

*Thrasher
Forsythe
Debate
on the
New Testament
Church*

Thomas N. Thrasher

Representing churches of Christ

Richard W. Forsythe

Representing United Pentecostal churches

Copyright © 2023 Thrasher Publications

Second Edition

All Rights Reserved

ISBN: 9781796960556

DEDICATION

To my beloved brother in Christ

Dallas Blevins

in acknowledgement of

his encouragement and support

in my service to

Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ

CONTENTS

	Introduction	1
1	Thrasher's First Affirmative	3
2	Forsythe's First Negative	16
3	Thrasher's Second Affirmative	29
4	Forsythe's Second Negative	44
5	Thrasher's Third Affirmative	57
6	Forsythe's Third Negative	75
7	Thrasher's Fourth Affirmative	87
8	Forsythe's Fourth Negative	106
9	Thrasher's Fifth Affirmative	125
10	Forsythe's Fifth Negative	140
11	Thrasher's Affirmative Rejoinder	155

INTRODUCTION

Debates on religious issues are often viewed negatively, especially since their existence indicates a lack of agreement on the issue(s) addressed. Of course, while unity in regard to Bible teaching is highly desirable (1 Corinthians 1:10), the willingness of Bible students to “contend earnestly” for their beliefs is likewise desirable (Jude 3). The publisher recommends that the reader study this material on the identity of the church of the New Testament by “searching the Scriptures” to determine whether these things presented by the participants are so (Acts 17:11).

Richard W. Forsythe and his wife made their home in Forest, Mississippi for many years. He was one of the best-known representatives of Oneness Pentecostal doctrine in the Southeastern United States, having served in official positions in the United Pentecostal Church organization, frequently defending their doctrines in formal debate. This was his fifth formal debate representing Oneness Pentecostalism.

Thomas N. Thrasher and his wife Jerretta live in Decatur, Alabama. He began preaching the gospel in March 1966, while he was still in high school. Since that time, he has done evangelistic work while working as a mathematics teacher, school administrator, or college/university professor. At the time of this book’s publication, he has participated in 111 formal debates, 18 of which have been published in book form.

The debate contained in this book was the fourth of six formal debates between these men during the period from 1972 to 2000. They remained friends despite their differences on numerous Bible subjects. Their discussions demonstrate that religious debates can be conducted on a high plane without rancor or bitterness.

Please read this volume with a fervent desire to know God's will more perfectly. "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8: 32).



Richard W. Forsythe Thomas N. Thrasher



PROPOSITION

"The church of Christ, of which I am a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice, and name, and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2."

Affirm: Thomas N. Thrasher

Deny: Richard W. Forsythe

THRASHER'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

Mr. Forsythe, brethren, and friends:

It is with the utmost respect for my God and for Truth that I am engaged in this religious discussion with my friend and opponent, Mr. Forsythe. We are not strangers to each other since we have met publicly in three previous encounters on the forensic platform. I respect his courage of conviction as demonstrated by the fact that he is willing to participate in an honorable discussion of religious differences. Jesus declared, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32). It is because of an interest in **truth** that I have come in affirmation of the proposition to be debated: "The church of Christ, of which I am a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice, and name, and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2."

Before introducing evidence as to the truthfulness of this proposition, it is proper that I define the terms involved in it. "The church of Christ" is that organization identified by the Lord in Matthew 16:18 when He stated, "I will build **My church**." It is

composed of all obedient believers in the dispensation of time that began with the day of Pentecost in Acts 2, and which will continue until the end of time. The phrase "of which I am a member" simply qualifies the term "church of Christ" to indicate clearly that I am defending the organization of which I am a member, and to which I was added by the Lord as a result of my obedience to the gospel (cf. Acts 2:37-38, 41, 47). In other words, I am **not** defending **every** institution that may refer to itself by the term "church of Christ." However, I do affirm that the church of which I am a member is scriptural. By "scriptural" I mean that every single thing that is taught and practiced is authorized by, or in harmony with, the Scriptures (the Bible, the word of God). We are especially concerned in this debate with the origin (source or beginning), doctrine (what is believed and taught), practice (what is done), and name (the way we designate ourselves) of the church. The final phrase, "is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2," means that the church of which I am a member is identical in origin, doctrine, practice, and name to the church as described in the New Testament. Briefly stated, I will produce Bible references to show that the things I believe about the church are the same things revealed about the church in the Bible and, therefore, the church of which I am a member is **scriptural**. Naturally, since Mr. Forsythe is in the negative, his obligation is to examine the arguments that I present and demonstrate my conclusions to be false. Please study with an open mind and an open Bible.

First, let us all recognize the fact that the church is referred to by several different **descriptive terms** in the New Testament. For example, it is often called simply "the church" (Ephesians 3:10; 5:25). Elsewhere in the New Testament the church is called "the church of God" (2 Corinthians 1:1), "the church of the living God" (1 Timothy 3:15), "the kingdom" (Colossians 1:13), "the body [of

Christ]" (Colossians 1:18), "the flock of God" (1 Peter 5:2), "the temple of the living God" (2 Corinthians 6:16), "the house of God" (1 Timothy 3:15), "the bride" (Revelation 21:9), and perhaps others. All of these are scriptural ways by which to refer to the church, as proven by the fact that I have cited Bible verses for each of them. In addition to these terms, we find the apostle Paul calling several congregations "churches of Christ" (Romans 16:16). Hence, this designation is also a scriptural one. This one verse is sufficient to prove that the church of Christ is scriptural in **name**, as my proposition declares. Let it be clearly understood that I am stating that **all** of these terms are appropriate designations for the church. When I say that the church of Christ is scriptural in "name," I do not mean that "church of Christ" is the only scriptural term. In my teaching and conversations, I use all of these descriptive phrases. When I am emphasizing that God's people have been "called out" of the world through obedience to the truth, I use the term "church," since that is what the word "church" means. When I want to emphasize the fact that Christ is "the head," I refer to the "body" of Christ. When I desire to point out that Jesus Christ is the "Chief Shepherd," I refer to the church as the "flock" of God. If I am speaking of Jesus as the "bridegroom," I use the word "bride" in referring to the church. Similarly, the other scriptural phrases may be used to point out the relationship between God and the church. However, one cannot "speak as the oracles of God" (1 Peter 4:11) and use terms never mentioned with reference to the church in the Bible.

With reference to the **origin** of the church, as the proposition states, the church began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2. This was in fulfillment of many statements from both the Old and New Testaments. Isaiah prophesied that the church would begin in Jerusalem (Isaiah 2:1-3). The prophet Daniel spoke of the time that the church would begin (Daniel 2:36-44). John the Baptist

preached that it was "at hand" (Matthew 3:2). The Lord Himself said that He would build it in the future (Matthew 16:18). The fulfillment of these statements, as well as many others we could cite, came on the day of Pentecost following the ascension of Jesus to heaven. On that day the apostles began to preach the gospel as the Savior had instructed them to do in the Great Commission (Mark 16:15-16). When the word of God was proclaimed on Pentecost, those people who believed the message were told to "repent and be baptized" (Acts 2:38). Those who obeyed (verse 41) were "added" by the Lord to His church (verse 47). This is exactly the way that people become members of the church of Christ of which I am a member. Just as a contractor can follow the blueprint of an architect in building a house, we can follow the inspired record given by the God of heaven and become exactly what the people on Pentecost became: saved believers, and members of the church of the Lord.

The book of Acts provides us with an inspired account of some events that transpired during the years following Pentecost; however, we do not have a complete record of every detail in the history of the church, even in the first century. Furthermore, it is not possible to trace the church of the Lord in minute detail throughout the period of time since the first century. We do not have an inspired history to cover that period, and even uninspired documents are relatively scarce and very incomplete. However, this presents no real problem since God promised that His church (or kingdom) would never be destroyed (Daniel 2:44). I believe that this is true whether we can locate specific congregations in uninspired historical accounts or not. The existence of the Lord's church on earth today is not dependent on our possessing a continuous line of congregations since the first century. What it does depend upon is that we still have the "seed" of the kingdom today—the word of God (Luke 8:11).

When God created the world, he instituted the law of procreation: all living things reproduce "after their kind" (Genesis 1:11-12, 24-25). This is so because of their "seed." For example, when a person wants to grow watermelons, he plants watermelon seeds. He doesn't plant acorns if he wants watermelons. Why not? He recognizes, as we all do, that things reproduce "after their kind." If I want "wheat," I don't plant "corn." Again, why? God ordained in the beginning that the "seed" determines the kind of plant that is produced. It is not simply an accidental process; it was a part of God's design and order in the universe.

Similarly, God has not left His church without a means of growing and spreading. He has established a law of spiritual procreation based upon the planting of the **seed** of the kingdom. In the Parable of the Sower, Christ pointed out that the seed is the word of God (Luke 8:11). The apostle Peter said, "For you have been born again not of **seed** which is perishable but imperishable, that is, through the living and abiding **word of God**" (1 Peter 1:3). How can we be members of the New Testament church today? Very simple: By planting the seed of the kingdom, just as was done on the day of Pentecost. When people hear, believe, and obey that gospel, they will be added by the Lord to **His church**. The existence of the church today is not dependent upon establishing a continuous succession of congregations back to the first century. It depends very simply upon the sowing of the seed of the kingdom in good and honest hearts (Luke 8:15). Those who are thus converted are Christians, and when "two or three" meet together to worship and serve God, they constitute a "church of Christ" (that is, a congregation) in that locality. This is the simple, uncomplicated plan of God for the growth of His church on earth. If followed without alteration, it will produce fruit for God to His glory (Ephesians 3:8-11).

Let me illustrate this process from the Scriptures. In Acts 18 we have information concerning the apostle Paul's visit to Corinth. In verse five we read that "Paul began devoting himself completely to the **word**, solemnly testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ." What happened when Paul preached to these people? The next verse tells us that some "resisted and blasphemed." Their hearts were not good and honest. But verse 8 informs us that "many of the Corinthians when they heard were believing and being baptized." The seed was planted, and it brought forth after its kind—children of God were produced! Later, when Paul wrote a letter to these people, he addressed it "to the church of God which is at Corinth, to those who have been sanctified in Christ Jesus, saints by calling, with all who in every place call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, their Lord and ours" (1 Corinthians 1:2). How is it that the church in Corinth came into being? Paul reminded the Corinthians how it happened: "I planted" the seed of the kingdom (1 Corinthians 3:6), and "God gave the increase." This is exactly the way that the church has been brought into existence and grown in every locality where it has existed since the first century. God's word is preached (Acts 8:35; Mark 16:15), the hearers believe (Hebrews 11:6; John 8:24), repent of their sins (Luke 13:3; Acts 17:30), confess their faith (Romans 10:10; Acts 8:37), and are baptized in water for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38; 22:16). When one thus obeys God, he is added by the Lord to **His church** (Acts 2:47). He does not need to go through any additional steps in order to become a member of the Lord's church. The same process that results in his being saved from his sins also results in his being added to the New Testament church.

When Christians in a locality met together as a congregation to **worship** God, what does the Bible reveal that they did? The Scriptures point out to us that the New Testament church

engaged in regular worship services: "And they were continually devoting themselves to the apostles' teaching and to fellowship, to the breaking of bread and to prayer" (Acts 2:42). Among the acts mentioned as a part of their worship to God was **study** of His word. In Acts 20:7 we read that when the disciples assembled on the first day of the week, Paul preached the gospel of Christ. Surely nobody would say that it would be wrong for Christians to study the Bible in their worship to God. The church of Christ of which I am a member includes Bible reading and study in its worship to the Lord. Will my friend, Mr. Forsythe, say we are unscriptural for so doing?

When we meet together to glorify God, we also continually **pray** unto God (Acts 12:12; 16:25). I believe that the word of God authorizes us to do so. Will Mr. Forsythe contend that we are wrong in this?

Furthermore, when we assemble, we engage in the **singing** of praise unto God (Ephesians 5:19; Colossians 3:16; Acts 16:25). The Bible teaches us to do it. Mr. Forsythe, are you denying the scripturalness of the church of Christ because we sing in worship?

In the next place, when a local church assembles on the first day of the week, there is the partaking of the **Lord's supper** in memory of His death for us (1 Corinthians 11:23-26; Acts 20:7). We do this because the Scriptures teach us that God commands it, and we want to please God. I wonder if my friend and opponent thinks the church of Christ is unscriptural because of our observance of the Lord's supper. I am certain that he will tell us!

Last of all, the church of Christ meets on the first day of the week so that each individual Christian may "lay by in store" (**give**) as he has been prospered in order that the Lord's will can be carried out and His work done. Are we wrong, Mr. Forsythe, because we give in this manner? Surely, he will not say so, since

the Scriptures authorize us to do it (1 Corinthians 16:1-2; 2 Corinthians 9:6-7). As a matter of fact, the churches of Christ, such as I am defending in this debate, do nothing in worship except what is divinely authorized in God's Book. If we are in error on these matters, I expect my honorable opponent to point out to us those matters so that we can correct them.

Another point involved in the proposition is that of the **organization** of the church of Christ. Once again, let us turn to the Bible to see what the proper organization is. Naturally, Jesus Christ is the builder, head, and chief shepherd of the church (Matthew 16:18; Ephesians 1:22-23; 1 Peter 5:4). However, the Scriptures reveal to us that each local church is to be independent and self-governing under the oversight of **elders** (also called bishops, overseers, pastors, shepherds, or presbyters) who possess special qualifications (1 Timothy 3:1-7; Titus 1: 5-9). In each local church there should be a plurality (two or more) of such men who tend the flock of God in that locality (1 Peter 5:1-4; Acts 20:17, 28; 14: 23). Please note that in every case the elders are mentioned in a congregation it is always "elders" (plural), not "the elder" (singular) of a congregation. No church can scripturally have one man who is "the elder" (or "the pastor"). Such an idea is foreign to the word of God.

Further, the New Testament mentions men serving as **deacons** in a congregation. These men also have special qualifications stated in 1 Timothy 3:8-13, and they serve under the oversight of the elders of the congregation. In addition to these men who possess special qualifications, the elders and the deacons, all Christians are referred to as **saints** (1 Corinthians 1:2). Thus, when writing to the church at Philippi, Paul addressed his letter "to all the saints in Christ Jesus who are in Philippi, including the overseers and deacons" (Philippians 1:1). This is the kind of organization that New Testament congregations had. There was

no hierarchy or general organization over many congregations in the first century; therefore, the churches of Christ do not have any such organizations today. Mr. Forsythe, since you deny the scripturalness of the church of Christ, will you take the position that the kind of organization I have described is unscriptural? If so, please point out wherein I have presented error on this matter.

Still another essential feature of the church is the **work** that it engages in to please God. By turning to the Truth, one finds that the New Testament congregations participated in a three-fold work. First, each local church engaged in **evangelism**, or preaching the gospel (1 Thessalonians 1:8; Ephesians 3:10; Acts 13:1-5). This is a primary activity of the church, and one which all will agree is scriptural. Secondly, each congregation in the New Testament **edified** itself, that is, provided for the growth of each individual member (Acts 9:31; Ephesians 4:15-16; 1 Thessalonians 5:11). Thirdly, the local church is to provide for the needs of destitute saints to whom it is responsible (1 Timothy 5:16; Acts 6:1-3). The scriptural work of the New Testament church is restricted to these three areas. The church of Christ of which I am a member participates in exactly this work, and is, therefore, scriptural in this respect. They do not enter the realm of social and recreational functions for which there is no Bible authority. Of course, many human religious organizations emphasize these areas of activity; however, the Lord's church is not authorized to act in these categories. It is the fervent desire, intention, and practice of churches of Christ to do only the work that God has designed them to do. Mr. Forsythe, will you tell us if you believe it is right for the church to act in the three areas I have mentioned, and to be content with that divinely approved work?

In order to clarify the issue in this discussion, I am asking several questions that pinpoint these matters I have presented for

each person's consideration. I ask that Mr. Forsythe answer these questions clearly and definitely, and then make any comment he would care to make relating to his answer. I am well aware that there are some questions that cannot be answered with a "yes" or "no"; however, I am asking questions that can be easily answered. Please give your attention to my opponent's responses to them.

1. Is the term "church of Christ" scriptural to use in referring to the church of the New Testament?

2. Is it scriptural for a local church to assemble to study the Bible, pray, sing, to partake of the Lord's supper on the first day of the week, and give on the first day of the week as each member is prospered?

3. Is it scriptural for a local church to have men possessing the qualifications given in 1 Timothy 3:1-7 serving as elders to oversee the local church, men possessing the qualifications given in 1 Timothy 3:8-13 serving as deacons under the elders, and other members of the congregation working together in carrying out divinely approved activities, without any additional organizational framework?

4. Is it scriptural for a local church to engage in its work of evangelism, edification, and benevolence, without becoming involved in social and recreational functions such as sponsoring ball teams, boy scout troops, and providing common meals for social purposes?

5. Since the seed of the kingdom is the word of God, do you accept the fact that the planting of the word of God into people's hearts, when they believe and obey it, will result in their being New Testament Christians, and that they will be added by the

Lord to His church?

In the remaining part of this speech, I want to emphasize the importance of respecting the silence of the Scriptures in connection with the different points I have mentioned. In other words, the Bible clearly teaches that “anyone who goes too far and **does not abide in the teaching of Christ, does not have God**” (2 John 9). As expressed in the concluding part of the New Testament, “I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: if anyone **adds to them**, God shall add to him the plagues which are written in this book” (Revelation 22:18). The same principle is stated in the Old Testament: “Every word of God is tested; He is a shield to those who take refuge in Him. **Do not add to His words** lest He reprove you, and you be proved a liar” (Proverbs 30:5-6). Many other passages could be cited demonstrating the Bible principle of authority: we must not **add** to the word of God nor **subtract** from it! The penalty for failing to respect the silence of the Scriptures is punishment from God.

Let us illustrate the principle by an example. In the Old Testament God gave specific instructions concerning the sacrifices and offerings He required. God did not have to mention specifically everything that was **forbidden**. All that was necessary was for God to tell the people what He **did want**—and everything else would have been automatically **excluded**. Therefore, we read in Leviticus 10:1-2, “Now Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took their respective firepans, and after putting fire in them, placed incense on it and offered **strange fire** before the Lord, which **He had not commanded** them. And fire came out of the presence of the Lord and consumed them, and they died before the Lord.” Please notice that these two men were engaged in worship to God; however, they sinned because they did that which God had not authorized them to do. It may have seemed

like a good thing for Nadab and Abihu to do, according to their own human wisdom; however, that did not make it pleasing to God. They were punished because of their failure to respect God's silence. Unfortunately, many religionists today are making the same mistake and are guilty of the same sin in principle that the sons of Aaron committed.

An example can be seen in the area of **worship** to God today under the law of Jesus Christ. God has given a command for His people to "sing" praise to Him (Ephesians 5:19; Colossians 3:16; Acts 16:25). There is no doubt that we can "sing" and be pleasing unto God because He has revealed that to us. However, many people are not content to "sing"; they want to introduce a kind of music into the worship of the church "which He has not commanded them." Thus, we can find all kinds of mechanical instruments of music being employed in the worship services: pianos, organs, guitars, accordions, etc. Where is the Bible authority for these instruments of music in the worship to God in the Lord's church? Surely, those who use these things should be able to produce passages from the law of Christ authorizing their using them; otherwise, they are guilty of "adding to" the word of God and are condemning themselves in the sight of God! Of course, I could cite other examples of people adding to the word of God, but I believe all can understand the concept involved. We must be very careful to do what the Bible teaches, without addition or subtraction.

The church of Christ, of which I am a member, is content to do exactly what God authorizes and, therefore, is scriptural in name, doctrine, and practice. Since it teaches exactly the same gospel that we find revealed in the New Testament, the church of Christ is the church of the New Testament. I urge each individual who is interested in these vital issues relating to the church to investigate these matters. Give close attention to Mr. Forsythe's

first speech. Thank you.

FORSYTHE'S FIRST NEGATIVE

Mr. Thrasher, brethren, and friends that read this debate,

It is with love and respect for God's Word that I enter into this discussion with my friend, Mr. Thrasher, to deny the proposition that he is affirming. As Mr. Thrasher has already said, we have met in three previous discussions, and even though our views of the Bible are quite different, I consider him a personal friend of mine.

First, I would like to say that I am not in disagreement with everything that my opponent has to say in this debate, and I do admire him for standing willingly with courage to defend what he thinks to be right according to the Scriptures. I believe "we have to know the truth and obey it to be free" (John 8:32).

The Church that Jesus spoke of in Matthew 16:18 **is** the Church that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2. **It is** composed of all obedient believers in the dispensation of time that began with the day of Pentecost, and which will continue until the end of time. I believe this; however, I want to say here that my opponent had just as well be trying to dam up the Mississippi River with corn cobs than to be trying to prove that he is a member of that Church with the doctrine and position he holds in this discussion.

My friend says, "Since Mr. Forsythe is in the negative, his obligation is to examine the arguments that I present and demonstrate my conclusions to be false." He also said, "Study with an open mind and Bible." Now, let us do that, please.

First, he says, "It is scriptural in origin." Now, this means beginning, coming into existence or birth. It is a strange thing to me (and I want the reader to notice) how my opponent could

write his whole speech and not one time mention what happened when the Church had its beginning, coming into existence, or birth; and that is, every individual member that day in the Upper Room at Pentecost was filled with the Holy Ghost and spoke with other tongues. Acts 2:4 says, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." The reason this happened was because prophecy foretold of this event. Isaiah 28:11 says, "For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people." Joel 2:28-29 says, "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions. And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit."

John the Baptist was prophesied to be the forerunner of Jesus Christ. Isaiah 40:3 says, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." Now, what did John the Baptist say about Jesus Christ when he came and began to preach? Mark 1:4-8 says, "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins and there went out unto him **all** the land of Judaea, and they of Jerusalem, and were **all baptized** of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." Verse 7 says, "And preached, saying, There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose." (Note here now, who did he preach to?) Verse 5 says, "... **All** the land of Judaea and they of Jerusalem." Verse 8 says, "I indeed have baptized **you** with water: but he shall baptize **you** with the Holy Ghost." (Note who is the **you** that John speaks of here). "**All**" the land of Judea and Jerusalem that came out to hear him preach and were baptized. Now, these verses let us know that every believer and follower of

Jesus Christ had the positive assurance of being baptized with the Holy Ghost. Jesus himself also gives us this assurance. St. John 4:14 says, “But **whosoever** drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.” Also St. John 7:37-39 says, “In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried saying, if “**any man**” thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.” Verse 39 says, “(But this spake he of the spirit, which **they** that believe on him should receive: For the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)” And Jesus said to his followers before his ascension in Luke 24:49, “And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.” Verses 52 and 53 says, “... they returned to Jerusalem with great joy and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God. Amen.”

Now, anyone that will study the Bible with an open mind and conscience can see that the New Testament Church was to have this experience and that is exactly what happened when the Church came into existence on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2. This is why I can say that Mr. Thrasher’s Church is **not that church in origin**, because it does not teach this. I want my opponent to take these scriptures right in order as I have given them and tell us why the “So Called” New Testament Church that he is a member of does not receive it. My opponent claims the Church that he is a member of came into existence at Jerusalem in 33 A.D. at Pentecost. If it did, it must have been across town from the one in the Upper Room because the “**True**” Church **talked in tongues**. Mr. Thrasher’s Church has not talked in tongues; therefore, it is **not** the “True” Church. This proves that his Church has **no original scriptural** position. As Mr. Thrasher said, on the first page of his

speech, he is defending the organization that he is a member of. That's right. But I say, it is a long way from being the Church that Jesus spoke about in Matthew 16:18, and the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2. My opponent said in his speech, upon referring to the Church, that John the Baptist said it was at hand (Matthew 3:2). I want to remind Mr. Thrasher and the readers of this discussion that John told **all** of these same people that he was preaching to that Jesus Christ would baptize them with the Holy Ghost (Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:5-8; Luke 3:15-16). Mr. Thrasher's own logic is getting him into trouble. This is just one of the many errors he will make in this discussion in trying to prove the Church he is a member of is the Church that was born on Pentecost in Acts 2.

My friend also said in his speech, when the Word of God was proclaimed on Pentecost, those people who believed the message were told to repent and be baptized (Acts 2:38). They were also told in that same verse, sir, to receive the Holy Ghost. Why did you not mention that, Mr. Thrasher?

My friend also said, "Just as a contractor can follow the blueprint of an architect in building a house, we can follow the inspired record given by the God of Heaven and become exactly what the people on Pentecost became." I agree to this, but my friend Mr. Thrasher is not following this procedure, because he has not received what they experienced in the Upper Room at Pentecost. Furthermore, he has not even mentioned the Holy Ghost experience in any of his speech. Mr. Thrasher said, "The Lord himself would build it (The Church)." How? It started in Acts 2 with the outpouring of the Holy Ghost (Acts 2:4; Acts 2:15-18); and Paul tells us in Ephesians 2:20-22 how it is to continue: "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly formed together groweth unto an holy temple in the

Lord: in whom **ye** also are builded together for an habitation **through the spirit.**" Paul also said in 1 Corinthians 3:11, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (Where did the foundation start?) In Jerusalem, of course, at Pentecost with the Holy Ghost and speaking in tongues. Now, Mr. Thrasher has a Church of which he is a member starting at Pentecost in Acts 2 with **no** Holy Ghost or Tongues. Therefore, it is **not of scriptural origin or doctrine.**

Now, Mr. Thrasher says what the Lord's Church on earth today is dependent upon is that we still have the seed of the kingdom today, The Word of God (Luke 8:11). He also says, when God created the world he instituted the law of procreation, all living things produce after their kind (Genesis 1:11-12, 24-25). This is so, because of their seed, and my opponent gives us examples. If a person wants watermelons, he doesn't plant acorns; if he wants wheat, he doesn't plant corn. God ordained in the beginning that the seed determines the kind of plant that is produced. Now, I believe this and agree to it, but again this is contrary to Mr. Thrasher's logic and does not even come close to the proposition that he is supposed to be affirming; and the best place I know to prove this is to look in the Word of God and see what the seed produced. In the Book of Acts (1:15), I believe there were about a hundred and twenty (120) in the Upper Room; and (Acts 1:14-15) these received the Holy Ghost and spoke in tongues (Acts 2:4; Acts 2:15-16; Acts 2:33). I believe these were the first members of the New Testament Church. Why? Because Peter preached from verse 14 of Acts 2 through verse 40, and he told them in verses 38-39 to **repent and be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins and they would receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost.** Verse 41 says, "... there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Now, the three thousand souls were added to the 120 that had already received the Holy Ghost, of

course.

Now, let us see what the seed produces when it is sown in another one of Peter's sermons. We find in Acts 10 the apostle Peter was summoned to the house of Cornelius by two men that were sent by him, in verse 17. When Peter got there in verse 33, Cornelius said to him, "Now, therefore, are we **all here** present before God, to hear **all things** that are **commanded thee of God.**" Verse 34 says, "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons." (This means of Jew, Gentile or any individual.) Verse 36 says, "The Word which God sent unto the children of Israel." Verse 37 says, "That word I say, ye know, which was published throughout **all Judea** and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached ..." Now, what was to happen after the baptism which John preached? If you remember back in Mark 1:5-8, John preached to **all the land of Judea** and **Jerusalem** that came to him. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but there cometh one mightier than I and He (Jesus) shall baptize you (this means **all** that will obey) with the Holy Ghost.

Now, the seed sown at the house of Cornelius produced the same thing that happened to the Jew at Pentecost. How do we know? Because verse 44 of Acts 10 says, "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on **all** them which heard the word." Verse 45 says, "And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." Verse 46 says, "For they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God." Now, if we will notice in Acts 11:15-16 what Peter said to the Jews that questioned him: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning." (This means at Pentecost in Acts 2. "Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water;

but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.”) What we have shown here by the **Word of God** proves without a shadow of a doubt that my friend’s own thinking is contrary to the proposition he is trying to affirm. Mr. Thrasher, I had given you credit for having more ability than to come out with such a statement as this, knowing the position you take on this subject. I am sort of disappointed in you.

Now, while we are on the seed subject, let us see what happen when sent down to the city of Samaria, and **preached** Christ unto them.” Verse 12 says, “... They believed Philip **preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God**, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.” Verse 14 says, the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received **The Word of God**, they sent unto them Peter and John. Verse 15 says, they prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Verse 17 says, “And they received the Holy Ghost.”

Now, in Acts 19:1-6 we find Paul came to Ephesus and found certain disciples of John’s baptism that had not heard of nor received the Holy Ghost; he preached to them, baptized them in the Name of Jesus Christ and they received the Holy Ghost and spoke in tongues (verse 6). If you will notice in verse 8, Paul went into the synagogue, and spake boldly, disputing and persuading the things **concerning the Kingdom of God**. Now, what he spoke there would have to be the same thing he spoke to John’s disciples; he would not change his doctrine. Galatians 1:8-9 tells us so.

Now, to conclude what the Bible teaches about the seed of the Kingdom, we find approximately six years later with several established congregations in Ephesus, Paul calls the elders together and says in Acts 20:25, “... ye all among whom I have gone preaching the Kingdom of God...” Verse 27 says, “For I have

not shunned to declare unto you ‘**all**’ the counsel of God.” Now, I believe that each member of every congregation that were saints of God had the same experience that the first disciples he preached to received. If not, why not? Now, I say again, Mr. Thrasher’s own logic has gotten him into trouble with his statements of the seed. Why? Because he says we still have the seed of the Kingdom today. (This is right). But what my opponent preaches does not produce what the preaching at Pentecost, Samaria, The House of Cornelius, and Paul’s preaching at Ephesus produced; therefore, Mr. Thrasher’s Church of which he is a member is **not** that Church in origin that came into existence on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2. He reminds me of the Indian I heard about, when he saw his first locomotive going down the track, he took out after it on his horse, got his lasso and threw it over the smokestack. You can imagine what happened when the slack was taken up. I do admire Mr. Thrasher’s courage in the affirmation of this proposition, although I cannot say I have any confidence in his judgment. Because the same thing is going to happen to my friend and his proposition that happened to the Indian that lassoed the locomotive. He will find, before this discussion is over, that he has obligated himself to prove something that is impossible with the position he holds concerning the New Testament Church and its doctrine. I believe what I have written proves the Church of which he is a member is **not** that Church in origin because **he does not have or preach** the experience that the **true** Church had in Acts 2; 10; and 19.

Now, I want to deal with the word “**practice**” in his proposition. Mr. Thrasher defines this as “What was done.” I will accept this definition to be correct; but let us see if his Church harmonizes with the **true** Church practice. The Bible teaches there were times when they **all** prayed (Acts 20:36; Acts 4:24, 31). When do the members of the so-called Church of Christ, that Mr.

