

THE WORD OF TRUTH

OTIS Q. SELLERS, Editor, OCT.-NOV. 1937

VOL. II, NO. 5

Table of Contents

- * Abram and Abraham
- * Concordance - "Last Day" and "Last Days"
- * Four Future Resurrections
 - * The Kingdom of God
 - * What is The Mystery?
 - * Notes on I Corinthians
 - * Letter From a Critic
- * The Editor to His Friends

ABRAM AND ABRAHAM

The faithful student of the Word of God will ever be careful to obey the divine instruction to "put to the rest the things that differ." See Phil.1:10, Rotherham Version. This we will do with the names Abram and Abraham, for it appears that some are making unwarranted distinctions here, and these distinctions have led to wrong conclusions. We quote from a recently published leaflet the following statements:

"There is a great difference between being the children of Abram and being the children of Abraham."

"There is a great difference between God's promise to uncircumcised Abram for Gentiles (Galatians 3:8) and God's covenant with circumcised Abraham concerning Israel and Gentile proselytes."

It is also declared that "the Abramic Covenant of promise" is "for the Church (Body) of Christ"; while the Abrahamic Covenant is not. Also that members of the Church which is His body are the children of Abram but not the children of Abraham.

It is with the earnest desire to be helpful that we turn to God's Word to present from it the facts in connection with Abram and Abraham.

It is a well known fact that Abram was the name of the patriarch from Genesis 12 to Genesis 17:5; then it was changed by God to Abraham. We would judge that the first name was given to him by his parents. We know that the second name was given to him by God. The name Abram means "high father," and the name Abraham means "father of a multitude." It is a positive fact that when he received the name Abraham the first name disappears from Scripture, being found only in two places after Gen. 17:5 - 1 Chron. 1:27 and Nehemiah 9:7. The reason for these two occurrences is plain when the references are examined. . It is plain that the Holy Spirit was Himself subject to the divine admonition of **Genesis 17:5 - "neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be called Abraham:'**

When we examine the New Testament we discover that every writer uses the same name, and there is no variation in the spelling of the name in any of the seventy-three occurrences. In view of this we repudiate the statement, which has been made before several audiences, that the name Abraham in Galatians 3:6 to 9 is a mistranslation and that it should be Abram. If it should be Abram in Galatians 3, then it should be Abram in everyone of the seventy-three occurrences, for the Greek never varies. Every writer in every occurrence uses the same name consistently.

If it is true that the "Abramic Covenant of promise" is for the Church which is His body as some are insisting, and if it is true that "there is a great difference" between the covenants God made with uncircumcised Abram and circumcised Abraham; it logically follows that every part of the covenant God made with uncircumcised Abram is for the Church or Body of Christ. And if the distinction insisted upon by these brethren is true, all that God promised to Abram is the "Abramic Covenant" and all that God promised to Abraham is the Abrahamic Covenant.

When we turn to the Scriptures we discover that God made the following promises to uncircumcised Abram:

I will make of thee a great nation. Gen. 12:2.

I will bless thee, and make thy name great. Gen. 12:2.

Thou shalt be a blessing. Gen. 12:2.

I will bless them that bless thee. Gen. 12:3.

I will curse him that curseth thee. Gen. 12:3.

And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. Gen. 12:3.

Unto thy seed shall I give this land. Gen. 12:7.

For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed forever. Gen. 13:15.

And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth. Gen. 13:16.

Tell the stars, if thou be able to number them. . . . so shall thy seed be. Gen. 15:5.

Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates. Gen. 15:18.

And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. Gen. 17:2.

These promises are the ones God made to faithful Abram. All these were made before he was circumcised. This does not record all that God DID for Abram, but it does set forth the things God promised to him. If, then, there is such a thing as the ABRAMIC covenant, as distinct from the ABRAHAMIC covenant, these promises make up the ABRAMIC covenant. And when we examine the things God covenanted to uncircumcised ABRAM, how ridiculous becomes the assertion that "the Abramic covenant" is for the Church which is His body. And again if "there is a great difference" between being the children of Abram and the children of Abraham, we would call attention to the fact that it was to the seed of ABRAM that God promised the land.

What does the Church which is His body have to do with becoming a great nation; will God make its name great, will he bless them who bless it and curse him that curseth it, will all families of the earth be blessed in the Church; what has the Church to do with the land of Palestine?

