

fact is based our plea for Christian union. Now if these are in the New Testament "Church of Christ," as freely admitted, and this same phrase is uniformly used to describe us *alone* as an organization, then in every such case the phrase "Church of Christ" is used in a mere restricted and sectarian sense, and the church thus adopting and using it becomes a sectarian church just to that extent. We have no right to wrest words and phrases from their proper connection and Scriptural meaning and restrict them to a use unknown to the word of God. We can hold on to mere names and Scripture forms of expression and still become sectarians. It is not so much the use of words and phrases themselves as their currently accepted meaning that constitutes sectarianism. It is bad enough when we are sometimes compelled by the force of circumstance to use names in a restricted and unauthorized sense; but for a convention to adopt such a use by which we are to be always known, we think is without excuse.

2. When we come to look into the New Testament Scriptures, we find that the church is to be known by different names. The question of the name of the church has been settled from the very beginning, and that too by the inspiration of God. What need we then to attempt to legislate in this matter? Now seeing that the church is to be known by a *number* of names if we shall adopt one to the exclusion of the rest, we endeavor to become wise above what is written, and to set up our knowledge against the positive legislation of God. If God intended that his church should be uniformly known by *one* name, then why has he given to it more than one? We should accept all the New Testament names of the church and use them in their different relations to the institution, and to one another, and not adopt one to the exclusion of all other. In this way only can we expect to avoid drifting into sectarianism. Remember we are not finding fault so much with the phrase "Church of Christ," but it is its uniform and restricted use to which we object. "Churches of Christ," and "Church of God" are found in the New Testament, and hence we are authorized to use them; while such expressions as Campbellite church, and Disciple church are as unscriptural and sectarian as Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian church, for none of

them are to be found in the Bible. Neither do we fancy the phrase "Christian church." It is true that this form is often used among us, but when objected to, it is usually claimed that it is simply used as a synonym of Church of Christ. But we answer, the phrase Christian church is almost invariably employed to describe us *alone*, and hence in a circumscribed and sectarian sense. And again, if it is only used as a synonym of Church of Christ, then why not use the original phrase itself rather than its synonym? In this way we could at least avoid the double work of first using the phrase and then explaining that we use it as a mere synonym. But we ask, Is Christian church a true synonym of Church of Christ? We leave this for our readers to answer for themselves. There is one thing certain, it is found nowhere in the Bible. In the meantime, if it should be found that it fails to express the true Scripture meaning, then we think it should be dropped from our theological vocabulary and a substitution made of such names, and such only, as are found in the Scriptures.

3. While we have no particular objection to being correctly represented in tables of statistics, etc., and of thus being made known to the world in our numerical strength and financial greatness, yet we do not care to sacrifice a principle or do violence to the word of God to obtain this end. We should be careful that we do not become puffed up with pride and thus fall into the condemnation of the devil. If our neighbors have a desire to fairly represent us or to learn more of our work, we apprehend they can very easily do so; and if we are only faithful to the principles committed to us, God will make our influence felt for good to a greater extent among the nations of earth than could otherwise be done by the silly and hurtful adoption of all the Scripture names under heaven.

Selections and Comments.

The Christian Index, a Baptist paper published in Atlanta, Ga. says:

The Index has given up nothing; nor have the Baptists of the south. So far as we know, none of the evangelical denominations of the south have given up anything unless we except infant baptism, which some of them seem to be giving up practically, though they still contend for it in words.

How about Dr. Graves and "Old Landmarkism"? Does the *Index*

indorse all this? But then would it not be well after all for them to give up something, for example, the name "Baptist"?

SALVATION EASY:
"The terms of salvation are easy. Whosoever believeth. Mark the word believeth. Mark the word whosoever."—*Christian Index*.

And is baptized. Mark the word baptized. Then please give heed to the Savior: "And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."