Thrasher is a member of, **lift their voices** to God and **all** pray? I have been in many of their congregations in times past and I never saw this practiced at any time. However, they could have just begun this practice. Have you, Mr. Thrasher? Also 1 Timothy 2:8 says, “I will therefore that men pray **everywhere, lifting up holy hands**, without wrath and doubting.” Psalms 134:1-2 says, “...Bless ye the Lord, all ye servants of the Lord, ... **Lift up your hands in the sanctuary, and bless the Lord.**”

Now, I would like to ask Mr. Thrasher if any of his congregation or any other congregation of the so-called Church of Christ that he knows of every lift up their hands to praise or pray in the sanctuary of the Lord? St. John 2:24 says, “... They that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.” Lifting our hands in praise and prayer is part of “**true**” worship. If it is not, let my friend explain to us why it’s not.

He said in his speech, “When Christians met to worship, they heard preaching and prayed (Acts 2: 42); they studied (Acts 20:7).” He says, “Will Mr. Forsythe contend that we are wrong in this?” No, I am not saying he is wrong in this much; but what makes him wrong is the inconsistency of his teachings. The same writers that wrote for us to assemble, hear preaching, and pray also wrote to lift up our voice with one accord in prayer to God and lift up our hands in prayer and praise in the sanctuary. I believe that the Bible teaches that “**all**” of these are included in worship. Obviously, my friend does **not** because he **fails to practice** what I mentioned here in worship. Therefore, this much of his **practice** is found to be *lacking*, according to *Scripture*.

Now, concerning the **practice** of taking the “Lord’s Supper,” I believe this is a scriptural observance and must be practiced; but where does the *Bible* say the “*first day of every week*,” like my friend teaches it? The Scripture teaches **not** how often we take it, but as often as we take it, we do show Lord’s death until he

comes. 1 Corinthians 11:25-26. I will ask my friend, Mr. Thrasher, where he gets his authority for the *Practice* of taking the Lord's Supper? I am assuming he gets it from the same place I get mine, the Words of Jesus Christ; but here again my friend is inconsistent in his teaching. Why? Simply because the same night He ate supper with them he also washed their feet. Not only that, but He included foot washing just as much an observance as the Lord's Supper. St. John 13:4 says, "He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel and girded himself." Verse 5 says, "... he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet ..." Verse 8: "Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, *If I wash thee not, thou has no part with me.*" If you will notice in Verse 12, after he had washed their feet and had taken his garments and had set down again he said unto them, "Know ye what I have done to you?" Here at this point Jesus began to teach them about ***practicing*** this same thing. How do we know? In verse 13, He says, "Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am." Verse 14 says, "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet." Verse 15 says, "For I have given you an '***example***' that ye should do as I have done to you." Verse 17 says, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." Now, Jesus said in Verse 16, "... The servant is not greater than his Lord." (This means if the Lord washed feet, the servant also should wash feet.) My friend must be one of those Jesus was speaking about in Luke 6:46 when he said, "... Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

Mr. Thrasher said in his speech, "The Churches of Christ such as I am defending in this debate do *nothing in Worship except what is divinely authorized in God's Book.*" My answer to his speech is *changing that to read*, "The Churches of Christ I am defending in this debate does not do all the things in worship that

are divinely authorized in God's Book."

I would like to mention also that the Lord's Church was to be *a fasting Church*; this was commanded by Jesus Christ, Mark 2:19-20, **practiced** by the early disciples, Acts 14:23, and preached to the Church by the Apostle Paul, 1 Corinthians 7:5. Now, if my friend's Church has ever *preached or practiced fasting*, it is more than I know anything about. Mr. Thrasher, you said you **practiced everything that was done**.

Now, on the subject of "Singing," in Ephesians 5:19, the same verse that teaches to sing also teaches to play; it says, "Singing and making melody." The word, "**melody**" means to *twitch, twang or to play a stringed instrument with the fingers*. If you will read 2 Chronicles 5:12-13, music was used in worship after the building of the Temple. What we want to see is the scripture where it was ever taken out. In Isaiah 38:20 it says, "We will sing songs to the stringed instruments *all the days of our life in the house of the Lord*." (This means as long as there is a people of God.) How long is all the days of our life? As long as He is worshiped in spirit and in truth; this means until the end of the age, Ephesians 3:20-21. Also Psalms 150 speaks of praising him on the instruments. Now, I believe in singing; however, what I am saying is, there is no more wrong in playing than there is in singing, and if my opponent believes this (and he does) it is his *obligation to prove it by the Scriptures*.

Now, in closing my speech, before I answer my opponent's questions and give mine, I will say that *what he believes about the New Testament Elders is contrary to the Scriptures*. First, I will say the Bible does **not** teach a plurality of *his so-called Elders* in every congregation, such as to hire the preacher, set his salary, tell him what to do, give him his check every week, decide when he's been there long enough and tell him to leave. Where do we find any plurality of men in the New Testament Church over the ministry?

If my friend believes this, he is obligated to prove it by the Bible. The ministry is the highest qualified office in the New Testament Church. I will prove this in my next speech. I want us to remember what my opponent said; he said, "In every case the Elders are *mentioned in a congregation*, it is always 'plural,' not 'singular.'" I want him to prove this in his next speech. I happen to know the Church where Mr. Thrasher is preaching does not have any Elders at this time. Again, he is inconsistent in his teaching. Mr. Thrasher, you are supposed to be doing everything just like the Bible says.

Now, I want to answer his questions:

1. Q Is the Term, "Church of Christ" scriptural to use in referring to the Church in the New Testament?
A The Term, "Church of Christ" was never used in making reference to the Name of the Church.
2. Q Is it scriptural for a local Church to assemble to study the Bible, Pray, Sing, to partake of the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week and give as each member has prospered on the first day of the week?
A Yes, with the exception of the Lord's Supper *every first day* of the week.
3. Q Is it scriptural for a local Church to have men possessing the qualifications given in 1 Timothy 3:1-7 serving as Elders to oversee the local Church; men possessing the qualifications given in 1 Timothy 3:8-13 serving as deacons under the Elders, and the other members of the congregation working together in carrying out divinely approved activities without any additional organizational framework?
A No, not the way you teach it. Where does the minister fit in?
4. Q Is it scriptural for a local Church to engage in its work of evangelism, edification, and benevolence, without becoming involved in social and recreational functions such as sponsoring ball teams, boy scout troops, and providing common meals for social

purposes?

A Yes.

5. Q Since the seed of the Kingdom is the Word of God, do you accept the fact that the planting of the Word of God in people's hearts, when they believe and obey it, will result in their being New Testament Christians and that they will be added by the Lord to his Church?

A Yes.

Questions for Mr. Thrasher to Answer in His Next Speech:

1. Q Is it scriptural for all New Testament Christians to take the Lord's Supper upon the first day of every week?
2. Q Please give us chapters and verses where your so-called Elders exercise authority over New Testament Ministers?
3. Q Does the Church you are a member of honor widows according to 1 Timothy 5:3?
4. Q Do the so-called Elders of the Church you are a member of anoint with oil and pray for the sick according to James 5:14?
5. Q Does the Church you are a member of teach and practice Fasting?

Thank you; give your attention to Mr. Thrasher's next speech.

THRASHER'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

Mr. Forsythe, brethren, and friends:

With greatest reverence for God and respect for Truth as revealed in the Bible, I enter again into the affirmation of the proposition: "The church of Christ, of which I am a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice, and name, and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2." In my first speech I introduced many passages of Scripture to show what the characteristics of the New Testament church are. I will point out in this speech the various attempts of my friend Mr. Forsythe to reply to those arguments, as well as his failure to respond to some of them at all.

In the beginning of the first speech, I quoted the words of the inspired apostle Peter: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God" (1 Peter 4:11). In this connection I introduced various scriptural terms that are used with reference to the church in the New Testament—"the church" (Ephesians 3:10; 5:25), "the church of God" (2 Corinthians 1:1), "the church of the living God" (1 Timothy 3:15), "the kingdom" (Colossians 1:13), "the body" (Colossians 1:18), "the flock of God" (1 Peter 5:2), "the temple of the living God" (2 Corinthians 6:16), "the house of God" (1 Timothy 3:15), "the bride" (Revelation 21:9), and "churches of Christ" (Romans 16:16). These are some of the **scriptural** designations of the church Jesus built. One can "speak as the oracles of God" and use such terms, like Peter said to do. I use all of these terms in referring to the church which I am defending in this discussion, because I believe in "speaking as the oracles of God." Mr. Forsythe, what did you say in reply to my statements? Remember that the proposition says, "scriptural in origin,

doctrine, practice, and **name**.” Now I gave you some scriptural **names** for the church, that is, scriptural terms or designations used when referring to the church of the New Testament. What did you say about it, Mr. Forsythe? If anyone wants to find out, just turn back and read what my opponent’s answer was. Absolutely nothing! He did not even mention my discussion of this matter of the name, yet that is one of the points in the proposition he is supposed to be denying! Of course, I do not blame Mr. Forsythe for his silence on this matter of scriptural designations for the church, since he is a member of an organization whose name is obviously not remotely mentioned in the word of God. Mr. Forsythe is a member of the **United Pentecostal Church**, a term which does not even distantly resemble anything scriptural. One cannot “speak as the oracles of God” and refer to the church as the “United Pentecostal Church.” Yet my opponent uses that term many times. It is not surprising that he does not want to discuss the part of the proposition dealing with the “name.” He knows quite well that he cannot find the United Pentecostal Church in the Scriptures. In fact, Mr. Forsythe admitted this fact in our Meridian, Mississippi debate. In his third speech during the session of March 16, 1972, he stated (as taken verbatim from the tape): “My proposition said, ‘In the New Testament church.’ The United Pentecostal Church hadn’t got a thing doing with me being here. Not nothing. They didn’t send me here. I come on my own. And let’s leave them out of it. Let’s don’t say no more about it. That don’t even pertain to the proposition.” Please observe that my friend admitted his proposition said, “**in the New Testament church**,” yet he plainly and unhesitatingly declared that the **United Pentecostal Church** ought to be **left out of the debate** because it didn’t even pertain **to the proposition**. How much clearer could that admission be that the “United Pentecostal Church” is **not** “the New Testament

church”!!! Again, I repeat that I am not surprised that Mr. Forsythe does not want to discuss the matter of the scriptural designations for the church. I hope that he will in his second speech.

In my discussion of the “origin” of the church, I pointed out that the church began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2. When the word of God was preached on that day, the hearers were told to “repent and be baptized” (Acts 2:38). Those who obeyed (verse 41) were “added” by the Lord to His church (verse 47). This is exactly the same process that occurs when people become members of the church of Christ today. I contend that the same process that made people Christians (and members of the New Testament church) in the first century also makes people that today. In responding to my comments on the “origin” of the church, Mr. Forsyth said, “It is a strange thing to me ... how my opponent could write his whole speech and not one time mention what happened when the church had its beginning ...; and that is, every individual member that day in the Upper Room at Pentecost was filled with the Holy Ghost and spoke with other tongues.” Let me observe the fact that Mr. Forsythe expounds upon his **theory** that the baptism of the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues is for all people, even today. However, this is an assertion without scriptural proof. Let us examine the events beginning in Acts chapter one.

In Acts 1:2-8 we have a record of the Lord's conversation with the eleven apostles just previous to His ascension into heaven. Please notice that Luke was speaking of the **apostles** (verse 2) when he wrote: “And, being assembled together with **them**, commanded **them** that **they** should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, **ye** have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but **ye** shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.... But **ye** shall

receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon **you**: and **ye** shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth” (Acts 1:4-5, 8). To whom was the Lord speaking when he said, “But ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost”? Read the inspired text—it says he was talking to the **apostles**, not to the 120, the 3000, or everybody in every age. After Jesus ascended into heaven, the **apostles** returned to Jerusalem. During the period of about ten days until Pentecost, the apostles were in the city of Jerusalem engaging in their activities of praise and worship to God. Please observe that the Bible does **not state** that the apostles remained in the **Upper Room** all of this time between the ascension of Jesus and Pentecost. The Bible says that they were in **Jerusalem** (Luke 24:49-53); however, it does not say they were in the “upper room” all of this time. That seems to be the implication my opponent makes, but it is simply his assumption. Mr. Forsythe, if you believe the apostles remained in the “upper room” the entire ten days, **without leaving**, I ask you to prove it by the Bible, or else admit you cannot prove it.

In Acts 1:15-26 we have an account of the selection of Matthias as an apostle to replace Judas, who had betrayed the Lord and killed himself. On this one occasion, sometime during the ten-day period between the ascension and Pentecost, the Bible mentions that about 120 were together. My opponent **assumes** that these 120 were together in the **upper room** during the **entire ten days**; however, there is no proof for this assumption. The text simply states that they were together on this occasion when Matthias was selected to be an apostle.

In verse 26 the writer Luke says: “And they forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven **apostles**.” What group of people is under consideration here? **The apostles**! Now notice the next statement: “And when

the day of Pentecost was fully come, **they** were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where **they** were sitting. And there appeared unto **them** cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of **them**. And **they** were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave **them** utterance” (Acts 2:1-4). Again, I ask: Who is under consideration in these verses? By a simple reading of the context, one ought to be able to see that this is speaking of the **apostles**! The **apostles** were the ones who received Holy Spirit baptism, just as Jesus had promised in Acts 1:2-8. The **apostles** were the ones who spoke in languages they had not studied so that all of those who came together could hear the gospel preached in their own native languages. The 120 are not under discussion in these verses—**the apostles are**! Thus, in verse 14 we read: “But **Peter**, standing up **with the eleven**, lifted up his voice, and said unto them....” Who stood up? Peter and the other eleven **apostles**! **Not the 120**! Notice verse 37: “Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto **Peter and to the rest of the apostles**, Men and brethren, what shall we do?” Again, who do we find doing the speaking on Pentecost and being asked the question here? The **apostles**! In fact, the chapter tells us that when the wonders and signs were done (verse 43), the **apostles** (not the 120 or the 3000) were doing them.

From an examination of Acts chapters one and two, we can see that Mr. Forsythe’s assertion that others besides the apostles received Holy Spirit baptism and spoke in languages that they had not studied on the day of Pentecost is unfounded and unproved. Mr. Forsythe, please cite the verse of Scripture to **prove** that anyone besides the apostles “spoke in tongues” on Pentecost! I believe that the **apostles** did on Pentecost because the Bible says

so! Can you **prove** that **anyone else** did on Pentecost? We shall wait and see if he does.

My friend Mr. Forsythe states: “When the Word of God was proclaimed on Pentecost, those people who believed the message were told to repent and be baptized, Acts 2:38. They were also told in that same verse, sir, to receive the Holy Ghost.” Mr. Forsythe, you leave the impression that “receiving the Holy Ghost” is a command just as “repent and be baptized” is a command. **That is not so!** Listen to what Peter said: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ: for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Peter does not command those people to receive the Holy Spirit—he **commands them to repent and be baptized**. Then, as a result of their obedience to these commands, he promises them that they will receive “the remission of sins” and “the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Receiving **the gift of the Holy Ghost** is no more of a **command** than receiving **the remission of sins**. Both are **promises** to the person who obeys the **command** to “repent and be baptized.” Peter says, “Ye **shall receive** the gift of the Holy Ghost.” There is no doubt about it; **every person** who repents and is baptized **shall receive** the gift of the Holy Ghost! I believe that, but Mr. Forsythe does not. He believes that many people “repent and are baptized” but do not receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, and some receive it (the gift of the Holy Spirit) perhaps several months or years later. Actually, *I believe the entire verse; my opponent does not!* According to him the verse should read: “Repent and be baptized ... and you **might** receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Peter said definitely: “you **shall**”! One who repents and is baptized receives the gift of the Holy Ghost just as surely as he receives the remission of sins—both are promises of God to the obedient penitent believer.

Mr. Forsythe mentions the case of the household of Cornelius

in Acts 10. I believe that the household of Cornelius received Holy Spirit baptism, because the Bible says so (Acts 11:15-17). However, this is the only other recorded case of Holy Spirit baptism in the Bible (that is, other than the apostles on Pentecost), and these people received it for a different reason than the apostles did. The apostles received Holy Spirit baptism in order to teach them all things (John 14:26), bring all things to their remembrance that Jesus had said to them (John 14:26), testify of Christ (John 15:26), and guide them into all truth (John 16:13), Cornelius' household received Holy Spirit baptism in order to demonstrate to the Jews that God accepted the Gentiles as gospel subjects (Acts 10:44-48). They did not receive Holy Spirit baptism in order to save them, because they were afterward commanded to be baptized in water (verses 47-48) which is "for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38). I repeat my statement that there are only two **recorded** cases of **Holy Spirit baptism** in the Bible: the apostles on Pentecost (Acts 2) and the household of Cornelius (Acts 10), and these two groups received it for different reasons. If Mr. Forsythe believes that there are other recorded instances of **Holy Spirit baptism**, let him produce the verse of Scripture that so states. Notice that I am not asking for verses that state others received the Holy Spirit but verses that state others received Holy Spirit **baptism**! The Bible very clearly shows that people can receive the Holy Spirit without receiving Holy Spirit baptism (Luke 1:15, 41, 67). If my opponent denies that people can receive the Holy Spirit without receiving Holy Spirit baptism, let him tell us. In other words, Mr. Forsythe, tell us if you believe that the terms "filled with the Holy Spirit," "the gift of the Holy Ghost," and "baptized with the Holy Ghost" always mean the same thing. If not, what is the difference in the meaning of these terms?

My honorable opponent says he wants to deal with the

practice of the church of Christ. He begins with an objection concerning “prayer.” In this connection he asks: “When do the members of the so-called Church of Christ, that Mr. Thrasher is a member of, **lift their voices** to God and **all** pray?” (emphasis RWF). The answer, my friend, is “every time the church assembles”! Whenever the church come together for worship, **all** faithful Christians pray. This does not mean necessarily that all pray **aloud**. However, everyone does pray. It seems that my opponent believes that **everybody must pray aloud**! The passage he gave to try to prove this was Acts 4:24, 31. However, that passage does not indicate that everyone prayed aloud different prayers in the very confusing and disorderly way that Mr. Forsythe’s brethren often do. In fact, the passage shows that they all prayed **the same prayer**, which could not have been done if everyone prayed his own prayer! Please read verses 24-31 and notice the unity of the prayer that those people prayed. It is much more reasonable to me to believe that they all prayed while one person led, than to believe that they all just happened to pray the same words out loud without anyone to direct their thoughts.

I would like to mention in this connection the statement of Paul in 1 Corinthians 14:40, “Let all things be done decently and in order.” I believe that Mr. Forsythe’s brethren violate the teaching of that passage, because in many of the services I have attended they have been anything except “decently and in order.” The practice of having one person “lead” while everyone prays is much more conducive to an orderly service.

But while we are on this point, I want to suggest a parallel to Mr. Forsythe’s argument on prayer. His argument is that since all are to pray, then all should pray aloud their different prayers. Similarly, then, since all are to “sing” (Colossians 3:16), then all should sing aloud their different songs. Tell us if you practice this, Mr. Forsythe?

I am truly amazed at the quibbles of my worthy opponent. He says, “I would like to ask Mr. Thrasher if any of his congregation or any other congregation of the so-called Church of Christ that he knows of ever lift up their hands to praise or pray in the sanctuary of the Lord?” Of course, he is referring to 1 Timothy 2:8, “I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.” Again, it seems that my friend implied something that the verse does not teach. The verse is simply teaching that those who pray should live holy lives, not unholy lives. One who would lift his hands in prayer unto God should be certain that he is not living inconsistently with his prayer. The verse is not at all intended to specify a “posture” for the body during prayer, since other verses mention different postures and places for prayer. For example, Jesus said, “But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father” (Matthew 6:6). According to my opponent’s reasoning and argument, this verse specifies that one must pray in a certain place: in his closet with the door shut! Of course, this is not the lesson Jesus is teaching in the verse. The context shows that we ought not to pray for the purpose of being seen of men. Matthew 26:39 says that the Lord “fell on his face, and prayed.” Would my friend Mr. Forsythe contend that we must pray with this posture in order to pray acceptably to God? Acts 10:9 says that “Peter went up upon the house top to pray.” Would anyone use this verse to teach that we must pray in that location: “on the housetop”? Surely, we can see that my opponent is simply quibbling on this subject of prayer. He cannot offer a single **scriptural** objection to prayer as offered by faithful members of the church of Christ.

Next Mr. Forsythe turns his attention to the Lord’s supper. He agrees that the Lord’s supper should be a part of our practices; however, he objects to partaking on the first day of every week.

May I ask, since he objects to this practice, if he believes it is **wrong** to partake of the Lord's supper each first day of the week? If not, he admits we may do so without violating the Scriptures! The authority for partaking of the Lord's supper each first day of the week is Acts 20:7, "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread" The disciples came together to break bread (partake of the Lord's supper) on the first day of the week. That is exactly what the churches of Christ do. We come together on the first day of the week to break bread. That is not the only act of worship authorized in the Scriptures, but it is at least one reason that the church assembled on the first day of the week in the New Testament. I ask my friend and opponent whether or not his brethren do what the Christians in the first century did: Do you come together on the first day of the week to partake of the Lord's supper? He would have to answer honestly that they do **not** come together for that reason the great majority of the time!

My fellow disputant shifts next to the practice of "foot washing." I recognize that the washing of feet is to be practiced today; however, I challenge Mr. Forsythe to produce even one verse that teaches it is a part of **worship**! Feet washing was **never** a part of **worship** in the New Testament, but it was always an act of personal cleanliness and hospitality. In the text from John 13, Jesus is teaching His disciples a lesson on humility, which He demonstrates by washing their feet. Apparently, their feet needed to be washed, otherwise Jesus would be making a mockery of the occasion. I believe that the washing of another person's feet would be altogether appropriate as an act of hospitality in situations similar to those of Jesus' day. However, for people to come together with clean feet and go through a mockery of "foot wetting," while claiming to practice feet washing as mentioned in the New Testament, is obviously foreign to what the Lord taught.

My opponent's next objection concerns the subject of "fasting." He claims that fasting is a **church activity**, while failing to cite a verse to prove his claim. He states: "The Lord's Church was to be a **fasting Church**; this was **commanded by Jesus Christ**, Mark 2:19-20, **practiced** by the early disciples, Acts 14:23, and preached to the Church by the Apostle Paul, 1 Corinthians 7:5," (emphasis RWF). Please read the verses given and notice that not one of them commands fasting as a **church activity**. "Fasting," when practiced, is a matter left up to the **individual**. The Bible does not prescribe a special time, place, or occasion for fasting today; therefore, since God has not legislated in this matter, neither will I. Any individual Christian who desires to fast as a matter of personal choice certainly may do so. There are occasions when fasting may be very appropriate for an individual. For example, Jesus mentioned that His disciples would fast when He was crucified (Mark 2:18-20). A Christian today might very well fast during a period of sorrow and mourning; however, periodic fasting is never **commanded** for Christians. If Mr. Forsythe believes that fasting is commanded, let him tell us **when** and **under what conditions** Christians are **required to fast**. Please cite Scripture for proof!

In my first speech I showed that God has authorized "singing" as a part of our worship to God under the law of Christ (Ephesians 5:19; Colossians 3:16; Acts 16:25). There is no doubt that we can sing and be pleasing unto God in our worship, and I do not know of anyone who contends that singing in worship is wrong. Therefore, the practice of the churches of Christ in this matter is unquestionably safe and scriptural. Mr. Forsythe says, "I believe in singing." Good! Then he agrees that we are right in our practice on this point.

However, my worthy opponent asserts that it is right to "play" on mechanical instruments of music in worship. What New

Testament verse did you give for proof, Mr. Forsythe? Since you contend that one may scripturally use instrumental music in worship, you should be able to give Book, Chapter, and Verse from the will of Christ. Your feeble attempt in your first speech falls far short. Please notice his “argument.”

He says, “Now, on the subject of ‘Singing,’ in Ephesians 5:19, the same verse that teaches to sing also teaches to play; it says, ‘Singing **and** making melody.’ The word ‘melody’ means to twitch, twang or to play stringed instrument with the fingers.” Mr. Forsythe, you had better be careful or you will get into even deeper trouble than you are in already. You state that Ephesians 5:19 teaches that **every Christian is to sing**, it follows that **every Christian must play on an instrument**, according to you. Since one person cannot **sing** for another person, neither can one person **play** for another person—**everybody must play!** Is this what your brethren practice, my friend?

Furthermore, Mr. Forsythe defined the word “melody” as meaning “to **twitch, twang or to play a stringed instrument with the fingers.**” Therefore, not only must everybody play on an instrument, but everybody must play, twitch, or twang a stringed instrument with the fingers, since my opponent claims the word “melody” means that! According to that definition, it is not sufficient to play an accordion, trumpet, organ, flute, tambourine, saxophone, trombone, clarinet, etc.—one **must play on a stringed instrument**; some other kind of instrument will not do! Of course, the truth of the matter is that Mr. Forsythe’s definition of “melody” in Ephesians 5:19 is incorrect! All that one needs to do to see that is to read the verse from God’s inspired Book: “Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, **singing and making melody in your heart** to the Lord.” What instrument is involved in the making melody? God’s word says,

“your heart”—not a stringed instrument such as a guitar or violin. The Bible plainly specifies the “heart,” yet Mr. Forsythe thinks he knows more about the matter than God; he says one must play on a “stringed instrument.” It seems very strange that I have been present in several services when Mr. Forsythe was present, yet I have never once seen him play on a stringed instrument! Perhaps he will explain why he did not “play” on a stringed instrument during those services.

My fellow disputant states: “If you will read 2 Chronicles 5:12-13, music was used in worship after the building of the Temple. What we want to see is the scripture where it was ever taken out.” Mr. Forsythe, we are not debating what was authorized under the Old Testament law; we are debating what is authorized for the **New Testament church** to practice! I am not obligated to show when something was taken out of the Old Testament law, since that entire law was **taken out of the way** and **nailed to the cross** (Colossians 2:14). Instead, my opponent is obligated to produce the Scripture where instrumental music was ever put into the worship under the law of Christ, since he claims “playing” is scriptural today. My friend, you cannot prove instrumental music scriptural under the New Testament law by quoting passages from the Old Testament. We are waiting for the New Testament passage!

The final negative objection to my first speech related to the “elders” who oversee each local church of Christ. I previously stated: “The Scriptures reveal to us that each local church is to be independent and self-governing under the oversight of **elders** (also called bishops, overseers, pastors, shepherds, or presbyters) who possess special qualifications (1 Timothy 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9). In each local church there should be a plurality (two or more) of such men who tend the flock of God in that locality (1 Peter 5:1-4; Acts 20:17, 28; Acts 14:23). Please notice that in every case that

the elders are mentioned in a congregation it is always ‘elders’ (plural), not ‘the elder’ (singular) of a congregation. No church can scripturally have one man who is ‘the elder’ (or ‘the pastor’). Such an idea is foreign to the word of God.” What did my opponent have to say in reply to these statements for which I gave Bible references? Notice, he said, “What he believes about the New Testament Elders is contrary to the Scriptures.” Sir, in what way is what I presented “contrary to the Scriptures”? I gave book, chapter, and verse to show that what I affirmed is true! Do you deny what I said about the **qualifications** of elders? If so, just read 1 Timothy 3:1-7 and Titus 1:5-9. Do you deny that there is to be a plurality of elders in each local church? I just open you Bible and read Philippians 1:1; 1 Peter 5:1-4; Acts 20:17, 28; Acts 14:23; and Titus 1:5. Sir, what is it that you object to that I did not give Scripture for?

My opponent mentions that the congregation with which I work does not presently have elders. That is true for the simple reason that there are not a plurality of men who possess all of the scriptural qualifications (1 Timothy 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9). The Bible clearly shows that New Testament congregations existed for a while before men became qualified and then appointed (Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5). However, after a period of time, a congregation that grows as it ought to will eventually have men who possess the scriptural qualifications to be elders.

In this speech I have taken up each reply that Mr. Forsythe made to my first speech and demonstrated that his statements do not disprove what I affirmed in this proposition. My proposition stands undamaged by the attacks of my opponent. Indeed, “the church of Christ, of which I am a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice, and name, and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2.”

Before I close this speech, I want to respond to Mr. Forsythe’s

questions. (1) Yes; Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 11:23-28; and Luke 22:19-20. (2) Acts 20:28 clearly states that the elders (verse 17) are to **oversee all** the flock. 1 Peter 5:1-2 proves that the elders are to take the **oversight** of the flock of God among them. (3) Yes. (4) Elders do pray for the sick; however, I believe that this specific passage has reference to the period of time when spiritual gifts were in operation. Since such gifts were to last until the complete New Testament was revealed, they are no longer in operation (John 20:30-31; Mark 16:17-20; 1 Corinthians 13:8-10). (5) If you are speaking of voluntary fasting by individual Christians as a matter of personal desire and conviction, yes; there are occasions when this may be done. However, I do not know of any command for Christians to fast at any specific time. If you do, please give the scriptural reference.

Please weigh carefully the arguments previously presented in the light of God's eternal truth and follow closely Mr. Forsythe's second reply.

FORSYTHE'S SECOND NEGATIVE

Mr. Thrasher, brethren, ladies, and gentlemen that read this discussion, it is with great pleasure that I enter into my Second Speech and continue to deny the proposition that my friend, Mr. Thrasher, has been trying to affirm unto you.

Mr. Thrasher says my attempts to answer his arguments have been various. However, if you will follow me closely, I will prove that my arguments have been and will be very successful in tearing to pieces the proposition that my opponent is trying to affirm. Now, in my last speech I dealt with origin, doctrine and practice and will be referring back to his attempts to answer my arguments that I have brought against his proposition.

Mr. Thrasher, I admire you for your courage in trying, but you have not done one thing with these arguments. Of course, you would like for the readers of this Debate to think this, but all we ask is for everyone to be honest and examine the facts.

Now, in beginning my speech, I will go right to the point of difference. It seems that my friend thinks he really has something on me and proposes that I am afraid to deal with the Name. Not at all, Mr. Thrasher; I just did not have enough time in my last speech. So first, I will begin with one of the questions that he asked me in his First Speech. "Is the term, 'Church of Christ' scriptural to use in referring to the Church of the New Testament?" My answer was, "This, the term 'Church of Christ', was never used in making reference to the Name of the Church. " My opponent must have agreed with the answer I gave, because he made no reply to it in his last speech.