There was one thing which God did for Abraham which was not the result of any promise or covenant, neither did it become part of any covenant or promise. We read in **Genesis 15:6: "And he believed in the Lord; and He counted it to him for righteousness."**

This was an act of pure grace on the part of God. He had not promised to do this, neither did he promise it to Abraham's seed after him. When Paul tells of the salvation of Gentiles apart from circumcision, he goes back to uncircumcised ABRAHAM and uses him as an illustration.

Another thing that should be noticed is this. In the statement made by the writer from which we quote, he refers us to Galatians 3:8. Let us note again his statement.

"There is a great difference between God's promise to uncircumcised Abram for Gentiles (Galatians 3:8) and God's covenant with circumcised Abraham concerning Israel and Gentile proselytes."

In Galatians 3:8 we read: "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen (Gentiles) through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed."

Now the fact is that Paul is quoting a promise made to circumcised ABRAHAM. The reader can compare Genesis 12:3 where the word is "families" and Genesis 18:18 and 22:18 where the word is "nations."

The last two promises concerning the nations were made after Abraham's circumcision.

In conclusion we would ask the following questions of those who are insisting upon these distinctions:

1. Just what is the Scriptural difference between being a child of Abram and a child of Abraham? If the difference is "great" it should be easy to point out.

2. Why is it that no New Testament writer ever makes such a distinction?
3. If the covenants belong to Israel as plainly stated in Rom. 9:4, how do you exclude from this your so called Abramic covenant?
4. What did God promise to Abraham which he did not promise to Abram?
5. Would you say that Ishmael was the seed of Abram and Isaac was the seed of Abraham?
6. What is your proof that the name ABRAHAM in Galatians 3 is a mistranslation, and how would you write Abram and Abraham in Greek, inasmuch as there is no letter "H" in the Greek alphabet?
7. Should we not recognize the will of God in all this and obey the words "neither shall thy name be called any more Abram."

CONCORDANCE TO LAST DAY AND LAST DAYS

In this concordance we give the location and an exact literal translation of the Greek. The preposition and definite article are also noted as they occur.

John 6:39-in the last day.	John 12:48-in the last day.
John 6:40--in the last day.	Acts 2:17-in the last days.
John 6:44-in the last day.	2 Tim. 3:1-in the last days.
John 6:54-to the last day.	Heb. 1:2-in the last of these days.
John 7:37-tlthe last day.	Jas. 5:3-in last days.
John 11:24-in the last day.	2 Pet. 3:3-on last of the days.

If in Bible study we come to an expression, the meaning of which is in dispute; we should, if possible, find it in another place where the meaning is clearly apparent. By taking John 7:37 we can easily learn the meaning of the expression "the last day." In that verse it cannot be misunderstood.

FOUR FUTURE RESURRECTIONS

(Continued from Vol. II, No. 4)

Those who take God at His word can rejoice in the emphatic simplicity of **Revelation 20:5.**

"But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection."

Only those who are bent upon extracting from the Word some predetermined meaning will attempt to make the words "this is the first resurrection" apply to the parenthetical explanation which immediately precedes it. The last part of verse five refers to verse four.

There is much in the word of God that would lead one to believe in a general resurrection. A casual examination of Daniel 12:2 or John 5:28-29, along with a tendency to reckon apart from all the facts, might lead to such a conviction. But if any have come to such erroneous conclusions from early Scripture passages, the Holy Spirit will certainly correct them if their studies continue to the end of the Book. There He states that certain dead are raised, and that the rest are not raised until the thousand years are finished.

The Word of God needs no adjustment, and the time set for the resurrection recorded in Revelation 20:4 will permit no adjustment. This resurrection takes place after the events recorded in Rev. 19. It does not take place at Rev. 4, nor does it take place before the great tribulation, for among the saints of that resurrection are the saints who are martyred in the time of Jacob's trouble. They refused to worship the beast, they refused his mark, they were beheaded-but they live and reign for one thousand years. It would be utterly ridiculous to hold that this resurrection takes place before Daniel's seventieth week, and then to have some who have part in this resurrection beheaded during that period.

This is called so emphatically "the first resurrection" that we would not want to be guilty of calling it "the completion of the first resurrection" as many teachers do today. This resurrection cannot be shifted around to meet the demands of man's theology. It will take place after the great tribulation, it will include the saints of that period, it is a distinct resurrection in itself and not the completion of something which began years before. Furthermore, we believe that upon examining all the truth revealed concerning this resurrection, we will discover the very day that it is to take place.

