

4. We come now to his clinching argument. He says: "The Church is not the 'vine,' and if it is not the vine, what can it be but the branches?" In order to bring out the full force of this argument he should have said, "A horse is not the 'vine,' and if he is not the vine, what can he be but the branches!" He would simply be a horse, and the Church of Christ is simply the Church of Christ.

5. The *Advocate* says it will notice our three points as we numbered them, but it never mentions our second. Why? We leave our readers to judge. But in that paragraph the *Advocate* will learn that Christ teaches that He is the vine and his individual disciples are the branches. Again we ask, "Does the *Advocate* understand?"

6. Our good friend thinks a wonderful man has stolen into Oregon, and that it is strange we have not had a "moral and intellectual earthquake, etc." It would seem from what we have before us that there has very recently been considerable quaking about the office of the *Advocate*. As to the moral and intellectual feature, we are not so certain. We are profoundly thankful however that this shock has not disturbed us in the least. We are used to them. The *Advocate* exclaims, "Upon what meat does this Caesar feed?" It would occur to most people that he is now feeding upon Methodist meat; and if his weakness is such as estimated by the *Advocate*, it is to be hoped that it will be attributed to the quality of the food rather than to any natural depravity.

7. We have now reached his closing paragraph, (keep cool my brother). It is a fine specimen of sectarianism, and this is the only reason we consent to refer to it. The sectarian spirit is the same wherever found. Like the opposers of pure Christianity in the days of the Savior, it knows nothing of honorable, dignified Christian investigation. It can only rant a little, and then retire from the field defeated and disgraced. But we thank God that there are many in the denominational ranks among the better enlightened and more refined who have thrown off the shackles of sectism and are willing to stand upon the broad platform of true principles and Christian courtesy, ever ready to investigate and learn that which pertains to life and godliness. As for the rest, it is to be expected that, in obedi-

ence to our command, they will choose to fold up their sheets and retire from the field rather than speak as the oracles of God speak. Of course it is understood that when "everybody in Oregon" understands that we are the most "sectarian," "the most denominational denomination on the coast," the *Advocate* is everybody in Oregon, and when it "folds its sheet," journalism and religion will be dead on the coast. (Keep cool) By the time we summer and winter on the coast, the *Advocate* may learn that there is somebody in Oregon besides itself.

And now we are truly sorry to have to part company so suddenly with our amiable friend, especially while he is likely to expire in a paroxysm of holy horror, for it makes us uneasy as to his future. But we will be glad to meet him in the far off by and by even as a "branch." In the mean time the destruction of denominationalism will go on as usual.

F-a-r e-well Bro. Crawford.

From C. H. Spurgeon.

One of our subscribers having made enquiry of us to the frequency of the celebration of the Lord's supper and the existence of ruling elders in the congregation in London under the pastoral care of C. H. Spurgeon we submitted the query to the great preacher himself. He replied very promptly, and we have the pleasure of giving an exact copy of his answer, which is as follows:

'R. C. Buckner, Dallas, Texas, U. S. A. Dear Sir:—

Yes, we break bread every Lord's day, for so it seems to have been apostolic practice. I conceive there is no law but there is precedent.

Yes, we have deacons for temporal, and elders for spiritual things. Do we not read of elders over every church? Are not both officers necessary?

Yours truly,  
C. H. SPURGEON.

This furnishes the information our querist wanted, and we wish to say nothing further just at this time but at another time would have no objection to writing at length on the two points.

The above is taken from the *Texas Baptist* of recent date. It is pretty plain as well as scriptural talk from the great Baptist preacher to a Baptist editor, and we suppose was easily understood by the latter. Our Baptist brethren were not satisfied with what the New Testament teaches on these questions, but had to refer the matter to Mr. Spurgeon. Now that they have his positive answer backed up by his

established custom all of which is substantially the teaching of the apostles and the practice of the primitive churches, the question arises, what are they going to do about it? Will they continue to oppose apostolic practice, or will they accept the teaching of their great preacher and that of inspired apostles and thus take another step towards New Testament Christianity? We will see.