Now, to prove that he has taken the wrong position about the Name, there are some things in his last speech I would like to point out to expose his inconsistency; *he gives eight other* names,

excluding the one named in his proposition, and *says*, "These are scriptural *designations*." (This, I do not deny.) But Mr. Thrasher's proposition does not say, "Designation of Names"; it says, "Name," and he teaches it to designate *Church of Christ*. To prove this, I point out that all of the so-called meeting houses of Mr. Thrasher's faith, that I have seen, did not have any of these other eight designating Names over the door; yet my friend says they are *scriptural Names* for the *Church*. If they are, Mr. Thrasher, then explain why you and your brethren do not use some of them. Also, there is something else I would like to mention about this; the scripture that Mr. Thrasher uses for the Name of the Church in Romans 16:16 also says, "Salute one another with an holy kiss." Sorrowful to say, I have been in and around Mr. Thrasher's Churches and people and have got my first kiss to ever see passed out. Shame on you, Mr. Thrasher, for your inconsistency of teaching. The Church did not have a proper Name; the term, "*Churches of Christ*," shows *possession and not a proper* Name. If "*Churches of Christ*" is a proper name, *then it would be false* to call it in terms of these other names that my friend claims he uses in referring to the Church; yet it is somewhat strange that we never see any of these Names over the doors of their meeting houses.

Mr. Thrasher has already forgotten something; the United Pentecostal Church Organization, of which he says I am a member, is not the issue in this discussion. The issue is, is the Church of Christ or Organization, of which Mr. Thrasher is a member, scriptural. So, my friend, you had better get busy in trying to prove this, because thus far, you have done a very poor job.

Now, I want to get back to the origin of the Church. It began on the Day of Pentecost in Acts 2. We both agree to this. When the Word of God was preached, they were told to repent and be

baptized.

Now, we both agree to this. They were told they would receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost. Now, here is where the difference begins; the Bible teaches that the Holy Ghost that Peter referred to in Verse 38 was the same Holy Ghost experience that each one had just received in the Upper Room. OK. Thrasher does not believe this. He says only the apostles were. Mr. Thrasher, you promised and received the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. Are you trying to read something into the scriptures that is not there. I say it teaches the same experience is promised to *all* and he has not done anything with the scripture I produced. What did he say about my answers to the Seed of the Kingdom he referred to in his first speech? *Nothing*; and I proved without a doubt that when it was sown, the same experience was witnessed; Acts 2; Acts 10:44-46; Acts 19:5, 6, 8. I also want to remind my friend of something here; he keeps referring to *just the apostles* and the *household of Cornelius* as receiving the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. Mr. Thrasher, you had better look again; you are still reading things into the scripture that are not there. The Bible does *not say that just the household of Cornelius* received the Holy Ghost. Acts 10:24 says Cornelius waited for them and had called together his *kinsmen and near friends*; Verse 27 teaches that Peter went in and *found many that were come together*, and he said unto them, (Cornelius, his kinsmen and near friends) God hath showed me that I should not call *any man common or unclean*; and in Verse 33, Cornelius said to Peter, Now, therefore are we all here present (Cornelius, his kinsmen and near friends) to hear *all things that are commanded thee of God*; Peter opened his mouth and said, *God is no respecter of persons*, and he says in Verse 36, The Word which God sent unto the children of Israel, and Verse 37 says, *that Word I say after the Baptism that John preached*. Now, I want to stop long enough to ask what did Mr. Thrasher say about

John's preaching in Mark 1:4-8? Absolutely nothing! John said, I indeed baptize *you* with water, but he (Jesus) will *baptize you* with the *Holy Ghost*. Who was the "you" that was promised the baptism of the *Holy Ghost*? Verse 5 says, all the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem. This brings out a strange sad point about Mr. Thrasher's doctrine; John could not have been preaching to the apostles or my friend's so-called *household of Cornelius*, because they were not present at the time. Now, I want to point out something here about John and Jesus in Luke 16:16, Jesus said, the law and the prophets were *until John*, since *that time the Kingdom of God is preached*. This lets us know *what John preached pertained to the Kingdom of God*, and John preached the Baptism of the Holy Ghost *to all that he baptized*, Mark 1:5, 8. There's one more thing you need to notice, Mr. Thrasher; Jesus said in St. John 5:33, *John bear witness unto the truth*.

Now, getting back to Acts 10. Verse 44 says, while Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost fell on *all* them which heard the Word. Who? (Cornelius, his kinsmen and near friends). Verse 45 says, on the *Gentiles* (not just the household of Cornelius) also was poured out the Gift of the Holy Ghost. Now, what was the meaning of the Holy Ghost coming to the Gentile? It was what saved them, Acts 11:14. It was repentance unto life, Acts 11:18. It was their conversion, Acts 15:3. It was the Word of the Gospel, Acts 15:7. It was the purifying of their hearts by faith, Acts 15:9.

Now, in dealing with some more of my friend's arguments on this, he tries to prove that Jesus was just talking to the eleven apostles. If he was, Mr. Thrasher, when did he tell Matthias he could have it? When did he tell Paul he could have it; and when did he tell the Gentiles in Acts 10 that they could have it? When did he tell those in Acts 19 they could have it? Common sense teaches us that if he just told the eleven in Acts 1, that they were the only ones to receive it, then no one else could have gotten it.

Now, about the 120 in the Upper Room, I have never asserted as to whether they came and went or stayed up there all that time. My friend is again trying to put words in my mouth. The important thing is, they were there when the Holy Ghost came, Acts 1:14-15, and were *all filled with it* and spake in other tongues. What my friend is obligated to prove is where all the rest of the congregation but the twelve apostles were dismissed just before the Holy Ghost fell. *Scriptures, Mr. Thrasher?* Good reader, you wait and see if he produces one. Now, in Luke 24:33, they found the eleven (apostles) gathered *together and them that were with them and* Verse 36 says, *Jesus stood in the midst of them* and saith unto them Who? (The eleven gathered together and them that were with them), and in Verse 49 he said, *behold I send the promise of my father upon you*, but tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high. Who? (The eleven gathered together and them that were with them) Verse 50 says, He blessed them, and Verse 52 says, They worshiped him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy. Verse 53 says, *And were continually in the Temple* praising and blessing God. Now, I ask our kind readers, does this look like anybody left? What does the word "*continually*" mean, Mr. Thrasher? Maybe he will tell us in his next speech.

The Bible does teach that about an hundred and twenty were in an Upper Room including the apostles. Read it for yourself in Acts 1:13-15. I want my friend to come to the point and show us where they all left the room but the apostles before the Holy Ghost came. *If he can't he loses the argument.* Now, something else, my friend said the apostles spoke in languages they had not studied so that all those who came together could hear the Gospel preached in their own native languages. How absurd and misleading can you get, Mr. Thrasher? Only Peter preached (Acts 2:14); *he lifted his voice*, because he had the keys, Matthew 16:19.

How would any of you readers feel in a service where twelve (12) preachers preached at the same time? What did you say about being out of order, Mr. Thrasher?

There's something else my friend has failed to notice, there were sixteen (16) Nations present and twelve apostles were supposed to be preaching. Now, I wonder which four of the twelve preached in two languages at the same time. How about you telling us, Mr. Thrasher, seeing as you have introduced this thought. Now, I will say that I believe in the Holy Ghost with all of my heart, but I will have to agree with what they said in Mark 2:12; I never saw it on this fashion. One more thing before I leave this subject, my opponent says that Mr. Forsythe believes that one repents and is Baptized and receives the Holy Ghost several months or years later. Where did I say that? (Again, he puts words in my mouth or tries to guide my writing.) The Holy Ghost with speaking in tongues follows repentance and obedience to the Gospel message of Salvation.

Now, referring back to the word, "*Practice*" (everything that was done) I want to call attention to the blunders my friend has made in trying to answer what I said. Mr. Thrasher says when the Church comes together all faithful Christians pray. My friend, give us *scriptures* for your silent prayer meetings. You said that it *does not necessarily mean* that they all prayed aloud. (Now, who is assuming things?) The only thing that will satisfy our thinking is for you to give the scripture where one man prayed and everybody listened silently. I gave scripture where *they all prayed and lifted their voices*, Acts 4:24, 31; Acts 20:36. Now, for your Church to be scriptural in praying, you must produce some scripture for your manner of practice or else cease from the way you conduct your prayer.

Now, Mr. Thrasher makes another assumption; he said they all prayed the same prayer, which could not have been done if

everyone prayed aloud his own prayer. Why, Mr. Thrasher? *You tell us why.* Does common sense not teach us that a prayer group can pray for the same thing in unity and not say exactly the same words? Also, something else my friend is trying to say is, that this would be confusing to God because he could not understand everyone praying at the same time and using different words. Mr. Thrasher, if this is your thoughts, then *you limit God, who is unlimited.* One more question here Why can God not hear a group of audible voices in prayer with different words just as well as He could read a group of minds in prayer with different thinking? Mr. Thrasher, give us *scriptures* for your *practice* of praying, one person leading and everybody else silent. We are waiting. You talk about quibbles and blunders; my friend, it looks like you are the one who is akin to these.

Mr. Thrasher suggested a *parallel* against my argument, *which has no biblical foundation.* He said, "Since all pray aloud their different prayers, then all should sing aloud their different songs He said, "Tell us if you believe in this practice, Mr. Forsythe." Certainly not, the Bible does not teach that they sang different songs, but it does teach they prayed different prayers. Please read and study carefully Romans 8:26-27. Now, I pointed out plainly in 1 Timothy 2 that Paul was teaching to lift their hands in prayer and worship. Mr. Thrasher says, "My friend implies something the verse does not teach". Why, Mr. Thrasher? I gave scriptures in 1 Timothy 2:1; Paul says, I *exhort*, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks *be made for all men*; and he ends up in Verse 8 in telling them to do it everywhere *lifting up holy hands*. My opponent tries to use some scriptures that do not help his argument. Mr. Thrasher, Jesus did not say, go to the Garden and get on our face. Peter did not say, go to Simon's and get on the house top, but Paul did say to *pray everywhere lifting up holy hands* and this means what it

says, All *Men*. Now, I still say this has never been *practiced* in any so-called Church of Christ that I have witnessed in their worshiping. (This is why they are "so-called") Now, my friend says that I cannot offer a single scriptural objection to prayer as offered by faithful members of the Church of Christ. I have just finished doing so. Objection #1: Where is your scripture for all remaining silent and one person praying? Objection #2: Psalms 134:1-2 Behold, bless ye the Lord, *all ye servants* of the Lord. (This means my opponent and his group if they are servants.) *Lift up your hands in the sanctuary* and bless the Lord. 1 Timothy 2:8, I will that *men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands* without wrath or doubting.

Now, I turn our attention again to the Lord's Supper and point out why the scriptures do **not** teach that it *must be taken* upon the first day of *every week*. First, the scriptures do not teach *how* often but *as oft* as we do this, 1 Corinthians 11:26. (What did my friend say about this?) **Nothing!** Second, Mr. Thomas N. Thrasher or no other so-called Church of Christ preacher can produce one scripture where the Lord's Supper was taken on the first day of the week much less saying the first day of *every week*. In Acts 20, it says they came together to break bread. Paul preached to them and continued his speech until *midnight* and a man fell out of the loft, they prayed for him, and God raised him up. *Bread was broken and eaten*; they talked a long while, even until break of day. Mr. Thrasher, have you ever taken it on Monday morning? Thirdly, I asked Mr. Thrasher a question in my last speech, "*Is it scriptural for all New Testament Christians to take the Lord's Supper upon the first day of every week?*" He gave a direct answer, "Yes." Now, if this be so, (and he said it was) then every person that is a member of the so-called Church of Christ must take the Lord's Supper 52 weeks in every year or be eternally lost in Hell; in other words, if any of you or your people happened to

miss Church on the weekend and died on Monday morning, then they would go to *Hell*, according to Mr. Thrasher. This is why I know that my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ does not bind anyone to any such erroneous doctrine as this, and it is my prayer that this will shed some light upon you that read this that believe like Mr. Thrasher.

Now, Mr. Thrasher says, "*I recognize the washing of feet is to be practiced today.*" All right, do you do it? And if it is to be practiced, do you teach it to the people *where* you preach? The Bible says in Romans 10:14, "**How** shall they hear without a preacher." However, Mr. Thrasher says it is not a part of *worship*. Now, how can this keep from being a contradiction; if it is to be practiced, then why is it not a part of worship? My friend tried to 'make it look like the scriptures I used had no meaning toward worship and living for God, but let us look again; Jesus said in St. John 13:8, if I wash thee not, *thou hast no part with me*. Verse 14, **If I** then your Lord and Master have washed your feet, *ye also ought to wash one another's feet*. Verse 15 says, "For I have given *you* an example that *ye should do* as I have done to *you*. Verse 17 says, "*if ye know these things happy are ye if ye do them.*" How much plainer could Jesus have made it that we are to wash one. (Maybe Mr. Thrasher believes it was just for the Apostles.) Well, I am about to prove by the scripture that it was practiced by the early church. I asked my opponent a question in my last speech, "Does your church honor widows according to I Timothy 5:3? And he gave a direct answer, "Yes". Now, Paul goes on to teach in verse 10, if she be *taken in*, for her to "*have washed the saints' feet.*" Now, this proves one thing, if Mr. Thrasher's church takes in a widow without the fulfillment of 1 Timothy 5:10, it will be contrary to the teachings of the Apostle Paul.

Now, on the subject of fasting, I did not say the Bible prescribed a special time, place, or creation period of time to fast.

This is my opponent's way of trying to add to what I say. I did say it was taught by Jesus Christ, Mark 2:19-20, practiced by the early disciples, and preached to the Church by the Apostle Paul, I Corinthians 7:5; and Mr. Thrasher has not dissolved this fact; he would like to, but he hasn't. This will come under the word, "*Practice*" (everything that was done) in my friend's proposition and if his church does not teach and *practice fasting* then they are not doing what the early Church did. They even *fasted* when Elders were ordained, Acts 14:23. Does yours do this, Mr. Thrasher? They also fasted when workers and ministers were sent out, Acts 13:1, 2, 3. Friends, Let me point out to you how out of balance and inconsistent my friend, Mr. Thrasher, is in his teaching; *Fasting* is mentioned twenty-nine (29) times in the New Testament alone. Taking the Lord's Supper upon the first day of *every* week is not mentioned even *one* time! Yet, my friend teaches that fasting is of opinion, and the latter is compulsory unto salvation. We will let you be the Judge as to who is in a "fix." There's one thing for sure, I am positive that his Name is not Forsythe.

Now, on the music again, Mr. Thrasher says, "My opponent asserts that it's alright to play." No, Mr. Thrasher, I did not just "assert" anything; I just gave what the scriptures teach. I pointed out that the same verse which authorizes us to sing also authorizes us to play and my friend (with his twisting and trying to misrepresent what I said) has not changed things. I did not say that every Christian must *sing* or *play* as my friend has tried to make it read. I was simply pointing out that *one of the definitions of "melody"* is to play a stringed instrument with the fingers. The word, melody" comes from the word, "*Psallo*", and primarily means to twitch, twang; then, to play a stringed instrument with the fingers. Mr. Thrasher, none of us are narrow minded enough to believe that melody is to be made on no other instruments but

the stringed ones. Mr. Thrasher said that Mr. Forsythe's definition of the word, "melody," is incorrect. If it is, let him prove it with some authority on words. I have done so with W. E. Vine's *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, Vol. III, Page 58. I believe we are authorized to do just what the Bible says we can do; sing (vocal music) *and make melody* (play on an instrument) in your heart, Ephesians 5:19. This does not mean to use our heart for a vocal box or an instrument; it simply means to *put our heart in our singing and playing*. The heart is not regarded here as the physical heart, but as being the seat of the intellect, the feelings and the will. Colossians 3:23 says, "Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as unto the Lord and not unto man." Mr. Thrasher said he wanted New Testament scripture for playing an instrument. This one seems to be doing all right, because he has not dissolved what I said about it. My friend said the *entire law* was taken out of the way and nailed to the cross. Mr. Thrasher, this is a reckless statement to make without explaining the scripture you used. Jesus said in Matthew 5:17, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfill." Before I leave this subject, I want to point out once again how inconsistent and mixed up my friend is with his doctrine. In my last speech, I asked him did his Elders anoint with oil and pray for the sick according to James 5:14. Here is what he said, "Elders do pray for the sick, however, I believe that this specific passage has reference to the period of time when spiritual gifts were in operation. Since such gifts were to last until the complete New Testament was revealed, they are no longer in operation." Now, my point here is, the verse before this (verse 13) said, "Is any merry? Let him sing." Now, in verse 13, Mr. Thrasher *teaches sing, sing, sing*; but in the very next verse (14) where it says to anoint with oil, and the prayer of faith will save the sick," Mr. Thrasher *teaches dissolved, dissolved, dissolved*, no longer in operation. My

friend has not proven his theory in teaching not to play; in fact he will become more erroneous in trying to prove his logic. Wait and see!

Now, in turning to the subject of the New Testament Elders; Mr. Thrasher says the Elders are to oversee all the flock of God (This I believe to be true). But the Bible clearly teaches us that the New Testament Eldership (as far as those in authority and rule over the congregation) is to be the Minister and not two or three men in the congregation that act as such and put themselves in the position of hiring the preacher, setting his salary, writing him a check every week for his wages, and firing him or running him off if they don't like what he preaches. Now, Mr. Thrasher talks about something foreign to the Word of God; he needs to examine this in his church government. Paul says in Hebrews 13:7, "Remember them which have the rule over *you*, who have spoken unto you *the* Word of God." Now, who speaks to the Church the Word of God? In Luke 4:20, it says that Jesus gave the Book (Word of God) to the Minister. In Hebrews 13:17, Paul says, Obey *them that have the rule over you*, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your soul as they must give account." Now, who watches and gives account? The Minister. Read 1 Timothy 4:6; 1 Thessalonians 2:19, 20; 1 Thessalonians 5:12, 13 and 1 Timothy 5:17. I asked my friend, Mr. Thrasher, in my last speech to cite us by *the scriptures* as to where the so-called Elders of his theory exercises authority over the New Testament Ministry. We are still waiting. I will deal with the remainder of this in my next speech.

Now, I have some questions for my opponent to answer:

No. 1 To whom was John the Baptist speaking to in Mark 1:5-8 when he said he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost?

No. 2 To whom and what position was Paul referring to when

he used the word, "Pastors" in Ephesians 4:11?

No. 3 Seeing as you have given Nine (9) scriptural designations of the church, other than churches of Christ, would you be willing to put any of these on your building *for* identification and leave off the one you use? *Yes or No.*

No. 4 Please explain what was being referred to when feeding the flock was spoken of in Acts 20:28 and 1 Peter 5:2?

No. 5 Please define the word, "Heart" as used in Ephesians 5:19. Please give your attention to my opponent's next speech.

Thank you.

THRASHER'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

Mr. Forsythe, brethren, and friends:

I appreciate very much the privilege of continuing to affirm the proposition under discussion: "The church of Christ, of which I am a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice, and name, and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2." In my previous speeches I have cited numerous passages from the inspired word of God in proof of this proposition. Although my good friend and opponent has tried to overthrow these scriptural arguments, I will again take up his objections one-by-one and demonstrate the weakness of his case. Please study with an open mind and unprejudiced heart the things that are presented in this speech.

Mr. Forsythe finally attempts a reply to my arguments concerning the "name," although it is a poor effort indeed! In previous speeches it has been pointed out that there are several **scriptural designations** used in referring to the church. One can "speak as the oracles of God" (1 Peter 4:11) by using these terms. among these terms is that used by the apostle Paul in Romans 16: 16—"churches of Christ"! By that term Paul referred to various congregations in different places that belonged to Christ. Surely anyone can understand that one of these congregations in a given locality would be a "**church of Christ.**" Even Mr. Forsythe could see this is he would!

In his second speech, Mr. Forsythe admits that the terms I mentioned "are scriptural **designations.**" However, he goes on to state: "But Mr. Thrasher's proposition does not say, 'Designation of Names'; it says, 'Name,' and he teaches it to designate *Church of Christ.*" Apparently, my opponent does not understand what

“**name**” means as I am using it in the proposition. He claims that I have shown scriptural **designations**, but not scriptural **names**. What does “**name**” mean? The following definition is given in *The American College Dictionary* (1966 Edition, page 806): “a word or a combination of words by which a person, place, or thing, a body or class, or any object of thought, is **designated** or known.” This is the sense in which I am using the term “**name**” in the proposition. The term “church of Christ” is a scriptural designation or name. As I stated in my second speech, I do not use the term “church of Christ” exclusively; I regularly use all of these scriptural terms (church, church of the Lord, body, kingdom, temple of God, flock of God, house of God, etc.) in my preaching, teaching, and writing.

The real problem with getting Mr. Forsythe to admit the scripturalness of the term “church of Christ” is that he is painfully aware that the organization of which he is a member, **The United Pentecostal Church**, is never to be found in the Bible! You will never read about **The United Pentecostal Church** in the word of God! It is not a **scriptural** term! One cannot “speak as the oracles of Gpd” and use that term. That is the very reason that my opponent has steadfastly *refused to affirm*, either in public or written debate, the scripturalness of that organization. In fact, he admitted in our debate held in Decatur, Alabama in March 1972, that he did not believe it was scriptural in everything. I will say a hearty “Amen!” to that fact!

I am puzzled by the intention of my opponent in one statement with reference to the United Pentecostal Church. Mr. Forsythe says, “The United Pentecostal Church Organization, of which he says I am a member” Notice, Mr. Forsythe states that **I said** he is a member of the United Pentecostal Church. Does he mean to imply that **he is not**??? I have a copy of the *United Pentecostal Church Directory* and Mr. Richard W. Forsythe is listed as a “minister.” It appears to me that my opponent is ashamed

and afraid to admit any connection with the United Pentecostal Church. He knows that it is not a **scriptural** organization!

With reference to Holy Spirit baptism on the day of Pentecost, Mr. Forsythe states that I say “only the apostles were promised and received the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.” My friend, in my second speech I *proved* from the Scriptures that Jesus promised, and that Acts 1-2 show very clearly that only they received it on Pentecost. However, my opponent claims “the same experience is promised to all.” Friends, if that is true, and Mr. Forsythe has received the same experience that the apostles did on Pentecost, then he is inspired like the apostles were! Jesus, in pointing out to the apostles why *they* would receive the Holy Spirit, declared: “But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, **He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance**, whatsoever I have said unto you” (John 14:26). Jesus further pointed out to the apostles: “how be it when he, the spirit of truth, is come, **he will guide you into all truth**: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and **he will show you things to come**” (John 16:13). Please observe the **reasons** that the **apostles** were promised Holy Spirit baptism: (1) To teach them all things; (2) To bring all things to their remembrance; (3) To guide them into all truth; (4) To show them things to come. Since my worthy opponent claims to have had the same experience as the apostles, he should be **inspired in in his preaching, teaching, and writing just as the apostles were!!!** Do you make that claim, Mr. Forsythe? If not, you cannot claim to have received what the apostles did on the day of Pentecost!

My friend asks, “what did Mr. Thrasher say about John's preaching in Mark 1:4-8?” Brethren and friends, I believe that the only completely safe course to follow in order to understand the **proper application** of John's statement is this: **Let the Lord and**

his inspired apostles tell us to whom this refers! In Acts 1:2-5 Jesus himself applied this to the apostles: “until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost commandments unto **the apostles** whom he had chosen: to whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God: and, being assembled together with **them**, commanded that **they** should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, **ye** have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but **ye** shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.” Dear student of Truth, you do not have to take my word, or Mr. Forsythe’s word, as to whom John was referring in Mark 1:8, but you ought to take **the Lord's word**! He applied these words about being baptized with the Holy Ghost to the **apostles**! Furthermore, the inspired apostle Peter applied these same words to the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius: “And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost” (Acts 11:15-16). Here are two instances in which the **inspired record** tells the application of John's statement. Since Mr. Forsythe contends that the statement applies on other occasions, I challenge him to cite another in the Bible. Of course, since he claims to have the same experience that is promised to all” should be given equal authority to that of **the Lord and the apostle Peter**! Personally, I am not willing to accept his assertions and assumptions. Let him **prove** that others received Holy Spirit baptism in fulfillment of John’s statement.

Mr. Forsythe asks, “Now, what was the meaning of the Holy Ghost coming to the Gentiles?” He answers his own question by saying, “It was what saved them, Acts 11:14.” Once again, he has

made an assertion **contrary** to what the **Bible says**. If you will simply read the verse that he cited, it states very plainly that **words, not Holy Spirit baptism**, were to be the instrument through which they would be saved. "Send man to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." The verse my opponent cites says nothing whatsoever about Holy Spirit **baptism** saving them. As a matter of fact, I challenge Mr. Forsythe to find **any verse in the Bible** that says ***Holy Spirit baptism saves!*** It is his doctrine, but he cannot prove it by the Scriptures. The truth of the matter is that those Gentiles at Cornelius' house received the Holy Spirit baptism simply to convince the Jews that Gentiles were gospel subjects (Acts 11:15-18). If Holy Spirit baptism **saved** those people, then they were saved **before** being baptized in water (Acts 10:44-48). Mr. Forsythe, do you believe that they were saved before they were immersed in water? Please tell us!

My honorable opponent says, "Now, about the 120 in the Upper Room, I have never asserted as to whether they came and went or stayed there all the time. The important thing is, they were there when the Holy Ghost came, Acts 1:14-15, **and were all filled with it** and spake in other tongues." Mr. Forsythe, you have once again presented **assertions!!!** Where does the Bible say that the 120 were in the upper room on Pentecost??? There was a period of about **ten days** from the ascension of Jesus until Pentecost. The Bible simply mentions that **on one occasion during this ten-day period** about 120 were together and Matthias was selected to take the place of Judas as an apostle (verse 15ff.). Notice that the Bible does not say **where** they were on that occasion. It does not mention the "upper room" on that occasion. It does not tell us that they stayed in that place from then until Pentecost. My opponent has admitted that he does not know that

they “came and went or stayed” in the same place. Thus, he has no right to **assume** that the 120 were together on Pentecost when the Holy Spirit filled the apostles. The Bible does say: “... And the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven **apostles**. And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, **they** were all in one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where **they** were sitting. And there appeared unto **them** cloven tongues like as a fire, and it sat upon each of **them**. And **they** were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave **them** utterance” (Acts 1:26-2:4). The individuals referred to are **the apostles**! They were the ones whom Jesus said would be baptized with the Holy Ghost (Acts 1:2-5); and **they were the ones who were**!

By his next argument Mr. Forsythe appears to argue himself into a contradictory position (which is nothing unusual). He cites the case in Luke 24:53, where we are told that the disciples returned from the ascension to Jerusalem “and were **continually in the temple**, praising and blessing God.” My opponent implies that this means **they did not leave the temple during that ten-day period from the ascension until Pentecost**! Yet we read in Acts 1:13 that the apostle’s abode (lived) in “an **upper room**.” Of course, these passages are simply teaching that although the apostles living quarters was “an upper room,” they frequently went to the *temple* to worship during the ten days between the ascension and Pentecost. There is *no indication* whatsoever that they **stayed in the temple the entire ten days**! In fact, the Bible says that on the day of Pentecost, the apostles were sitting in a **house** (Acts 2:1-2)!!! Please observe Mr. Forsythe’s **confusion**: (1) he says the disciples were in the upper room during the ten days from the ascension to Pentecost, but he apparently does not know whether they “came and went or stayed up there all that

time.” (2) He says the disciples were continually in the **temple** and implies that this means nobody left there during the entire ten days. (3) Yet the **Bible** does not say the disciples were in the **upper room** or the **temple** on the day of Pentecost. **The word of God** simply states that the **apostles** were sitting in a **house**! Mr. Forsythe, please make up your mind as to where you believe the disciples were during these ten days between the ascension of Jesus and the day of Pentecost, and then **tell us what you believe—without contradiction!**

Mr. Forsyth again quibbles about the matter of prayer. He implies that it is wrong for the *congregation to pray* unto God with one man *leading the prayer*. I would like for him to tell us if he believes it is sinful for several people to pray while one person directs the thoughts. He says, “I gave scripture where *they all prayed and lifted up their voices*, Acts 4:24, 31; Acts 20:36.” My friend, neither of the passages you cited here state that they lifted up their **voices** (plural)! Acts 4:24 states: “They lifted up their **voice**” (singular) to God. Only one **voice** is mentioned, perhaps indicating the idea that one person led the prayer that is recorded in verses 24-30. When I asked Mr. Forsythe how all of those people happened to pray the same prayer, he said, “Does common sense not teach us that a prayer group can pray for the same thing in unity and not say exactly the same words?” I reply with the observation that **these people did pray exactly the same words, because their prayer is recorded in verses 24-30!** This company of disciples lifted up their **voice** and **prayed the same prayer in the words recorded by inspiration!** Again ask Mr. Forsyth: **Did these disciples just “accidentally” pray the same prayer, or did they all pray while one person led them?** I ask: which is more **reasonable?**

As is so often the case when one cannot scripturally prove his position, my opponent resorts to misrepresentation. Mr. Forsythe

claims, "Something else my friend is trying to say is, that this would be confusing to God because he could not understand everyone praying at the same time and using different words."

Sir, where did I say or imply any such things? I challenge you to quote any statement from me to this effect or else apologize for making such a charge. I deny entirely any suggestion that God would be unable to understand the prayers of many people at once. However, I charge that it would be in violation of New Testament teaching to have such confusion and disorder created by everybody speaking at one time in the assembly. In fact, in 1 Corinthians 14:27-31, Paul points out that when "the whole church is come together into one place" (verse 23), there was to be only **one speaker** at a time! What reason was given for this instruction? "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints" (verse 33). Let me also point out that Mr. Forsythe's brethren violate the instruction given in verses 34-35: "Let your **women keep silence in the churches**: for it is not permitted unto them to speak.... For it is a shame for **women to speak in the church**." What about this passage in the light of your practice, Mr. Forsythe? Do your brethren follow the Bible on this point?

Incidentally, as to this matter of one's being silent and yet being heard by God in prayer, this is evidently shown to be possible in 1 Corinthians 14:28. In this verse Paul referred to one who could "keep silence in the church" and yet "speak to himself and to God." It is possible for one to **speak to God** and yet be **silent**!

Mr. Forsythe again refers to 1 Timothy 2:8 where Paul said, "I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting." He has contended that this verse teaches a **posture in prayer**, that is, that one cannot pray to God unless he *literally* "**lifts up his hands**"! That is not at all what Paul

is teaching. The apostle is simply pointing out that men should be **holy** in their conduct. For one to pray without making a sincere effort to live a holy life is of no benefit.