In **John 6:39-40** we have the words of the Lord Jesus Christ as follows:

"And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which He hath given me I should lose nothing, but raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day."

This passage sets forth much truth concerning this resurrection, and it also gives us the exact time in which it shall take place. It is twice repeated that it shall be "at the last day." The reader should note that this passage does not say "in last days" or "in the last days," but "at (or in) the last day."

The time of this resurrection is found again in the conversation of Christ with Martha, the sister of Lazarus: **"Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto Him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day. John 11:23-24.**

These passages are sufficient to establish the fact that there is a resurrection to take place at the last day, that it was, proclaimed to Israel, and that it was well understood by at least one faithful woman in Israel. Our next task is to discover what "the last day" refers to, so we ask the question- "the last day of what?"

If at this point any of our readers should have difficulty in following the study, let them make sure that they understand the true scriptural meaning of the word "age," also

the distinction between ages and administrations, We can be of no further help to those who are guilty of using the word age and dispensation interchangeably. There is no such thing in Scripture as an "age of grace." This present period of grace is an administration and not an age.

In Gal. 1:3 we read of "this present evil age." This present evil age has included a number of administrations or dispensations such as Law, Pentecostal, Grace, and will yet include the administration of judgment or the great tribulation. The millennial period is an age, and its chief characteristic will be righteousness, just as the chief characteristic of this age is evil. . This present evil age will some day come to an end, and the next day will be the first day of a one thousand year age of righteousness.

This coming age of righteousness, or the Kingdom, is Israel's age. It is then that she will come into all that God has promised her. It will be her time of greatest glory. It is no small wonder that every instructed Israelite was interested in and inquired about "the conclusion of the age." See Matt. 24:3, 14.

An examination of all references (See Concordance in this issue) will show that this present evil age has its "last days" and its "last day." The "last days" take in all of Daniel's seventieth week. The "last day" brings the evil age' to its end; the next day begins the age of righteousness.

In Revelation 19 we read of the events which close the present age. In Revelation 20 we read of events which open an age of righteousness. it is at the beginning of Revelation 20 that we also read of that of which John says, "this is the former resurrection," This brings the conviction that "the last day" of John 5:39, 40, 44, 54, refers to the final day of this age, Thus we have fixed the exact time of the last two resurrections. One takes place on the day before the one thousand year Kingdom begins, the second takes place at its close.

Our next task is to discover the subjects of this resurrection. This we shall take up in our next article.

(Continued, Vol. II, No. 6)

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

(Continued from Vol. II, No. 4)

In the pages of this magazine we desire to present all the facts in our possession on every subject with which we deal, to give light and let the people find their own way. This is the purpose that led us to give the concordance listing every occurrence of the phrase "the kingdom of God." No one has the right to accept any definition of the kingdom of God until he is familiar with every passage where the term appears. Neither has he the right to reject any definition until this familiarity is gained. And this knowledge must extend to the context of all passages. Once this familiarity is gained he has the right to accept or reject definitions according to his knowledge of the Word of God.

Those who have examined the concordance given in the last issue, have discovered that the phrase occurs seventy-two times in the New Testament. Of these occurrences five are in Matthew, thirty-three are in Luke, two in John, seven in Acts, nine are in the Pauline epistles and one in Revelation.

Reckoning apart from all the facts in a case will usually bring wrong conclusions. Reckoning upon one fact will do the same. Such reckoning has produced some crude conclusions concerning the meaning of "the kingdom of God." For example, the fact that the terms "the kingdom of heaven" and "the kingdom of God" are apparently used interchangeably in the first three gospels, has led some to conclude that these terms are identical, and that they are only different names for the same things. Thus, to many, the kingdom of God means nothing more than the earthly kingdom of the heavens which was covenanted to David.

It is true that in several places, such as the parallel records of the parables, we find that one writer reporting a parable uses the term "the kingdom of heaven"; while another writer reporting the same parable uses the term "the kingdom of God." Full recognition must be given to this fact, but we must not reckon on one fact alone. The fact that these terms are used interchangeably reveals to us that the kingdom of heaven is in the kingdom of God. The first is a limited sphere, while the second is a much larger sphere, though not unlimited. The kingdom of heaven is part of the kingdom of God, yet we cannot give the same limits to both. And it is permissible to refer to a part by calling it with the name of the whole. Thus the kingdom of heaven can be called the kingdom of God, but the kingdom of God cannot be called the kingdom of heaven.