Please notice furthermore that Mr. Spurgeon does not talk about the Sabbath, but he calls the day on which they break bread the Lord's day.

Selections and Comments.

BAPTISM AND REMISSION.—In the *Christian at Work*, C. Kendrick publishes an extract from a letter written by Dr. T. J. Conant:

"MY DEAR SIR:—In Acts ii. 38, I understand the words 'unto the remission of sins' as a shorter and more literal expression of Dr. Hackett's 'in order to the forgiveness of sins'; 'unto' and 'in order to' having the same import. The words stand connected with both the requirements that precede, namely, repentance and immersion upon the name of Jesus Christ. Immersion upon the name of Jesus Christ, as the foundation and ground of it, is "an acknowledgement of him in that act as being what his name imports, the sinner's hope, his Redeemer, Justifier" (Hackett).

I am, my dear sir, very truly yours,  
T. J. CONANT.

It should be remembered that Dr. Conant is one of the finest critics and greatest biblical scholars in the Baptist ranks. Let our Baptist brethren carefully read the above extract.

"ABOUT NAMES."—The *Christian Messenger* under this heading has some very sensible things to say about the adoption of a name:

A brother writes the *Messenger* suggesting that the disciples of Christ should take some one scriptural name, and wear it, to the exclusion of all others. This is impossible, while we take the Bible for our creed. The same suggestion was made at the last general convention, in the form of a resolution, and was ruled out of order. Christ's people were not called by any one name in the days of the apostles, to the exclusion of all others. As a denomination, with Christ at their head, they are called Christians; as learners and followers of Christ, they are called disciples; as holy people, set apart to a pure and holy life, they are called saints; as children of a common family, they are called brethren; as a church, they are called the church of God or the church of Christ. All these names are correct, when correctly used. It would be unscriptural to take the name saints as a denominational title, and spell it with a capital S, as the Mormons do; or brethren, and spell it with a capital B, as the Tunkers do; or the name disciples, and spell it with a capital D, as the *Christian Review* and *Christian Standard* do. This is sectarianism. It is also unscriptural and sinful to call the people of

God Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, Catholics, and Campbellites. There were no such churches in the days of the apostles. People who are educated in the Scriptures do not wear these outlandish titles.

Our great interest in this question is the only apology we offer for our frequent reference to it. Most of our papers have been free to speak out in condemnation of this move, and we are astonished to see article after article appear in the *Christian Standard* from those who seem to be more interested in a few statistics than in a close adherence to New Testament principles, without a word of comment from the editor. Are we to take this silence of the *Standard* as giving its consent? Yet the *Messenger* says, "As a denomination, with Christ at their head, they are called Christians." But if they are a "denomination," then why not wear a denominational name?

GREETINGS.—This is from the *Atlantic Missionary*:

The *CHRISTIAN HERALD*, of Monmouth, Oregon is now under the management of Bro. Floyd. The last number was especially good.

The *HERALD* and the *Missionary* now shake hands across the American continent. Smooth the troubled waters of the Atlantic brethren, and we will do what we can for old Pacific.

Here is what the *Christian Standard* says:

The *CHRISTIAN HERALD*, of Monmouth Oregon, now appears with the name of J. F. Floyd as editor and publisher. Bro Floyd is already known in connection with the *Faithful Witness*, of Kansas. We wish him all success in his new venture.

The *Standard*, we believe, never forgets to mention us in our many changes. This shows enterprise, and something more. We feel like taking off our hat when the *Standard* comes into our office, but then we expect to grow too.

MUST STOP SOMEWHERE.—The *Christian Instructor* says:

Professor Park, of Andover seminary, speaking of the orthodox wing of the New England Congregationalist says: "We have given up doctrine after doctrine, and we must stop somewhere." Professor Park will find that the mistake which he and his friends have made was in beginning to give up to the demands of the liberal elements in the church. Having begun to yield, they will make the discovery that they must continue to yield until all that has constituted them an evangelical church has been lost. They can stop nowhere short of casting out the liberal element, or separating themselves from it.

This is good advice. When preachers and churches once begin getting broad it does not take long to get a good deal broader than Christ and the apostles.