

CHRISTIAN HERALD.

EDITOR:

J. F. FLOYD.

FRIDAY, JAN. 19, 1883.

Work.

We mean work for Christ, and for every thing that is good, pure and lovely. One of the pressing needs of the day is more hard work for our Master and less theorizing and speculation about what should be done and what we are going to do sometime in the future. We don't mean that we must make a great noise, flourish our trumpets and attract all the attention we can from the world in order to become popular with the people, draw a big crowd to listen to our preaching and seek to please men generally; but we mean a straight-forward consistent course of quiet, daily work for Christ and the establishment of his cause. It is a very easy matter for some Christians to sing, "Work, for the night is coming," and then lie down in the shade and wait for the night to come so they can have a good nap; and the longer the night the better with them. Like Jonah, they delight in going down into the bottom of the ship to sleep; and it requires no small storm and no inconsiderate voice, "What meanest thou, O sleeper? arise, and call upon thy God," to arouse them from their slumbers. They are literally asleep in Jesus.

When the husbandman sent men into his vineyard he commanded them to work, and when he saw others standing idle he sent them that they might have something to do. In like manner does our Savior send men into his spiritual vineyard. The exhortation to Christians is to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling. There is no escape for any, for if some can not do one thing, there will be other kinds of work provided for them. This is a beautiful system of things, and we ought to thank God that he has so amply provided for all. We may have our faith and hold our theories, but this alone will not save the people. We want a Christianity that is more practical; something that the people can see and feel. We want a Christianity that reaches the home, the farm, the workshop, the store, the school-room, the steamship, the railroad and in short every vocation of life alike. Such and

such only will save the soul, convince the skeptic, and build up and advance the cause of Jesus Christ.

A Useless Controversy.

The following is from the CHRISTIAN HERALD, the paper and organ of the "Christian church" published at Monmouth, Oregon:

We take the following editorial note from the *Pacific Christian Advocate*, a Methodist paper published at Portland:

The CHRISTIAN HERALD has the funny habit, whenever it gets a new editor, of undertaking to correct the *Advocate* and the other religious papers of the coast in quite a penological way. Last week it says that the *Advocate* "talks about the different branches of the Church of Christ," and it asks the original and very profound question if "the *Advocate* does not know that the Church of Christ had no branches?" The *Advocate* has only to ask, if the HERALD does not consider the little denomination to which it belongs a branch of the Church of Christ, what is it a branch of?"

A "profound question, indeed!"

We reply 1. The HERALD does not profess to belong to a "denomination" at all. As we can find no place for the denominations in the New Testament, we know of no better use to which we can put them than to turn them over to our Methodist friends out of which to make "branches." We profess to belong simply to the Church of Christ. If we do not belong to that, then we belong to nothing, and if the Church of Christ is a branch, will the *Advocate* please tell us what it is a branch of?

2. We claim to be a "branch" ourselves. Christ said to his disciples: "I am the vine, ye are the branches." Does the *Advocate* understand?

3. If the *Advocate* and "the other religious papers of the coast" do not wish to be "corrected," they may expect to do one of two things, either to fold up their sheets and retire from the theological field, or to speak as the oracles of God speak. A portion of the HERALD's special work is not only the correction, but the absolute destruction of sectarianism in all their forms, and from present indications a good large portion will have to be devoted to this work. We consider this a fair introduction.

There is something in the above so openly amenable to the charge of a "strife about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers" that we refer to it reluctantly lest we might fall under the same condemnation. And we do so with the assurance to our readers that the *Advocate* will not depart from its well understood and well approved course in regard to such debates. The *Advocate* has no space for them, its Editor has no taste for them, and it and he can be employed in much holier and more charitable uses. We refer in a few words to the three points attempted by the HERALD, as they are numbered by itself.

