

tural at the present time? To these questions the *Advocate* makes no reply. Now we see no use in arguing something he does not deny, and if he does not intend to meet the issue fairly, then we do not care to waste more time with it. If weekly communion is not Scriptural, let him say so, and we will proceed to defend our practice. Let him also tell us what is Scriptural. We want something definite along here.

2. For the command for immersion we pointed him to the commission, and asked, "Did Christ command immersion in his last commission?" As well as we remember, he answers this by denying that Christ commanded the *specific* act of immersion. Now brother, this is not the question. The question is simply, Did Christ in this commission command *immersion*? Will the *Advocate* answer yes or no? We say *yes*. Now we ask the *Advocate* to state definitely if there was any thing *else* commanded? If so, what was it? We pause for *definite answers* to these questions.

PERSONAL MENTION.

We learn that Bro. Bruce Wolverton has a fine girl baby at his house. We congratulate him on his family addition. We look for lots of good contributions to the *HERALD* from his pen now.

The wife of Bro. L. B. Wilkes has just come from Mo. to California to be with her husband. This indicates we suppose that Bro. W. intends making California his permanent home.

We are sorry to learn that Bro. R. B. Neal, of the *Worker*, Louisville, Ky., is quite unwell. He is improving and will soon be at his post as usual.

ECCLESIASTICISM.

It would seem that our brother, "Christian Missionary," was a little unfortunate in the use of his language the other week in which he said, "About all the ecclesiasticism we have (and it would be well if we had none for there is none in the New Testament) is comprehended in our cherished idol, a plurality of elders and deacons in every congregation." In reply to our criticism of this statement, "Christian Missionary" in another column of this issue says: "Now while I don't want ecclesiasticism or idols

in the church, I did not say one word against elders and deacons." Now if the plain statement that "about all the ecclesiasticism we have is comprehended in our

cherished idol, a plurality of elders and deacons in every congregation," is not saying "one word against elders and deacons," then we confess we do not understand the meaning and force of the English language. It was this wholesale sweep at the divinely appointed officers of the church, as we understood it, that we called a remnant of the Papacy; and we are still of the same opinion. But as our brother disavows any attack on these officers, of course we accept his correction, and proceed to his real position as he defines it.

Just what our brother means by "our modern deacon" and "ministers of the gospel" is not very plain to us. If he means that those *called* deacons in some of our churches who are appointed to carry around the bread and wine and whose duty seems to end with this simple act, are nowhere described in the New Testament, then he is probably correct. But if he means that there was no particular class of officers described in the New Testament whose *official* duty it was to look after and attend simply to the *secular* wants and interests of the congregation, and that the "deacons" described by Paul were all public proclaimers of the gospel, or evangelists, then we think he is very much mistaken. On the other hand, we submit that there is not an intimation in the New Testament that teaching or preaching was any part of the official duty of the deacons. That there was a particular class of officers in the church called deacons, is certain, for Paul, while giving their qualification, speaks of their using the *office of a deacon*. Now are we to understand that these official servants of the church were all public teachers and preachers of the word, and that there is no such thing as the office of deacon (diakonos) as has been understood and taught from the beginning of this reformation? Our brother seems to place *deacons* on an equality with "clerks," "trustees," etc. Do we read of the *office* of clerks and trustees in the Bible? and are these to be selected and ordained to their work like the deacons and elders? The latter are divinely appointed; the former are human and unknown to the Bible.

"Christian Missionary" thinks no power attaches to the person by virtue of his official position. Well, are not the elders to *RULE*? If so, by what authority, if not by virtue of their *official* position? Or do we understand that all alike are to be rulers!

His allusion to feet-washing has been sufficiently dwelt on in our columns. If there was no difference between this institution and the institution of the Lord's supper, then we can deal with both of them in the same way. Hence we can observe the *principle* of the Lord's supper without observing the act itself which Christ instituted. This is exactly the view Henry Ward Beecher takes of it; hence he says that milk and cheese will answer him as well as the emblems the Lord used, and these can be partaken of once a year or every week just as will best suit his fancy and convenience. It is only the *substance* he is after. It is true that Jesus instituted both, but it is also true that the one was instituted for the *church*, while the other was a *private affair* depending so far as the act was concerned on the customs of the people in that age and designed simply to teach a lesson of *humility*. This is the reason why we can observe the *principle* taught in feet-washing without retaining the specific act itself under all circumstances, while the Lord's supper being a *church ordinance*, can not be retained in *substance* without doing the *thing* commanded. Hence while we believe in feet-washing (and a good deal of it) we prefer to attend to it in private. If our brother wishes to observe his part of it in the public assembly, he will please excuse us, for indeed we do not see how he can avoid this conclusion while he holds his present view of the subject. But he thinks neither the *language* nor *idea* of "church ordinance" is in the New Testament, and thus he tries to convict us of inconsistency. Well, Paul talks about the "ordinance of God" and the "ordinances of divine service," and we naturally suppose that some of these are in the *church* of God. Hence the *idea* of "church ordinance" must be in the New Testament, to say the least of it. When we observe the lesson taught in the institution of feet-washing we observe all the Savior purposed in the command, and we do it *because* he has commanded it. We still contend, therefore, that we should observe

nothing for which we do not have a positive command, a plain precedent or a logical and necessary inference; and when we have such evidence, we are not at liberty to neglect any institution or make any substitutes.

SUFFERING FOR CHRIST.

Peter says, "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf." To suffer as a Christian is to suffer for Christ and his cause, and this is a suffering which no Christian may expect to escape. The world is under the influence of the evil one, and he who would be a Christian must stand firm in opposition to all evil. This will not only bring opposition but trials through which he must pass. The true Christian has buckled on the armor of God and volunteered for life, and he who would obey the orders must fight the battle to the end. With him there is no such a thing as a compromise or failure. He knows that Jesus is his leader, and that He has suffered and died for every soldier of the cross. Hence he fully makes up his mind to meet and overcome opposition, to pass through trials, and to suffer for Christ at the hand of his opposers. But in all of this he is not ashamed nor cast down, for he knows that God is his friend and Jesus his exemplar. He knows the prize cannot be obtained without a race, nor the victory won without a fight. Hence he glorifies God on this behalf. He realizes that he is suffering for Christ and not for self, and in this thought lies his strength of endurance when he is brought face to face with the trials and difficulties of life which through his pathway from time to time. But in the days of Peter, and so it is now, some men and women seem to think it strange that they are called upon to suffer for Christ. To all such the apostle continues: "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you; but rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy. If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you; on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified." These are consoling words to the child of God as he passes through