

jection to a short sermon is that—we wanted more. We will come again and get it. Thus the people do. The lingering lifeless existence of many a prayer meeting is all for want of *energetic brevity*.

Parsons, Kansas.

### OUGHT.

In the HERALD of June 22nd I find over the signature of Anderson the following: "Feet washing is not enjoined by Christ. Therefore feet washing ought not to be practiced as an ordinance."

In love I desire to submit a few thoughts. There is no question as to feet washing under certain circumstances; but as an ordinance what saith the record? Jesus was engaged in the act of washing the disciples' feet when Peter objected. Jesus answered him, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." Can it be conjectured that the washing was because of the dust that had adhered through the day and that this was preparatory to the usual rest at night? Did Peter so understand Jesus? "Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." The washing here referred to is the same as 15th chap. 3rd verse, "Ye are clean through the word," and he that is thus cleansed needeth not "save to wash his feet." Jesus said to them, "Ye are not all clean," having reference to the "inner man" authenticated by Judas' work that night. Why the feet washing? Where is the key to solve the question? "Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." First teach, then baptize them and then teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you—to observe. We claim our authority from this commission; and for church ordinances we go to the form as instituted by our Great Exemplar. "Ye call me Master and Lord (Master is teacher and Lord is one having authority to command), and ye say well, for so I am; If I then the Lord and the Master have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet." Why? "For I have given you an example that ye also should do as I have done to you." Truly, "A servant is not greater than his Lord, neither an Apostle that is sent

greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things (the Supper, the feet washing, the bread and the wine) blessed are ye if ye do them." Shall we with the words of life in our hands single out from the institutions of one single hour and say, that this only is binding on us? The very fact that Jesus was speaking not of bodily cleansing, saying nothing of the corresponding fact that *these things* were not preparatory for a night of rest, teaches us that as the bread and wine is monumental—an evidence of our faith, so is the feet washing a token of that humility of soul and brotherly love that permeates the church and should live together since our Savior gave them divine authority and connected and designated them "*these things*," and since the "servant is not greater than his Lord," would it not be well for us, as followers of an exemplar, consider in the absence of that which declares null and void the institutions of our Savior as binding on us?

J. L. WIGLE.

### "The Lord's Day."

Dear Bro. Floyd:

I am pleased with the spirit and "get up" of your paper. I hope you will hear me patiently, and set me right if I am wrong. In reading your paper I see two things. 1. That the Christian Church (or Campbellites) are warm-hearted defenders of a strict adherence to Bible teaching, which is right. And 2nd, they call the first day of the week "Lord's day," which is wrong, perhaps. I say it is wrong 1. Because there is manifestly no Bible for it. John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day. 2. The phrase has no history, it occurs nowhere else in the Bible, nothing is said as to how the day is to be kept, what day it is, or whether it is to be kept at all or not. 3. It is out of order, because the first day of the week is called Sabbath eight times in the New Testament, twice by John himself. Sabbath has a history, we know what it means. And the frequent use of the name Lord when not required may be profane. At any rate the too frequent use of the name of God is an aggravated breach of the third commandment. But on this I do not insist. But I think it strange that none of the Bible writers ever thought of that delightful and honorable name "Lord's day" for the Christian Sabbath.

WM. M. STEWART.

Puyallup, W. T., July, 1883.

### Correspondence.

FROM T. F. CAMPBELL.

AURORA, IND.,  
June 26, 1883.

Dear Bro.:

I have traveled many miles since I wrote you; and the incidents have been so numerous that I know not how to untangle the yarn, which has become greatly confused on the reel, and place it consecutively before you.

From Springfield, Ill., I went to Decatur, where I met Bro. Pinkerton, and made a few lectures; thence to Indianapolis, that wonderful city of the interior with its seventy-five thousand inhabitants, far in the interior, without navigation, the result of a combination of rich land and railroad connections. It is a city of churches, in which the Disciples are represented by about six congregations. Chief among these is the Central church with its membership of seven hundred, presided over by Bro. David Walk. The cause seems to be in a flourishing condition. I attended the celebration of the semi-centennial of the founding of the Central church in Indianapolis at which Pres. Pendleton of Bethany, Va., and Bro. I. Errett of the Standard were invited guests and speakers. Immediately connected with the history of the congregation were Dr. Brown and Bro. Jameson, venerable men whose long and earnest lives have been consecrated to the gospel work. Bro. Jameson is a double cousin of our Bro. T. D. Humphreys of Hillsboro, Or. The favor is very striking. He is a fine singer, and he delighted the large audience several times in the semi-centennial meetings with solos rendered in the very finest style. But the friends at Monmouth will be most interested to hear of David Rohrer and his interesting family consisting now, since the death of Sister Rohrer, more than two years ago, of Sisters Mary and Alice, and Charlie. There lives not a more generous and noble spirit in any land than Dave Rohrer. The girls and Charlie, with their cousin, John Rusk, who makes his home with them, spared no effort to make my stay among them pleasant. Indeed it was so delightful to be with them, that I spent nearly all my time, when not actually engaged, speaking in their hospitable and happy mansion. They are still ministering to the

comfort and cure of the afflicted by furnishing to consumptives and others, the Great Oregon Cure, Mrs. Rohrer's New Remedy for the Lungs. I learn that notwithstanding the limited effort to place this valuable medicine fairly before the public by a fair system of advertising, the sales, since the death of Sister Rohrer, have been well sustained and the business is reasonably good. With ample means for advertising much suffering might be relieved and a full harvest of wealth reaped by the proprietor.

From Indianapolis I came to this point on the Ohio river, where I find a little band of Disciples, without a house of worship, yet nobly striving for position amongst the wealthy denominational organizations by which they are surrounded. Here, as elsewhere, a few choice, leading spirits constitute both the salt and the light. Bro. J. N. Walton, a Christian hero, and his excellent wife, a noble sister whose influence is better than a host, are bearing the burden and heat of the day, hoping for others to come in later and share with them the pleasure and fruits of successful toil. Bro. Walton's mother, residing with him, and Bro. and Sister Davis, old Disciples, are heroically seconding their efforts, while other brethren and sisters are doing what they can to push forward the good work. Satan has a stronghold on this town, however, as seen by a large distillery and a brewery of grand proportions, supplemented with thirty or forty retail *drunkeries*. The Disciples here, as almost everywhere, are staunch and earnest prohibitionists.

In my travels I have noted with sadness a want of courtesy amongst our preaching brethren, which I may be permitted, I trust, to speak of without offence to any. Often when a meeting closes, the preacher in charge rushes around shaking hands with all as if afraid that the neglect of one might affect his salary, while a strange preacher is left standing near the pulpit twirling his hat between his fingers or tapping a front tooth with the head of his umbrella. I have often been made to think of good Bro. J. E. Murphy who never overlooked any, nor failed through any selfish motive or feeling to show all the courtesy due to a stranger. I say not these things from any want of attention to myself. Indeed I have received, in the main, all the kindness and honor due me. But as all