The writer lives in the United States, and he also lives in Michigan. These terms can be used interchangeably, yet they are not the same. All that is true of the United States as a whole is true of Michigan; but all that is true of Michigan is not true of the United States as a whole, and may not be true of any other part. Any man who enters Michigan enters the United States, but all who enter the United States do not enter Michigan.

Even so, those who enter the kingdom of heaven also enter the kingdom of God; but all in the kingdom of God will not be in the kingdom of heaven. All that is true of the kingdom of God as a whole is also true of the kingdom of heaven; but some things true of the kingdom of heaven may not be true of the kingdom of God. To speak of a man entering into the kingdom of heaven, is to speak of him entering the kingdom of God. Thus in that manner the terms are interchangeable; but it must be remembered that to speak of a man entering into the kingdom of God may not mean that he is in that sphere called the kingdom of heaven. To change the terms here might be misleading.

This leads us to the conclusion that these terms are not interchangeable, and that they have been used carefully and exactly by the Holy Spirit. He alone has the right to replace the term "kingdom of heaven" with the term "kingdom of God."

Another wrong conclusion concerning the kingdom of God is that it must include everything that is of God. The genitive here is not the genitive of character, but the

genitive of origin and efficient cause. It means the kingdom which has its origin and source from God. Thus it is not essential that everything and everyone over which God rules shall be included in those subjects and spheres designated by the term "the kingdom of God." One verse is sufficient to prove that certain disciples --true believers --were not in the kingdom of God.

"Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." Acts 14:22.

Now if these disciples were in the kingdom of God, it would seem senseless to talk of them entering it through many tribulations. This verse is highly illuminating, and the full force of it must be considered in seeking a definition of the kingdom of God. We should also notice here that if the commonly accepted definition of the kingdom of God is true, these disciples were in the kingdom of God. Yet Paul tells them they must enter it through many tribulations. In this verse the commonly accepted definition of the kingdom of God breaks down.

Those who insist on the universality of the kingdom of God, insist just as strongly that it includes only those who are willingly subject to God's will. Yet in excluding those not subject to His will, universality is broken. And if they fail to include the bottomless pit and the lake of fire, universality is broken as to the extent.

Let no one imagine that the writer includes such in the kingdom of God, for he does not. We simply desire to demonstrate that if such are excluded, then the kingdom of God is not universal. And it is possible to limit it to exclude evil people and places, then there may be other limitations which may put some of God's willing subjects in spheres of glory which are not included in the term the kingdom of God. In other words, everything that has its origin and source from God may not be included in that kingdom that has its origin and source in God.

In **John 14:2** we read: **"In the house of my Father are many dwellings."** (Rotherham Version),

We hold that the sphere of God's rule His the Universe, with no exceptions. We hold that the sphere of God's willing subjects is "the Father's house." In the Father's house are many dwellings or abodes. One of these abodes is the kingdom of God, and in the kingdom of God will be the kingdom of heaven. Another abode in the Father's house is "the kingdom of the Son of His love" mentioned in Col. 1:13. We do not believe that the kingdom of the Son of His love is part of those realms called the kingdom of God. Our reasons for this will be developed in the next article.

If the reader will refer once more to the commonly accepted definition of the kingdom of God--that it is universal, including all moral intelligences willingly subject to the will of God, whether angels, the Church, or saints of past or future dispensations--we would like to set forth one more verse to show why we cannot accept this definition.

In **Matthew 21:43**, the Lord Jesus, speaking to the leaders in Israel, said to them:

"Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

This is a definite promise, and the promise states that "the Kingdom of God" shall be given to the nation that brings forth its fruits. Can this mean that the Church which is His body is to be given to that nation? The very statement of such is its own refutation. This verse demands that our definition of the kingdom of God shall be limited to the exclusion of God's present out-calling.

If any should suggest that in Matt. 21.43 the Lord is referring to the kingdom of heaven, our answer would be—then why did He not say the kingdom of the heavens? Did He make out this promise for too great an amount? The answer is NO.

(Continued, Vol. II. No.6)

WHAT IS THE MYSTERY?