However, since my worthy opponent thinks that this verse requires a given posture when he prays, let us notice Matthew 6:6, which I cited in my previous speech. The Lord Jesus said, “But thou, when thou *prayest*, *enter into thy closet*, and when thou *hast shut the door*, *pray* to thy Father which is in secret; and the Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.” Now, this Paul specified a **posture** that **must** be used when praying, then Jesus is specifying a **place** that must be used when **praying!** **Both would be required if Mr. Forsythe’s reasoning is true!** However, neither passage requires a **posture** or a **place**, but both are setting forth a **principle**: Paul is saying that one must be **holy in life**, and Jesus is saying that one ought to not pray for the purpose of being **seen of men**. Incidentally, I did not find any reference or reply to point in Mr. Forsythe’s last speech. Did you “**overlook**” this point, Mr. Forsythe? Please reply to next time! Tell us if you believe a person is required **literally** to enter his closet and shut the door in order to pray acceptably!

My friend and opponent again tries to find some objection to the practice of churches of Christ with regard to the Lord’s supper. I have shown that we have an approved example (sanctioned by the inspired apostle Paul) of the disciples coming together on **the first day of the week** (Sunday) to **partake in the Lord’s supper** (Acts 20:7). Notice: “And upon *the first day of the week*, when the disciples *came together to break bread....*” Please observe that the **purpose** mentioned for the disciples assembling on this day was **to partake in the Lord’s supper!** I pointed out that churches of Christ follow this **divinely revealed example** by meeting **on the first day of the week** to observe this memorial of the Lord’s death. Mr. Forsythe’s objection to this **practice** is

actually an objection to doing **what the word of God teaches!**

In my second speech, in response to his objections, I asked Mr. Forsythe two questions in order to better understand his position. He “**overlooked**” both questions in his reply! It seems that my opponent finds much about which he can quibble, but he cannot “remember” to answer my questions in response to his objections! I ask him again: (1) Do you believe it is wrong (sinful) to partake of the Lord’s supper each first day of the week? If so, why? (2) Do you and your brethren come together on the first day of the week to partake in the Lord’s supper? If not, how often do you partake in it?

Mr. Forsythe seems to think that the disciples partook in the Lord’s supper on Monday morning in Acts 20. However, the Bible says that they came together on the first day of the week to partake of it, and I believe they did what they **came together** to do! Then Paul preached unto them. After Eutychus had been raised (verses 9-10), **Paul ate a common meal** in preparation for his departure (verse 11). Please note that the Bible only mentions **Paul eating a meal** in verse 11; however, all of the disciples who came together (including Paul) **partook of the Lord’s supper** in verse 7. The disciples thus partook in the Lord’s supper, whereas later Paul ate a common meal, perhaps on Monday morning.

Mr. Forsythe again is guilty of misrepresentation. He had asked me a question: “Is it scriptural for all New Testament Christians to take the Lord’s Supper upon the first day of every week? My answer was: “Yes; Acts 20:7, 1 Corinthians 11:23-28, and Luke 22:19-20.” My “honorable”(?) opponent responds by saying, “Then every person that is a member of the so-called Church of Christ must take the Lord’s Supper 52 weeks in every year or be eternally lost in *Hell*; in other words, if any of you or your people happened to miss Church on the weekend and died on Monday morning, then they would go to *Hell*, according to Mr.

Thrasher.” Sir, you did not read anything that I have said to lead you to draw such a conclusion! I said that it is **scriptural** for all Christians to partake of the Lord’s supper on the first day of every week; however, this does not imply in any way that **all Christians are able to assemble every first day of the week**. Things such as serious illness will sometimes prevent Christians from **assembling** on the first day of the week, and thus prevent them from eating the Lord’s supper. I believe that a Christian who **willfully forsakes** the assembles of the church is guilty of **sin** which will cause his soul to be **lost in hell** (Hebrews 10:25-31). One **must repent** of such sin, **confess** it, and **pray** for forgiveness (Luke 13:3; James 5:16; Acts 8:22-24). I want my opponent to answer a question: Is it scriptural for Christians to partake of the Lord’s supper on each occasion when practiced by your brethren? Please notice if Mr. Forsythe answers this clearly and without equivocation, friends, or if he “overlooks” it as he has so many other questions!

Mr. Forsythe goes next to the subject of “foot washing.” He completely “overlooked” most of what I said about it: “Feet washing was never a part of worship in the New Testament but was always an act of personal cleanliness and hospitality. In the text from John 13 Jesus is teaching His disciples a lesson on humility, which He demonstrates by washing their feet. Apparently, their feet needed to be washed, otherwise Jesus would be making a mockery of the occasion. I believe that the washing of another person’s feet would be altogether appropriate as an act of hospitality in situations similar to those of Jesus’ day. However, for people to come together with clean feet and go through a mockery of ‘foot wetting,’ while claiming to practice feet washing as mentioned in the New Testament, is obviously foreign to what the Lord taught.” What did my friend and opponent say in reply to this? He again **asserts** that “foot washing” is a part of the **worship** that the **church** does when

assembled. He offered no proof for his claim!

Again I point out that feet washing is an act of **personal cleanliness** and **hospitality** in those situations where **it is needed** as a result of people getting dirty feet due to their travel, or when, due to illness, they are unable to wash their own. Notice the following quotation on this matter: “Egyptians, Hebrews, and Syrians washed the dust of the road from their feet when they tarried at a house” (*Davis Dictionary of the Bible*, page 78). Observe that the washing of feet was not mere **formality**, but it was actually intended to cleanse the feet of dirt when it was needed. That was exactly what Jesus meant when He said, “He who has bathed needs only to wash his feet, but is completely clean” (John 13:10, NASB). One should have no trouble understanding that the **purpose** for **washing feet** in the **Bible** was to clean them! Again, Mr. Forsythe has **not cited a verse** where the **church came together for some kind of “foot washing” service!**

Mr. Forsythe **tried** to find a **church “foot washing” service** in 1 Timothy 5:10; however, he did not bother to **quote** that passage so that all could read what it says! I will quote it: “Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works; if she have **brought up children**, if she have **lodged strangers**, if she have **washed the saints’ feet**, if she have **relieved the afflicted**, if she have **diligently followed every good work**.” Notice, if this passage teaches a church “feet washing” service, then it also teaches the following: (1) a church “bringing up children” service; (2) a church “lodging strangers” service; (3) a church “relieving the afflicted” service; (4) A church “every good work” service. According to my opponent’s “reasoning”(?), anything that is a **good work** ought to be a part of the **worship assemblies** of the church! Will he accept this? The truth of the matter is that

1 Timothy 5:9-10 is speaking of **individual** duties, not **congregational** duties. There are many things that are right for the individual to do but are wrong for a **congregation** (collectively) to do.

Since Mr. Forsythe continues to insist that “fasting” is compulsory under the law of Christ, I ask him again to tell us “**when** and under what **conditions** Christians are **required to fast**”! He failed to answer in his previous speech. It seems that his “overlooker” was really active in that speech! I will, however, state again my position on “fasting.” Fasting, when practiced, is a matter left up to the **individual**; **it is not a congregational activity**. The Bible does not **prescribe** a special **time**, **place**, or **occasion** for fasting today. Therefore, since God has not legislated in this matter, neither will I. Any individual Christian who desires to fast as a matter of personal choice certainly ought to do so. There are occasions when such may be very appropriate for an individual. For example, Jesus mentioned that His disciples would fast when He was crucified (Mark 2:18-20). A Christian today might fast during a period of sorrow or mourning. However, *periodic* fasting is **never commanded** for Christians!

Coincidentally, as I was reading the *Manual* of the United Pentecostal Church, of which Mr. Forsythe is a member, I failed to find any mention of **fasting** in the *Articles of Faith*. Very strange, indeed! They discuss such things as foot washing, conscientious scruples, secret societies, and public school activities—but no mention of **fasting**! Mr. Forsythe needs to contact their “headquarters” in Hazelwood, Missouri, and get them to correct that oversight! While he is doing that, he might cite us Bible authority for an *earthly headquarters* for the church. Can you find it, my friend?

On the subject of music in worship. I have cited Bible authority for **singing** (vocal music) in worship (Ephesians 5:19;

Colossians 3:16; Acts 16:25). My opponent has admitted that it is scriptural to sing. Thus, the practice of churches of Christ in this matter is right. However, my opponent thinks it is also scriptural to play mechanical instruments of music. He has yet to cite a New Testament passage that authorizes this such!

My opponent claims that he has found his mechanical instruments in Ephesians 5:19. That verse says: “*Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.*” The only kind of music mentioned in this verse is **vocal music (singing)**! However, Mr. Forsythe says he has found his mechanical instruments in the word *melody*. He misuses Mr. W.E. Vine’s *Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words* by implying that Vine says “melody” includes mechanical instruments in the New Testament. Such is simply not so! After giving a history of the development of the word, Mr. Vine then gives the meaning *in the New Testament*. This information was **withheld by my opponent** when he gave the definition. I will quote what Mr. Vine says about the meaning in the New Testament: “denotes, in the N. T., to sing a hymn, sing praise; in Eph. 5:19, ‘making melody’ (for the preceding word *ado*, see SING). Elsewhere it is rendered ‘sing.’ Rom. 15:9; 1 Cor. 14:15; 1 Cor. 14:15; Jas. 5:13, R.V., ‘let him sing praise’ (A.V., ‘let him sing psalms’). See SING.” **This is the entire definition given by Mr. Vine on the meaning of the word “melody” as used in the New Testament.** He says that the word translated “make melody” means to **sing**! Why did you not quote this part, Mr. Forsythe? Also, Mr. J. H. Thayer, in his *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, points out the same thing: “in the N.T., to sing a hymn, to celebrate the praises of God in song” (page 675). Mr. T. S. Green, in *A Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament*, gives the meaning “in the N.T.,

to sing praises” (page 206). These citations should be sufficient to prove to the honest enquirer that the word does **not** include mechanical instruments of music, such as asserted by Mr. Forsythe. We are still waiting for him to present book, chapter and verse from the New Testament for his mechanical instruments of music in worship!

My opponent’s final point in trying to negate my affirmative relates to the “organization” of the church. I have given passages proving that elders are men possessing specific qualifications (1 Timothy 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9). My opponent has not denied it. Further, I have pointed out that the work of elders is to **oversee** the local church of which they are elders (1 Peter 5:1-3; Acts 20:17, 28). Mr. Forsythe has not proven otherwise. I have also shown that there are several designations used in the New Testament to refer to the same work: elders, presbyters, bishops, overseers, pastors, and shepherds (1 Peter 5:1-4; Acts 20:17, 28; Titus 1: 5, 7). Again, my friend has not disproven this fact.

An important scriptural point thus far **ignored** by Mr. Forsythe is the fact that, in the New Testament, there were **always** several (a plurality) of these men in a congregation. **Why do you refuse to deal with this, Mr. Forsythe???** Paul addressed the church in Philippi and referred to the “bishops” (plural). Paul told Titus that “elders” (plural) were to be ordained in every city (Titus 1:5). Peter mentioned the “elders (plural) which are among you” (1 Peter 5:1). The writer of Hebrews commanded the disciples to “obey them [plural] that have the rule over you” (Hebrews 13:17). Luke recorded the fact that “elders” (plural) were ordained in every church (Acts 14:23). When Paul was at Miletus, he sent to Ephesus and called the “elders” (plural) of the church (Acts 20:17). Mr. Forsythe apparently does not desire to accept these

passages, since he wants to be **the pastor** of the congregation—a term **not mentioned anywhere in the New Testament!**

Mr. Forsythe does not at all like the idea of **elders overseeing** the work of the local church as specified in the Bible. However, he does not mind having **the complete oversight himself!** Notice the following quotation from the *Manual* of the United Pentecostal Church relating to the “**Pastor’s Authority**”: “He shall have the *oversight* and *superintendence* of *all* interests of the church and of *all* departments of its work, both spiritual and temporal.... He should be consulted in regard to *all* business of any importance pertaining to the spiritual, moral, and material affairs of the church. He shall *call for* and *preside over* business and church board meetings” (page 107, 1973 Edition). Also, he has the power to *appoint* an assistant pastor, deacons or members of the church board, the secretary and the treasurer of the church, the Sunday School Superintendent, the Young People’s President, and perhaps others (*Manual*, pages 107-108). Thus, we see that Mr. Forsythe does not like having several men serving as overseers (or elders) of a congregation **like the Bible teaches**. He wants **all of the oversight for himself**, contrary to the teaching of God’s book!

Mr. Forsythe ridicules the simple New Testament form of church government that I have presented from the Bible. I want to notice another quotation on this matter from the *Manual* of the United Pentecostal Church under the heading *Local Church Government*: “The assembly may use our adopted form of local church government, or any form which a majority of the members voting shall endorse, so long as its provisions do not conflict with the constitution of the General

Body.” As can easily be seen, the government of the church of which Mr. Forsythe is a member can be of basically two types: **the adopted form** or **the form endorsed by majority vote of the congregation**. Personally, I believe **both** should be rejected and the New Testament form of organization should be accepted!

Having taken up and responded to Mr. Forsythe’s speech, I now proceed to answer his questions.

(1) John was speaking to a mixed audience, including righteous and wicked people. I have discussed the application of the phrase “he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost” in this speech, showing that it was applied by Jesus to the **apostles**, and by Peter to the **Gentiles at Cornelius’ house**.

(2) The bishops of a local church.

(3) Yes; I am willing to use any scriptural designation. However, let me remind our audience that the term United Pentecostal Church, which is used by my opponent, is **not** a **scriptural designation**, and should **not** be used. Incidentally, since Mr. Forsythe asks about the designation used **on the church building**, I want to quote another statement from his *Manual*: “Each church that is either affiliated with The United Pentecostal Church or is pastored by a minister who holds license or credentials with the United Pentecostal Church *shall identify by sign or otherwise on the outside of its building* that it is associated with the United Pentecostal Church” (page 95). Thus, Mr. Forsythe and his brethren **must** identify their buildings by using a term **nowhere used in the Bible!** I ask Mr. Forsythe: Would you be willing to put the designation “church of Christ” on your building for identification and leave off the one you now use? Don’t forget to tell us!

(4) The term indicates “to tend, to care for, to watch

over, to provide for, to oversee, to shepherd.” Again, we observe that in 1 Peter 5:1, Peter addresses the **elders** (plural) and told them to do this. In Acts 20:28 Paul was speaking to the **elders** (plural) of the church at Ephesus, whom he referred to as “overseers” of the flock.

(5) The mind.

In this speech I have continued to present scriptural evidence that: “The Church of Christ, of which I am a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice, and name, and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2.” Much that I have introduced in my speeches has been overlooked and ignored by Mr. Forsythe, although he is supposed to fulfill the responsibility of the negative, which includes answering my arguments (not perverting and misrepresenting them). Please give your careful attention to his next speech. Observe whether or not he takes up my arguments and tries to answer my questions given in this affirmative. May the Lord bless you in a further study of his Truth.

FORSYTHE'S THIRD NEGATIVE

Mr. Thrasher. Brethren and Friends that read this Discussion, it is with great pleasure that *I come for the third time and continue to deny the proposition* that my friend and opponent, Mr. Thrasher, is supposed to be affirming: **"The church of Christ of which he is a member is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice and name and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2."**

So, without many words of introduction I want to go directly to the point of difference and expose the blunders my opponent has made along with the dilemmas he has gotten himself into while trying to affirm his proposition as well as denying the arguments that I have presented against him.

Now, in dealing with the Name again, the reason I say he has taken the wrong position about the Name is because he gives eight (8) other Names for the Church, excluding the one named in his proposition, and says these are scriptural designations (this I do not deny). Mr. Thrasher says that I said they were not scriptural Names. **I did not say that**; this is a misrepresentation of what I said. Here is what I said: If they are scriptural Names for the Church, then explain why he and his brethren do not use some of them. Mr. Thrasher says he does not use the *term*, **"Church of Christ"** exclusively. He says, "I use all these **scriptural terms** in my preaching, teaching and writing." Well now, ladies and gentlemen, I wonder why he does not use any of them in identification written on the sign in the yard or on the shingle over the door???? My only contention about the term, Church of Christ, *as used by Mr. Thrasher and his brethren*, is that I cannot see it to be a positive proper name, because the term, **Church of**

Christ, was *never used* in making reference to the Name of the Church. The only scripture he has is Romans 16:16, and this shows possession and not a proper name and I also said if he is going to get so excited about part of this scripture, “The Churches of Christ salute you,” then why be so inconsistent about the rest of it, “*Greet ye one another with an holy kiss.*” I asked him this in my last speech. What did he say about it? **Nothing!** Why? I’ll tell you why. It shorts out his wires in Romans 16:16 and kills his doctrine dead, that’s why. So you be quiet about the Name of the Church, Mr. Thrasher, until you can pass out a few kisses.

Now, my dear reader friends, I did not know we had changed propositions. The proposition we are discussing says, “The Church of Christ of which Mr. Thrasher is a member.” It does not say, the United Pentecostal church of which I (Forsythe) *am a member*. He has had a lot to say about the United Pentecostal Church in his last speech and I will predict to all of you readers that before this Debate is over he will probably challenge every preacher in our fellowship. Mr. Thomas Thrasher, the **Big ... Challenger**. Mr. Thrasher, anybody that knows anything about debating can see the reason you are trying to change propositions is you cannot stop up the holes that are being punched in yours by the Sword of the Spirit. The issue is the organizational structure and position of your church and not mine. I will clear up one thing and that’s what was said in Decatur, Alabama in March 1972. I did not say that just **it** (The United Pentecostal Church) was not scriptural in everything. Here is what I said: The church of which I am a member, or Mr. Thrasher is a member, or anyone else, cannot find scripture for everything that we do, (or that we practice) and I was having reference to things such as buying church buildings or renting them, using song books, having baptistries, using blackboards, etc. Don’t try to misrepresent me again, Mr. Thrasher.

Now, I want to turn attention to the blunders he has made and dilemmas he is in with trying to answer my arguments on Holy Ghost baptism:

1. My friend says that **only the apostles were promised** Holy Ghost baptism. Now, if this be so, then no one else could have received it. We cannot come any shorter or go any further than what the Word of God says. Read Revelation 22:18-19. Mr. Thrasher, you are in trouble if only the eleven apostles were **promised** the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. Then pray tell us how did Matthias receive it? How did Paul receive it in Acts 9:17? How did the Gentiles receive it, Acts 10:45-46? How did those Paul Baptized in Acts 19:6 receive it? I asked Mr. Thrasher this in my last speech. What did he say about it? **Nothing!** Quit dodging and answer, my friend.

2. Now, I would like to say, in answer to Mr. Thrasher, that I have received the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and have spoken in other tongues; it does teach me all things God wants me to know in His Word, and it does inspire me when I am preaching and teaching His Word, and guides me into all truth of the Word. Mr. Thrasher, you must believe in non-inspired writers of the New Testament, because Luke wrote two books, Luke and Acts, and according to your logic, he never did receive the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. Well now, finally (after much pressure has been applied) he has come across with answering (or at least trying). Mark 1:4-8. And his only complete course to follow has gotten him into more trouble. Now again, who was the "You" in Verse 5 that *John said* would receive the Baptism of the Holy Ghost? **All** the land of *Judea* and they of *Jerusalem*. Does this look like **just the apostles**? We know better than that and so does my opponent. Mr. Thrasher, you have lost this argument. I pointed out something in my last speech about Jesus and John in Luke 16:16; *Jesus said*, the law and the prophets were until John, since

that time ***the Kingdom of God is preached***. This lets us know that **what John preached** pertained to **all that would enter the Kingdom of God**, not just the apostles. What was it? Everyone he baptized had the promise of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. There was also something else that I asked Mr. Thrasher to notice: St. John 5:33, Jesus said, **“John bare witness unto the truth.”** What did he say about this? **Nothing!** He can’t, because there is not a so-called Church of Christ Preacher by the name that can answer these scriptures in the light of their position. (That’s why they are “so-called”).

Now, let us look at another dilemma that Mr. Thrasher has gotten himself into. I asked him a question in my last speech: To whom was John speaking in Mark 1, when he said, “He shall Baptize you with the Holy Ghost”? His answer was this, “He was speaking to a mixed audience, including **righteous and wicked**.” Now, Mr. Thrasher, don’t you know that John said **repent**? Why? Because they were all sinners. The Bible teaches us that the righteous and just persons need no repentance. Read Luke 15:7 and Mark 2:17. When you preach, do you tell the supposedly to be righteous and just people of your congregation to repent and be baptized? Answer this please in your next speech. Friends, I affirm to you that *if* my opponent is right in his logic about Mark 1:4-8, then John the Baptist and Jesus Christ did not tell the truth with reference to the scriptures I have just used.

Now, in answer to what you said about the Holy Ghost coming to the Gentiles, I say it does have something to do with saving them. That’s why Peter commanded them to be Baptized in the Name of the Lord immediately after they received the Holy Ghost. The Bible teaches we must be born of the Water and the Spirit, St. John 3:5, and the Bible teaches there is one Spirit, 1 Corinthians 12:13 and Ephesians 4:4. Come on with your different measures in the next speech, Mr. Thrasher, and you will get just

about as far with them as you did with Mark 1:4-8. You say my views of Holy Spirit Baptism are assertions and assumptions. Just answer these scriptures, my friend, if you can in the light of your position.

Now, my friend is still making contention about the 120 and he says, "Where does the Bible say that the 120 were in the Upper Room at Pentecost?" Well, Mr. Thrasher, I have got them in there in Acts 1:14-15. It is your job to get them out, and you just have from the sixteenth verse to the twenty-sixth verse of the first Chapter of Acts. We want you to do it with scriptures, my friend. That is the way they got in there and that is the only way we are going to accept them getting out. Now, I want to point out again that my opponent has misrepresented me. He said, "My opponent has admitted that he does not know that they came and went or stayed." I said no such thing! I said, I never **asserted** as to any of this happening. I gave what the Bible said in verses 13, 14, and 15. They went up into an Upper Room, they all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication. number of names together were about an hundred and twenty. You are the one that's speaking where the Bible is silent. Listen to what my opponent reads into the scriptures: "The Bible does not say where they were, it does not mention the Upper Room, it does not say they stayed in that place until Pentecost." Where did they get out, Mr. Thrasher? Show us this with the scriptures or forever close your mouth.

Now, there is one more thing my opponent said that I want to point out: "The Bible says that on the day of Pentecost the apostles were sitting in a House. Acts 2:1-2." My friends, if you will get your Bible and read those words in these verses, I will surrender my position right now. I want you to notice what my opponent reads into Acts 1:13: "The apostles abode in an upper room, which was their living quarters. they frequently went to the

Temple to worship during the ten days between the ascension and Pentecost.” Is that the way it is, Mr. Thrasher? Dear readers, get your Bible and see if you can find anything like that in the first chapter of Acts????? Mr. Thrasher said in his second speech, the apostles were the only ones who spoke in languages they had not studied so that all those who came together could hear the gospel preached in their own native languages. Now, there were sixteen nations present and twelve apostles. I asked my friend which four of the apostles spoke in two different languages at the same time???? We are still waiting for an answer—but my opponent has observed the Passover. This is just another one of the many dilemmas he has gotten into by fighting the **Truth**.

Now, Mr. Thrasher has strongly contended throughout this discussion that only the apostles received Holy Ghost baptism from Acts 2 until Acts 10, when it fell on the Gentiles. Let us see what the Bible says. Look at Acts 10:45-47, *they of the circumcision which believed were astonished as many as came with Peter*, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the Gift of the Holy Ghost for they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. *Then answered Peter*, can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which **have received the Holy Ghost as well as we**. Friends, this lets us know without a doubt that **these Jews who came with Peter had the baptism of the Holy Ghost**. Let us look also in Acts 11:1-2 and verse 17 and the apostles **and brethren that were in Judea** heard that the Gentiles had also received the Word of God. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, **they that were of the circumcision** contended with him. Listen to Peter’s answer in Verse 17, “Forasmuch then as God gave them the like Gift as He did unto *us....*” Who? (Peter, the apostles, *and they of the circumcision he was talking to*) “What was I that I could withstand God?” Mr. Thrasher is not only withstanding the apostle Peter, he is withstanding God. Friends,

my poor defeated bewildered opponent is a drowning man that doesn't even have a straw to reach for with his contention about Holy Ghost Baptism. Mr. Thrasher, you are not even making the argument interesting. According to my friend's logic, they must have appointed more apostles; of course, that's easy for him to do, when he gets in a dilemma, he just writes him some scriptures and steps out of it. We are waiting for you to get out of this one, my friend.

Now, he says I have quibbled about prayer. No, I just said that he has no scripture for the way the (so called) Church of Christ prays *to God* in worship. I gave scripture where they all prayed. Acts 4:24; *they* lifted up **their voice** to God with **one accord**. I know the voice is spelled singular, but that's nothing for my opponent to get excited about, that's understood by the **one accord**. But **they** and **their** IS plural, thus teaching us that every voice was audible. **They lifted up their voice**. Mr. Thrasher, demonstrate to us how you lift up your voice silently ... Mr. Thrasher says only one voice is mentioned, *perhaps indicating the idea* that one person led the prayer. My friend, we do not preach on perhaps, indications and ideas. He says, I asked Mr. Forsythe, did these disciples just accidentally pray the same prayer? No, the Spirit led them to pray the same prayer, read Romans 8:26-27. Mr. Thrasher says people can pray while one directs their thoughts. Where is this taught in the Bible? This is foreign to the Word of God. The Spirit is the director. Read 1 Corinthians 2:10-12. Now, my friend says I have misrepresented him by saying that he implied God could not hear everybody praying at one time. No, I said, **if** this is your thought. Go back and read what I said. Now, Mr. Thrasher directs his thoughts to speaking and says, "However, *I charge* that it would be in *violation* of *New Testament teaching* to have such confusion and disorder created by everybody speaking at one time in the assembly." He says in 1 Corinthians

14:26-31, Paul points out that when the whole church is come together into one place (verse 23) there was to be only one speaker. Well, I agree to this on speaking and the only one I know who is guilty of the charge is Thomas N. Thrasher, because if you will look back in his second speech you will find that in the second chapter of Acts after the Holy Ghost came he has **twelve men preaching at the same time**, and four of them *speaking in two different languages at the same time*. Now, who's guilty? Mr. Thrasher. Friends, let's see if he wiggles out of this one!

Now, my friend asked the question about 1 Corinthians 14:34-35. What about this passage in the light of your practice, Mr. Forsythe? Do your brethren follow the Bible on this point? Yes. Now, my friend goes back again to 1 Timothy 2:8 where Paul says for men to **pray everywhere** lifting up holy hands. He makes another feeble attempt in trying to change the meaning. Listen to what he says, "That is **not at all what Paul is teaching**, he is pointing out that men should be Holy in their **conduct**." Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have seen hands spelled a lot of times, but I have never seen it spelled "**conduct**"! Mr. Thrasher is supposed to be a school teacher, but he must not be any better school teacher than he is a preacher, *if* this be the case. He tried to use Matthew 6:6 to help his theory, but all Jesus is teaching here is to get in a closet of prayer, by closing our mind, conscience, hearing, etc. to all hindrances, praying to God acceptably. I used Psalms 134:1-2, Behold bless ye the Lord all ye servants of the Lord which stand in the house of the Lord, lift up your hands in the sanctuary and bless the Lord. What has he said about it? **Nothing**! My friend has not touched my position of these scriptures with his carnal theory, logic, misused words and assumptions. We will let the reader be the judge.

Now, my opponent's position is getting weaker all the time on the Lord's Supper. He says Acts 20:7, the purpose *mentioned*

for the disciples assembling on this day was to partake of *The Lord's Supper*. I challenge him to read those words in that verse. It says, they came together **to break bread**; Paul preached unto them. My friend adds a "**then**." Paul preached. There's no "**then**" there. I say **if** this was the Lord's Supper, *Paul preached before it was taken*; read the text, friends. Mr. Thrasher likes to read things into the verses because his proposition is struggling to survive. I want to ask my opponent this: Does everywhere in the New Testament "Breaking Bread" is mentioned refer to the Lord's Supper?

In answer to my friend's questions he's asked me: Do I believe it is wrong to partake of the Lord's Supper the first day of the week? Mr. Thrasher, my answer to this is, I think it would be completely silly of me to teach the people I pastor to practice something **every week** that I cannot find taught in the Bible. The Bible doesn't say how often to take it, but it says, "As oft as ye do this," 1 Corinthians 11:26. Why have you not dealt with this scripture? Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have heard it all. Mr. Thrasher has a preacher eating a *common meal in a worship service* to God. I thought the denominational world was the only ones who were guilty, but it looks like it has joined the Church of Christ. Now, I want to point out here that the only difference in verse 7 and verse 11 of Acts 20 about the bread is that in Verse 7 it wasn't broken and eaten, but in verse 11 it was broken and eaten. A **common meal**. Whoever heard of any such interpretation of scriptures? Friends, it is amazing what people will insert while trying to defend a false position.

Now, he said I misrepresented him when I said his people would go to hell if they did not take it 52 weeks a year. No, that's just the position he has put **himself in** with his argument; if the scriptures *teach you must take it every week* and you miss one then you have sinned. Let him prove different. Sin will cause you

to be lost. Now, he asked a question, "Is it scriptural for Christians to partake of the Lord's Supper on each occasion when practiced by your brethren?" (Yes).

Now, he says foot washing was an act of personal cleanliness and he says Jesus, in John 13, is teaching his disciples a lesson on humility. (I agree). But do we not still need these lessons today? Notice how my friend has tried to answer my arguments on this: *"Personal cleanliness, hospitality, situations where it is needed, Davis Dictionary of the Bible, purpose of washing feet was to clean them, etc."* **Not a verse of scripture** to answer what I said. In fact, he completely ignored the scriptures I gave. Deal with the scriptures, my friend. I am going over them again: John 13:14, "If I then your Lord and Master have washed your feet ye also ought to wash **one another's feet**. Verse 15, "For I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done unto you." Verse 17 says, "If you know these things happy are ye if ye do them." 1 Peter 2:21 says, *leaving us an example that we should follow his steps*. My opponent has not said anything about these scriptures or made any effort to answer them. Friends, this shows he is dodging. If he had an answer for them, he would come directly to the paper with them. He tried to brush off what I said about the widow's foot washing in 1 Timothy 5:10; but if the Church takes care of her, she has still got to wash the saints' feet. Look at it again, Mr. Thrasher, it is still there. He said there are many things that are right for the individual to do but are wrong for the congregation to do. I can imagine this with the doctrine he preaches, but we would like to have some chapters and verses for this statement, wouldn't we, reader friends?

Now, on the subject of fasting, I am just going to bring the scriptures back that he has not touched or made any effort to answer. Jesus taught that His disciples would, Mark 2:20. (Mr. Thrasher quibbled about this and just applied it to crucifixion.)

Paul taught fasting to the church, 1 Corinthians 7:5. (Not mentioned by my opponent). The Church at Antioch fasted when workers were sent out, Acts 13:1-3. (Not mentioned). The church fasted when Elders were ordained, Acts 14:23. (Not mentioned) Does yours do that, Mr. Thrasher? My friend has not answered these scriptures. We want to hear from you, sir. All of this would come under the word “**practice**” in his proposition. Friend, if you will just examine my opponent’s doctrine and what they teach, it is nowhere near what the early church was in the Book of Acts.