ALL PARTS UNISON.—Here is the way an exchange proposes to solve the mysterious Hymnal question:

We propose that the hymn book disputants now sing the 638th hymn. Bro. Errett will raise the tune. Bros. Rice and Johnson will sing bass. Bros. Bishop and Bosworth will ply the alto. Bro. Fillmore will beat time. The Standard Publishing Co. will play the organ. Here we go:

"How sweet, how heavenly is the sight,
When those who love the Lord,
In one another's peace delight,
And so fulfill the word!"

We further suggest, that while this song is being sung, the remaining portion of the brotherhood pay strict attention to the rests.

RELIGION IN BUSINESS.—There is much wholesome food for the professor of Christianity in the following, from the *North British Review*:

The pressing need of our faith is not simply faithful evangelists to proclaim its doctrines, but legions of men consecrating their worldly vocations, witnessing to the truth on which much skepticism prevails, that Christianity so received as to become an integral part of a man, is omnipotent to keep from him the evil, not by taking him out of the world, but by making him victorious over it. He is a most worthy disciple of Christ, who, like Palissy, or Buxton, or Budgett, or Perthes, exhibits religion as "the right use of man's whole self"—as the one thing which gives dignity and nobility to what is in itself sordid and earthly—as the mainspring of earnest and successful strivings after loftier ends and a purer life—as the power outside of and within man, which, lifting up conduct in the individual, raises the community—and not as a state of mind mystical, and in active life unattainable, high up among things intangible, separated from contact with work-a-day life, appropriate to Sabbath days and special hours, old age and death-beds. Every man who is "diligent in business, serving the Lord," is a sermon brimfull of the energies of life and truth, a witness to the comprehensiveness and adaptability of Christ's religion, a preacher of righteousness in scenes where none can preach so effectively or so well.

MINISTERS MUST FIGHT:

Many of the preachers would do well to call to mind often Pres. C. L. Loos' earnest talk at the Lexington Convention about playing "fast and loose in the temperance work." The traffic is the deadliest foe of the church. The minis-

ter who refuses to enter this fight with all his consecrated power and talents for God and humanity, is a betrayer of his trust, a Benedict Arnold, a Judas Iscariot, a traitor to his country and church. Unite and fight a common foe and the best agent of the devil, with half the

zeal that the dogmas and doctrines of at least moral and conscientious people are fought and the end of the traffic in homes, hearts and souls, will come like the "crack of doom."—*The Worker*.

We say, amen. But we don't understand Bro. Neal to contend that in order for a minister to enter this great fight he must necessarily don all the blue, red and yellow ribbons of the day, join all the temperance organizations that are set on foot, or that he must even become a fanatical prohibitionist. The one point before him is the fact that all ministers *must fight*. Good men may differ as to the manner of attack, and there is indeed, more than *one* way of making effectual fights; but still there is no question about the fact that all must fight. Then let us see to it.

GOOD ADVICE.—The *Christian Standard*, under the head of "The Winter Campaign—A Suggestion," says:

The suggestion we have to make, is this: Dismissing all these incidental changes in themes or in the method of their treatment, let this winter be given up to genuine, old-style presentation of the Gospel, and aggressive warfare against sectarianism. There are several reasons for this suggestion.

This is a good suggestion; but why confine it to this winter's campaign? We had an idea that the greater portion of the minister's time should be devoted to this kind of work. But Bro. Errett, what shall be done about those who do not believe in preaching "first principles?" As one of the reasons for pursuing this course, the *Standard* adds:

There is much yet to call for aggressive warfare against sectarianism and corrupt teaching. If, in the discussions of the last half century, many batteries of the enemy have been silenced, the victory is yet but partial. On the questions of converting power, the source of faith, the evidence of pardon, the basis of Christian fellowship, the spiritual characteristics of Christian brotherhood, the sin of sectarianism, the absolute necessity of the abandonment of party names, creeds and politics for the sake of oneness in Christ, and the action, subjects and designs of baptism, there are yet great battles to be fought before the final victory can be won.

INFIDEL PREACHING.—As another specimen of infidel preaching read the following from an exchange:

Rev. Dr. L. D. Watson, a New York Methodist, in a recent discussion on baptism, having defined *baptizo* as meaning "to purify," said: "I hold that Christ was never baptized; I do not think he possibly could have been baptized."