The Mystery, of which Paul speaks in the Colossian and Ephesian epistle, has been for three years the chief concern of all our study, teaching and writing. We are making a new study of God's Word, and this study is made in the light of what knowledge we have of the Mystery or Secret. The Mystery is the truth that completes the Word of God. It is the capstone of the pyramid of truth. Even as the weight of the capstone is felt by the entire pyramid, so the Mystery has a bearing on the entire Word of God. He who has given time, effort and prayer to the task of knowing the truth of the Mystery, and then studies the Word in the light of the knowledge gained, is sure to come to different conclusions than those who care not to know the Mystery and even seem to detest the very mention of the word. And we can see no value in seeking the truth if the truth can never lead us beyond certain denominational or sectarian limitations which were set long before the search began.

We have set forth in detail in Volume One, that the word "Mystery" in Scripture does not mean something mysterious or incomprehensible. A radio listener wrote recently stating that they "do not believe that there is anything mysterious in the Bible." Neither do we. Some things are hard to be understood, but nothing is incomprehensible. The Greek word for "mystery" means a secret, pure and simple; a secret which can be understood when it is made known. This definition of the word mystery is in harmony with Paul's declaration in **Col. 1:26**. **"Even the mystery (secret) which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to His saints."**

Again in **Eph. 3:9** he states: "**And to make all men see what is the administration of the mystery (secret) which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God.**"

From these verses we see that the truth which Paul reveals in the Colossian and Ephesian epistle was in times past, a secret; that it had been hid, but it is now made manifest; that it had been hid in God, but he was now commissioned to make all men see.

Thus the question contained in our subject becomes one of great importance. We should ask, "What is the Mystery?" And it is to the Word of God that we should turn to discover our answer.

In answering the question certain things must be carefully avoided. First of all care must be exercised so that we do not include too much in the Mystery, and thus turn the truth of the Mystery into a mixture of many doctrines. Then we must be careful not to confuse "the Mystery" or "Secret" with other mysteries or secrets in the Word of God. We must not leave out of the Mystery any truth that belongs to it. Finally we must not be guilty of making the Mystery mean something that was never a secret and never hidden. Let us not infer that in Colossians and Ephesians Paul is giving the same old message under a new title.

Having established that, in the Scriptures, Mystery means Secret; we will now drop the word "Mystery," and use the word "Secret" altogether.

No human writer has ever been able to condense as much in few words as has the Holy Spirit in the Word of God. Truth which man could not properly present in volumes is presented by the Spirit in one sentence. This is true of the Secret which the Holy Spirit has summed up and condensed in the few words which make up **Ephesians 3:5**.

"That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same, body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by tale gospel."

One does not need to be a Greek scholar in order to see that the Authorized Version rendering of this verse is weak, and does not present the truth contained in the Greek language. Instead of translation here, we have a weak and unsatisfactory attempt made at interpretation. To comprehend the Secret we must understand Eph. 3: 5, but this verse can never be understood, the truth can never be realized on the basis of the Authorized Version translation. Therefore in our next article we will give time and study to discovering the true rendering of this verse.

(Continued, Vol. II, No. 6)

NOTES ON 1 CORINTHIANS

7:36-38. Paul's advice, that it was good for a man to remain unmarried, was sure to create many problems. He faces every difficulty in connection with these instructions. There was the problem of a father with a marriageable daughter. His means were not such that he could provide for her support for the future. Her marriage would mean that she would have a husband to provide for her. If she remained single and the father passed on, what then could she do?

Paul tells them that if any father thinks that he is not doing right by his unmarried daughter, so that she is passing the time when a woman should marry and that it should not be postponed, he should permit his daughter to marry. In so doing he committed: no sin. But if a father stood firm in his resolution that his daughter should not marry, and being free from all other considerations, if he kept his daughter single he did well. Thus, he who gave his daughter in marriage did well, and he who did not give her in marriage did better.

It should be noted once more that if these instructions are carried over into the present economy, they will work hopeless confusion. Let them remain in the Pentecostal Administration. That is where God placed them.

7:39-40. A woman is bound by law to her husband during the whole period that he lives. If he dies she is at liberty to marry whom she will, provided he is a believer. However, Paul's judgment is that she will be happier if she remains single.

The closing words of this chapter do not express a doubt, but an absolute certainty.

(Continued, Vol. II, No. 6)

LETTER FROM A CRITIC

A number of letters have been received, from time to time, from pastors of churches. Most of these seem to have the same general characteristics. The following letter from a Baptist minister is representative of these letters we have received. This brother speaks plainly, and is somewhat sharp in his criticism, but this he has the right to be, and we do not mind it. He calls us no names and hurls no epithets as so many do. Therefore, we print his letter, and will print our answer to it in the next issue.