Now, on the music question; if Mr. Thrasher holds his position on the word “**melody**” to just mean *sing* in the New Testament, here is the way he is having you to read Ephesians 5:19. Speaking to yourselves in **singing** and **singing** and spiritual songs **singing** and making **singing** in your heart to the Lord. They sure do believe in **singing**, don’t they?

In my last speech, if you remember how I pointed out the inconsistency of his teaching, in James 5:13-14, it says. “Is any among you afflicted? Let him pray. Is any merry? Let him sing psalms.” Mr. Thrasher says we believe that. Oh yeah? Sing! Sing! Sing! Sing! But the very next verse says, “Is any sick among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church and let them pray over him anointing him with oil in the Name of the Lord.” Mr. Thrasher says what? We don’t believe that, **No! No! No!** Dissolved! Dissolved! Dissolved! Did he answer that? **No!** He can’t, that’s why.

Now, I want to turn to the subject of New Testament Elders. The Bible clearly teaches us that the New Testament Eldership (as far as those in authority and rule over the congregation) is to be the Minister. In the early Church days they did not have just one big building as we have today that would hold several hundred people where they traveled from a distance of several miles to attend. (Mr. Thrasher cannot find where they ever bought, built

or rented a building of this sort.) However, the saints did assemble in different localities for worship, which I believe the Bible teaches to be the meeting house of which most of the time would be the residence of the Elder (or Minister) And I will begin my scriptural Foundation in Acts Chapter 20. Now, Mr. Thrasher says this is a plurality of men over one congregation (or assembly of saints). Let's see, in Verse 17, Paul called them together. Verse 20 says, "And how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you and have taught you publicly, and from **house to house**." Now, Paul was telling these Elders (or Ministers), "I have been to your **house**." (singular). And he says in Verse 28, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and all the flock which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers (Does the Holy Ghost make your Elders overseers?) to feed the Church of God." (This means to minister the Word); because verses 29-31 is a parance of what Paul wrote to Timothy (a Minister) in II Timothy 4:1-5. Read it. Now, when Paul wrote to the Corinthian Church, he wrote to the called to be saints with **all that in every place** call upon the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord, 1 Corinthians 1:2. Now, in verse 11, he spoke of the **house** of Chloe. In verse 16, he spoke of the **house** of Stephanas; and in closing his letter he sent greetings from Aquila and Priscilla with the Church that is in their **house**. 1 Corinthians 1:16-19, and in closing his letter to the Philippians, he sent greeting from all the saints of Caesar's **household** and in Colossians he sent greetings from Nymphas and the Church which is in his **house**. Now, notice this, Paul wrote to Archippus in Colossians 4:17, saying, "Take heed to the **ministry** which thou has received in the Lord that thou fulfill it." And he writes again to **Archippus** in Philemon 2, "... and the Church in thy **house**."

Now, Mr. Thrasher said in his last speech that Elders, Presbyters, Bishops, Overseers, Pastors and Shepherds are designations used in the New Testament referring to the same

work. **I am glad he said that**, because I am going to add Steward, Minister and Chief. Go with me now through some more scripture. In Titus 1:7, Paul said for a **bishop** must be blameless as the **steward** of God. Now, Paul said again in 1 Corinthians 4:1-2, let a man so account of us as of the **ministers** of Christ and **stewards** of the mysteries of God, moreover it is required in **stewards** that a man be found **faithful**. (Please read here 1 Timothy 3:1-7 for the qualifications of a **bishop** that Mr. Thrasher gave that will paralance this scripture.) Now, in Mark 10:42-43, Jesus said, ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and Verse 43 says. but so shall it not be among you; but whosoever shall be great among you shall be your **minister** and whosoever **chiefest** shall be servant of all. Now, Jesus here was teaching for the **minister to bear rule**, but not exercise Lordship. This is a paralance to what Peter said to the Elder (ministers) in 1 Peter 5:2-3, feeding the flock (preaching the Word), taking the oversight thereof (bearing the rule), neither being Lords over God's heritage. Now, Mr. Thrasher would **try** to have you believe in this scripture that Peter was writing to a plurality of men in one congregation that ran the Church, told the Minister what to do, payed him a salary each week and fired him or ran him off if they did not like what he preached. What did he say about this in his last speech? **Nothing!** Why? He knows that's the way they operate. Now, let us see how wrong Mr. Thrasher was in who Peter was writing to. 1 Peter 1:1 says, "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the Strangers **scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.**" Mighty **big** congregation, isn't it, Mr. Thrasher? How would you like to take orders from all those Elders? Friends, I thank God I know the Truth!

Now, I want to mention some things about this subject that my opponent failed to answer in his last speech. Paul said in

Hebrews 13:7, remember them which have the **rule** over you who have spoken unto you the Word of God. Now, in Luke 4:20, *Jesus gave* the Book (Word of God) to the **minister**. Now, *who* speaks the Word of God? (The Minister) Who bears rule in Hebrews 13:7? The one who speaks the Word of God. (The Minister) **Answer this!** Now, I have asked my opponent in **every speech** to show us **with scriptures** where the (so-called) Elders of his theory exercises authority over the New Testament Ministry? We are still waiting

Now, I am the Pastor, Bishop, Overseer. Minister, Steward, Servant, Shepherd of the assembly here where I preach and have some of the best saints I know of to help me in the work here; and what my friend has said about the fellowship of the United Pentecostal Church, which I have, will not help him dissolve this. We must be good and sound, because it took him from January until July to answer my last speech, and the proposition says **thirty days**. So something must be going good for me.

Now, I want to say in closing that I don't like false accusations brought against me, and my opponent says I have overlooked much he has said in his speeches. I deny this and I challenge him to bring them to the front, one by one, in his next speech. Now, I want to say something regarding his answer to one of my questions, Number 3: He asked, "Would you be willing to put the designation, "Church of Christ," on your building for identification and leave off the one you now use? My answer is, "**No**": The reason? It would associate me with the falsity of your doctrine. I'll say this, I will put the Church of Jesus Christ and keep the fellowship of all my brethren if you will put the "Church of the Lord Jesus Christ and keep the fellowship of all of yours; and I will not have to ask a plurality of Elders.

Give your attention to Mr. Thrasher, please. Thank you.

THRASHER'S FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE

Mr. Forsythe, brethren and friends:

I am thankful for another privilege to “earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints” (Jude 3). You have just given attention to Mr. Forsythe’s third attempt to deny the Truth in this current discussion. I continue to affirm from the inspired Book of God that “The church of Christ, of which I am a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice, and name, and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2.” In the previous speeches, I have shown by scriptural argument that this proposition is true. Please study carefully the evidence presented in this speech.

Since my first speech, I have continually pointed out that we find several **scriptural terms** used with reference to the church, e.g. “the church” (Ephesians 3:10; 5:25), “the church of God” (2 Corinthians 1:1) “the church of the living God” (1 Timothy 3:15), “the kingdom” (Colossians 1:13), “the body” (Colossians 1:18), “the flock of God” (1 Peter 5:2), “the temple of the living God” (2 Corinthians 6:16). “the house of God” (1 Timothy 3:15), “the bride” (Revelation 21:9), and “churches of Christ” (Romans 16:16). These are **all scriptural** designations. One can use any of these terms and “speak as the oracles of God” (1 Peter 4:11). I have no objection to the use of any of these terms when referring to the church of the New Testament. However, I do object to the use of **unscriptural terms** such as **The United Pentecostal Church** (or any other not of divine origin)! It is simply amazing to me that my friend and opponent continues to quibble about the term “church of Christ” while at the same time exalting a term of completely **human origin**—“United Pentecostal Church”! My dear friend, why do you insist upon bypassing scriptural terms to use

an unscriptural one??? The *Manual* of the United Pentecostal Church even **requires** that this unscriptural designation be indicated by a sign or otherwise on the outside of the church building (p. 95, 1973 edition). Why didn't you reply to this, Mr. Forsythe? This was with reference to the matter of the **sign** on the building that **you** introduced! Incidentally, my opponent said in his last speech: "I don't like false accusations brought against me, and my opponent says I have overlooked much he has said in his speeches. I deny this and I challenge him to bring them to the front, one by one, in his next speech." Well, my friend, this is the first one!

Mr. Forsythe asks about his "holy kiss" of Romans 16:16. This is no problem. It was a customary form of greeting at that time, just as our common custom today is to shake hands. Is my opponent contending that this is the **only** form of greeting that may be used? If not, what is his point? Incidentally, I have sometimes seen Mr. Forsythe's brethren greet one another with a "hug." When I asked what they were doing, they replied, "We're greeting one another with a holy kiss"! In their practice they recognize that greeting may be done in various ways, but when they get into a debate, they **act** like they don't know that!

My friend complains that I have made reference to the United Pentecostal Church. Of course, one can easily see why he doesn't want me to mention **their practice**, since his **inconsistency** on many points is demonstrated. However, I shall continue to point out his **inconsistencies** and **contradictions** in his **practice**. It is perfectly fair and right that I do so, since no position can be true and scriptural if it is inconsistent with itself.

I am reminded of an admission which Mr. Forsythe made in our debate in Meridian, Mississippi. He said, "My proposition said 'in the *New Testament Church*.' The United Pentecostal Church hadn't got a thing doing with me being here. *Not nothing*! They

didn't send me here. I come on my own. And let's *leave them out of it*. Let's *don't say no more about it*. That *don't even pertain to the proposition*." Please observe that, although the proposition dealt with the *New Testament church*, Mr. Forsythe declared that the *United Pentecostal Church* did not even pertain to the proposition and should be left out of it! I agree with him on that matter—the United Pentecostal Church does not have one thing to do with the New Testament church!!! This is another point he has overlooked.

With reference to the statement made by Mr. Forsythe during the debate in Decatur, Alabama in March 1972, I have the exact statement taken from the tape. He said, "I said I'd deny his proposition. I didn't say I would sign to affirm anything, because, listen, **I don't believe I'm in practice with everything**, and I don't believe he is either." Mr. Forsythe did not *specify* any particular practice when he made the statement; however, he now says he *meant* such things as church buildings, song books, baptistries, etc. I will take his word on that matter. Yet the fact remains that he **will not affirm** the scripturalness of the **United Pentecostal Church** in **name, organization, worship, and work**, because that is what I asked him to affirm! I wonder if he believes it is **scriptural** in those points! (Incidentally, I believe that church buildings, song books, baptistries, etc. are scriptural expedients, being authorized **generically**).

On the subject of Holy Spirit baptism, Mr. Forsythe asks about Matthias and Paul receiving such. They did, because they were **apostles** (Acts 1:26-2:1f.; 2 Corinthians 11:5; 12:11). The Gentiles at Cornelius' house received Holy Spirit baptism, although for a different reason: to convince the Jews that Gentiles were gospel subjects (Acts 10:44-48; 11:15-17). The Ephesians in Acts 19 did **not** receive Holy Spirit baptism. They received the Holy Spirit by the laying on of Paul's hands (Acts 19:6).

Mr. Forsythe apparently does not understand the differences between Holy Spirit baptism, miraculous gifts of the Spirit, and the indwelling of the Spirit. Only the apostles and the Gentiles at Cornelius' house received Holy Spirit *baptism*, which was always administered directly from heaven (not by means of a human agent). Certain other Christians received miraculous gifts of the Spirit (1 Corinthians 12:6-11) administered by means of the laying on of the apostles' hands (Acts 6:5-6; 8:17-18; 19:6; Romans 1:11). Since there are no living apostles on earth today, no Christian today receives the Holy Spirit in a miraculous way. However, **all** Christians receive the Holy Spirit in a *non-miraculous* way (Acts 5:32; Romans 8:9). My opponent *seems* to think that all Christians receive the Holy Spirit in the same way and to the same extent that the apostles did, yet he continually hedges on this matter.

Notice what he said in his third speech: "I have received the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and have spoken in other tongues; it does **teach** me all things God wants me to know in His Word, and it does **inspire** me when I am preaching and teaching His Word, and **guides** me into all truth of the Word." Mr. Forsythe, are you claiming that He **teaches, inspires, and guides you** in **exactly the same way** and to the **same extent** that He did the **apostles**??? If so, then **your teaching, preaching and writing** are just as **authoritative** as **Paul's, Peter's, John's**, etc.!!! Ladies and gentlemen, if you ever have any questions about the word of God, just ask Richard W. Forsythe about it—he can give you an infallible and unerring explanation of God's will! Mr. Forsythe's "claims" rival those of the pope himself! Remember, my opponent claims to have exactly what the apostles did, so he could no more be in error in his teaching, preaching, or writing than they could! He is "not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles" in these things, *if* his claim is true.

My friend says, “Mr. Thrasher. you must believe in non-inspired writers of the New Testament, because Luke wrote two books, Luke and Acts, and according to your logic, he never did receive the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.” No, I do not believe in uninspired writers of the New Testament. Men such as Luke were inspired because they received the spiritual gift of prophecy by the laying on of the apostle’s hands (1 Corinthians 12:10; Acts 6:5-10; 8:5-6).

Mr. Forsythe tries again to prove that Holy Spirit baptism is promised to everybody by citing Mark 1:4-8. I have previously shown the proper application of John’s statement is indicated by inspiration. Jesus applied this to the apostles (Acts 1:2-5), and Peter applied it to the Gentiles at Cornelius’ house (Acts 11:15-16). Mr. Forsythe has not given any other instance of its being applied by an inspired man (except his own “inspired” assertion!). Notice how Mr. Forsythe applies it. He says, “Who was the ‘**you**’ in Verse 5 that *John said* would receive the Baptism of the Holy Ghost? **All** the land of *Judea* and they of *Jerusalem*.” Please observe to whom my opponent says this applies: **All the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem**. What about them? Jesus “**shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost**”! Thus, according to my “inspired” opponent, **every person in the land of Judea would be** (not “might be”) **baptized with the Holy Ghost**! Do you really believe this, Mr. Forsythe? Remember that there were many *wicked, impenitent people* in Judea (cf. Matthew 3:7-11). Were these wicked people **all** baptized with the Holy Ghost? Apparently so, because you said the “**you**” to whom John spoke was “**ALL** the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem”! Please tell us, my friend, did that word “**all**” include **every person**? If so, it included the impenitent wicked. If not, then **you**, Richard W. Forsythe, have done the very thing you condemned me for doing—saying that the word “**all**” is restricted in its application. So, tell us which

position you will take, Mr. Forsythe?

My opponent cites Luke 16:16, "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." My opponent concludes, "What John preached pertained to **all that would enter the Kingdom of God**, not just the apostles." Naturally, John prepared the people for the Lord's coming. However, it is inaccurate to say that what John preached pertained to **all** who would enter the kingdom. For example, John *preached* that people should receive *his baptism* (Mark 1:4). Does that pertain to **all** who enter the kingdom of God? If so, Mr. Forsythe, you had better begin preaching the "baptism of John"! Of course, the truth is that John's baptism is no longer valid (Acts 18:25-26; 19:1-5). Today, one must be baptized "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matthew 28:19).

We are referred to John 5:33, where Jesus said that John "bare witness unto the truth." I believe that! However, John never promised that every person would be baptized with the Holy Spirit. My opponent misapplies what John says. My prayer is that my friend R. W. Forsythe will give up his error, accept the truth, and begin to proclaim the way of salvation revealed in the Book of God.

With reference to a question he had asked about Mark 1:5-8, Mr. Forsythe says that those addressed "were *all sinners*." However, let us read what the Bible says. In verse 8 we read that John said, "I indeed **have baptized** you with water ..." Notice please that John had already baptized some of those to whom he was speaking (cf. Matthew 3:5-11). They had repented, confessed their sins, and had been baptized for the remission of sins (Matthew 3:1-2, 5-6; Mark 1:4-5). These people were righteous insofar as it is possible to be righteous. On the other hand, there were those present who were wicked (Matthew 3:7-10). They

were impenitent. Thus, just as I answered previously, John was speaking to a “mixed” audience—including both *righteous* and *wicked* people. Mr. Forsythe *thinks* they were **all** sinners, or at least that is what my “inspired” opponent *said*! Perhaps **his** inspiration is *better* than that of Matthew and Mark!

My opponent still contends that Holy Spirit baptism **saved** the Gentiles in Acts 10. He has not found proof of this claim in the Bible. He cites John 3:5, where Jesus says that one must be born of water and the Spirit, but this verse does not say Holy Spirit **baptism**! This verse teaches exactly what Mark 16:15-16 teaches. When the gospel (which is the sword of the Spirit) is preached, one must believe it and be baptized in water in order to be saved. We are still waiting for a verse of Scripture stating that Holy Spirit **baptism** *saves*!

Mr. Forsythe still asserts that the 120 received Holy Spirit baptism on Pentecost. His basic assumption is that all of the 120 were in the “upper Room” on Pentecost. This he has not and cannot prove. Of course, even if he could prove that they were in the upper room, that would not prove that they received Holy Spirit baptism! But he cannot prove that the 120 were even in the upper room **on Pentecost**. His argument is that the 120 were in the upper room in Acts 1:15; therefore, he concludes, they were in the upper room on Pentecost. He says it is my “job to get them out” before Pentecost. However, the fact is that Mr. Forsythe **asserts** and **assumes** that the 120 were in the “upper room” **on Pentecost**, but he has **not proved** they were there **on Pentecost!!!** I am *not* obligated to “get them out”—because he has *not* yet **gotten them in the upper room on Pentecost!!!** However, I have shown that the **apostles** (not the 120) were promised Holy Spirit baptism (Acts 1:2-5). Please notice that **the Lord said to the apostles**, “**Ye** shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence” (Acts 1:5). In the last verse of

chapter one, we are told that Matthias “was numbered with the eleven **apostles**. And when the day of **Pentecost** was fully come **they** were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where **they** were sitting. And there appeared unto **them** cloven tongues like as of fire. and it sat upon each of **them**. And **they** were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave **them** utterance.” Of whom is this speaking? **The apostles!**

Furthermore, with reference to my opponent’s request that I try to “get the 120 out of the upper room before Pentecost,” I would like to observe this fact. When the gospel was preached on Pentecost there were about 3000 who obeyed (Acts 2:38, 41). The Bible does not tell us how many “heard” the preaching, but at least 3000 came together to hear. According to my opponent’s “logic”(?), since the Bible tells us that this large audience “came together” (Acts 2:6), but the Bible does not *mention* anyone **leaving the upper room**, we conclude that this entire multitude gathered **in the upper room** to hear the preaching. Thus, according to Mr. Forsythe’s reasoning, there were over 3000 people in that “upper room”! What a room that must have been!!! Now, my friend, do not “overlook” this point in your next speech! Tell us if you believe that *multitude* of people was in that one *upper room*. If not, please cite the verse where they “got out”!

Mr. Forsythe next quotes my statement that “The Bible says that on the day of Pentecost the apostles were sitting in a **house** (Acts 2:1-2).” He then says, “If you will get your Bible and read those words in these verses I will surrender my position right now.” Here is another case where my friend Richard Forsythe flatly denies what the Bible says. Read it in your Bible: “And when the **day of Pentecost** was fully come, **they** were all with one

accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind. And it filled all the **house** where they were **sitting**" (Acts 2:1-2). Notice: On the day of **Pentecost**, the **apostles** were **sitting** in a **house**! What is it that Mr. Forsythe does not believe on this? Does he deny that it was on **Pentecost**? Does he deny that they were **sitting** in a **house**? **What does he deny about my statement???** Tell us, my friend!

Next, Mr. Forsythe says, "There were sixteen nations present and twelve apostles. I asked my friend which four of the apostles spoke in two different languages at the same time?" Again, my *scholarly* opponent makes a completely unwarranted assumption: namely, that there were sixteen **languages** spoken on this occasion. The Bible does not mention 16 *languages* (as my opponent states), but it mentions 16 (or 17) groups of people from various places. My opponent needs to **prove** that there were 16 different **languages** spoken here, but he cannot do so. Thus, he will probably "overlook" this point in his next speech.

My worthy opponent says of me, "When he gets into a dilemma he just writes him some scriptures and steps out of it." No, it is Mr. Forsythe who claims the ability to write "scripture"—remember, he claims to be "**inspired**"!

Once more we come to the subject of **prayer**. Mr. Forsythe has contended that a group of people cannot pray with one person directing the thoughts orally. He asks me to demonstrate how one can lift up his voice silently. Well, I showed him in my last speech, but he chose to "overlook" my comment. In 1 Corinthians 14:28 the apostle Paul gave instruction about one's speaking in a language the audience did not understand: "But if there is no interpreter, let him keep **silence** in the church; and let him **speak** to himself, and **to God**." The Bible shows that one may **speak to God** while being **silent**!!! Thus, when people *pray*, it is not necessary for **all** to pray **aloud** in order for God to hear their

prayer. The practice of one person leading the prayer is in accordance with Paul's instruction that "all things be done decently and in order" (1 Corinthians 14:40).

With respect to my charge that Mr. Forsythe misrepresented me in his second speech, he says, "No, I said, if this is your thought" (that God could not hear everybody praying aloud at the same time). However, I want to again **quote** the other part of his statement showing that he *did* in fact make the false charge. Notice, he said, "Something else my friend **is trying to say is**, that this would be confusing to God because he could not understand everyone praying at the same time and using different words." Mr. Forsythe said **I was trying to say that**; however, I was **not** trying to, and **I didn't!** He should apologize for the misrepresentation.

I asked my opponent about 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 in the light of his brethren's practice. His response was simply that his brethren follow the Bible on this point. However, that is not so! I have been present in many of their assemblies in which women violated Paul's instruction. Their women preach, testify, make announcements, etc. in direct disobedience to Paul's command that they "keep silence"! No, Mr. Forsythe, your brethren do not believe or obey this passage of Scripture.

Another quibble by my opponent has been to the effect that people **must literally lift up their hands** when they pray. From his emphasis on this, he believes that one **cannot pray** unto God without actually and literally raising his hands into the air. I am made to wonder about the person who *has no hands*! Can he pray? What about one who cannot speak? Can he pray? If so, then obviously one **may** pray without speaking orally (aloud) or lifting up his hands (literally). I have repeatedly pointed out the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:8. Mr. Albert Barnes expresses it well: "'Holy hands' here mean hands that are not defiled by sin, and that have

not been employed for any purpose of iniquity. The idea is, that when men approach God they should do it in a pure and holy manner.”

I have demonstrated my friend’s inconsistency on prayer by citing Jesus’ words in Matthew 6:6, “But thou, when thou *prayest*, enter **into thy closet**, and when thou hast **shut the door**, *pray ...*” Mr. Forsythe *refuses* to accept this command **literally**, but he *insists* on applying 1 Timothy 2:8 **literally**. **Why???** He wants to quibble, instead of recognizing that **both** passages are illustrating **principles** relating to prayer. Incidentally, to echo my opponent’s comment: I have seen “**closet**” spelled a lot of times, but I have never seen it spelled “**mind**,” “**conscience**,” or “**hearing**”!

Mr. Forsythe thinks I should mention Psalms 134:1-2. Well, I *would* like to again emphasize his inconsistency on prayer. Since he applies this passage to one’s **posture while praying**, then a person would be *required* to **stand** up when he prays! The passage refers to servants of the Lord who “**stand** in the house of the Lord”! Mr. Forsythe, do you contend that a person **must stand** as well as literally **lift up his hands** when he **prays???** Please tell us about it, since you are the one who introduced this passage. Now, don’t “*overlook*” it, please!

Now, we come again to the Lord’s supper. I have shown that the disciples in the New Testament came together on the first day of the week to partake of the Lord’s supper (Acts 20:7). Mr. Forsythe thinks that “break bread” here refers to a “common meal”; however, the text does not indicate such. In fact, the mention of “the first day of the week” as the occasion when the disciples “came together” shows that this was not simply a common meal. The **first day of the week** was “**when**” the disciples **came together** to “**break bread**”! Of course, the disciples ate common meals *daily*, and they did not need to “come together” to do so! However, the Lord’s supper is eaten when the

disciples “**come together**” (1 Corinthians 11:18-34. Note especially verses 18, 20, 33, 34—“come together”). When did the disciples “come together”? On *the first day of the week* (Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2). One of the purposes for their assembling on this day was to partake of the Lord’s supper in obedience to the command of the Lord (Matthew 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:19-20).

Mr. Forsythe asks, “Does everywhere in the New Testament “Breaking Bread” is mentioned refer to the Lord’s Supper?” No; however, as I have already demonstrated, the context indicates that in Acts 20:7 “break bread” refers to the Lord’s supper. However, the mention made of Paul’s “breaking bread” in verse 11 is not the Lord’s supper, but a common meal taken as refreshment for Paul before his departure. Observe that **the disciples** came together to break bread in verse 7, while only **Paul** is said to have broken bread in verse 11. Thus, there are two separate events referred to: the *Lord’s supper* eaten by all of the disciples (verse 7), and a *common meal* eaten by Paul after the worship was completed (verse 11).

In my third speech I asked Mr. Forsythe a question which he dodged. I asked: “Do you believe it is wrong (sinful) to partake of the Lord’s supper each first day of the week?” What was your answer, sir? Did you say “Yes,” or did you say “No”? He didn’t say either! That is a simple, straightforward question. It is either wrong to do so or it is not. Please tell us which, Mr. Forsythe! Don’t “overlook” it!

My “honorable” opponent refuses to take note of what I said about partaking of the Lord’s supper each Lord’s day, and he continues to misrepresent what I have said. I *have* said, “It is **scriptural** for all Christians to partake of the Lord’s supper on the first day of every week; however, this does not imply in any way that **all Christians are able to assemble every first day of the**

week. Things such as serious illness will sometimes prevent Christians from assembling on the first day of the week, and thus prevent them from eating the Lord's supper." What did my opponent say about this? **Nothing!** He continues to **misrepresent** me by saying that brethren will go to hell if they do not partake of the Lord's supper 52 weeks a year. Mr. Forsythe, why didn't you respond to what I said, instead of **falsely** making this charge?

I asked my opponent the question: "Do you and your brethren come together on the first day of the week to partake of the Lord's supper? If not, how often do you partake of it?" What did he answer? **Nothing!** Absolute silence on this. His "overlooker" is working superbly!

My opponent did answer one question plainly, which I appreciate. I asked: "Is it scriptural for Christians to partake of the Lord's supper on each occasion when practiced by your brethren?" His reply: "Yes." Then, *according to my opponent's argument* on my answer to a similar question, he believes that every member of the United Pentecostal Church (if he claims they are Christians) **must** take the Lord's supper every time it is observed by their brethren or be eternally lost in Hell! Please notice that I am simply applying Mr. Forsythe's reasoning to his own practice. If such "reasoning" proves my practice wrong, then it also proves **your** practice wrong!

With reference to "**footwashing**," my honorable opponent has once again "overlooked" my basic point; that is, where is the **verse of Scripture** where the **church "came together"** for any kind of **footwashing service** such as Mr. Forsythe is contending for? What passage did you cite, my friend? **None!** The verses he has given all refer to an **individual act** of hospitality and personal cleanliness, **not** an act of **worship when the church "comes together"**!

In this same connection he wants to know something that it is

right for an **individual** to do, but wrong for the **congregation** to do. I am going to be quite frank in giving a plain example. It is right for **individuals** who are married to each other to engage in sexual love (Hebrews 13:4; 1 Corinthians 7:2-3). However, it would be wrong to practice such as a **congregational** activity. Does the congregation where you preach practice such as a **congregation**, Mr. Forsythe?

Next my friend turns to **fasting**. I have continually asked him for the passage stating **when** and **under what conditions** Christians are **required** to fast, but he has not offered a Scripture yet! He has cited instances where some fasted, and I have in turn stated that I believe there are occasions during which it may be very appropriate for individuals to fast, such as a period of great sorrow or mourning (Mark 2:18-20). Again, I emphasize that **periodic** fasting is **never commanded** for Christians. Incidentally, what did Mr. Forsythe say about the fact that the *Manual* of the United Pentecostal Church does not even mention **fasting** at all in its *Articles of Faith*! Although it mentions such things as secret societies, public school activities, and conscientious scruples, there is no mention of **fasting**! It is very strange that an act that my opponent thinks is so important would not be mentioned at all in their *Manual*. Once more, Mr. Forsythe “overlooked” these observations in his last speech.

When we come to the question of music in worship, it is interesting to observe that my opponent did not even try to find a verse authorizing mechanical instruments for use in the worship by the church in his last speech. He also entirely **ignored** my *quotations from various lexicons* on this matter, just as he **ignored** my pointing out his **misuse** of Mr. Vine’s definition.

Mr. Forsythe cites James 5:14, relating to the sick calling for the elders of the church. I believe in doing this; however, Mr. Forsythe does not! Because he does not believe that a church is to

have **elders** (plural)! He believes in **one man** who is **the pastor** of the church, even though he cannot find this idea mentioned in the Bible.

My opponent goes to great lengths to try to prove that congregations often met in **houses** in the New Testament. I will **freely grant that**; I have never denied that! However, he also asserts that “**most of the time**” they met in the house of **the elder** (or **minister**). *He did not **prove this**!* He did not and cannot prove that there is to be **one man over the congregation**. As I have already proven from the Scriptures, the congregations in the New Testament had a **plurality** of men (two or more) who **oversee** the work (1 Peter 5:1-3; Acts 20:17, 28; Hebrews 13:17). Mr. Forsythe simply **denies** the **word of God** on this matter.

In citing Acts 20, my opponent again disproves his contention. Notice verse 17: “He [Paul] sent to Ephesus. and called the **elders** [plural] of the church.” The congregation (the only one mentioned) in Ephesus had **elders**, not one man who was the *pastor*! Then verse 28: “Take heed therefore unto **yourselves** [plural], and to all the flock [singular], **over the which** the Holy Ghost hath made you **overseers** [plural], to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.”

My friend “thinks” that he can prove that a **minister** (**preacher**) and an **elder** are one and the same because the term **steward** is applied to both. However, his argument will not stand the test. Let me cite Mr. Vine on the word “steward”: “it is used metaphorically, in the wider sense, of a steward in general, (a) of preachers of the Gospel and teachers of the Word of God, 1 Cor. 4:1; (b) of elders or bishops in churches, Tit. 1:7; (c) of believers generally, 1 Pet. 4:10” (vol. IV, p. 74). Please note that, if a **preacher** is an elder because both are called stewards, then **all believers** are called elders since the word “steward” is applied to them also! Will my opponent accept this conclusion? We will see,

unless he “overlooks” it!

Mr. Forsythe makes a similar argument on the word “Minister.” However, if his argument is so, then **preachers** are also **angels**, since angels are also referred to as “ministers” (Hebrews 1:13-14).