1. "The HERALD does not profess to belong to a denomination at all." This is not a question of "profession" but of fact. Let a notice be published in Portland for "a meet-

ing of the pastors of the different denominations of Christians in the city," and among them will appear Brother Shadle, pastor of the denomination that calls itself the "Christian church," but is more widely known outside of its own limited circle as the "Campbellite church."

He will be received and respected as the pastor of one of the Christian denominations of the city. It has everything that makes a denomination has. It has nothing that entitles it to call itself the Church of Christ that they have not. If they are denominations it is. To that denomination the HERALD belongs, whatever it may "profess not to belong to."

"If the Church of Christ is a branch, will the *Advocate* please tell us what it is a branch of?" The *Advocate* has never said the Church of Christ is a branch. The Church of Christ, in its largest sense, consists of the whole body of believers, and as such a whole may be spoken of as a body, like the body of a tree, of which the various denominations may very properly be called the branches. The Church is not the "vine," and if it is not the vine, what can it be but the branches?

3. This is a wonderful paragraph. Will our readers turn back and scan it again? What a wonderful man we have among us. And stolen in so quietly too.

It is a wonder that there was not a moral and intellectual earthquake when he touched Oregon. We, and our co-temporary "religious papers of the coast," have the command: "fold up your sheets and retire from the theological field or speak as the oracles of God speak," according to the interpretation of the giant of Monmouth. "Upon what meat does this Caesar feed?"

Now if the Editor of the HERALD does not know that all such talk as he has given us in that beautiful bit of self fondling is set down by the average Oregon "theologian" as gasconade, he will find it out by the time he has summered and wintered on this coast. If the HERALD's "special work" is "the destruction of sectarianism and denominationalism in all their forms" on this coast, we advise it to go to work on its own "sect" for everybody in Oregon understands that it is the most "sectarian" sect, the most denominational denomination on the coast. The *Advocate* does not claim that Methodism is more the Church of Christ than any other denomination of Christians, with all of which we gladly fraternize and affiliate.

Having said this much we take leave of this subject, without any intention of returning to it again.

REPLY.

1. Just as we expected. Raw mules kick out of the harness; well trained ones never. And if a Methodist paper should make an argument and then defend it, it

would be another wonder of the world. When a man feels his defeat, it is natural for him to refer to it "reluctantly," and how could it be otherwise with the *Advocate*? In view of this fact it is not at all remarkable that its Editor has no "taste" for "debates."

2. If it is a question of "fact," then it is a fact that we are not a "denomination," the *Advocate* to the contrary notwithstanding. "A drunk man thinks every body else is drunk." Because the *Advocate* claims to be nothing but a denomination and thinks we are one, does not make it so. If Bro. Shadle should appear in answer to a call for a meeting of the pastors of the different denominations of the city, he would not appear there to represent a mere sect or denomination, although the denominational pastors might think he did. Will the *Advocate* ask him? It might gain a ray of light. Paul appeared in a Jewish synogogue in answer to their call for Jewish worship; but he went there as a Christian only, and a member of the one Church, although they doubtless thought he came there to represent that "sect" which was everywhere spoken against. We are not responsible for the *Advocate's* inability to see this distinction; and until the first principles of Christian courtesy have been learned, we expect to be called "Campbellite church" outside of our own circle. If the Church of Christ has everything that makes it a denomination and nothing that entitles it to call itself the Church of Christ, then we belong to a denomination; otherwise, we do not.

3. The *Advocate* says: The Church of Christ, in its largest sense, consists of the whole body of believers, and as such and a whole may be spoken of as a body, like the body of a tree, of which the various denominations may very properly be called the branches." But did it never occur to the *Advocate* that the denominations as such are no part of the body? This is the very question in dispute. When he proves them to be any part of the tree it will be time enough to talk about its being proper to call them "branches." If our friend should see a tree which had more than six hundred different kinds of branches, and bearing so many kinds of fruits, he would doubtless conclude that there was something wrong with the whole affair. Let him study the application.