Dear Mr. Sellers:

I have received several numbers of your little magazine, "The Word of Truth," and I have noticed that you have changed your views several times on certain Bible doctrines which you seem to be making a hobby of, and I suppose as time goes on you will change your views again. In view of the above I feel that you are not a safe leader to follow. You

seem to be devoting your time in quarreling about little things that are of really no moment, and that do not affect my salvation one way or the other.

For example: In the September issue (**Vol. II, No. 4**) you are arguing about four resurrections. What difference does it make if there are two, four, or twenty resurrections to the child of God (or son of God if you prefer) who knows he or she has been redeemed by the blood and adopted into the family of God. In opening your article on the Four Resurrections you say, "As a result of turning from EVERY commonly accepted theory concerning the resurrections. . . we have discovered, etc., etc. Please, my dear brother, do not make yourself look so fearfully ridiculous by challenging the scholarship of the ages--and I mean the scholarship of real men of God--and setting forth your theory and your scholarship as being the only one that can possibly be right.

I heard you in your attempt to explain away the Communion, and to me, it was a pitiably weak argument, and anything but convincing. If we who feel like obeying I Cor. 11:24-26 and by so doing proclaim our precious Saviour's death till He come, why should any living person challenge that right? Certainly you can find no Scripture that will bar us from heaven for so doing. I am NOT basing my hope of salvation on such observance, because I am saved by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and His finished work on Calvary.

About all that you are doing--as I see it--is to add a little more confusion to an already fearfully confused body of believers. Why not devote your time and energy to preaching Christ and Him crucified and leave all these little side issues for the Lord to explain when He comes. Remember Paul said, "For I am determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

In closing I want to rebuke you for your reply to B. W. D. Illinois-September issue. My brother, who set you up as a Judge of your brother in Christ? How do you know that 'many Christians' are hoping for salvation because they have been dipped in water and partake of the elements at stated periods? How do you know that they have not complied with Romans 10:9,10, or that they are not standing on Rom. 5:1? Do you mean to infer that the only ones that are to be saved are those that set aside every other authority and accept one Otis Q. Sellers?

I know of instances where your questionable teachings have pulled Christians out of a real Fundamental church and caused division over things that in no manner can possibly affect one's salvation. This kind of thing should be condemned--and that most severely.

Sincerely yours,

THE EDITOR-TO HIS FRIENDS

****This is the combined October-November issue of THE WORD OF TRUTH, although it is no larger in size than preceding issues. The next issue will be designated December-January and will be placed in the mail before January 1. From that time on we will issue the magazine every month, and earnestly strive to have it in the mail no later than the first day of each month. During the first months of the magazine we fell behind, and this will bring us into harmony with the calendar. The magazine will again be sixteen pages as soon as income makes this possible.

****The four leaflets advertised in this issue represent the first literature to come from our own printing equipment. We have also printed stationery, mailing envelopes, filing cards, etc., and our project to do our own work has so far measured up to all our hopes concerning it. At present time we can turn out such literature as these leaflets, but cannot do the magazine until funds are available for the purchase of a stitcher and paper cutter. Several other smaller items are yet needed, but are not absolutely essential as are the two mentioned. The amount required is \$150.00, but we have already exhausted all possibilities as far as friends are concerned. So we are looking to and waiting upon the Lord in this matter.

A friend will buy the stitcher (\$40.00) if others will buy the cutter (about \$100.00), but so far we cannot meet this condition.

Many of our readers have doubted the feasibility of our project, but we have now done enough with our limited equipment to prove to our own satisfaction that it is entirely practical. Some of our readers may be interested in knowing that our press is a 10x15 new series Chandler and Price with Miller automatic feeder and variable speed motor.

*****A number of projects are connected with our witness, all of which require financial support, and it is ever our determination that every project shall "stand on its own legs." The Radio is supported entirely by funds sent in for that express purpose, and no other funds are ever used to carry on that ministry. Every penny used for the printing equipment has been given for that purpose. The magazine is supported by its readers, and all gifts sent in for THE WORD OF TRUTH are used for it and it alone. Mr. White's living expenses are taken care of personally by the Editor. When we begin to print our own magazine, we will give Mr. White everything we save out of the present amount we spend for printing.

****A letter received today may be suggestive to others. "Please send me twenty five copies of leaflet No.1 on "God's Plan of Salvation." I plan to send one with the Christmas cards to my friends. I think it is just the message for the unsaved."

End, Vol. II, No. 5