Incidentally, Mr. Forsythe implies that the **preacher** is the *only one* who **speaks** the word of God. Is this what you really believe? Aren’t **all Christians** to speak the word of God? (Cf. Acts 8:1, 4; Titus 2:3-5). My friend, your “arguments” are based upon misrepresentation and perversion!

One more point about the organization of the church. The passages dealing with qualifications of elders (1 Timothy 3:1-7; Titus 1:6-9) tell us that a **bishop (elder) must be ... the husband of one wife!** My opponent has not mentioned how **women** who are **pastors** in United Pentecostal Churches can satisfy this **scriptural requirement!** Mr. Forsythe, is each of these **women pastors** “the **husband** of one wife”? Do they “**rule**” well their own houses (1 Timothy 3:4-5), and thus **usurp authority over their husbands** (1 Timothy 2:12; Titus 2:4-5; Ephesians 5:23-24)? Tell us, where is your scripture for your practice, Mr. Forsythe? Don’t “overlook” this!!!

Finally, in concluding this speech, I want to again point out the reason why Mr. Forsythe does not like **what the Bible says** about elders overseeing the work of the congregation—he **wants all of the oversight for himself!** I quoted from the United Pentecostal Church *Manual* (which he chose to “overlook”) about the “**Pastor’s Authority.**” I will not be able to give that lengthy quotation again here, but you can turn back to my third speech and read it. It is shameful that one will reject the **divine pattern** of church organization, and substitute one of **human origin**. Yet this is exactly what Mr. Forsythe does.

Please study diligently and accept what the **Bible teaches** on

this ... and **all subjects**. Thank you for your attention in this speech.

FORSYTHE'S FOURTH NEGATIVE

Mr. Thrasher, brethren, ladies and gentlemen that read this discussion:

I am thankful for the privilege to come back again for the fourth time and continue to deny my opponent's proposition that he is affirming and point out the inconsistencies and blunders he has made in presenting his false position and answering the arguments that I have presented against him. *His proposition says*, "The Church of Christ of which I am a member is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice and name and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2."

Now, here I want to remind my opponent and our readers that if his church did come into existence at Pentecost in Acts 2 (which it didn't), he cannot associate it with the original because the first Church talked in tongues. So if yours did come into existence, Mr. Thrasher, it must have been across town from the Upper Room where the original Church was born. Kind readers, let us not forget this throughout this discussion, even if there was a specific name for the Church and he had it (which he doesn't) this would not make him the original Church for the simple reason that what he teaches about the Church is so far from what the apostles and the early Church taught. And he talks about the faith once delivered to the Saints. Now, isn't that pitiful? You know it would be easy for me to put on a white jacket and put a sign over my door and tell you that I was a Dentist; but you would certainly find out the difference when you sat down in the chair. This is the same way about Mr. Thrasher's Church. All you have to do is take the Bible and compare his experience, doctrine, practice and worship with that of the first Church and what the apostles and

brethren taught and it is no trouble to see the difference.

Now, I want to go directly to the point of my friend's arguments of his last speech. My friend says he has pointed out some scriptural terms used for the Church (I do not deny these). But what is so peculiar about this is the fact that my friend refuses to use any of these names for identification. Why, Mr. Thrasher? I have pressed him hard on this issue in every speech and he has continued to evade the point of issue. Now, there is a reason for this, and I will tell you what the reason is. He knows that if he used any term of identification other than the Church of Christ he would lose the fellowship of his brethren and be branded as having an unscriptural name. He has had a lot to say about the United Pentecostal Church and its identification. Well, I offered to put on our Church sign **The Church of Jesus Christ** if he would identify his with a sign, **The Church of the Lord Jesus Christ**. What was his answer to this? Absolute silence-----.

I have pointed out in every speech that the term, Church of Christ, was never used in making reference to the Church. Has he made an effort to answer this? No! He goes to Romans 16:16; that shows possession and not a positive proper name. Then he wants to know my point about the holy kiss. Well, that's easy to see and explain (however, I think my point has already been detected). Here it is: If my friend is going to be so ironclad on identification with Romans 16:16, then he is going to have to be the same with the giving of a little sugar to his brethren. Speak where the Bible speaks, Mr. Thrasher. My friend asked me if I believed this was the only form of greeting to be used? No, but it is for you, Mr. Thrasher, **if** you believe Church of Christ is the only proper term for identification.

Now, he talked about my complaints of his making reference to the United Pentecostal Church. I really don't mind, but I think I know what debating is and that's not the issue. Your Church and

its origin is the issue. Now, Mr. Thrasher, in resorting to the United Pentecostal Church is proving one of three things to be factual: 1. He does not know what debating is. 2. He's flooding me with so many questions about my position to keep me off of his (because he knows he's in a fix) or 3. He sees he cannot prove his position to be right and is **trying** to prove mine wrong.

Now, on what he said about the sign for identification, if my friend will look in the index of the Manual under "Local Church Government," he will find it to read, "*The suggested form of ...*"; the reason we suggest to this is because many groups go under the name "Pentecostal" that are not preaching what we believe to be the truth. This is the reason the sign is *suggested*. Also the affiliation of the local Church or the Minister is not compulsory for fellowship. It is the Biblical experience, the doctrine and the life that is the issue. (Page 106, Article XVII under "Local Assemblies," 1975 edition)

I remember I was having an oral debate with my opponent, Mr. Thrasher, in Myrtle, Mississippi, and one of their preachers was surprised when he saw on the Church sign, "The Church of the Lord Jesus Christ." He also seemed surprised that we fellowshiped brethren and assemblies that were not affiliated with the United Pentecostal Church. Our brethren do not believe the United Pentecostal Church alone to be the Church. We believe it is a part of the Church (Body of Christ) that Jesus Christ is coming after. Mr. Thrasher is as much in error on interpreting the manual as he is the Bible. So don't pay any attention to what he says about either one. I know about Mr. Thrasher and his group well enough that *if they have not changed* (allow space for repentance here), that they condemn every group to hell that does not have Church of Christ written for identification and even a big majority of their own kind. I was telling a man here one time about a debate I was having with Mr. Thrasher and invited him to

come. You know what he said? “No, I am as much against him as I am you!” I wonder why? Because this man believed in three persons in the Godhead (trinity); he believed in baptism for remission of sins (in titles); he didn’t believe in the Holy Ghost, speaking in tongues; he didn’t believe in music in worship; he did believe in communion every Sunday. Now, my opponent believes the very same thing this man here does; yet he believes Mr. Thrasher is going to hell. You say, did he say that? No, but he said he was as much against him as he was me. This should clear up any doubt if you have any about where he put him.

Now, about what was said in former debates. This has been answered. Mr. Thrasher, you had better come to *this* debate.

Now, I want to turn attention here to Holy Ghost Baptism and show you readers how he *tries* to misrepresent what I said about Mark 1:4-8. (This is proof he is trying to dodge the truth and only hurts his position more with the sincere reader). He says, “Forsythe applies the *You* in *all* the land of Judea and Jerusalem to include the *impenitent wicked*.” *I applied no such thing*. This is his way of deliberately quibbling over the truth because he cannot answer Mark 1:4-8 in the light of his position. There’s not a so-called Church of Christ preacher by the name that can. (That’s why they are so called).

Now, if you will look back in my first speech where I introduced these scriptures against his position, here is what you will find. (quote): Mark 1:4-8 says, John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the *Baptism of repentance for the remission* of sins and there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan confessing their sins. (unquote) (Now, anybody knows that the **all** who were baptized were the ones that repented and confessed their sins). Verse 7 says, “And preached, saying, there cometh one mightier than I after me the latchet of

whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. (Note here now who did he preach to?) Verse 5 says **all** the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem.” (This would have to be the **all** in Verse 5 that repented, confessed and were baptized in Jordan). “I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize **you** with the Holy Ghost.” (Note who is the “You” that John speaks of here). All the Land of Judea and Jerusalem that *came out to hear him preach and were baptized*. Now, these verses let us know that every believer and follower of Jesus Christ had the *positive assurance* of being baptized with the Holy Ghost. Now, all an honest person has to do is examine these quotes and know that the Baptism of the Holy Ghost does not pertain to the impenitent wicked. That’s why Mr. Thrasher has not got it. He needs to repent! Now, when John spoke in Mark 1:4, he was speaking to all wicked (no mixed audience). When John spoke in Verse 8 he was speaking to those who had repented, confessed and were baptized (no mixed audience). A mixed audience would not help you anyway, Mr. Thrasher, because you said **only the apostles** were promised the baptism of the Holy Ghost. This is why I brought the contention about Paul and Matthias receiving it (I believe they received it), but according to his position, he cannot believe this. Why? Because of the scriptures he uses to try to prove that only the apostles were promised it. Paul and Matthias were not there; they were not yet apostles and there is no scripture where Jesus said I am just going to give the baptism of the Holy Ghost to the apostles. If there were, Mr. Thrasher would be right, but there is not. The only apostles that were promised the baptism of the Holy Ghost is in the scriptures that my opponent used and he nailed it down real good (against him). Go back and look at the first parts of his second speech how he quotes it in Acts 1:2-8. He says we have a record of the Lord with the **eleven apostles** ... wait for the promise of the Father (eleven

apostles) which saith he, **YE** shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost (eleven apostles) ye shall receive power after the Holy Ghost has come upon you. (eleven apostles) And ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria and unto the uttermost part of the earth (eleven apostles). Now, Mr. Thrasher says to whom was he speaking; he was talking to the apostles (eleven apostles). Not the 120, the 3,000 or everybody in every age (Just the eleven apostles). This is why Paul and Matthias could not have received it, they were not promised it, they were not there, they were not yet apostles. So, according to his logic only the *eleven apostles that he spoke to and promised it to* were the only ones who could receive it. Mr. Thrasher, you are getting into more trouble every time you touch the typewriter keys to explain this. The effort you made to do so in your last speech did not work. Now, he said the gentiles received Holy Ghost baptism *to convince the Jews that Gentiles were gospel subjects*. Read that in the Bible; it's not there. That's his thinking, but it's not there. The Bible says in 1 Corinthians 12:13 by **one Spirit we are all Baptized** into one body whether we be Jews or Gentiles; that's the reason they received it. He also says the Ephesians in Acts 19 did not receive Holy Spirit Baptism. **Prove it!** They spoke in tongues just like they did in Acts 2 and Acts 10. Now, I want to point out some more of his misquotes, adding and blunders. He said only the apostles and the Gentiles at Cornelius' house received Holy Spirit Baptism. I proved in my last speech that the Jews that came with Peter from Joppa, Acts 10:23 had the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, because when the Gentiles received it and spoke in tongues, Peter said they have received the Holy Ghost **as well as we**. (Talking to the Jews that came with him) Acts 10:47. Answer this. You have not mentioned it, Mr. Thrasher. Again when Peter was approached in Acts 11, Verses 1, 2 and 17, by the **apostles and brethren and they of the circumcision** about

the Gentiles and him going to them, he said, God gave them the **like gift as he did unto us**. My opponent never answered this. We want to hear from you, friend. All right, let's look at some more. He said certain Christians received miraculous Gifts of the Spirit administered by laying on of the apostles' hands and he gives Acts 6:5-6 and Acts 8:17-18. I challenge you to read miraculous Gift or Measure in these scriptures. It's not there. That's your logic and thinking, my friend. Again he says, all Christians receive the Holy Spirit in a non-miraculous way, Acts 5:32. I challenge you to read non-miraculous in that scripture. It's not there. The Bible teaches there is **One Spirit**, Ephesians 4:4, 1 Corinthians 12:13. Such additives used by Mr. Thrasher as Baptismal Measure, Miraculous Measure, Non-Miraculous, Ordinary or Indwelling Measure is not found to be anywhere in the Bible. I know he has not used the word "Measure" in this debate, but he believes that. He is just afraid if he does use it he will get into more trouble. If he doesn't believe in Measures **now**, let him say so; and I will thank God he has repented that much.

Now, he says, my opponent seems to think that all Christians receive the Holy Spirit in the same way the apostles did. Friends, that's the way it came to the Jews, Acts 2, and that's the way it came to the Gentiles, Acts 10. They spoke in tongues, and if Jew or Gentile gets it today, they will get it the same way and you cannot and will not prove any different. My opponent seems to think the Holy Ghost guided only the apostles into all truth, John 16:13. If this be so, then truth stopped at the apostles; not only that Baptism stopped there, the Lord's Supper stopped there, because they are the only ones he gave it to. This is what your position brings you to, Mr. Thrasher. If preaching was not just as authoritative today as Paul's, Peter's, John's, etc., then no one could get salvation today (I am talking about New Testament preachers that preached what they preached). Of course, this

does not include Mr. Thrasher, because he does not believe his is authoritative. He just said it by the statement he made to this effect in his last speech.

Now, he says Luke was inspired because he received the spiritual Gift of Prophecy by laying on of the apostles' hands. Read that in the Bible; it's not there. Where did any of the apostles lay their hands on Luke to give him a miraculous gift? Where does it **say** the apostles laid their hands on anyone for the purpose of giving them a miraculous gift? It's not there. Oh well, just some more of Mr. Thrasher's dodging blunders.

Now, he says it is inaccurate to say that what John preached pertained to all that would enter the kingdom of God. You are wrong again, Mr. Thrasher. John preached repentance, confession, baptism in water for remission of sins and He (Jesus) shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost. That is exactly what the New Testament preachers preach today (That's why you are not a New Testament Preacher).

The only difference in John's baptism and that of the New Testament preacher today was what was said over the candidate. Acts 19:4-5. John's baptism pointed them to Christ, St. John 3:28-30; that of today puts one in Christ, Romans 6:3; Galatians 3:26-28. Mr. Thrasher says John never promised that every person would be baptized with the Holy Ghost. You are the one that misapplies, my friend. Everyone that John baptized he told them that He (Jesus) would baptize them with the Holy Ghost, Mark 1:8; and that's not about right, **that is right**. You tell us how many that was, Mr. Thrasher????? According to Mark 1:5, it must have been quite a few. I don't know how many, but I do know this, it was more than just the eleven apostles. By the way, maybe you would like to tell us if any of the apostles were there??????

Now, my opponent says, Mr. Forsythe asserts that the 120 received Holy Spirit Baptism on Pentecost; his basic assumption is

that all of the 120 were in the upper room on Pentecost. Friend, there are no assertions or assumptions to it; **that's what the Bible teaches**. I ask our readers to examine the arguments again. However, here I will give some more. Acts 1:13 says, And when they were come in they went up into an upper room. Verse 14 said, these **all continued** with **one accord** in prayer and supplication, and Verse 15 says, and in **those days** Peter stood in the midst of the disciples and said (the number of names together were about an hundred and twenty). Can you count, Mr. Thrasher? Come on now, I'll help you, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 ... and so on ... Maybe that's one thing he never learned in school. That's odd; I believe it was one the first things I learned. Now, they did go in there, Verse 13, also these **all** continued with **one accord** in prayer, Verse 14, and in **those days** Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples (the number of names together were about an hundred and twenty). Now, Verse 15 shows that *days elapsed* and the hundred and twenty were still there. Now, read Acts 2:1, and when the day of Pentecost was fully come, **they were all** (who? the 120) **with one accord** (about 120) **in one place** (Where? The Upper Room) Here please read Verses 13, 14 & 15 again of Acts 1 and compare with Acts 2:1. Do you know who Mr. Thrasher said occupied Acts 2:1? *The Twelve Apostles*. He couldn't prove that to save his proposition or even his life if he had to.

Now, about his little silly wacky contention and the 3,000. My friend, the issue is not how many were in there when the preaching came, but how many were in there when the Holy Ghost came. And what do I deny about your sitting in the house statement? All right, because of your verbal statement, (quote) "that on the day of Pentecost, the apostles were sitting in a house (Acts 2:1-2)." You said it mentioned the apostles. Find the word in Acts 2:1-2 You would like for it to say that; but it does not. I believe the apostles were there but they were not all that were

there. The Bible says it filled all the house where they were sitting. Acts 2:2. (and I just proved who **they** were) Acts 1:13, 14, 15. Acts 2:1. No, the Bible did not say **the apostles were sitting in a house**.

Now, Mr. Thrasher on *your language blunder* (not mine) from your second speech, "The apostles were the one who spoke in languages they had not studied so that all those who came together could hear the gospel preached in their *own native languages*." Now, he says "my scholarly (enough to figure out your blunders) opponent makes an unwarranted assumption." No, you did, my friend. Mr. Thrasher says the Bible did not mention 16 different languages. I did not say it did, my friend; but you did. Prove it. All right, the **plurality** is **your implication** of more than one (language); and the "**own native**" is *your implication of different languages*. Don't accuse me of having anything to do with creating this 16 languages business. That's your adopted thought, my friend. All I know is you have 12 preachers preaching at one time, (in tongues) all different, to sixteen represented nations with their **own native language**. What a fix my friend is in!

Now, on the subject of prayer, I believe we can meditate or pray silently, but when the saints came together for a prayer meeting or praying in worship, I believe they prayed aloud. I proved this in Acts 4:23-31. Acts 20:36-38. The scriptures Mr. Thrasher used in 1 Corinthians 14:28 for *his silent* praying applies to speaking in tongues and he tries to make an application here of one man praying and all the rest keeping quiet. See if you can find it there, reader friends. He also uses 1 Corinthians 14:40, let everything be done *decently and in order*. If this be so, then everything that is not done silently is not *decently* and *orderly*. These scriptures do not fit your position. They are a long way from it, friend.

Now, you say I made a *false charge*. No, I don't need to sum

up false charges to take care of you; all I need is the truth and I have that. I don't believe a person apologizes for something he does falsely; I believe he apologizes for something he does accidentally or unintentionally. Falsity does not apologize; it repents. Therefore, I do not apologize, because you said I made a *false charge*.

Now, about 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, Mr. Thrasher has yet to prove this "Just a worship service" and if your women in church are going to keep silent in the rest of you are going to have to jump on (1 Corinthians 14:1, *desire spiritual gifts*; Verse 2, speak to God in an unknown tongue; verse 5, all speak with tongues; verse 14, pray in an unknown tongue). These men, like Mr. Thrasher, grab these two verses about women keeping silent in the churches and drop all these other scriptures like a hot potato I mentioned here, and call themselves the Church of the New Testament. Now, I think we have another member of the "Silence Club" and *I don't believe it's a woman*.

On the lifting of Holy Hands, 1 Timothy 2:8, my opponent continues to try and deny this without touching the scripture I gave and resorts to Commentaries and Lexicons instead. (Which has not helped his position) including how Mr. Barnes expressed it, "Holy Hands not defiled by sin, not employed for any purpose of iniquity." This does not help you. Where did he dissolve the "lifting"? Actually, what Paul was saying in 1 Timothy 2:8 was, when you lift your hands be sure they are Holy, not defiled by sin, not employed for any purpose of iniquity. You see, Mr. Thrasher, I believe the Bible teaches the walk a man has with God is what causes him to raise his hands in worship to God. This happened before Paul wrote 1 Timothy 2:8. Read 1 Kings 8:22-23; Psalms 134:2. The early Church had this experience and also the Church today has it. That's why you don't practice it; you do not have the experience. You say, "I wonder about a person who has no

hands?" If he has none to lift up, he has none that have been defiled by sin or iniquity; and if he has none to be defiled, he has none to cleanse and keep holy. (They always come back with things like this; but it does not dissolve what Paul said in 1 Timothy 2:8).

Now, he says, "Forsythe refuses to accept closet literally but applies 1 Timothy 2:8 literally. Why???" Well, that's simple. We can't drag *a big closet* around *everywhere we go*. Paul said, pray *everywhere lifting up* Holy hands.

Now, he makes contention about "Standing" being required. Well, it must be required for him, because I believe all of their congregations I have ever been in they were asked to stand when prayer was called.

Now, on the Lord's Supper, Acts 20:7-11, Mr. Thrasher says, Forsythe thinks that breaking bread here refers to a common meal. I think (nor said) no such thing. See if you can find it in my speeches??? I said, they did not break bread in Acts 20:7. Listen to what it says, "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ..." Mr. Thrasher in his speech adds a "**then Paul preached.**" I reminded him there's no "**then**" there and he has overlooked me calling his attention to this. The reason? He knows without the "**then**," he is helpless in trying to prove they broke bread before the preaching. It said they came together "**to**" break bread (it didn't say they broke it). It said, "Paul preached unto them." I pointed out in my last speech the only difference in verse 7 and verse 11 of Acts 20 about the bread is, that in verse 7, it wasn't broken and eaten, but in verse 11 it was broken and eaten. There's no *common meal involved*; that's my opponent's theory. Now, I have not denied this to be the Lord's Supper. But it was not taken in verse 7 on the first day of the week; it was taken in verse 11 after the first day of the week had passed. Mr. Thrasher *added*

Lord's Supper to verse 7 and *common* with Paul's name in verse 11 to try and push his point across. He said Paul broke bread by himself in verse 11 and he yet has that to prove. If it had of been a meal (which it wasn't), it would have been *uncommon* because that time of morning is *not proper eating time*. This is just *one* of some more things in this debate he has *backwards*.

There is one more thing that is kind of shocking; all of the so-called Churches of Christ I ever attended always *preached before taking the Lord's Supper*. If this still be so, Mr. Thrasher is going to have to change this and change all of you like him before he can hold this position. Remember now, he believes in doing *everything decently and in order*.

Now, he said I dodged the question about taking the Lord's Supper the first day of the week. Let the reader be the Judge; go back and look in my third speech. The first day of *every week* is the issue. The Bible does not say *how often* to take it, but it says as oft as ye do this, 1 Corinthians 11:26. I haven't gotten my friend to deal with this scripture yet. And again, he says I misrepresented him when I said his people would go to hell if they did not take it 52 weeks a year. Go back and read what I said (quote) No, that's just the position he has put *himself* in with his arguments; *if the scriptures teach you must take it every week* (unquote). (according to his position). Mr. Thrasher, several times you have tried to prejudice the readers against me; this actually helps me, because it only continues to expose the weakness and weakening ... of your position.

Now, Mr. Thrasher asked, "Do you and your brethren come together on the first day of the week to partake of the Lord's Supper? If not, how often do you partake of it?" The point my friend is trying to press out here is that we have no scriptural position for taking the Lord's Supper. Now, as far as a scriptural time, place or how often, the scriptures set no binding position; I

have proven this. My friend has not proven where it was ever taken on the first day of the week, much less the first day of *every week*. The Bible does not say how often, but it says as oft as ye do this, 1 Corinthians 11:26. Now, as far as where I get scripture for how often, if you will look real hard, it could be (according to you) right under that one that tells you *when* and *how often* to have one of your (so-called) gospel meetings.

Now, back to the subject of footwashing. He said the verses I have given do not apply to the Christian washing feet. Who does it apply to; just the apostles? My friend makes reference to the scriptures I gave but he refuses to quote or make an effort to explain any of them. He says the verses he has given all refer to an individual act of hospitality and personal cleanness, not an act of worship when the Church comes together. I challenge him to read this in any of the verses. I am going over them again: John 13:14, *if I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet.*" Verse 15 says, *For I have given you an example (here also read 1 Peter 2:21) that ye should do as I have done unto you.* Now, Jesus said in verse 16, the Servant is not greater than his Lord. I want to say here, Mr. Thrasher is above his Lord. Why? He claims he is a servant of Jesus Christ, but yet refuses to wash feet. He has not even attempted to shake my position on this with (his) personal cleanness, hospitality, situations where it is needed and Davis Dictionary of the Bible. I gave scripture in 1 Timothy 5:10 where a widow could not be taken in unless she had washed the saint's feet. Deal with the scriptures in St. John 13, my friend. Nower said (in this same connection) he wants to know something that is right for the individual to do, but wrong for the congregation to do. Did you notice the answer that my poor bewildered opponent gave? Mr. Thrasher, the issue is in *worship*. My friend, do you actually connect Hebrews 13:4 and 1 Corinthians 7:2-3 with worship?

There's no reflection here on our part at all; it only shows that you don't know the difference between lovemaking and worship. The reflection is on you and your congregation, not mine.

We turn now to fasting. Again, he tries to escape the pressure put on him by asking for passages of scripture where periodic fasting was commanded; I don't have to show that. This would come under the word "Practice" in his proposition (everything that was done by the early Church). Jesus emphasized "Fasting," Mark 2:18-20. Mr. Thrasher applies this to just the crucifixion; Jesus applied it to the bride (church). It was preached to the Church by the Apostle Paul, 1 Corinthians 7:5. Now, my friend has asked me to cite passages where the Church fasted and under what conditions. I have done this. Acts 13:3, the Church fasted when workers were sent out. Acts 14:23, the Church fasted when elders were ordained (I asked him did he do this). SILENCE ... His doesn't even have elders where he preaches (unless they appointed them since this debate started). Answer this my friend; if your Church is not doing this, you are not *practicing* what the early Church did. My opponent has *refused* to answer these scriptures. Now, he brings up the *Manual* and misrepresents it again. It does not specify the word "Fasting," but it's covered under Holiness in the Articles of Faith. (quote) Godly living should characterize the life of every child of the Lord, and we should *live according to the pattern and example given in the Word of God*. (unquote) Here read Titus 2:11-12.

Now, on the music, my opponent makes another attempt to prejudice the readers against me by saying that I ignored and misused Vine's definition of melody. When the truth of the matter is my opponent is the one who is guilty of misuse. Prove it? All right, he says, "*denotes in the N.T. to sing a hymn, sing praise*. (my friend left off what disfavored him. Naturally) Well, here is the way it reads, "Sing psalms, denotes, in the N.T. to *sing* a hymn.

sing praise" (this means that where just the word '*sing*' is used; that's what it refers to). In Ephesians 5:19, "Making Melody" (this means that there is something involved here *other than singing*, which would be playing an). *Elsewhere it is rendered sing* (this means *but not in Ephesians 5:19*). Romans 15:9; 1 Corinthians 14:15 in James 5:13 R.V., Let him *sing* praise, (A.V. Let him *sing* psalms) *See sing*. It looks like my friend has resorted to twisting the commentaries and dictionaries as well as the Bible. I said in my last speech that if Mr. Thrasher holds his position on the word "Melody" to just mean "Sing" in the New Testament, here is the way he is having you to read Ephesians 5:19: Speaking to yourselves in *singing* and *singing* and spiritual songs *singing* and making *singing* in your heart to the Lord. What did he say about this????? Nothing! Mr. Thrasher, I have told you all along (in this debate) that Ephesians 5:19 authorizes musical instruments in worship; when you do something with this scripture (which you can't), I will give you some more. Ephesians 5:19 says, "Singing *and* making *melody*." Anybody knows that the conjunction here gives an additional melody other than singing, also any musical authority will tell you there are only *two* kinds of melody; *one* is *singing* (vocal) *and* the other is *instrumental* (playing). Therefore, *both of these are mentioned* in Ephesians 5:19. Now, if 1 John 3:4 says *sin is the transgression of the law* and Paul said in Romans 4:15, *where no law is there is no transgression*, then what my opponent is *obligated to prove* in this debate is what law I transgress or what scriptures I violate when I play a musical instrument in worship?????

Now, on the subject of elders praying for the sick (their elders); if any of theirs ever have anointed with oil and prayed for the sick, it is unknown to me. Also my friend says he believes in this. Well, I say he doesn't believe in (or practice) this. Because he has no so-called elders in the Church where he preaches now

(unless he has appointed some since this debate started); also preachers cannot pray for the sick (His preachers that is). Because the Bible teaches him (according to his position) to call *the elders* (not the preacher). Therefore, my friend has *no scriptural authority whatsoever to pray for the sick*. Every time he does, he *violates* the scriptures according to his position. Also something else my opponent has misrepresented is that James was not writing to *one congregation*. Read James 1:1, please.

Now, in closing, I want to point out my friend's *blunders and failures* he has made on his "Elder" argument. First, he comes back and tries to revive his scriptures, 1 Peter 5:1-3, Acts 20:17-28, Hebrews 13:17 and says Forsythe denies the Word of God on this matter. No, I proved the Word of God, (you are backwards again). 1 Peter 5:1-3 does not prove *Elders in one congregation*, because Peter was writing to the *strangers scattered* throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia. You never answered this!!!! Acts 20:17-28 does not prove *one congregation* at Ephesus, because Paul said in verse 20 (to the Elders), I have taught you from *House to House*; this means where each elder was having Church. I proved this by citing other scriptures of the same nature. 1 Corinthians 1:11, *House of Chloe*. Verse 16, House of Stephanas; 1 Corinthians 16:19, Aquila and Priscilla with the *Church that is in their House*. Philippians 4:22, they of Caesars *Household*. Colossians 4:15, Nymphas and the *Church which is in his House*. Philemon, Verse 2, Archippus and *the Church in thy House*. Also I used in my last speech Colossians 4:17, proving Archippus to be *a Minister*. My friend, you are supposed to answer these scriptures in the light of your position. Find us some of *your elders* in these *Houses* (congregations) that hire and fire the preacher, pay him a certain salary by writing him a check each week and tell him what to preach. So, before resort to Mr. Vine's definition of words, you had better answer what the Bible says!

Now, what did you say about what Jesus said in Mark 10:42-43, the Minister being the chiefest? Nothing! What did he say about all the parlanes I used that fit his scriptures proving that Elder, Steward, Minister, Preacher, Servant, Bishop and Chief all designate the same *when referring to the leadership and overseeing of the congregation in the New Testament Church*. Nothing!!!! (Readers, please go back and read my third speech on this). In Ephesians 4:11-12, he gave some Apostles and some prophets and some evangelists and some *Pastors* and teachers for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the *Ministry*; this proves two things: That God uses all of those in verse 11 for the perfecting of the saints (His Church) and that the word “Pastor” is associated to the Ministry. Now, my opponent resorts again to *Vine on the Word “Steward,”* but this is no help to him against my argument. This applies to each Christian being but a steward in works of spiritual activity besides speaking and is in relation to outward service rather than moral and intellectual ability. He misapplies this verse. Read and study the context of 1 Peter 4:8-10.

Now, he also says if my argument on Minister is right, then preachers are angels, since *angels* are also *referred to as ministers*, Hebrews 1:13-14. You are *wrong again*, my friend. *Angels are not referred to as ministers*. Read the text. Angels are *ministering spirits*, preachers are *ministering men*. What you are saying with this is that every time we see the word, “Minister” it means *Preacher*. With this you take a dose of your own medicine. Matthew 8:15, Peter’s wife’s mother *ministered to them*. She was a preacher (according to Thrasher). In Acts 20:34, Paul said these hands have *ministered* my needs. Paul’s hands were preachers (according to Mr. Thrasher). Now, it is no trouble for an intelligent person to see that my friend has run out of arguments and that all he has used against mine has backfired on him.

I will have to close since I have run out of time. I will answer the remainder in my next speech.

