, I can't express my gratitude to them. But to my surprise, I failed to find that some of our strongest preachers have failed to give their support, and talent to the writing of the paper as they should. I fail to see why they are not getting behind *IT IS WRITTEN* as they should. Brethren, we have not done our best by a lot. There is much more to be done. The church needs your help, it needs all the forces it has to combat false doctrine with. We need *IT IS WRITTEN* doubled by the best writers that the church of Christ has. False doctrine is

multiplying all the time. The unlearned are continually calling for the truth. I receive questions almost every day about things that are being taught, wanting to know if this is Bible, or that is Bible. Brethren why not all of us try to do our part?

I had the question asked me, "If Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever, why does he not baptize with the Holy Ghost, as on the day of pentecost?" Many good people don't seem to realize how it is that Christ does not perform such today. Yes Christ is the same. He has never changed, and never will. God is the same God, and has never changed, and neither one of them will ever change. Christ came and fulfilled his mission, then returned to sit down at the hight hand of God. The Holy Spirit came, and fulfilled its work. The apostles came and fulfilled their works. We are fulfilling our part. God was good, and is still good. He will never change. He gave his will to man, it was good and is still good. Christ is the same Christ that lived yesterday, the same Christ that lives today, and the same Christ that will live forever. His word will abide forever, it being a perfect will. Christ being a perfect Christ, and one that will never change, his will also being perfect will never change, but will abide forever. Man can try all he may, but he can't do away with what Christ has planned to do.

R. C. Clements, Broken Bow, Okla.

I received a letter recently from Brother Spurlin of Reydon, Okla. He tells me that he baptized four the Sunday before he wrote the letter. This is good news. I have known Bro. Spurlin about eighteen years, and have found him to be a real Christian man; one who is always laboring for the Lord. Brother Spurlin has had to shoulder most of the responsibility of the church there, as much of the time he was the only member to take the lead. I feel that if we had more members like him we would have more loyal congregations today. I want to say that I am glad to hear of this addition to the Church at Reydon, and hope they will continue to grow.—L.E.A.

I received a letter this week from Brother Curtis C. Forbis of San Pablo, Calif. The congregation there is now meeting at 2867 N. 17 St. They formerly met at Point Richmond, Standard and Eddy St. If you are living near, or passing through, you have a special invitation from Brother Forbis to worship with them. —L.E.A.

May we at this time extend our appreciation to the brethren for their continued support to *IT IS WRITTEN*. Those sending in their support this month are the Churches at LaHabra, Calif., San Pablo, Calif., and Somerton, Ariz., and R. C. Clements, Broken Bow, Okla., and Robert L. Foley, Los Angeles, Calif.