

but when he remembers that near half of that consisted of quotations from his own pen he has *some less* ground for complaint. Let us now see what there is in his reply.

1. Our brother raises a false issue to evade the real question. He

tried to make it appear that the *isms* of the day grew out of different interpretations of the Scriptures. We replied that this was a mistake, that God's people are not divided about what is in the Bible, but over that which is *not* in it.

As an example, we asked, "Does he find it in the Bible that the primitive Christians wore human names by divine authority, and that it is right to do so now?" Why does he not answer this question instead of trying to show that the name "Christian Church" was not given by divine authority? Who said it was? and what has that to do with the question? This forcibly reminds us of a public discussion we held some years ago with a prominent Methodist divine in Mo. who affirmed that "Sprinkling and Pouring is Scriptural Baptism," and then spent most of his time in trying to show that those who were immersed in primitive times were immersed "naked!" and therefore sprinkling and pouring is Scriptural baptism! Of course we completely failed to convince

this preacher that his conclusion did not necessarily follow from his premises. If our brother should succeed in showing that the name "Christian" was of human origin, would that prove it right for God's people either as churches or individuals to wear such human names as Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, etc.? It would only show that we should get rid of the name "Christian" along with all other human names and wear such names only as are given by divine authority. Or does the *Advocate* think that God has never named his Church? How the *Advocate* in the face of all we have written can represent us as contending that the name "Christian" can "be properly appropriated by one 'Church' as more, or more rightfully theirs, than another," without a wilful misrepresentation of our position is a mystery to us. If he knows anything, he knows that we have contended that the word "Christian" was always applied by the Holy Spirit to *individuals*, and not to the Church. Neither do we limit its use to one "denomination only," but think that it not only

rightfully belongs to *all* God's people alike, but that all will be held alike responsible to God for not wearing it and other Bible names to the exclusion of all human and sectarian names which divide God's children, and are an abomination in His sight.

2. His answer to our question in reference to creeds is simply no answer at all. He knows that the primitive Christians had no book of discipline apart from the Bible, and that the word of God alone was all they needed. Why then draw up a book of Discipline now for the Churches containing the *interpretations* of the Bible? If the "Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation," etc., why have *another* book of Discipline? Can we improve on the Bible? Is it not a fact that creeds have always been a cause of strife and division among professed Christians, and is it not a fact that they are really and directly rules of faith and practice in many churches instead of the Bible? It is not strictly true that "any man who undertakes to interpret the Scriptures has a creed," that his understanding of what the Bible teaches is his creed," etc. It is only when men's opinions and interpretations are written out in the form of a book of doctrine and discipline and adopted by the churches as such that they become a rule of action by which the church is to be governed. When thus formulated, the appeal in case of doctrine and discipline is not directly to the Bible, but to the creed, and if the *creed* is set at naught, the transgressor is regarded as unworthy of further fellowship. As the *Advocate* has quoted from his Discipline, we also wish to make a quotation just at this point.

In the Book of Discipline, Sec. 8, under the Duties of Ministers, we find the following questions put to them: "Do you constantly attend the sacrament? Have you read the form of Discipline? Are you willing to conform to it?" From this it would seem that ministers are to keep the rules of the Discipline. Under the same section, page 78, we have the following instruction given to Methodist preachers:

"Observe! it is not your business only to preach so many times, and to take care of this or that society; but to save as many as you can; to bring as many sinners as you can to repentance, and with all your power to build them up in that holiness without which they cannot see the Lord. And remember! A Methodist preacher is to mind every

point, great and small, in the Methodist Discipline! Therefore you will need to exercise all the sense and grace you have."

From this it seems that there is no escape for a Methodist preacher who refuses to mind every point, both great and small in the Discipline; and this is the more apparent when it is seen that by a single refusal he fails to exercise all the sense and grace he has.

Here then we find *one* of the pens that separate the Lord's sheep.

3. We did not ask about Methodism, but we asked if the Methodist church was found in the Bible? If not, then why not be satisfied with simply the Church of Christ and leave off the Methodist—another "pen?" According to the *Advocate's* own definition taken from the Discipline, the Methodist church is not in the Bible and hence is not the Church of Christ or any part of it. For 1. The pure word of God is not preached in it. 2. The sacraments are not duly administered (1) In this church the Lord's table is set quarterly, whereas the Scriptures require it weekly. (2) Immersion, the act Christ commanded, is set aside and sprinkling and pouring substituted for it. (3) Infants are sprinkled, a thing not found in the word of God. Hence our greatest desire is not to improve the definition, but to get rid of all the *isms*, or pens, connected with the Church itself, and thus convert it into a Church of Christ.

4. The *Advocate* resorts to the same old dodge of trying to convict us of that for which it contends, viz.: denominationalism. Would it not look a little more like honest journalism to just answer our question than to keep continually charging us with something we positively disavow? But then any thing to evade the question. If we as a people are in a pen, why is it so? Is it because we have built the pen or aided others in building it? We answer that it is because our religious neighbors have built pens all around us, and thus it is that our six hundred thousand are so hemmed in that they are *compelled* to graze to themselves. A fine specimen of primitive Christianity indeed for his boasted "many times six hundred thousand" sheep to fence themselves off into more than six hundred separate pens thus completely hedging in one struggling flock, while one old wether from a half starved flock thrusts his nose through a crack of the fast decay-

ing pen and pitifully bleats, "We could'nt all get into *your* pen!" We don't want you in *our* pen. If you have sufficient strength, tear down your own pens, and you will then find us in the open field where the great Shepherd has placed us. If you are not able, our special business is to give you assistance. We have besieged these pens and now have our battering-rams turned against them, and by the help of God we will bring them to the ground sooner or later. Dear brother, you need not be surprised to see *your* pen fall at any time, and if you will take our best advice, you will keep out from under the falling timbers.

5. We repeat that the *Advocate* does misrepresent us in stating that we contend that our Church is the "only Christian Church." We have said no such thing. We affirm simply that our local churches are churches of Christ. The *other* churches are to be measured by the Bible. The Church of Christ in the aggregate is composed of *all* Christians, many of whom are still in the Babylon of Sectarianism. Hence our grand plea. The *Advocate* still needs to be enlightened. Will he now correct?

6. We are not concerned about what the *Advocate* has gone over with Bro. Adams or any one else. We are fully aware that all sectarianism, as other error, wants to be let alone. Of course it does, because it cannot bear the light and logic of gospel truth. The narrow minded Pharisees saw any thing but Christianity in the assaults of Christ on their errors and traditions; but still the good work went on. And so now, we shall go on overturning the *parts* of churches and scattering them to the four winds until all God's people shall have been brought into the *one true Church of Christ*, of which He is the Head.

As we went to Scio the other Saturday, a few miles beyond Albany we had occasion to ask a gentleman if he could direct us to Central Chapel? He inquired, "The C-a-m-p-b-e-l-l-i-t-e church?" We said, y-e-s, and drove on. Brethren, don't forget to let your light shine in that neighborhood.

There is evil enough in man, God knows! But it is not the mission of every young man and woman to detail and report it all. Keep the atmosphere as pure as possible and fragrant with gentleness and charity.