Questions For Mr. Thrasher:

1. Did John say to all of them he baptized in Mark 1:8 that Jesus would baptize them with the Holy Ghost? Yes_____ No_____

2. Since you say that Elders (your Elders) have the authority and oversight of the congregation, then why did Paul write to Timothy (*a minister* 1 Timothy 4:6) and exhort him to instruct the congregation, 1 Timothy 3:15, 2 Timothy 4:2 instead of writing to the Elders?

3. Will you please point out to us the preachers in the congregations of the early Church, as in Acts, the Epistles, etc.?

4. If your position on Elders is right, then explain to us why Titus had *all the authority*, Titus 2:15, instead of the Elders?

Give your attention to Mr. Thrasher. Thank you.

THRASHER'S FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE

Mr. Forsythe, ladies and gentlemen:

Once again it is a privilege to continue the affirmation of the proposition that “The church of Christ, of which I am a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice, and name, and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2.” In my very first affirmative speech, and also in the speeches since then, I have presented the teaching of the Scriptures concerning the points mentioned in the proposition: (1) the origin of the church of Christ, (2) the doctrine or teaching, (3) its practice, and (4) its scriptural designations. Although my friend and opponent, Mr. Forsythe, has *referred* to many of the statements I have made, he has not really *dealt with the arguments*. Instead, he has resorted to quibbling, misrepresentation, and perversion, several instances of which I have pointed out already in this discussion. I would have expected better of my friend, but I realize that he is struggling hard to overturn the Truth, and is, therefore, laboring under extreme difficulty. Let us review the things that he has had to say, keeping in mind that all of us will one day stand before the eternal and almighty God to give account of how we have received His word.

Mr. Forsythe has somewhat to say about “talking in tongues.” His argument is that the church of Christ, of which I am a member, cannot be “the original” church “because the first Church talked in tongues.” In fact, my opponent and his brethren do not understand what “speaking in tongues” was in the Bible. Tongues were languages—understandable, intelligible languages that were actually spoken by various nationalities (cf. Acts 2:4, 6-11). The gift of speaking in tongues such as the apostles did on

Pentecost was the ability to speak a language that one had not learned naturally through study. It was **not** mere mumbling or gibberish such as that which many call “tongues” today. I have been present in the assemblies of Mr. Forsythe’s brethren on numerous occasions when some supposedly “spoke in tongues,” yet what they uttered was not an understandable language, it was the result of the highly emotional situation that the people had stirred up by their handclapping, shouting, feet-stomping, etc. Furthermore, no effort was made to “interpret” these so-called tongues as the apostle Paul said to do with the tongues of the New Testament (1 Corinthians 14:13, 27-28). The word of God says, “But if there be no *interpreter*, let him **keep silence** in the church.” Even if Mr. Forsythe and his brethren (and sisters) had the gift of tongues (which they don’t), they still would be condemned for not doing what the apostle says about it. The truth is that speaking in tongues such as mentioned in these verses was a temporary gift—it was to **cease** (1 Corinthians 13:8). Many so-called churches, including the United Pentecostal Church, claim the gift of tongues today, yet they continue to teach many *conflicting* and *contradictory* doctrines. Mr. Forsythe, do all of these who **claim** to “speak in tongues” **actually** do so? They make the same claim that you and your brethren do. Nonetheless, the Bible says “tongues” **ceased!** I accept what the Scriptures say.

My opponent continues to quibble about the “name” of the church. He refuses even to try to understand what I have contended for in this connection. I have pointed out again and again that there are several **scriptural** terms that may be used, including “the church” (Ephesians 3:10; 5:25), “the church of God” (2 Corinthians 1:1), “the kingdom” (Colossians 1:13), “the body” (Colossians 1:18), “the flock of God” (1 Peter 5:2), “the house of God” (1 Timothy 3:15), “the bride” (Revelation 21:9), and “churches of Christ” (Romans 16:16). I use **all** of these terms,

because they are **scriptural**! Yet my opponent acts as if I had never pointed all of this out. Instead, he **pretends** that I am affirming that the term “church of Christ” is the one and only designation that may be used. This I emphatically deny and have always denied. **I do affirm** that one must “speak as the oracles of God” (see 1 Peter 4:11), while Mr. Forsythe apparently does not. He believes one may use the term **United Pentecostal Church**, a term which is never found (or hinted at even remotely) in the Bible.

Mr. Forsythe continues his misrepresentation on this matter by saying, “I know about Mr. Thrasher and his group well enough that *if they have not changed* (allow space for repentance here), that they condemn every group to hell that does not have Church of Christ **written for identification**” (emphasis his). This is a complete perversion of what I contended for. I challenge him to find just one quotation from me to the effect that a congregation must have “*Church of Christ*” **written for identification**. I believe that a congregation may use any (and all) **scriptural** designations.

The problem with my opponent and his brethren is that they want to delight in a *human* rather than a *Bible* name. I pointed out in my previous speech that the United Pentecostal Church **Manual** even requires identification “by sign or otherwise on the outside of its church building that it is associated with the United Pentecostal Church” (1973 edition, page 95). My opponent tries to dodge the consequences of this quotation by saying, “If my friend will look in the index of the **Manual** under ‘Local Church Government,’ he will find it to read, ‘*The suggested form of ...*’”; the reason we suggest to this is because many groups go under the name ‘Pentecostal’ that are not preaching what we believe to be the truth. This is the reason the sign is *suggested*.” Mr. Forsythe, I did look in the **Index** under “**Local Church Government**” and it does say “Suggested Form of”; **however**, the

quotation I gave about “*Identification*” is **not listed under “Local Church Government”**—it is listed under the heading “**Local Assemblies**”! According to the **Index**, the statement regarding “Suggested form of” does not apply to “*Identification*”! The quotation I gave stands.

Mr. Forsythe says, “It would be easy for me to put on a white jacket and put a sign over my door and tell you that I was a Dentist,” but that would not make him a dentist. He is right about that! Putting a sign up that says “**Dentist**” does not make that person a dentist. And, of course, putting a sign up that says “**church of Christ**” would not necessarily make that congregation of people the church of Christ. One would need to investigate further to find out. But I will tell you this: If I saw a sign that said “**Gas Station**,” I would know not to look for a *dentist* there, and if I see a sign that says “**United Pentecostal Church**,” I know not to look for the *church of Christ* there!

Incidentally, several times Mr. Forsythe has used such expressions as “Mr. Thrasher’s Church.” My friend, I do not have a church! The church of which I am a member is **the Lord’s**. He added me to it when I obeyed the gospel (cf. Acts 2:47). And if you would accept the Truth, you could also be a member of that church!

Mr. Forsythe says that Romans 16:16, “The churches of Christ salute you,” shows possession and is not a positive proper name. Certainly, I agree that the expression “churches of Christ” indicates **possession**: the congregations that belong to Christ! However, my point, which my opponent has consistently dodged, is that this is a **scriptural designation** for the church. It is not the only scriptural term, but it is one! The term **United Pentecostal Church**, which Mr. Forsythe uses, is **not** a scriptural designation for the church of the Bible. I ask again: why not “speak as the oracles of God” by using terms of divine revelation?

With reference to this matter of the “holy kiss” mentioned by my opponent, my brethren and I often use this, as well as other forms of greeting, the most common being (in our society) a handshake. The “holy kiss” was not the only form of greeting then and is not now. However, Mr. Forsythe had better be careful with his remarks about that which the Bible calls a “**holy** kiss.” He thinks of it as “giving of a little sugar to his brethren”! My friend, your reference does not demonstrate a very high regard for that which the Bible calls “**holy**”!

I want to thank my opponent for admitting that the “holy kiss” is not the only form of greeting to be used. He says, “My friend asked me if I believed this was the only form of greeting to be used? No, but it is for you, Mr. Thrasher, **if** you believe Church of Christ is the only proper term for identification.” Please observe that, since I have stated several times that any (and all) **scriptural terms** may be used “for identification,” then it follows that any form of greeting (consistent with the principles of holiness) may be used by my brethren and me!

Mr. Forsythe objects (though he now says he doesn’t really mind my doing it) to my mentioning the **United Pentecostal Church**. He cries, “That’s not the issue”! The fact is that I have simply been showing Mr. Forsythe’s **inconsistency** of argument and practice! He has shown his refusal to sign a proposition affirming the scripturalness of the United Pentecostal Church in the past, and he still will not do it. I have the original proposition which we signed, eventually resulting in this discussion. A second proposition was directly below it but was crossed out by Mr. Forsythe. It reads: “The Scriptures teach that the United Pentecostal Church, of which I am a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, practice, and name.” He refused to sign it! I might add that he did sign a proposition with brother Drew Falls, in which Mr. Forsythe would have denied brother Falls’ affirmation

that the United Pentecostal Church is unscriptural. However, Mr. Forsythe later “backed out” of having that debate.

My opponent states: “Our brethren do not believe the United Pentecostal Church alone to be the Church. We believe it is a part of the Church....” Friends, it is not a part of the church of the New Testament! Its “name” is not mentioned in the New Testament! Its “Executive Board” is not mentioned In the New Testament! Neither is its “**Manual**,” its “General Constitution,” its “District Constitution,” its “General Superintendent,” its “Assistant General Superintendent,” its “Headquarters,” its “Boards” and “Committees,” etc., etc., etc.!!! It is simply an unscriptural, man-made, denomination!

Mr. Forsythe mentions a man who “didn’t believe in the Holy Ghost” and “didn’t believe in music in worship,” then adds “my opponent believes the very same thing this man here does.” You are wrong, Mr. Forsythe. I believe in the Holy Ghost—He is one of three Divine personalities in the Godhead. I will not extend fellowship to one who does not believe in the Holy Ghost! Furthermore, I believe in music in worship—vocal music (singing). I will not extend fellowship to anyone who does not (will not!) sing praises unto God. The man you referred to does not believe the same thing I do, **if you represented him fairly!**

With reference to “former debates” my friend says, “This has been answered.” This is not so! I have found that the so-called “Pentecostal” debaters will make many unguarded statements in a debate, then in later debates will pretend that they didn’t make them, or that they did not mean what they said. They cannot consistently take a firm position on their “pet” (**false**) doctrines, but they argue *this way* one time and *that way* the next.

With reference to Mark 1:4-8, Mr. Forsythe asserts that the “all” does not refer to the “impenitent wicked” but only to those who repented and confessed their sins. If that is his position, then

I certainly want to represent him accurately. However, in his third speech he had said: “Who was the **‘you’** in Verse 5 that *John said* would receive the Baptism of the Holy Ghost? **All** the land of Judea and they of Jerusalem.” My opponent did not restrict the **“all”** in that statement, but he now wants to do so. He still does not have the proof for his doctrine that people *today* may receive Holy Spirit baptism. In the first place, *nobody* living today is (or could be) included within the promise that John made in these verses. How many people **today** were present when John preached in Mark 1? As *Mr. Forsythe* applies the statement of John (“I indeed have baptized *you* with water: but he shall baptize **you** with the Holy Ghost”), it would include only those who “came out to hear him preach and were baptized”! Thus, neither my opponent nor any of his brethren are included, since **none** of them heard John preach or were baptized by him! My friend, even **your application** of this text does not help your position that people **today** may receive Holy Spirit baptism. Not only that, but the text does not say that those people to whom it does refer **might** receive Holy Spirit baptism. It says, “He **SHALL baptize you with the Holy Ghost**”! My opponent believes that He **MAY**. Furthermore, I know that people are not being baptized in the Holy Spirit **today** because the apostle Paul said there is “**one baptism**” (Eph. 4:5)! This *one baptism* is **water baptism** by the authority of Jesus Christ (Mark 16:15-16; Acts 8:38-39; 1 Peter 3:21). If Holy Spirit baptism were still in effect, that would make **two baptisms**, when the word of God says “**one**”! Mr. Forsythe is simply mistaken on the matter of Holy Ghost baptism. He relies on emotion rather than the word of God.

Mr. Forsythe argues that I contended only the apostles were promised Holy Spirit baptism, but that this would include only the “eleven” apostles (excluding Matthias and Paul). No, my friend, you need to read the Scriptures with an open mind to determine

the Truth. In Acts 1:15-26 the apostle Peter explains that one man was to become an apostle to take the place of Judas: “And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, ... show whether of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship.... and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles” (Acts 1:24-26). Thus, Matthias had part in the apostleship to the same degree as the “eleven”! Furthermore, Paul was appointed to the apostleship to the same degree as the other apostles (cf. 2 Corinthians 12:11; Acts 9:15-16; 1 Corinthians 8:1-2).

Mr. Forsythe states that the Jews who came with Peter to Cornelius’ house “received the Holy Ghost.” Certainly, I believe that every person who obeys the gospel of Christ receives the Holy Spirit as a gift (cf. Acts 2:38; 5:32; Romans 8:9). However, the trouble with my opponent and his brethren is that whenever they see the words “Holy Ghost” (or related terms), they automatically think of Holy Spirit **baptism**. They **assume** that it is Holy Spirit **baptism**. Yet in our previous debate on this subject, my opponent has acknowledged that it was possible for some to have received the Holy Spirit, but **not** have received Holy Spirit **baptism**! It is amazing that my opponent cannot (or will not) understand that people can receive the *Holy Spirit* without receiving Holy Spirit **baptism**!

Mr. Forsythe says, “The Bible teaches there is **one Spirit**.” That is right! However, that does not mean that the **one Spirit** gives to everyone the **same gift** (cf. 1 Corinthians 12:4). What my opponent **assumes** is that, since there is one Spirit, every person **must** receive exactly the *same gift*—to the same *degree* and *extent*. I wonder if he will be consistent on his argument and claim the **same gift** (to the **same degree** and the **same extent**) as the **apostles** had! Does he have the power to **raise the dead** (Acts 20:9-12; 9:36-41)? Can he do the “**signs of an apostle**” (2

Corinthians 12:12)? Can he do *anything* that any other person who received the Holy Spirit in the New Testament could do? If so, why doesn't he do so? If not, then there is living proof that people may receive the same Spirit, but to a different degree or extent (in other words, a different **gift**).

My opponent says, "I know he has not used the word 'Measure' in this debate, but he believes that. He is just afraid if he does use it he will get into more trouble." Mr. Forsythe, you are mistaken about my being afraid to use the word "**measure**"—in fact, the word "measure" is a Bible term (Romans 12:3; Ephesians 4:7, 13, 16; etc.). I do not hesitate to use scriptural terms, as I have already emphasized (1 Peter 4:11). It is strange, however, that Mr. Forsythe is so interested in bringing things that I have not introduced (remember, I am in the affirmative). Perhaps he wants to mention these *other things* so that he can take your mind off of the fact that he is not replying to what I *have stated* in my speeches!

Next, he says, "My opponent seems to think the Holy Ghost guided only the apostles into all truth, John 16:13. If this be so, then truth stopped at the apostles." Is my opponent, Mr. Forsythe, saying that he is guided into the truth **in the same way** that the apostles were—directly by the Holy Spirit? The apostle Paul told the Ephesians that they could understand the revelation of God's word made known unto him by **reading** the inspired writings (Ephesians 3:1-4). That is the way we can know God's will **today**, by reading and studying the Scriptures (John 20:30-31). It is very easy to **claim** direct guidance from God—the Mormons claim it, the Catholics claim it, and so do many others, including Mr. Forsythe, but they do not have it! They do not even do what the New Testament directs us to do. That is why they **claim** inspiration and guidance today for their teaching and practice!

Mr. Forsythe asserts that I do not believe that my preaching is “authoritative.” Well, it depends on what you mean. If you mean “given directly from heaven to me,” no. But if you mean that it is authorized by Jesus Christ through His New Testament, then yes!

Next, my opponent asks about Luke being inspired. He was not an apostle, but he possessed the gift of prophecy, and this gift was given by the apostles’ hands (Acts 6:6-8; Romans 1:11). Incidentally, Mr. Forsythe, where does the Bible **say** that Luke received Holy Spirit baptism??? I am sure that you can find the verse, if it is in the Bible!

Mr. Forsythe says that I was wrong when I said, “It is inaccurate to say that what John preached pertained to **all** who would enter the kingdom.” Well, why didn’t you quote what I said about it, instead of ignoring it like you did. I went on to point out that John preached that people should receive *his baptism* (Mark 1:4). However, John’s baptism is no longer valid baptism (see Acts 18:25-26; 19:1-5). Why didn’t you deal with this, Mr. Forsythe, instead of *asserting* that I was wrong!

My opponent also **asserts**: “The only difference in John’s baptism and that of the New Testament preacher today was what was said over the candidate.” You didn’t **prove** that, Mr. Forsythe! But you did admit that John’s baptism and New Testament baptism are not the same! Thank you.

My friend is just not satisfied with his contention about the 120 being in the upper room on Pentecost. He argues that they were in there sometime before Pentecost, and that the Bible does not say they left; therefore, they remained there throughout the ten days until Pentecost. By exactly the same argument and logic, I pointed out that when Pentecost came the Bible does not say anything about the people leaving the place where they were assembled, but it says the multitude “came together.” Hence, over 3000 were then in the “**upper room**,” according to my

opponent's "powerful" logic!

In fact, the Bible shows that the apostles did not stay in the "upper room" **all of the time** between the ascension of Jesus and the day of Pentecost. Luke 24:51-53 shows that they were continually (frequently, regularly) "in the **temple**"! My opponent just ignores this as he does so many other things I have pointed out in this debate. I invite the earnest seeker for *Truth* to review the points made in my speeches and see how many have been dealt with by my opponent. In some cases, he makes a passing reference to it, but chooses to skip over the real argument or to sidestep it.

I thank Mr. Forsythe for admitting that the *apostles* were *sitting* in a *house* when the day of Pentecost came, just as I said. He quibbles about the word "apostles" not being in Acts 2:2, but he says he believes they were there.

Next, we are referred to the matter of "16 languages" being spoken on Pentecost. Mr. Forsythe simply will not admit his error on this point. I have showed that different languages were spoken by the apostles on Pentecost (Acts 2:4—"tongues"). I said nothing about **how many** were spoken, only that the languages of the various people assembled were spoken. Mr. Forsythe jumped on this by asserting that there were 16 **languages** but only 12 apostles. I stated that the Bible does not mention 16 languages, but 16 or 17 groups of people from various places. He refuses to turn from his error, just as he will not acknowledge the Truth on other matters.

Mr. Forsythe says, "I believe we can meditate or pray silently." Thanks! Our practice is admittedly right and scriptural. He should have said so in the beginning instead of quibbling about prayer in the worship. But he had to find **something** that he could object to!

In response to 1 Cor. 14:34-35, Mr. Forsythe says, "If your

women in church are going to keep silent in verses 34-35, then the rest of you are going to have to jump on (1 Corinthians 14:1, desire spiritual gifts ...). Notice my opponent's approach to my argument on this inspired passage of scripture. He never does tell us why their women **disobey** and **disregard** this part of God's word! He claims to believe 1 Corinthians 14, but he doesn't! Their women do about anything they want to, as far as speaking in worship, without rebuke. In fact, they are often called upon to take a leading part, even to "preach"! Why don't you tell us about this???

I have accused Mr. Forsythe of making a **false charge** with reference to his statement on everyone praying aloud at the same time in the assembly, and **I proved that he falsely charged me**. What did he say? "Falsity does not apologize; it repents." Then why didn't you **repent**? You cannot let it pass by thinking that people will not know any better. They can see the truth.

My opponent comments on "standing" in prayer: "Well, it must be required for him, because I believe all of their congregations I have ever been in they were asked to stand when prayer was called." Perhaps he hasn't been in very many assemblies of my brethren, because "standing" is not an exclusive posture in prayer. However, he dodged my argument, as the reader will see by turning back to my statement. I asked my opponent, do you contend that a person **must stand** as well as literally **lift up his hands** when he **prays**??? He did not answer! He ignores the argument!

Regarding the Lord's supper. my friend says, "All of the so-called Churches of Christ I ever attended always **preached before taking the Lord's Supper.**" This may be so, as far as your experience is concerned, but it is by no means universal. In fact, the congregation where I presently preach normally partakes of the Lord's supper **before** the sermon.

Mr. Forsythe again misrepresents me in the matter of one's "going to hell" for not partaking of the Lord's supper every first day of the week. I invite the reader to go back and read what I actually have stated. However, when I asked him the question: "Do you and your brethren come together on the first day of the week to partake of the Lord's Supper?"—he did not answer! He quibbled around, but he did not answer. Why not? Could it be that he knows he will get into trouble if he tries to answer honestly?

My opponent makes another false statement. Mr. Forsythe says about my comments, "He said the verses I have given do not apply to the Christian washing feet." My friend, I said **no such thing**! I very clearly stated that there were occasions when it is quite appropriate for a Christian to wash another person's feet. However, I said that the Bible does not teach that footwashing is an **act of worship** to be engaged in by the church when it assembles together. Neither did the Lord intend for his disciples to go through the mockery of washing feet that were already clean. My opponent again misrepresents me by saying, "Mr. Thrasher is above his Lord. Why? He claims he is a servant of Jesus Christ, but yet refuses to wash feet." Please tell me of one occasion when one needed his feet washed when I have refused to do it, Mr. Forsythe! You are big on assertions and charges and misrepresentations, but short on **proof**! You were correct when you said, "The issue is in *worship*"! And that is the very **occasion** where you have not proved your position!

With reference to "fasting," I asked Mr. Forsythe why it is not mentioned in their **Manual**. He says, "It's covered under Holiness in the Articles of Faith." He still did not prove that fasting is required for any particular time, according to the Scriptures. When is fasting to be practiced, and for how long, etc.? Please answer this!

With regard to music in worship, my opponent still contends that “making melody” means **playing** on a **mechanical instrument** such as a guitar, piano, etc. However, the **Bible** says, “**Singing and making melody in (with) your heart** to the Lord” (Ephesians 5:19). The Word of God says “**heart**”; my opponent says, “**mechanical instrument**”! Which will you accept?

A further false statement is made by my opponent: “Preachers cannot pray for the sick (His preachers that is).” This is simply not so! I have often prayed for those who are sick. Any Christian may do so! The elders, as the overseers of the congregation, do have a responsibility in this area.

Another false charge: Mr. Forsythe says, “Something else my opponent has misrepresented is that James was not writing to **one congregation**.” Friend, I never said that he did! Where did you read anything like that from me? Please tell us.

Mr. Forsythe fights very hard against the truth of the New Testament that each local church was to have men possessing the qualifications (1 Timothy 3; Titus 1) appointed as elders (plural). He asserts that there were several congregations in Ephesus, each meeting in the house of an elder. However, this is simply not so. When the Lord addressed the remarks of Revelation 2:1-7, he said “the **church**” (**singular**) of Ephesus! Not *churches*, but **church**! My opponent just will not handle the word of God aright. He must uphold his false doctrine!

Another misrepresentation by my opponent is that he says, “What you are saying with this is that every time we see the word, ‘Minister’ it means *Preacher*.” I do not believe, nor have I said, any such thing! Why don’t you at least try to answer the arguments rather than changing the argument and trying to answer that!

In this speech, and in past speeches, I have asked several questions which Mr. Forsythe has not answered. I will not ask others now, but I will expect him to answer the ones already

asked.

As to Mr. Forsythe's questions: (1) no. (2) Paul was writing to the evangelist Timothy so that he might be an effective preacher, not an exclusive teacher of the gospel. He was not given the oversight of any congregation, but he was to teach those who were Christians and those who ought to be. (3) The apostles and evangelists. (4) With all authority here simply means that he was to preach without ambiguity, without holding anything back.

I appreciate your study of these matters and invite your attention to Mr. Forsythe's next speech.

FORSYTHE'S FIFTH NEGATIVE

Mr. Thrasher, ladies and gentlemen, that read this discussion. It is with pleasure that I can come back again and continue to *successfully deny* this proposition that my friend, Mr. Thrasher, is *struggling* to affirm. Mr. Thrasher makes the statement that Mr. Forsythe and his brethren do not understand what speaking in tongues is in the Bible. You are *backwards again*, Mr. Thrasher, you are the ones that do not understand. As a matter fact your English language cannot be understood to writing and explaining the Bible, because of the misrepresentations, perversions, and contradictions that you have made and are continuing to make in this discussion.

What you need to first realize is that when a person speaks in tongues (Scripturally) it is not on their own effort or ability, but as *the Spirit gives utterance*, Acts 2:4 and is the sign, or evidence, that they have been filled, Baptized, or have received the gift of the Holy Ghost. Acts 2:4; Acts 10:45, 46; Acts 11:16, 17, Acts 19:2, 6. What you are doing, Mr. Thrasher, is confusing the tongues that were spoke at Pentecost, and the gift of tongues mentioned in 1 Corinthians chapters 12, 14, when they were at a different time, and for a different purpose. Those at Pentecost *did not receive the gift of speaking in. tongues, they received* the gift of the Holy Ghost. When people receive the gift of the Holy Ghost as in Acts 2, they speak with *other* tongues (languages) as the *Spirit gives the utterance*. When the *gift of tongues* are in operation through someone, it takes the *gift of interpretation* through another for it to be understood, I Corinthians 14:27. Now, gift of the Holy Ghost, filled with Holy Ghost, and Baptism of the Holy Ghost, all refer to the same experience that happened in Acts 2. Scriptures: Acts 1:5;

Acts 2:4; Acts 10:45, 46; Acts 11:16, 17. Let Mr. Thrasher prove different in Acts. He cannot do it to save his proposition or even his life if he had to. He said he had been present in our services and could not understand when they spoke in tongues. That is because you do not have the Holy Ghost or the gift of interpretation either, my friend. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God for they are foolishness to him, neither can he know them because they are Spiritually discerned, 1 Corinthians 2:14. He says tongues are a *temporary gift*. You can't prove that. Where does it say this? A gift is something given or bestowed. Gifts are not given to take back. That's not the nature of giving. Man does not even think on these terms, and how much more can we say of God. Paul told the Church at Corinth (1 Corinthians 1:7, 8), that ye *come behind in no gift* waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall also *confirm you unto the end*. Now, Mr. Thrasher, the Bible does *not say tongues ceased* (past tense). It says in I Corinthians 13:8, whether there be tongues they *shall cease* (future tense), Friends, don't you see how he tries to twist the Scriptures to fit his position. That's why I reject what Thomas N. Thrasher says and take what the Bible says.

Now, on the Name of the Church, I perfectly understand the connection *you have not made*, and that is identifying yourself with another name other than the Church of Christ, and still have the fellowship of your brethren. Any of these names you mentioned will do, just put one in the Church yard, or over the door other than Church of Christ. I suggested a good one in my last speech, Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. What was his answer? Silent as the cemetery tombs. I say these men believe this to be the designated name for the Church, and any other name of identity of sign, etc. would be the wrong name. Now Mr. Thrasher you got yourself into this and the only way to make it

right in this debate is to change signs, and you know when you change signs you had better be ready to change brethren.

I have never seen a Church that supports his doctrine with another name other than Church of Christ, and when you do it will cease to be what *they call Church of Christ* if it changes that shingle on the door.

Now about the name Pentecostal. My friend, you had better stay off of mine until you have done something about your own. You say I can get no Scriptural designation for the Church I am a member of. You are wrong my friend. The assembly where I worshipped before I started pastoring was called the Calvary Pentecostal Church. It was purchased at Calvary and came into existence at Pentecost. I told Mr. Thrasher we use the name United to distinguish us from other groups that go under the name Pentecost, because they do not all preach what we believe to be the truth. Acts 2:1 says, And when the day of *Pentecost* was fully come they were *all* with one accord in one place (that's *United*) and Acts 2:47 says the Lord added to the *Church* 'daily' such as should be saved. Mr. Thrasher can find nowhere in the Bible where the Church was ever called the Church of Christ. I can have as much Church with my name as he can his.

If the Church was to have a proper name, God would have given us some authority on the subject. Mr. Thrasher says putting up a sign does not make a Church of Christ. One would have to investigate further to find out. That's right. When they look in yours they do not find the Acts 2 experience, and that leaves you out. But you do find it in the United Pentecostal Church, so that puts us in. Hallelujah! Now my friend says not to use the expression Mr. Thrasher's Church. Alright, let us look at the history of the so-called Church of Christ. (quote) The Churches of Christ to have originated on the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem 33 A.D. and to be identified with the New Testament Church in

origin, doctrine and practice. They believe that in the early centuries there were departures from New Testament teachings, to the extent that the identity of the Churches as they were in the New Testament times became lost. Effort was made to restore the doctrines and practices of these Churches, but it was not until *the early part of the 19th century* that they culminated in Great Britain, and in the United States, later in *what became known as the Restoration movement*. The foremost leaders were Barton W. Stone, Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, and Walter Scott. Alexander Campbell and *his followers* adopted Baptism by immersion in the year 1812. In 1813 *they joined the Baptist* and remained there until the year 1830. In the year 1832 under the leadership of Barton W. Stone, they formed the *Disciples of Christ or Christian Church*. The federal census shows that the disciples of Christ, or Christian Church *was divided* over the question of instrumental music, and organized missionary efforts, in the year of 1906. We have no record of the *so-called Church of Christ as it exist today prior to the year of 1906*. (unquote) *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Volume 5, page 686, 687, *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Volume 4, page 714.

Now it looks like we have come up with something here. It doesn't belong to Mr. Thrasher, so we will turn it back to its rightful owner (not Jesus Christ) but the Campbells, Stone, and Scott, and make Mr. Thrasher a member of it. How is that? Now he says my reference to a holy kiss does not demonstrate a very high regard. It doesn't make any difference with the reference to yours, Mr. Thrasher, because your sugar is a long way from being Holy. Now the proposition I refused to sign with you on the Church, this was because of the wording. I explained this in my last speech. And the one I signed with Drew Falls, they never found a place to have it or Churches to back it. I talked with one of your Preachers in the Gibson store one day at Meridian, Miss. and

ask him if he would back Drew Falls in a debate there and he refused. You see, friends, Mr. Thrasher is the same way with things like this as he is with the Bible. He *tries* to twist it to his favor. Now he says we are not a part of the New Testament Church, because we have boards, manuals, General Constitution, Headquarters, Committees, etc. etc. Mr. Thrasher, pray tell me where you find some of the things in your Church (oh pardon me, Scott, Campbells, and Stone) to fit in the New Testament, such as salaried Preachers. I received a paper not long ago from one of your brethren arguing about the Preacher's salary. Find me a Scripture where certain men called Elders hire the preacher, set his salary, tell him what to preach, and when to leave?

Show us also where we find the preacher in these houses in the New Testament under subjection to a plurality of Elders? Show us where the Church owned any land, or owned a meeting house? show us where they had Sunday School teachers, and Gospel Meetings once or twice a year? Friends, the Church of Christ, as I know it, is guilty of all the above mentioned. If Mr. Thrasher is not, then he can start arguing with some of his own brethren. They have all of these things and then want to condemn everybody else to hell that has any kind of helps or Government. Mr. Thrasher, sweep off your own porch then you can come over and help us (if we need any). The man I mentioned in my last speech that said he was as much against Mr. Thrasher as he was me is a member of the *so-called* Church of Christ (just a different set with some very very small division). The Holy Ghost and music I said he did not believe in was the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and Instrumental music. Yes, I represented him fairly (You knew this). You like to try and twist what I say, but I just come right back and expose you again.

Now about former debates. I have answered and straitened out the things *you have tried to twist*. I do not make unguarded

statements. What I Preach is the truth. I study for my debates, and I do consistently take a firm position. With reference to my affirmation of Mark 1:4, 8, it stands just like I wrote it, with what the Bible says. Let's read it. The reason I did not restrict the all in verse 5 is because of what it says, (quote) and there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all Baptized of him in the river of Jordan, *confessing their sins*, and verse 8 says, I indeed *have* Baptized you with water, but he shall Baptize *you* with the Holy Ghost. Now anybody knows the *you* here that John said Jesus would *Baptize with the Holy Ghost*, was the *all* that he (John) had Baptized with water in verse 5. Mr. Thrasher, you don't even know what *all* and *you* means, because you are bold enough with your false doctrine to come directly against the word of God and say it's not so. I asked him a question in my last speech (quote) Did John say to all of them he Baptized in Mark 1:8, that Jesus would Baptize them with the Holy Ghost? (unquote) You read his answer *No*. This little two letter word has lost the debate for him, besides all the other dilemmas he has gotten *himself* into, *such as in his last speech* he said nobody today could be Included within the promise that John made in these verses. How many people today were present when John Preached in Mark 1? (unquote) *Here is my point*, He said it would include *only those* who came out to hear John Preach and were Baptized. Mr. Thrasher, with these statements you are really in a fix. Listen what he says friends in his third speech about this issue (quote) Dear student of truth, you do not have to take my word, or Mr. Forsythe's word as to whom *John was referring to* in Mark 1: 3, but you ought to take the Lord's word: he applied these words about being Baptized with the Holy Ghost to the Apostles. (unquote) Now, I am going to do some quoting. My friend has made the statement that the only ones who could have received Holy Ghost Baptism were the ones *present when John Preached*.

In another speech, he stated that *John applied these words* about being Baptized with the Holy Ghost *to the Apostles*. Now if he cannot prove the Apostles were there at John's Baptizing (and he can't to save His Proposition or even his life if he had to), then we have twelve Apostles without the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. But the reason I know it pertains to us today is because what John preached pertained to the Kingdom of God, Luke 16:16, and Jesus said in St. John 5:33, John bare witness unto the truth. What did my opponent say about this? **Nothing!** what did he say about my answer to the seed of the Kingdom in my first and second speech? **Nothing!** What did he say about Acts 19:8 and Acts 20:25 concerning the Kingdom of God and it would have to be what Paul first preached at Ephesus Acts 19:1, 6,? **Nothing!** If this is how Mr. Thrasher is defending his proposition, just a **big bunch of Nothing**. Of course, I am sure we all understand the reason by now. He don't have **Nothing**. Mr. Thrasher, you had better get busy. There is a lot you have not answered about Mark 1:8, that I have connected with it.

He says my opponent believes that when John says he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost in verse 5, it means you might or may. Where have I made that insinuation? Check my speeches. This is just some more of his misrepresenting my position. My opponent (Mr. Thrasher) says the one Baptism of Ephesians 4:5 is water Baptism. Prove it! you have not even started to prove that Holy Ghost Baptism is not in effect, and until you do we will not accept your position on Ephesians 4:5. My opponent is also misleading you in what I said about the Jews that came with Peter to Cornelius' house. These Jews had the **Baptism of the Holy Ghost** (not the kind you claim, Mr. Thrasher). Read Acts 10:23. Certain brethren from Joppa accompanied him. Acts 10:45, 46 says on the Gentiles *also* was poured out the *Gift* of the Holy Ghost, for they heard them speak with tongues. Verse 47, Peter

says these have received the Holy Ghost as well as we. We who? Peter and the Jews that came with him. Also, when Peter was approached by the Apostles and brethren, and they of the circumcision in Acts 11, verses, 1, 2, 17, about the Gentiles and him going to them, he said, God gave them *the like Gift* as he did unto us. Us who? He and *those* he were talking to, *the Apostles and brethren*, and they of *the circumcision*. My opponent never answered this. (Deal with this) You tried to brush it off. You can't brush this off, my friend. This means the **Baptism of the Holy Ghost**, not one of your little measures. Answer it! Mr. Thrasher says in our previous debate on this subject, My opponent has acknowledged that it was possible for some to have received the Holy Spirit, but not received Holy Spirit Baptism. You either misunderstood me or you are misrepresenting me. I have never made a statement like that in any Sermon I have Preached, no debate I have had, or no time in my whole Ministry. I deny the charge Mr. Thrasher—not guilty. Next my opponent says, If Mr. Forsythe believes in one Spirit does he claim the same *Gift* to the same extent as the Apostles had? Does he have the Power to raise the dead? Mr. Thrasher, was there a *Gift* of raising the dead? You have just added *another Gift* to the *nine Gifts* of 1 Corinthians 12: 8, 10.

Theres one thing I want to insert here before I forget. The quotation you gave about the Church sign does not stand, because our Local Church Government and local assemblies, are under the same ruling. Now Mr. Thrasher speaks against guidance of the Holy Spirit to understand the Scriptures, and uses Ephesians 3:4. Why didn't you read verse three, Mr. Thrasher? Paul said, How that by *revelation* he made known unto me the mystery as I wrote afore in few words, then verse 4 says, Whereby *when ye read* ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ. (This means they were to understand by the same

knowledge Paul did, Spiritual knowledge.) James 1:5 says, If any of you lack *wisdom*, let him ask of God, that giveth *to all men liberally* and upbraideth not, and it *shall be given him*. Read here also 1 Corinthians 2:12, and that's the reason your Preaching is not authoritative, Mr. Thrasher. You rely upon the wrong source, man's wisdom instead of God's. Also read here Jeremiah 17:5, 6. Now Mr. Thrasher, if Luke was in the body (Church), and he was, then he had the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. Read 1 Corinthians 12:13, By *one Spirit* we are *all Baptized* into *one body*. Mr. Thrasher said in his fourth speech *certain Christians* received miraculous Gifts of the Spirit administered by laying on of the Apostles hands. And he gives Acts 6:5, 6, Acts 8:17, 18. I challenged him to read miraculous Gift or measure in those Scriptures. Did he read it? Again he says all Christians receive the Holy Spirit in a *non-miraculous* way, Acts 5:32. I challenged him to read *non-miraculous* in Acts 5:32. Did he read it? We will let the reader be the Judge. Now seeing as he knows so much about this administration of miraculous Gifts we will let him straiten this next one out. If miraculous Gifts were administered from one to another (by the Apostles), then why in Acts 13:1, 3 did Prophets and Teachers lay their hands on Barnabas and Saul (who were already Apostles), Acts 14:4, and give them more of what they already had? When the *Prophets* and *teachers* were not supposed to have nothing to give them, but they (Barnabas and Paul) *being Apostles* were supposed to have the miraculous Gifts to confer to them. How about it, Mr. Thrasher? Friends this man has so many dilemmas in this debate there is no way that I can keep calling your attention to them. You will just have to go back and read the many many things he has failed to reply to. Now I did point out that John's Baptism was no longer valid. Go back and study my speeches. John said, he (Jesus) must *increase* but I must decrease, St John 3:30, and the difference in the Baptism was what was said

over the candidate. I did prove that, Acts 19:5, and they received the Holy Ghost and spoke in tongues. Acts 19:6 proves that all who were Baptized of John in his ministry were told that Jesus Christ would Baptize them with the Holy Ghost, Mark 1:8, That's the increase, Mr. Thrasher.

Now about the 120, in the upper room. In my last speech I pointed out in Acts 1, verse 15, that *days elapsed*, and they were still there. My friend did not deal with this. And from verse 15, Peter went on to tell the transgression of Judas, Baptism of John, to the appointment of Matthias, and from there Acts 2:1 says *they were all* in one accord in one place. This had to be those in verses 14 and 15 of Acts 1. Deal with this! Also, if my friend puts the three thousand in there with them, then he is going to have to put a Baptismal tank in there and Baptize them, because Acts 2:41 says they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day; there were added unto them about *three thousand souls*. Mr. Thrasher keeps talking about ten days. Well, the Bible does not teach they were there ten days. Let's look at the contradiction. Jewish history teaches the Passover of the Feast of unleavened bread was celebrated on the first month of the religious year of the Jews. On the 14th of Nisan (our April) and commemorate the deliverance of the Jews from Egypt and the establishment of Israel as a nation by God's redemptive act. The Feast of Unleavened Bread began on the day after the Passover and lasted *seven days*. The Feast of Pentecost, on the 6th day of the month of Sivan (our June). The name *Pentecost*, meaning *50th*, originated from the fact that there was an interval of *50 days* between the two. Now Jesus ate the Passover of unleavened bread with his disciples, Matthew 26:17, 25, Jesus was Crucified, buried, and rose *the third day*, Matthew 16:21, St. John 2:19, Jesus was seen of his disciples *forty days*, Acts 1:3, 1 Corinthians 15:1, 5, 6. This leaves an interval of seven days before the Holy

Ghost fell on Pentecost. This proves that my friend is just as wrong about the days of tarrying as he is about the number that received. Oh well, just some more of Mr. Thrasher's blunders. Mr. Thrasher, I have not agreed with *your position* on the Apostles sitting in a house. Go back and read my last two speeches. Quit *trying* to misrepresent me. Now about the languages that were spoke in Acts 2 at Pentecost, the error is on your point and not mine. All I did was put together what you said, and it come out with your dilemma. There were sixteen Nations present. You said the Apostles spoke in languages they had not studied, so that all of those who came together could hear the Gospel Preached in *their own native* languages. All right the plurality is *your implication* of more than one *language*, and the *own native* is **your** *implication* of *different languages*. Now there are sixteen *nations* present and you plainly stated that all had an own native (different language). Now according to *your logic* there were four of the twelve Apostles that Preached in *Two different languages* at the same time, and that's not about right that is right (according to your logic). I ask the readers to go back and study the speeches.

Mr. Thrasher, I did not agree with you on silent prayer. I *said* a person could pray silently (individually), but when the Church came together for a prayer meeting, or worship, I believe they prayed aloud. I proved this in Acts 4:23, 31, Acts 20:36, 38. The Scriptures Mr. Thrasher uses to confirm his silent praying is 1 Corinthians 14:28. He misapplies this Scripture. This applies to speaking in tongues.

Now about I Corinthians 14. Our women are in harmony with these Scriptures. The women of the *so-called Church of Christ* are the ones that are out of harmony with the Bible. Do your women Prophecy according to 1 Corinthians 11:5. Nay, they don't even believe in that. Besides this they cut their hair off like a man; they

wear that which pertaineth unto a man (pants suits), they deck out in all sorts of Jewelry and Ornaments, and painted faces. Mr. Thrasher, I don't know why you are trying to condemn us with 1 Corinthians 14:35, because there's not a verse in the entire chapter that will fit any of your worship services I have ever attended.

Now about standing in prayer. All of their services I was ever in they were asked to stand when prayer was called to the best of my knowledge. I have never contended that a person must stand (as a command). I have not even contended for lifting hands as a command, but it was *practiced* by the Church in Paul's writing to Timothy, 1 Timothy 2:8. This would come under the word *practice* in my friend's proposition. I contended that the experience a person has with God is responsible for this, and that's why you do not see this practiced in Mr. Thrasher's Congregation. They do not have the New Testament experience. Praise is comely for the upright, Psalms 33:1, 134:2.

Regarding the Lord's supper, my friend never proved where it was ever took on the *first day of the week*, much less proving we are to take it on the first day of *every week*. Go back and read the speeches where I got him into a dilemma in Acts 20, about the common meal, and the things he never attempted to answer about this. You lost the argument, Mr. Thrasher.

And in regard to foot washing, go back and read the speeches. He started out fighting hard against it, but now says when it is appropriate. Well when is this? He says it is not to be an act of Worship (at any time). I have *tried and tried* to get him to deal with the Scriptures I gave against his position and apply them to *his group today*, St. John 13, verses 12 through 17. Has he done it? **No!** His dodging shows the weakness of his position. I say Thomas N. Thrasher has never washed a saint's feet. Why? That's simple. He is not a saint. So you lost the argument, Mr. Thrasher.

You refuse to apply the Scriptures to your position.

Now on the subject of fasting being *practiced* by the early Church. I gave the Scriptures: 1 Corinthians 7:5, Paul taught it to the Corinthians; Acts 13:3, the Church fasted when workers were sent out; Acts 14:23, the Church fasted when Elders were ordained. I asked him did he do this? Silent! Friends, in *every speech* I asked him to define these Scriptures to his position. Did he do it? **Silent** as the cemetery tombs. We are still waiting.

Now about his musical position. He *tries* to insert the word *with* in Ephesians 5:19. Mr. Thrasher, this only shows a weakness of your position. Go back and read my arguments on this, friends. He has not shaken my position. I showed you how Ephesians 5:19 reads to him. If it just means singing (one melody), here's how it reads: Speaking to yourselves in *singing* and *singing* and Spiritual *singing*, *singing* and making *singing* in your heart to the Lord. Now that's his position on Ephesians 5:19. What did he say about it? **Nothing**. Jesus said in Luke 24:44, All things must be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me. Now Psalms 87:5, 6, 7 says, (and this is speaking of the Church); let him prove different if it's not. And of Zion it shall be said this and that man was *born in her* and the highest himself shall establish her, the Lord shall count when he writeth up the people that this man was born there. Selah. As well as the singers [he believes this] as the players on instruments [he don't believe this] shall be there, *all* my springs are in thee. My friend has not yet even started to prove that *vocal music* is the only music in the New Testament Church. I pointed out to him in 1 John 3:4 that sin is a *transgression* of the *Law*, and Romans 4:15 says, Where *no Law* is there is *no transgression*. I asked Mr. Thrasher to show me *what Law* I have transgressed, or where I sin when I play a musical Instrument? Did he do it? **Silent**. Get busy, Mr. Thrasher, we are waiting. And. now I say again, Preachers

(according to your position) cannot pray for the sick. You cannot find a preacher in any of these houses (I proved to be assemblies of the saints) where these Elders are. My friend, you have not defined **none** of these Scriptures and applied them to your position that I have used against your Elder argument. I used 1 Peter 1:1 to prove that he was not writing to one congregation as you applied in 1 Peter 5:1, 3. What did you say about it? **Nothing**. Readers, what did he say about what Jesus said in Mark 10:42, 43, the Minister being the chiefest? **Nothing**. Did he define the Scriptures to his position that I gave about the Elder, Steward, Minister, Preacher, Servant, Bishop, and Chief to all designate the same office when referring to the leadership and overseeing of the congregation in the New Testament Church?

Let the reader be the Judge. Mr. Thrasher, we want to hear from you. Now I explained 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1 in the light of my position and you have not come back with rebuttal speech. All you tried to use was Women Pastors. Well that's easy for me to answer. I do not defend Women Pastors. If they Pastor let them defend themselves. I believe 1 Timothy 3, just like it is written A Bishop (overseer or Pastor) be the *Husband* of one wife. The Bible still teaches the congregations *of Ephesus* to be *Plural*, the very Scriptures you used in Revelation 2:1, 7, are in my favor, because in closing with verse 7, John said, He that hath an ear let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the *Churches (plural)*, Mr. Thrasher.

Friends, my opponent has one more speech, and he has not even started to defend his position and answer the many, many Scriptures that I have brought against his proposition. We will be waiting for an answer. Give your attention to my opponent's next speech.

Thank You.

PS: One thing for sure we found out in this speech, and that's what the name of Mr. Thrasher's Church is. Campbells, Stone, and

Scott, Incorporated. or maybe we should say, INCOMPLETE.

THRASHER'S REJOINDER

Mr. Forsythe, Ladies, and Gentlemen:

I consider it a privilege to prepare this summary speech in the affirmation of the proposition. I regret that my opponent has chosen to continue his quibbles, misrepresentations and perversions, rather than attempting to deal fairly with the Bible and my arguments. However, in 23 previous debates (mostly with Pentecostal preachers) I have learned that false teachers cannot attempt to uphold their doctrines without employing such tactics.

In my five previous speeches, I have proved that "The church of Christ, of which I am a member, is scriptural in **origin, doctrine, practice** and **name**, and is the one that began on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2." Let me summarize the principal points.

The church of Christ is scriptural in **Origin**. I showed the truth concerning the origin of the church in my first speech. However, Mr. Forsythe turns to uninspired men in order to try to prove differently. I could cite numerous historians to contradict his claims that the church of Christ originated with Stone and Campbell. For example: "In faith and practice they date back to the founding of the church of the New Testament on the first Pentecost after Jesus' resurrection" (*Encyclopedia Americana*, VI, 661). Space prohibits a lengthy discussion of uninspired history; however, I have previously challenged my opponent to affirm that the church of Christ, of which Thomas N. Thrasher is a member, originated with Alexander Campbell. He refuses! Nevertheless, in this debate, I am interested in **inspired** history.

The church of Christ is scriptural in **Doctrine**. Various matters, including the plan of salvation, have been mentioned in earlier speeches. I teach that, in order to receive the forgiveness of sins,

the alien sinner must **hear** the gospel (Matthew 7:24; Acts 18:8; Romans 10:17), **believe** (John 8:24; Mark 16:16); **repent** (Luke 13:3; Acts 17:30), **confess** (Romans 10:9-10; Acts 8:37), and be **baptized** in water (Acts 2:38; Mark 16:16; 1 Peter 3:21). One is **added** by the Lord to the church (Acts 2:47). **Faithfulness** is required (2 Peter 1:5-10; Matthew 10:22; Revelation 2:10). I believe that every Christian should be “a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth” (2 Timothy 2:15).

The church of Christ is scriptural in **Practice**. For example, I have demonstrated that we practice exactly what the Bible teaches in **worship** and **work**. In fact, Mr. Forsythe has admitted this in answering several questions. I asked him: “Is it scriptural for a local church to engage in its work of evangelism, edification, and benevolence, without becoming involved in social and recreational functions such as sponsoring ball teams, boy scout troops, and providing common meals for social purposes?” His answer was simply, “Yes.” I asked him: “Is it scriptural for a local church to assemble to study the Bible, pray, sing, partake of the Lord’s supper on the first day of the week, and give as each member is prospered on the first day of the week?” He responds, “Yes, with the exception of the Lord’s Supper *every first day* of the week.” Thus, he believes that our worship is scriptural except that he apparently *thinks* it is **wrong** to eat the Lord’s supper every first day of the week. However, I have shown that the early disciples “came together to break bread” on “the first day of the week” (Acts 20:7). Let him argue with the Bible!

In his various speeches, Mr. Forsythe has offered several objections which I will summarize.

Objection: Mr. Thrasher's brethren do not claim to receive Holy Spirit **baptism** today. Actually, Mr. Forsythe has not cited a single verse to prove that people today should! In fact, he teaches

that people must receive **two** baptisms (water baptism **and** Holy Spirit baptism) in order to be saved. He, therefore, contradicts the apostle Paul who wrote: “**There is one baptism**” (Ephesians 4:5)!

I asked my friend to prove from the Bible that Holy Spirit **baptism** saves. He did not and cannot do it!

Objection: Mr. Forsythe has denied that tongues were a *temporary gift*. He wrote, “You can’t prove that. Where does it say this?” How about what the apostle Paul wrote in 1 Corinthians 13:8, “Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be **tongues, they shall cease**; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.” Paul showed that the spiritual gifts were **to cease**! Consequently, the gifts, **including speaking in tongues**, were **temporary**!

My friend contends that Paul simply said tongues “shall cease (future tense).” However, Mr. Forsythe neglected to tell our readers what the specified **duration** of these gifts was: “But **when that which is perfect is come**, then that which is **in part** [the gifts listed in the context of 1 Corinthians chapters 12-14] **shall be done away**” (1 Corinthians 13:10). The word “perfect” (Greek: *teleios—complete*) refers to the complete revelation of the New Testament (cf. James 1:25). We have that **now** (!), so **tongues have ceased**! My opponent should have known this; maybe he did, but perhaps he simply didn’t want **you** to know!

Objection: Mr. Thrasher’s brethren do not practice the holy kiss. This is not so! The holy kiss is **one** of the forms of greeting we use, but not the **only** one. In fact, my opponent has admitted the holy kiss is *not* “the only form of greeting to be used”! I do not object to my brethren greeting each other with a “**holy**” kiss!

Objection: Mr. Thrasher’s brethren do not practice foot washing. Not so again! When such is needed (such as by a sick person in the hospital), it should be done. However, I have pointed out that it is not an act of **public worship**.

Objection: Mr. Thrasher's brethren do not all pray when the church assembles. Not so! Whenever my brethren assemble, **all** Christians are to pray. However, my opponent has not proved that all must pray **aloud** and that it is wrong to have someone to **lead** a prayer.

Objection: Mr. Thrasher's brethren do not lift up their hands when they pray. This is inaccurate; some do. However, I might add that Mr. Forsythe's brethren do not "enter into their closets" whenever they pray (see Matthew 6:6). However, the truth is that neither passage specifies a **posture** or a **place** for prayer, but a **principle**.

Objection: Mr. Thrasher's brethren do not "fast." This is not so; I believe that there are situations when fasting is proper. However, my opponent has not produced the passage that **requires fasting** for all Christians at any particular time. Furthermore, it was not considered important enough for the United Pentecostal Church to put it in its **Manual**!

Objection: Mr. Thrasher's brethren do not use instrumental music in worship. This is true, since there is **no New Testament authority** for such to be done. Does Mr. Forsythe believe that the church cannot worship without it? The New Testament says, "**Sing**" (Colossians 3:16; Ephesians 5:19; Acts 16:25; etc.).

Mr. Forsythe alleges that Psalms 87 authorizes his mechanical instruments in worship; however, if his argument is true, why don't we find his instruments in the New Testament. The truth is that Psalms 87 refers to **Jerusalem** ("Zion," cf. 1 Kings 8:1; 2 Kings 19:21; and many other passages), not the New Testament church!

My opponent continues to pervert the teaching of Ephesians 5:19. Yet, the passage still reads just as I quoted it: "**Speaking** to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, **singing and making melody in your heart** to the Lord"! Regardless of how much Mr. Forsythe **wants** it to say "making melody **on a**

mechanical instrument,” the Bible still reads **“singing and making melody in your heart** to the Lord”!!! My opponent’s efforts at ridicule and perversion do not change what Paul wrote.

Incidentally, Mr. Forsythe also asserted, “He *tries* to insert the word *with* in Ephesians 5:19.” Evidently my opponent neglected to read other English translations of Ephesians 5:19 that use the word “with.” I will list only some of the other translations to make this point: *American Standard Version, Christian Standard Bible, Contemporary English Version, Disciples’ Literal New Testament, Evangelical Heritage Version, English Standard Version, God’s Word Translation, International Standard Version, Legacy Standard Bible, New American Standard Bible, Revised Standard Version* In addition, *Berry’s Interlinear* also uses the translation “with.” I think these examples are more than sufficient to overturn Mr. Forsythe’s insinuation that I tried to **insert** (having ulterior motives) the word “with” in Ephesians 5:19. I simply noted that many English translations use this word “with.” There was certainly nothing sinister in my referring to this fact, contrary to my opponent’s charge.

Objection: Mr. Thrasher’s brethren do not teach the truth concerning elders. Absolutely untrue! Any honest person who will read what I have affirmed concerning elders can see that I have given Bible verses on each point. I have shown the scriptural *terms, qualifications, and work* of elders. They are to **oversee** the congregation (Acts 20:28; 1 Peter 5:1-4). Again, it is evident that Mr. Forsythe wants all the oversight **himself**. Notice the following quotation from his ***Manual*** concerning the **“Pastor’s Authority”**: “He shall have the *oversight and superintendence* of *all* interests of the church and of *all* departments of its work, both spiritual and temporal.... He should be consulted in regard to *all* business of any importance pertaining to the spiritual, moral, and material affairs of the church. He shall *call for* and *preside over* business

and church board meetings...” (p. 107, 1973 edition). He also has the power to *appoint* an Assistant Pastor, deacons or members of the church board, the secretary and treasurer of the church, the Sunday School Superintendent, and others. **Yet, Mr. Forsythe objects to the oversight of *our* elders???**

The church of Christ is scriptural in **Name**. Various scriptural terms have been given repeatedly (see my first speech for an extensive discussion of this point). Among these is “churches of Christ” (Romans 16:16), where Paul referred to many congregations. If a group of churches are called **churches of Christ**, what would **one** be called? Obviously, a “church of Christ”! Despite my opponent’s quibbles and false charges, the argument I made stands. He is simply hurting because he knows that **no one** can find “**United Pentecostal Church**” in the word of God.

Mr. Forsythe introduced a proposal: “I offered to put on our Church sign **The Church of Jesus Christ** if he would identify his with a sign, **The Church of the Lord Jesus Christ.**” One problem with his “offer” is that it violates the UPC **Manual**, which requires identification “by sign or otherwise on the outside of its church building that it is associated with the United Pentecostal Church” (1973 edition, page 95). Therefore, his proposal is contrary to this requirement of their **Manual** concerning the church of which he is “Minister.”

Furthermore, his proposal that I put up a sign of identification that says “Church of the Lord Jesus Christ” **ignores** my point endorsing use of any of the several terms I have affirmed to be **scriptural designations** for the Lord’s church, none of which I would be opposed to putting on a sign or otherwise using to identify the church of which I am a member.

My friend and opponent complains that I have taken more than 30 days in sending some of my speeches to him. I regret that my various responsibilities have not allowed me to devote more

time to this discussion. However, in fairness, let me point out that Mr. Forsythe has also taken more than 30 days on some of his speeches. In fact, in at least one speech he used in excess of **2000 more words** than that specified in our agreement. “Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?” (Romans 2:21).

I appreciate the opportunity to affirm the truth in this discussion, and I wish for my opponent and his family the best of health. I also pray that he will turn from error to God’s eternal Truth in order that he may use his efforts in support of the church of our Lord and its work.

THRASHER PUBLICATIONS

1705 Sandra Street S.W.

Decatur, AL 35601-5457

Email: thomas.thrasher@att.net

Bogard—McPherson Debate on miraculous healing

Ben M. Bogard (Baptist) and Aimee Semple McPherson (Foursquare)

Calhoun—Kurfees Discussion on instrumental music in the worship

H. L. Calhoun (Christian) and M. C. Kurfees (Christian)

Dating the Book of Revelation: Arguments for the Late Date

Thomas N. Thrasher

Debate on Salvation

Traever Guingrich (Reformed Baptist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Discussion of the Sabbath

A two-night panel debate involving three Christians (Drew E. Falls, Hiram O. Hutto, and Thomas N. Thrasher), two Seventh Day Baptists (John McGuire and Leslie Welch), and two Seventh-day Adventists (J. B. Goodner and A. A. Willis).

Donahue—Thrasher Exchange on eternal life as a present possession

Patrick T. Donahue (Christian) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Falls—Franklin Debate on Holy Spirit Baptism & Gifts of the Spirit

Drew E. Falls (Christian) and Ben J. Franklin (Charismatic)

Falls—Speakman Debate on Miracles

Drew E. Falls (Christian) and Lummie Speakman (Pentecostal)

Falls—Storment Debate on the coverings of 1 Corinthians 11

Drew E. Falls (Christian) and Keith Storment (Christian)

Falls—Welch Debate on the coverings of 1 Corinthians 11

Drew E. Falls (Christian) and D. L. Welch (Pentecostal)

Garrett—Thrasher Debate on the Great Commission

Eddie K. Garrett (Primitive Baptist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Madrigal—Mayo Debate on the necessity of water baptism

Dan Mayo (Baptist) and John R. Madrigal (Christian)

McCay—Porter Debate on the communion cup

G. Earl McCay (Christian) and Rue Porter (Christian)

Must We Keep the Sabbath Today?

Carrol R. Sutton

O’Neal—Hicks Debate on church-sponsored recreational activities

Thomas G. O’Neal (Christian) and Olan Hicks (Christian)

Porter—Dugger Debate on the Sabbath and the Lord’s Day

W. Curtis Porter (Christian) and A. N. Dugger (Church of God—7th Day)

Rejecting Naturalistic Theories of Origins: Scientific and Scriptural Arguments.

Thomas N. Thrasher

Replies to 36 Arguments Affirming Unconditional Salvation

Thomas N. Thrasher

Scambler—Langley Debate on the truth of Christianity

T. H. Scambler (Christian) and J. S. Langley (Rationalist)

Sutton—Woods Debate on Congregational Benevolence

Carrol Ray Sutton (Christian) and Guy N. Woods (Christian)

Tant—Frost Debate on instrumental music and societies

J. D. Tant (Christian) and W. G. Frost (Christian)

Tant—Harding Debate on rebaptism

J. D. Tant (Christian) and James A. Harding (Christian)

Tant—Smith Debate on Alexander Campbell's baptism

J. D. Tant (Christian) and C. A. Smith (Baptist)

Thrasher—Barr Debate on the identity of the New Testament church

Vernon L. Barr (Baptist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Coleman Debate on the Lord’s Supper

Pat S. Coleman (Pentecostal) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Davis Debate: Will Everyone Be Eternally Saved?

Myles Davis (Universalist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Donahue Discussion on Blasphemy Against the Holy Spirit

Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian) and Patrick T. Donahue (Christian)

Thrasher—Forsythe Debate on the church of Christ

Richard W. Forsythe (Pentecostal) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Garrett Debate on unconditional salvation and apostasy

Eddie K. Garrett (Primitive Baptist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Green Debate on the Christian and civil government

Ken Green (Christian) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Martignoni Debate: Was Peter the First Pope?

John Martignoni (Roman Catholic) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Maxey Debate on eternal punishment

Al Maxey (Christian) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Mayo Debate on the impossibility of apostasy

Dan Mayo (Baptist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Miller Debate on Bible classes and women teachers

E. H. Miller (Christian) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Owens Debate on everlasting punishment for the wicked

Lester Owens (Seventh Day Adventist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Waters Debate on divorce and remarriage

Robert Waters (Christian) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—Welch Debate on the formula of words used in baptism

D. L. Welch (Pentecostal) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Christian)

Thrasher—White Debate on Creation versus Evolution

David L. White (Evolutionist) and Thomas N. Thrasher (Creationist)

Warnock—Williams Discussion on weddings and funerals in the meetinghouse

Weldon E. Warnock (Christian) and Ralph D. Williams (Christian)